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Abstract

Sweat it out: Attitudes and decision making surrounding ethical garments

Jessica Pasinetti

Many consumers purchase sweatshop products, despite the hazardous conditions for workers. The psychological factors that influence (un)ethical garment purchasing are not well understood. Two studies explored consumers’ knowledge, attitudes, and behaviour. University students (Study 1; \( N = 130 \)) said they would pay more for ethically-labelled garments, particularly students who were community and future-orientated. Importantly, most students were unaware of where to purchase ethical garments. In Study 2, female undergraduate students (\( N = 74 \)) were randomly assigned to read about a sweatshop collapse or garment care. Students who read about the disaster chose more ‘sweatshop-free’ garments in a virtual shopping task. All students spent similarly (clothes, accessories, and in general) in the week following the experiment, however. Students may buy ethically-made garments if clearly labelled, but sweatshop information in the media may not affect consumer behaviour. Changes in public policy and education about the human costs of overconsumption are needed.
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Sweat it out: Attitudes and decision making surrounding ethical garments

**Fast Fashion and Ethical Consumption**

Consumption is a complex matter within our lives that affects us environmentally, ethically and personally. There are many reasons why we consume other than to satisfy necessity. Modern North American consumers believe they can fulfill deeper motivations and unconscious needs by purchasing (Niinimaki, 2010). Furthermore, by using purchasing to fulfill our needs, we have seen high volumes of consumption, which has led to the concept of overconsumption. Overconsumption in industrial countries is one of the leading causes of environmental degradation; this trend is linked to a decrease in the earth’s ability to sustain human population levels (Byun & Sternquist, 2011; Tanner & Wölfing Kast, 2003; Winter, 2004). A less studied area of overconsumption is the impact on the lives of the workers who help create the products that sustains it. Human rights are currently being violated to provide an inexpensive labour force to ensure a certain sample of the population can fulfill their overconsumption needs at a reduced price (Byun & Sternquist, 2011). Research on consumers’ opinions, attitudes, and behaviours is limited. This thesis will focus on these important issues from a psychological perspective as there are many psychological phenomena, that need further study, that may aid in reducing the impact of sweatshops on workers’ lives. However, it is important to note the many perspectives that can analyze consumption of fashion including Marxism and Feminist theory. For example, Marxism may speak to the lack of input of the worker on production processes including speed of production and working conditions (Ollman, n.d.). While Feminist theories may explore how fashion has shaped women’s identities both in a social and personal context (e.g., women must be dressed to attract a mates; Sika, 2014).
However, for the purpose of this thesis, I will focus on the psychological research of the fashion industry and use a more exploratory method of data collection.

Certain forms of consumption may serve psychological needs and in the fashion industry consumers are fulfilling emotional needs, expressing their personality, differentiating themselves from others, as well as conforming to social groups through the purchasing of garments (Kaiser, 1990). Furthermore, flaunting the newest fashion items displays wealth and status within society (Kim, Choo, & Yoon, 2012). This constant requirement for new garments has fed into the overconsumption cycle termed ‘fast fashion’ (Byun & Sternquist, 2011). In 2012, Americans purchased on average approximately 64 articles of clothing per year and it is estimated that only 21 per cent of these garments were still in their possession a year later (Haegele, 2012). The 2 billion pounds of clothing and textiles discarded across the globe annually are indicative of the speed at which fast fashions are consumed and the magnitude of this industry (Kay & De Jesus, 2012). The fast fashion market has led to negative consequences for workers and purchasers of such clothing. Research has demonstrated that workers who produce fast fashion garments often work in unethical conditions and consumers purchasing such garments sometimes feel guilt, knowing they contribute to this (Arnold & Hartman, 2005; Zane, Irwin, & Reczek, 2015). Therefore, research is needed to better understand why consumers purchase such garments, if it leads to negative effects on well-being. Similarly, more work is needed to identify knowledge and awareness about unethical and ethical production and why consumers do not seek out alternatives. Ethical fashion for the purpose of this thesis will assumed to use fair wages, safe working environments, no child labour and no sexual harassment (Bradu, Orquin, & Thogersen, 2013; Byun & Sternquist, 2011; Sluiter, 2009). This thesis will attempt to address these issues and add to the literature on ethical purchasing.
Fast fashion has three main requirements: high turn-over rate, quick speed to market, and attractive products at affordable prices (Byun & Sternquist, 2011). Turn-over rate refers to the amount of garments that are being bought in a certain amount of time. A high turn-over rate is crucial to fast fashion because the higher the turn-over rate, the greater the demands on workers in the production process. Quick speed to market entails that garments are designed, conceptualized, produced, and available to the consumer faster in order to ensure a variety of new and different garments when the consumer returns to the retailer. Finally, garments must be produced at low cost in order to be sold at competitive prices that perpetuate consumer demand. Unfortunately, the high demand for fast fashion has resulted in low-cost clothing made through unethical processes (Niinimaki, 2010). Often these unethical processes within the fashion industry are associated with sweatshop labour.

A sweatshop is a workplace in which workers experience two or more of the following: their income for a 48-hour work week is less than the poverty rate for their country of habitation; people are forced to work overtime regularly; there are risks to health and safety, either resulting from negligence or the proactive disregard for workers’ well-being; workers experience coercion by employers; there is deception that endangers workers; and, workers receive less payment than earned (Arnold & Hartman, 2005). It has been estimated that 84 per cent of fashion garment workers are women and this accounts for 30 to 40 million women worldwide (Sluiter, 2009). Often factory workers are poor, uneducated and young. Unethical behaviours such as children sleeping under their parent’s sewing machine while they work long hours, women being forced to wear black clothing during their menstrual cycles because bathroom breaks are infrequent and having stains on their garments would embarrass them, and pregnant women having to stand all day are examples of sweatshop conditions that many workers may face (Sluiter, 2009). Even
though examples of unethical treatment of workers have been reported, there continues to be a market for clothing produced under these circumstances. Therefore, it is of interest why consumers do not purchase ethically produced alternatives and why we continue to support unethical labour by purchasing these garments.

There have been attempts to cease the practice of using sweatshops for garment production; however, there is a need for continuous intervention because after desired results are achieved, such as better pay for factory workers, the factories conform to the changes for only a short period of time and revert to a lower standard of labour practices (Armbruster-Sandoval, 2005). As the environmental and human costs of fast fashion have been exposed, concepts such as corporate social responsibility, eco-clothing, recycled apparel, Fair Trade branding, environmentally friendly, and sweatshop-free clothing have developed (Bradu, Orquin, & Thogersen, 2013; Hoek et al., 2012; Hwang, Lee, & Diddi, 2015; Joergens, 2006). Consumer opinion and purchasing behaviour around ethically produced garments is understudied. Little is known about the psychological factors involved in consumers’ choices of sweatshop products and more research is needed on how personality and other individual differences effects purchasing. Therefore, this thesis will explore the connection between consumers’ personalities, opinions and their actual behaviours surrounding ethical purchasing within the fashion industry.

**Consumption, Materialism, and Well-being**

Despite the consequences of fast fashion and unethical production, little is known about the connection between ethical consumerism, consumption, and personality. Personality in part can influence how we make decisions and influence what we consume and to what degree. Consumption can be motivated by emotional, social, and personal reasons, and not simply owing to necessity (Niinimaki, 2010). Materialism is one motive for why people consume particularly
excessive amounts of goods (Richins & Dawson, 1992). Materialism is defined as a focus on material items as the centre of one's life; moreover these items are a direct source of happiness (Richins & Dawson, 1992). For highly materialistic individuals, personal success is measured by how many, as well as how high of quality the material goods are that they possess. Therefore, materialistic consumption is problematic for fast fashion and ethical labour as materialistic consumers will continue to purchase high amounts of fast fashion in order to demonstrate success and wealth. Furthermore, this issue pertains specifically to Canadian and American societies as research has found that American citizens are more materialistic than people in less developed nations, such as India and China, as well as equally developed countries like France and Germany (Clarke & Micken, 2002; Ger & Belk, 1996). Recent research has shown that materialistic values are growing in countries that have been deemed as less materialistic (Podoshen, Li, & Zhang, 2011). Therefore, the rate of materialism is continuing to grow and is beginning to affect cultures that did not previously adhere to such values, further affecting increased consumption and its negative effects.

Materialism is introduced to us at a young age (Richins & Chaplin, 2015). There are multiple views on how materialism develops; socializing agents (e.g., family) and emotional states (e.g., stress, anxiety, and impaired self-esteem) have been explored (Chaplin & John, 2007; Moschis & Churchill, 1978). For example, one study found parents who received material rewards (e.g., toys) as children were more likely to think that consumer goods are important to their self-construction as well as their self-expression (Richins & Chaplin, 2015). As our society uses fashion as a way to express our sense of identity and personality, fast fashion is an easy way for us to continuously purchase garments and demonstrate a sense of self as well as our wealth.
Therefore, many citizens of more materialistic cultures may tend to be conditioned at a young age to admire expensive possessions and judge success based on what others own.

Consumers also purchase goods in order to be seen more favourably in our social hierarchy (Mullins, 1999). This generally leads to a search for greater social status. This type of consumption has led to the creation of the term “conspicuous consumption”. This type of consumption is defined as the purchasing of goods in order to display wealth, power and status. These types of products give us satisfaction when we see others’ response to it as opposed to satisfaction from the use of the product (Trigg, 2001). Moreover, this has led to the concept of the “super consumer”, a consumer who has high levels of status seeking, brand identification, and materialism (Flynn & Goldsmith, 2015). Such consumption has been linked with physiological responses, for example increases in testosterone in men, as well as psychological benefits such as defining one’s self-concept through brand engagement (Goldsmith, Flynn, & Kim, 2010). Individuals who are classified as super consumers score higher on measures of shopping and spending volume, and tend to be significantly younger than other consumers (Flynn & Goldsmith, 2016). This research demonstrates how important consumption can be for certain individuals and the actual impact it may have on our well-being. Moreover, research focusing on the purchase of luxury brands that demonstrate one’s status, such as Gucci, Godiva, and Lacoste, has shown a link to perceived life satisfaction (Hudders & Pandelaere, 2012). Brand identification is important to consumers of clothing. Often consumers in western culture want the best brands or the most popular brands to demonstrate our wealth and style. Therefore, consumers who are concerned with the brand of their clothing will purchase higher amounts of fashion and fast fashion allows them to constantly renew their wardrobe with the brand that is
most popular at the time. The super consumer who is more concerned with their self-image is more likely to consume than the average consumer only furthering their need for fast fashion.

**Fashion and satisfaction with life.** Consumers often compare themselves to others when they are measuring their satisfaction with life. Life satisfaction is defined as an assessment of our quality of life based on criteria that are important to us (e.g., love, money, friendship; Shin & Johnson, 1978) When engaging in social comparison (i.e. when individuals compare themselves to others in their society on characteristics, skills, and life circumstances), our well-being may be affected if the comparison is not in our favour (Diener & Fujita, 1997; Dittman & Goebel, 2010). However, positive effects will be present if we are in the more favourable position. One life aspect that is strongly affected by social comparison is income (Frey & Stutzer, 2002). The income of others we may compare ourselves to, such as relatives, neighbours, and co-workers, has a significant impact on our satisfaction with life (Boes et al., 2010; Brown et al., 2008; Luttmer, 2005). Generally speaking, when we earn more than those around us we are more satisfied with our lives (Mentzakis & Moro, 2009). One common way we can measure how well we are doing in comparison to our peers is through possession of consumer goods (Christen & Morgan, 2005). Luxury items may be purchased as people want the best quality, but they are also driven by the need to be accepted and to impress others (i.e. conspicuous purchases; Frank, 1999). Purchasing of the newest luxury brands in fashion can function as a simple way to compare our wealth to others in our society, and if we possess the best fashion our satisfaction with life may well increase. Having this mentality aids in creating a need for the fast fashion cycle.

**Alternatives to the use of material goods to increase well-being.** The use of material goods in order to increase our well-being negatively impacts consumers, as well as the earth.
Materialism has many negative outcomes for consumers such as depression, debt and psychosomatic problems (e.g., stress and anxiety; Kasser, 2002; Schor, 2004). Materialistic lifestyles also have negative impacts at the global level; materialism has been linked to the overuse of natural resources, environmental pollution, and contributes to waste of all kinds (Kilbourne & Pickett, 2008; Witkowski, 2005). Therefore, consumption of material goods has many harmful consequences for both the consumer and those who may suffer as part of the production process. An alternative to materialistic spending is the consumption of experiential purchases (Howell, Pchelin, & Iyer, 2012). In contrast to material purchases made with the intention of acquiring a material good, an experiential purchase is one that will provide one primarily with a life experience, for example going for a hike or out for dinner (Van Boven & Gilovich, 2003). Just as some people are high in trait materialism, others place more importance on experiences. People who habitually choose to spend money on experiences report increased levels of positive mood and higher levels of happiness (Kumar & Gilovich, 2015; Van Boven & Gilovich, 2003). In western society, there is great emphasis on material products as a basis for happiness; however the research on experientialism suggests consumers derive more happiness from non-material purchases. Moreover, experiencing less happiness from material products may explain why consumers are constantly replenishing their wardrobe. Consumers become less satisfied with their material purchases over time, which leads them to purchase new items in order to fill the void left by boredom associated with previous purchases (Carter & Gilovich, 2010; Haegele, 2012). To better understand how personality relates to purchasing, this thesis will explore experiential tendencies, aspirations and any links with fashion and ethical purchasing.

Research on consumption, materialism and satisfaction with life demonstrates that we tend to purchase material items, in part, to increase our happiness and social status; however,
consumption and materialism may increase negative affect and reduce consumers’ well-being. The consumption of fast fashion may lead to the experience of these negative effects for the consumer, but materialism and consumption of fashion also lead to negative effects on factory workers. In two studies, I explore the connection between materialism and happiness on ethical fashion purchasing, as well as the effect of information about factory workers on consumers’ purchasing behaviours.

**Consumers’ Opinions and Behaviours Surrounding Ethical Purchasing**

Despite the demand for fast fashion, a market of environmentally, ethically and socially responsible products has become more established. Disastrous events like garment factory collapses have made consumers more aware of the existence of sweatshops and sweatshop-free products (Neumann, Dixon, & Nordvall, 2014). Recently, more research attention has been devoted to consumers’ opinions regarding unethical production.

One of the main issues with ethical products is price. Consumers state that ethical products cost too much and price is one of the reasons why they do not purchase ethically (Chatzidakis, Hibbert, & Smith, 2007). However, survey data suggests consumers would pay 28 per cent more on a $10 item and 15 per cent more on a $100 item if it were ethically produced (Elliott & Freeman, 2004). Real world ethical purchasing has been measured by the Ethical Purchasing Index (EPI; Doane, 2001), which includes food, fuel and energy, household goods, personal items (cosmetics and toiletries), transport and subscriptions to charities. The index was used to measure the growth of these categories from 1999 to 2000. All categories saw an increase in revenue, with most increasing between 25 and 70 per cent, demonstrating that consumers are increasing their purchasing of ethical products. Furthermore, there is a need to
better understand the ethical consumer and what drives their behaviour in order to understand why they purchase ethically.

Consumers' changing attitudes and concerns surrounding ethical products and their production standards may account for increases in the ethical market. For example, 70 per cent of participants in one study stated that social responsibility was a factor they considered when purchasing a product or service from a company (Singh, Iglesias, & Batista-Foguet, 2012). Elliott and Freeman (2004) found that 75 per cent of their sample would avoid purchasing from a store if it were linked to unethical labour practices. Furthermore, 57 per cent of consumers say they would stop buying a product if they became aware that it was fabricated by children (Rogers & Ahmad, 2001). Two-thirds of respondents in another survey stated they would change brands if a new company offered a similar product and was associated with a positive cause (e.g., breast cancer research; Hoeffler & Keller, 2002). Therefore, consumers are concerned with the ethical nature of companies beyond production standards. Consumers want to become customers of companies that act ethically and will strive to avoid purchasing from companies who act unethically. Indeed, up to 44 per cent of consumers have boycotted a product because of their ethical beliefs in one given year (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001). Survey data has demonstrated a growing concern surrounding the fast fashion industry with consumers showing greater intentions to alter their spending habits to end unethical conditions for workers. However, psychology research is focused mostly on consumers' ethical intentions rather than actual behaviour. More research is needed on the intentions of consumers as well as a better understanding of how those intentions connect to consumers’ actual spending behaviours.
The Gap Between Ethical Intentions and Ethical Behaviours

Research suggests consumers have strong intentions to avoid companies that act unethically and reward companies who act ethically. There is also an apparent increase in the ethical market, likely owing to an increase in knowledge surrounding working conditions, an increase in attention to health issues, and an increase in environmental consciousness (Haikin & Wenchaun, 2011). However, studies measuring actual ethical spending behaviour reveal a gap between what consumers say they will purchase and what they actually buy. This gap has been labelled the intention-behaviour gap (Shaw, Hogg, Wilson, Shiu, & Hassan, 2006). Researchers believe that this gap has arisen because of social desirability bias (Carrington, Neville, & Whitwell, 2010). This bias occurs when individuals act (or claim to act) in line with what is acceptable in our society. Therefore, consumers may not be as ethically inclined as they report. Shaw and her colleagues (2006) studied the intention behaviour gap by sampling people who subscribed to the UK magazine Ethical Consumer and found that 81 per cent had strong intentions of avoiding sweatshops on their next shopping excursion; however, follow up testing indicated only 32 per cent believed they had made sweatshop-free purchases. Furthermore, only six per cent claimed they had no issue finding sweatshop-free items. This result demonstrates that although consumers had the intention of buying ethically they did not succeed. Research has demonstrated that there is a discrepancy between consumers’ perceived ethical behaviour and their actual recorded behaviour. However, the gap may be due to the many barriers that make ethical purchasing challenging for consumers rather than social desirability.

Ethical Purchasing Barriers

Consumers wish to purchase ethically as it is valued to ensure the safety and well-being of others, however there are many factors that can make ethical purchasing difficult. For example
consumers report a lack of retailers with sweatshop-free clothing, a limited range of clothing offered and often with less stylish designs, information regarding the ethicality of the clothing is often missing, and the price of ethical clothing is higher than its non-ethical counterparts (Carrigan & Attala, 2001; Joergens, 2006; Shaw et al., 2006). As mentioned earlier, the constant need to change appearance and fulfill fashion needs may make purchasing ethical clothing inconvenient (Solomon & Rabolt, 2004). Aside from these practical barriers to ethical consumption, consumers may be constrained by internal psychological factors.

Research on the psychological aspect of consumers’ ethical behaviour has been limited. The concept of consumer uncertainty has emerged in the literature to explain why consumers do not have much knowledge surrounding ethical alternatives (Clavin & Lewis, 2005; Shiu, Walsh, Hassan, & Shaw, 2011). For example, consumers do not have much knowledge surrounding which brands are ethical and which are unethical. In one study, participants were asked to name companies that were and were not socially responsible; 25 per cent were able to name a socially responsible company and only 18 per cent were able to name a non-ethical brand (Boulstridge & Carrigan, 2000). Therefore, a low number of consumers know of the ethics of companies who practice ethical and unethical procedures. These types of knowledge gaps can lead to consumer uncertainty - when the information provided deviates from the consumers expected level of information (Daft & Lengel, 1989). This uncertainty can manifest in two ways: knowledge and/or choice uncertainty. Knowledge uncertainty is present when the information people have to evaluate services and goods does not match an ideal information state. For example, when reading the label on an ethically made garment and the label fails to mention the garment was made without the use of child labour. Choice uncertainty occurs when people are faced with decisions regarding which brand, size, or colour to purchase (Urbany, Dickson, & Wilki, 1986).
Consumers engage in an information-searching process when they have a deficit in their knowledge and do not have the resources to evaluate the products (Shiu, Walsh, Hassan, & Shaw, 2011). Therefore, a lack of knowledge should lead to searching behaviours in order to clarify any issues consumers may have with the product. However, consumers will only search for information if they believe the results of the search will produce desired information. This research may explain why consumers are not aware of the fashion industry and its processes; to search for information on production systems may produce information that is contrary to their beliefs. For example, if you are against child labour, you may not search the manufacturing details of a certain product because there may be a chance that the product has been made by children.

A second argument that has surfaced explaining why consumers continue to purchase unethically made products is that purchasing ethical may trigger negative feelings. These feelings may remind consumers that ethical products exist because many workers are suffering to produce goods for our consumption (Zane, Irwin, & Reczek, 2015). This explanation suggests that consumers will experience negative affect when they purchase ethically produced products because it reminds them that ethical products exist because other products are being made under poor conditions. Therefore, research testing the knowledge consumers have or acquire about unethical production and how it affects consumers purchasing behaviours is needed. This thesis would like to educate consumers on the consequences of fast fashion and understand how it shapes their purchasing behaviour directly afterwards and in the short term.

**Reducing external and internal barriers.** Given that ethical fashion has many external and internal barriers, ways to reduce the burden on consumers and shape their behaviours and attitudes in a favourable sense have been explored. There has been an increase in the use of eco-
fashion or environmentally friendly labels, which provide consumers with more information to help them make an informed decision. Many studies are based on survey data as opposed to real world behaviours, therefore they report on perceived behaviour as opposed to actual behaviours. One study looking at consumers’ ethical purchasing behaviours used real world shopping in order to understand the effect of garment knowledge on our actual purchasing behaviour (Prasad, Kimeldorf, Meyer, & Robinson, 2004). Through the use of labels, the researchers took two identical racks of socks and added a sign to one rack that advertised the socks as GWC (made under good working conditions) paired with an explanation that the socks were made in a safe environment, without child labour, and did not use sweatshop conditions. Over a five-month period the researchers gradually raised the price of the GWC socks from one dollar to four dollars. At each five cent price increase, 30 per cent of consumers bought the labelled socks over their non-labelled counterpart. Therefore, 30 per cent of consumers were satisfied and valued the label and working conditions the socks were made under. Consumers were willing to pay four dollars for a pair of socks simply because they were marked as being made in good working conditions. For those who were willing to pay more for the socks, the label aided the customers to educate themselves on the product and chose which product was in line with their beliefs. Research of this nature is very limited, and there is a need for further research to determine the impact of labelling ethical garments - whether the content of garment labels is noticeable and influential in consumers' choices, and how individual differences may play a role in consumer behaviour.

