



SELF-DETERMINATION, CLEAN CONSCIENCE, OR SOCIAL PRESSURE? UNDERLYING MOTIVATIONS FOR ORGANIC FOOD CONSUMPTION AMONG YOUNG MILLENNIALS

Journal:	<i>Journal of Consumer Behaviour</i>
Manuscript ID	JCB-20-085.R2
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Special Issue
Keywords:	organic food consumption, young millennials, attitude-behaviour gap, self-determination theory, cluster analysis

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 **Full title: SELF-DETERMINATION, CLEAN CONSCIENCE, OR SOCIAL**
5 **PRESSURE? UNDERLYING MOTIVATIONS FOR ORGANIC FOOD**
6 **CONSUMPTION AMONG YOUNG MILLENNIALS**
7

8 **Short title: UNDERLYING MOTIVATIONS FOR ORGANIC CONSUMPTION**
9 **AMONG YOUNG MILLENNIALS**
10

11
12
13 **Abstract**
14

15 The present world has led in individuals to become ever more interested in the
16 consumption of organic food. Accordingly, companies are incorporating these worries
17 in their managerial decisions by paying special attention to market segmentation. In this
18 context, a relevant target audience is that conformed by young Millennials, a group
19 defined by its growing purchase power, its intense influence on societies, but also by its
20 inconsistency in terms of pro-environmental behaviors. In order to understand the
21 mechanisms that rule the human behavior, motivations emerge as fair predictors of
22 sustainable products consumption. Therefore, the present study aims at analysing the
23 motivations that stimulate young Millennials to purchase organic food. Hence, it was
24 conducted a survey study with a total sample of 378 college students. Afterwards, once
25 executed a cluster analysis, four differentiated groups were highlighted: *amotivated*
26 (23.02%), who have no intention to perform any sort of organic purchase; *socially-*
27 *influenced* (24.34%), motivated to purchase organic due to social acceptance; *self-*
28 *determined* (25.92%), mainly autonomous in their organic food consumption; and
29 *conscience-affected* (26.72%), who behave organic for self-esteem. Although data
30 reveal the existence of an overall organic concern among the sample, only *self-*
31 *determined* individuals may be prone to maintain their behaviours among time since the
32 *intrinsic motivation they show is higher than that of the other groups*. These findings are
33 of undeniable interest. The study of the motivational system of young Millennials will
34 allow companies in the organic food sector to adjust their offer to the relevant target and
35 achieve an enduring organic consumption.
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Keywords**
42

43 Organic food consumption, young millennials, attitude-behaviour gap, self-
44 determination theory, cluster analysis
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Full title: SELF-DETERMINATION, CLEAN CONSCIENCE, OR SOCIAL**
4 **PRESSURE? UNDERLYING MOTIVATIONS FOR ORGANIC FOOD**
5 **CONSUMPTION AMONG A GROUP OF YOUNG MILLENNIALS**
6

7
8 **1. INTRODUCTION**

9 Without any kind of doubt, nowadays consumers, increasingly concerned about the
10 environment, assume ever more that there is an overriding need for evolution in our
11 methods of production and styles of consumption if we intend to continue living within
12 the ecological limits of our planet (Barth et al., 2012 ; Lai and Cheng, 2016; Rana and
13 Paul, 2017). Such concerns have begun to be displayed in their attitudes and, at times, in
14 their behaviours (Akenji, 2014), with individuals particularly interested in the
15 consumption of the so-called ‘sustainable products’.
16

17
18 Within this broader category of sustainable consumption, the organic food market has
19 developed significantly in recent years, amounting to almost 97 billion euros in 2018
20 (FiBL and IFOAM, 2020). By region, North America market has the greatest figures
21 (43.7 billion euros), followed by the European market (40.7 billion euros), and the
22 Asian market (10.1 billion euros). In the same line, worldwide markets point currently
23 positive growth rates in all cases, which are in double digits sometimes.
24

25
26 In this sense, most of the companies in the sector, seeking to remain competitive in the
27 market and to achieve the fulfilment of consumer needs just as much utilitarian as self-
28 expressive (Du et al., 2017; Sharma and Joshi, 2019), have begun to incorporate
29 systematically these emerging worries in their management and marketing decisions by
30 paying special attention to market segmentation and market orientation (Dolnicar et al.,
31 2018; do Paço et al., 2008; González et al., 2015; Lu et al., 2013). To this effect, organic
32 food companies gradually require specific research in order to implement effective
33 marketing communication strategies at the time of focusing on different consumer
34 groups.
35

36
37 In this context, a relevant target audience is that conformed by young adults. Commonly
38 referred as Millennials, youths who reached adulthood in the early twenty-first century
39 represent a group of interest for both business and academic publics due to their
40 growing purchase power and their eventual influence on the upcoming societies and the
41 environment (Heo and Muralidharan, 2017; Kotler et al., 2017). Regarding the central
42 topic of this research, related studies have revealed so far ambiguous findings of
43 Millennials’ perceptions of the environment and their tendencies to behave (Coskun and
44 Özbük, 2019). Whereas some authors have found Millennials to be sensitive to
45 environmental problems (Allen and Spialek, 2018; Muralidharan et al., 2016), others
46 have shown that most of these young consumers are not consistent translating these
47 attitudes into actual behaviour (Debevec et al., 2013; Naderi and Van Steenburg, 2018).
48
49

