

Consumers' shift towards sustainable behaviors : use of Minimalism concepts

Abstract

Minimalism is a strategy that has the potential to strengthen customers' transition towards more environmentally responsible behaviours, and it also has the added benefit of enhancing emotional well-being. Desire to adopt a minimalist lifestyle. This enables us to understand the natural values and socio-psychological components that influence the choice to choose a minimalist lifestyle better. Accomplished via the use of a partial least squares path modelling approach. The findings reveal that all of the linkages that were evaluated had beneficial effects. Surprisingly, we also discover a positive influence for egoistic values, which suggests that there is a need for further study exploring the relationship between minimalism and sustainability in India that is cross-cultural.

Keyword; consumers' shift; Measurement; Inner Model; TPB Dimensions;

1. Introduction

A component that is essential to any activities that are designed to address the global climate crisis. Transition is an essential component that you must take into consideration. Only behind the use of energy, transportation, and food, which are the three most significant pressure categories. The utilisation of basic resources and the production of emissions of greenhouse gases are the two factors that are used to determine this ranking. The process is significantly impacted by both conventional media and social media (SM), which both play a vital role. There is a significant contribution made by traditional media. Traditional media is helping to assist the process of consumers being more conscious of the consequences that their purchase decisions have on the natural and social surroundings. They are getting more aware of the ramifications that their purchase choices have.

According to Pew (2021), social media (SM) channels have evolved from "social networks" that made it possible for users to contact with their friends and family into essential channels that made it possible for users to obtain information in an instant. SM has been instrumental in fostering change and facilitating conversations within the fashion industry. These individuals advocate for more responsible fashion consumption behaviours, such as renting, exchanging, and purchasing second-hand items (Haines et al., 2023; Vladimirova, 2021). As a further reaction to the excessive consumption of fashion, a new movement known as "deinfluencing" has evolved in more recent times (Mayer, 2023).

With the purpose of synthesising and critically evaluating the most recent research, this systematic literature review (SLR) that is organised and based on themes tackles this gap. The following is the research question that serves as the foundation for this SLR: Who can encourage consumers on social media to participate with more sustainable fashion consumption patterns, and how can this influence be effectively exerted? Previously been proved by study; nevertheless, it is necessary to investigate whether or not this holds true for the "online" context. Especially among members of Generations Y and Z, there is a pressing need to get a deeper comprehension of the ways in which social media may be used to encourage sustainable lives, this includes fashion purchasing patterns. In addition to

providing an overview of a future research agenda within the framework of fashion and textiles, this SLR provides a critical evaluation and synthesis of fascinating research that has been conducted in the sector.

2. Background

Henninger et al. (2021) and Luo et al. (2022) have both found that the research on sustainable fashion consumption has been lacking in enthusiasm. It has been stated by Vladimirova et al. (2021) that the definitions of "sustainable fashion consumption" practices are still in the process of changing in accordance with the expansion of conceptual understanding. These definitions are relatively recent. This is required in order to prevent consumer "scapegoatism" (Akenji, 2014). It is vital to understand how to modify present fashion consumption habits that are not sustainable in a way that is nuanced and inclusive.

The topic of what reasons motivate consumers to adopt lifestyles that are more environmentally friendly in light of the growing popularity of social media is one of the many elements that still need more examination (Ki et al., 2022; Sun et al. 2021). The numbers in parentheses indicate the number of active users in millions. The rising proportion of social media commerce throughout the world is proof that social media is driving mainstream consumption (Phaneuf, 2021).

Moving away from conventional advertising forms (such as paper magazines; Dalton, 2017), an omnichannel strategy places a significant focus on social media marketing activities vs traditional advertising formats. The fashion industry, from luxury to high street businesses, has resorted to social media influencers in order to communicate with a demographic that would otherwise be inaccessible to them: Generation Z (Monroe, 2021). During the COVID-19 epidemic, social media "influencer marketing" gained significant popularity (Wiley, 2021). This is due to the fact that some new fashion firms have completely transitioned to e-commerce and social media in order to cut their expenses.