Labels and Purchasing Behaviours

Labelling within the clothing industry in order to help consumers become informed about their purchases and reduce any uncertainties has support. A Marymount University (1999) study
on ethical garments revealed 56 per cent of people were in favour of a label with information about the working conditions of those who made the garments, as opposed to a list of stores (33%) where ethical items could be purchased. This demonstrates the needs of the consumers and that having labels for ethical clothing may influence their behaviour by increasing the amount of ethical garments purchased. In recent years, the use of eco, fair trade, and carbon labels has become more popular (Hoek et al., 2012). These types of labels make it easier for consumers to search for information on the production of the garment and make an educated purchasing decision.

Traceability labels, for example, which convey where and how the product was produced and manufactured, are effective in shaping consumers purchasing behaviours (Bradu et al., 2013). Traceability labels have been tested on food products such as chocolate bars, and compared to other labels such as health warnings and organic disclaimers. These labels influence consumers to purchase food featuring traceability labels more often than comparable food products featuring health labels and organic claims (Bradu et al., 2013). Thus, when the label is explicit and informative it will have a positive impact on the consumer. Furthermore, traceability labels often state where the product has been manufactured (i.e., country of origin). Research exploring how people’s beliefs and values affect their purchasing has found that country of origin influences a large amount of consumers (90%) to purchase products that were made in their own country. However, this only occurs if those consumers shop in accordance with their beliefs and ideologies (e.g., believe in fair wages for workers) in mind (Niinimaki, 2010). In terms of ethical garments, consumers who are concerned with workers’ rights and where their garments are being produced may be more inclined to purchase ethically; traceability labels can aid consumers with this goal. Therefore, labels may be a useful addition to garments in the
fashion industry as it may aid consumers in choosing garments that follow more strict labour laws and support consumers’ pride.

Although labels can have positive effects on consumers’ behaviours, the effectiveness of these labels may vary depending on people's awareness. Consumers look infrequently at garment labels; thirty-nine per cent of consumers do not look at the brand before purchasing the garment, 50 per cent look infrequently, and only 11 per cent look frequently (Iwanow, McEachern, & Jeffrey, 2005). Moreover, some consumers do not trust that all labels are credible. The declaration of ethical production is voluntary and takes shape in two ways: Third-party endorsement and manufacturer self-declaration claims (Hoek, Rolling, & Holdsworth, 2013; Hussain & Lim, 2000). Consumers trust third-party endorsement claims, such as “Fair Trade”, more than self-declaration claims, as a manufacturer’s self-declaration does not require certification from a well-respected third-party. In order for the claims on ethical labels to be successful in influencing consumers’ behaviours, they should feature a third-party endorsement as this increases trust and positive attitudes towards the product and reduces any ambiguity (Hussain & Lim, 2000; Hyllegard et al., 2012). This research suggests that consumers appreciate labels and they have a positive effect on their opinion of products, however, claims that are made need to be direct, unambiguous and credible.

Therefore, not only do labels need to conform to certain specifications, there is also the issue of consumers not taking the time to look at the labels or finding the claims made on these labels as credible. However, labels begin to reduce the burden on consumers by making their decision making easier and removing many barriers. Labels in the fast fashion system help consumers develop knowledge about the production and origins of their garments, aiding in the
increase of purchasing from more ethical brands. More research on how to influence consumers’ level of knowledge surrounding ethical garments is needed.

**Media Involvement in Sweatshops and Consumer Consumption**

Similarly to labels, media can be a source of information that is used to alter consumers’ feelings and opinions regarding sweatshop issues. As previously mentioned, consumers often have less information than is needed to make the fashion decisions that correspond with their beliefs. Media can be used to inform consumers of companies that are acting unethically. Recently, there has been an increase in research on how media influences people’s opinions and attitudes about the environment (Sampei & Aoyagi-Usui, 2009). This has led researchers to believe that media can have an impact on directing consumers’ choices and behaviours (Bellotti & Panzone, 2016). Negative media coverage of environmental issues has a negative impact on readers’ attitudes or leads to confusion about the issue (Gavin and Marshall, 2011). Therefore, reading news articles about negative events in the fast fashion industry may influence consumers to avoid companies associated with the unethical issues and reward companies who act ethically.

Media coverage on sweatshops began to appear consistently in the mid-1990s reportedly due to a raid on a sweatshop in El Monte, California and the Kathie Lee Gifford clothing line scandal in which it was discovered that children were making her products in unfair working conditions (Greenberg & Knight, 2004). Greenberg and Knight suggest that sweatshops have been defined as a problem in the media because of consumers growing concern for how and where their garments have been produced. However, sweatshop issues are often framed in ways that will increase consumers’ awareness of positive aspects of the ethical marketplace, for example ‘how to shop ethically this Christmas’, as opposed to emphasizing the conditions and well-being of the sweatshop workers. This type of media coverage can bias consumers by
swaying their attention from the reality of hazardous sweatshop conditions and increase focus on buying ethically (i.e., distracting from the larger issue of workers who make the unethical products). If ethical purchasing functions similarly to environmental issues, negative media coverage of events such as sweatshop collapses may create negative affect towards companies who produce their products unethically. However, current sweatshop media attempts to convince and manipulate consumers’ views of sweatshops and disasters that occur within them in order to continue the cycle of fast fashion. For example, at the Foxconn Technology Group factory in China, many factory workers committed suicide; the Chinese press heavily framed the factory workers’ suicides as a manifestation of workers’ psychological problems as opposed to a sweatshop related issue (Guo, Hsu, Holton, & Jeong, 2012). Corporate media sometimes attempts to change the image associated with sweatshops and discredit the workers to reduce the impact the tragedy has on their own business. This strategy may reduce consumer ethical purchasing and concern as they may be influenced by the media to believe it is the workers fault as opposed to a much larger societal issue.

There is a lack of research on the impact of sweatshop media coverage on consumers’ purchasing behaviour. Research in the health food industry has discovered a link between news media and purchasing behaviours. Readers who read a published newspaper purchased more organic products, fish, and whole grains when the newspaper featured more articles about organic food (Bellotti & Panzone, 2016). An increase in purchases made by consumer who have read about a specific type of product suggests that media can influence what consumers are purchasing, therefore having articles about sweatshops and ethical alternatives may influence consumers to purchase more ethically.
In addition, this effect may be seen in regards to companies using unethical production. Reading about companies involved with sweatshop disasters may increase consumer boycotting. When accidents occur in the sweatshop industry, the companies who produce their garments in the factory are often mentioned in news coverage (Logan, 2013). This will provide consumers with knowledge of which companies to avoid. Research in the garment industry is limited; however, research in the food industry has demonstrated that news coverage of a scandal in which companies sold rotten food, negatively affected the companies involved (De Paola & Scoppa, 2013). Participants significantly reduced their consumption of goods from companies that were involved forcing them to reduce prices and increased consumers need for more ethical companies. However, effects diminished over time as consumers forgot about the fraud committed. These findings are relevant to the fashion industry. When companies are caught using sweatshop labour, there may be a reduction in revenue and increased consumer pressure to offer more ethical choices. This thesis explored the link between media coverage of a sweatshop disaster and the level of impact on the individual and their purchasing behaviours.

**Engaging in perspective taking to increase ethical behaviours**

To successfully take the perspective of another is to imagine how they feel in a situation and understanding their point of view (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000). Reading news media and taking the perspective of someone who experienced a sweatshop first hand may help in increasing our concern for these individuals as well as consumers commitment to ethical purchasing. The task of perspective taking can be modified to either imagine how the other would feel or to imagine how you would feel in a certain situation; the type of perspective taken effects the type of emotion felt after the task (Batson, Early, & Salvarani, 1997). Being told to take the perspective of another person leads to more physiological arousal and self-reported emotion than being told to be objective (Stotland, 1969). Furthermore, often taking the
perspective of another results in two emotional outcomes: empathy and personal distress (Batson, Early, & Salvarani, 1997). Personal distress has been found to be an outcome specifically when one imagines how they would feel in the others’ situation, while empathy has been shown to occur in both types of perspective taking tasks (Batson, Early, & Salvarani, 1997). For example, one study found that participants who took the perspective of an individual who recently experienced a tragedy felt more empathy than those in an objective condition. Moreover, those who imagine themselves as the individual felt more distress than participants who were objective or who took the individuals perspective (Batson, Early & Salvarani, 1997). Both personal distress and empathy have been linked to prosocial behaviours (Andreychick & Migliaccio, 2015). Therefore, having consumers take the perspective of an individual, or imagine they are an individual in a sweatshop, may increase their concern for workers and their personal distress. Feeling such emotions may lead to an increase in helping behaviours. An increase in helping behaviours may lead to higher levels of ethical purchases to discourage companies who use unethical production standards. The connection between perspective taking of sweatshop workers and the effects on ethical purchasing will be explored in Study Two.

It may be difficult for a consumer to imagine how a sweatshop worker feels if they have never experienced a sweatshop; however, research on empathy and personal distress has found that we do have the ability to feel as another does (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). Consumers may feel discomfort or anxiety in response to a negative situation another has experienced (Batson et al., 1997). It may affect consumers differently, as some consumers may feel hopeful for sweatshop workers and their chances of being successful after experiencing a disaster, while other consumers may feel higher levels of personal distress (Andreychick & Migliaccio, 2015). Regardless of the emotions evoked, both types are related to prosocial behaviours. Prosocial
behaviour in the ethical industry may manifest as boycotting unethical companies, purchasing strictly from ethical companies, and/or searching for ways to help factory workers. Therefore, reading about workers and their experiences in sweatshops, while taking their perspective, may help reduce the cycle of fast fashion.

**The Present Research**

Currently, there is less research in psychology on consumers’ actual behaviours than on attitudes and self-reported behaviours. Research has demonstrated that consumers feel strongly about ethical alternatives to sweatshop or unethically produced fashion (Auger, Burke, Devinney, & Louviere, 2003; Elliott & Freeman, 2004; Rogers & Ahmad, 2001). Consumers have stated that they wish to avoid purchasing sweatshop items and view these types of items more negatively than their ethical counterparts (Elliott & Freeman, 2004). However, as the research has demonstrated consumers do not always act accordingly to their perceived attitudes (Shaw, Hogg, Wilson, Shiu, & Hassan, 2006). Consumers often face many barriers such as knowledge concerning ethical products, lack of availability and the cost of such products (Carrigan & Attala, 2001). These barriers lead to consumption of items that may be against consumers’ attitudes. Therefore, solutions such as labels for ethically made items have been suggested in order to help relieve some of the burden on consumers. The current research aims to identify whether consumers prefer ethical fashion products and determine if labelling has a positive effect on consumption of ethical products. Furthermore, as knowledge is limited, the immediate and short-term impact of consumers being exposed to the consequences of fast fashion through the media will be explored. This research may help bridge the gap between consumers’ perceived attitudes and actual behaviours, as well as give consumers knowledge about the negative effects of our purchasing decisions and explore whether this can make a difference on their consumption habits.
This thesis included two studies regarding ethical products in the fashion industry. Study One was an exploratory study used to inform materials and methods for Study Two. Study One focussed on exploring individual differences (personality), general shopping habits, preferences for garment features, and understanding how much consumers believe garments are actually worth (Appendix A). The study was comprised of online personality measures, followed by questions asking participants about their overall and their ethical spending habits. Moreover, participants rated and determined ideal prices for ten gender appropriate garments. The likability and pricing of garments were used to inform part of Study Two. The goal of this study was to explore general shopping habits of consumers as well as further the research regarding ethical tendencies and preferences in the garment industry.

Study Two combined an experimental manipulation in the laboratory with longitudinal assessment of real-world behaviour. This second study focussed on testing the effects of media information by having some students read about a sweatshop disaster, then choose from ethically- or unethically-made garments (see Appendix B for Study Two materials). The goal was to understand whether reading about the impact of a sweatshop disaster, on a garment worker’s life, would have an immediate effect on participant spending in a virtual shopping task in the lab. Further, as previous research has demonstrated that the effects of news media on consumers declines after a period of time (De Paola & Scoppa, 2013), participants in Study Two kept a week-long spending log to determine any lasting impact from reading about the sweatshop worker.

**Study One: Shopping Time**

Research on personality and how it affects ethical consumption is very limited. The goal of this study is to better understand the personality and behaviours of the general and ethically inclined consumer. Consumption in general is linked with materialism and many studies have
demonstrated the negative effects of materialism on our well-being and satisfaction with life. However, the connection between ethical consumption and these traits is not known; therefore this research explored personality traits and how they relate to ethical purchasing. Furthermore, consumers state they are willing to pay more for ethical garments and that they would purchase these garments over unethical garments, however results on how much consumers are willing to pay and if consumers have purchased ethical garments is mixed. This study was used to further understand how much consumers would pay for ethical garments, as well as explore participants’ experience with purchasing such garments. Finally, it is of interest to establish the level of consumers’ knowledge concerning ethical companies and brands. Participants were asked about their personality traits and general and ethical consumption through questionnaires and survey based questions. The following hypotheses were proposed:

1) Participants, in general, will be willing to pay more for ethically made garments. Moreover, participants with greater feelings of community (assessed with the Aspirations Scale) will be higher in ethical tendencies (i.e., willingness to pay more, have bought an ethical item before, etc.).

2) Participants who think more about the future consequences of their actions are likely to pay a higher amount for ethical clothing, as well as consider more ethical features (i.e., organic cotton, Fair Trade certified, Made in Canada, sweatshop-free) to be important to them while shopping.

3) Consumers are unlikely to know of and be able to name ethical brands and retailers, when asked.

4) Students higher in socioeconomic status will be willing to pay a greater amount of money for an ethically made item.
5) Students who are higher in materialism will have lower levels of positive affect, nature relatedness, satisfaction with life and experiential buying tendencies.

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants were recruited through the Psychology department undergraduate research participation system (SONA) at Trent University for an online "Shopping Time" study about consumer preferences and their personality traits. One hundred and thirty participants completed the study (n = 121 females, n = 8 males, n = 1 other; 93.1% female, 6.2% male, 0.7% other). The participants had a mean age of 22.34 (SD = 6.79; range: 18 to 55) and most were in their first (29.2%), second (31.5%), or third (21.5%) year of study (4th = 14.6%; other = 3.2%). Thirty-seven per cent of participants identified as being psychology majors; 54.6% were in other programs of study and 8.5% were undeclared.

**Materials**

Participants were given routine demographic questions, including income allocation questions, followed by six questionnaires that assessed personality and well-being (Appendix A); all measures had reliable alphas and can be found in Appendix C. Several individual difference measures were included, as previous research has demonstrated links between overconsumption and these well-being indicators:

The *Aspirations Index* (Kasser & Ryan, 1996) assesses how important certain intrinsic and extrinsic aspirations are to individuals. For this study, a modified version was used to measure the importance of financial success (extrinsic) and community feeling (intrinsic). Participants indicate how much they agree or disagree with statements such as “You will be financially successful” and “You will work to make the world a better place” on a 5-point Likert
scale ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Extremely). Items are averaged, within each subscale, and higher scores indicate the strength of the aspiration.

The Materialism scale (Richins & Dawson, 1992) measures individuals’ materialistic values and to what degree consumers associate acquisition with happiness and using possessions to define success by asking how much they agree with statements such as “I admire people who own expensive homes, cars, and clothes” on a 5-point Likert scale that ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). All items are averaged and higher scores indicate more materialistic values.

The Nature Relatedness Scale (Nisbet, Zelenski, & Murphy, 2009) measures participants’ subjective sense of connection to nature at the affective, cognitive, and experiential levels. The scale is comprised of 21-items such as “I always think about how my actions affect the environment” and “My relationship to nature is important to who I am” on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (disagree strongly) to 5 (agree strongly). Items are averaged and a higher score indicates a stronger connection with nature.

The Experiential Buying Tendencies scale (Howell, Pchelin, & Iyer, 2012) measures individuals’ desires to purchase materialistic items versus experiences. The scale consists of four questions regarding individuals’ preferences to spend money on a material or an experiential purchase. An example statement is: “When I have extra money I am more likely to buy a…”. The scale ranges from 1 (material items/goods) to 7 (a life experience). Items are averaged and a higher score indicates a preference to spend money on a life experience, while a lower score indicates a preference to purchase material goods.

The Consideration of Future consequences scale (Strathman, Gleicher, Boninger, & Edwards, 1994) measures the extent to which people think about their short-term and long-term
consequences. The scale consists of statements such as “I consider how things might be in the future, and try to influence those things with my day-to-day behaviour”. Participants indicate how well each statement describes them, on a 5-point Likert scale that ranges from 1 (extremely uncharacteristic) to 5 (extremely characteristic). All items are averaged and a higher score indicates stronger intentions to consider the impact of present behaviours on the future.

The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) is used to measure positive and negative emotions. Participants use a 5-point Likert scale that ranges from 1 (very slightly or not at all) to 5 (extremely) to identify to what degree they feel each emotion (i.e. interested, distressed, excited, upset, strong, guilty, scared, hostile, enthusiastic, proud, joyful, sad, irritable, alert, ashamed, inspired, nervous, determined, attentive, jittery, active, afraid, content, anxious, happy, relaxed). The 13 positive emotion words are averaged to create a positive affect score and the 12 negative emotion words are averaged to create a negative affect score.

The Subjective Happiness scale (Lyubomirsky & Lepper, 1999) measures participants’ level of happiness in relation to others. The scale comprises four items such as “Compared to most of my peers, I consider myself…” measured on a 7- point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not very happy) to 7 (very happy). All items are averaged and a high score indicates strong feelings of being happy in comparison to others.

The Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) measures participants’ life satisfaction. For the purpose of this study a modified 4-item version was used. The scale includes items such as “In most ways, my life is close to my ideal…”, rated on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strong disagreement) to 6 (strong agreement). All items are averaged and a higher score indicates stronger feelings of satisfaction with life.
Interspersed between the scales, were questions that asked about participants' interest in fashion (how long they had been purchasing their own clothing and their favourite stores to shop) and their frequency, as well as their methods of consumption (online/ in-store).

Participants were also provided with photographs of ten gender appropriate shirts, modified from images of real garments advertised in online catalogues, modelled by gender-appropriate models. The garments were ranging in colour and style (i.e., blouse, button up shirt, long sleeve, short sleeve, sweater and tank top). Participants were asked how much they would pay for the garment and were given a scale from $0 to $100. They were also asked if they would purchase the garment (yes/maybe/no). After pricing each garment they were asked about the importance of certain general clothing features (price, fit, style, trend-setting, quality, comfort, easy care, size, colour, fabric, and manufacturing location) and ethical clothing features (organic cotton, fair trade certified, sweatshop-free, and made in Canada). Finally, participants were given a question asking how much extra they would be willing to pay on a $10 shirt, to ensure it was ethically made, on a scale ranging from $0 to $20.

Procedure

Participants signed up for a study about shopping using the psychology department online participation system (SONA). All parts of the study were completed online through the Qualtrics survey program (Appendix A). Participants completed an Informed Consent form and then began the online questionnaire, including demographic and background questions on age, sex, socio-economic status, and income dispersion. Participants completed measures of life aspirations, materialistic tendencies, buying habits, positive and negative affect, subjective happiness, and satisfaction with life. Additional items asked about participants' interest in fashion and shopping habits, such as frequency. Participants were then presented with the virtual clothing catalogue,
including ten gender appropriate shirts. Students then indicated how much they would be willing to pay and whether they would purchase the item if they saw it in stores.

Following the pricing task participants answered questions about general garment preferences and ranked their top five features they search for when selecting a garment. Next participants gave feedback on their preferred presentation of typical label information (e.g., 100% organic, fair trade, country of origin etc.): whether they preferred the information was disseminated through bullet form or paragraph formatting. The final series of questions concerned ethical purchasing experience; participants listed any ethical brands they were aware of, as well as their attitudes towards ethical clothing features (i.e., organic cotton, Fair Trade certified, sweatshop-free, Made in Canada). The last page of the online study was a debriefing form with more detailed information about the purpose and goals of the research.
Results

Sample Spending Characteristics

**Fashion interest.** Participants were asked about their interest and experiences with fashion. The majority (60.8%) of the sample stated that they were somewhat or very interested in fashion; another 28.5% stated that they felt neutrally about the subject of fashion ($M = 3.69$). Participants had been buying their own clothing for approximately 8 years. The frequency with which participants shop varied: 26.2% of the sample shop less than once a month, 23.8% shop once a month, 33.1% shop 2-3 times a month, 11.5% shop once a week, and 5.4% shop 2-3 times a week. Moreover, 77.7% of the students said they shop online as well as in store. However, participants shop less frequently online: 36.9% shop less than once a month. Most frequently, participants shop online for clothing (67.7%) followed by textbooks (53.1%) and accessories (40.8%).

**Income allocation.** Participants were asked to provide proportions of how much of their income they do spend and how much they should spend in five categories (i.e., essentials, savings, material purchases, experiential purchases, charitable donations). Participants spent the highest amounts in essentials ($M = 44.41$, $SD = 23.63$) and material purchases ($M = 20.23$, $SD = 14.37$). In contrast participants believed they should spend the most on essentials ($M = 36.60$, $SD = 17.53$) and savings ($M = 23.77$, $SD = 13.59$). Participants spend significantly more than they believe they should in essential and material purchases (see Table 1 for paired sample t-test results). In contrast, participants stated they should spend significantly more in the savings and investment, and charitable donations categories. Gender differences were present in spending habits and personality (detailed analyses of these differences can be found in Appendix D) however this is beyond the scope of this thesis and there were insufficient males to test the main hypotheses of this study according to gender.
Table 1

Participants’ means of how much they should spend and what they do spend on five categories and whether they differ significantly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Income spent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essentials</td>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>44.41</td>
<td>4.42**</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>23.77</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>-3.96**</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Purchases</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>20.23</td>
<td>5.82**</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td>-.284</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>-6.77**</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Paired samples t-tests were used to determine any differences between what participants should spend and what they do spend.

* p < .05, ** p < .01

Socio-Economic Status. To further understand the sample and explore any relations between income and spending, participants economic status, their real and recommended spending (in the five categories), and financial status was tested. Participants were asked on a 1 to 10 scale where they would place themselves economically in comparison to the rest of society. Participants' socio-economic status varied (M = 6.64, SD = 1.58). The majority of participants (72.3%) fell between 6 and 8, each scale rank was chosen by at least one participant except for a socio-economic status (SES) of 2. There were correlations present between SES and how much participants stated they do spend. A negative moderate correlation between how much participants spend on essentials and their SES existed, r(127) = -.24, p = .000, suggesting that
participants who are higher in SES spend less on essentials. There was also a weak positive correlation between charitable donations and SES, \( r(127) = .18, p = .05 \), suggesting that those higher in SES give more to charities.