50
51 In an attempt to comprehend those underlying mechanisms that pace sustainable
52 products consumption, authors note that the psychographic traits of individuals might
53 fairly forecast environmental buying behavior (Jang et al., 2011 Kanchanapibul et al.,
54 2014; Muralidharan and Xue, 2016). Following this same line, motivations are also
55 emphasized as significant predictors of ecological behavior (Bechtel et al., 2006;
56 Grønhøj and Thøgersen, 2017; Moisander, 2007). Concretely, the study of motivational
57 structures contributes to better understand why consumers do not express a high
58 stability in their daily actions and thus why accurate estimations of next purchases are
59 complex (Thøgersen, 2004).
60

Therefore, the present study is aimed at sorting and profiling a group of young Millennials according to the underlying motivations that may drive them to acquire organic food products. This will contribute to shed light on the attitude-behavior discrepancy mentioned lines above.

In this line, the remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Along the following two sections, the essential literature pertaining to factors influencing organic food consumption is reviewed and objectives are developed. After this contextualization, the methodological aspects related to the investigation are presented in the fourth section. Next section is the results of the study. Finally, the last section gathers main conclusions.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Organic food consumption and the ‘attitude-behaviour gap’

Generally speaking, organic food refers to natural food items free from genetically modified organisms which have been grown without the use of artificially developed chemicals, including herbicides, pesticides, fertilizers, antibiotics, or hormones (Honkanen et al., 2006).

Even though the practice of organic agriculture and organic food represents an activity of great interest which reflects high growth rates in current days (FiBL and IFOAM, 2020), when debating on organic food consumption, it is worth of mention that it was in the 1990s when this market experienced a huge progression mainly due to the rising consumer’s concern about the ecological impact of their purchases (Rana and Paul, 2017) and the introduction of the first regulation on organic production within the context of the EU (EUR-Lex, 1991). With Germany and the United Kingdom leading the way initially (Willer et al., 2014), this movement has extended gradually among all developed countries (Willer and Lernoud, 2016) and also become of major relevance in many emerging economies (Ahmad and Juhdi, 2010; González et al., 2015; Hasimu et al., 2016; Kautish and Sharma, 2019; Saleem et al., 2018; Sobhanifard, 2018; Taufique and Vaithianathan, 2018).

Nevertheless, although marketers can assure that needs of environmentally conscious consumers are better addressed if organic products are introduced into the market (Lu et al., 2013), the fact is that organic features are effectively taken into account by only a part of consumers (Janssen, 2018; Vermeir and Verbeke, 2006) and that the organic food market share and consumer expenditure share of organic food and beverages are relatively low when compared to non-organic expenditures (FiBL and IFOAM, 2019).

In the context of this dialectic, aimed at profiling consumers, academics have further tried to explore and understand prospective personal drivers that may lead individuals towards the acquisition and consumption of organic food (Naderi and Van Steenburg, 2018), but despite the substantial evidence gained, the core explanatory factors underlying the purchases of organic items are still ambiguous (Testa et al., 2019).

At this point, the postulation of the ‘attitude-behaviour gap’ (Carrington et al., 2010, 2014; Chatzidakis et al., 2006; Chekima et al., 2017; Wiederhold and Martinez, 2018) has proved to be certainly valuable and clarifying. In accordance with it, behavioral patterns of consumers are not univocally consistent with attitudes, that is, there is inconsistency between what people claim via their attitudes and the way in which they actually behave (Fuller et al., 2016). Therefore, concerning organic food purchases, evidence has shown that consumers’ may declare positive attitudes towards organic

1
2
3 food (Du et al., 2017; Kautish and Sharma, 2019; Naderi and Van Steenburg, 2018), but
4 these are not necessarily translated into actual purchases (Debevec et al., 2013; Haws et
5 al., 2013; Testa et al., 2019). For such an eventuality, two main interpretations emerge:
6 first, consumers will not purchase a product only for its organic attributes sacrificing
7 other products' characteristics (Dzene and Yorulmaz, 2011; Ginsberg and Bloom, 2004;
8 Grunert, 2011; Vermillion and Peart, 2010), and second, consumers face barriers at the
9 time of purchasing organic food itself, for instance, inconvenience, lower performance,
10 lack of awareness, higher prices, skepticism about organic certification, or non-
11 availability of products, amongst others (Haws et al., 2013; Kumar et al., 2019; Naderi
12 and Van Steenburg, 2018; Nguyen et al., 2019; Thøgersen, 2010).

13
14
15 Confronting this matter, academics demand additional studies about the determinants of
16 organic food consumption based on actual purchasing data (Dowd and Burke, 2013;
17 Vassallo et al., 2016; Yadav and Pathak, 2016; Yazdanpanah and Forouzani, 2015) or
18 more profound personal drivers such as values, subjective norms, lifestyles or
19 motivations (Adnan et al., 2017; Grønhøj and Thøgersen, 2017; Jang et al., 2011;
20 Moisander, 2007; Naderi and Van Steenburg, 2018; Peattie, 2010) rather than exploring
21 self-reported behavioral intention data that consumers tend to undermine (Testa et al.,
22 2019).