According to Monroe (2021), the narcissistic part of the culture of social media influencers has been critiqued for leading followers to indulge in compulsive buying behaviour. According to Zafar et al.'s research from 2020, parasocial relationships with digital celebrities, which are founded on the sense of closeness between influencers and their followers, play a significant role in propelling consumers to make impulsive purchases. These individuals are individuals that generate content on subjects that they actually care about, as opposed to only providing superficial paid brand endorsements. Further connections may be made between this and the relatively recent phenomena of "deinfluencers" (Mayer, 2023) that has not been thoroughly researched.

Fashion Revolution, a worldwide non-governmental organisation with its headquarters in the United Kingdom, was the group that used the hashtag #WhoMadeMyClothes in the campaign that became the most well-known. Customers were strongly encouraged to pose this inquiry to the companies from whom they make purchases that they interact with on social media. In the beginning, ethical concerns about working conditions were the driving force behind the discourse on sustainable fashion.

3. Materials and Methods

3.1. Data

The questionnaire was distributed to social media channels, and every individual who responded to the survey was respectfully requested to forward the questionnaire to their own personal network. If one were to determine the sample size using the inverse square root approach, the minimal sample size that was advised by the WarpPLS 7.0 programme was 410, whereas the estimated sample size was 390.

3.2. Measurement

A contains information that provides specifics on the measuring items and the latent constructs that relate to them. Each and every item was evaluated using a Likert scale with seven points of response. The planned behaviour change. We decided to remove the second item of the scale for PBC, which said, "For me to adopt minimalism in consumption within the next month would be... 1 = impossible/7 = possible." This decision was made because to the low loading of the item. We employed the value inventory that was provided by, which is a trustworthy scale that worked well in connection to other constructs, in order to assess the values involved in biospheric, altruistic, and egistic behaviour.

3.3. Method

TPB and the factors that determine attitudes are shown in Figure 1, which provides an explanation for this phenomenon. The PLS-PM is a kind of research that is exploratory in character and provides ground for the aim of illuminating both theoretical and practical answers. One of the reasons why the method was so well received. This was one of the components that contributed to the method's widespread adoption. The PLS-SEM model is broken down into its two components, which are addressed in Section 4. The measuring model, which is also known as the outside model, is comprised of these respective components. By analysing the relationships between the measurement items and the latent constructs that correspond to them, this model provides an evaluation of those linkages. This model is responsible for estimating the real connections that exist between the latent variables that are included inside the model. With the support of the WarpPLS 7.0 programme, we were able to carry out our research.

4. Results

The median age represents the middle of the age range. The participants are aged between 18 and 25 years old, which accounts for 82.05% of the total. Table 1 contains the comprehensive description of the sample in its entirety.

Table 1. Data analysis.

		Study Participants		Total N = 741 (100%)
		Gender		
		Male	Female	
		177 (23.89%)	564 (76.11%)	
Age	18–25	146 (19.70%)	462 (62.35%)	608 (82.05%)
	26–35	49 (6.61%)	11 (1.48%)	60 (8.09%)
	36–45	12 (1.62%)	36 (4.86%)	48 (6.48%)
	46–55	5 (0.67%)	16 (2.16%)	21 (2.83%)
	56–65	3 (0.40%)	1 (0.14%)	4 (0.54%)
Income	Under 500 RON	45 (6.07%)	146 (19.71%)	191 (25.78%)
	500–999 RON	26 (3.50%)	93 (12.56%)	119 (16.06%)
	1000–1499 RON	16 (2.16%)	58 (7.83%)	74 (9.99%)
	1500–1999 RON	13 (1.75%)	53 (7.15%)	66 (8.90%)
	2000–2499 RON	19 (2.56%)	59 (7.96%)	78 (10.52%)
	2500–2999 RON	10 (1.35%)	38 (5.13%)	48 (6.48%)
	Above 3000 RON	48 (6.48%)	117 (15.79%)	165 (22.27%)
Education	High school	134 (18.08%)	420 (56.69%)	554 (74.77%)
	Bachelor's degree	34 (4.59%)	99 (13.36%)	133 (17.95%)
	Master's degree	6 (0.80%)	27 (3.65%)	33 (4.45%)
	Doctoral degree	3 (0.40%)	18 (2.43%)	21 (2.83%)

4.1. Outer Measurement Model

Table 2, which can be viewed at this location. A significant departure from the norm. This indicates that the egoistic values are significantly different from the norm. Even though it is below the threshold that would be regarded acceptable, this figure is still somewhat lower than the requirements. The dependability of measurement has been attained as a consequence of the cooperation that has taken place between all of these different components.