**Correlations of Personality Measures**

With regard to the general correlations and as hypothesised, all well-being variables were negatively related to materialism, and positive affect was related to experientialism and nature relatedness (see Table 2). More specifically individuals higher in materialism are less positive, less connected to their community, and less likely to buy experiences over material purchases. Materialistic individuals are also more financially driven. The correlations indicate that participants more interested in helping the community are more likely to use money to purchase experiences rather than material items, and are also less materialistic. Similarly, those more concerned with financial success prefer material purchases rather than experiences. Those who aspire to be financially successful, however, also endorsed the desire to contribute to their community. Finally, people with strong community aspirations are also concerned with the way their behaviours will impact the future and prefer to have experiences rather than purchase material items.
Table 2:

*Correlations of personality and well-being measures and their relation to ethical opinions and behaviours.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Negative Affect</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Positive Affect</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subjective Happiness</td>
<td>-.48**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Materialism</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Community Feeling</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Financial Success</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Future Consequence</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Experiential Tendencies</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Amount paid</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01.

**Ethical Behaviours, Opinions, and Preferences**

To understand the ethical experience and knowledge of the sample, frequencies were calculated for the questions, “would you pay more for an ethically made garment” and “have you ever bought an ethically made garment”. A total of 70% of participants stated that they would pay more for an ethical garment. A single sample t-test demonstrated that participants were
significantly more willing to pay extra for an ethical garment \((M = 1.32, SD = .47)\) than an unethical one, \(t(129) = 32.15, p = .000, d = 0.94\), confirming the hypothesis. Furthermore, if participants agreed they would pay more for an ethical garment, they were asked: regarding a $10 garment how many more dollars would you pay. On average participants were willing to pay $7 more \((SD = 4.13)\) and 22.5% of the sample was willing to pay double ($10 more) for the garment.

One of the main interests of Study One was the relationship between participants’ connection to their community and their concern with the impact of their present actions on the future and how these traits related to willingness to purchase ethical clothing. An independent samples t-test was used to analyze whether those who would pay more for an ethical garment differed depending on their aspirations for community involvement. Participants who would pay more were significantly more interested in being involved in their community \((M = 3.95, SD = 0.65)\) than those who would not \((M = 3.63, SD = 0.71)\); \(t(128) = 2.535, p = .012, d = 0.47\). This result supports the hypothesis that participants with greater community aspirations will have higher ethical tendencies and suggests that participants who have a higher connection to their community feel more strongly about paying a higher price for an ethical garment.

Similarly, an independent samples t-test was conducted to test whether participants who were willing to pay more for an ethical garment differed on how concerned they are with the impact of their behaviours on the future. Participants who said they would be willing to pay more were significantly more concerned with their behaviours and how they impact the future \((M = 3.58, SD = 0.59)\) than those who said they would not pay more for an ethical garment \((M = 3.35, SD = 0.57)\); \(t(128) = 2.02, p = .046, d = 0.39\). This result confirmed the hypothesis stating that more future conscious individuals will have more ethical tendencies and suggests that
participants who are more concerned with their short-term and long-term consequences in life are more likely to pay a higher price for an ethical garment.

With regards to whether participants had bought an ethically made garment before, over half the sample (52.3%) were unsure, while 40.8% believed they had, and 6.9% stated they had never bought an ethical garment. Furthermore, personality characteristics and their effect on ethical garment purchases were explored by conducting independent samples t-tests. Interestingly, (trait) subjective happiness differed significantly between participants who had purchased an ethical garment ($M = 5.04, SD = 0.12$) versus those who were unsure ($M = 4.45, SD = 1.4$); $t(119) = 2.467, p = .015, d = 0.59$. In other words, students with experience buying ethical clothing in the past, reported being happier, in general.

**Importance of Ethical and General Garment Features**

In order to understand what is important to consumers when they shop for garments, participants were asked to choose their top five garment features and rank those features from most important to least important (See Table 3). Almost all participants (96.2%) chose price as an important feature when shopping for garments. Over half (64%) of participants ranked price as their most important garment feature and that number rose to 76% when looking at those who ranked it as their first or second choice. Secondly, the fit of the garment was also very important to most of the sample (86.9%). Although this feature was in the top five most important features for many participants, only 18.6% of the sample stated it is the main feature that drives them to purchase a garment, however about half the sample (47.8%) said it was the second most important feature for them. The third most important reason for purchasing garments was style, 70% of the sample said the style of the garment is why they purchase what they do. This feature was ranked most often (39.6%) as their third most important feature overall. Interestingly, where
the garment was manufactured was chosen by only 10% of the sample. The ranking of manufacturing location varied in importance to participants and was ranked most commonly (46.2%) as the fifth most important feature for those who chose it.

Table 3

*Garment features and the frequency of being ranked in top five for garment feature preferences as well as the percentage of the sample that chose the feature as one of their top five most important options.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Ranked in top 5</th>
<th>Per cent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend-setting</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy Care</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sizing Option</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric Blend</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to ethical features, participants were asked which features they would like an ethical garment to have if they were going to purchase it (i.e., organic cotton, sweatshop-free, Fair Trade Certified, made in Canada, other). Participants were able to check off as many as they wished. Participants chose an average of 2 features and only 6.9% of the sample chose all four described features to be important to them (see Table 4 and 5 for frequencies of ethical features selected and the proportion of sample endorsing each feature). The most important item was the sweatshop-free feature. Almost three quarters of students agreed the feature was important to
them. Sweatshop-free was followed in importance by Fair Trade Certified and Made in Canada. Only a quarter of the sample was concerned with their garment using organic cotton, suggesting that this issue is the least important.

Table 4

*Frequency with which each feature was chosen and percentage of the sample that chose each ethical garment feature.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical feature</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organic Cotton</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Trade Certified</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweatshop-free</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made In Canada</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

*Frequencies and percentages of how many ethical features were chosen as important to participants.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of ethical features</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Labelling of ethical garments.** Because little is known about how label content and presentation affects consumer garment choices, participants were asked about labelling preferences for garments and were asked to choose between two types of formats for labels:
bullet form or sentence structure (see Figure 1). Participants showed a preference for the bullet form option (86.9%) over the sentence structure format.

![Figure 1: Types of information sharing styles offered to participants](image)

**Knowledge of Ethical Garments and Retailers**

Another aim of this study was to assess the knowledge of ethical brands and opinions on ethical clothing in the university sample. Participants were asked if they knew of any ethical brands and if they could please list them, 73.6% of the sample reported they did not know of any ethical brands. For the remaining participants, the most commonly mentioned brands that are thought to be ethical are Ten Tree, Tom’s, and American Apparel (See Table 6 for complete list of brands and frequencies). The 34 (26.4%) participants listed a total of 23 brands as ethical. As expected, confirming hypothesis three, the majority of participants were not aware of ethical brands and where to purchase them.
Table 6

*Brands listed by participants as being ethically made and their frequencies with which they were mentioned.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ten Tree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom’s</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Apparel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Tree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nike</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nudie</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FabOrganics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Voices</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemp Authority</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Chateau</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Fresh</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGG</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;M Sea Island Line</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lulu Lemon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lush</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flirt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirabelle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamboo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamboo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komodo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Reasons for purchasing ethical garments.** As previously discussed, participants were asked if they would pay more for an ethically made garment. Participants were also asked why they chose to pay more and four categories were derived from the qualitative responses: for social change, for the worker, manufacturing an ethical item is more costly, and purchasing ethical garments creates positive feelings for the participants. The most common reason why participants would purchase an ethical garment was because they wanted to ensure the workers had a better experience (39.6%). Answers for this category consisted of statements such as “if it helps reduce the amount of child labour and sweatshops I would be okay spending a little bit more to ensure those children get a childhood” and “I want employees to be paid proper wages”. Participants were concerned with the well-being of the workers in the factories, as well as wanted to ensure fair pay was received.

The second most common answer was that participants wanted to try to help social change by purchasing ethical garments (27.5%). Participants made a connection between ethically produced garments, and environmental and human rights progress. Statements such as “if there is increased interest in ethically made garments, it is likely that more will be produced - lead to social change” and “Ensures that there are people out there making these clothes and helping the world at the same time” were made suggesting that if consumers purchase more ethical clothing there will be a demand for such garments resulting in more ethical production and less focus on unethical products. Having this shift in focus will help decrease the amount of unethical factories leading to social change.

A third reason that was mentioned was the price of ethical clothing should be higher as it costs more to ensure the garments are meeting labour standards (7.7%). Participants stated that the production of ethical garments ensures the manufacturing process is more humane and
concerned with the environment; therefore these items will cost more. There was also a personal reason in which 8.8% of participants mentioned they themselves would feel better if they knew they were purchasing or wearing a garment that was ethically made.

**Reasons for not purchasing ethical garments.** In terms of participants who said they would not pay more for an ethical item, five categories were found: ethical garments costs too much, consumers cannot change the production system, ethical production is not valued, consumers do not trust that the garment is truly ethical, and I don’t know/blank. Cost of the garment was the most important reason (41%). Participants made comments such as “Because I don't have the leisure to pay for it…” and “the cheaper the better”. Therefore, participants who spoke about price would not purchase ethical garments simply because they do not have the income to allow for this or because they would prefer to pay the least amount of money possible.

Secondly, 20.5% of participants stated that a garment being ethically made is not something that they value. For example, participants simply wrote “Don't see the purpose” or “I don't believe in paying too much for clothing”. Therefore, participants who stated this answer do not value or understand the benefits of ethically made products or they do not value spending money on clothing itself and would perhaps spend their money in other ways. Another 10.3% mentioned that they were in doubt that ethical clothing is in fact ethical. For example, participants made statements such as “I feel as if it’s still the same fabric and the countries will continue to use people unethically no matter what…” and “workers might not be paid a good amount to make it”. This demonstrates that some consumers worry that even if a garment states it is ethical, this may not be factual and workers may still suffer.

In terms of the production system, 5.1% of participants stated they would not pay more for a garment because they doubt that we can make a change or that it is not their responsibility.
Statements such as “I don’t think I should pay more for something that should be made ethically as a consumer” and “I do not believe that by me, (only one person) making an effort to buy their clothes ethically, I will be able to make that much of a difference…” demonstrate that some consumers believe that as one person we cannot make a change as well as the responsibility of making ethical garments is something that should not be shouldered by the consumer. Finally, a total of 12.3% of the whole sample were unaware of why they would or would not pay more for an ethical garment.

**Discussion**

Study One was an exploratory study aiming to understand garment choices and purchasing in general, as well as ethical preferences. Overall it appears that participants are interested in ethical production, have purchased ethical garments before and are willing to pay more to ensure garments are being manufactured in acceptable ways. Moreover, certain personality traits are connected to ethical tendencies and this new area of exploration may help to shape future studies. However there continues to be a knowledge gap, as consumers do not know where to purchase ethically-made garments making it difficult to support ethical companies.

**Shopping Tendencies**

In general participants demonstrated that they are interested in fashion to some degree, and that they are shopping on average three to four times per month, including online shopping. This reflects typical public consumption rates; the students in this study were not spending unusually, as "super consumers" (Flynn & Goldsmith, 2015). However, even average rates of consumption contribute to the fast fashion cycle. Interestingly, although more convenient, online shopping was reported as being much less frequent than shopping in-store, which demonstrates that these students prefer more traditional ways of shopping. This is somewhat discouraging
considering that many ethical retailers are based on-line as opposed to in-store. Participants may shop on-line less frequently, as they have expressed that size and fit is very important to them. As consumers cannot try on these garments before having them delivered this may explain why purchasing on-line is less appealing. However, the majority of students do shop on-line to some degree. Therefore, there may be a market to target for on-line ethical fashion sales if retailers give exact measurements for size and fit, easing the on-line purchasing process for consumers.

Participants demonstrated that as consumers they purchase more materialistic items than they should. Although they are aware that more of their income should be allocated to essentials and savings they continue to purchase materialistic items. Previous research would suggest that participants exhibit these purchasing behaviours in order to socially demonstrate their wealth and status (Kim, Choo, & Yoon, 2012). Interestingly, participants lower in SES spent more than those higher in SES on material items. This result may be due to consumers with lower SES wishing to provide the illusion of wealth and status through materialistic objects. This type of spending attributes to the success of fast fashion as it relies on consumers to purchase the newest designs once they are available. Participants who are attempting to prove their wealth through their garment choice will purchase these new styles in order to remain relevant. Further research examining why consumers who do not necessarily have the income to spend on name brand fast fashion garments is needed to understand if there are reasons beyond social pressures.

In contrast, participants who were higher in SES demonstrated less emphasis on material objects as well as higher helping behaviour tendencies (i.e., allocated some income to charity). Research on how to target consumers with higher SES may benefit the ethical market, as these individuals have the income to purchase the higher priced ethical fashions. Moreover, as helping behaviours were higher in this sample of participants, further research is needed in order to
understand what ethical features are important to these consumers and how to increase their knowledge on these issues. Understanding how to bring attention to fast fashion consequences may increase this populations helping behaviours to those affected by the industry.

**General and ethical features**

When consumers go shopping for garments, they are very clear in what drives them to purchase a specific garment: price, style, and fit. These three main factors coincide with the strongest marketing points for fast fashion. Primarily, almost all participants in the sample noted price as their most important feature; fast fashion is the only form of garment production that has the ability to feature stylish garments at surprisingly low prices. The system uses unfair working conditions and pays garment factory workers minimal salaries to ensure garments can be produced at a lower cost, resulting in a lower final price for the consumer. Moreover, by producing garments at such low prices, consumers purchase high volumes of garments at high rates as they wish acquire all the latest designs and remain relevant. As fast fashion fulfills these three main garment requirements, it is understandable why consumers continue to purchase garments made under this process.

In contrast to the ideal fast fashion features, research has demonstrated that purchasing ethical fashion is more costly and less convenient; as well, ethical garments are believed to be less stylish (Carrigan & Attala, 2001; Joergens, 2006; Shaw et al., 2006). These are barriers that likely make it difficult for consumers to purchase ethically. More exposure to ethically made garments and retailers is needed, in order to demonstrate the quality and style of these garments, as well as where to purchase. By giving consumers this information it may make the purchasing of ethical items easier and more common. Moreover, by providing consumers with information about unethical and ethical companies, consumers may choose to boycott unethical companies. If
people feel guilty buying clothes they know contribute to workers’ suffering, they may be motivated to change their behaviours (i.e., people may change where they shop in order to avoid the psychological discomfort of inconsistency between their beliefs and behaviours).

Furthermore, consumers must understand the benefits of paying more for an ethically produced item. The higher cost of ethical clothing can ensure workers are receiving better pay and working environments.

However, as seen in the qualitative results, some participants do not value paying more for garments or do not care about the ethicality of clothing. This may be a unique challenge for people with less disposable income (i.e., the students in this study), but, future research should explore consumers’ feelings towards ethically made clothing in greater depth. Most research has asked consumers yes or no questions regarding their views on ethical clothing (e.g., would you pay more for an ethically made garment) rather than qualitatively asking what is important to the consumer (e.g., no child labour, fair wages, clean working environments, etc.). Once a stronger understanding of what is important to the consumer is established, it may be easier for ethical companies to market their products, reducing the purchasing of fast fashion garments.

**Manufacturing location.** One area of ethicality that has been explored is the manufacturing location of garments. Fast fashion garments do not usually include labels to indicate where they are produced, but ethically made garments often do. Previous research has found that a large portion of individuals have a preference for products made in their country of origin, but only if they consider their beliefs when shopping (Niinimaki, 2010). Unfortunately, when participants were asked about what is important to them in terms of garments in general, it appears that manufacturing location is not thought about very often. It is possible that this sample does not value country of origin when they think about garments in general or perhaps
consumers need to be primed to think about their beliefs before going shopping (i.e., media, public service announcements, marketing, education, etc.). As consumers are rarely reminded of their beliefs before making a purchase this is in the favour of fast fashion. Most fast fashion companies outsource their garments to countries with lower labour standards in order to reduce the overall cost of the garment by paying workers less and spending less maintaining a safe work environment.

In contrast, ethical garments appear to have different standards than fast fashion garments. Participants stated it was important for their garment to be made in Canada when asked specifically about ethical garments. This contradictory finding shows that consumers may not worry about the production location of all garments; however it is important for them that an ethically made garment is made in Canada. Moreover, participants who are more connected to their community are willing to pay more for ethical garments. This may be because participants believe that garments made locally are ethically made. Having garments made within your community might ensure the ethicality as well as reduce outsourcing, increasing profits for your community. However, there have been reports of sweatshops in major Canadian cities, suggesting that a label or claim of Made in Canada does not always ensure the garment was ethically made (Weinberg, 1997). Currently, it is unclear whether consumers assume garments made in Canada are ethically made, therefore future research looking into consumers’ opinions surrounding Canadian and locally made garments may increase our understanding of consumers’ ethical needs and beliefs.

**Ethical feature preference.** Garments that claim to be ethically made may benefit from a sweatshop-free label. A garment being sweatshop-free was more important to participants than organic cotton, being made in Canada, or being Fair Trade Certified. This demonstrates that
participants had a higher preference for their garments to be made away from sweatshop conditions rather than worrying about location of production and what materials the garment consist of. Participants were given the option to provide other ethical features that are important to them. However, no other features were mentioned; this suggests that participants may assume issues such as no child labour, fair wages, and no sexual harassment are covered by a sweatshop-free label. Or, students may have very little knowledge about these human rights issues. This uncertainty about consumer knowledge is a problem since manufacturers may assume label content is meaningful to shoppers. Studies on labels and their effectiveness have demonstrated that labels must be unambiguous and credible (i.e., third party labels such as Fair Trade) in order to be successful. The simple label ‘sweatshop-free’ does not include any specific information on the manufacturing process, which makes it vague and less credible according to previous research (Hoek, Rolling, & Holdsworth, 2013). Therefore, consumers’ preference for a sweatshop-free label may suggest that the issue consumers have with the clarity of the label is not with the language used to describe the feature, but with the content of the label. In other words, the label may be more effective if the issue is one consumers are concerned with.

Participants in this study were unaffected by the vagueness of this feature and have demonstrated that having garments that are sweatshop-free are important to them. It is also possible that students in this study did not understand what the other label items actually meant (sweatshop-free is a more intuitive term; fair trade may be less understood). Future research exploring what features (e.g., child labour, fair wages, good working conditions, etc.) are important to consumers and believed to be covered by the sweatshop-free label would be of value in understanding consumers’ values and label effectiveness.
**Ethical garment costs.** The importance of sweatshop-free and ethical garments was further solidified through the stated intentions of the sample. The price of ethical garments is one of the main deterrents stated by consumers (Chatzidakis, Hibbert, & Smith, 2007). However, a large amount of participants said they would pay more for an ethical garment demonstrating that price may not be as large of a factor as previously thought. Furthermore, participants were willing to pay more than previous research has documented (i.e., Elliott & Freeman, 2004). This sample of participants may be demonstrating a trend that consumers’ price tolerance for ethical garments may be increasing. This type of increase may also demonstrate that consumers have more concern for how their garments are produced and increasing ethical knowledge may influence consumers’ ethical behaviours. As this sample consisted of students, future research would benefit from testing consumers from different stages in life in order to understand whether older consumers or consumers with different educational backgrounds differ in their views of ethical pricing. Moreover, this result is limited as it is based off survey data as opposed to real world behaviours. As previous research has speculated that consumers state they will pay more for an ethical garment because it is the social norm (i.e., Carrington, Neville, & Whitwell, 2010), future research should focus on actual spending behaviours of consumers to document whether they will pay more for ethical items when given the opportunity.

**Ethical personalities and brand knowledge**

Participants who hold ethical beliefs appear to have certain traits that make them more willing to purchase ethically. Participants who had higher levels of concern for the impact of their behaviour on the future were more likely to pay more for ethical garments. These participants may have created the link between their behaviours now and how they can act in order to ensure a better future of both sustainability and ethicality. Overconsumption is one of
the leading causes of environmental degradation, therefore consumers who are more aware of their consumption behaviours and how they will affect the future may be more likely to help create a movement for less consumption of fast fashion (Byun & Sternquist, 2011; Tanner & Wölfing Kast, 2003; Winter, 2004).

However, knowledge of ethical and non-ethical companies continues to be subpar, reducing the effectiveness of these future oriented consumers as they are unaware of where to purchase ethically in order to help reduce fast fashion. Many participants stated they would purchase an ethical garment, but many were unsure of whether they had or not and the majority of the sample were unable to list any ethical brands. Knowledge of ethical brands and processes is one of the keys to helping consumers change their behaviours which would in turn create more demand for ethical products, ideally ending the cycle of fast fashion. These findings are in line with the literature on ethical purchasing as many consumers are unaware of where to purchase ethical garments, further demonstrating that there is a lack of knowledge of ethical fashion. Further research on consumers who purchase ethically, what drives them to do so, and how they have educated themselves would be useful to better understand how we could help others create ethical tendencies as well.

Study One has demonstrated that ethical production is an issue that participants are not overly familiar with as they are unsure who produces these garments and where to purchase them. However, they say they are willing to pay more for an ethically made garment, which suggests there is a market for ethical production. Furthermore, there is a preference for garments that are listed as sweatshop-free, as well as made in Canada. In order to help consumers make better decision that are in line with their beliefs, research is needed to better understand how to educate consumers on ethical processes and companies. Once more knowledge of this kind is
acquired, consumers may be able to use their purchasing power in order to make a difference in sweatshop workers’ lives.

**Limitations and future directions**

Study One was an exploratory study that aimed to advance knowledge on consumers’ preferences, awareness of ethical fashion, and shopping behaviours in general. The sample was derived from a university population and did not have a large age or SES range, limiting the type of consumer being surveyed. Consumption of ethical garments may differ depending on age and income; therefore future research should work to understand how different populations spend their money in terms of ethical garments, as well as how knowledge of ethical fashion differs by age, income, and education. In addition to age and SES, some gender differences were present demonstrating that females and males spend their money differently. However, the sample consisted of a small number of male participants making it difficult to analyze or discuss any gender differences. Further analyses of gender differences and ethical spending may help us better understand who is more likely to purchase ethically, as this research has found that females would pay more for ethical garments than males.