23
24
25 In this tone, the intention of this study is to analyze the motivational system of young
26 individuals in respect of its capability to adequately predict or determine future organic
27 food consumption.

28 29 **2.2 The Self-Determination Theory and young Millennials**

30
31 The analysis of motivation as a suitable predictor of the intentions to engage in diverse
32 routines of human behavior is common among the literature (Ryan and Deci, 2017). In
33 this same line, within the theory of motivation, the Self-Determination Theory –SDT-
34 (Deci and Ryan, 2000, 2012; Ryan and Deci, 2017) is well-documented. Authors define
35 six motivational types that differ according to the extent to which they are
36 autonomously supported by an individual: autonomous motivation, integrated
37 motivation, identified motivation, introjected motivation, external motivation, and
38 amotivation. Excluding from the list amotivation, which denotes the no intention to act,
39 the remaining five states could be categorized as intrinsic motivations and extrinsic
40 motivations.

41
42
43 The SDT has also been vastly utilized in studies that address motivations as drivers of
44 pro-environmental behaviors (Baxter and Pelletier, 2020; de Groot and Steg, 2010;
45 Osbaldiston and Sheldon, 2003; Tagkaloglou and Kasser, 2018; Thøgersen, 2006).
46 According to SDT, individuals seem to be more prone to engage in pro-environmental
47 behaviors in a steady manner when they are said to be intrinsically motivated, that is,
48 self-determined, and thus act autonomously or see themselves as initiators of their own
49 behavior aimed at attaining objectively valid patterns. By contrast, people extrinsically
50 motivated may also engage in the same behavior, but feel controlled, lacking in choice,
51 or just behave green because of a sense of obligation related to approval from oneself
52 (to fulfil pre-existing personal attitudes or beliefs) or from others (to satisfy current
53 social schemes).

54
55
56 In support of this, investigations framed under this theoretical framework have showed
57 that the frequency of engaging in a range of pro-environmental behaviors, such as
58 recycling, energy-saving, conserving resources, purchasing environmentally-friendly
59 products, employee green behaviors, or green information technology behaviors
60

1
2
3 increases when grounded by intrinsic motivations (Graves et al., 2013; Joachain and
4 Klopfert, 2014; Koestner et al., 2001; Koo and Chung, 2014; Pelletier et al., 1998;
5 Seguin et al., 1998; Villacorta et al., 2003; Webb et al., 2013). Also, it has been found
6 that people with stronger self-determined motivational types were more likely to
7 perform pro-environmental behaviors that were perceived to be difficult whereas more
8 extrinsically motivated individuals carried out easier pro-environmental behaviors in
9 terms of time, energy and personal resources involved (Green-Demers et al., 1997;
10 Pelletier et al., 2011; Sheldon et al., 2016; Van der Werff et al., 2013; Venhoeven et al.,
11 2013). Thereupon, it can be assumed thus that intrinsic motivations will provide a more
12 stable behavioral basis for organic food consumption than extrinsic motivations (de
13 Groot and Steg, 2010; Grønhøj and Thøgersen, 2017).

14
15
16 Apart from why people buy organic products, it is also considered remarkable to know
17 who buys such products. By sorting bulk consumers, companies will better target the
18 specific needs of the segmented groups with the properly devised marketing strategy
19 while also meeting at once the company's objectives (Dahlstrom and Crosno, 2018).

20
21
22 Among the entire market, particular emphasis should be given to Millennials. This
23 generation refers to the population born between the mid-1980s and the late 1990s that
24 will soon become the largest living generation surpassing the Baby Boom generation
25 (Statista, 2019). Within it, two main cohorts are distinguished (Fry, 2015): older
26 Millennials (25–33 years), who are beginning their careers in the labor market already,
27 and younger Millennials (18–24 years), still at university, but representing a larger
28 group than the former. Young Millennials, although economically dependent now, are
29 expected to have more disposable income than that of any previous generation (Frank
30 and Chong, 2002; Heo and Muralidharan, 2017; Kanchanapibul et al., 2014;
31 Muralidharan and Xue, 2016) and be a crucial segment in the growth of green
32 consumption practices which will significantly impact on the environment of future
33 society (Fischer et al., 2017; Hume, 2010; Wray-Lake et al., 2010).

34
35
36 For all of these reasons, this very group of young Millennials conforms a high priority
37 segment for marketers (Kotler et al., 2017). However, targeting them in reference to
38 their pro-environmental characteristics can be tremendously challenging since they
39 seem not to be willing enough to adopt green behaviors (Debevec et al., 2013; Naderi
40 and Van Steenburg, 2018) even if their attitudes are so (Allen and Spialek, 2018;
41 Muralidharan et al., 2016). The persistence of the mentioned attitude-behaviour gap
42 reveals the discrepancy between young Millennials' pro-environmental opinions and
43 actions (Coskun and Özbük, 2019; Grønhøj and Thøgersen, 2009; Heo and
44 Muralidharan, 2017), and leads to considerate other psychographic factors as predictors
45 of pro-environmental behaviors such as motivations.