Table 2. Dependability of measurement

Variable	Composite Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Intention to adopt a minimalist lifestyle (INT)	0.963	0.943	0.897
Attitudes (ATT)	0.956	0.944	0.783
Subjective norms (SN)	0.948	0.926	0.819
Perceived Behavioral control (PBC)	0.883	0.735	0.790
Biospheric values (BIO)	0.944	0.911	0.849
Egoistic values (EGO)	0.828	0.686	0.618
Altruistic values (ALT)	0.872	0.804	0.630

As part of the reflective evaluation of the latent constructs in Table 3. These loadings and cross-loadings are shown in the table. Cross-loadings and combined loadings are shown in Table 3,

Table 3. Cont.

	INT	ATT	SN	PBC	BIO	EGO	AVO
INT1	0.940	-0.009	-0.030	-0.004	0.028	0.017	-0.029
INT2	0.947	-0.053	0.066	-0.024	-0.021	0.010	-0.019
INT3	0.954	0.061	-0.036	0.027	-0.007	-0.026	0.048
ATT1	0.019	0.895	-0.130	-0.012	0.019	-0.034	-0.013
ATT2	-0.041	0.908	-0.110	0.017	0.048	-0.054	0.032
ATT3	0.051	0.913	-0.043	-0.007	0.028	-0.010	-0.025
ATT4	0.022	0.884	0.047	-0.049	-0.030	0.042	0.033
ATT5	-0.050	0.839	0.144	0.018	-0.036	0.060	-0.064
ATT6	-0.005	0.868	0.107	0.033	-0.034	0.002	0.035
SN1	-0.030	0.005	0.892	-0.039	0.042	0.067	-0.042
SN2	0.001	0.074	0.912	0.014	-0.034	-0.023	0.034
SN3	-0.043	-0.046	0.930	0.022	0.021	-0.009	-0.020
SN4	0.075	-0.033	0.885	0.002	-0.029	-0.035	0.028
PBC1	0.026	0.019	0.075	0.889	0.024	-0.080	0.043
PBC3	-0.026	-0.019	-0.075	0.889	-0.024	0.080	-0.043
BVO1	-0.000	0.004	0.042	0.011	0.906	-0.005	0.050
BVO2	0.005	0.005	-0.023	-0.007	0.935	-0.030	0.005

Table 3

	INT	ATT	SN	PBC	BIO	EGO	AVO
BVO3	-0.005	-0.009	-0.018	-0.004	0.922	0.036	-0.054
EVO1	-0.101	0.066	-0.144	0.084	0.276	0.701	0.144
EVO2	0.038	-0.008	-0.044	-0.050	-0.049	0.876	0.013
EVO3	0.049	-0.051	0.181	-0.019	-0.196	0.771	-0.145
AVO1	0.046	-0.111	0.040	-0.022	-0.092	-0.159	0.827
AVO2	0.018	-0.050	0.136	0.012	-0.151	-0.026	0.807
AVO3	-0.014	0.165	-0.082	0.035	-0.050	0.117	0.763
AVO4	-0.054	0.008	-0.103	-0.024	0.304	0.081	0.777

The exception of PBC2, which was eliminated since it did not have a strong relationship with the latent construct that corresponded to it. All of the readings are higher than the theoretical threshold that is necessary, which is 0.7. the values of the block diagonals that correspond to each latent construct are seen in Table 4.

Table 4. AVE square root latent construct relationships.

