

A Work Project, presented as part of the requirements for the Award of a Master's degree in  
Management from the Nova School of Business and Economics.

An Empirical Examination of the Relationship between Sustainable Consumption  
and Luxury Purchases: A Consumer Behavior Perspective - The Impact of  
Explicit Sustainability Marketing on Consumer Choices

Emma Paula Petronella Lena Maria Breukel

Defense Date: 31<sup>st</sup> of January 2025

Work project carried out under the supervision of:

Professor Arnaud Monnier

09/02/2025

## **Abstract**

This study examines the relationship between luxury and sustainability, focusing on how sustainable luxury marketing influences consumer behavior. Using an experimental survey design, four hypotheses were tested to evaluate the impact of sustainability marketing, product guarantees, sustainable framing, and messaging strategies on consumer choices. Findings indicate that sustainability marketing in the luxury sector has the potential to promote sustainable consumption. The study examines how integrating authenticity and durability into brand strategies is essential to aligning luxury with sustainability and fostering long-term consumer trust. While sustainability is a key factor for consumers, its direct influence on willingness to pay remains limited.

**Keywords:** sustainability, durability, sustainable luxury, fashion, sustainable consumption, consumer behavior

This work used infrastructure and resources funded by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (UID/ECO/00124/2013, UID/ECO/00124/2019 and Social Sciences DataLab, Project 22209), POR Lisboa (LISBOA-01-0145-FEDER-007722 and Social Sciences DataLab, Project 22209) and POR Norte (Social Sciences DataLab, Project 22209).

## Table of Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>List of Abbreviations.....</b>   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>1 Introduction .....</b>   | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>2 Background.....</b>  | <b>6</b>  |
| 2.1 Understanding Luxury.....   | 6         |
| 2.2 Assessing the Luxury Fashion Market .....   | 8         |
| 2.3 Understanding Sustainable Fashion .....   | 9         |
| 2.4 Market Trends in Sustainable Luxury Fashion .....                                   | 11        |
| <b>3 Literature Review.....</b>   | <b>12</b> |
| 3.1 Theoretical Frameworks Used to Assess Sustainable Behavior .....                    | 13        |
| 3.2 Luxury Sustainability Paradox .....   | 14        |
| 3.3 Consumer Perceptions of Luxury and Sustainability.....                              | 16        |
| 3.4 Drivers of Sustainable Consumption.....   | 18        |
| 3.5 Brand and Marketing Implications.....   | 20        |
| 3.6 Challenges in Promoting Sustainable Luxury .....                                    | 21        |
| 3.7 Identified Research Gap .....   | 23        |
| <b>4 General Methodology.....</b>   | <b>24</b> |
| <b>5 Study 1: The Impact of Explicit Sustainability Marketing on Consumer Choices..</b> | <b>26</b> |
| 5.1 Introduction .....  | 26        |
| 5.2 Literature Review .....   | 27        |
| 5.3 Methodology .....   | 30        |
| 5.4 Results .....   | 32        |
| 5.5 Discussion .....  | 33        |
| 5.6 Conclusion.....   | 36        |
| <b>6 General Discussion and Conclusion.....</b>   | <b>38</b> |
| 6.1 Discussion of Findings .....  | 38        |
| 6.2 Practical Implications .....  | 41        |
| 6.3 Limitations .....   | 43        |
| 6.4 Concluding Remarks and Future Research Directions .....                             | 44        |
| <b>List of References .....</b>   | <b>47</b> |
| <b>Appendix .....</b>   | <b>57</b> |
| Appendix A – Experimental Survey Design .....   | 57        |
| Appendix B – Respondent Characteristics and Demographics.....                           | 69        |
| Appendix C – Results Study 1 .....  | 72        |

**List of Abbreviations**

|           |                                   |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| AUC.....  | Area Under the ROC Curve          |
| CAGR..... | Compound Annual Growth Rate       |
| CI.....   | Confidence Interval               |
| CSR.....  | Corporate Social Responsibility   |
| EU.....   | European Union                    |
| PwC.....  | PricewaterhouseCoopers            |
| ROC.....  | Receiver Operating Characteristic |
| TPB.....  | Theory of Planned Behavior        |
| TRA.....  | Theory of Reasoned Action         |
| UK.....   | United Kingdom                    |
| US.....   | United States                     |
| VIF.....  | Variance Inflation Factor         |
| WTP.....  | Willingness to Pay                |

## 1 Introduction

“Buy less, choose well, make it last” (Vivienne Westwood, n.d.). This statement by Vivienne Westwood, renowned British fashion designer and pioneer of the punk fashion movement, encapsulates a significant shift in the luxury industry. Traditionally characterized by indulgence and opulence, luxury is being redefined to align with broader societal demands for accountability. This transition is particularly important in the fashion industry, as the sector is responsible for 10% of global carbon emissions (UNECE 2018). By encouraging consumers to prioritize durable, high-quality items over short-lived alternatives, luxury brands have the potential to significantly reduce these emissions and address a key factor driving global warming (Sun, Bellezza, and Paharia 2021).

This shift reflects not only a response to environmental challenges but also changing consumer values. According to PricewaterhouseCoopers’ (PwC; 2024) Voice of the Consumer Survey, 80% of consumers are willing to pay more for sustainably produced or sourced goods. Similarly, McKinsey & Company (2023b) highlights that 87% of fashion executives believe sustainability regulations will impact their business in the coming year. These findings underscore a new reality: sustainability is no longer optional but central to the luxury market.

As consumers increasingly prioritize products that align with their values, luxury brands operate in a dynamic environment that requires constant adaptation to changing expectations. Attributes such as ethical sourcing, eco-friendly practices, and product longevity have become critical to staying competitive. Brands like *Gucci* and *Stella McCartney*, pioneers of sustainable luxury, demonstrate their leadership through initiatives such as their commitment to carbon neutrality and the use of innovative sustainable materials such as mushroom leather (Gucci 2023; Stella McCartney 2024). However, this shift is not without tension. The traditional ethos of indulgence and exclusivity often clashes with sustainability’s emphasis on conservation and moderation, creating a paradox that the industry must navigate.

This intersection of luxury and sustainability is reshaping the entire definition of luxury. It is no longer just about exclusivity or rarity; but about creating lasting value for both consumers and the planet. As the industry evolves, it has the potential to become a powerful force for positive change, balancing timeless craftsmanship with modern responsibility.

While much of the discussion around sustainability focuses on corporate practices, this research takes a consumer-centric perspective, specifically in the context of the luxury fashion industry. The study is limited to examining how consumers perceive sustainability attributes in luxury fashion products, such as durability, ethical sourcing, and environmentally friendly practices. By narrowing the focus to consumption patterns, the study seeks to understand how consumer behavior interacts with evolving sustainability demands in this market.

This consumer focus is supported by a growing body of research that examines the relationship between luxury and sustainability. Sun, Bellezza, and Paharia (2021) emphasize that framing luxury products as durable and long-term investments encourages consumers to view them as consistent with sustainable values. Their concept of “buy less, buy luxury” suggests that quality purchases can counteract the overconsumption associated with fast fashion (Sun, Bellezza, and Paharia 2021, 28). However, prior studies also reveal contradictions in consumer attitudes. Achabou and Dekhili (2013) argue that while consumers express interest in sustainable luxury, their purchasing behavior often prioritizes exclusivity and status over environmental concerns. Similarly, Kapferer and Michaut-Denizeau (2014) highlight the difficulty consumers face in reconciling sustainability with luxury’s traditional emphasis on indulgence and rarity.

Existing research highlights the potential for luxury to promote sustainable consumption, particularly through attributes like durability. However, a limited understanding remains on how consumers reconcile the tension between luxury’s exclusivity and sustainability’s focus on responsibility. Additionally, luxury has the potential to encourage

behaviors that prioritize reduced consumption in favor of fewer, higher-quality purchases. This shift, which may also increase consumers' financial commitment, is a promising area for further research. This thesis addresses these gaps by examining how consumers navigate indulgence and responsibility, exploring whether luxury can drive more mindful consumption practices. In doing so, it builds on existing literature and offers insights for aligning the luxury sector with environmental priorities.

Following this introduction, key concepts central to this study are defined to provide a contextual framework. This is preceded by a review of the existing literature on luxury and sustainability, which provides theoretical insights and identifies key research gaps in understanding consumer behavior. Building on this, the core of the study is structured around four hypotheses, each addressing a different aspect. The first explores how sustainability marketing that emphasizes durability and timelessness can shift consumer preferences toward luxury products over cheaper alternatives. The second analyzes whether life-cycle extensions, such as lifetime guarantees, encourage consumers to prioritize fewer, higher-quality purchases. The third looks at how framing luxury as an investment in quality and longevity affects willingness to pay (WTP) for sustainable features. Finally, the fourth examines how different approaches to sustainability messaging, contrasting excessive versus moderate claims, influence purchase intent and perceived authenticity. The thesis concludes by synthesizing these findings in a broader discussion and reflecting on their implications for both theory and practice. It also offers recommendations for how luxury brands can align themselves with sustainability while preserving their core values.

## **2 Background**

### **2.1 Understanding Luxury**

The concept of luxury is inherently multifaceted and varies across cultures, industries, and individual preferences. It combines tangible qualities, such as superior craftsmanship, with

intangible attributes, such as exclusivity, status, and symbolic value (Kapferer and Michaut 2016). This complexity makes it essential to clearly define luxury, particularly in the context of its intersection with sustainable consumption, which is the foundation of this study. Without a precise understanding of luxury, assessing how sustainability aligns with or challenges its traditional characteristics becomes difficult.

Luxury has been described as “more than necessary” (Bearden and Etzel 1982, 184) and as an “art applied to functional items” (Kapferer 1997, 253). These definitions demonstrate that luxury goes beyond mere functionality to create elevated experiences rooted in beauty, and aspiration. Historically, luxury has symbolized a dream or idealized lifestyle, being associated with indulgence, and superfluity (Barnier, Rodina, and Valette-Florence 2006; Seringhaus 2002). For consumers, luxury goods often serve as tools of conspicuous consumption, allowing individuals to signal social status and assert identity (O’Cass and McEwen 2004). Core characteristics such as rarity, cultural significance, and emotional value further distinguish luxury from other categories and reinforce its symbolic and desirable role in society (Brun et al. 2008; Vigneron and Johnson 2004).

In practice, the distinction between luxury and premium products is less clear but crucial for this study. While luxury is defined by its focus on artistry, heritage, and symbolic value, premium products emphasize superior functionality and measurable quality (Kapferer and Bastien 2009; Karpik and Scott 2010). This divergence is also manifested in pricing strategies: premium products rely on competitive justification, while luxury pricing is rooted in perceived uniqueness and cultural prestige (Kapferer and Bastien 2012).

For the purposes of this research, we focus primarily on premium products because they are more closely aligned with the attributes of interest. While these distinctions set premium products apart from true luxury, consumer perceptions often blur the boundaries between the two categories. This overlap is particularly evident in the context of sustainable consumption,

where both premium and luxury goods are increasingly evaluated not only for their symbolic value but also for their potential to align with ethical and environmental considerations. By adopting a broader definition of luxury, this study captures the nuanced ways in which consumers navigate these overlapping categories. This perspective allows for a comprehensive examination of how sustainability attributes influence purchase decisions across both segments. It reveals the evolving role of premium and luxury products as instruments for expressing not only social status, but also personal values associated with responsibility and environmental stewardship.

## **2.2 Assessing the Luxury Fashion Market**

The luxury fashion market continues to grow steadily, solidifying its position as a key driver of the global economy. Valued at approximately \$245 billion in 2023, the market is projected to reach \$410 billion by 2032, representing a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 5.8% over the forecast period (Straits Research 2023). This growth reflects the industry's ability to adapt to evolving consumer expectations while maintaining its core values.

The United States (US) will remain the largest domestic market for luxury goods, with estimated sales of \$35 billion in 2024 (Statista 2024). However, the Asia-Pacific region, particularly China, is predicted to drive future expansion. By 2025, Chinese consumers are expected to account for nearly 40% of global luxury spending, driven by a growing middle class and increasing demand for aspirational purchases (Bain & Company 2023). This shift reflects not only rising purchasing power, but also a growing appreciation for Western luxury brands, solidifying the region's influence on global sales.

Long considered the epicenter of luxury fashion, the European market continues to play a pivotal role in the industry. Famous for iconic houses such as *Louis Vuitton*, *Chanel*, and *Hermès*, Europe continues to lead the world in both production and total consumption, which includes domestic and tourist spending. According to Bain & Company (2024), overall luxury

consumption in Europe reached €102 billion in 2023, supported by a 50% year-on-year increase in tourist spending, entirely driven by higher purchase prices. Data indicates that spending by US tourists in Europe has increased by a factor of 2.5 since 2019, while spending by Middle Eastern tourists has risen by 70% over the same period. However, expenditures by Chinese tourists have yet to regain their pre-pandemic level, remaining at approximately 40% of the 2019 figure. European craftsmanship continues to underpin the market, exemplified by *LVMH*, one of the world's top-performing luxury conglomerates. In 2023, Europe (excluding France) accounted for 17% of the group's total revenue, while France contributed an additional 8% (LVMH 2023). These figures underscore the region's importance in the global luxury landscape. Despite increasing competition from other regions, Europe's dual role as a producer and consumer of luxury goods ensures its continued dominance in the global market.

### **2.3 Understanding Sustainable Fashion**

Sustainable fashion has emerged as an essential focus at the intersection of environmental responsibility and consumer behavior, reflecting broader societal trends toward eco-conscious living. However, in order to gain a comprehensive understanding of sustainable fashion and its implications, it is essential to first define sustainability itself. As a dynamic and multifaceted concept, sustainability evolves continually to address pressing global challenges across environmental, social, and economic domains (Purvis, Mao, and Robinson 2019; Vogt and Weber 2019). The Brundtland Report (1987) provides a foundational definition of sustainable development, describing it as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (37). This definition highlights the intrinsic adaptability of sustainability, enabling its objectives to evolve in alignment with emerging global priorities (Purvis, Mao, and Robinson 2019). However, the lack of a universally accepted definition presents a challenge to researchers. Scholars have identified over 300 definitions of sustainability across various disciplines, underscoring the

concept's diverse interpretations and applicability (Geissdoerfer et al. 2017).

This dynamic understanding of sustainability provides a foundation for examining its specific role within the fashion industry, which represents a critical point in global sustainability discussions. Frequently identified as one of the most polluting industries globally, fashion production is associated with considerable water consumption, the use of harmful dyeing chemicals, and the disposal of large quantities of unsold goods (Legere and Kang 2020). Such practices endanger ecosystems and give rise to concerns regarding the long-term sustainability of the industry. The need to address these challenges has led to the emergence of the concept of sustainable fashion, which aims to integrate sustainability principles into every stage of the value chain, from the sourcing of materials to post-consumer recycling.

Sustainable fashion discussions began in the 1960s, driven by increased awareness of the environmental impact of traditional production practices (Purvis, Mao, and Robinson 2019). By the 1980s and 1990s, consumer advocacy prompted brands to adopt sustainable practices, including the use of organic and fair-trade materials (Henninger, Alevizou, and Oates 2016; Jung and Jin 2014). In the early 2000s, it transitioned from a niche to a mainstream movement, driven by advances in material sourcing and recycling (Beard 2008).

This evolution of sustainable fashion reflects an ongoing effort to reconcile environmental and social responsibility with consumer expectations. However, its implementation remains challenging, as interchangeable terms like "green," "ecological," "organic," and "ethical" fashion often confuse consumers, researchers, and businesses (Thomas 2008, 530). This ambiguity, coupled with higher costs of sustainable materials and logistical hurdles in post-use recycling, complicates the realization of fully sustainable practices (Biswas 2017; Strübel et al. 2023).