46
47
48 Up to now, little is known about the underlying motivations that drive young
49 Millennials to purchase organic food. In an attempt to connect to the SDT, it should be
50 noted that, even though Renaud-Dubé et al. (2010) found that intrinsically motivated
51 young consumers also tend to perform pro-environmental behaviors more frequently
52 than others, the environmental concern and the commitment to engage in pro-
53 environmental activities is anyway lower and less intrinsically motivated in younger as
54 compared to older generations (Renaud-Dubé et al., 2010; Wray-Lake et al., 2010).

55
56
57 In addition, some authors (Grønhøj and Thøgersen, 2009; Otto and Kaiser, 2014,
58 Watkins et al., 2019) point that learning rather than maturation is responsible for the
59 higher environmental commitment seen in older generations, which means that the more
60

1
2
3 exposed people are to information that deals with environmental topics, the more
4 pronounced their ecological engagement is, independently from the natural process of
5 change that is common to all individuals because of ageing. All these considerations
6 may suggest that, initially, the reasons why a young Millennial acquires organic food
7 would be often externally regulated or extrinsically motivated but would become
8 internalized, assimilated to the self, or intrinsically motivated in the long term mainly
9 due to the learning process instead of the maturation.
10

11
12 Bearing in mind all previously mentioned, the present study is therefore intended to
13 segment young Millennials on the basis of the diverse underlying motivations that
14 stimulate them to purchase organic food. In this sense, the contribution of the study will
15 be twofold: first, it will enable a better comprehension of the attitude-behavior gap, and
16 more particularly, the motivational system that prompts young Millennials to organic
17 food consumption, issue in which the related literature is scarce, and second, it will
18 provide companies in the organic food sector with valuable information to better adjust
19 their offer to a relevant target as depicted above and achieve an enduring organic
20 consumption.
21

22 23 **3. METHODOLOGY**

24 25 **3.1. Sampling**

26
27 In order to address the purpose previously pointed, it was conducted a survey study with
28 a total sample of 378 college students at the Faculty of Business and Economics of the
29 University of Leon (Spain). The sample comprised 204 females (54.0%) and 174 males
30 (46.0%), aged 18 to 28 years old ($\mu = 20.59$; $\sigma = 2.38$). For more detailed information
31 about methodological aspects, see Table 1.
32

33
34 Table 1. Technical data.

35 36 **3.2 Measure**

37
38 All respondents answered voluntarily to a questionnaire composed of two main
39 sections. The first section gathered information about the most basic demographic
40 variables, age and gender. In turn, the second section was integrated by 25 items
41 concerning diverse motivations for organic food consumption. For each item,
42 participants were asked to report their level of agreement on a five-point Likert scale
43 from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Concretely, these 25 items were
44 organized in three scales representing three different concepts of motivations (Table 2):
45

46
47 a) Self-determination motivations (8 items): Intrinsic motivations based on objective
48 drivers that lead to durable organic consumption. The organic consumption is
49 accomplished under impartial and neutral premises, independently of pre-existing
50 personal attitudes or beliefs, and due to the benefit that entails its fulfilment per se.

51
52 b) Personal image motivations (8 items): Extrinsic motivations based on subjective
53 drivers that lead to non-durable organic consumption. The organic consumption is
54 achieved to satisfy principles and values attached to the personal image, and regarded as
55 act of individual defense and reinforcement.

56
57 c) Social context motivations (9 items): Extrinsic motivations based on established
58 social standards that also lead to non-durable organic consumption. The organic
59 consumption is executed to meet social schemes, to gain society acceptance or just for
60 social pressure/imposition.

Table 2. Questionnaire statements.

Scales, originally developed for this research, were evaluated by a group of experts who was selected in order to assess the content validity (Hernández-Sampieri et al., 2010; Muñiz and Fonseca-Pedrero, 2019; Skjong and Wentworth, 2000). The group was compounded by three academics in marketing research and a professional in psychology. They presented suggestions about the potential deletion/modification of existing items, and/or the inclusion of prospective ones. Particularly, the criterion considered to add an item to the final version of the instrument required, the at least agreement of 80% of experts (Hyrkäs et al., 2003).

Once data were collected and processed, Cronbach's alpha (α) coefficients for each one of three scales were calculated with the intent to check the reliability levels. After that, it was conducted an Exploratory Factor Analysis in order to assess constructs validity and a k-means Cluster Analysis to segment respondents by using the software SPSS version 24.0.0.1.

In the next section, main results are presented under two sections: first of all, the study of reliability and validity of constructs, and after that, the analysis of the different clusters.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Scales reliability and constructs validity

In order to assess the internal consistency of the self-determination, personal image, and social context motivations scales, it was verified the Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α), which is considered tolerable when stands above .70 (Nunnally, 1978; Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). The reliability of the scale is ensured since α coefficient was higher than .70 in the three cases (Table 3).

Moreover, it was also examined the validity of the three constructs (self-determination, personal image, and social context motivations) by executing an Exploratory Factor Analysis. Construct validity attempts to guarantee the existence of an underlying dimension that supports the scale scores. The analysis reported a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy certainly satisfactory (0.925) according to Kaiser (1970, 1974) and a Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) statistically significant at 99% level of confidence ($p < 0.01$) (Table 3).

Table 3. Scales reliability, KMO measure, and Bartlett's Test.