	INT	ATT	SN	PBC	BIO	EGO	AVO
INT	0.947	0.745	0.573	0.567	0.312	0.097	0.383
ATT	0.745	0.885	0.486	0.618	0.418	0.139	0.481
SN	0.573	0.486	0.905	0.443	0.197	0.234	0.220
PBC	0.567	0.618	0.443	0.889	0.376	0.176	0.407
BIO	0.312	0.418	0.197	0.376	0.921	0.393	0.644
EGO	0.097	0.139	0.234	0.176	0.393	0.786	0.334
AVO	0.383	0.481	0.220	0.407	0.644	0.334	0.794

Suggestions made by the theoretical framework [76]. Consequently, convergent validity and discriminant validity are both validated.

4.2. Inner Model

The estimated coefficients of the study model are shown in Table 5, along with the effect sizes that are intricately connected to those coefficients. Together with the impact sizes, these coefficients are presented here for your consumption. According to Tenenhaus, the goodness-of-fit index that he developed has a value of 0.617, which is a figure that is considered to be very high. The model did not exhibit any signs of statistical suppression or Simpson's dilemma, and it was discovered that there was no bivariate causality direction. Additionally, there was no evidence of statistical suppression.

4.2.1. The TPB Dimensions

The hypothesis (H1) is shown to be correct as a result of this discovery. Attitudes had the biggest effect size (0.401), which implies that they are the predictor that has the most significant impact on intention. Although there were three TPB predictors, attitudes also had the largest effect size. It has been shown that subjective standards have an effect size of 0.153, which is the opposite of what was previously suggested. With an impact value of just 0.061, the PBC is the least reliable predictor of the factors. This is out of the four variables that are being considered. The summary of the material can be found in Table 6.

Table 5. P-values in brackets for path coefficients.

Estimated Coefficients	Direct Effects		Indirect Effects via Mediator	Total Effects
	Model	Attitudes	Intention	Intention
Attitudes	-	0.536 *** (<i>p</i> < 0.001)	-	0.536 *** (<i>p</i> < 0.001)
Subjective norms	-	0.265 *** (<i>p</i> < 0.001)	-	0.265 *** (<i>p</i> < 0.001)
Perceived Behavioral Control	-	0.106 ** (<i>p</i> = 0.002)	-	0.106 ** (<i>p</i> = 0.002)
Biospheric values	0.212 *** (<i>p</i> < 0.001)	0.018 (<i>p</i> = 0.311)	0.114 *** (<i>p</i> < 0.001)	0.132 *** (<i>p</i> < 0.001)
Egoistic values	0.065 * (<i>p</i> = 0.038)	0.069 * (<i>p</i> = 0.029)	0.035 * (<i>p</i> = 0.026)	0.104 ** (<i>p</i> = 0.002)
Altruistic values	0.393 *** (<i>p</i> < 0.001)	0.056 (<i>p</i> = 0.064)	0.211 *** (<i>p</i> < 0.001)	0.267 *** (<i>p</i> < 0.001)
Age	-	0.008 (<i>p</i> = 0.418)	-	0.008 (<i>p</i> = 0.418)
R ² / Adjusted R ²	29.9% / 29.6%	65.4% / 65.1%	-	-
Tenehaus GoF	0.617 (large)			-

Table 6. Direct, indirect, and total impact sizes

Estimated Coefficients	Direct Effects		Indirect Effects via Mediator	Total Effects
	Model	Attitudes	Intention	Intention
Attitudes	-	0.401	-	0.401
Subjective norms	-	0.153	-	0.153
Perceived Behavioral Control	-	0.061	-	0.061
Biospheric values	0.092	0.006	0.037	0.043
Egoistic values	0.009	0.008	0.004	0.012
Altruistic values	0.198	0.023	0.088	0.111
Age	-	0.001	-	0.001

4.2.2 Controls

There is no statistically significant link between age and the variables under investigation ($\beta = 0.008$, $p = 0.418$).when it came to the remaining control variables that were evaluated as categories. This was done in order to discover whether or not the model behaved differently. The same information is presented in Table 8 for education. Both tables include the same information. These two tables provide the same information in its entirety. Table 7. Gender differences in path coefficients