Building on the challenges of implementing sustainable fashion, the market has

evolved significantly, driven by shifting consumer expectations. Luxury brands are uniquely positioned to lead this transformation by emphasizing values like longevity, ethical sourcing, and environmental responsibility, which align naturally with sustainability principles. Nevertheless, meaningful progress can only be achieved by addressing the systemic challenges that persist, including those related to resource scarcity. As indicated by the Boston Consulting Group (2021), while global demand for sustainable raw materials is projected to triple by 2030, supply is expected to increase by only 50%. This imbalance thus calls for the development of innovative circular business models and material sourcing strategies. Consumer trends further underscore the importance of sustainability in fashion. It is anticipated that by 2025, Millennials (individuals born between 1981 and 1996) and Generation Z (those born between 1997 and 2012) will represent the majority of the luxury market (Dimock 2019). These demographics are inclined to prioritize ethical sourcing and transparency in purchasing decisions. As reported by McKinsey & Company (2023a), 60% of Generation Z consumers are willing to pay a premium for sustainably produced goods. These shifts make sustainability a pivotal factor in market success, compelling brands to strike a balance between environmental objectives and consumer preferences.

#### **2.4 Market Trends in Sustainable Luxury Fashion**

Building on the preferences of Millennials and Generation Z, the luxury fashion market is experiencing transformative changes. One of the most notable trends is the rapid growth of the pre-owned luxury market, which aligns with the values of younger, sustainability-conscious consumers. Platforms such as *The RealReal* and *Vestiaire Collective* have emerged as key players in meeting the demand for pre-owned luxury goods (The RealReal 2024; Vestiaire Collective 2024). According to Business Research Insights (2024), the global second-hand luxury market was valued at \$26 billion in 2023 and is forecast to reach \$69 billion by 2032, at a CAGR of 11.5%.

At the same time, digital innovation is playing a progressively important role in driving sustainability in the luxury market. For example, virtual fashion and augmented reality initiatives reduce the need for physical production, minimizing waste and carbon footprints. *Gucci's Sneaker Garage* is an example of this, allowing users to virtually try on, customize, and explore digital products such as the *Gucci Virtual 25*, providing an eco-friendly alternative to traditional product launches (Gucci 2024). Similarly, *Balenciaga's* digital-only collections in virtual environments like *Fortnite* highlight how immersive digital spaces can redefine engagement while addressing environmental concerns (Fortnite 2024).

E-commerce is further accelerating this trend, with more than 25% of global luxury sales now occurring online; a figure that will grow as brands enhance immersive, personalized experiences (McKinsey & Company 2023b). These strategies foster deeper connections with consumers and support sustainability by reducing physical inventory and waste.

Additionally, digital technologies are driving transparency in supply chains. Platforms such as *Renoon* use blockchain to verify the origin of materials, empowering consumers to make ethical choices (Renoon 2024). Such innovations emphasize the luxury sector's evolving commitment to accountability and sustainable practices, positioning it as a leader in addressing global environmental challenges.

### **3 Literature Review**

The evolving interplay between luxury and sustainability has received considerable attention in academic research, reflecting a broader shift in societal values and consumer expectations. At the heart of this discourse is the question of whether these two seemingly opposing domains can coexist in harmony (Kapferer and Michaut-Denizeau 2014). This question gives rise to the so-called *Luxury Sustainability Paradox*, which defines the intuitive contradiction between luxury's extravagance and sustainability's principles of preservation and resource efficiency (Athwal et al. 2019; Heil and Langer 2017).

To fully understand the market implications of this paradox and the state of research, it is essential to examine consumer perceptions and the motivations that influence their purchasing decisions. Identifying common attributes between luxury and sustainability may reveal ways in which they can coexist. From a marketing perspective, integrating sustainability into the value proposition of luxury brands is crucial for shaping consumer behavior and strengthening brand loyalty (Beckham and Voyer 2014).

### **3.1 Theoretical Frameworks Used to Assess Sustainable Behavior**

To explore consumer perceptions and motivations of sustainable behavior in depth, a breakdown of the theoretical foundation is needed. Two key frameworks that have been used extensively in this context are the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) and the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA; Balasubramanian and Sheykhmaleki 2024).

The TPB is used to understand how consumers make rational decisions (Qi and Ploeger 2019). It states that, before deciding how to act, individuals are thought to carefully evaluate the information they have and consider the possible outcomes, assuming that they make decisions rationally (Lira and Costa 2022). The TPB has, therefore, been used to assess sustainable consumer behavior for several decades (Yuriev et al. 2020). Created by Ajzen (1991), the TPB proposes that individual intention can be understood through (1) attitude, which represents personal evaluations of an object or issue; (2) subjective norm, which reflects the perceived social pressure from others; and (3) perceived behavioral control, which captures an individual's sense of how easy or challenging it might be to engage in a particular behavior. According to Paul et al. (2015), looking at consumer attitudes is most important for predicting consumer intentions toward sustainable behavior. Consumers who like certain aspects of an item are more willing to translate their purchase intention into an actual purchase (Cerri, Testa, and Rizzi 2018). Similarly, subjective norms often shape intentions to purchase sustainable products, as social circles help to raise awareness and concern about environmental issues

(Moser 2015). Lira and Costa (2022) found that slow fashion, which prioritizes longevity, is driven by key elements of the TPB. Ethical concerns, in particular, lead consumers to reject fast fashion – characterized by rapid turnover – in favor of sustainable options.

The TRA, developed by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975), explains how motivation affects the likelihood of engaging in a particular behavior. Similar to the TPB, it highlights the links between personal attitudes, perceived social expectations, and resulting behaviors. People who strongly believe that a behavior will bring positive results are more likely to have positive attitudes toward it, which increases their chances of actually doing it (Liu, Segev, and Villar 2017). However, the TPB extends the TRA by recognizing that intentions alone do not always lead to action. External circumstances, such as limited resources or situational barriers, often determine whether an individual can translate his or her intentions into behavior.

### **3.2 Luxury Sustainability Paradox**

While theoretical frameworks such as the TPB and TRA provide insights into individual sustainable behavior, the *Luxury Sustainability Paradox* shifts the focus to a broader systemic level. This paradox represents the intrinsic conflict between the defining attributes of luxury – exclusivity, indulgence, and high resource consumption – and the tenets of sustainability, which prioritize conservation, ethics, and moderation (Athwal et al. 2019; Heil and Langer 2017). Historically, luxury brands have pursued perfection and rarity, frequently utilizing resource-intensive materials such as exotic leathers and precious metals that raise concerns about biodiversity and animal welfare (Kapferer 2010; Kapferer and Michaut-Denizeau 2014). While luxury is criticized for its association with excess and social inequality, it is simultaneously praised for its exceptional craftsmanship, quality, and durability, traits that align with sustainable consumption practices (Heil and Langer 2017; Kapferer 2010; Kapferer and Bastien 2009; Vigneron and Johnson 2004). These attributes distinguish luxury from the fast fashion industry, offering the potential to contribute positively to sustainability by

emphasizing long-term value (Grazzini, Acuti, and Aiello 2021).

Luxury brands such as *Gucci* have responded to growing consumer demands for sustainability by implementing initiatives like its *Equilibrium program* to align with customer expectations and regulatory pressures (Gucci 2023). However, despite these efforts, sustainability often occupies a secondary position in consumer priorities regarding purchasing decisions (Ehrich and Irwin 2005; Gardetti and Torres 2013). Furthermore, consumer behavior frequently falls short of the expressed interest in sustainability, as WTP for sustainable luxury products does not consistently align with these values (Heil and Langer 2017). The WTP for sustainable luxury is influenced by diverse value perceptions, including conspicuousness, uniqueness, and quality (Kapferer and Bastien 2009; Vigneron and Johnson 1999; 2004). While younger generations, particularly Millennials and Generation Z, demonstrate a growing desire for sustainability, this does not always translate into a higher WTP for sustainable products (Bhattacharya and Sen 2004; Heil and Langer 2017). This divergence between attitudes and purchasing behavior underscores the complexity of aligning luxury consumption with sustainability principles.

Adding to this complexity are perceptions of quality, which remain a significant barrier to integrating sustainability into luxury. A notable concern among consumers is that environmentally friendly modifications may compromise product quality (Achabou and Dekhili 2013; Davies, Lee, and Ahonkhai 2012). This is supported by findings from Achabou and Dekhili (2013), who discovered that luxury products crafted from recycled materials were perceived as inferior in quality despite acknowledging their environmental benefits. Beyond quality concerns, other factors also shape perceptions of sustainable luxury. Social consciousness, personal style, and cultural context play essential roles in influencing how consumers balance sustainability and luxury attributes (Cervellon and Shammass 2013; Wang et al. 2021). These diverse influences reflect the multifaceted nature of consumer expectations,

which luxury brands must navigate to address the paradox effectively.

### 3.3 Consumer Perceptions of Luxury and Sustainability

Building on the complexity of aligning luxury and sustainability, it is essential to examine how consumer perceptions are defined and structured. Researchers consistently define consumers' perceptions of luxury items with qualities such as expensive, qualitative, rare, excessive, and aesthetic, among others (Dubois, Laurent, and Czellar 2001; Kunz, May, and Schmidt 2020). Generally, the perception of a luxury brand can be vastly influenced by marketing incentives, word-of-mouth, and interaction with the brand (Hudders 2012; Romaniuk and Huang 2020). However, as discussed in the previous chapter on the *Luxury Sustainability Paradox*, the combination of luxury and sustainability remains somewhat conflicting for several consumer groups. For instance, Kapferer and Michaut-Denizeau (2014) found that about one-third of their study respondents perceived luxury and sustainability as contradictory, whereas another third believed they were concordant.

Luxury consumers view a brand's commitment to the environment as a secondary factor in their decision to purchase luxury goods and perceive the use of recycled materials in luxury goods as negative (Ehrich and Irwin 2005; Achabou and Dekhili 2013). A prominent example of how an Italian leather company handles this negative perception is by emphasizing the uniqueness of the products rather than focusing on their eco-design itself (Cimatti, Campana, and Carluccio 2017; Kunz, May, and Schmidt 2020). Notably, this negative perception cannot be generalized, as perceptions of luxury product quality vary by nationality. For instance, Saudi consumers tend to view the quality of items as lower than French consumers when social and sustainability information is provided (Dekhili, Achabou, and Alharbi 2019).

This tension is further complicated by the duality of how consumers consciously and unconsciously associate luxury with sustainability. Beckham and Voyer (2014) tested

conscious and unconscious methods to investigate attitudes toward sustainable luxury, and the results show that while conscious attitudes can vary based on context, consumers tend to unconsciously associate luxury with unsustainability. Participants were quicker to associate luxury with unsustainability than with sustainability, highlighting an inherent tension in the consumer mindset between these two ideas (Beckham and Voyer 2014). It was also found that consumers are more favorable toward luxury items they personally deem sustainable, as opposed to items externally labeled as such. This suggests that authenticity and personal belief are critical to consumer acceptance of sustainable luxury, indicating a need for a deeper understanding of how personal ethics influence buying behavior, especially in the context of sustainability (Beckham and Voyer 2014; Irwin and Spira 1997).

Beyond individual attitudes, specific industries provide examples of how luxury and sustainability intersect in unique ways. In the hospitality sector, luxury hotels often emphasize environmental responsibility alongside high-end offerings, creating an opportunity to align these seemingly opposing concepts (Kunz, May, and Schmidt 2020). Research highlights that characteristics like scarcity and ephemerality may play a role in shaping this perception. For example, Janssen et al. (2014) suggest that when luxury experiences are exclusive but short-lived, this can influence consumers' perceptions of whether luxury hotels can genuinely incorporate sustainable practices. Similarly, companies like Tesla exemplify how luxury and sustainability can coexist in the automotive industry by integrating eco-friendly technology (Aybaly et al. 2017).

Finally, the perceptions of the individuals who purchase luxury products add another dimension to this discussion. Respondents to the aforementioned study conducted by Beckham and Voyer (2014) reacted very positively to sustainable luxury, yet argued that the typical luxury consumer would rather purchase conventional items compared to sustainable ones. In a romantic context, luxury buyers are perceived to be more physically appealing than eco-

friendly product buyers, who are perceived to be more competent, suitable for long-term relationships, and warmer than luxury purchasers (DiDonato and Jakubiak 2016). These stereotypes illustrate the complex interplay between luxury consumption, sustainability, and social perceptions.

### **3.4 Drivers of Sustainable Consumption**

Understanding the drivers of sustainable luxury consumption is crucial for navigating the complexity of how consumers perceive the relationship between luxury and sustainability, and how these perceptions shape their behavior. Psychological and emotional factors are particularly important among the many influences on sustainable luxury consumption (Cervellon and Shammass 2013; Kapferer and Michaut-Denizeau 2020; Wang et al. 2021). These drivers not only shape how consumers perceive sustainability in the context of luxury but also play a critical role in their purchasing decisions. Hedonic satisfaction, self-expression, and personal style-related motivations emerge as key elements in this dynamic (Cervellon and Shammass 2013; Kapferer and Michaut-Denizeau 2020; Wang et al. 2021). The pleasure of owning luxury items, or hedonic satisfaction, is enhanced when sustainability is a factor, creating a sense of responsible indulgence (Athwal et al. 2019; Kunz, May, and Schmidt 2020).

Self-expression and social identity formation are equally important factors. Consumers utilize luxury goods to convey their values and social identity, and products with sustainable attributes introduce an ethical dimension to this form of expression (Pandelaere and Shrum 2020). Such an approach resonates strongly with Millennials and younger audiences, who actively seek out brands that align with their personal and environmental beliefs (Kunz, May, and Schmidt 2020). For these consumers, sustainable luxury serves as a marker of sophistication and social consciousness, blending ethical considerations with personal style (Kapferer and Michaut-Denizeau 2020). Despite the growing interest in sustainability across

various groups, significant differences in market participation exist based on income levels. High-income individuals remain the primary market for luxury goods, with their purchasing power shaping much of the industry (Dubois and Duquesne 1993; Ikeda 2006; Kapferer and Bastien 2009). However, the market has also expanded to include middle- and lower-income consumers, driven by the democratization of luxury through more accessible offerings (Truong, McColl, and Kitchen 2009; Vigneron and Johnson 2004).

While self-expression and social identity highlight the psychological and emotional dimensions of sustainable luxury, economic and environmental considerations further enhance its appeal, mainly through the concept of durability. Durable luxury products align with financial rationality by minimizing replacement and reducing overall consumption (Cervellon and Shamma 2013). This perspective frames goods as responsible investments that meet both economic and environmental criteria, enhancing their appeal as sustainable choices (Athwal et al. 2019). However, consumers often disregard their long-term benefits. This phenomenon, termed by Sun, Bellezza, and Paharia (2021) as the “durability neglect” (28), presents a challenge for luxury brands to effectively communicate these advantages. The long-term use of high-quality luxury products reinforces sustainable consumption practices by emphasizing resource efficiency and waste reduction, starkly contrasting the fast fashion model characterized by planned obsolescence and rapid consumption cycles (Joy et al. 2012; Kapferer and Michaut-Denizeau 2020). By offering timeless and resource-efficient products, luxury brands can position themselves as sustainability leaders and appeal to consumers who value both quality and environmental responsibility (Cervellon and Shamma 2013).

In addition to psychological and economic drivers, environmental and ethical factors, particularly corporate social responsibility (CSR), have become critical in driving consumer confidence in sustainable luxury. CSR has evolved from being perceived as a form of philanthropy to being integrated into business strategies to meet regulatory and transparency

standards (Galan 2006; Rojek-Nowosielska 2014). Contemporary CSR practices concentrate on aligning corporate operations with sustainable and ethical principles, thereby appealing to consumers who prioritize transparency and responsible business conduct (Raczkowski, Fijalkowska, and Sułkowski 2016). For luxury brands, CSR is crucial in maintaining a reputable image and meeting consumer expectations regarding ethical consumption (Athwal et al. 2019).

### **3.5 Brand and Marketing Implications**

Building on the drivers of sustainable luxury consumption, effective brand and marketing strategies are critical for translating these values into consumer engagement. According to Mazzalovo (2008), luxury marketing relies heavily on selective advertising strategies to create an exclusive and prestigious brand image. Premium pricing reinforces this image by acting as a calculated signal of rarity and exceptional value, enhancing the consumer's perception of luxury (Dryl 2018).

With rising consumer awareness around sustainability, luxury brands increasingly integrate sustainable practices into their marketing to resonate with consumers' values in both emerging and developed markets (Osburg et al. 2024). The origin of luxury brands significantly influences consumer trust in these sustainability practices, as they often perceive brands from countries with high ethical standards as more credible in their environmental and social commitments. This country-of-origin effect can, therefore, reinforce the authenticity of sustainability claims, adding a layer of trust and perceived value to luxury products if communicated effectively (Godey et al. 2011).