One feature explored in Study One was the value of a garment being made in Canada. Currently some garments sold in Canada are marked as being ‘Made in Canada’. However, sources have documented that sweatshops exist in Canada, suggesting that even if garments state they are made in Canada it does not mean they are ethically made (Weinberg, 1997). This was a limitation as it was not made clear if ‘Made in Canada’ and ‘Sweatshop-free’ were used interchangeably when participants explained why they would pay more for an ethical garment. Further research is needed to understand if consumers believe that garments made in Canada are free of sweatshop labour. Similarly, participants were asked to list any ethical brands they were aware of. The list of companies was reported on, however it is beyond the scope of this thesis to
research each company listed to determine whether they are in fact ethical. This knowledge is difficult to locate and is another supporting point for ethical companies to carry a sweatshop-free label.

A third limitation of this study was the method of data collection on some of the questions of interest. This study used a hypothetical and survey based method to ask about important questions like ‘How much would you pay for a garment that was ethically made’. This method of data collection could be subject to social desirability bias and participants may have stated they would pay more than they would in a real world situation. Currently, there is a lack of field studies measuring consumers’ purchasing behaviours of ethical garments; therefore future research should focus on testing consumers’ ethical tendencies in real world situations in order to receive data without bias.

This research is still in the preliminary stages and needs much more attention. Future research should focus on creating a base knowledge of personality traits, spending behaviours, and knowledge levels linked to ethical fashion. A further understanding of who is more likely to purchase such garments and how to inform consumers about the negative consequences associated with sweatshops in order to help form healthier purchasing behaviours is crucial. Furthermore, real world behaviours need to be monitored to gain more knowledge into actual spending behaviours of the average consumer as well as the ethical consumer.

**Study Two: Shopping Habits**

Research is needed to understand what influences consumers to purchase ethical products. The aim of Study Two, "Shopping habits", was to expand and build on the results found in Study One and test whether consumers’ shopping behaviours are affected by knowledge of sweatshop issues. An additional goal was to explore how personality traits affect spending
habits (for ethical products and in general) and how this relates to spending on material goods, particularly fashion-related. Study One assessed personality traits and self-reports of shopping habits. Most participants were willing to pay more for ethical fashion and concern with the future consequences of one's behaviour was associated with more consumption of ethical products. Importantly, willingness to pay was established based on several items of clothing pilot tested in Study One for consumer appeal.

Study Two was designed to mimic realistic shopping situations and to further evaluate the personality traits and contextual factors (media information, labelling) related to purchasing ethical garments. An experimental design was used to observe whether media information affected purchasing (i.e., ethical or non-ethical clothing). Participants were assigned to one of three news article conditions: reading about clothing care, reading about a sweatshop collapse, or reading about a sweatshop collapse with perspective taking. The perspective-taking instruction was added to test how this might increase the effect of information. Research has shown that perspective taking can increase empathy and helping behaviours, which may impact participants' purchasing behaviours (Andreychick & Migliaccio, 2015; Kidd & Berkowitz, 1976).

Garment label information about the ethics of production is limited, especially in terms of fashion. Labelling garments to indicate that they have been made in good working conditions will influence some consumers to purchase them over their non-marked counterparts (Prasad, Kimeldorf, Meyer, & Robinson, 2004). In Study Two, label content was varied in an online shopping scenario to observe the effects on ethical and non-ethical garment purchasing. Based on the willingness to pay information gathered in Study One, ethical garments were priced higher than non-ethical clothing to test whether consumers would actually pay more for an ethical item - as is claimed in many survey based studies (e.g., Elliott & Freeman, 2001).
In keeping with efforts to capture real world behaviour, an experience sampling method approach was also used. Previous research has demonstrated that any effects news articles have on consumers spending habits diminish with time and consumers begin purchasing as though they had never read about the issue (De Paola & Scoppa, 2013). In Study Two, participants completed daily spending logs for a week, indicating daily purchases in six categories, including fashion. Thus, both laboratory and real life information about spending choices were collected to test the immediate and longer-term effects of learning about sweatshops on purchasing.

Based on the literature about consumer choices and ethical purchasing, and using materials refined during Study One, the following hypotheses were proposed:

1) Students who read an article about a sweatshop collapse will choose sweatshop-free garments in a shopping task more often than those students reading a neutral article about garment care.

2) Students taking the perspective of the workers while reading a sweatshop disaster article will be more likely to shop for sweatshop-free garments than the students reading the same article objectively, or reading a neutral article.

3) Students who read about a sweatshop disaster (particularly if they take on the perspective of workers in the article) are expected to spend less, in general, each week than students reading a neutral story. Moreover, participants will spend less on fashion items (i.e., clothing, footwear and accessories) if they read about a sweatshop disaster.

4) Students with higher materialistic values (trait materialism, less experiential buying tendencies, more financial aspirations, and less consideration of future consequences) will spend more money on non-essential goods each week, regardless of the type of article they read.
5) Students who are more materialistic (trait materialism, less experiential buying tendencies) will be less happy and less connected with nature and their community than people less motivated by status and material goods.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited for a study about shopping habits through the Psychology department undergraduate research participation system (SONA) at Trent University. Seventy-four participants completed an in lab session ($n = 59$ females; 79.7%, and $n = 15$ males; 20.3%), and most ($n = 72$; $n = 57$ females, $n = 15$ males) completed a brief at-home spending log the week following their in-lab session. The mean age of participants was 21.27 years ($SD = 5.86$; range: 18 to 59). Half (51.4%) of participants were in their first year of study; 23% were in their second year; 21.6% were in their third year; and 4.1% were in their fourth year. Participants identified as being psychology majors (40.5%), in other programs of study (51.4%), or undeclared (8.1%). Participants were also asked about their own socio-economic status through self-report on a 10-point Likert scale from 1 (worst off) to 10 (best off). The sample had a mean score of 6.01 ($SD = 1.26$; range 2 to 9). Participants were also asked in the same fashion to report their family socio-economic status, $M = 6.89$ ($SD = 1.26$, range 4 to 10).

Materials

The same individual difference measures from Study One were used to assess participants’ aspirations, materialism, nature relatedness, future orientation, and well-being (the Aspirations Index, the Materialism Scale, the Nature Relatedness Scale, the Consideration of Future Consequences Scale, the PANAS, and the Satisfaction with Life Scale; see Appendix A and also Appendix B for materials specific to Study Two). All scales showed acceptable
reliability (Cronbach’s alpha ranged from 0.69 to 0.95; reliability statistics for all measures can be found in Appendix C).

**Perspective Taking.** Four items were adapted from Schultz’s (2000) perspective taking task to assess how well participants took the perspective of individuals described in a news article about a sweatshop collapse. Participants responded to statements such as “To what extent did you try to imagine how the subjects were feeling?” and “To what extent did you take the perspective of the subjects in the images?” using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*all the time*). Higher scores indicate participants were able to take the perspective of the individuals in the news article more effectively.

**News Articles.** A sweatshop news article (Styles, 2014) focussed on one individual’s experience during the Rana Plaza building collapse in Bangladesh in 2013. The article was approximately three pages in length and featured pictures of the collapse and its victims. The article informed the reader of how and why the building collapse occurred and what the workers experienced (e.g., death toll, days trapped under rubble, and dismemberment).

A neutral news article (George-Parkin, 2016) featured five ways to make clothing last longer (clean often, zip zippers, use cold water, use fabric softener, and use mesh bags). The news article featured pictures to illustrate ways to care for clothing and was approximately three pages in length.

**Comprehension questions.** Each article was accompanied by three comprehension questions. These questions served as a manipulation check as they tested whether participants were reading carefully, as well as tested how much information was retained. The sweatshop article questions asked about the number of victims, why the building collapsed, and how long the individual in the article had to wait for assistance (2 multiple choice and one *yes/no*
question). Correct responses were summed in order to give a total score out of three. The clothing care questions were about three strategies given by the article: how to reduce wear on clothing, how to prevent snags, and whether most laundry soils are visible. The answers consisted of yes/no or true/false options. Correct responses were summed for a score out of three.

**Shopping task.** Participants viewed gender-appropriate garments, presented similar to an online catalogue. The garments were six shirts/blouses pre-tested (in Study One) as being attractive, priced well, and desirable to purchase. These shirts were accompanied by a label that provided manufacturing, origin, or fabric information in four configurations (see Figure 2). Two of the four labels established the garment was ethically made by stating the garment was “Sweatshop-free”. The labels also varied on whether the garment was made in Canada or imported. The remaining bullet points were about garment features and style, such as “high quality”. The garments ranged from $15.99 to $28.99 for women and $14.99 to $34.99 for men. The ethically made garments were $7 more than their unethically made counterparts (this amount was established through the willingness to pay testing in Study One).

![Figure 2: Labels randomly assigned to garments](image)

**Spending log.** Participants recorded their daily spending for one week, using a brief online report (Qualtrics) designed for the study. Participants entered daily spending in six categories: accessories, clothing, footwear, entertainment, personal care/cosmetics, and alcohol (the additional categories were designed to distract from the focus on clothing and to be
realistic). Participants reported the date, store name, number of items bought, total cost, item
descriptions, and price (e.g., gold earrings, $25).

The final spending report (at the end of the week) included the same personality measures
assessed at the beginning of the study and participants were asked to describe any impact the
study had on their lives.

**Procedure**

Participants signed up for a "Shopping Habits" study using the psychology department
online participation system (SONA) and attended an in-lab session. All study materials were
administered on computers, using the Qualtrics survey system. After completing an informed
consent, participants began routine demographic questions on age, sex, year of educational
standing and major, preferred gender of clothing, socio-economic status, disposable income, and
spending distribution according to various categories (see Appendix B). Participants then
completed measures of materialism, aspirations, experiential buying tendencies, future
consequences, nature relatedness, and subjective happiness.

Upon completion of the questionnaires, participants were randomly assigned to one of
three conditions. In two of the conditions, participants read the same news article about a
sweatshop disaster. Within this condition, half of the participants were randomly assigned to take
the perspective of the individual in the article; the others received no special instructions. In a
third condition, participants read a neutral article about clothing maintenance. Participants then
answered three comprehension questions regarding the article they had just read, and described
any impact the article had on them. This was followed by a measure of negative and positive
affect. Next, participants completed an online shopping simulation in which they could browse
through gender appropriate shirts and choose which they would like to buy, to a maximum of
$45. All participants viewed six different garments with labels that contained information about ethical production, fabric, and garment origin. Pricing of shirts was based on participants' responses in Study One, with the ethically made garments deliberately priced higher.

Before leaving the lab, participants received instructions for completing the at-home daily spending log and how to enter purchases. In the week following the in-lab session, participants recorded their spending on footwear, clothing, accessories, alcohol, personal care/cosmetics, and entertainment, using an online form provided via email. Participants were also instructed to keep their receipts for purchases they had made each day, to encourage compliance. The final spending log survey included the same personality and attitude scales measured before the manipulation, as well as debriefing information.

Results

Randomization of conditions

All participants were randomly assigned to experience only one of three conditions: read sweatshop article (n = 21), read sweatshop article and perspective taking (n = 21), read garment care article (n = 32). By chance, the distribution of participants in each condition was not equal\(^1\).

One-way ANOVAs were conducted on age, year of study, major, socio-economic status (SES; family and self), gender, and each of the personality measures as Dependent Variables to test if random assignment was successful. Conditions did not differ on any demographic features (age, year of study, major, SES, or gender). Similarly, there were no significant differences between the three experimental conditions for materialism, consideration of future consequences, consideration of future consequences, consideration of future consequences.

---

\(^1\) Random assignment was programmed using the Qualtrics system. Recruitment to reach the desired number of participants for each type of article resulted in uneven numbers.

\(^2\) Participants in the perspective taking group said they were reading both objectively (\(M = 3.76, SD = 1.22\); i.e. “To what extent did you objectively observe the subjects in the images?”) as well as taking the perspective of the worker in the news article (\(M = 4.38, SD = .74\); i.e., “To what extent did you try to imagine how the subjects were feeling?”). Thus, participants may not have understood or paid careful attention to the wording of the single item asking about reading objectively. The reliability of the four perspective-taking items combined was \(\alpha = .18\), so the
subjective happiness, experiential buying tendencies, community or financial aspirations, or nature relatedness, demonstrating that random assignment was successful (see Appendix E for ANOVA results on baseline variables).

**Manipulation Checks - Perspective taking and comprehension question scores**

Some participants were given the perspective taking task, and it was expected that these individuals would be more effective at taking the perspective of the workers in the sweatshop article. In order to test whether participants were successful in doing so, an independent samples t-test was conducted. The perspective taking group ($M = 3.67, SD = 0.57$) was significantly better at taking the perspective of the individuals in the article than those in the objective group ($M = 3.27, SD = 0.98$); $t(40) = -1.59, p < .01, d = 0.50$.

Participants also received a short quiz after reading the article to test whether they had paid attention to the information differently, depending on experimental condition. It was expected that individuals in the perspective taking condition would score higher on the quiz than those in the sweatshop article without instruction or the neutral article. A one-way ANOVA revealed significant differences between the neutral, perspective taking, and objective conditions in article comprehension, $F(2, 71) = 8.80, p < .01, \eta^2 = 0.20$. Contrary to what was predicted, Tukey’s post hoc comparisons found that participants in the neutral condition ($M = 2.75, SD = 0.57$) performed better on the quiz than those in the objective sweatshop condition ($M = 2.14, SD = 0.73$) as well as the perspective taking condition ($M = 2.00, SD = 0.84$). Those in the sweatshop groups (perspective taking, $M = 2.00, SD = 0.84$; objective $M = 2.14, SD = 0.73$)

---

2 Participants in the perspective taking group said they were reading both objectively ($M = 3.76, SD = 1.22$; i.e. “To what extent did you objectively observe the subjects in the images?”) as well as taking the perspective of the worker in the news article ($M = 4.38, SD = .74$; i.e., “To what extent did you try to imagine how the subjects were feeling?”). Thus, participants may not have understood or paid careful attention to the wording of the single item asking about reading objectively. The reliability of the four perspective-taking items combined was $\alpha = .18$, so the objective item was removed increasing reliability to an acceptable level of $\alpha = .69$. 
scored similarly on the quiz. Therefore, people who read the neutral article appeared to remember more about the content than those who read about the sweatshop collapse. There were no differences in how people comprehended the sweatshop article based on whether they read it objectively or took on the perspective of the injured worker.

Once the analyses on the manipulation checks (i.e., perspective taking and article comprehension) were completed, hypotheses were tested. However, because there were no differences between the perspective taking and objective reading conditions for the sweatshop article (on garment choice, or the week long spending log), the two sweatshop conditions were collapsed into one ($n = 42$) for comparison against those in the neutral article condition ($n = 32$). Results examining the differences between all three conditions can be found in Appendix F.

**Effects of article content on affect**

It was predicted that participants in the sweatshop condition would experience more negative affect than those in the neutral condition after reading the article. An independent samples t-test was used to compare participants’ affect in each condition. Those who read the sweatshop article ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 0.93$) felt significantly more negative affect than those who read the neutral article ($M = 1.29$, $SD = 0.53$); $t(72) = -6.91$, $p < .01$, $d = 1.67$. Reading about the sweatshop disaster reduced positive emotions, but did not lead to distress in readers. Participants who read about clothing care did not have significant differences in positive emotions ($M = 2.61$, $SD = 0.79$) compared to those who read the sweatshop article ($M = 2.09$, $SD = 0.67$); $t(72) = 3.02$, $p = .28$, $d = 0.70$.

**Influence of news article on choice of garment and amount spent**

Participants were given the opportunity to hypothetically purchase $45$ worth of garments from a selection of shirts similar in style, but with varying label information (i.e., indicating the
garment was sweatshop-free or not). It was hypothesized that participants who read the sweatshop article would be more likely to choose one of the sweatshop-free options than those who read about garment care. A Chi-square test of independence was conducted to test this and participants who read the sweatshop article bought significantly more ethically labelled garments than those in the neutral condition, $\chi^2 (2, N = 74) = 7.74, p < .01$ (see Table 7 for detailed analyses on the proportion of ethical items purchased by article condition).

Secondly, a Chi-square was used to determine whether those in the sweatshop condition were more likely to purchase a garment that was made in Canada (see Table 7). This result approached significance, suggesting that participants who read about sweatshops had a somewhat greater tendency to purchase garments made in Canada than those who read a neutral article, $\chi^2 (2, N = 74) = 3.06, p = .08$.

Table 7

*Chi-square counts and percentages for the two news article conditions for participants who did or did not buy sweatshop-free and Canadian made garments.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bought Sweatshop-free</th>
<th>Bought Canadian Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweatshop article</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15$^a$ (35.7%)</td>
<td>27$^b$ (64.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral garment</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care article</td>
<td>21$^a$ (65.6%)</td>
<td>11$^b$ (34.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Counts with differing subscripts are significantly different at the $p < .05$ level.

It was also hypothesized that participants in the sweatshop condition would spend less money on the garments in the shopping task than those in the neutral condition. An independent samples t-test was used to test whether the conditions differed in spending. Contrary to what was expected, all participants spent similar amounts in the virtual shopping task. Participants who
read about the sweatshop disaster ($M = 35.35$, $SD = 12.16$) spent a similar proportion of the allotted $45 as those who read the article about garment care ($M = 31.56$, $SD = 12.80$); $t(2,72) = -1.30, p = .19, d = 0.30$.

**Explanation for choice of garment**

Participants were asked to describe why they had chosen the garments they did with an open-ended question. These responses were categorized and coded, then analyzed for frequency based on the type of article participants read. The most popular reasons listed were style, price, sweatshop-free, and made in Canada. Style and price were the most popular responses (73%; $n = 54$) given for why participants bought the garments they did. When attributing their purchase to style participants made statements such as “it looks nice” or “this is my style”. In terms of selection based on price, participants often mentioned “the cheaper the better” or “by paying less, I could purchase more garments”. A quarter of participants (24.3%) reported their selections were based on items being described as made in Canada and/or sweatshop-free. Specifically, among the participants who read the sweatshop article, 33.3% ($n = 14$) attributed their purchase to being made in Canada and/or sweatshop-free. In contrast, only 12.5% ($n = 4$) of participants who read the garment care article bought items because they were made in Canada or sweatshop-free. Participants who read about the sweatshop disaster attributed their purchase to being sweatshop-free and/or Made in Canada significantly more often than those in the neutral condition, $\chi^2 (2, N = 74) = 6.39, p = .04$. When discussing garments made in Canada, participants wrote direct statements such as “they were made in Canada” or more detailed explanations such as “made in Canada, which eliminates child labour being used to make my clothes”. Participants who attributed their choice to the garment being sweatshop-free wrote statements such as “they
were sweatshop-free and after reading that article I did not want to contribute to sweatshop owners if it could be avoided”.

After finishing the shopping task, participants responded to an open-ended question asking what they remembered about the garment labels (i.e., Made in Canada, Sweatshop-free, imported, clothing details). Of the 74 participants, only 31.1% \((n = 23)\) noticed that some garments were sweatshop-free; many \((n = 51; 68.9\%)\) failed to notice. In terms of Canadian made, 43.2% \((n = 32)\) noticed that some garments were made in Canada, while 56.8% \((n = 42)\) did not notice. Participants who read the sweatshop article were more likely to notice the sweatshop label \((40.5\%; n = 17\) vs. 18.8% of those who read the garment care article; \(n = 6)\). However, reading the sweatshop article did not affect participants in terms of the made in Canada label, as all participants noticed this feature similarly \(\text{sweatshop article: 45.2\%; } n = 19\) vs. neutral article: 40.6%; \(n = 13)\).

**Weekly Spending Reports**

At the beginning of the study, participants were asked how much money they typically spent in a normal week, in 11 categories. Participants were asked to list their average weekly income and indicate how they typically spent that money in each category. Twenty-three participants reported no regular weekly income and 51 reported having some income \((M = 190.64, SD = 170.26, \text{range } = 10 - 1000)\). The sample was split into those with an income and those with an irregular income as analyses demonstrated that spending habits differed based on income status. Participants with irregular income were excluded from the following analyses as no comparisons could be made between their spending during the in-lab session and their weekly spending (i.e., if they had no money to spend; see Appendix F for analyses on the irregular income individuals). Participants in the income group estimated they were spending $160.94 \((SD}
= 113.54, range = $10 - $450), on average, in all 11 categories (see Table 8 for means of estimated spending by category). There was a discrepancy between average disposable income and estimated spending in the 11 categories suggesting that some of participants' spending was not covered by the categories provided. Participants who said they had an income estimated that most of their money goes to savings ($M = $49.02, $SD = $73.03), entertainment ($M = $28.47, $SD = $32.85), and take-out food ($M = $25.90, $SD = $21.72).

In the week following the in-lab manipulation, purchasing behaviour was recorded daily (then aggregated) in six categories: clothing, accessories, entertainment, footwear, alcohol, and personal care. Participants with a reported income spent an average of $110.53 ($SD = $113.72) over the week in the six categories. Participants in the income group spent the most in footwear ($M = $53.64, $SD = $45.58), accessories ($M = $56.93, $SD = $130.27), and clothing ($M = $35.81, $SD = $29.80).

At the beginning of the study, the income group estimated spending an average of $77.21 ($SD = 57.12) total on the six purchasing categories. When participants kept track of their spending, they reported spending an average of $110.53 ($SD = 113.72) in the six categories. A paired samples t-test was conducted to determine whether estimated spending differed from actual purchases in the six categories. Overall, participants spent significantly more ($M = 45.75, $SD = 37.50) than they estimated they usually do ($M = 23.98, $SD = 25.96); $t(31) = 2.44, p = .03, d = 0.68. A paired samples t-test was also conducted on the income group and the result approached significance; participants in the income group spent more ($M = 110.53, $SD = 113.72) than they estimated they usually do in a week ($M = 76.97, $SD = 58.44); $t(46) = 1.84, p = .07, d = 0.37.
Table 8

Average estimated and actual weekly spending per category and proportion of total income spent in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Baseline Estimates</th>
<th>Spending Log</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean spent</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>23.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessories</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Care</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>12.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>28.47</td>
<td>32.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>17.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footwear</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Purchases</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>12.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>14.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take-out food</td>
<td>25.90</td>
<td>21.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>49.02</td>
<td>73.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weekly spending by type of article read.