Estimated Coefficients	Direct Effects		
	Model	Attitudes	Intention
Attitudes	-	-0.133 *	(<i>p</i> = 0.043)
Subjective norms	-	0.045	(<i>p</i> = 0.294)
Perceived Behavioral control	-	0.075	(<i>p</i> = 190)
Biospheric values	-0.143 *	-0.084	(<i>p</i> = 0.160)
	(<i>p</i> = 0.040)		
Egoistic values	0.049	0.006	(<i>p</i> = 0.473)
	(<i>p</i> = 0.284)		
Altruistic values	-0.155 *	-0.132	(<i>p</i> = 0.058)
	(<i>p</i> = 0.029)		
Age	-	-0.016	(<i>p</i> = 0.427)

4.2.3. The Mediation Effects

In addition, the findings that are shown in Table 5 suggest that if it comes to predicting attitudes towards minimalism, each of the three categories of values is statistically significant. The impact size of altruistic values is 0.198, while the effect size of biospheric values is 0.092. The H4a and H4c categories are allowed, however the H4b category is not accepted since this is the situation. The attitude towards minimalism, which has positive indirect effects. The coefficient of determination (β) for this relationship is 0.114, and the p-value is less than .001.

Limitations and future research directions

There are certain limits to our study that point to potential avenues for further investigation. First, despite the fact that we evaluated the reactions of consumers to minimalist brands by using attitudinal measures (in all of the studies), an incentive-compatible choice measure (in Study 1), and actual purchase experience (in Study 4), we used a cross-sectional methodology. A significant inquiry that has to be addressed is whether or not customers who like minimalist products continually participate in sustainable consumption throughout the course of its lifetime. The opposite is also true: minimalist brands may encourage customers to consume in a more sustainable manner, not just in their purchases of that particular brand but also in other consumption circumstances. This is due to the fact that brands reflect and influence the attitudes and beliefs of consumers towards societal problems. It's possible that this will make the collective effort to achieve sustainability easier. It is possible that longitudinal studies that track the reactions of customers to minimalist businesses might be a successful pathway for more study in the future. In the second place, we discovered that the quality–quantity preference of customers acted as a mediator for our impact, and we eliminated a number of other potential reasons. There is a possibility that the association between socioeconomic level and minimalist brand ratings is multidetermined. One example is that customers who have a lower socioeconomic standing have a tendency to have lower levels of trust in their interpersonal relationships. It is possible that this will cause them to have less faith in companies who promote simplicity since it looks to be detrimental to the earnings of the business. Furthermore, we want to point out that the design of Study 3 has a

restriction. The goal of this study was to directly demonstrate an empirical relationship between socioeconomic status and quality–quantity choice. To do so, we assessed quality–quantity preference, which served as the mediator, prior to brand assessments, which served as the dependent variable. The degree of economic development of the civilization that serves as the focal point of a research need to be taken into consideration, given that some people regard minimalism to be a "first world issue."

Conclusion

When it comes to everyday living, popular culture, and commercial communication, minimalism is becoming an increasingly popular trend. In addition, we discovered a boundary condition, sometimes known as a moderator, of our effect, which has significance for practical applications. In spite of this, we strongly encourage academics to do more study on the generalizability and boundaries of the impact that we documented. There is a possibility that our observed impact will change depending on the cultural orientation and economic state of the country. Moreover, additional study should be conducted in the future to investigate other methods of attracting customers of low socioeconomic status to minimalist firms. This might potentially encourage inclusion within the minimalist movement as well as the larger goal of sustainability. Last but not least, the concentration of our study was on a particular facet of minimalism, namely decreased consumption and possessions. Consumer groups that are distinct in terms of their socioeconomic level, on the other hand, react differently to businesses that use minimalism into their marketing message. Considering that minimalist brands have the potential to promote sustainability, it is important to have a knowledge of the reactions that consumers have to minimalist brands in order to identify chances to encourage sustainable consumption.