To actively steer consumer choices toward sustainable luxury, marketers are leveraging insights from behavioral economics, which suggests that structured messaging and strategic product positioning can effectively influence purchasing behavior (Sun, Bellezza, and Paharia 2021). By emphasizing attributes such as durability, brands help customers see the long-term

value of luxury purchases and counter the tendency to overlook the opportunity costs associated with less sustainable options (Frederick et al. 2009). In addition to focusing on functional benefits, luxury marketers are also using emotional strategies to create deeper connections with consumers, encouraging them to identify with the sustainable values embedded in luxury products personally. This dual approach fosters symbolic connections and aligns brand identity with consumer values, allowing them to identify with the sustainable qualities of the products they choose (Platania, Santisi, and Morando 2019).

The CSR component in luxury branding is increasingly recognized as a key driver of brand loyalty, as effective communication of CSR initiatives increases brand recognition and fosters stronger emotional connections with consumers (Singh et al. 2023). Effective CSR messaging that highlights positive environmental impacts not only builds brand equity but also increases acceptance (Kunz, May, and Schmidt 2020). Luxury brands can further these efforts by creating products dedicated to charitable causes, raising awareness, and adding value to the brand (Dryl 2018). While some see a contradiction between luxury and CSR, key luxury attributes align well with CSR values such as environmental preservation and social responsibility. Thus, effective CSR communication can strengthen brand loyalty by reinforcing the brand's commitment to quality and social values (Schwartz 2012).

However, the relationship between CSR communication and brand perception remains complex. When consumer trust in a brand's motives is low, a strong fit between the brand and its CSR activities enhances evaluations. In contrast, when trust is already high, the importance of this alignment diminishes, as consumers are less reliant on CSR fit to evaluate the brand positively. As a result, luxury brands need to be mindful of consumers' beliefs about their intentions when promoting such initiatives (Kunz, May, and Schmidt 2020).

### **3.6 Challenges in Promoting Sustainable Luxury**

In promoting sustainable luxury, marketers face several challenges. As highlighted in

Chapter 3.2, one of the central challenges in sustainable luxury marketing is the *Luxury Sustainability Paradox*, in which individuals question whether exclusivity and environmental consciousness can coexist without compromising the unique appeal of luxury products (Henninger, Alevizou, and Oates 2016; Walker 2006). Additionally, sustainability labels themselves can detract from a product's luxury appeal. Consumers may perceive these labels as signals of lower quality or mass production, which contrasts with the high craftsmanship and rarity typically associated with luxury brands (Hong et al. 2024).

Another challenge lies in consumers' limited knowledge of sustainable practices in the luxury sector. Many are unaware of the complex environmental impacts associated with luxury goods (Sun, Bellezza, and Paharia 2021). As a result, even when shoppers recognize the benefits of sustainable options, their choices are often driven by immediate factors that can overshadow the long-term value of quality and durability in luxury consumption (Sun, Bellezza, and Paharia 2021). Therefore, targeted marketing strategies must be used effectively to close the knowledge gap (Sesini, Castiglioni, and Lozza 2020).

A related challenge is the *Attitude Behavior Gap*, where consumers' positive attitudes toward sustainability do not always translate into purchasing behavior. In the luxury market, status and self-expression often precede ethical considerations (Carrigan and Attalla 2001; Wiederhold and Martinez 2018). Although many European consumers say they are willing to pay a premium for sustainable products, the market share of these products remains relatively low (Mandarić, Hunjet, and Vuković 2022). This discrepancy highlights a conflict between consumers' values and their motivations for luxury (Wiederhold and Martinez 2018). Studies confirm that even when individuals express environmental concerns, these concerns are often secondary to other motivations in the context of luxury purchases (Ehrich and Irwin 2005; De Klerk, Kearns, and Redwood 2019; Nguyen, Nguyen, and Nguyen 2019).

Given the complexity of consumer perceptions and behaviors, effectively

communicating sustainability initiatives is a significant challenge for luxury brands. Many view sustainability claims as superficial marketing tactics designed to enhance brand image rather than genuine environmental responsibility (Bryson, Atwal, and Hultén 2013; Henninger, Alevizou, and Oates 2016). This skepticism is heightened in the luxury sector, where expectations of authenticity and exclusivity are paramount (Bryson, Atwal, and Hultén 2013). If consumers perceive a brand's sustainability efforts as insincere, it can damage its reputation and undermine trust, ultimately threatening customer loyalty (Kunz, May, and Schmidt 2020; Torelli, Monga, and Kaikati 2012).

Finally, luxury brands face the challenge of promoting sustainability without diluting their prestigious image. While differentiating products based on ethical practices could help communicate sustainability, it could also lead consumers to question the luxury status of the product, as these values are often associated with more mainstream goods (Torelli, Monga, and Kaikati 2012). To maintain the exclusivity and appeal of high-end products, luxury brands must integrate sustainability into their brand identity as a core value rather than positioning it as a secondary feature (Henninger, Alevizou, and Oates 2016; Walker 2006).

### **3.7 Identified Research Gap**

The existing research has established a robust foundation for understanding the interplay between luxury and sustainability, yet significant gaps still need to be addressed. A review of the literature revealed the potential for luxury to promote sustainable consumption through attributes such as durability. However, limited attention has been given to how consumers perceive and reconcile the inherent tension between luxury's traditional emphasis on exclusivity and sustainability's principles of responsibility and conservation.

Furthermore, the role of luxury in promoting more sustainable behaviors, such as reducing overall consumption in favor of fewer, higher-quality purchases, still needs to be explored.

While prior studies often focus on consumer attitudes in isolation, this presents an opportunity

to investigate how these attributes translate into purchasing behaviors, particularly within the luxury fashion market, where fast consumption trends frequently prevail. By addressing this gap, our study aims to examine how consumers navigate the intersection of indulgence and responsibility, uncovering whether luxury can act as a catalyst for more mindful and sustainable consumption practices.

We aim to contribute to this field by addressing the overarching question of whether luxury can be in harmony with and promote sustainable consumption. Specifically, we investigate the impacts of (1) explicit sustainability marketing on consumer choices, (2) product guarantees on encouraging sustainable consumption, (3) framing strategies on consumers' WTP, and (4) sustainability claim intensity on consumer choices. Through these four sub-studies, we aim to provide a comprehensive understanding of the complex relationship between luxury purchases and sustainable consumption.

#### **4 General Methodology**

Following a comprehensive review of the existing literature, the methodology employed in this study was an experimental design. We conducted an online survey using the platform Qualtrics, and over 14 days, we recruited a total of 180 valid participants (completion rate of 100%; 47% female; median age = 27) via various channels, including personal communication, social media, and professional networks.

The survey was comprised of four individual sections, one for each sub-study presented in this paper, in addition to a set of general questions applicable to all studies. All participants were provided with an identical introduction to the survey, which outlined the purpose of the research and indicated what the subsequent sections would entail. The participants were informed that they would be presented with four distinct products and that it was imperative to read the product descriptions with great attention. Additionally, participants were advised that the research was focused on consumer behaviors in the context of premium/luxury fashion,

while the specific research questions were not disclosed to avoid any potential biases. To prevent influence from brand familiarity or loyalty, two fictitious brands were used: “Brand X” as the premium brand and “Brand Y” as the mid-range brand. Following this, the participants were automatically randomly assigned to either a control group or a test group for each of the four individual studies. Consequently, a participant may have encountered questions pertaining to the control group in one section of the survey and been presented with questions for the test group in another. Upon completion of the four sub-surveys, respondents proceeded to the general and final part of the survey, where they rated themselves on a scale from “1 – Tightwad” (difficulty spending money) to “7 – Spendthrift” (difficulty limiting their spending). Lastly, a series of demographic questions were posed, including those regarding gender, age, income, education, and country of residence (see Appendix A for complete survey questions and flow and Appendix B for respondent characteristics and demographics).

## 5 Study 1: The Impact of Explicit Sustainability Marketing on Consumer Choices

### 5.1 Introduction

Sustainability marketing has emerged as a fundamental strategy for brands responding to the growing demand for eco-conscious products. In the luxury sector, traditionally defined by exclusivity and indulgence, the challenge lies in harmonizing sustainability with the values of discerning consumers. Explicit sustainability messaging, which emphasizes attributes such as product durability and timelessness, offers a compelling approach by positioning luxury items as ethical choices and long-term investments.

Recent research underscores the increasing relevance of sustainability claims in consumer decision-making. A study conducted by second-hand fashion platform *Vinted* (2024) found a notable shift toward mindful consumption. 65% of their buyers expressed a preference for buying fewer, higher-quality fashion items that are designed to last rather than prioritizing larger volumes of cheaper, short-lived alternatives. This shift highlights the appeal of durability as a core attribute in sustainability marketing. Furthermore, the credibility of eco-friendly branding has grown significantly, with only 5% of global respondents to a Deloitte survey viewing it as a mere marketing gimmick, reflecting the increasing sophistication of sustainability messaging (Pieters et al. 2023). Luxury brands can leverage these trends to integrate sustainability as a differentiating factor without compromising their premium appeal.

The present study adopts an experimental approach informed by a comprehensive literature review exploring the intersections of luxury and sustainability, consumer perceptions, and message framing. The survey conducted for this research exposed respondents to explicit sustainability marketing for a premium product and assessed their brand preferences, with particular attention to the role of durability in their decisions. The results are then analyzed and discussed in the context of their implications for consumers and marketers.

## 5.2 Literature Review

The concepts of traditional marketing and luxury consumption often contradict the overarching aims of sustainability. As noted by Athwal et al. (2019) and Keinan, Crener, and Goor (2020), sustainable consumption is fundamentally tied to ethical considerations and moderation. In contrast, the success of marketing is driven by stimulating increased consumption, aligning with the general perception of luxury as excessive and its association with overconsumption (Athwal et al. 2019; Dubois, Laurent, and Czellar 2001; Veblen 1889). Furthermore, luxury brands have traditionally conveyed an aspirational image of escapism, often associated with indulgence and detachment from real-world concerns, which is antithetical to the fundamental principles of sustainability, such as responsibility and mindfulness (Kapferer and Michaut-Denizeau 2014; Keinan, Crener, and Goor 2020).

Research on the impact of sustainability messages on luxury consumer behavior reveals varied effects on consumer perceptions of brands and products. For instance, as discussed in Chapter 3.3, mentioning recycled elements in luxury marketing can negatively impact consumer preferences (Achabou and Dekhili 2013). This highlights the need to further understand how consumers perceive and process sustainability-related information. Keinan, Crener, and Goor (2020) argue for additional investigation into the extent of consumer awareness regarding sustainability, specifically whether such awareness stems from personal interests or brand marketing strategies. Brands increasingly use eco-labels, care symbols, and certification logos to inform consumers, which has been shown to positively influence consumer perceptions of both luxury and utilitarian products (Keinan, Crener, and Goor 2020; Steinhart, Ayalon, and Puterman 2013).

A related study by Sun, Bellezza, and Paharia (2021) highlights that explicitly mentioning the word *durable* in product descriptions or providing estimated product lifespans encourages consumers to make more sustainable choices. This finding indicates that emphasizing

durability within the context of sustainability can be an effective marketing strategy for luxury brands (Sun, Bellezza, and Paharia 2021). However, despite these insights, Beckham and Voyer (2014) observed that consumers often associate luxury with unsustainability, even when they perceive luxury products as more sustainable than mass-market options. Their research also revealed that consumers value sustainable luxury more when they perceive it as inherently sustainable, while externally imposed labels can trigger skepticism (Beckham and Voyer 2014).

The perception of trustworthiness is a crucial determinant of how consumers respond to sustainability claims in luxury marketing. Scandals and controversies have eroded public confidence, making it essential for brands to establish credibility, trustworthiness, and competence in sustainability efforts (Kapferer and Michaut-Denizeau 2014; Keinan, Crener, and Goor 2020). Understanding the drivers of trust in sustainability and identifying effective marketing strategies that avoid perceptions of greenwashing, such as pairing weak environmental performance with overly optimistic messaging about sustainability efforts, is crucial (Delmas and Burbano 2011; Keinan, Crener, and Goor 2020). These strategies should demonstrate a sincere commitment to sustainability without triggering consumer skepticism. As mentioned in Chapter 3.6, many consumers view sustainability claims as superficial marketing tactics designed to enhance brand image rather than reflecting genuine environmental responsibility (Bryson, Atwal, and Hultén 2013; Henninger, Alevizou, and Oates 2016).

Message framing significantly influences consumer responses to sustainability claims. Newman et al. (2012) found that tailoring sustainability messages to match consumers' levels of concern is critical. For consumers with low concern for climate change, prevention-focused messages emphasizing the consequences of inaction are more persuasive. Conversely, for highly concerned consumers, the framing of the message (positive or negative) has less impact,

suggesting that other elements of the communication strategy may exert a more significant influence (Newman et al. 2012). Martin and Strong (2016) further highlight that consumers who are aware of marketing tactics prefer implicit messaging that allows them to draw their own conclusions, fostering trust and enhancing brand evaluations.

While substantial research has explored sustainability in luxury marketing, mainly focusing on aspects like recycling and eco-labeling, limited attention has been given to consumers' responses to sustainability messages that go beyond these aspects – particularly regarding product durability and timelessness (Athwal et al. 2019). This leaves a significant gap in understanding how luxury brands can effectively communicate sustainability without risking perceptions of greenwashing. Keinan, Crener, and Goor (2020) emphasize the need to examine consumers' general knowledge of sustainability and whether personal motivations or brand-driven narratives shape this knowledge. This perspective underscores the importance of understanding how explicit sustainability messages influence consumer behavior, particularly regarding durable products.

Sun, Bellezza, and Paharia (2021) investigated the role of durability messaging in promoting high-end products. However, their research primarily focused on consumers' tendency to overlook product longevity rather than examining how explicitly framing this attribute impacts perceived durability and the likelihood of choosing premium items over mid-range options. Investigating this gap would contribute to a nuanced understanding of how explicit sustainability framing can drive consumer preference for premium goods over cheaper alternatives.

Based on these considerations, we propose the following hypothesis:

**H<sub>1</sub>:** Explicit sustainability marketing, such as emphasizing product durability and timelessness, increases consumers' perceived durability of luxury goods, which in turn leads to greater likelihood of choosing luxury products over cheaper alternatives.

### 5.3 Methodology

As the first of four sub-surveys, this study aims to determine whether explicit sustainability marketing, specifically messaging that emphasizes product durability, can increase the likelihood of consumers choosing premium items over more affordable alternatives. Based on an extensive literature review, a between-subjects experimental design was employed to compare two groups: a test group exposed to explicit sustainability messaging and a control group that received a neutral product description.

The survey opened with a brief introduction: “In the following section, you will be shown two sweaters available for sale. Please take a moment to review each one carefully, as you will be asked to answer questions about them.” Subsequently, participants were randomly assigned to either the test or control condition by Qualtrics, with each group viewing descriptions of two sweaters, presented one at a time. This sequential format encouraged participants to focus on each item independently, thereby reducing the likelihood of bias from direct comparison. In order to enhance the realism of the study, each description was accompanied by a simple image of a gray sweater, along with illustrative size options and a price. The premium item, Brand X, was priced at €120, while the mid-range item, Brand Y, was set at €40. The prices were inspired by actual market examples from well-known brands, such as *Patagonia* for premium items and *Mango* for mid-range items, thus ensuring that the prices were perceived as credible within the given context. The control group was presented with the following information regarding the premium brand, omitting any references to the longevity and durability of the sweater: “Brand X: Classic Sweater. €120. A premium grey sweater with a round-neck design, offering a comfortable fit and classic style for everyday wear. Available in multiple sizes.” Upon proceeding with the survey, the description of the mid-range sweater became visible: “Brand Y: Classic Sweater. €40. A mid-range grey sweater with a round-neck design, offering a comfortable fit and classic style for everyday wear.

Available in multiple sizes.” The test group, however, was exposed to a description of the premium item that placed particular emphasis on its durability: “Brand X: Classic Sweater. €120. Crafted for the long haul, this grey sweater offers a classic look that never goes out of style. Made from durable materials, it’s designed to last, offering sustainability and timeless appeal. Available in multiple sizes.” For this group, the description for the mid-range sweater was identical to that of the control group.