After the related principal component analysis, three main dimensions emerged explaining 53.32% of the total variance. Furthermore, factorial loadings were of .50 or higher for all items in its corresponding dimension, providing strong evidence of convergent validity to the scales (Barclay et al., 1995), with the exception of items 13, 16, 19, 20, 24, and 25, which were excluded for subsequent analyses (Table 4).

Table 4. Factorial loadings (Varimax rotation).

4.2 Clustering

In second term, a k-means Cluster Analysis was conducted from the three factors retained in the previous analysis in order to segment young Millennials who were surveyed. After several preliminary trials, this statistical procedure distinguished four

groups of individuals which come together through similarities in various aspects associated to the three sorts of motivational dimensions.

Once interpreted and compared characteristics and patterns of each cluster, the different segments were labelled with the names *amotivated*, *socially-influenced*, *self-determined*, and *conscience-affected* (Table 5).

Table 5. Clusters' size.

Table 6. Clusters scoring.

Amotivated, 23.02% of the sample (Table 5), represent the absence of any kind of motivation for organic consumption. Youngsters of this group have no intention to perform any organic purchase at all, at least in the short or medium-term (Table 6). Usually, amotivation is accompanied by feelings of incompetence, lack of control, and no-sense of purpose, reward, or change of course with respect to pro-environmental behaviours.

By contrast, *socially-influenced*, 24.34% of the sample (Table 5), show the strongest motivation for organic consumption of the entire group of participants, although it is true that its nature is extrinsic (Table 6). *Socially-influenced* young adults are motivated to purchase organic due to social acceptance or social imposition, that is, by the need to belong to a group or social background. This group show a timid understanding of what an organic product objectively is, and hence, an unsteady motivation to act autonomously.

Self-determined represent 25.92% of the sample (Table 5) and the most intrinsically motivated group of the young adults interviewed (Table 6). These people know quite accurately the process for organic production, and use this information to fuel their willingness to act pro-environmentally, which is autonomous, resolute and unbiased. Anyhow, this cluster of *self-determined* individuals also show extrinsic motivations in terms of personal image. This indicates that foreign aspects to organic production such as subjective considerations related to the individual's conscience may have a certain effect on their predisposition to perform a sustainable consumption (e.g. the auto-definition an individual has about him/herself). Besides that, the social context does not seem to exert excessive influence over this group.

Conscience-affected, 26.72% of the sample (Table 5), are extrinsically motivated to carry out organic consumption (Table 6). *Conscience-affected* youngsters behave organic for self-esteem and clean conscience reasons. They are not quite familiar with what organic production refers to (actually, their knowledge on it is poorer than that of *amotivated* people), and therefore, they are neither autonomous nor self-determined if acting pro-environmentally, but they consider that doing so is a sign of good person.

5. DISCUSSION

The present study has enhanced the comprehension of what stimulates young Millennials to organic food consumption. In this sense, **concerning the theoretical contribution of this research**, it has been proposed and examined a conceptual approach to understand how self-determined, personal image, and social context motivations can explain factors influencing youths' actual consumption of organic food instead of being limited to intention to purchase (Testa et al., 2019). In this sense, it should not be ignored that there are few studies that empirically test the motivational structure of young Millennials towards this topic.

1
2
3 In the light of the findings, there is a concern that the organic intrinsic motivation of the
4 young generation appears to be erratic. It should be kept in mind that, apart from a
5 group of young individuals without any kind of motivation (amounting to 23%),
6 approximately 50% are extrinsically motivated to act organic, which implies a priori a
7 poor hope of lasting in the long term (de Groot and Steg, 2010; Grønhøj and Thøgersen,
8 2017).

9
10 Moreover, it has been found that the motivational structure is not simple. For instance,
11 *self-determined* youngsters, almost 26% of the sample, appeared to be both intrinsically
12 and extrinsically motivated. In this case, the evolution of organic purchases along time
13 is even more imprecise. And above all, there is a discrepancy between attitudes and
14 behaviour (Chekima et al., 2017; Naderi and Van Steenburg, 2018), whereby
15 behavioural patterns are not univocally consistent with attitudes, which is expected to
16 affect *conscience-affected* and *socially-influenced* Millennials in greater extent than
17 *self-determined* ones.
18

19
20 **Also, results largely contribute to inspire practical considerations by** revealing valuable
21 information for producers and marketers of organic food who are promoting the
22 consumption of their offer and are seeking to know the underlying behaviour of their
23 young consumers. Accordingly, the study is of importance to the government due to its
24 attempt to promote organic consumption creating confidence among its citizens
25 holistically besides introducing the corresponding organic certificate in regard to the
26 compliance of organic farming in terms of production, preparation, storage, and
27 labelling.
28

29
30 This investigation is aligned with other recent and remarkable studies on pro-
31 environmental behavior and Millennials segmentation such as Coskun and Özbük
32 (2019). In this connection, *amotivated* Millennials could be deemed as equivalent to
33 *non-greens*, *conscience-affected* and *socially-influenced* to *reluctant greens*, and *self-*
34 *determined* to *true greens*. However, this association must be contemplated with
35 extreme care since the mentioned authors do not focus their research on a concrete
36 product category, use an entirely different group of variables to carry out the
37 segmentation, and performed the data gathering in the context of an emerging economy.
38