Reference

- Hot or Cool. (2022). *Unfit, unfair, unfashionable*. Hot or Cool Institute.
- United Nations. (2023, May 18). The 17 sustainable development goals. UN,
- EEA. (2019). Textiles in Europe's circular econ`
- Pew. (2021). Social media fact sheet. Retrieved August 28, 2021, from
- Hilbert, M. (2022). Digital technology and social change. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*, 22(2), 189–194.
- Haines, S., Fares, O. H., Mohan, M., & Lee, S. H. (2023). Social media fashion influencer eWOM communications. *Journal of Fashion Marketing & Management*, 1361–2026.
- Vladimirova, K. (2021). Consumption corridors in fashion. *Sustainability: Science, Practice & Policy*, 17(1), 103–117.
- Henninger, C. E., Brydges, T., Iran, S., & Vladimirova, K. (2021). Collaborative fashion consumption – A synthesis and future research agenda. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 319, 128648.

Luo, S., Henninger, C. E., Le Normand, A., &Blazquez, M. (2022). Gen Y consumer perceptions of web-based sustainability communications – The case of luxury fashion. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 1–17.

Vladimirova, K., Henninger, C. E., Joyner-Martinez, C., Iran, S., Diddi, S., Jestratišević, I., Durrani, M., Iyer, K., McCormick, H., Niinimäki, K., Prriyadarshini, T., Sauerwein, M., Singh, R., Simek, P., &Wallaschkowski, S. (2021). Fashion consumption during COVID-19: Comparative analysis of changing practices across nine countries. *Journal of Cleaner and Responsible Consumption*, 5, 100056.

McNeill, L., & Moore, R. (2015). Sustainable fashion consumption and the fast fashion conundrum. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 39(3), 212–222.

Akenji, L. (2014). Consumer scapegoatism and limits to green consumerism. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, [63](#), 13–23.

Ki, C. W., Park, S., & Kim, Y. K. (2022). Investigating the mechanism through which consumers are “inspired by” social media influencers and “inspired to” adopt influencers’ exemplars as social defaults. *Journal of Business Research*, 144, 264–277.

Sun, Y., Wang, R., Cao, D., & Lee, R. (2021). Who are social media influencers for luxury fashion consumption of the Chinese Gen Z? Categorisation and empirical examination. *Journal of Fashion Marketing & Management*, 26(4), 603–621.

Siregar, Y., Kent, A., Peirson-Smith, A., & Guan, C. (2023). Disrupting the fashion retail journey: Social media and Gen Z’s fashion consumption. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 51(7), 862–875.

Wang, P., & Huang, Q. (2023). Digital influencers, social power and consumer engagement in social commerce. *Internet Research*, 33(1), 178–207.

Dixon, S. (2023). Most popular social networks worldwide as of January 2023. Statista.

Phaneuf, A. (2021, May 18). Social commerce 2021. *The Business Insider*.

Dalton, M. (2017). Fashion ads, a last bastion of print, are going digital. *WSJ*. Retrieved August 21, 2021, from

Monroe, R. (2021). Ultra-fast fashion is eating the world. *Atlantic*.

Wiley, D. (2021, June 26). Influencer marketing’s surprising rise of the “everyperson”. *Forbes*.

Monroe, R. (2021). Ultra-fast fashion is eating the world. *Atlantic*.

Yan, Y., & Bissell, K. (2014). The globalization of beauty: How is ideal beauty influenced by globally published fashion and beauty magazines? *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, [43](#)(3), 194–214.

Zafar, A. U., Qiu, J., &Shahzad, M. (2020). Do digital celebrities’ relationships and social climate matter? *Internet Research*, [30](#)(6), 1731–1762.

Bakhtiari, K. (2020). Influencer fatigue sets stage for a new generation of creators. *Forbes*. Retrieved July 9, 2021, from

Mayer, A. (2023). Can social media's new deinfluencing trend really encourage us to buy less stuff? *Vogue*.

Beecham, A. (2019). Is ethical influencing the answer to both our environmental and social media concerns. *Glamour*. Retrieved June 26, 2021, from

Siegel, L. (2018, October 7). Influencers can combat fast fashion's toxic trend. *Guardian*.