Following a review of both products, participants were asked to indicate which sweater they would rather choose: “Would you prefer to choose Brand X (€120) or Brand Y (€40)?” The responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from “1 – Would definitely prefer Brand X (€120)” to “7 – Would definitely prefer Brand Y (€40)”, thereby measuring respondents’ preference and behavior change, which is the study’s dependent variable.

Following this preference question, participants were prompted to evaluate the perceived durability of each brand’s sweater using another 7-point Likert scale, with the question, “How durable do you believe the products are?” This assessment was conducted to test the perceived durability of the products, which serves as the mediating variable in this study. This scale ranged from “1 – Not at all durable” to “7 – Very durable.” To avoid any order effect that might influence durability perceptions, the question first addressed Brand X (€120), followed by Brand Y (€40). The complete questionnaire used in this study is provided in Appendix A.

The sequence of the questions was selected to minimize any potential bias in the responses through a structured questioning approach. The preference question was posed initially to capture participants’ spontaneous choices without prompting them to consider durability explicitly beforehand. Furthermore, the forced-response function of the Qualtrics platform was utilized, necessitating responses before participants could proceed, thereby ensuring the completeness of all data points.

## 5.4 Results

The study included a total sample of 180 valid participants, randomly divided into two conditions: the control group ( $n = 92$ , 51.1%) and the test group ( $n = 88$ , 48.9%). Regarding the dependent variable brand preference, 26.7% of participants preferred the premium Brand X, 7.8% remained neutral, and 65.6% preferred Brand Y. The overall brand preference question yielded a mean score of 5.09 ( $SD = 2.01$ ), indicating a majority tendency to favor the mid-range Brand Y over the premium Brand X. All participants rated the durability of Brand X with a mean score of 5.16 ( $SD = 1.25$ ), suggesting that it was generally perceived as durable. In contrast, Brand Y's perceived durability had a relatively lower mean score of 3.83 ( $SD = 1.16$ ; Appendix C.1).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare brand preference ratings across the two conditions. The analysis revealed a significant effect of the experimental condition,  $F(1,178) = 13.11$ ,  $p < .001$ . Participants in the control group ( $M = 5.61$ ,  $SD = 1.88$ ) reported significantly higher brand preference scores for the cheaper, mid-range Brand Y compared to those in the test group ( $M = 4.56$ ,  $SD = 2.02$ ). The experimental condition accounted for approximately 6.9% of the variance in brand preference ( $\eta^2 = .069$ , 95% confidence interval [CI; 0.014, 0.149]), indicating a small to medium effect size (Cohen 2013; Appendix C.2). Supporting this, an independent samples t-test confirmed significant differences,  $t(178) = 3.621$ ,  $p < .001$ . The effect size was large ( $d = 1.95$ ), indicating that the experimental condition strongly influenced brand preference (Sullivan and Feinn 2012; Appendix C.3). These results suggest that those exposed to explicit sustainability marketing (test group) were more likely to prefer the high-end Brand X compared to the control group.

An additional independent samples t-test examined the perceived durability differences between the control and test conditions for Brand X and Brand Y. For Brand X, there was no significant difference between the control group ( $M = 5.20$ ,  $SD = 1.18$ ) and the test group ( $M =$

5.11,  $SD = 1.33$ ),  $t(178) = 0.438$ ,  $p = .662$ . Similarly, the perceived durability of Brand Y showed no significant difference between the control group ( $M = 3.79$ ,  $SD = 1.13$ ) and the test group ( $M = 3.86$ ,  $SD = 1.19$ ),  $t(178) = -0.406$ ,  $p = .685$  (Appendix C.4). These findings demonstrate that the explicit sustainability marketing employed in this study did not significantly alter participants' perceptions of durability for either Brand X or Brand Y.

Although the latter t-test revealed no statistically significant differences between the conditions, a mediation analysis was conducted utilizing PROCESS Model 4 to explore potential indirect effects among the variables (Hayes and Little 2022). For this analysis, the independent variable was the condition (test vs. control), the dependent variable was the preference for the mid-range Brand Y, and the mediator was the durability perception of Brand X. The analysis indicates a significant direct effect of the experimental condition on brand preference (direct effect =  $-1.08$ ,  $SE = 0.2841$ ,  $t[178] = -3.803$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Participants in the test condition showed reduced preference for Brand Y and increased preference for Brand X compared to those in the control condition. However, the indirect effect of exposure to explicit sustainability marketing (test group) on brand preference through perceived durability was not statistically significant (indirect effect =  $.03$ , 95% CI  $[-0.117, 0.169]$ ; see Appendix C.5)

These results suggest that explicit sustainability marketing directly influences brand preference, but perceived durability does not mediate the relationship between explicit sustainability marketing and the preference for the premium Brand X. This finding underscores the complexity of consumer decision-making in response to sustainability messaging and the necessity for further investigation into other potential mediating factors.

## **5.5 Discussion**

This study provides valuable insights into the role of explicit sustainability marketing in influencing consumer preferences for luxury products. The findings suggest that participants exposed to explicit sustainability messaging demonstrated a stronger preference for the

premium brand (Brand X) compared to those in the control group. This result supports the initial assumption that explicit sustainability marketing can directly influence consumer preferences. It aligns with the prior research by Sun, Bellezza, and Paharia (2021), suggesting that emphasizing durability encourages consumers to make more sustainable choices.

However, the study found no statistically significant differences in the perceived durability of Brand X or Brand Y between the test and control conditions. This suggests that the explicit focus on durability in the messaging was not sufficient nor an effective means of enhancing participants' perceptions of the premium brand's durability. This discrepancy between the intended durability message and consumers' processing highlights the critical role of factors such as brand trustworthiness in shaping consumer responses to sustainability marketing (Kapferer and Michaut-Denizeau 2014; Keinan, Crener, and Goor 2020).

Contrary to previous findings, the results propose that explicit references to durability alone may not suffice to alter consumers' direct perceptions of a product's attributes. The absence of a change in perceived durability underscores the need for additional contextual factors to bolster the effectiveness of explicit messaging. While durability messaging may have limitations in isolation, the increased preference for Brand X in the test group points to alternative mechanisms influencing consumer choice, warranting further investigation.

Furthermore, the study's findings indicate that perceived durability does not mediate the relationship between explicit sustainability messaging and consumer preference in the context of luxury products. Instead, broader factors such as brand credibility, ethical practices, and transparency may exert a more substantial impact on consumer preferences in response to sustainability narratives (Kapferer and Michaut-Denizeau 2014; Keinan, Crener, and Goor 2020). Additionally, subtle emotional engagement may play a role; words like *crafted* and *designed* evoke a sense of care and craftsmanship, potentially fostering a stronger emotional connection to the brand or product and influencing consumer preference. This aligns with the

notion that consumer responses to explicit sustainability messages are shaped not only by rational evaluations but also by emotional and contextual factors. For instance, as discussed by Newman et al. (2012), consumer knowledge and sustainability concerns likely shape how explicit sustainability messages are interpreted and acted upon. Although not directly examined in this study, these factors may explain the observed disconnect between the explicit emphasis on durability and its effect on consumer perceptions. This highlights the potential of implicit messaging and the importance of balancing consumer education with trust-building through subtle brand actions.

While the results challenge the role of durability as a mediator, it would be hasty to dismiss it altogether. Sun, Bellezza, and Paharia (2021) demonstrated that durability-related considerations can influence decisions regarding high-end products, suggesting that the effectiveness of durability messaging depends on nuanced contextual and individual differences.

When interpreting these results, several study-specific limitations should be considered. First, the study accounts for only a small portion of the variance in consumer preferences, indicating that other unmeasured factors – such as emotional engagement, product guarantees, or cultural influences – may significantly shape decision-making. Second, participants were not provided with an imaginary budget or financial context, which may have led to variability in how respondents perceived affordability and their willingness to pay, potentially introducing bias. Third, focusing on a single product category (a sweater) limits the generalizability of the findings to other types of fashion items. Different categories may elicit varying consumer responses to sustainability messaging due to differences in perceived longevity, usage patterns, or emotional significance. Finally, while using fictitious brands reduced pre-existing biases, it may have diminished the authenticity of consumer-brand interactions. In real-world settings, established brands evoke powerful associations and emotional connections that can influence

consumer preferences, which were not captured in this study.

Despite these limitations, the study emphasizes the importance of message framing in bridging the perceived gap between luxury and sustainability. While explicit messaging can influence consumer preferences, it must be accompanied by broader elements of credibility to mitigate skepticism. Luxury marketers can enhance the impact of sustainability messaging by combining explicit claims about product durability with efforts to build and enhance brand trust through transparent practices and compelling storytelling. This approach resonates with the broader shift toward valuing durability and authenticity in sustainability marketing. For example, the outdoor fashion brand *Patagonia* prioritizes transparency and education to build trust and underscore its environmental commitment. When visiting *Patagonia*'s online store, visitors are first confronted with articles or updates about the brand's environmental activism, with product categories appearing only after scrolling. This prioritization of sustainability information over product promotion communicates a genuine commitment to environmental values and stresses that sustainability is an integral part of the brand's ethos (Patagonia 2024a). Furthermore, messaging strategies should be tailored to specific target audiences. For sustainability-conscious consumers, detailed claims about durability and ethical practices may resonate strongly, while for less engaged consumers, aspirational messaging and implicit cues may be more effective in fostering positive brand perceptions. Ultimately, these approaches allow luxury brands to capitalize on the growing preference for fewer, higher-quality items and the increasing credibility of sustainability messaging as identified in recent research.

## **5.6 Conclusion**

The impact of explicit sustainability marketing – particularly messaging that emphasizes product durability and timelessness – on consumers' likelihood of choosing premium products and their durability perception was examined in this study. Building on the premise that sustainability attributes can serve as a compelling differentiator for luxury brands,

this research addresses a notable gap in the existing literature. It focuses on the limited exploration of consumer responses to sustainability messaging beyond traditional themes like recycling and eco-labeling, with particular attention to how durability-focused communication influences consumer behavior within the luxury market.

The experimental findings partially support the hypothesis. While explicit sustainability messaging positively influenced consumer preferences for the premium product, perceived durability did not mediate this effect. Therefore, these results suggest that the way sustainability messages are framed can play a critical role in shaping consumer behavior. Explicit claims regarding product durability have the potential to sway consumer preferences, but their effectiveness depends on the presence of supporting contextual elements. This study demonstrates that luxury marketers can maximize the impact of sustainability messaging by combining durability claims with trust-building strategies such as transparent practices, certifications, and compelling storytelling. Tailoring sustainability messaging to align with the preferences and values of the target audience is essential for maximizing their effectiveness.

By addressing the gap in understanding the influence of explicit sustainability messaging on consumer preferences, this study contributes to the broader literature on sustainable consumption in the luxury market. The findings challenge prior assumptions about the mediating role of durability and highlight the importance of broader factors, such as consumer trust and the consistency of brand actions with their messaging. Future research should explore the applicability of these findings across other product categories to evaluate their generalizability. Longitudinal studies are also recommended to examine the long-term effects of sustainability messaging on consumer behavior, including brand loyalty and sustained purchasing patterns. Investigating these areas will enhance the comprehension of the interplay between luxury, sustainability, and consumer preferences, thereby providing valuable strategies for promoting sustainable consumption in the luxury and premium sectors.

## **6 General Discussion and Conclusion**

### **6.1 Discussion of Findings**

The primary aim of this thesis was to investigate the relationship between sustainable consumption and luxury purchases. To achieve this, we conducted four independent sub-studies, each contributing unique insights and collectively providing a nuanced understanding of this research area.

Reflecting on the findings from these studies, Study 1 proved the significant relationship between explicit sustainability marketing and consumer preference. As previously hypothesized, consumers exposed to sustainability-focused framing were more likely to opt for the premium brand over the cheaper alternative. However, contrary to expectations, this relationship was not mediated by perceived durability. Building on these results, Study 2 provided further evidence that effective sustainability marketing can serve as a powerful tool to influence consumer behavior. In this specific case, prompting consumers with an unconditional guarantee enhanced their recognition of product durability, leading them to choose a single premium item over three mid-range alternatives. Study 3 further expanded on this relationship by investigating consumer decision-making under financial considerations. Explicitly, this study compared consumers' WTP for luxury items framed with sustainable messaging versus traditional framing. Although the hypothesized effect of a higher price acceptance for the former could not be confirmed, the perceived overall value was identified as a significant predictor of WTP. Recognizing the potential limits of sustainability marketing, Study 4 explored the possible adverse effect of excessive sustainability claims in luxury marketing on consumers' purchase intentions. While perceived authenticity was found to influence purchase intent, the intensity of sustainability claims did not have a significant effect.

In relation to the existing literature in this area, our findings yield several important

conclusions. A key takeaway from our research is that structured marketing can effectively encourage consumers to adopt more sustainable purchasing and consumption behaviors, as formerly suggested by Sun, Bellezza, and Paharia (2021). Within this context, we identified durability as a key factor in the decision-making of consumers. Not only does it serve as an effective instrument to position products as high-end, but it also aligns them with financial and environmental values (Cervellon and Shammas 2013; Sun, Bellezza, and Paharia 2021). Additionally, durability allows consumers to appreciate the long-term value of luxury purchases, further reinforcing its importance in purchasing decisions (Frederick et al. 2009).

Product lifespan enhancements (such as offering unconditional guarantees) can be perceived as investments that simultaneously address both economic and environmental considerations. Such features align closely with principles of sustainable consumption and motivate consumers toward such behaviors (Cervellon and Shammas 2013; Joy et al. 2012; Kapferer and Michaut-Denizeau 2020). This insight provides a valuable contribution to the research field, as it helps bridge the gap between utilitarian product attributes and sustainable consumption patterns.

While the significance of durability is evident, we recognize that a number of additional factors influence product selection in the context of premium items. Beyond financial considerations, such as price or budget constraints, psychological and emotional factors are pivotal determinants of consumer behavior. These include perceived quality, self-expression, or personal style (Cervellon and Shammas 2013; Kapferer and Michaut-Denizeau 2020; Wang et al. 2021).

Our research further revealed that while consumers generally recognize sustainability when prompted, more awareness is needed to translate this into more sustainable purchasing decisions. Environmental concerns often remain secondary to other motivations, with immediate and practical factors taking precedence in purchasing behavior (De Klerk, Kearns,

and Redwood 2019; Nguyen, Nguyen, and Nguyen 2019; Sun, Bellezza, and Paharia 2021). Building on this, it is notable that our study featured a considerably younger sample population compared to the EU's median age (27.0 vs. 44.5 years; Appendix B; Eurostat 2024). Therefore, our findings confirm prior observations by Bhattacharya and Sen (2004) and Heil and Langer (2017), who found that while younger generations consider sustainability in products, they are not necessarily inclined to pay a premium for such attributes. This suggests a potential avenue for future research whereby the present studies could be replicated with older cohorts to assess generational differences.

Our finding that authenticity influences consumers' purchase intentions offers further insights into the complex relationship between luxury branding and sustainability marketing. We proved the importance of this topic for future research as it touches upon crucial determinants such as trust and brand perception. In connection with consumers' personal beliefs, this finding is in line with research conducted by Irwin and Spira (1997) as well as Beckham and Voyer (2014). Consequently, luxury brands need to take these aspects into account when defining social responsibility strategies (Kunz, May, and Schmidt 2020).

Overall, our findings align closely with pre-existing research. While we identified durability and sustainability as essential factors in promoting sustainable consumption within the luxury sector, evidence suggests that consumers continue to prioritize other considerations (Ehrich and Irwin 2005; Gardetti and Torres 2013). This emphasizes the need for effectively addressing consumer priorities. Enhancing consumer education about the environmental impacts of their purchasing and consumption patterns could elevate the perceived significance of these factors. Such an approach offers a compelling counterpoint to fast fashion and resonates with the growing emphasis on sustainability, heightened environmental awareness, and the broader shift toward green initiatives.

## 6.2 Practical Implications

In order to formulate effective marketing strategies, management should take several practical implications into consideration. A fundamental step is ensuring that a brand's marketing efforts align with the company's overarching environmental strategy and the underlying questions of how the brand intends to position itself and how it wishes to be perceived by consumers within its target market. Given the increasing significance of sustainability, recognized as one of the most influential purchasing factors in the fashion industry (McKinsey & Company 2024), it is imperative for companies to integrate sustainability throughout their entire value chain. This integration extends beyond marketing communication to include earlier stages, such as production and logistics, as exemplified by brands prominent for their sustainable commitments, such as *Fjällräven* (2024b).