39
40 Nonetheless, whichever the case, from the marketing practitioners' perspective, this
41 situation confirms the importance of formal organic education by increasing young
42 Millennials' exposure to credible information about the organic food production and
43 consumption through both formal (Internet, television,...) and informal sources
44 including social media and groups of reference.
45

46
47 Furthermore, organic food consumption could be also stimulated by launching
48 differentiation strategies and promoting conventional foods substitution in the shopping
49 basket. Some of them could be including safety certifications, stating clearly
50 environment and farm solidarity motives, or highlighting the good taste and quality of
51 organic food products. Alternatively, a larger number of prospective organic consumers
52 could be attracted by the curiosity carrying out promotional campaigns played on prices,
53 or conducting information and tasting panels.
54

55
56 Even so, attention should be drawn to the fact that these short-term measures will
57 uniquely reduce the group of *amotivated* youths generating a priori extrinsically
58 motivated individuals (*conscience-affected* and/or *socially-influenced*).
59
60

1
2
3 If the final goal of companies is to facilitate the internalisation of extrinsic motivations
4 and nurture an enduring organic consumption held in the long-term that results in young
5 consumers' loyalty (*self-determined* consumers), it will be necessary to monitor all
6 these strategies along time. Only the learning process maintained in the long term is
7 cause for intrinsic engagement in organic food consumptions, not so much the process
8 of ageing of individuals (Grønhøj and Thøgersen, 2009; Otto and Kaiser, 2014, Watkins
9 et al., 2019)
10

11
12 Ultimately, as Grønhøj and Thøgersen (2017) suggest, understanding how young
13 Millennials' intrinsic motivation is established and supported is key to fostering a young
14 generation that will engage in pro-environmental behaviours and favour the transition
15 towards a more sustainable society.
16

17
18 Finally, despite the contribution of this study, the scope of the findings is limited by
19 some aspects. First of all, it is necessary to point that the research context is only
20 focused on a single product category (organic food), which restricts the generalizability
21 of the results to other products. In the same line, this study has retrieved information
22 from one particular geographic region (North-west Spain) and one concrete population
23 segment (college economics students). Moreover, another factor that should not be
24 overlooked is that the measuring instrument has not been tested and validated before,
25 even though it has been developed from theoretical foundations and associated
26 reliability and validity analyses have been included. These limitations, however,
27 represent new opportunities for an enhanced future research, since this approach if
28 replicated (e.g. in other sectors of activity) and expanded (e.g. to national/international
29 contexts, to other young adults segments) and its errors if controlled would endow
30 future studies with greater validity, generalizability and comparability of results.
31
32

33 REFERENCES

- 34 Adnan, A., Ahmad, A., & Khan, M. N. (2017). Examining the role of consumer
35 lifestyles on ecological behavior among young Indian consumers. *Young Consumers*,
36 18(4), 348-377: 10.1108/YC-05-2017-00699
37
38 Ahmad, S. N. B., & Juhdi, N. (2010). Organic food: A study on demographic
39 characteristics and factors influencing purchase intentions among consumers in Klang
40 valley, Malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(2), p. 105-118.
41
42 Akenji, L. (2014). Consumer scapegoatism and limits to green consumerism. *Journal of*
43 *Cleaner Production*, 63, 13-23.
44
45 Allen, M. W., & Spialek, M.L. (2018). Young millennials, environmental orientation,
46 food company sustainability, and green word-of-mouth recommendations. *Journal of*
47 *Food Products Marketing*, 24(7), 803-829.
48
49 Barclay, D., Higgins, C., & Thompson, R. (1995). The partial least squares (PLS)
50 approach to causal modeling: Personal computer adoption and use as an illustration.
51 *Technology Studies*, 2, 285–309.
52
53 Bartlett, M. S. (1954). A note on the multiplying factors for various chi square
54 approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 16, 296–298.
55
56 Barth, M., Fischer, D., Michelsen, G., Nemnich, C., & Rode, H. (2012). Tackling the
57 knowledge–action gap in sustainable consumption: Insights from a participatory school
58 programme. *Journal of Education for Sustainable Development*, 6(2), 301-312.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Baxter, D., & Pelletier, L. G. (2020). The roles of motivation and goals on sustainable
4 behaviour in a resource dilemma: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of*
5 *Environmental Psychology*, *69*, 101437-101450: 10.1016/j.jenvp.2020.101437
6
7 Bechtel, R. B., Corral-Verdugo, V., Asai, M., & González, A. (2006). A cross-cultural
8 study of environmental belief structures. USA, Japan, Mexico and Peru. *International*
9 *Journal of Psychology*, *41*, 145-151.
10
11 Carrington, M. J., Neville, B. A., & Whitwell, G. J. (2010). Why ethical consumers
12 don't walk their talk: Towards a framework for understanding the gap between the
13 ethical purchase intentions and actual buying behaviour of ethically minded consumers.
14 *Journal of Business Ethics*, *97*(1), 139–158.
15
16 Carrington, M. J., Neville, B. A., & Whitwell, G. J. (2014). Lost in translation:
17 Exploring the ethical consumer intention–behavior gap. *Journal of Business Research*,
18 *67*(1), 2759–2767.
19
20 Chatzidakis, A., Smith, A., & Hibbert, S. (2006). Ethically concerned, yet unethically
21 behaved: Towards an updated understanding of consumer's (un)ethical decision
22 making. *Advances in Consumer Research*, *33*, 693–698.
23
24 Chekima, B., Oswald, A. I., Wafa, S. A. W. S. K., & Chekima, K. (2017). Narrowing
25 the gap: Factors driving organic food consumption. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *166*,
26 1438-1447.
27
28 Chen, Y. H., Wen, X. W., & Luo, M. Z. (2016). Corporate social responsibility
29 spillover and competition effects on the food industry. *Australian Economic Papers*,
30 *55*(1), 1–13.
31
32 Dahlstrom, R., & Crosno, J. L. (2018). *Sustainable marketing* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL:
33 Business Press.
34
35 Debevec, K., Schewe, C., Madden, T., & Diamond, W. (2013). Are today's millennials
36 splintering into a new generational cohort? Maybe! *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, *12*,
37 20–31.
38
39 Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human
40 needs and the self-determination of behaviour. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*, 227-268:
41 10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
42
43 Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). *Motivation, personality, and development within*
44 *embedded social contexts: An overview of self-determination theory*. In R. M. Ryan
45 (Ed.). Oxford handbook of human motivation (85–107). Oxford, UK: Oxford University
46 Press.
47
48 De Groot, J. I., & Steg, L. (2010). Relationships between value orientations,
49 self-determined motivational types and pro-environmental behavioural intentions.
50 *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *30*(4), 368-378.
51
52 Dolnicar, S., Grün, B., & Leisch, F. (2018). *Market segmentation analysis:*
53 *Understanding it, doing it, and making it useful*. Wien, Austria: Springer.
54
55 Do Paço, A. M. F., Raposo, M. B., & Filho, W. L. (2009). Identifying the green
56 consumer: A segmentation study. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement & Analysis for*
57 *Marketing*, *17*(1), 17-25.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Dowd, K., & Burke, K. J. (2013). The influence of ethical values and food choice
4 motivations on intentions to purchase sustainably sourced foods. *Appetite*, 69, 137–144.