Participants reported their daily spending over a week, allowing for a comparison of total weekly spending, based on the type of article they read. It was hypothesized that participants in the sweatshop condition would spend less during the week than those who read about garment care. An independent samples t-test was used to test this. Participants spent the same amount, in total, over the week, regardless of which article they read; \( t(2,64) = .62, p = .54, d = 0.15 \) (sweatshop, \( M = 87.76, SD = 98.54 \); neutral, \( M = 101.80, SD = 82.54 \)). Moreover, there were no significant spending differences in any of the fashion categories, which the sweatshop article was directly related to (i.e., accessories and clothing).

Correlations of personality and spending

Traits were further analysed to explore any connections between spending and personality. It was expected that participants higher in materialism, at baseline, would spend
more during the week log regardless of condition exposed. While there was not a statistically significant relationship between being materialistic and spending more, there was a trend showing people who prefer material goods spent slightly more, $r(74) = .20, p = .10$. Secondly, it was predicted that participants more concerned with the future consequences of their actions would spend less overall. There was not a significant relationship, but a trend suggesting that participants more concerned for the future spent less over the week, $r(74) = - .18, p = .15$. There was, however, a strong link between participants' interest in experiences (over material items) and lower rates of spending, $r(74) = -.26, p = .03$.

Finally, initial (baseline) traits were explored for relationships between materialism, connectedness to community, connectedness to nature, subjective happiness, and how their behaviours affect the future. There are various ways to measure trait materialism; one specific way is measuring how it is central to their lives (materialism scale). It was predicted that participants higher in materialism and materialistic traits would be less happy, less connected to their communities, and less connected to nature. Looking at all participants in the study (measures taken at baseline), more materialistic participants were less happy; they were less likely to experience positive affect, $r(74) = -.23, p = .05$, and reported lower levels of subjective happiness, $r(74) = -.28, p = .05$. Moreover, participants higher in materialism were less connected with nature, $r(74) = -.33, p < .01$, and spend less money on experiences, $r(74) = -.35, p < .01$. Furthermore, individuals higher in materialism are less concerned with their communities, $r(74) = -.34, p < .01$, and focus less on how their behaviours may affect the future, $r(74) = -.31, p < .01$.

Another way to measure materialism is to look at how people spend their money on goods: experiences or material goods. Contrary to materialistic individuals, participants who tend
to purchase experiences over material goods are more likely to be happy, $r(74) = - .26, p = .05$.

Participants who purchase experiential excursions were also more likely to be connected to nature, $r(74) = .52, p = .000$. Those higher in nature relatedness were also more concerned with the consequences of their behaviours on the future, $r(74) = .25, p = .05$, and are more interested in interacting with their community, $r(74) = .31, p < .01$. These results confirmed that more materialistic individuals are less happy, less connected to nature, and less involved with their community in comparison to less materialistic individuals.

**Overall sample personality characteristics.**

Baseline (measured in-lab, prior to any manipulation) characteristics of the entire sample suggest participants’ were generally happy, slightly more likely to purchase experiences rather than material items, and only modestly materialistic. Participants aspired to be a part of their community, but also financially successful. They were moderately focussed on the future consequences of their actions and connected to nature (see Table 9 for overall means).
Table 9

Overall means and standard deviations of personality measures (including scale ranges in brackets) for the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (response options)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PANAS: Positive Affect (1-5)</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS: Negative Affect (1-5)</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialism Scale (1-5)</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of Future Consequences Scale (1-5)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Happiness Scale (1-7)</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Buying Tendencies Scale (1-7)</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations Scale: Financial Success (1-5)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations Scale: Community Feelings (1-5)</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Relatedness Scale (1-5)</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of the study on participants

The final spending report included an open-ended question inquiring about whether the study had any impact on participants' lives. Almost half (48.6%; n = 36) of participants mentioned that the study made them more aware of their spending in some sense. For example, some people felt it made them more aware of which categories they spend the most money in. A third of participants (32.4%; n = 24) either left the section blank or said it had little or no impact on their life. Six participants (8.1%) mentioned the impact of their purchasing on others. For example, a connection was made between spending and the workers who make the products. All six participants were in the sweatshop condition, and these participants accounted for 14.3% of the participants who read the sweatshop article. A small number of participants (6.8%; n = 5) mentioned that the study helped them understand their spending and how it relates to their personality (e.g., spend more when stressed). Finally, 4.1% (n = 3) of participants mentioned the
study had an impact on their materialistic values and spending. For example, one participant wrote that it made them more aware of the value they placed on materialistic items.

**Discussion**

Study Two tested whether reading about sweatshop workers’ conditions would impact consumers’ concerns and spending behaviour. The study focused on participants’ simulated and actual spending behaviour and whether they made a connection between their shopping habits and the consequences of overconsumption and fast fashion. The news article manipulation (informing consumers on the hazardous conditions of sweatshops) yielded mixed results in terms of spending. Encouragingly, participants purchased more ethical garments in the virtual shopping task if they read about the sweatshop collapse. This result compliments previous research in the environmental field that has demonstrated that people’s opinions and attitudes about the environment may be influenced by reading about environmental issues in the media (Sampei & Aoyagi-Usui, 2009). As media coverage of sweatshops and their maltreatment of workers becomes more prevalent, the impact of this industry deserves further attention to understand which types of coverage have the greatest (or any) impact on ethical consumption behaviours.

**Impact of news article on spending habits**

In addition to participants purchasing more ethical garments after reading about a sweatshop disaster, it was also expected that reading about the sweatshop disaster might dampen participants' enthusiasm for spending money in the virtual task, but this was not the case. Therefore, it is important to note that reading about the disaster affected the type of garments consumed, but did not impact participants' consumption levels. It is possible that participants felt obligated to spend their entire (imaginary) budget because the online shopping task was in the
context of a laboratory experiment. Therefore, further research in real world settings will be needed to determine if results would differ when consumers are spending their own money.  

**Perspective-Taking**

While the sweatshop information was effective in promoting ethical garment choices in the virtual shopping task, the perspective taking exercise had little impact over and above exposure to the information (reading the article objectively). Previous research has demonstrated that taking the perspective of an individual creates an emotional reaction (Batson, Early, & Salvarani, 1997). It was expected that participants in the perspective taking condition would identify with the survivors in the news article, and show increases in socially conscious spending (i.e., choosing more ethical garments in the lab scenario and spending less in the real world over the following week). This did not occur, however. It is possible that student participants were not able to identify with the sweatshop workers in the article. The workers were of different ethnicity, nationality, and from another part of the world that is very different from what most Trent students experience in everyday life. Moreover, many students likely have not faced the extreme hardships and life-threatening work environment that sweatshop factory workers experience. These differences may explain why the perspective-taking task was ineffective and are important considerations for future interventions with participants from economically advantaged countries. Finding ways to generate compassion and empathy for workers in far away places, with very different backgrounds, should be the focus of future research on this topic. As a first step, educating consumers with continuing media coverage of these unethical work places is needed to ensure people understand what conditions fast fashion workers experience. Without exposure to these issues, many consumers will remain unaware of these working conditions and will not change their perspective on the fashion industry. Although
participants in this study were not successful in taking the perspective of the sweatshop workers, it is still encouraging that simply reading about the factory collapse - even objectively - had an influence on the choice of garments. Finding ways to evoke a more empathetic or stronger emotional response might promote ethical consumption, but consumers may also resist such overt efforts if it triggers guilt. News articles and educational information may need to be explicit about the connection between overconsumption, fast fashion, and workers’ conditions, but also empower consumers with options and alternatives.

**Ethical purchasing and personality characteristics**

In order to understand what factors shape participants' spending habits, personality characteristics were also measured. Trends (non-significant, or only verging on significant, due to sample size) were found in which more materialistic individuals spent more, while future oriented people and those more likely to purchase experientially (rather than materialistically) tend to spend less. These findings may be explained, in part, by the literature linking materialism with well-being. People high in trait materialism tend to use material goods as a source of happiness, as well as a way to demonstrate wealth and status (Mullins, 1999; Richins & Dawson, 1992; Trigg, 2001; Wong, 1997). The week-long spending logs revealed a trend in which future oriented students spent less money. It seems plausible that these students made the connection between overconsumption and how it may affect their well-being, the well-being of garment workers, or even the impact on the environment. Furthermore, individuals who are more interested in having experiences rather than purchasing material goods spent less overall. This reflects less concern with maintaining a materialistic image to signal wealth and power. Currently, there is a lack of research on the personality characteristics that predict ethical purchasing. Future experimental work, testing the direct effects of personality on ethical
consumption, will help to determine how important traits are in guiding consumer decision making. Furthermore, researching how to increase or promote personality traits linked with prosocial behaviour may aid in reducing the focus on materialistic products. Similarly, studying individuals with these characteristics may provide some insight into the antecedents of ethical and prosocial values and suggest interventions to counter materialism, excessive and unethical consumption. Finding ways to encourage consumers to think about the impact of their current spending on the future seems another promising avenue of research.

Effects of Sweatshop Information on Real World Spending

One of the main goals of Study Two was to introduce ecological validity to this research topic - to understand if there was a link between news information and real world spending behaviours. In addition to the virtual shopping task (completed in the lab, after the article manipulation) participants also reported on their actual daily purchases in six categories for a week. Although reading the sweatshop disaster article impacted participants ethical purchasing in the lab setting, real world spending (in general and in the fashion categories) was not affected. After leaving the laboratory, participants might not have given any further consideration to how their own (real) fast fashion purchases impact workers’ conditions. Currently, fast fashion is able to thrive because of the high demand by consumers (Byun & Sternquist, 2011). If the cycle of fast fashion (i.e., purchasing rates create a demand that necessitates unethical production and high profit) becomes more visible and obvious to consumers, there may be an impact on spending frequency. Clearly, increasing awareness is a challenge and information alone may not be enough to change consumer behaviour. Results from the present study suggest that providing knowledge about sweatshop workers’ conditions can motivate consumers to purchase more ethically when the information is presented at the point of purchase (as it was in the virtual
shopping task). The challenge for future researchers will be to determine how best to make the connection between overconsumption and fast fashion salient for consumers when they are engaged in every day purchasing decisions.

It is important to note that the virtual shopping task included labels stating the ethicality of the garments, facilitating a morally responsible choice. Currently, this type of information is not commonly available when shopping in-store or online for garments. The labels simplified the purchasing of ethically made garments and, by their very presence, may have influenced participants purchasing decisions. Therefore, it is important to recognize that the lack of labels in most real world shopping experiences is a barrier to behaviour change. Without easily available information about manufacturing (ethical production information on labels is uncommon) participants returned to their normal shopping patterns as opposed to making the connection between overconsumption and fast fashion. Ideally, future research will include real world shopping excursions and observations of actual purchasing decisions to better understand if consumers purchase ethically without explicit labels.

**Overall impact of the study on participants**

Participants were asked to describe any impact the study had on their lives. Almost half of the sample said the study made them more aware of how they are spending their money in some sense (e.g., in which categories they spend money, and how much or how little). This finding is not surprising as participants kept a detailed log for a full week in which they were required to track what they were purchasing and how much they were spending. This is a good first step to increase consumers’ awareness of fast fashion purchases, if combined with education about sweatshops. If consumers are more aware of their purchasing habits and which brands and manufacturers are ethical, they may give more consideration to how they spend their money.
Furthermore, over-consumption, in general, is harmful to the environment. Therefore having consumers track everything they purchase in a day may help them to prioritize and reduce their spending. Many people (and particularly young people who may not know how to budget) may not be fully aware of how much they are purchasing or the impact of their choices. A very small percentage of participants did mention the connection between consumption and the impact on others’ lives (workers in the garment industry). These were all participants who read the sweatshop article, suggesting it did have a lasting impact on the spending habits of some students. It may require a more powerful intervention and possibly direct education at the point of purchase to achieve lasting changes in consumer behaviour.

**Preference for garment features**

The data on garment choice was measured qualitatively to further understand why participants made their purchasing decisions in the virtual shopping task. The main reasons participants chose their garments were price, style, being made in Canada, and being sweatshop-free. Interestingly, many participants (over half) who read the sweatshop article chose sweatshop-free garments, however only a small percentage of the participants attributed their purchase of sweatshop-free garments to the fact that they were labelled as such. This suggests that the choice of a sweatshop-free garment may have been unconscious and, as a result, attributed to another factor such as price or style. However, it is important to note that some participants who read the neutral article attributed their purchasing to the sweatshop-free label as well. Thus, even without reading vivid information on sweatshops, some students valued and selected garments with the ethical labels. This is inconsistent with some of the previous research indicating consumers do not look at labels frequently. There is very little empirical evidence on
the features or designs of labels that would be most effective in promoting ethical consumption, but this is clearly an area needing attention.

The made in Canada label was also listed as a reason for garment selection in the virtual shopping task. Previous research has found that almost all individuals who prioritize their own values and ideology in their purchasing behaviours valued a product that was made in their country of origin (Niinimaki, 2010). Participants who read about the sweatshop collapse chose this feature more often than those who read the neutral article. They may have been primed to think about their values and how they connect to the clothing industry when reading about the negative consequences of sweatshops. It is possible that news coverage of sweatshops impacts consumers’ consumption of goods made in their own country. This underscores the need for research to test this, and also to gauge consumers' knowledge of what country of origin implies. Some participants may have assumed locally-made is synonymous with sweatshop-free, however garments made in Canada can still be made under unsafe working conditions.

**Label effectiveness**

Although sweatshop-free and made in Canada labels aided consumers in making more educated purchases during this study, previous research has shown consumers rarely look at labels attached to clothing. In this study, a particularly small number of participants noticed the garment labels - even fewer than in previous research (cf., Iwanow, McEachern, & Jeffrey, 2005). It may be that labels are not the most effective way to inform certain types of consumers about ethical features of garments; students may be a unique group who pay less attention to labels. Future research could explore how to make ethical labels more noticeable and why there is so little consumer demand for labels that include garment production standards. Consumers, collectively, have the power to demand such information from companies and consumer
advocacy may lead to increased knowledge of brands that are ethical and non-ethical if this information was required on labels. Furthermore, companies required to communicate their manufacturing processes on the label may be forced to follow more ethical labour standards to avoid becoming the target of consumer pressure and boycotts (Carrigan & Attalla, 2001).

In sum, Study Two revealed important links between personality traits and ethical purchasing as well as the potential impact of reading about sweatshop disasters in shifting consumers’ willingness to make ethical choices. More research is needed, but the fact that participants were willing to make ethical purchases, at all, is encouraging. Clearly, however, consumers need more information in order to understand the connection between overconsumption and the fast fashion cycle. Labelling garments is a good first step as previous research has demonstrated that consumers would appreciate labels informing them of garment features and processes (Marymount University, 1999). However, there should also be more of a focus on how to increase the amount of attention consumers are paying to labels and the personality factors associated with ethical consumption. In this study, media information and labels had an impact on shopping behaviours in a realistic on-line shopping task, however more work is needed to understand why so few people notice labels and how to best educate the public about the conditions of sweatshop garment workers.

**Limitations and future directions**

Psychological research on ethical consumerism and clothing is limited. Currently, analyses of personality differences and their impact on ethical decision making are in the preliminary stages. Little is known about the individual difference characteristics that affect people's purchases, or how these may vary across people with different demographic backgrounds. This study had some limitations as it was an exploration into this understudied
topic and the sample population consisted of female students, many of whom were lacking a stable income. Students must prioritize what to spend their money on, potentially making fashion less important in relation to necessities. Furthermore, student participants may have other unique characteristics that distinguish them from adults in the general population, or older consumers. Therefore, future studies should include consumers from a variety of cultural and socio-demographic backgrounds in order to better understand ethical purchasing.

Another limitation of this study is that although the laboratory task was designed to be realistic and resemble online shopping, the choices included items with labels stating the garments were ethically made. Currently, this type of information is not commonly available when shopping for clothing in-store or online. The labels made it easier for participants to shop ethically, but possibly unrealistically. Ideally, future research will explore what type of information to use on these labels in order to convey to the consumer that ethical standards were met. Labels in this study were developed through testing with student participants and the desired features or content may vary depending on consumers' backgrounds. Real world shopping excursions and observations of actual purchasing decisions are needed in order to better understand if consumers purchase ethically with labels. Made in Canada was clearly an important feature for some participants in this study, however this also raises questions about whether consumers confuse made in Canada with ethical production, or whether this is prioritized over Fair Trade or Sweatshop-free claims. Future research might address these questions by measuring participants’ opinions and perspectives of ethical claims and determining consumers' objective (versus subjective) knowledge of what the various labels, including made in Canada, actually mean.
A challenge of the study design was determining how to monitor students' spending in the week long post-laboratory period and capture real world spending with some accuracy. Currently it is difficult to determine which brands and companies use ethical production standards, making it impossible to measure students' ethical purchasing in the real world. During the laboratory part of the study, participants had information about which garments were ethical (on labels), but in the week long spending log there was no way to capture this behaviour. It was not possible to track ethical spending or to determine if reading about the sweatshop collapse had any effect on such spending. Therefore ethical shopping behaviours were measured by the amount spent in the fashion categories rather than what was purchased. This practical challenge in the data collection limited any direct examination of how the article information affected participants' real world ethical shopping choices. It will be important for future research to test the causal links between media information and consumer behaviour. This research also did not address human rights issues directly, or the environmental impact of sweatshop garment production, but overconsumption and fast fashion are related to both unethical working standards and environmental consequences, and so deserve further study (Byun & Sternquist, 2011; Tanner & Wölfing Kast, 2003; Winter, 2004).

Finally, a larger sample size and greater power would allow for more analyses of the individual differences associated with awareness of unethical fashion and why certain consumers chose to purchase ethically, even without reading about sweatshops. Trends suggested materialistic individuals purchase more, and participants concerned with the future spend less. A larger and more diverse sample would increase power and potentially confirm significant relationships between these traits. Research on consumers with a larger income range is needed to capture more spontaneous shopping behaviour and determine if income is correlated with
ethical purchasing. Moreover, many participants who read about the sweatshop collapse chose ethical garments, but did not attribute their choice to the sweatshop-free aspect. In this relatively understudied area of consumer behaviour, qualitative methods could be useful in determining consumer awareness and motives.

**General Discussion**

Research on ethical garments, production standards, and how consumer behaviours are impacted by knowledge of the fast fashion industry is limited. However, these two studies demonstrated that there is a market for ethical garments and consumer behaviours may be impacted by news coverage of unethical manufacturing processes. Together, these studies explored a number of different factors that impact spending and shopping behaviours in students. Participants in Study One were asked to indicate how much they were willing to pay for specific garments if they were ethically made, as well as to indicate which ethical features were truly important to them. This demonstrated that students believed ethical clothing should be priced higher than non-ethical items and brought to light a feature important to students when thinking about ethical garments (i.e., Sweatshop-free).

In Study Two, students participated in two shopping tasks. The first aimed to understand whether participants would purchase ethically made garments after being informed of the horrors of fast fashion working conditions in a realistic online shopping task. The prices assigned to the garments in this task were informed by the willingness to pay findings from Study One. Importantly, this process ensured that the pricing of garments in the virtual shopping task was appropriate for students. Participants in Study Two once again demonstrated that a higher price for ethical clothing is acceptable, and they purchased these garments (in a shopping simulation) regardless of the higher cost. Observational data was also collected in the form of the spending log, in which participants outlined every fashion purchase they had made each day, for a week,
reducing the bias inherent in retrospective survey data collection. Study Two attempted to capture real world behaviours as most research in this area is survey based (and often retrospective).

Many positive and encouraging results were established through these two studies. Most importantly, participants appear to express concern and interest in ethical production in the fashion industry. The studies demonstrated important findings on willingness to pay for ethical garments, realistic purchasing behaviours, links between ethical values, beliefs, and personality, and further information on the ability to shape behaviours of consumers through information and media. In general both studies found that participants were willing to pay a premium for ethically made garments - and more than has been recorded in previous research (cf. Elliott & Freeman, 2004).

Currently, there is a lack of information on personality traits and how different traits impact consumers’ opinions and actions when shopping. However, it appears that some personality traits, such as consideration for future consequences, can influence participants’ likelihood to purchase ethical garments. This suggests that marketing campaigns to promote ethical garments should emphasize the future consequences of present-day purchasing decisions. Furthermore, participants also chose to purchase ethical garments in a virtual shopping task, particularly if they had read about the consequences of unethical fashion on others’ lives (i.e., sweatshop factory collapse). These findings demonstrate the potential impact of news media on consumer behaviour and that media information can foster pro-social choices, not only on environmental issues, but also ethical issues. The implications of this are encouraging and suggest that more media attention to the unethical process of fast fashion may help increase consumers awareness of issues in this industry and may impact their spending behaviours.
Ethical Labelling

Labelling of ethical garments is an issue needing attention in ethical and fast fashion research. In both of the current studies, participants valued the Sweatshop-free label over all other options (i.e., Fair Trade, organic cotton, Made in Canada) in determining that their garment was ethically made. This is a novel finding and demonstrates that participants believe Sweatshop-free is synonymous with ethical production. Previous research on labels suggests they must be direct, unambiguous, and credible (Bradu et al., 2013; Hoek, Rolling, & Holdsworth, 2013; Hussain & Lim, 2000). Having the option to purchase a garment labelled as Sweatshop-free was sufficient to increase purchasing of ethical garments, despite the ambiguity of this term (it does not explain where or how the garment was made). Given that participants put faith in this terminology, further research is needed to understand what this means to consumers, including basic knowledge surrounding the concepts of Sweatshop-free, ethical garments, Fair Trade, and how these differ. Some participants in Study One mentioned they were unaware of what Sweatshop-free entails and were completely unfamiliar with the term ethical clothing. Further research on how to best educate the public on these issues is needed, in order to empower consumers interacting with retailers, corporations, and policy makers.

More pervasive, consistent, and informative labelling may have a positive impact on consumers’ ethical consumption. As seen in Study Two, participants were more likely to purchase the ethical items after reading a news article about the sweatshop collapse. However, during this shopping task, clothing items were accompanied by information and labelling that aided consumers in choosing garments that fit more appropriately with their values and beliefs. Currently, the fashion industry has no requirement that companies declare their manufacturing processes. There has been a shift in the food industry in which labels such as Fair Trade and
Organic have helped consumers shop more responsibly. Having sweatshop-free labels attached to garments that are made to ethical standards by ensuring human rights and safe working conditions may aid consumers in purchasing garments that align with their beliefs. Labelling of such garments may increase awareness of companies who do not hold such standards, and may eventually lead to a change in the labour force if consumers start to avoid unlabelled garments. Therefore, further research on the effectiveness of labels is needed to understand whether petitioning to have all companies declare their manufacturing processes will have a positive impact on the fashion industry.