Brands should ensure that their marketing explicitly communicates sustainability attributes, fostering consumer awareness of factors like durability. Marketing campaigns should employ precise wording that highlights a product's quality and sustainable characteristics. For instance, *Fjällräven* (2024a) mentions durability not only in their detailed product descriptions but already prominently on their product listing pages, immediately drawing attention to this key attribute. By directing awareness to such qualities, consumers are more likely to engage in sustainable purchase behavior.

Another effective strategy involves offering features that enhance a product's lifecycle, thereby increasing its longevity and value for consumers. Companies could provide extended or unlimited guarantees, which signals both the brands' confidence in their product's quality and durability. This approach, commonly used by established eco-conscious brands like *Patagonia*, also proves effective for high-end luxury brands such as *Canada Goose*, as discussed in Study 2. By offering such assurances, brands provide not only environmental incentives but also functional value, which can justify premium pricing.

For these strategies to be effective, consumers must perceive them as authentic. Merely including sustainability claims in product descriptions may be insufficient to influence consumer preference and does not lead to a higher WTP for luxury goods. To ensure these claims translate into consumer action, companies must integrate their environmental commitments into their core brand identity (Henninger, Alevizou, and Oates 2016; Walker 2006). Achieving this requires addressing all aspects of the value chain, from sourcing sustainable raw materials to minimizing waste through care instructions and repair services. In this context, transparency plays a pivotal role in fostering this perception of authenticity. Companies should actively communicate their tangible, sustainable practices to consumers. For example, the premium brand *Patagonia* provides detailed information for each product on “How it’s made” and “Where it’s made.” This includes comprehensive data on the materials used, the certifications obtained, the suppliers involved, and the precise locations of the factories where the products are manufactured (Patagonia 2024b).

Recognizing and evaluating authentic, sustainable practices in companies’ offerings can be challenging from a consumer perspective. This difficulty is often compounded by limited knowledge of sustainability issues and a prevalent distrust rooted in widespread greenwashing within the fashion industry (Henninger, Alevizou, and Oates 2016). Such skepticism is particularly pronounced when higher prices are involved. To address these challenges, companies can take the initiative in educating consumers about the environmental impact of their products. While transparency regarding production processes and materials is essential, companies should also prioritize efforts to inform consumers about product care, typical product lifespans, and other related aspects. In this context, previous research highlights opportunities through educational initiatives such as tutorials or targeted advertising campaigns (Sun, Bellezza, and Paharia 2021).

However, these recommendations must be carefully balanced against financial

considerations. Developing educational advertising campaigns, offering lifetime guarantees, or providing free repair services entails substantial costs. Managerial decision-makers must evaluate these expenditures in relation to the potential for increased price acceptance as a means of offsetting them. Nevertheless, the potential for such initiatives to foster brand loyalty should not be underestimated. As the importance of sustainability will presumably continue to grow, companies that adopt proactive and authentic practices in this area are likely to secure lasting competitive advantages.

### 6.3 Limitations

In addition to study-specific constraints, several general limitations must be considered when interpreting the findings of this thesis.

First, the experimental design relies on hypothetical scenarios and a virtual shelf setup, which may not reflect actual consumer behavior. The actual purchasing behavior of consumers may be influenced by a number of factors, including the local conditions present in a physical shopping environment as well as in-store experiences, peer influence, and the consumers' financial circumstances or constraints. The *Attitude Behavior Gap* may play a role in this instance (Wiederhold and Martinez 2018), as consumers might indicate a preference for the sustainable option in a theoretical context but behave differently in practice.

Second, the study focuses exclusively on short-term consumer reactions immediately after exposure to sustainability claims. This approach does not account for potential long-term effects, such as the evolution of trust and purchase intent with repeated exposure, or how consumers assess the consistency between a brand's claims and actual practices over time. Examining these longitudinal dynamics would yield a more comprehensive understanding of the impact of sustainability messaging in the luxury sector.

Finally, the demographic characteristics of respondents limit the broader applicability

of the findings. For instance, a disproportionately high percentage of participants (92.2%) reside in Germany, making it challenging to generalize the conclusions to other countries with differing economic contexts (Appendix B). Consumers living under different economic conditions may exhibit distinct preferences and behaviors compared to the sampled population. Additionally, as previously mentioned, the respondents represent a relatively young population, with a median age of 27 years. Compared to this, the EU median age (44.5 years) is significantly higher, limiting our studies' generalizability to older generations, whose consumption patterns may differ significantly (Eurostat 2024b). Furthermore, there were notable differences between the educational profiles of our sample and that of the EU population. In 2023, 32.6% of EU residents had attained advanced levels of education (i.e., tertiary education), whereas 69.4% of our observation group reported holding a Bachelor's degree or higher (Appendix B; Eurostat 2024). Such differences in education levels could influence preferences and decision-making processes, as more educated consumers may make more informed or sustainability-conscious choices.

Despite these limitations, this thesis provides meaningful contributions to the study of consumer behavior in a luxury context. By addressing underexplored areas, the findings offer valuable insights and practical implications, which future research can build upon to further extend these results.

#### **6.4 Concluding Remarks and Future Research Directions**

The relationship between sustainable consumption and luxury purchases is multifaceted, and understanding it is crucial for both businesses and consumers. This study, grounded in an extensive review of prior literature and an empirical investigation employing an experimental survey design, offers a nuanced comprehension of this dynamic. We conclude that sustainability marketing within the luxury sector can serve as an effective mechanism for promoting sustainable consumption practices. Although sustainability emerged as a significant

factor recognized by consumers when appropriately framed, we acknowledge that its direct influence on purchasing decisions remains limited.

Based on four focused studies examining explicit marketing, product guarantees, sustainability framing, and sustainability claims and their impact on product preferences and choices, we observed diverse outcomes. The research revealed that explicit durability marketing for premium brands significantly enhances consumer preference for such products. However, only in the context of product guarantees were we able to identify significant indirect effects, leaving the underlying mechanisms of the remaining research areas needing to be clarified and warranting further exploration

We observed that explicit marketing strategies and product guarantees act as key drivers of product preference. Nevertheless, no substantial evidence was found to support consumers' increased WTP as a result of sustainability framing. Similarly, we did not observe adverse effects from varying intensities of sustainability claims in the luxury context. We suggest that marketers consider these findings when establishing communication strategies in this sector.

Methodologically, the empirical approach proved effective in capturing consumer behavior under various marketing conditions. Segmenting respondents into distinct groups enabled clear identification and differentiation of the efficacy of hypothesized marketing tools. The present study contributes to the existing discourse on the interplay between the seemingly contrasting areas of sustainable consumption and luxury purchasing. The evidence presented indicates that consumer behavior and perceptions can be shaped by eco-conscious communication.

However, in light of the limitations of this study, including the demographic disproportionality of the sample population and the insufficient capture of long-term effects, we propose the following avenues for future research. To enhance the generalizability of the

findings, it would be beneficial to broaden the scope of respondents and to undertake longitudinal studies to gain insight into the long-term effects of sustainability framing on brand identity and consumption behavior.

Moreover, a critical question remains: Are luxury brands truly more sustainable, or is this perception driven by superficial sustainability claims? Future research should delve deeper into actual sustainable practices within companies' supply chains. By fostering a more comprehensive understanding of this, consumers will be better equipped to make more informed choices, potentially driving shifts toward more sustainable consumption patterns in the premium market and beyond.

## List of References

- Achabou, Mohamed Akli, and Sihem Dekhili. 2013. "Luxury and Sustainable Development: Is There a Match?" *Journal of Business Research*, no. 66, 1896–1903. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.02.011>.
- Ajzen, Icek. 1991. "The Theory of Planned Behavior." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 50 (2): 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T).
- Athwal, Navdeep, Victoria K. Wells, Marylyn Carrigan, and Claudia E. Henninger. 2019. "Sustainable Luxury Marketing: A Synthesis and Research Agenda." *International Journal of Management Reviews* 21 (4): 405–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12195>.
- Aybaly, Remy, Laura Guerquin-Kern, Ivan Coste Manière, Dorisa Madacova, and Julia Van Holt. 2017. "Sustainability Practices in the Luxury Industry: How Can One Be Sustainable in an over-Consumptive Environment?" *Procedia Computer Science* 122:541–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2017.11.404>.
- Bain & Company. 2023. "Bain & Co Luxury Goods Worldwide Market Study (Fall 2023)." 2023. [https://www.bain.com.cn/news\\_info.php?id=1769](https://www.bain.com.cn/news_info.php?id=1769).
- . 2024. "Long Live Luxury: Converge to Expand through Turbulence." Bain. 2024. <https://www.bain.com/insights/long-live-luxury-converge-to-expand-through-turbulence/>.
- Balasubramanian, Mahendran, and Pariya Sheykhmaleki. 2024. "Comprehending the Consumer Behavior toward Sustainable Apparel." *Sustainability* 16 (18): 8026. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16188026>.
- Barnier, V., I. Rodina, and P. Valette-Florence. 2006. "Which Luxury Perceptions Affect Most Consumer Purchase Behavior? A Cross-Cultural Exploratory Study in France, the United Kingdom and Russia." <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/WHICH-LUXURY-PERCEPTIONS-AFFECT-MOST-CONSUMER-A-IN-Barnier-Rodina/d1aa45e76729a809b00367c241db2cb5077d1b3d>.
- BCG. 2021. "Consumers' Adaptation to Sustainability in Fashion." BCG Global. 2021. <https://www.bcg.com/consumers-adaptation-to-sustainability-in-fashion>.
- Beard, Nathaniel Dafydd. 2008. "The Branding of Ethical Fashion and the Consumer: A Luxury Niche or Mass-Market Reality?" *Fashion Theory* 12 (4): 447–67. <https://doi.org/10.2752/175174108X346931>.
- Bearden, William, and Michael Etzel. 1982. "(PDF) Reference Group Influence on Product and Brand Purchase Decisions." *ResearchGate*, February. <https://doi.org/10.1086/208911>.
- Beckham, Daisy, and Benjamin G. Voyer. 2014. "Can Sustainability Be Luxurious? A Mixed-Method Investigation of Implicit and Explicit Attitudes Towards Sustainable Luxury Consumption." *Advances in Consumer Research* 42:245–50. <https://www.snowdropsolution.com/pdf/Can%20Sustainability%20Be%20Luxurious%20A%20Mixed->

Method%20Investigation%20Of%20Implicit%20And%20Explicit%20Attitudes%20Towards%20Sustainable%20Luxury%20Consumption.pdf.

- Bhattacharya, C.B., and Sankar Sen. 2004. "Doing Better at Doing Good: When, Why, and How Consumers Respond to Corporate Social Initiatives." *California Management Review* 47 (1): 9–24. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166284>.
- Biswas, Aindrila. 2017. "A Consumption Value-Gap Analysis for Sustainable Consumption." *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 24 (8): 7714–25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-016-8355-9>.
- Brun, Allesandro, Federico Caniato, Maria Caridi, Cecilia Castelli, Giovanni Miragliotta, Stefano Ronchi, Andrea Sianesi, and Gianluca Spina. 2008. "Logistics and Supply Chain Management in Luxury Fashion Retail: Empirical Investigation of Italian Firms." *ResearchGate*, August. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2008.02.003>.
- Brundtland, Gro Harlem. 1987. "Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future." A/42/427. Oslo: United Nations General Assembly. <https://www.are.admin.ch/are/en/home/medien-und-publikationen/publikationen/nachhaltige-entwicklung/brundtland-report.html>.
- Bryson, Douglas, Glyn Atwal, and Peter Hultén. 2013. "Towards the Conceptualisation of the Antecedents of Extreme Negative Affect towards Luxury Brands." *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal* 16 (4): 393–405. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QMR-06-2013-0043>.
- Business Research Insights. 2024. "Secondhand Luxury Goods Market Size & Share." 2024. <https://www.businessresearchinsights.com/market-reports/secondhand-luxury-goods-market-102564>.
- Carrigan, Marylyn, and Ahmad Attalla. 2001. "The Myth of the Ethical Consumer – Do Ethics Matter in Purchase Behaviour?" *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 18 (7): 560–78. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760110410263>.
- Cerri, Jacopo, Francesco Testa, and Francesco Rizzi. 2018. "The More I Care, the Less I Will Listen to You: How Information, Environmental Concern and Ethical Production Influence Consumers' Attitudes and the Purchasing of Sustainable Products." *Journal of Cleaner Production* 175 (February):343–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.12.054>.
- Cervellon, Marie-Cécile, and Lara Shammass. 2013. "The Value of Sustainable Luxury in Mature Markets: A Customer-Based Approach." *Journal of Corporate Citizenship* 2013 (December). <https://doi.org/10.9774/GLEAF.4700.2013.de.00009>.
- Cimatti, Barbara, Giampaolo Campana, and Laura Carluccio. 2017. "Eco Design and Sustainable Manufacturing in Fashion: A Case Study in the Luxury Personal Accessories Industry." *Procedia Manufacturing* 8:393–400. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2017.02.050>.
- Cohen, Jacob. 2013. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. 0 ed. Routledge.

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587>.

- Davies, Iain A., Zoe Lee, and Ine Ahonkhai. 2012. "Do Consumers Care About Ethical-Luxury?" *Journal of Business Ethics* 106 (1): 37–51. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1071-y>.
- De Klerk, Helena M., Madelein Kearns, and Mike Redwood. 2019. "Controversial Fashion, Ethical Concerns and Environmentally Significant Behaviour: The Case of the Leather Industry." *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management* 47 (1): 19–38. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-05-2017-0106>.
- Dekhili, Sihem, Mohamed Akli Achabou, and Fatmah Alharbi. 2019. "Could Sustainability Improve the Promotion of Luxury Products?" *European Business Review* 31 (4): 488–511. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-04-2018-0083>.
- Delmas, Magali A., and Vanessa Cuerel Burbano. 2011. "The Drivers of Greenwashing." *California Management Review* 54 (1): 64–87. <https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64>.
- DiDonato, Theresa E., and Brittany K. Jakubiak. 2016. "Sustainable Decisions Signal Sustainable Relationships: How Purchasing Decisions Affect Perceptions and Romantic Attraction." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 156 (1): 8–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2015.1018858>.
- Dimock, Michael. 2019. "Defining Generations: Where Millennials End and Generation Z Begins." *Pew Research Center* (blog). January 17, 2019. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/>.
- Dryl, Wioleta. 2018. "Can a Luxury Brand Be Socially Responsible? Luxury Business and Corporate Social Responsibility - Areas of Coexistence." *International Journal of Contemporary Management* 17 (4): 63–89. <https://doi.org/10.4467/24498939IJCM.18.037.10023>.
- Dubois, Bernard, and Patrick Duquesne. 1993. "The Market for Luxury Goods: Income versus Culture." *European Journal of Marketing* 27 (1): 35–44. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090569310024530>.
- Dubois, Bernard, Gilles Laurent, and Sandor Czellar. 2001. "Consumer Rapport to Luxury: Analyzing Complex and Ambivalent Attitudes" 2001 (November).
- Ehrich, Kristine R., and Julie R. Irwin. 2005. "Willful Ignorance in the Request for Product Attribute Information." *Journal of Marketing Research* 42 (3): 266–77. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.2005.42.3.266>.
- Eurostat. 2024a. "Educational Attainment Statistics." May 2024. [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Educational\\_attainment\\_statistics](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Educational_attainment_statistics).
- . 2024b. "EU Median Age Increased by 2.3 Years since 2013." February 15, 2024. <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/w/ddn-20240215-1>.