5
6 Du, S., Bartels, J., Reinders, M., & Sen, S. (2017). Organic consumption behavior: A
7 social identification perspective. *Food Quality and Preference*, 62, 190–198:
8 10.1016/j.foodqual.2017.07.009
9

10 Dzene, S., & Yorulmaz, O. (2011). Consumer behaviour towards sustainable food
11 consumption in Europe. *Proceedings of the 6th Baltic Conference on Food Science and*
12 *Technology -Innovations for Food Science and Production, Jelgava, Latvia, 5th-6th*
13 *May 2011*. Retrieved from <http://llufb.llu.lv/conference/foodbalt/2011/index.html>
14 (accessed 3 June 2020).
15

16 EUR-Lex (1991). Access to European Union Law: Council Regulation (EEC) No
17 2092/91 of 24 June 1991 on organic production of agricultural products and indications
18 referring thereto on agricultural products and foodstuffs. Retrieved from [https://eur-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A31991R2092)
19 [lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A31991R2092](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A31991R2092) (accessed 3 June
20 2020).
21
22

23 FiBL & IFOAM (2019). The World of Organic Agriculture. Statistics and Emerging
24 Trends 2019. Retrieved from
25 <https://shop.fibl.org/CHde/mwdownloads/download/link/id/1202/?ref=1> (accessed 3
26 June 2020).
27

28 FiBL & IFOAM (2020). The World of Organic Agriculture. Statistics and Emerging
29 Trends 2020. Retrieved from
30 <https://shop.fibl.org/chde/mwdownloads/download/link/id/1294/> (accessed 3 June
31 2020).
32

33 Fischer, D., Böhme, T., & Geiger, S.M. (2017). Measuring young consumers'
34 sustainable consumption behaviour: Development and validation of the YCSCB scale.
35 *Young Consumers*, 18(3), 312–326.
36

37 Frank, R. F., & Chong, D. D. (2002). Generation Y: Purchasing power and implications
38 for marketing. *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal*, 6(2), 89–102.
39

40 Fry, R. (2015). Millennials Surpass Gen Xers as the Largest Generation in U.S. Labor
41 Force. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from [http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-](http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/05/11/millennials-surpass-gen-xers-as-thelargest-generation-in-u-s-labor-force/)
42 [tank/2015/05/11/millennials-surpass-gen-xers-as-thelargest-generation-in-u-s-labor-](http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/05/11/millennials-surpass-gen-xers-as-thelargest-generation-in-u-s-labor-force/)
43 [force/](http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/05/11/millennials-surpass-gen-xers-as-thelargest-generation-in-u-s-labor-force/) (accessed 3 June 2020).
44
45

46 Fuller, C. M., Simmering, M. J., Atinc, G., Atinc, Y., & Babin, B. J. (2016). Common
47 methods variance detection in business research. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(8),
48 3192–3198.
49

50 Ginsberg, J., & Bloom, P. N. (2004). Choosing the right green marketing strategy. *MIT*
51 *Sloan Management Review*, 46(1), 79–84.
52