It is worth noting that previous research shows consumers look infrequently at labels attached to their clothing (i.e., Iwanow, McEachern, & Jeffrey, 2005) and therefore having garments labelled as ethically made or Sweatshop-Free may not automatically lead to change; consumers may not even notice. In Study Two, participants who read the sweatshop article purchased more ethical garments, however less than a third noticed the labels stating ethicality. Therefore, it is important for future research to test label awareness amongst consumers and identify the format, presentation, and content that is most impactful.

**Information sharing and the media**

Although participants purchased ethical garments in the virtual shopping task, the sweatshop article seemed to have little effect on real world spending patterns during the following week. The total amount spent in fashion categories (i.e., accessories and clothing) did not differ based on whether participants read the sweatshop article or a neutral article. In the laboratory, reading about the sweatshop collapse had an emotional impact on participants (significantly lower positive affect, compared to those who read the neutral article), but this did not translate into changes in spending in the week following the manipulation. Although
participants may have understood the connection between garments and sweatshops after reading the informative article, there was no observable long term change in general spending. This may be partly due to the fact that no direct information was provided about how to reduce one's personal consumption in order to reduce the need for fast fashion and sweatshops. The sweatshop article had a clear description of the factory disaster in which workers lost their lives, but may not have explicitly linked this with specific fashion items - things that participants might recognize when they make these types of purchases. It may be that consumers need to read about certain clothing items or brands that they immediately identify with, or see a sweatshop worker making the type of garment they purchase in order for this type of media information to directly impact spending. More research is needed to establish what types of media best impact consumers (e.g., news articles, PSA’s, television commercials for companies who utilize ethical methods, etc.). Similarly, the type of information that must be portrayed through these avenues needs further attention. For example, research is needed to determine whether images of sweatshop workers have more impact than information on brands involved in unethical production. In addition, targeted interventions designed specifically to reduce consumption need to be developed and tested. The present studies were exploratory and focussed on information presentation, rather than messaging. It is possible that direct and specific instructions to avoid unethical spending could influence consumer choices.

Perspective taking was included in Study Two in attempts to increase the impact of the sweatshop news article on participants. Previous research has demonstrated that perspective taking can increase empathy and result in changes in behaviour (i.e., Schultz, 2000). It was hypothesized that participants taking the perspective of the sweatshop worker would be better able to imagine what it was like to work in such an unpleasant environment, resulting in
participants purchasing fewer garments in the shopping task and in the following week. However, the perspective taking exercise did not affect the amount of money spent on fashion. A plausible explanation is that participants were not able to identify with the sweatshop workers, or were uncomfortable when considering their own role in perpetuating the fast fashion cycle. The connection between fast fashion, consumption, and sweatshop workers lives was not explicit in the news article. Thus further research is needed to determine the type of information that will motivate consumers to take action about sweatshops and ensure safe working conditions.

Moreover, further research into perspective taking may increase identification with sweatshop workers, potentially increasing consumer concern, leading to boycotts and increased pressure on companies with unethical production standards. The environments that workers are subjected to are situations that most individuals in Western society are unfamiliar with; workers are mostly from different countries, of different ethnicity or skin colour, and the places simply look different. This may partly explain the absence of any lasting effects from the perspective taking task, in which participants were instructed to imagine themselves in the position of the workers in the news article. Research on how to inform consumers about workers lives and work conditions may increase consumers’ understanding, concern and empathy for these workers and the human rights abuses so prevalent in garment production. Such awareness may lead to helping behaviours (as previous research has found), resulting in action and consumers using their purchasing power to make changes in the fashion industry.

**Ethical Barriers**

In addition to the challenge of asking participants to identify with sweatshop workers, factors such as consumer mood, identity, and personality affect shopping behaviours. The difficulty in finding ethically-produced products may also discourage consumers from making
the effort. Ethical garments are usually more expensive than non-ethical counterparts, as it costs more to manufacture in a safe working environment. All these factors, combined with perception (right or wrong) about inferior quality, and scepticism about the accuracy of Fair Trade, Organic, or Sweatshop-free branding may explain why shifting consumer behaviour is challenging. Social norms have a powerful influence on many behaviours (including environmental actions such as recycling or energy consumption; Cialdini, 2003; Schultz, Nolan, Cialdini, Goldstein, & Griskevicius, 2007) and this topic may also yield insights into how to promote more ethical production and consumerism.

It is also important to consider the emotional distress and guilt consumers may experience when asked to choose between ethical and non-ethical garments. If reading about sweatshop disasters and confronting the link between one's purchases and the potential of lost life it causes is excessively distressing, consumers may deny or avoid the issue of garment ethics in general. Consumers may feel discomfort (cognitive dissonance; Festinger, 1957) when forced to acknowledge that purchasing certain garments leads to the suffering or even death of fashion workers.

The connection between fast fashion, ethical garments and overconsumption

The focus of this thesis was to further research on the ethical fashion market by attempting to understand more about consumers’ ethical preferences, knowledge, and personality traits that may affect their shopping behaviours. However, it is important to address why ethical fashion is necessary today. The garment industry has been under great stress as consumers have begun to replace their wardrobes as quickly as the food in their pantries. The high rate of spending and consumption has led to the need for fast fashion. In western societies, people are likely to use garments for more than necessity, to fulfill deeper needs (e.g., demonstrate
personality, increase well-being and satisfaction with life). Fast fashion is part of the larger issue of overconsumption and has led to disastrous consequences in general (e.g., environmental degradation) and in the fashion industry (e.g., lost lives, working in unhealthy environments, abuse, child labour, etc.). Ideally, consumers must limit their consumption in order to reduce the environmental burden, as well as the need for such high production rates. Purchasing only what is needed (versus wanted) will help reduce the impact of fast fashion on workers lives and the environment. Research on how to reduce consumption levels is necessary, and reduction in consumption may be a complex multi-step process, but the shift from fast fashion to ethical garments may be the first step.

In conclusion, these two studies establish that consumers not only have positive attitudes and purchasing intentions toward ethical garments, but they are willing to pay more, particularly when informative labels are present. This research provides some suggestive evidence that media information can shape behaviour (in a virtual shopping task). However, actual shopping habits seem more resistant to behaviour change and information about sweatshops, alone, may not be sufficient or have lasting effects. This area of research has serious implications for human rights, and the health and well-being of workers who jeopardize their lives every day in the workplace. Consumers are the driving force for the fast fashion industry and currently many are unaware of the working conditions of people who manufacture clothing in this industry. Without changes in consumer knowledge and pressure on manufacturers and government, little change is likely. This research provides some insights on further areas for study such as personality factors that predict ethical consumption, and some encouraging results on willingness to pay for fairly produced garments. This thesis contributes to the existing literature on ethical consumerism by
establishing several potential avenues future researchers should explore to mobilize the public in demanding safe, fair and humane working conditions.
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Appendix A:

Materials from Study One

Informed Consent

The purpose of an informed consent is to ensure that you are aware of your rights and what would be required of you as a participant. The consent form will provide you with enough information about this study for you to make an informed decision on whether you would like to participate.

Present Study: Shopping Time!

Research Personnel:
Jessica Pasinetti, Graduate Student, Trent University, jessicapasinetti@trentu.ca
Dr. Elizabeth K. Nisbet, Department of Psychology, Trent University
Phone: (705) 748-1011 ext. 7855, elizabethnisbet@trentu.ca

Purpose.
This survey is investigating opinions about shopping and garment pricing.

Task Requirement.
You will be asked to complete some online questionnaires about your background, personality, mood, and opinions. We will show you some photos of clothes and ask you to rate and assign prices to them, as well as indicate your opinions on clothing manufacturing, as well as brands. The study will take less than 1 hour to complete and is worth 1.0 (one) credit towards PSYC courses.

Potential Risk/Discomfort.
This study has no unusual risks.

Rights to Withdraw.
Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time, for any reason. If you choose to withdraw, credit will be prorated accordingly (e.g. 0.5 credit for completing half of the study). There are several other options to obtain credits such as assignments set up by your professor and other studies listed on the SONA system. You are not obligated to answer any question; however, we would greatly appreciate your help with this research project.

Confidentiality.
Any information that will be collected from you during this study will be kept in a password-protected file on a password-protected computer and will only be available to the researchers. At the end of the study, the final data will be stored separately from your identifying information (name, email). Data will be destroyed after seven years. Only aggregate scores from the study will be used in publications, reports, presentations, and teaching. No commercial use will be made of this data, and the researcher has no conflict of interest arising from this research. If you are interested in the findings of the study, you are welcome to contact the researcher after the study is finished.

If you wish to participate in this study, please read the following statements then indicate your consent by clicking on the "I agree" button below.

Thank you!

Please read the following statements carefully:

• I have been informed as to the nature and the purpose of this study as described above.
• I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw my participation at any point during the study, in which case my data will not be used.
• I understand that my information will be kept private and confidential using methods described above and that any identifying information will be removed from the final stored data.
• I agree to my data being used in the analysis of research collected for the purpose of this study.
• I understand that this research project has received ethical approval from the Trent University Research Ethics Committee (15-23883).
• I have read and understood this consent form.
• I am aware that I may contact the primary contact for the Research Ethics Board (Karen Mauro; 705-748-1011 ext. 7986, kmauro@trentu.ca) should I have any ethical concerns about this study.

By clicking on the “I agree” link below, I confirm that I have read and understood the above information and that I freely give my informed consent to participate in this study.

This study has received clearance by the Trent University Research Ethics Board (15-23883).

Please enter your TRENT email below (this helps us to assign your credit in the sona system):
______________________________

Please enter your SONA user ID code here. This is the only way we know you completed this part of the study (to give you credit) since this survey is separate from SONA. (NOTE: this is a 5-digit number - if you aren’t sure, check your sona account and retrieve the ID number before continuing on with this survey)

______________________________

General Information

We have a few questions about your background.

Please select your gender: Female / Male / Other

Please select the type of clothing you prefer to wear: Men’s/Women’s

What is your current year of study at Trent University?

_____ 1st year (undergraduate) _____ 2nd year (undergraduate)

_____ 3rd year (undergraduate) _____ 4th year (undergraduate)

What is your major: Psychology/ Undeclared (undecided)/ Other

Where did you spend the most time while growing up? (please choose only one response from the options below)

_____ city (downtown) _____ city suburbs _____ small town _____ rural or farm

_____ other (please specify: ________________________________________________)
Where do you live now?

___ campus residence  ___ small town
___ city (downtown)  ___ city suburbs  ___ rural or farm
___ other (please specify: ________________________________ )

Imagine that the ladder below shows how your society is set up (the society you live in right now/today). At the top of the ladder are the people who are best off—they have money, the highest amount of schooling, and the jobs that bring the most respect.

At the bottom are people who are the worst off—they have the least money, little or no education, no jobs or jobs that no one wants or respects. Please think of your family and choose the numerical level that best represents your family. 1 - 10

What percentage of your income DO you spend on the following 5 categories of expenses (please ensure your answers add up to 100% before you continue)? For example, if you spend 50% of your income on essentials type 50.

______ Essentials (food, housing, insurance, etc.)
______ Savings and Investments
______ Material purchases (furniture, clothes, jewelry, etc.)
______ Experiential purchases (vacations, concerts/theater/films, restaurant meals)
______ Charitable donations (e.g., tithing, gifts made to charities and foundations, etc.)
What percentage of your income SHOULD you spend on the following 5 categories to have the happiest life possible (please ensure your answers add up to 100% before you continue)?

_______ Essentials (food, housing, insurance, etc.)
_______ Savings and Investments
_______ Material purchases (furniture, clothes, jewelry, etc.)
_______ Experiential purchases (vacations, concerts/theater/films, restaurant meals)
_______ Charitable donations (e.g., tithing, gifts made to charities and foundations, etc.)

**Aspirations Index**

On the next few pages we have some questions about your consumer interests, shopping preferences, and life goals.

Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the statements below using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not at all</strong></td>
<td><strong>A little</strong></td>
<td><strong>Moderate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Very</strong></td>
<td><strong>Extremely</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You work to make the world a better place. _____
You will help others improve their lives _____
You will help people in need. _____
You will donate time or money to charity. _____
You will work for the betterment of society. _____
You will teach others the things that you know. _____
You will participate in social or political movements. _____
You will buy things just because you want them. _____
You will be financially successful. _____
You will be your own boss. _____
You will have a job with high social status. _____
You will have a job that pays well. _____
Materialism Scale

Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the statements below, using the following scale.

1  2  3  4  5
strongly disagree  disagree  Neutral  agree  strongly agree

I admire people who own expensive homes, cars, and clothes. ______
Some of the most important achievements in life include acquiring material possessions. ______
I don’t place much emphasis on the amount of material objects people own as a sign of success ______
The things I own say a lot about how well I’m doing in life. ______
I often climb the stairs on my hands ______
I like to own things that impress people. ______
I don’t pay much attention to the material objects other people own ______
I usually buy only the things I need ______
I try to keep my life simple, as far as possessions are concerned ______
The things I own aren’t all that important to me ______
I enjoy spending money on things that aren’t practical. ______
Buying things gives me a lot of pleasure. ______
I like a lot of luxury in my life. ______
I put less emphasis on material things than most people I know. ______
I have all the things I really need to enjoy life ______
My life would be better if I owned certain things I don’t have. ______
I wouldn’t be any happier if I owned nicer things ______
I’d be happier if I could afford to buy more things. ______
It sometimes bothers me quite a bit that I can’t afford to buy all the things I’d like. ______
**Experiential Buying Tendencies Scale**

We would like to know more about the purchasing choices you are typically more likely to make. A material item is something tangible, such as jewelry or clothes. An experiential item is something that is intangible, like going out to dinner or going on vacation.

In general, when I have extra money I am likely to buy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A material item</td>
<td></td>
<td>A life experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When I want to be happy, I am more likely to spend money on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material goods</td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities and events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some people generally spend their money on a lot of different life experiences-- e.g., eating out, going to a concert, traveling, etc. They go about enjoying their life by taking part in daily activities they personally encounter and live through. To what extent does this characterization describe you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some people generally spend their money on a lot of material goods and products-- e.g., jewelry, clothing. They go about enjoying their life by buying physical objects that they can keep in their possession. To what extent does this characterization describe you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consideration of **Future Consequences Scale**

Now we have a few questions about your opinions on the future.

Please rate to what degree each statement is characteristic of you by using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extremely uncharacteristic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somewhat uncharacteristic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncertain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somewhat characteristic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extremely characteristic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I consider how things might be in the future, and try to influence those things with my day-to-day behaviour.  

Often I engage in a particular behaviour in order to achieve outcomes that may not result for many years.  

I only act to satisfy immediate concerns, figuring the future will take care of itself.  

My behaviour is only influenced by the immediate (i.e., a matter of days or weeks) outcomes of my actions.  

I am willing to sacrifice my immediate happiness or well-being in order to achieve future outcomes.  

I think it is important to take warnings about negative outcomes seriously even if the negative outcome will not occur for many years.  

I think it is more important to perform a behaviour with important distant consequences than a behaviour with less important immediate consequences.  

I generally ignore warnings about possible future problems because I think the problems will be resolved before they reach crisis level.  

I think that sacrificing now is usually unnecessary since future outcomes can be dealt with at a later time.  

I only act to satisfy immediate concerns, figuring that I will take care of future problems that may occur at a later date.  

Since my day-to-day work has specific outcomes, it is more important to me than behaviour that has distant outcomes.
### Nature Relatedness Scale

For each of the following, please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement, using the scale below. Please respond as you really feel, rather than how you think “most people” feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree a little</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree a little</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I enjoy being outdoors, even in unpleasant weather.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some species are just meant to die out or become extinct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Humans have the right to use natural resources any way we want.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My ideal vacation spot would be a remote, wilderness area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I always think about how my actions affect the environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I enjoy digging in the earth and getting dirt on my hands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My connection to nature and the environment is a part of my spirituality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am very aware of environmental issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I take notice of wildlife wherever I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t often go out in nature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing I do will change problems in other places on the planet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am not separate from nature, but a part of nature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please leave this item blank with no response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The thought of being deep in the woods, away from civilization, is frightening.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My feelings about nature do not affect how I live my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animals (mammals, birds) and plants should have fewer rights than humans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Even in the middle of the city, I notice nature around me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My relationship to nature is an important part of who I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation is unnecessary because nature is strong enough to recover from any human impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The state of non-human species is an indicator of the future for humans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think a lot about the suffering of animals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel very connected to all living things and the earth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PANAS

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you feel this way in general, that is, on average. Use the following scale to record your answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very slightly or not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite a bit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

____ interested          ____ irritable
____ distressed          ____ alert
____ excited             ____ ashamed
____ upset               ____ inspired
____ strong              ____ nervous
____ guilty              ____ determined
____ scared              ____ attentive
____ hostile             ____ jittery
____ enthusiastic        ____ active
____ proud               ____ afraid
____ in awe              ____ fascinated
____ curious             ____ content
____ joyous              ____ anxious
____ sad                 ____ happy
Subjective Happiness Scale (SHS)

For each of the following statements and/or questions, please circle the point on the scale that you feel is most appropriate in describing you.

1. In general, I consider myself:

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   not a very a very

   happy happy

   person person

2. Compared to most of my peers, I consider myself:

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   less more

   happy happy

3. Some people are generally very happy. They enjoy life regardless of what is going on, getting the most out of everything. To what extent does this characterization describe you?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   not at a great

   all deal

4. Some people are generally not very happy. Although they are not depressed, they never seem as happy as they might be. To what extent does this characterization describe you?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   not at a great

   all deal
Satisfaction with Life Scale

Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by placing the appropriate number on the line preceding that item. Please be open and honest in your responding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong Disagreement</th>
<th>Moderate Disagreement</th>
<th>Slight Disagreement</th>
<th>Slight Agreement</th>
<th>Moderate Agreement</th>
<th>Strong Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.

_____2. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

_____3. I am satisfied with life.

_____4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.

_____5. The conditions of my life are excellent.
How long have you been buying your own clothing (in years)?
__________________________________________

How interested are you in fashion?

Not at all interested/ Not very interested/ Neutral/ Somewhat interested/ Very interested

What stores do you like to shop at? Please list your top five (5) favourite.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

How often do you go shopping (in store)?

Never/Less than once a month/ Once a month/ 2-3 times a month/ Once a week/ 2-3 times a week/ daily

Do you shop online?

Yes/No

Please select the top five (5) most important clothing features you think about when purchasing clothing.

Price/Fit/Style/Trendsetting/Quality/Comfort/Easy care/Sizing options/ Colour/ Fabric blend (i.e., % cotton, spandex etc.)/Manufacturing location (i.e., Canada, China, Bangladesh)

Please rank your top five features from most important to least important.

1.

2.
Retailers often wish to inform customers about special features of their products. Which format of information would you prefer to see when you shop (i.e., bullet form or sentence)?

Option A: Bullet form
- 100% organic cotton
- Reinforced shoulder and neck for durability
- Fair Trade certified
- Made in Canada

Option B: Sentence
This t-shirt is 100% organic cotton and fair trade certified. It features a reinforced shoulder and neck for durability and a classic style. Made in Canada.

If you were to buy an ethically made garment which of the features below would be of importance to you? Please check as many as are relevant.

_Organic Cotton
_Fair Trade Certified
_Sweatshop-free
_Made in Canada
_Other

Have you ever bought an ethically made garment?
Yes/No/Unsure

Would you pay more for an ethically made garment?
Yes/No
Could you please explain why you would not pay more for an ethically made garment?

________________________

Why are you willing to pay more for an ethically made garment?

________________________

Do you know of any ethically produced brands? If so, please list them below.

________________________
Example of garment pricing task for women and men.
Appendix B:

Material from Study Two

Informed Consent

The purpose of an informed consent is to ensure that you are aware of your rights and what would be required of you as a participant. The consent form will provide you with enough information about this study for you to make an informed decision on whether you would like to participate.

Present Study: Shopping Habits

Research Personnel:

Jessica Pasinetti, Graduate Student, Trent University, jessicapasinetti@trentu.ca
Dr. Elizabeth K. Nisbet, Department of Psychology, Trent University, Phone: (705) 748-1011 ext. 7855, elizabethnisbet@trentu.ca

Purpose: To understand individual differences in consumer behaviour, attitudes, and well-being.

Task Requirement: You will be asked to come into the lab and complete some questionnaires about your background, personality, mood, and opinions. You will then read a news article about fashion and complete a hypothetical online shopping task. For the next week, we will ask you to complete brief daily report forms on all your non-essential purchases (using Trent's secure online system, Qualtrics). At the end of the week, we have a follow-up survey to be completed online. The study will be worth 4.25 (in-lab) credits for your training and at-home work, towards PSYC courses.

Potential Risk/Discomfort: There are no unusual risks beyond those encountered in day to day life. The news articles in this study are typical of what we read online or in newspapers, however some people may find some of the content and images in the news stories upsetting.

Rights to Withdraw: Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time, for any reason (credit will be prorated accordingly, e.g. 2.0 credit for completing half of the study). Our research relies on your open and honest responses. There are several other options to obtain bonus marks such as assignments set up by your professor and other studies listed on the SONA system. You are not obligated to answer any question; however, we would greatly appreciate your help with this research project.

Confidentiality: Any information that will be collected from you during this study will be kept in a password-protected file on a password-protected computer and will only be available to the researchers. At the end of the study, the final data will be stored separately from your identifying information (name, email). Data will be destroyed after seven years. Only aggregate scores from the study will be used in publications, reports, presentations, and teaching. No
commercial use will be made of this data, and the researcher has no conflict of interest arising from this research. If you are interested in the findings of the study, you are welcome to contact the researcher after the study is finished.

If you wish to participate in this study, please read the following statements then indicate your consent by clicking on the "I agree" button below. Thank you!

Please read the following statements carefully:

I have been informed as to the nature and the purpose of this study as described above.
• I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw my participation at any point during the study, in which case my data will not be used.
• I understand that my information will be kept private and confidential using methods described above and that any identifying information will be removed from the final stored data.
• I agree to my data being used in the analysis of research collected for the purpose of this study.
• I understand that this research project has received ethical approval from the Trent University Research Ethics Committee (2016-24256).
• I have read and understood this consent form.
• I am aware that I may contact the primary contact for the Research Ethics Board (Karen Mauro; 705-748-1011 ext. 7986, kmauro@trentu.ca) should I have any ethical concerns about this study.