- Fishbein, M, and Icek Ajzen. 1975. "Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research." *Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA*.
- Fjällräven. 2024a. "Discover All Men's Trousers | Fjällräven." 2024. <https://www.fjallraven.com/eu/en-gb/men/trousers/>.
- . 2024b. "Sustainable Production | Fjällräven." 2024. <https://www.fjallraven.com/eu/en-gb/about-fjallraven/sustainability/sustainable-production/>.
- Fortnite. 2024. "High Digital Fashion Drops into Fortnite with Balenciaga." Epic Games' Fortnite. 2024. <https://www.fortnite.com/news/high-digital-fashion-drops-into-fortnite-with-balenciaga?lang=en-US>.
- Frederick, Shane, Nathan Novemsky, Jing Wang, Ravi Dhar, and Stephen Nowlis. 2009. "Opportunity Cost Neglect." *Journal of Consumer Research* 36 (4): 553–61. <https://doi.org/10.1086/599764>.
- Galan, Jose I. 2006. "Corporate Social Responsibility and Strategic Management." *ResearchGate*, February. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/4993063\\_Corporate\\_Social\\_Responsibility\\_and\\_Strategic\\_Management](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/4993063_Corporate_Social_Responsibility_and_Strategic_Management).
- Gardetti, Miguel Angel, and Ana Laura Torres. 2013. "Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Luxury: The Aïny Savoirs Des Peuple Case." *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, no. 52, 55–75. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/jcorpciti.52.55>.
- Geissdoerfer, Martin, Paulo Savaget, Nancy M. P. Bocken, and Erik Jan Hultink. 2017. "The Circular Economy – A New Sustainability Paradigm?" *Journal of Cleaner Production* 143 (February):757–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.12.048>.
- Godey, Bruno, Daniele Pederzoli, Gaetano Aiello, Raffaele Donvito, Priscilla Chan, Hyunjoo Oh, Rahul Singh, Irina I. Skorobogatykh, Junji Tsuchiya, and Bart Weitz. 2011. "Brand and Country-of-Origin Effect on Consumers' Decision to Purchase Luxury Products." *Journal of Business Research* 65 (10): 1461–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.10.012>.
- Grazzini, Laura, Diletta Acuti, and Gaetano Aiello. 2021. "Solving the Puzzle of Sustainable Fashion Consumption: The Role of Consumers' Implicit Attitudes and Perceived Warmth." *Journal of Cleaner Production* 287 (March):125579. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.125579>.
- Gucci. 2023. "Gucci Equilibrium." 2023. <https://equilibrium.gucci.com/de/>.
- . 2024. "Discover the Gucci Sneaker Garage." 2024. <https://www.gucci.com/us/en/st/stories/article/sneaker-garage>.
- Hayes, Andrew F., and Todd D. Little. 2022. *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A Regression-Based Approach*. Third edition. Methodology in the Social Sciences. New York London: The Guilford Press.
- Heil, Oliver P., and Daniel André Langer. 2017. "Identifying the Luxury Sustainability Paradox: Three Steps Toward a Solution." In *Sustainable Management of Luxury*,

- edited by Miguel Angel Gardetti, 125–44. *Environmental Footprints and Eco-Design of Products and Processes*. Singapore: Springer Singapore.  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-2917-2\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-2917-2_6).
- Henninger, Claudia E., Panayiota J. Alevizou, and Caroline J. Oates. 2016. “What Is Sustainable Fashion?” *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal* 20 (4): 400–416. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFMM-07-2015-0052>.
- Hong, Yingxiu, Abdullah Al Mamun, Qing Yang, and Mohammad Masukujjaman. 2024. “Predicting Sustainable Fashion Consumption Intentions and Practices.” *Scientific Reports* 14 (1): 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-52215-z>.
- Hudders, Liselot. 2012. “Why the Devil Wears Prada: Consumers’ Purchase Motives for Luxuries.” *Journal of Brand Management* 19 (7): 609–22.  
<https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.2012.9>.
- Ikeda, Shinsuke. 2006. “Luxury and Wealth.” *International Economic Review* 47 (2): 495–526. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2354.2006.00386.x>.
- Irwin, Julie R, and Joan Scattone Spira. 1997. “Anomalies in the Values for Consumer Goods With Environmental Attributes.” *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 6 (4): 339–63.  
[https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp0604\\_02](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp0604_02).
- Janssen, Catherine, Joëlle Vanhamme, Adam Lindgreen, and Cécile Lefebvre. 2014. “The Catch-22 of Responsible Luxury: Effects of Luxury Product Characteristics on Consumers’ Perception of Fit with Corporate Social Responsibility.” *Journal of Business Ethics* 119 (1): 45–57. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1621-6>.
- Joy, Annamma, John F. Sherry, Alladi Venkatesh, Jeff Wang, and Ricky Chan. 2012. “Fast Fashion, Sustainability, and the Ethical Appeal of Luxury Brands.” *Fashion Theory* 16 (3): 273–95. <https://doi.org/10.2752/175174112X13340749707123>.
- Jung, Sojin, and ByoungHo Jin. 2014. “A Theoretical Investigation of Slow Fashion: Sustainable Future of the Apparel Industry.” *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 38 (5): 510–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12127>.
- Kapferer, Jean-Noël. 1997. “Managing Luxury Brands.” *Journal of Brand Management* 4 (4): 251–59. <https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.1997.4>.
- . 2010. “All That Glitters Is Not Green: The Challenge of Sustainable Luxury.” *European Business Review*, January, 40–45.
- Kapferer, Jean-Noël, and Vincent Bastien. 2009. “The Luxury Strategy: Break the Rules of Marketing to Build Luxury Brands,” January.
- . 2012. *The Luxury Strategy: Break the Rules of Marketing to Build Luxury Brands*. 2nd edn. London: Kogan Page.
- Kapferer, Jean-Noël, and Anne Michaut. 2016. “Pursuing the Concept of Luxury A Cross-Country Comparison and Segmentation of Luxury Buyers’ Perception of Luxury.” ResearchGate. December 2016.  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317688463\\_Pursuing\\_the\\_Concept\\_of\\_Luxu](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317688463_Pursuing_the_Concept_of_Luxu)

ry\_A\_cross-country\_comparison\_and\_segmentation\_of\_luxury\_buyers'\_perception\_of\_luxury.

- Kapferer, Jean-Noël, and Anne Michaut-Denizeau. 2014. "Is Luxury Compatible with Sustainability? Luxury Consumers' Viewpoint." *Journal of Brand Management* 21 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.2013.19>.
- . 2020. "Are Millennials Really More Sensitive to Sustainable Luxury? A Cross-Generational International Comparison of Sustainability Consciousness When Buying Luxury." *Journal of Brand Management* 27 (1): 35–47. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41262-019-00165-7>.
- Karpik, Lucien, and Nora Scott. 2010. *Valuing the Unique*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Keinan, Anat, Sandrine Crener, and Dafna Goor. 2020. "Luxury and Environmental Responsibility." In *Research Handbook on Luxury Branding*, edited by Felicitas Morhart, Keith Wilcox, and Sandor Czellar. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781786436351.00031>.
- Kunz, Jennifer, Stephanie May, and Holger J. Schmidt. 2020. "Sustainable Luxury: Current Status and Perspectives for Future Research." *Business Research* 13 (2): 541–601. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-020-00111-3>.
- Legere, Alisha, and Jiyun Kang. 2020. "The Role of Self-Concept in Shaping Sustainable Consumption: A Model of Slow Fashion." *Journal of Cleaner Production* 258 (June): 120699. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120699>.
- Lira, Jordana Soares De, and Marconi Freitas Da Costa. 2022. "Theory of Planned Behavior, Ethics and Intention of Conscious Consumption in Slow Fashion Consumption." *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal* 26 (5): 905–25. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFMM-03-2021-0071>.
- Liu, Yu, Sigal Segev, and Maria Elena Villar. 2017. "Comparing Two Mechanisms for Green Consumption: Cognitive-Affect Behavior vs Theory of Reasoned Action." *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 34 (5): 442–54. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-01-2016-1688>.
- LVMH. 2023. "Financial Documents."
- Mandarić, Doroteja, Anica Hunjet, and Dijana Vuković. 2022. "The Impact of Fashion Brand Sustainability on Consumer Purchasing Decisions." *Journal of Risk & Financial Management* 15 (4): N.PAG-N.PAG. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm15040176>.
- Martin, Brett A. S., and Carolyn A. Strong. 2016. "The Trustworthy Brand: Effects of Conclusion Explicitness and Persuasion Awareness on Consumer Judgments." *Marketing Letters* 27 (3): 473–85. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-014-9343-9>.
- Mazzalovo, Gerald. 2008. "Luxury Brand Management: A World of Privilege," March. [https://www.academia.edu/108427475/Luxury\\_Brand\\_Management\\_A\\_World\\_of\\_Privilege](https://www.academia.edu/108427475/Luxury_Brand_Management_A_World_of_Privilege).

- McKinsey & Company. 2023a. "Mind the Gap: Eighty-Eight Percent of Gen Z Doesn't Trust Eco-Friendly Claims." 2023.  
[https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/mckinsey/email/genz/2022/12/06/2022-12-06b.html?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/mckinsey/email/genz/2022/12/06/2022-12-06b.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com).
- . 2023b. "The State of Fashion 2024."  
<https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/retail/our-insights/state-of-fashion-archive#/>.
- . 2024. "The State of Fashion 2025."
- Moser, Andrea K. 2015. "Thinking Green, Buying Green? Drivers of pro-Environmental Purchasing Behavior." *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 32 (3): 167–75.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-10-2014-1179>.
- Newman, Christopher L., Elizabeth Howlett, Scot Burton, John C. Kozup, and Andrea Heintz Tangari. 2012. "The Influence of Consumer Concern about Global Climate Change on Framing Effects for Environmental Sustainability Messages." *International Journal of Advertising* 31 (3): 511–27. <https://doi.org/10.2501/IJA-31-3-511-527>.
- Nguyen, Mai Thi Tuyet, Linh Hoang Nguyen, and Hung Vu Nguyen. 2019. "Materialistic Values and Green Apparel Purchase Intention among Young Vietnamese Consumers." *Young Consumers* 20 (4): 246–63. <https://doi.org/10.1108/YC-10-2018-0859>.
- O’Cass, Aron, and Emily McEwen. 2004. "Exploring Consumer Status and Conspicuous Consumption." *Journal of Consumer Behaviour* 4 (1): 25–39.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.155>.
- Osburg, Victoria-Sophie, Vignesh Yoganathan, Fabian Bartsch, Mbaye Fall Diallo, and Hongfei Liu. 2024. "How Sustainable Luxury Influences Product Value Perceptions and Behavioral Intentions: A Comparative Study of Emerging vs. Developed Markets." *Journal of Business Ethics* 191 (4): 713–38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-024-05661-8>.
- Pandelaere, Mario, and L.J. Shrum. 2020. "Fulfilling Identity Motives through Luxury Consumption." In *Research Handbook on Luxury Branding*, edited by Felicitas Morhart, Keith Wilcox, and Sandor Czellar. Edward Elgar Publishing.  
<https://doi.org/10.4337/9781786436351.00014>.
- Patagonia. 2024a. "Outdoor Clothing & Gear | Patagonia UK." 2024.  
<https://eu.patagonia.com/gb/en/home/>.
- . 2024b. "Patagonia Men's Better Sweater® Fleece Jacket." 2024.  
[https://www.patagonia.com/product/mens-better-sweater-fleece-jacket/25528.html?dwvar\\_25528\\_color=TPGN](https://www.patagonia.com/product/mens-better-sweater-fleece-jacket/25528.html?dwvar_25528_color=TPGN).
- Paul, Justin, Ashwin Modi, and Jayesh Patel. 2015. "Predicting Green Product Consumption Using Theory of Planned Behavior and Reasoned Action." *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* 29:123–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2015.11.006>.
- Pieters, Leon, James Cascone, Stephen Rogers, and Derek Pankratz. 2023. "Green Products Come of Age." *Deloitte Insights*, May 31, 2023.  
<https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/industry/retail-distribution/consumer-behavior-trends-state-of-the-consumer-tracker/sustainable-products-customer->

expectations.html.

- Platania, Silvia, Giuseppe Santisi, and Martina Morando. 2019. "Impact of Emotion in the Choice of Eco-Luxury Brands: The Multiple Mediation Role of Brand Love and Brand Trust." *Quality - Access to Success* 20 (March):501–6.  
<https://research.ebsco.com/linkprocessor/plink?id=db7f59b0-658f-30ec-9780-5f1308862ec5>.
- Purvis, Ben, Yong Mao, and Darren Robinson. 2019. "Three Pillars of Sustainability: In Search of Conceptual Origins." *Sustainability Science* 14 (3): 681–95.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-018-0627-5>.
- PwC. 2024. "Voice of the Consumer Survey." PwC. 2024. <https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/newsroom/press-releases/2024/pwc-2024-voice-of-consumer-survey.html>.
- Qi, Xin, and Angelika Ploeger. 2019. "Explaining Consumers' Intentions towards Purchasing Green Food in Qingdao, China: The Amendment and Extension of the Theory of Planned Behavior." *Appetite* 133 (February):414–22.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.12.004>.
- Raczkowski, Konrad, Justyna Fijalkowska, and Łukasz Sułkowski. 2016. "Comparative Critical Review of Corporate Social Responsibility Business Management Models." *International Journal of Contemporary Management* 15 (2): 123–50.  
<https://doi.org/10.4467/24498939IJCM.16.014.5554>.
- Renoon. 2024. "Sustainability Management for Fashion Industry." 2024.  
<https://www.renoon.com/>.
- Rojek-Nowosielska, Magdalena. 2014. "Corporate Social Responsibility Level – Theoretical Approach." *ResearchGate*, June. <https://doi.org/10.2478/manment-2014-0003>.
- Romaniuk, Jenni, and Ava Huang. 2020. "Understanding Consumer Perceptions of Luxury Brands." *International Journal of Market Research* 62 (5): 546–60.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1470785319891109>.
- Schwartz, Shalom H. 2012. "An Overview of the Schwartz Theory of Basic Values." *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture* 2 (1). <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1116>.
- Seringhaus, F.H. Rolf. 2002. "Cross-Cultural Exploration of Global Brands and the Internet." In *ResearchGate*. Groupe ESC Dijon Bourgogne, Dijon, France: School of Business and Economics, Wilfrid Laurier University.  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228917919\\_Cross-cultural\\_exploration\\_of\\_Global\\_Brands\\_and\\_the\\_Internet](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228917919_Cross-cultural_exploration_of_Global_Brands_and_the_Internet).
- Sesini, Giulia, Cinzia Castiglioni, and Edoardo Lozza. 2020. "New Trends and Patterns in Sustainable Consumption: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda." *Sustainability; Volume 12; Issue 15; Pages: 5935*, January.  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su12155935>.
- Singh, Varsha, Sakshi Kathuria, Deepika Puri, and Bharat Kapoor. 2023. "Corporate social

- responsibility and behavioral intentions: A mediating mechanism of Brand Recognition.” *Corporate Social Responsibility & Environmental Management* 30 (4): 1698–1711. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2445>.
- Statista. 2024. “Luxury Fashion - Worldwide.” Statista. 2024. <http://frontend.xmo.prod.aws.statista.com/outlook/cmo/luxury-goods/luxury-fashion/worldwide?currency=USD>.
- Steinhart, Yael, Ofira Ayalon, and Hila Puterman. 2013. “The Effect of an Environmental Claim on Consumers’ Perceptions about Luxury and Utilitarian Products.” *Journal of Cleaner Production* 53 (August):277–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.04.024>.
- Stella McCartney. 2024. “Ethical Fashion.” 2024. [https://www.stellamccartney.com/gb/en/sustainability/sustainability.html?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.stellamccartney.com/gb/en/sustainability/sustainability.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com).
- Straits Research. 2023. “Luxury Fashion Market Size, Trends and Demand by Forecast 2032.” 2023. <https://straitsresearch.com/report/luxury-fashion-market>.
- Strübel, Jessica, Saheli Goswami, Ji Hye Kang, and Rosemary Leger. 2023. “Improving Society and the Planet: Sustainability and Fashion Post-Pandemic.” *Sustainability* 15 (17): 12846. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151712846>.
- Sullivan, Gail M., and Richard Feinn. 2012. “Using Effect Size—or Why the *P* Value Is Not Enough.” *Journal of Graduate Medical Education* 4 (3): 279–82. <https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-12-00156.1>.
- Sun, Jennifer J., Silvia Bellezza, and Neeru Paharia. 2021. “Buy Less, Buy Luxury: Understanding and Overcoming Product Durability Neglect for Sustainable Consumption.” *Journal of Marketing* 85 (3): 28–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242921993172>.
- The RealReal. 2024. “Buy & Sell Designer Clothes, Bags, Shoes & More |.” 2024. <https://www.therealreal.com/>.
- Thomas, Sue. 2008. “From ‘Green Blur’ to Eco-fashion: Fashioning an Eco-Lexicon.” *Fashion Theory* 12 (4): 525–39. <https://doi.org/10.2752/175174108X346977>.
- Torelli, Carlos J., Alokparna Basu Monga, and Andrew M. Kaikati. 2012. “Doing Poorly by Doing Good: Corporate Social Responsibility and Brand Concepts.” *Journal of Consumer Research* 38 (5): 948–63. <https://doi.org/10.1086/660851>.
- Truong, Yann, Rod McColl, and Philip J. Kitchen. 2009. “New Luxury Brand Positioning and the Emergence of Masstige Brands.” *Journal of Brand Management* 16 (5): 375–82.
- UNECE. 2018. “UN Alliance Aims to Put Fashion on Path to Sustainability | UNECE.” 2018. <https://unece.org/forestry/press/un-alliance-aims-put-fashion-path-sustainability>.
- Veblen, T. 1889. *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

- Vestiaire Collective. 2024. "Vestiaire Collective: Second-Hand-Mode kaufen und verkaufen." 2024. <https://de.vestiairecollective.com/>.
- Vigneron, Franck, and Lester Johnson. 1999. "A Review and a Conceptual Framework of Prestige-Seeking Consumer Behavior." *Academy of Marketing Science Review* 2 (January):1–15.
- Vigneron, Franck, and Lester W Johnson. 2004. "Measuring Perceptions of Brand Luxury." *Journal of Brand Management* 11 (6): 484–506. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.bm.2540194>.
- Vinted. 2024. "Second-Hand Is Replacing New in Wardrobes Across Europe, According to Vinted's Latest Impact Report." *Vinted Newsroom* (blog). June 18, 2024. <https://company.vinted.com/newsroom/impact-report>.
- Vivienne Westwood. n.d. "Vivienne Westwood." Accessed November 25, 2024. <https://www.viviennewestwood.com/sustainability/?srsltid=AfmBOoqtqHKxdzEQgbsb61qw1JIVo39VdRXEvjvzdBUDtbyWflUcmRW->.
- Vogt, Markus, and Christoph Weber. 2019. "Current Challenges to the Concept of Sustainability." *Global Sustainability* 2 (January):e4. <https://doi.org/10.1017/sus.2019.1>.
- Walker, Stuart. 2006. *Sustainable by Design : Explorations in Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge. <https://research.ebsco.com/linkprocessor/plink?id=fd0933e3-29a9-34f9-b69c-28dd91c76de6>.
- Wang, Pengji, Adrian T. H. Kuah, Qinye Lu, Caroline Wong, K. Thirumaran, Emmanuel Adegbite, and Wesley Kendall. 2021. "The Impact of Value Perceptions on Purchase Intention of Sustainable Luxury Brands in China and the UK." *Journal of Brand Management* 28 (3): 325–46. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41262-020-00228-0>.
- Wiederhold, Marie, and Luis F. Martinez. 2018. "Ethical Consumer Behaviour in Germany: The Attitude-behaviour Gap in the Green Apparel Industry." *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 42 (4): 419–29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12435>.
- Yuriev, Alexander, Mehdi Dahmen, Pascal Paillé, Olivier Boiral, and Laurence Guillaumie. 2020. "Pro-Environmental Behaviors through the Lens of the Theory of Planned Behavior: A Scoping Review." *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 155 (April):104660. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2019.104660>.

## **Appendix**

### **Appendix A – Experimental Survey Design**

#### **Appendix A.1 Survey Structure**

##### **Introduction**

PLEASE SELECT YOUR PREFERRED LANGUAGE (ENGLISH / GERMAN) Thank you for participating in our survey for our master's thesis at Nova SBE! We aim to investigate consumer preferences in luxury / premium fashion. Completing the survey should take around 5-7 minutes. You will see four different products / scenarios. They are all independent from each other. Please review each product and its description very carefully, as you will be asked questions about them. We appreciate your participation! In case of any questions, please don't hesitate to contact us via 58883@novasbe.pt. All responses are collected anonymously and will remain confidential.

##### **Additional information**

In the following you will see different products from two fictitious brands:

Brand X – This is a premium brand known for high-quality materials and timeless design.

Brand Y – This is a mid-range brand known for its trendy designs and high accessibility (i.e., affordable, widely available).

ATTENTION: You cannot go back between pages, please read the descriptions carefully!

##### **Section 1**

In the following section, you will be shown two sweaters available for sale. Please take a moment to review each one carefully, as you will be asked to answer questions about them.

Remember that you cannot go back between pages!

*Participants saw product visualizations and descriptions for a premium and mid-range product*

**Question 1 – H1**

Would you prefer to choose Brand X (€120) or Brand Y (€40)?

- 1 – Would definitely prefer Brand X (€120)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 – Would definitely prefer Brand Y (€40)

**Question 2 – H1**

How durable do you believe the products are?

Sweater Brand X – €120 (1 – Not at all durable to 7 – Very durable)

Sweater Brand X – €40 (1 – Not at all durable to 7 – Very durable)

**Section 2**

In the following section, you will be shown two t-shirts available for sale. Please take a moment to review each one carefully, as you will be asked to answer questions about them.

Remember that you cannot go back between pages!

*Participants saw product visualizations and descriptions for a premium and mid-range product*

**Question 1 – H2**

You have a budget of €60. Which of the following options would you choose if you had to select one?

- Buy one t-shirt of Brand X for €60
- Buy three t-shirts of Brand Y for €20 each

**Question 2 – H2**

In the previous question, how important was the consideration of durability in your decision?

- 1 – Not at all important
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 – Very important

**Section 3**

In the following section, you will be shown a jacket available for sale. Please take a moment to review it carefully, as you will be asked to answer questions about it. Remember that you cannot go back between pages!

*Participants saw a product visualizations and description*

**Question 1 – H3**

Based on the product description, how much are you willing to pay for this jacket? Please use the slider to indicate an amount between €100 and €1000.

*Slider from €100 to €1000 with €100 interval steps*

**Question 2 – H3**

Why did you choose the price you indicated for this jacket? Please select the most relevant reason(s) provided.

- Materials used
- Design and aesthetics
- Craftsmanship or quality of production
- Personal budget
- Prices of comparable products

- Brand reputation
- Perceived luxury or status associated with the product
- Sustainability features
- Environmental impact

### **Question 3 – H3**

How likely are you to purchase this jacket based on the description you saw?

- 1 – Not likely at all
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 – Very likely

### **Question 4 – H3**

How would you rate the overall value of this jacket, considering its ability to meet your needs or provide a solution (e.g., warmth, protection, style)?

- 1 – Very low value
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 – Very high value

### **Section 4**

In the following section, you will be shown a pair of jeans available for sale. Please take a moment to review them carefully, as you will be asked to answer questions about them.

Remember that you cannot go back between pages!

*Participants saw a product visualizations and description*

**Question 1 – H4**

How likely are you to purchase this product?

- 1 – Not likely at all
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 – Very likely

**Question 2 – H4**

To what extent did the sustainability claims in the product description influence your overall impression of the jeans?

- 1 – Not at all
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 – Very much

**Question 3 – H4**

How authentic (i.e., credible) do you find the sustainability claims in this product description?

- 1 – Not at all authentic
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 – Very authentic

**Final Section****Shopping Behavior**

The following question is about your usual shopping behavior. Please answer honestly. Which of the following descriptions fits you better?

- 1 – Tightwad (someone who has trouble spending money)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 – Spendthrift (someone who has trouble limiting their spending)

**Demographics**

What is your individual monthly disposable income? (after taxes; incl. salary, alimony, family support, capital gains, pension, etc.)

*Dropdown:* Below €500; €501 to €1000; €1001 to €1500; €1501 to €2000; €2001 to €2500; €2501 to €3000; €3001 to €3500; €3501 to €4000; €4001 to €4500; €4501 to €5000; €5001 to €6000; €6001 to €7000; Above €7000

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Non-binary
- Other
- Prefer not to say

What is your age?

*Free text entry (only numerical values from 18 to 100)*

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- No formal education
- Secondary education (e.g., Highschool, GCSEs, A-Level, Hauptschule, Abitur) or equivalent
- Technical qualification (e.g., Apprenticeship) or equivalent
- Bachelor's degree or equivalent
- Master's degree or equivalent
- Doctoral degree or equivalent
- Other

Where is your primary country of residence?

*Dropdown list with 197 countries*

## Appendix A.2 Product visualizations and descriptions

### Appendix A.2.1 Study 1

|   |  |   |   |    |     |     |   |    |   |   |   |    |     |
|---|--|---|---|----|-----|-----|---|----|---|---|---|----|-----|
|  <p style="font-size: small;">Designed by Freepik</p>   |  <p style="font-size: small;">Designed by Freepik</p>   |   |   |    |     |     |   |    |   |   |   |    |     |
| <p><b>Brand X – Classic Sweater</b><br/> <b>€ 120</b></p> <p>A premium grey sweater with a round-neck design, offering a <b>comfortable fit</b> and <b>classic style</b> for everyday wear.<br/>         Available in multiple sizes.</p> | <p><b>Brand Y – Classic Sweater</b><br/> <b>€ 40</b></p> <p>A mid-range grey sweater with a round-neck design, <b>offering a comfortable fit</b> and <b>classic style</b> for everyday wear.<br/>         Available in multiple sizes.</p> |   |   |    |     |     |   |    |   |   |   |    |     |
| <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tbody> <tr> <td>XS</td> <td>S</td> <td style="background-color: #cccccc;">M</td> <td>L</td> <td>XL</td> <td>XXL</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>                                 | XS   | S | M | L  | XL  | XXL | <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tbody> <tr> <td>XS</td> <td>S</td> <td style="background-color: #cccccc;">M</td> <td>L</td> <td>XL</td> <td>XXL</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | XS | S | M | L | XL | XXL |
| XS  | S  | M | L | XL | XXL |     |   |    |   |   |   |    |     |
| XS  | S  | M | L | XL | XXL |     |   |    |   |   |   |    |     |

Figure 1 - Study 1: Control Group (implicit sustainability marketing)



|   |   |
|---|---|
|  <p style="text-align: right; font-size: small;">Designed by Freepik</p>   |  <p style="text-align: right; font-size: small;">Designed by Freepik</p>  |
| <p><b>Brand X – Classic Sweater</b><br/> <b>€ 120</b></p> <p>Crafted for the long haul, this grey sweater offers a classic look that never goes out of style. Made from durable materials, it's <b>designed to last</b>, offering sustainability and timeless appeal.<br/>                 Available in multiple sizes.</p> <p>XS   S   <b>M</b>   L   XL   XXL</p> | <p><b>Brand Y – Classic Sweater</b><br/> <b>€ 40</b></p> <p>A mid-range grey sweater with a round-neck design, <b>offering a comfortable fit and classic style</b> for everyday wear.<br/>                 Available in multiple sizes.</p> <p>XS   S   <b>M</b>   L   XL   XXL</p> |

Figure 2 - Study 1: Test Group (explicit sustainability marketing)

**Appendix A.2.2 Study 2**



|  |   |
|--|---|
|  <p style="text-align: right; font-size: small;">Designed by Freepik</p>  |  <p style="text-align: right; font-size: small;">Designed by Freepik</p>  |
| <p><b>Brand X – Timeless T-Shirt</b><br/> <b>€ 60</b></p> <p>A stylish, <b>high-end</b> t-shirt made from cotton with a crew neck for perfect comfort.</p> <p>XS   S   <b>M</b>   L   XL   XXL</p> | <p><b>Brand Y – Timeless T-Shirt</b><br/> <b>€ 20</b></p> <p>A stylish, <b>mid-range</b> t-shirt made from cotton with a crew neck for perfect comfort.</p> <p>XS   S   <b>M</b>   L   XL   XXL</p> |

Figure 3 - Study 2: Control Group (no extended guarantees)



|  |  |
|--|--|
|  <p style="text-align: right; font-size: small;">Designed by Freepik</p>  |  <p style="text-align: right; font-size: small;">Designed by Freepik</p> |
| <p><b>Brand X – Timeless T-Shirt</b><br/><b>€ 60</b></p>   | <p><b>Brand Y – Timeless T-Shirt</b><br/><b>€ 20</b></p>   |
| <p>A stylish, <b>high-end</b> t-shirt made from cotton with a crew neck for perfect comfort. This product comes with an unconditional guarantee for its entire lifetime (you can repair or replace the product at any time).</p> | <p>A stylish, <b>mid-range</b> t-shirt made from cotton with a crew neck for perfect comfort.</p>  |
| <p>XS S <b>M</b> L XL XXL</p>  | <p>XS S <b>M</b> L XL XXL</p>  |

Figure 4 - Study 2: Test Group (unconditional product guarantee)

### Appendix A.2.3 Study 3


|   |   |
|---|---|
|  | <p><b>Brand X – Unisex Jacket</b></p> <p>This luxury jacket is crafted from the finest premium materials, designed for those who value timeless elegance and refined style. With a modern fit, it offers a balance of contemporary fashion and classic luxury. Every detail, from its high-end materials to its expert craftsmanship, reflects a commitment to quality and exclusivity. This jacket is perfect for individuals who prioritize sophistication and luxury, making it a distinguished addition to any wardrobe. A true reflection of high-end fashion, it offers an elegant, polished look that stands the test of time.</p> |
|---|---|

Figure 5 - Study 3: Control Group (traditional luxury framing)



### Brand X – Unisex Jacket

This luxury jacket is crafted from the finest eco-friendly materials, designed for those who value sustainability and refined style. With a modern fit, it offers a balance of contemporary fashion and ethical luxury. Every detail, from its recycled fabrics to its eco-conscious production, reflects a commitment to both quality and the environment. This jacket is perfect for individuals who prioritize sustainability without compromising on sophistication, making it a distinguished, responsible choice for any wardrobe. A true reflection of ethical luxury, it offers an elegant, polished look with a reduced environmental impact.

Figure 6 - Study 3: Test Group (sustainable luxury framing)

## Appendix A.2.4 Study 4



### Brand X – Jeans

€ 130

Crafted from a durable cotton blend, these jeans are designed for **comfort and durability**. Made to retain their shape and color over time, they are a conscious choice for those who value both quality and style. With attention to sustainable practices, these jeans are **probably the best choice** for those looking for a **responsible, premium wardrobe staple**.

**Main fabric:** Organic cotton blend (70% organic cotton, 30% regular cotton)

**Lining:** Partially recycled polyester

**Dyeing process:** Low impact, environmentally friendly dyes

**Made in:** EU (Produced under fair working conditions)

**Delivery:** Free standard shipping

Figure 7 - Study 4: Control Group (moderate sustainability claims)



### Brand X – Jeans

€ 130

Made entirely from recyclable materials, these jeans are **100% environmentally friendly** and **carbon neutral**. Designed to retain their perfect fit and rich color through countless wears and washes, they resist fading and stretching, ensuring they look as good as new after each wear. Produced in line with the highest sustainability standards, these are the **best sustainable jeans** on the market, designed for those who value both **sustainability and quality**.