By clicking on the "I agree" link below, I confirm that I have read and understood the above information and that I freely give my informed consent to participate in this study.

This study has received clearance by the Trent University Research Ethics Board (2016-24256).

Please enter your TRENT email below (this helps us assign your credit in the SONA system):

TRENT Email Address: ____________

Please enter your SONA user ID code here. This is the only way we know you completed this part of the study (to give you credit) since this survey is separate from SONA. (NOTE: this is a 5-digit number - if you aren't sure, check your sona account and retrieve the ID number before continuing on with this survey)

Your SONA ID number: _______
General Information
We have a few questions about your background.

Please select your gender: Female / Male / Other

For the shopping task, later in the study- what gender of clothing do you prefer to wear?
Men’s/ Women’s

What is your age?
____

What is your current year of study at Trent University?
_____ 1st year (undergraduate) _____ 2nd year (undergraduate)
_____ 3rd year (undergraduate) _____ 4th year (undergraduate)

What is your major: Psychology/ Undeclared (undecided)/ Other

Where did you live, most of the time, while growing up?
___ city (downtown) _____ city suburbs ___ small town ___ rural or farm
___ other (please specify: ________________________________)

Where do you live now?
___ campus residence ___ small town
___ city (downtown) _____ city suburbs ___ rural or farm
___ other (please specify: ________________________________)
Imagine that the ladder below shows how your society is set up (the society you live in right now/today). At the top of the ladder are the people who are best off- they have money, the highest amount of schooling, and the jobs that bring the most respect.

At the bottom are people who are the worst off- they have the least money, little or no education, no jobs or jobs that no one wants or respects. Please think of your FAMILY and choose the numerical level that best represents your family. 1 - 10

Imagine that the ladder below shows how your society is set up (the society you live in right now/today). At the top of the ladder are the people who are best off- they have money, the highest amount of schooling, and the jobs that bring the most respect.

At the bottom are people who are the worst off- they have the least money, little or no education, no jobs or jobs that no one wants or respects. Please think of YOURSELF and choose the numerical level that best represents your family. 1 - 10
The next section asks you some questions about your spending habits.

What is your usual disposable income in dollars AFTER paying for essentials (housing/rent, utilities, and groceries) in a normal week?

$______

Keeping in mind your answer to the question above, how much do you spend in a normal week, in dollars ($), on the following categories of expenses? (please use the boxes below to indicate what you usually spend, per week, in each category).

_______ Personal Care (Cosmetics, shower products, lotions, etc.)

_______ Household goods (furniture, small appliances, sports, crafts, etc.)

_______ Entertainment (concerts/theater/films, fine dining/sit down restaurants, etc.)

_______ Travel (vacations)

_______ Take-out/fast food (McDonald’s, Harvey’s, Tim Hortons, etc.)

_______ Alcohol (drinks at restaurants, tobacco, LBNO/beer store purchases)

_______ Savings
Aspirations Index

On the next few pages we have some questions about your consumer interests, shopping preferences, and life goals.

Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the statements below using the following scale.

1  2  3  4  5
Not at all  A little  Moderate  Very  Extremely

You work to make the world a better place. _______
You will help others improve their lives _______
You will help people in need. _______
You will donate time or money to charity. _______
You will work for the betterment of society. _______
You will teach others the things that you know. _______
You will participate in social or political movements. _______
You will buy things just because you want them. _______
You will be financially successful. _______
You will be your own boss. _______
You will have a job with high social status. _______
You will have a job that pays well. _______
Materialism Scale

Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the statements below, using the following scale.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I admire people who own expensive homes, cars, and clothes.  
Some of the most important achievements in life include acquiring material possessions.  
I don’t place much emphasis on the amount of material objects people own as a sign of success  
The things I own say a lot about how well I’m doing in life.  
I often climb the stairs on my hands  
I like to own things that impress people.  
I don’t pay much attention to the material objects other people own  
I usually buy only the things I need  
I try to keep my life simple, as far as possessions are concerned  
The things I own aren’t all that important to me  
I enjoy spending money on things that aren’t practical.  
Buying things gives me a lot of pleasure.  
I like a lot of luxury in my life.  
I put less emphasis on material things than most people I know.  
I have all the things I really need to enjoy life  
My life would be better if I owned certain things I don’t have.  
I wouldn’t be any happier if I owned nicer things  
I’d be happier if I could afford to buy more things.  
It sometimes bothers me quite a bit that I can’t afford to buy all the things I’d like.
Experiential Buying Tendencies Scale

We would like to know more about the purchasing choices you are typically more likely to make. A material item is something tangible, such as jewelry or clothes. An experiential item is something that is intangible, like going out to dinner or going on vacation.

In general, when I have extra money I am likely to buy:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

A material item  A life experience

When I want to be happy, I am more likely to spend money on:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Material goods  Activities and events

Some people generally spend their money on a lot of different life experiences—e.g., eating out, going to a concert, traveling, etc. They go about enjoying their life by taking part in daily activities they personally encounter and live through. To what extent does this characterization describe you?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all  A great deal

Some people generally spend their money on a lot of material goods and products—e.g., jewelry, clothing. They go about enjoying their life by buying physical objects that they can keep in their possession. To what extent does this characterization describe you?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all  A great deal
Consideration of **Future Consequences Scale**

Now we have a few questions about your opinions on the future.

Please rate to what degree each statement is characteristic of you by using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extremely uncharacteristic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Somewhat uncharacteristic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Uncertain</strong></td>
<td><strong>Somewhat characteristic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Extremely characteristic</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I consider how things might be in the future, and try to influence those things with my day-to-day behaviour. _______

Often I engage in a particular behaviour in order to achieve outcomes that may not result for many years. _______

I only act to satisfy immediate concerns, figuring the future will take care of itself. _______

My behaviour is only influenced by the immediate (i.e., a matter of days or weeks) outcomes of my actions. _______

I am willing to sacrifice my immediate happiness or well-being in order to achieve future outcomes. _______

I think it is important to take warnings about negative outcomes seriously even if the negative outcome will not occur for many years. _______

I think it is more important to perform a behaviour with important distant consequences than a behaviour with less important immediate consequences. _______

I generally ignore warnings about possible future problems because I think the problems will be resolved before they reach crisis level. _______

I think that sacrificing now is usually unnecessary since future outcomes can be dealt with at a later time. _______

I only act to satisfy immediate concerns, figuring that I will take care of future problems that may occur at a later date. _______

Since my day-to-day work has specific outcomes, it is more important to me than behaviour that has distant outcomes. _______
### Nature Relatedness Scale

For each of the following, please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement, using the scale below. Please respond as you really feel, rather than how you think “most people” feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Neither agree or disagree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I enjoy being outdoors, even in unpleasant weather.  
Some species are just meant to die out or become extinct.  
Humans have the right to use natural resources any way we want.  
My ideal vacation spot would be a remote, wilderness area.  
I always think about how my actions affect the environment.  
I enjoy digging in the earth and getting dirt on my hands.  
My connection to nature and the environment is a part of my spirituality.  
I am very aware of environmental issues.  
I take notice of wildlife wherever I am.  
I don’t often go out in nature.  
Nothing I do will change problems in other places on the planet.  
I am not separate from nature, but a part of nature.  
Please leave this item blank with no response  
The thought of being deep in the woods, away from civilization, is frightening.  
My feelings about nature do not affect how I live my life.  
Animals (mammals, birds) and plants should have fewer rights than humans.  
Even in the middle of the city, I notice nature around me.  
My relationship to nature is an important part of who I am.  
Conservation is unnecessary because nature is strong enough to recover from any human impact.  
The state of non-human species is an indicator of the future for humans.  
I think a lot about the suffering of animals.  
I feel very connected to all living things and the earth.
**Subjective Happiness Scale (SHS)**

For each of the following statements and/or questions, please circle the point on the scale that you feel is most appropriate in describing you.

1. In general, I consider myself:

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   not a very a very
   happy happy
   person person

2. Compared to most of my peers, I consider myself:

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   less more
   happy happy

3. Some people are generally very happy. They enjoy life regardless of what is going on, getting the most out of everything. To what extent does this characterization describe you?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   not at a great
   all deal

4. Some people are generally not very happy. Although they are not depressed, they never seem as happy as they might be. To what extent does this characterization describe you?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   not at a great
   all deal
Thank you for completing the background questionnaire!

We now have an informational article for you to read, using a link on the next page. Please follow the instructions and read the article carefully. We will ask you some questions about your opinion on the article afterwards.

**Sweatshop Article Condition**

As you view the following news story, try to imagine how the people who are reporting their stories felt. Try to take their perspective, imagining how they are feeling about what is happening. While you view the images and read their stories, picture to yourself just how they feel. Think about their reactions. In your mind's eye visualize clearly and vividly how they feel in their situation. Try not to concern yourself with attending to all the information presented. Just imagine how they feel in their situations.

**Article 1: EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION**

He said "I'm giving you a saw - you'll have to do it yourself": Woman reveals how she was forced to amputate her own ARM to escape from the rubble of sweatshop

- **Rojina Begum**, from Dhaka in Bangladesh, was trapped in Rana Plaza
- Building, which contained several garment factories, collapsed last April
- Made clothes for Primark, Matalan and Bonmarche among many others
- 1,129 people were killed in the disaster while 2,515 workers were injured
- Ms Begum was trapped beneath the rubble for three days
- **Was forced to cut off her own arm to escape and has had little help since**

By RUTH STYLES


For Rojina Begum, a former garment worker from the Bangladeshi capital Dhaka, the nightmares continue a year after she and more than 3,000 others were trapped in the rubble of Rana Plaza.

Although she survived, 1,129 people were killed, among them her younger sister, whose body was so badly damaged, it had to be identified using DNA testing.

A year on from the disaster, Ms Begum, who lost an arm in the collapse, says not enough is being done to help survivors with many, herself among them, left to fend for themselves.
Rajina Begum was trapped beneath rubble for three days and had to amputate her arm to escape.

'I don’t know what happened to my sister,’ adds Ms Begum. 'We did not get her dead body. We found her grave later, from a DNA sample.'

Rana Plaza, an eight-storey building that housed five factories making clothes for Primark, Bonmarche and Matalan among others, collapsed on the morning of the 24th April 2013. Despite having planning permission for just five floors, owner Sohel Rana managed to persuade authorities to turn a blind eye to a further three, which like the rest of the building, had been put up as cheaply and quickly as possible.

Although a crack in a pillar had been spotted the day before, owner Sohel Rana insisted that the building was safe and instructed workers to return on the 24th. By the time the building collapsed at 8.45am, the huge tower block was crammed with workers, among them Ms Begum and her sister.

'I woke up that day and cooked,' remembers Ms Begum. 'Then I had breakfast. I fed my daughter, then sent her to school. Then I prepared lunch. I thought I'd have it after work.'
When she arrived at Rana Plaza, it was to find the building surrounded by worried workers, spooked by the previous night's TV reports of a crack in the infrastructure. Under the threat of wage cuts, Ms Begum and fellow workers were convinced to go inside and begin the day's work as normal.

'After I went inside I saw the rumour was true,' says Ms Begum who had worked as a seamstress in a second floor factory.

'There was a crack in the pillar and the rods had come out. There were cracks in the ceiling too. It could collapse any time. I told my sister, "We made a mistake coming, let's leave".'

But it was too late. As the factories of Rana Plaza whirred into life, intense vibrations from the eighth floor generators and heavy looms elsewhere proved more than the weakened infrastructure could cope with.

'Suddenly we heard a loud noise, at around 8:45am,' says Dipu Asaduzzaman, a production manager who worked on the fifth floor of Rana Plaza.

'It was like the sound of a bomb going off. It sounded exactly the same. When I heard the noise, I looked up and saw everything collapsing.'

The building took just 90 seconds to collapse, leaving thousands of workers trapped inside the rubble, among them Mr Asaduzzaman and Ms Begum.

'I regained consciousness 20 minutes later,' said Mr Asaduzzaman. 'There was a wall on both my legs. A rod had gone through my right leg.

'I was bleeding. I was lying on my back. When I looked up I saw the ceiling was six inches above me. I had my phone in
my hand and checked it. There was no reception, so I could not call anyone.'
'All I could think was where is my sister?', remembers Ms Begum. 'I was worried about her and I
was panicking. I stood there and screamed and as soon as I screamed I fell into darkness. I was
calling my sister’s name.'

Rescue: The last survivor was pulled out of the rubble 17 days after the building collapsed

Pain: Dipu
Asaduzzaman was
badly hurt in the disaster
but hopes to one day
open his own leather
workshop
Like Mr Asaduzzaman, when Ms Begum awoke minutes later, it was to find herself trapped beneath the rubble and in agony from her wounds. ‘I was lying in a cramped space in darkness,’ she says. ‘My arm was trapped under rods, beams, machines, and tables. My head hurt and I was bleeding from my ear. It was horrible. Many of the people around me had died. Their blood rolled down my body. Everyone was screaming. I was thinking, where is my sister?’

Unbeknown to Ms Begum, her sister was already dead and it would be another 48 hours before rescuers appeared. Mr Asaduzzaman, lying trapped in the rubble with a broken leg, was also in for a long wait. ‘Sometimes we were screaming, “Save us, save us, save us”,’ he remembers. ‘We could hear sounds outside but we did not know if anyone could hear us. Then we realised they were rescuing people. I told everyone we are alive so we will survive. They will rescue us, either today or tomorrow.’

Grim: One of the 2,515 wounded survivors is carried away from the remains of Rana Plaza
'Time was passing. We did not feel hungry. We did not feel anything. It was 8 o'clock. Then we heard someone from outside call, "Is there someone in there?"
'We screamed, "Save us, save us". One of the people said "OK, we are coming". Then one guy came, a rescuer.
'He put some trousers under me, denim ones from the label sewing section. They dragged me out, using those trousers.
'Two people held me from the back and two people folded my knees from the front. My legs were fractured. I was in a lot of pain. I think of that moment sometimes. That's what I think of most.

He was lucky. For Ms Begum, her arm pinned down with a chunk of concrete for more than 48 hours, getting out of Rana Plaza meant being forced to hack off her own limb with a saw.
'I never thought that I'd have to amputate my own arm,' she says. 'But I was forced to by the situation. The doctor tried to amputate it but couldn't reach.
'I said, "No matter how hard it is, amputate my arm". He said, "I'm giving you a saw and you can do it yourself".
'At first I said, "I can't. I have no strength." It was the start of the third day. He said, "Give it a try". I said, "OK, give it to me" and I cut it. I had only one thing on my mind, to look for my sister. That's why I could do it.'

For both Mr Asaduzzaman and Ms Begum, life since the disaster has been tough. Both are still receiving treatment and neither have had much help.
'If I'm having treatment in the hospital,' says Mr Asaduzzaman, 'I don't know for how long. It will be a long process. The doctors said so.
'But I am hoping to start a leather goods business very soon. I tell everyone this - I ask you to pray I can do it.'

Ms Begum says her future looks bleak. 'I never imagined in my entire life that I'd have to see my younger sister's grave,' she says, tears rolling down her cheeks.
'I'd hoped to do a lot of things. What will I hope for now? I have only one hand. I can't do anything.'

**Article 1 Content Questions**

**Approximately how many people lost their lives in the factory collapse?** 1000/1500/2000

**Were the workers forced to work after voicing their concerns regarding the cracks in the buildings foundation?** Yes/No

**It took up to 48 hours for Begum to be rescued?** 24/48/72
What was your experience when reading about the individuals in the article?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all time</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did you try to imagine how the subjects were feeling?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did you objectively observe the subjects in the images?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did you take the perspective of the subjects in the images?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did you remain detached from the subjects in the images?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Article 2: NEUTRAL CONDITION

5 tips for making our clothes last forever

You probably don’t spend much time thinking about laundry—until, that is, you really screw it up. Whether it's tossing a stray red sock into a load of crisp white sheets or shrinking a favorite sweater to straightjacket proportions, the accidental havoc a single spin cycle can wreak is enough to give anyone anxiety. And while most of that can be alleviated by obeying the cardinal rules you probably learned growing up—separate your colors, don't dry knits on high—things get a little trickier when you consider what’s actually in your wardrobe.

Mesh-paneled leggings, scuba sweatshirts, 3D knits, and bright, graphic prints may be just as ubiquitous as t-shirts and jeans these days, but when it comes time to wash them, it’s easy to get stumped. Shouldn’t a “high performance” hoodie basically clean itself? Does an embellished dress have to go straight to the dry cleaner? And who the heck understands those cryptic care tag symbols, anyways? The world of laundry, as it turns out, is evolving right alongside your wardrobe—but there are a few tricks that today’s fashion girl should have up her sleeve.

Just ask Susanna Lau, the veteran blogger, journalist, and bona fide street style star behind Style Bubble. “I didn't grow up in a very fashion-y household; my mum would just chuck everything in the washing machine and just let it do its thing,” she said at Procter & Gamble’s recent Future Fabrics conference in Barcelona. A collection of designer clothing—much of it made from uncommon fabrics or affixed with unusual embellishments—made this strategy a risky one to follow, and Lau confessed to amassing an embarrassing “mini-landfill” of warped, discolored, and otherwise ruined garments at the back of her closet before visiting P&G’s laundry lab in Brussels this fall and learning the tricks of the trade.

On top of sparing the rest of her clothing the same sad fate, the newly-honed skills serve another purpose: reducing an astronomical dry cleaning bill. Defaulting to dry cleaning can seem like the safest bet—but unless you have some serious space in your budget, this isn’t really an option. Below, find five tips for caring for your favorite garments:
1. **Clean early and clean often, especially when it comes to synthetic fibers.**

“Synthetic fibres [think polyester, elastane, and acrylic] attract dirt because of hydrophobicity—they don't like water,” explained Margarita Bahrikeeton, P&G’s global research and development leader. “Synthetic fibers like oily things.” Since the body produces an average of 1 liter of sweat, 10 grams of salt, 40 grams of oil, and 10 grams of skin flakes per day (even without a heavy workout), there’s a lot that can get trapped in your clothes. And the longer you go without washing something, the more chance dirt has to build up.

2. **Zip zippers, button buttons, and turn your clothes inside out.**

There’s a lot of twisting and tumbling that goes on in a washing machine after you shut the door. Make sure your jeans don’t have the chance to maul a mesh top in the process. Many embellished garments are also machine washable, but should be turned inside out so they don’t snag on anything. (Plus, unless you’ve been rolling around on the ground, it’s actually the inside of clothing that’s dirtier—according to P&G research, 70 percent of laundry soils are invisible.)
3. Make use of the cold cycle.

Even if it feels like the best way to scour away all that dirt, heat is seriously harsh on clothes. Not only can it encourage colors to fade faster, it can erode the integrity of fibers, especially elastane, leaving you pulling up the waistband of your yoga pants all day. Steering clear of the hot water setting on your machine is one of the easiest ways to get more wear out of your wardrobe.


That bodycon dress that seems like it shrunk in the wash? It may have actually lost its stretch due to damage to elastane, the fiber that gives many garments their form-fitting shape. Fabric softener may seem like just another way to make your clothes smell nice, but on top of that, it helps fabrics keep their shape and feel better against your skin. In fact, it may help salvage that itchy acrylic sweater you bought at H&M but can’t bring yourself to wear for fear you’ll be scratching your arms all day. The one exception is moisture-wicking or thermal-insulated garments. “The way that wicking works is there are little capillary channels that allow moisture to travel, so they may get a little clogged,” said Bahrikeeton.
5. Invest in mesh bags.

A surefire way to combat snags can be yours for cheap on Amazon. Mesh bags keep your lingerie, tights, and flimsy blouses safe from potential damage—which is great when you’re feeling way too lazy to abide by that “Hand Wash Only” tag.

Article 2 Content Questions

Does the article suggest using cold water to help reduce wear on clothing? Yes/No

Are the majority of laundry soils invisible? Yes/No

Mesh bags will help prevent snags from occurring? True/False
PANAS

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you feel this way **in general**, that is, on average. Use the following scale to record your answers.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very slightly or not at all</td>
<td>a little</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>quite a bit</td>
<td>extremely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>interested</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>irritable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>distressed</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>alert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>excited</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>ashamed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>upset</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>inspired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>nervous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>guilty</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>scared</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>attentive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>hostile</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>jittery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>enthusiastic</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>proud</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>in awe</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>fascinated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>curious</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>joyous</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>anxious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>sad</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>happy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What did you think about the article you read? What was your opinion or reaction to the information?

Shopping Task

Imagine it's Saturday and you're surfing the internet, looking at some online stores. You have saved $45 this month to shop with. How would you spend your money if you were at the virtual store below? (Look over all the options, then choose what you like and fill out the form at the bottom of the page to make your purchases)

Online hypothetical shopping

Example Female Shirt with ethical label

- 100% organic cotton
- Reinforced shoulder and neck for durability
- Fair Trade certified
- Made in Canada

Example Male Shirts with care instructions label

- Machine washable
- 100% Cotton
- Reinforced shoulder and neck for durability
- Low Iron
Please tell us about why you chose to buy the items you did

____________________________________

Below, please list everything you remember about the shirt labels (the information listed under the details section of the clothing items you saw).

![Size Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>COLOUR: TANGERINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Details]

?
Spending Log

Now it is time to record your spending for the day. You will be presented with 6 categories of items, shown below.

For this part of the survey please have your receipts handy and enter the exact amounts you spent in each category based on your receipts (there will be an option to skip a category if you haven't purchased any of those items).
Example of reporting

Category 1: **Accessories**

**Examples:**
Scarves  Hats  Gloves  Jewellery
Sunglasses  Watches  Belts  Hair clips

Please select the date you are reporting your spending for:

Month
Day

Please fill in the details of your purchases.

Name of Store(s)
Number of items bought
Total Cost

Please list and describe each of the items you bought along with their prices.

For example:  Gold Earrings  $25
Charm Bracelet  $15
Debriefing

Thank you for using your valuable time to participate in our study! The main goal of this study is to understand the impact of media on people's shopping behaviours. I am interested in how various types of information (garment care, manufacturing processes, labour conditions for garment workers) influences shopping habits and attitudes about manufacturing. I am also investigating whether consumer attitudes and behaviour about 'fast fashion' and working conditions are affected by viewing information objectively versus taking on the perspective of a person involved in hazardous working conditions. This study is also about how people differ in their spending habits, their consumer priorities, and how this is related to personality characteristics, mood, and connectedness with the environment.

This research is relevant in today's world because shopping has become such a common activity in our society. The high consumer demand for garments has led to increases in production. Some clothing producers have realized that by moving factories to other countries (outsourcing) where wages and health and safety standards may be inadequate, they can make clothing with fewer costs and higher profit margins. Unfortunately, these profits may come at the cost of the employees who suffer long hours in unsafe conditions.

This is a relatively new area of study, but some research has found that consumers may be willing to pay more for ethically made products (garments not made in sweatshops). In addition, the way people spend money can influence well-being. Therefore, by looking into whether consumers are willing to change their spending habits, for example buying only ethically made clothing or reducing their fashion purchases in general, we may better understand how to improve the lives of sweatshop workers, as well as our own. Moreover, we can help increase the effectiveness of media news articles and programs by better understanding their current impact on readers.

We thank you for your contribution, as this research would not be possible without willing participants like you. Be assured that any information that you have provided will be treated with the upmost confidentiality in that there will be no public record which could associate you with this study. Once again, thank you for being part of this study.

Contact Information
The following people are involved in this research project and may be contacted at any time if you have any further questions about the project, what it means, or concerns about how it was conducted:
Jessica Pasinetti, Graduate Student, Trent University, jessicapasinetti@trentu.ca
Dr. Elizabeth K. Nisbet, Department of Psychology, Trent University, (705) 748-1011 ext. 7855, elizabethnisbet@trentu.ca

Should you have any ethical or other concerns about this study then please contact the primary contact for Trent University's Ethics Committee for Psychological Research (Karen Mauro; 705-748-1011 ext. 7986, kmauro@trentu.ca) or Dr. Brenda Smith-Chant (Chair, Dept. of Psychology, 705-748-1011, ext. 7780).

Thank you again for helping us with this research!
# Appendix: C

## Scale Cronbach alphas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Shopping Time</th>
<th>Shopping Habits: Time 1</th>
<th>Shopping Habits: Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PANAS: Positive Affect</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS: Negative Affect</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialism Scale</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of Future Consequences Scale</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Happiness Scale</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Buying Tendencies Scale</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations Scale: Financial Success</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations Scale: Community Feelings</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Relatedness Scale</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations: Wealth</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Life</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective Taking Scale: Objective</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective Taking Scale: Perspective</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D:

Gender differences Study One

The sample was divided by gender to further analyze differences in spending and ethical behaviours. In terms of income allocation, females ($M = 20.84, SD = 14.69$) spent significantly more than males on materialistic purchases ($M = 12.50, SD = 4.63$); $t(19.167) = -3.935, p = .001$ (See table 10 for means by gender). In contrast, males spent significantly more on essentials ($M = 56.87, SD = 11.00$) than females ($M = 43.27, SD = 23.90$); $t(12.074) = 3.048, p = .010$. There were no gender differences on the remaining categories.

Table 10: Means and standard deviations of how much participants should and do spend on major expense categories categorized by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Should Females</th>
<th>Should Males</th>
<th>Do Females</th>
<th>Do Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essentials</td>
<td>36.30</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>40.62</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>23.88</td>
<td>13.96</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Purchases</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>6.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Purchases</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable donations</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of ethical behaviours and opinions, 50% of males stated they would pay more for an ethical garment, while 69.4% of females agreed they would pay more. In regards to whether participants had bought an ethically made garment before, over half the sample (52.3%) was unsure, while 40.8% believed they had and 6.9% stated they had never bought an ethical garment. When gender was considered, 62.5% of males were unsure compared to 51.2% of females, 37.5% of males said they had bought a garment compared to 41.3% of females. No males reported never buying an ethical garment; however 7.4% of females said they had not bought an ethical garment.
Appendix E:
Condition differences for ANOVAs on personality measures

Participants in the various experimental conditions were similar. Participants did not differ significantly on materialism in any of the conditions; participants had an average materialism score of 2.96 ($SD = 0.57$) which suggests participants were neutral in materialism (see Table 11 for overall means). There were no differences on the considerations of future consequences scale and participants had an average of 3.44 ($SD = 0.49$) which suggests participants were slightly above neutral in considering the impact of their behaviours on the future. Similarly, there were no differences in participants’ subjective happiness, or experiential buying tendencies. Participants scored an average of 4.88 ($SD = 1.11$) on the subjective happiness scale suggesting they agree with being happy as the highest score possible is a 7. Similarly, participants scored an average of 4.70 ($SD = 1.17$) on the experiential buying tendencies which suggests they are slightly more likely to purchase experiences rather than material products. Participants did not differ significantly on the aspiration subscales of financial success or community feelings. Participants scored an average of 3.56 ($SD = 0.74$) on the financial subscale suggesting they fall between the scale points of moderately and very financially driven. Participants scored an average of 3.93 ($SD = 0.55$) on the community aspirations scale suggesting they are very interested in being involved with their community. Finally, participants did not differ significantly on their level of nature relatedness, participants scored an average of 3.64 ($SD = 0.62$), suggesting they are between the scale points of unsure how they feel towards nature and agree a little that they care for nature.

In terms of demographics participants did not differ by condition. Participants gender did not differ significantly, $F (2, 71) = 0.69, p = .51$, as well as their age, $F (2, 71) = .24, p = .79$. 

Participants were similarly distributed based on their current year of study, $F(2, 71) = 1.39, p = .26$, as well as social economic status measures. Participants did not differ on how they perceived themselves in society in terms of social economic status, $F(2, 71) = 0.70, p = .93$, or by how they saw their family’s status in society, $F(2, 71) = 2.82, p = .07$. 
Table 11

Means, standard deviations, and One-way ANOVA results categorized by condition, for tested personality measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Perspective Taking</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F(2,71)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PANAS: Positive Affect</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS: Negative Affect</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialism Scale</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of Future Consequences Scale</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Happiness Scale</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Buying Tendencies Scale</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations Scale: Financial Success</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations Scale: Community Feelings</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Relatedness Scale</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F:

Results of Study Two with three conditions

Impact of sweatshop article on mood

Mood was manipulated by the condition participants were exposed. A one-way ANOVA testing negative affect demonstrated a significant difference between groups ($F(2,71) = 25.483, p = .000$). A Tukey post-hoc test demonstrated that participants who read the sweatshop article and took the perspective of the individual ($M = 2.74, SD = .91, p = .000, d = 1.57$) scored significantly higher on negative affect than those who read the neutral article ($M = 1.29, SD = .53$). Similarly, participants who read the sweatshop article and were asked to remain objective scored significantly higher on negative affect than those in the neutral condition ($M = 2.38, SD = .94, p = .000, d = 0.39$). However, those who read the sweatshop article and took the perspective ($M = 2.74, SD = .91$) did not differ from those who read the same article and remained objective ($M = 2.38, SD = .94, p = .287$). These results demonstrate that participants who were exposed to the sweatshop article were higher in negative affect than those who read the neutral clothing article. Furthermore, in the sweatshop article conditions, being objective or taking the perspective of the individual did not have an effect on participants’ negative affect.

In regards to positive affect, a one-way ANOVA demonstrated a significant difference between conditions ($F(2, 71) = 3.120, p = .003$). A Tukey’s post hoc test demonstrated a significant difference between positive affect for participants in the neutral condition ($M = 2.60, SD = .79$) than those in the objective sweatshop condition ($M = 1.90, SD = .67, p = .002, d = 0.96$). Interestingly, there was no significant difference in positive affect between those in the neutral condition and those in the perspective taking sweatshop condition ($M = 2.29, SD = .63, p = .250$).
Finally, there was no significant difference in positive affect between the sweatshop article conditions ($p = .205, d = 0.43$).

**Weekly spending based on News Article Read**

Participants reported their daily spending over a week, allowing for a comparison of total weekly spending, by experimental condition. A one-way ANOVA tested whether participants who read the article about sweatshop conditions spent less over the total week than those who read a neutral article about garment care. There was no significant effect of news article condition on total spending ($F(2, 64) = 1.139, p = .326$). People who read the news article about the sweatshop disaster did not differ in their weekly spending, compared to people who read the neutral article. Moreover, a one-way ANOVA tested whether there was a difference in participants’ reported clothing purchases in the week following the in-lab manipulation. The article participants read in the lab was unrelated to how much money was spent on clothing, $F(2, 64) = .209, p = .813$. Participants did not differ in how much money they spent on clothing based on what type of article they read. Similarly, a one-way ANOVA was run to determine whether there was a difference between experimental condition and amount spent on accessories over the follow up week. There were no significant differences between the three conditions of the amount spent on accessories, $F(2, 12) = .125, p = .884$. This again suggests that the article read did not influence the participants in the following week on their accessories purchasing.

**Influence of news article on choice of garment and amount spent**

Participants were given the opportunity to purchase $45 worth of garments, based on a selection of similar shirts but with varying label information indicating sweatshop-free or not. It was predicted that participants who read the sweatshop article would be more likely to choose one of the sweatshop-free options than those who read a neutral article. A chi-square test of
independence was run in order to determine whether the relationship between experimental condition and garment label was present (See table 12 for frequency). Participants in the sweatshop article condition differed significantly than those in the neutral condition suggesting that participants who were in the sweatshop conditions were more likely to purchase sweatshop-free garments than those in the neutral condition, $\chi^2 (2, N = 74) = 7.74, p = .005$.

The garment labels also featured the descriptor of made in Canada, whether participants chose a garment based on this feature was also of interest. A chi-square testing whether there was a connection between the condition experienced and the purchasing of a garment made in Canada was run (See table 12 for frequency). There was no significant difference between condition and purchasing of a Canadian made garment, $\chi^2 (2, N = 74) = 3.95, p = .139$.

Table 12:

*Frequency and percentage of participants, by condition, who chose to purchase sweatshop-free and Canadian made garments.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective Taking and read sweatshop article</th>
<th>Bought Sweatshop-free</th>
<th>Bought Canadian Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N 9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 42.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectively read sweatshop article</th>
<th>Bought Sweatshop-free</th>
<th>Bought Canadian Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N 6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 28.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral garment care article</th>
<th>Bought Sweatshop-free</th>
<th>Bought Canadian Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N 21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65.6</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, a one-way ANOVA was run in order to determine whether there was a difference between the total amount spent of the $45 and which condition participants were exposed. Results demonstrated that participants in the perspective taking sweatshop article
condition \((M = 32.36, SD = 14.94)\) did not differ significantly from those in the objective sweatshop condition \((M = 36.65, SD = 11.13)\) or the neutral article condition \((M = 32.55, SD = 11.66); F(2,71) = .835, p = .438.\) This result suggests that reading a news article about sweatshop conditions does not have an effect on how much participants spent on their garments in total.

**Sample Spending Characteristics, income dispersion, and spending log dispersion**

Participants reported the perceived amount of money spent in a normal week in 11 categories (see table 13 for detailed statistical information). On average, participants had a normal weekly disposable income of \$131.39 \((SD = 166.57, \text{range} = \$0 - \$1000)\). Participants predicted they were spending \$141.26 \((SD = 121.08, \text{range} = \$0 - \$620)\) on average in all 11 categories. Participants reported having spent the highest amounts, on average, in savings \((M = 36.76, SD = 64.51)\), entertainment \((M = 25.69, SD = 30.01)\) and take-out food \((M = 24.54, SD = 22.75)\). Time 2 included six categories: clothing, accessories, entertainment, footwear, alcohol, and personal care. In these specific categories, participants predicted spending an average of \$70.24 in a normal week \((SD = 60.30)\). Out of these categories, participants spent the most in entertainment \((M = 25.69, SD = 30.01)\), clothing \((M = 15.95, SD = 22.05)\), and personal care \((M = 15.54, SD = 16.89)\).

After keeping track of their actual spending, participants spent on average \$101.34 \((SD = 108.01, \text{range} = \$4.25 - \$572.45)\) over the seven days. The actual amounts spent when participants kept the seven day log were highest in footwear \((M = 54.21, SD = 39.42)\), accessories \((M = 50.81, SD = 117.39)\), and clothing \((M = 37.16, SD = 27.56)\).
Table 13:

*Predicted amount of money spent in a normal week at time 1 per category and actual spent amount at time 2 and proportion of income spent in each category at time 1 and time 2.*

*note only those who had income higher than 0 were included in proportions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Time 1 Mean</th>
<th>Time 1 SD</th>
<th>Time 1 Proportion %</th>
<th>Time 2 Mean</th>
<th>Time 2 SD</th>
<th>Time 2 Proportion %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and Accessories</td>
<td>33.62</td>
<td>23.89</td>
<td>21.64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>37.16</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>31.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessories</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>50.81</td>
<td>117.39</td>
<td>50.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Care</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>16.89</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>30.30</td>
<td>31.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td>30.01</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>30.32</td>
<td>37.03</td>
<td>32.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>17.38</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>34.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Purchases</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>26.59</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take-out</td>
<td>24.54</td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>36.76</td>
<td>64.51</td>
<td>26.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G:

Irregular income participants: Study Two

Some participants listed having a steady weekly income, while other participants stated they had no regular income. These groups were separated in order to understand any differences between groups in spending. Participants who stated having a regular income were included in the document results in Study Two. The following results reflect participants who stated having no regular income.

An independent samples t-test was run in order to determine whether participants in the irregular income group differed from those in the income group based on how much they spend in a normal week, in the 11 categories. Those in the irregular income group \((M = 97.61, SD = 128.29)\) spent significantly less than those in the income group \((M = 160.94, SD = 113.54)\); \(t(72) = -2.133, p = .036, d = 0.52\).

In the spending log categories participants in the irregular income group spent an average of $79.75 \((SD = 92.30)\) during the week long follow up. Participants in the irregular income group spent the most in footwear \((M = 56.49, SD = 0)\), clothing \((M = 40.25, SD = 23.46)\), and entertainment \((M = 33.73, SD = 40.39)\).

External comments addressed

**Psychology Code of Ethics**: In order to begin the study all materials and study designs are looked at by an ethics committee. These individuals go over all issues that may arise from the study and ask for changes if they feel the study is unfit in certain areas. These studies both passed through the ethics board and all issues were addressed before participation.

**Psychological theories**: Touch a little on cognitive dissonance. One large theory that may help explain our behaviours in terms of purchasing ethical garments is the Theory of planned behaviours. In this case we take several things into account: our attitudes towards the behaviour, our behavioural intentions (what motivational factors influence the decision), subjective norms (do people approve or disapprove), social norms (customary codes of behaviour), perceived
power (perceived presence of factors that might impact our behaviours), perceived behavioural control (the perception of the ease or difficulty of performing the behaviour).

**Inconsistency with terms/ no ethical garments:** Currently there are no exact terms that are decided upon by all researchers. Going through the research I found fair trade, no sweat, traceability labels etc. I attempted to outline a ethical garment definition: “*Ethical fashion for the purpose of this thesis will assumed to use fair wages, safe working environments, no child labour and no sexual harassment*” for the purpose of this study. However, when speaking about other research I did use the terms they referred to in their studies in an attempt to represent that research properly. Through study one I wanted to test what was a good term for participants in the study and it appeared that Sweatshop-Free was the term that most participants identified with so this was the term that I used throughout my study and discussion.

In terms of the definition not being possible (woman are not paid fairly in most places and harassment still exists), this is a valid point and there probably aren’t any places where you can buy a garment that is 100% ethically made with this definition in mind. The approach I was looking at for these studies was more of a harm reduction approach. Looking at the inequities of gender are beyond the scope of this thesis in particular. I think that this concept needs further attention, but I was really trying to get a base level of knowledge surrounding students experiences with ethical garments. So for this thesis we wanted to try to look at garments that were more ethically produced than the current standard. In an ideal world we would all grow our own food and make our own clothing in order to reduce all this abuse and use of toxins, etc.

**Feminist theory:** I feel as though these concepts are beyond the scope of this thesis. This document’s primary focus was to understand participants basic knowledge of ethical garment (where to buy, how much they are willing to pay), as well as if we provide participants with knowledge of sweatshop conditions and disasters will this have any impact on how they consume (will they consume less, will they purchase garments that are labelled as ethically made).

I did not focus on the workers in the factories, the information in the introduction was to give a background to the reader of what a sweatshop would look like. However, during the study this specific information of being mostly woman and having sexual harassment present in the work place was not communicated to the participants as this was not the focus of the thesis.

At this stage, research in psychology is very new and my intentions with these studies were to understand basic information, less so than to dive into gender differences- especially since Trent is so female dominated, there is not enough data to look at gender differences.

**Gender and fluidity:** I definitely acknowledge that these gender categories are not all encompassing. I will be the first to say I am not an expert in feminism and gender issues. There was not a focus on these issues, as I am not strong enough in these fields in order to know how to measure and what to test for. So I simply went ahead with the categories (female, male, other) which is consistent with the discipline of psychology.
In relation to the garment choices of female or male clothing, my supervisor and I sat down and a few chats about these issues and how to best represent/be most inclusive in this issue. The study needed to include both female and male types of garments, and given that the samples at Trent are mostly all female and heterosexual I felt that providing participants with female or male garments was acceptable. The wording in the study was that participants were asked what clothing category they prefer to wear- male or female. The answer to this question reflected which garments they were shown. So I still tried to be mindful that simply because you identify with one gender does not mean that you like to wear the clothing that is stereotypical/social norm. However, this is something that future research could look into.

- Unisex garments are an option, but because most of the sample is female I thought it would be acceptable to give these two options.

**Cultural information:** In these studies we did not ask about ethnicity. After hearing your comments on ethnicity I sat back and thought, right we didn’t collect data on ethnicity… This information would have been helpful at analyzing deeper meanings of this data. So if I had the option to do this again I would include ethnicity.

In my defense, sometime collecting ethnicity is a little invasive and we try not to make participants feel uncomfortable.

**Men Vs. Women:** There are simply not enough males in this study to make any conclusions. In the body of the document I did not include any analyses for this reason. I do have an appendix on the gender differences, and perhaps I could be clearer in that section saying that no conclusions can be drawn from this research, or I could remove this part of the document. But never was I trying to put males on a higher moral ground than females. The differences in genders should be researched in the future, but given this sample there were no analyses that could be done. The appendix was there simply to say, there could be gender differences and future research should look at them in the future.

**Student sample:** Firstly, this is a convenience sample, and I understand that it is a limited sample. However, I think studying students has some merit. For example, this population is interested in fashion, they shop frequently, as well as they might be more knowledgeable of environmental and ethical issues because we are learning about some of these issues in class. As well this research is very preliminary, there is not much research in psychology looking into ethically made garments and consumers opinions and shopping habits. So these studies were aimed to be exploratory to inform future studies, to see if we could find some information that could be useful in the future to analyze further. I am more than willing to include a sentence or two about the sample and its limitations in the study information, I touched on it in the limitations, however I can work on making this come through better.
Ethical thinking/ ethics/ ethical decision making: In terms of this thesis the aim was to look at how to purchase things that are more ethically made- if they include a sweatshop free label will this facilitate purchasing ethically?

I think that ethics is very culturally and socially defined. And so for the purpose of this thesis I settled on that definition that “Ethical fashion for the purpose of this thesis will assumed to use fair wages, safe working environments, no child labour and no sexual harassment”.

Utilitarian approach: ethical actions are those that provide the greatest balance of good over evil.

Rights approach: People are not objects to be manipulated; it is a violation of human dignity to use people in ways they do not freely choose.

Common-good approach: This approach to ethics assumes a society comprising individuals whose own good is inextricably linked to the good of the community.

- Ethical decision making frame work:
  1. Collect information and identify the problem
  2. Specify feasible alternatives
  3. Use your ethical resources to identify morally significant factors in each alternative
  4. Propose and test possible resolutions
  5. Make your choice

- What I looked at: Intention behavior gap
  To measure the intention behavior gap is much beyond the scope of this thesis- outside of the in-lab task. Ethical garments are so murky at this point in our existence. It is very difficult to purchase ethically, but as research has shown when you ask individuals how they feel or how they would purchase they say they would not purchase garments if they were sweatshop made. But we do. And we do so because it is difficult to find these ethical alternatives. So for the purpose of this study, I wanted to see if in the controlled setting of the lab would they purchase garments that are labelled as ethical. In the real world garments don’t feature this, so it would be close to impossible for me to determine during the spending log if participants spent ethically or not. This study was exploratory and in the future I would look more at the intention behavior gap, but at this stage with my level of knowledge of the market I’m not able to study this gap. There were many different routes to choose and I could focus on all the different ethical literature however I cannot test it all. Given the design of my study I felt that I summarized the literature that was related to what I wanted to look at in my study.

Personality: Psychologists access and view personality and individual differences in different ways than other disciplines, perhaps. We look at traits and for this study materialism, positive and negative emotions are seen as important traits to spending habits. I know the most popular
way to look at personality is through the big five (neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness), however these traits were not what was of interest in this study. In psychology, how unhappy, how satisfied with your life, how joyful you are these are all parts of your personality that we like to measure. Similarly, we used measures such as the aspiration index and materialism because these items in past research correlate with purchasing and we can see correlations that speak to peoples happiness and well-being.

- Aspirations index, materialism scale, nature relatedness, experiential buying tendencies, consideration of future consequences, positive and negative affect schedule, subjective happiness, satisfaction with life.

**Experiential:** Experiential can be damaging as well, for example using an airplane to go on vacation, the vacation is experiential but the airplane is damaging for the environment. I think the idea behind this is maybe a little more harm reduction. Not encouraging people to go on vacation, but finding that people who are more experiential are less materialist so they spend less, these people may be a good target population in order to increase knowledge of processing standards. Perhaps these individuals will be more likely to purchase Sweatshop-Free because they are less materialistic, so these individuals care less about brand names and purchasing the newest lulu lemon leggings. There are for sure damaging experiences, but this personality trait may give us some insight into how people spend their money and this should be studied further.

**Social desirability:** In this type of research it is hard to avoid social desirability, therefore it is possible that in the shopping task in study two that there was some social desirability. However, when being asked why they bought certain garments, only some participants said they bought the garment because it was sweatshop free, when asked why they bought the garment. Similarly at the end of the study, only 30% of participants remembered seeing the sweatshop-free label.

**If I could do this again:**

- Sample. Ethnicity, age, stage in life etc.
- Longer time frame for the study- 2 weeks before and two weeks after manipulation- **have to be careful of attrition rate!**
- More diverse sample- age, gender, stage in life, etc.
- Try to be more effective in perspective taking- maybe pilot the news stories see if people identify better with certain stories, or give different instructions to help facilitate the perspective taking
- Look more into attitudes towards ethical garments- is it important to you?