**Main fabric:** 100% recyclable materials

**Lining:** 100% recycled polyester

**Dyeing process:** Non-toxic, eco-friendly dyes

**Made in:** EU (Produced under ethical labor practices and strict environmental standards)

**Delivery:** Free standard shipping

Figure 8 - Study 4: Test Group (excessive sustainability claims)

### Appendix A.3 Survey Flow

| Qualtrics Survey Flow                               |
|---|
| Introduction  |
| Section 1   |
| Introduction Section 1                              |
| <i>Block Randomizer 1 – Evenly Present Elements</i> |
| Group: Test   |
| If: Device Type is Mobile                           |
| Test Premium Product (Mobile) – H1                  |
| Test Mid-Range Product (Mobile) – H1                |
| If: Device Type is Not Mobile                       |
| Test Premium Product – H1                           |
| Test Mid-Range Product – H1                         |
| Question 1 – H1                                     |
| Group: Control                                      |
| If: Device Type is Mobile                           |
| Control Premium Product (Mobile) – H1               |
| Control Mid-Range Product (Mobile) – H1             |
| If: Device Type is Not Mobile                       |
| Control Premium Product – H1                        |
| Control Mid-Range Product – H1                      |
| Question 1 – H1                                     |
| Question 2 – H1                                     |
| Section Break 1>2                                   |
| Introduction Section 2                              |
| <i>Block Randomizer 1 – Evenly Present Elements</i> |
| Group: Control                                      |
| <i>Block Randomizer 2 – Evenly Present Elements</i> |
| Group: Control / Premium                            |
| If: Device Type is Mobile                           |
| Control Premium Product (Mobile) – H2               |
| If: Device Type is Not Mobile                       |
| Control Premium Product – H2                        |
| Group: Control / Mid-Range                          |
| If: Device Type is Mobile                           |
| Control Mid-Range Product (Mobile) – H2             |
| If: Device Type is Not Mobile                       |
| Control Mid-Range Product – H2                      |
| Question 1 – H2                                     |
| Group: Test   |
| <i>Block Randomizer 2 – Evenly Present Elements</i> |
| Group: Test / Premium                               |
| If: Device Type is Mobile                           |
| Test Premium Product (Mobile) – H2                  |
| If: Device Type is Not Mobile                       |
| Test Premium Product – H2                           |

| <b>Qualtrics Survey Flow</b>                        |
|---|
| Group: Test / Mid-Range                             |
| If: Device Type is Mobile                           |
| Test Mid-Range Product (Mobile) – H2                |
| If: Device Type is Not Mobile                       |
| Test Mid-Range Product – H2                         |
| Question 1 – H2                                     |
| Question 2 – H2                                     |
| Section Break 2>3                                   |
| Introduction Section 3                              |
| <i>Block Randomizer 1 – Evenly Present Elements</i> |
| Group: Control                                      |
| If: Device Type is Mobile                           |
| Control Product (Mobile) – H3                       |
| If: Device Type is Not Mobile                       |
| Control Product – H3                                |
| Question 1 – H3                                     |
| Group: Test   |
| If: Device Type is Mobile                           |
| Test Product (Mobile) – H3                          |
| If: Device Type is Not Mobile                       |
| Test Product – H3                                   |
| Question 1 – H3                                     |
| Question 2 – H3                                     |
| Question 3 – H3                                     |
| Question 4 – H3                                     |
| Section Break 3>4                                   |
| Introduction Section 4                              |
| <i>Block Randomizer 1 – Evenly Present Elements</i> |
| Group: Control                                      |
| If: Device Type is Mobile                           |
| Control Product (Mobile) – H4                       |
| If: Device Type is Not Mobile                       |
| Control Product – H4                                |
| Question 1 – H4                                     |
| Question 2 – H4                                     |
| Group: Test   |
| If: Device Type is Mobile                           |
| Test Product (Mobile) – H4                          |
| If: Device Type is Not Mobile                       |
| Test Product – H4                                   |
| Question 1 – H4                                     |
| Question 2 – H4                                     |
| Question 3 – H4                                     |
| Section Break 4>End                                 |
| General Questions                                   |

Table 1 - Survey Flow in Qualtrics Platform (H1 = Study 1; H2 = Study 2; H3 = Study 3; H4 = Study 4)

## Appendix B – Respondent Characteristics and Demographics

### Appendix B.1: Frequency Statistics for Income

*Income*

|       |                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | €1001 to €1500 | 33        | 18.3    | 18.3          | 18.3               |
|       | €1501 to €2000 | 16        | 8.9     | 8.9           | 27.2               |
|       | €2001 to €2500 | 18        | 10.0    | 10.0          | 37.2               |
|       | €2501 to €3000 | 18        | 10.0    | 10.0          | 47.2               |
|       | €3001 to €3500 | 19        | 10.6    | 10.6          | 57.8               |
|       | €3501 to €4000 | 14        | 7.8     | 7.8           | 65.6               |
|       | €4001 to €4500 | 8         | 4.4     | 4.4           | 70.0               |
|       | €4501 to €5000 | 8         | 4.4     | 4.4           | 74.4               |
|       | €5001 to €6000 | 3         | 1.7     | 1.7           | 76.1               |
|       | €501 to €1000  | 26        | 14.4    | 14.4          | 90.6               |
|       | €6001 to €7000 | 2         | 1.1     | 1.1           | 91.7               |
|       | Above €7000    | 9         | 5.0     | 5.0           | 96.7               |
|       | Below €500     | 6         | 3.3     | 3.3           | 100.0              |
|       | Total          | 180       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Table 2 - Frequency Statistics for Income Distribution of Sample Population

### Appendix B.2 Frequency Statistics for Gender

*Gender*

|       |                   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Female            | 85        | 47.2    | 47.2          | 47.2               |
|       | Male              | 92        | 51.1    | 51.1          | 98.3               |
|       | Non-binary        | 1         | .6      | .6            | 98.9               |
|       | Prefer not to say | 2         | 1.1     | 1.1           | 100.0              |
|       | Total             | 180       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Table 3 - Frequency Statistics for Gender Distribution of Sample Population

**Appendix B.3 Frequency Statistics for Age**

| <i>Statistics</i> |         |        |
|-------------------|---------|--------|
| <u>Age</u>        |         |        |
| N                 | Valid   | 180    |
|                   | Missing | 0      |
| Mean              |         | 33.91  |
| Median            |         | 27.00  |
| Std. Deviation    |         | 12.825 |
| Minimum           |         | 19     |
| Maximum           |         | 82     |

*Table 4 - Frequency Statistics for Age Distribution of Sample Population***Appendix B.4 Frequency Statistics for Education**

| <i>Education</i> |   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid            | Bachelor's degree or equivalent   | 60        | 33.3    | 33.3          | 33.3               |
|                  | Doctoral degree or equivalent   | 7         | 3.9     | 3.9           | 37.2               |
|                  | Master's degree or equivalent   | 58        | 32.2    | 32.2          | 69.4               |
|                  | No formal education   | 1         | .6      | .6            | 70.0               |
|                  | Secondary education (e.g., Highschool, GCSEs, A-Level, Hauptschule, Abitur) or equivalent | 23        | 12.8    | 12.8          | 82.8               |
|                  | Technical qualification (e.g., Apprenticeship) or equivalent                              | 31        | 17.2    | 17.2          | 100.0              |
|                  | Total   | 180       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

*Table 5 - Frequency Statistics for Education Distribution of Sample Population*

**Appendix B.5 Frequency Statistics for Country**

| <i>Country</i> |             |           |         | Valid   | Cumulative |
|----------------|-------------|-----------|---------|---------|------------|
|                |             | Frequency | Percent | Percent | Percent    |
| Valid          | Austria     | 1         | .6      | .6      | .6         |
|                | Belgium     | 1         | .6      | .6      | 1.1        |
|                | Germany     | 166       | 92.2    | 92.2    | 93.3       |
|                | Italy       | 3         | 1.7     | 1.7     | 95.0       |
|                | Netherlands | 3         | 1.7     | 1.7     | 96.7       |
|                | Portugal    | 1         | .6      | .6      | 97.2       |
|                | Switzerland | 5         | 2.8     | 2.8     | 100.0      |
|                | Total       | 180       | 100.0   | 100.0   |            |

*Table 6 - Frequency Statistics for Country of Residence Distribution of Sample Population*

## Appendix C – Results Study 1

### Appendix C.1 Study 1: Descriptive Statistics

#### Appendix C.1.1 Frequency Statistics for Experimental Condition

|       |         | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Control | 92        | 51.1    | 51.1          | 51.1               |
|       | Test    | 88        | 48.9    | 48.9          | 100.0              |
|       | Total   | 180       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Table 7 - Study 1: Frequency Statistics for Experimental Condition (Control vs. Test Group)

#### Appendix C.1.1 Frequency Statistics for Brand Preference

|       |                      | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Least prefer Brand Y | 12        | 6.7     | 6.7           | 6.7                |
|       | 2                    | 14        | 7.8     | 7.8           | 14.4               |
|       | 3                    | 22        | 12.2    | 12.2          | 26.7               |
|       | 4                    | 14        | 7.8     | 7.8           | 34.4               |
|       | 5                    | 24        | 13.3    | 13.3          | 47.8               |
|       | 6                    | 23        | 12.8    | 12.8          | 60.6               |
|       | Most prefer Brand Y  | 71        | 39.4    | 39.4          | 100.0              |
|       | Total                | 180       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Table 8 - Study 1: Frequency Statistics for Brand Preference for mid-range Brand Y

|       |         | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Brand X | 48        | 26.7    | 26.7          | 26.7               |
|       | Neutral | 14        | 7.8     | 7.8           | 34.4               |
|       | Brand Y | 118       | 65.6    | 65.6          | 100.0              |
|       | Total   | 180       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Table 9 - Study 1: Frequency Statistics for Brand Preference (grouped into three categories)

#### Appendix C.1.3 Descriptive Statistics for Brand Preference and Durability Perception

|                              | N   | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|------------------------------|-----|------|----------------|----------|
| Brand Preference             | 180 | 5.09 | 2.013          | 4.052    |
| Perceived Durability Brand X | 180 | 5.16 | 1.254          | 1.573    |
| Perceived Durability Brand Y | 180 | 3.83 | 1.157          | 1.339    |
| Valid N (listwise)           | 180 |      |                |          |

Table 10 - Study 1: Descriptive Statistics for Brand Preference and Durability Perception

## Appendix C.2 Study 1: One-Way ANOVA

### Descriptives – Brand Preference

|         | N   | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean |             | Minimum | Maximum |
|---------|-----|------|----------------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|
|         |     |      |                |            | Lower Bound                      | Upper Bound |         |         |
| Control | 92  | 5.61 | 1.881          | .196       | 5.22                             | 6.00        | 1       | 7       |
| Test    | 88  | 4.56 | 2.016          | .215       | 4.13                             | 4.98        | 1       | 7       |
| Total   | 180 | 5.09 | 2.013          | .150       | 4.80                             | 5.39        | 1       | 7       |

Table 11 - Study 1: Group Differences with one-way ANOVA (Condition\*Brand Preference) - Descriptives

### Tests of Homogeneity of Variances

|                  |                                      | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2     | Sig. |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----|---------|------|
| Brand Preference | Based on Mean                        | 2.077            | 1   | 178     | .151 |
|                  | Based on Median                      | 2.262            | 1   | 178     | .134 |
|                  | Based on Median and with adjusted df | 2.262            | 1   | 144.014 | .135 |
|                  | Based on trimmed mean                | 2.843            | 1   | 178     | .094 |

Table 12 - Study 1: Group Differences with one-way ANOVA (Condition\*Brand Preference) - Test of Homogeneity of Variances

### ANOVA - Brand Preference

|                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F      | Sig.  |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------|
| Between Groups | 49.765         | 1   | 49.765      | 13.111 | <.001 |
| Within Groups  | 675.629        | 178 | 3.796       |        |       |
| Total          | 725.394        | 179 |             |        |       |

Table 13 - Study 1: Group Differences with one-way ANOVA (Condition\*Brand Preference) – ANOVA

### ANOVA Effect Sizes<sup>a</sup>

|                  |                             | Point Estimate | 95% Confidence Interval |       |
|------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------|
|                  |                             |                | Lower                   | Upper |
| Brand Preference | Eta-squared                 | .069           | .014                    | .149  |
|                  | Epsilon-squared             | .063           | .009                    | .144  |
|                  | Omega-squared Fixed-effect  | .063           | .009                    | .143  |
|                  | Omega-squared Random-effect | .063           | .009                    | .143  |

a. Eta-squared and Epsilon-squared are estimated based on the fixed-effect model.

Table 14 - Study 1: Group Differences with one-way ANOVA (Condition\*Brand Preference) - ANOVA Effect Sizes

### Appendix C.3 Study 1: Independent Samples t-Test (Brand Preference)

#### *Independent Samples Test*

|                             | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |      | t-test for Equality of Means |         |              |             | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |                       |       |       |
|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------|---|-----------------------|-------|-------|
|                             | F                                       | Sig. | t                            | df      | Significance |             | Mean Difference                           | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
|                             |   |      |                              |         | One-Sided p  | Two-Sided p |   |                       |       |       |
| Equal variances assumed     | 2.077                                   | .151 | 3.621                        | 178     | <.001        | <.001       | 1.052                                     | .290                  | .479  | 1.625 |
| Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 3.615                        | 175.714 | <.001        | <.001       | 1.052                                     | .291                  | .478  | 1.626 |

Table 15 - Study 1: Group Differences with independent samples t-test for experimental Condition and Brand Preference Brand Y (mid-range brand)

#### *Independent Samples Effect Sizes*

|                  | Standardizer <sup>a</sup> | Point Estimate | 95% Confidence Interval |           |
|------------------|---------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------|
|                  |                           |                | Lower                   | Upper     |
| Brand Preference | Cohen's d                 | 1.948          | .540                    | .242 .837 |

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Table 16 - Study 1: Group Differences with Independent Samples t-Test (Condition\*Brand Preference) - Independent Samples Effect Sizes

**Appendix C.4 Study 1: Independent Samples t-Test (Durability Perception)***Group Statistics*

|              | Condition | N  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|--------------|-----------|----|------|----------------|-----------------|
| Durability X | Control   | 92 | 5.20 | 1.179          | .123            |
|              | Test      | 88 | 5.11 | 1.334          | .142            |
| Durability Y | Control   | 92 | 3.79 | 1.134          | .118            |
|              | Test      | 88 | 3.86 | 1.186          | .126            |

Table 17 - Study 1: Group Differences with independent samples t-test (Condition\*Durability Perception) - Group Statistics

*Independent Samples Test*

|   |                             | Levene's Test for<br>Equality of<br>Variances |      | t-test for Equality of Means |         |                                 |                 | 95% Confidence<br>Interval of the<br>Difference |                          |       |       |
|---|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|---------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------|-------|-------|
|   |                             | F   | Sig. | t                            | df      | Significance<br>One-<br>Sided p | Two-<br>Sided p | Mean<br>Difference                              | Std. Error<br>Difference | Lower | Upper |
| X | Equal variances assumed     | .533  | .466 | .438                         | 178     | .331                            | .662            | .082  | .187                     | -.288 | .452  |
|   | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | .436                         | 173.146 | .332                            | .663            | .082  | .188                     | -.289 | .453  |
| Y | Equal variances assumed     | .151  | .698 | -.406                        | 178     | .343                            | .685            | -.070   | .173                     | -.411 | .271  |
|   | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | -.405                        | 176.595 | .343                            | .686            | -.070   | .173                     | -.412 | .271  |

Table 18 - Study 1: Group Differences with independent samples t-test for experimental condition and durability perception of Brand X and Brand Y

**Appendix C.5 Study 1: PROCESS Model 4 – Mediator Analysis***Model Summary: Durability Perception of Brand X*

| R     | R-sq  | MSE    | F     | df1    | df2      | p     |
|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| .0328 | .0011 | 1.5806 | .1914 | 1.0000 | 178.0000 | .6623 |

Table 19 - Study 1: Mediator Analysis with PROCESS Model 4 (Condition\*Durability Perception) - Model Summary

*Model Summary: Brand Preference*

| R     | R-sq  | MSE    | F       | df1    | df2      | p     |
|-------|-------|--------|---------|--------|----------|-------|
| .3394 | .1152 | 3.6261 | 11.5236 | 2.0000 | 177.0000 | .0000 |

Table 20 - Study 1: Mediator Analysis with PROCESS Model 4 (Condition\*Brand Preference Brand Y) - Model Summary

*Direct Effect of Condition on Brand Preference*

| Effect  | SE    | t       | p     | LLCI    | ULCI   |
|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|--------|
| -1.0803 | .2841 | -3.8027 | .0002 | -1.6409 | -.5197 |

Table 21 - Study 1: Mediator Analysis with PROCESS Model 4 (Condition\*Brand Preference Brand Y) - Direct Effect

*Indirect Effect(s) of Condition on Brand Preference*

|                              | Effect | BootSE | BootLLCI | BootULCI |
|------------------------------|--------|--------|----------|----------|
| Perceived Durability Brand X | .0284  | .0700  | -.1169   | .1690    |

Table 22 - Study 1: Mediator Analysis with PROCESS Model 4 (Condition\*Brand Preference Brand Y) - Indirect Effect