53 González, E. M., Felix, R., Carrete, L., Centeno, E., & Castaño, R. (2015). Green
54 Shades: A Segmentation Approach Based on Ecological Consumer Behavior in an
55 Emerging Economy. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 23(3), 287–302.
56

57 Graves, L. M., Sarkis, J., & Zhu, Q. (2013). How transformational leadership and
58 employee motivation combine to predict employee proenvironmental behaviors in
59 China. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 35, 81–91: 10.1016/j.jenvp.2013.05.002
60

- 1
2
3 Green-Demers, I., Pelletier, L. G., & Ménard, S. (1997). The impact of behavioural
4 difficulty on the saliency of the association between self-determined motivation and
5 environmental behaviours. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 29(3), 157-166.
6
7 Grønhøj, A., & Thøgersen, J. (2009). Like father, like son? Intergenerational
8 transmission of values, attitudes, and behaviours in the environmental domain. *Journal*
9 *of Environmental Psychology*, 29(4), 414-421.
10
11 Grønhøj, A., & Thøgersen, J. (2017). Why young people do things for the environment:
12 The role of parenting for adolescents' motivation to engage in pro-environmental
13 behaviour. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 54, 11-19:
14 10.1016/j.jenvp.2017.09.005
15
16 Grunert, G. K. (2011). Sustainability in the food sector: A consumer behaviour
17 perspective. *International Journal on Food System Dynamics*, 2(3), 207-218.
18
19 Hasimu, H., Marchesini, S., & Canavari, M. (2016). A concept mapping study on
20 organic food consumers in Shanghai, China. *Appetite*, 108(1), 191-202:
21 10.1016/j.appet.2016.09.019
22
23 Haws, K. L., Winterich, K. P., & Naylor R. W. (2013). Seeing the world through
24 GREEN-tinted glasses: Green consumption values and responses to environmentally
25 friendly products. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 24(3), 336-354:
26 10.1016/j.jcps.2013.11.002
27
28 Heo, J., & Muralidharan, S. (2017). What triggers young millennials to purchase eco-
29 friendly products? The interrelationships among knowledge, perceived consumer
30 effectiveness, and environmental concern. *Journal of Marketing Communications*,
31 25(4), 421-437.
32
33 Hernández-Sampieri, R., & Mendoza-Torres, C. P. (2018). *Metodología de la*
34 *investigación: Las rutas cuantitativa, cualitativa y mixta*. Mexico: McGraw Hill.
35
36 Honkanen, P., Verplanken, B., & Olsen, S.O. (2006). Ethical values and motives
37 driving organic food choice. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 5(5), 420-430.
38
39 Hume, M. (2010). Compassion without action: examining the young consumers
40 consumption and attitude to sustainable consumption. *Journal of World Business*, 45(4),
41 385-394.
42
43 Hyrkas, K., Appelqvist-Schmidlechner, K., & Oksa, L. (2003). Validating an instrument
44 for clinical supervision using an expert panel. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*,
45 40(6), 619-625.
46
47 Jang, Y. J., Kim, W. G., & Bonn, M. A. (2011). Generation Y consumers' selection
48 attributes and behavioral intentions concerning green restaurants. *International Journal*
49 *of Hospitality Management*, 30(4), 803-811.
50
51 Janssen, M. (2018). Determinants of organic food purchases: Evidence from household
52 panel data. *Food Quality and Preference*, 68(6), 19-28: 10.1016/j.foodqual.2018.02.002
53
54 Joachain, H., & Klopfert, F. (2014). Smarter than metering? Coupling smart meters and
55 complementary currencies to reinforce the motivation of households for energy savings.
56 *Ecological Economics*, 105, 89-96: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2014.05.017
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kaiser, H. (1970). A second generation little jiffy. *Psychometrika*, 35, 401-415:
4 10.1007/BF02291817
5
- 6 Kaiser, H. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 31–36:
7 10.1007/BF02291575
8
- 9 Kanchanapibul, M., Lacka, E., Wang, X., & Chan, H.K. (2014). An empirical
10 investigation of green purchase behaviour among the young generation. *Journal of*
11 *Cleaner Production*, 66, 528-536
12
- 13 Kautish, P., & Sharma, R. (2019). Value orientation, green attitude and green behavioral
14 intentions: an empirical investigation among young consumers. *Young Consumers*,
15 20(4), 338-358: 10.1108/YC-11-2018-0881
16
- 17 Koestner, R., Houliort, N., Paquet, S., & Knight, C. (2001). On the risks of recycling
18 because of guilt: An examination of the consequences of introjection. *Journal of*
19 *Applied Social Psychology*, 31, 2545-2560.
20
- 21 Koo, C., & Chung, N. (2014). Examining the eco-technological knowledge of smart
22 green it adoption behavior: A self-determination perspective. *Technological*
23 *Forecasting and Social Change*, 88, 140–155: 10.1016/j.techfore.2014.06.025
24
- 25 Lai, C. K. M., & Cheng, E. W. L. (2016). Green purchase behavior of undergraduate
26 students in Hong Kong. *The Social Science Journal*, 53(1), 67-76.
27
- 28 Lee, K., Conklin, M., Cranage, D. A., & Lee, S. (2014). The role of perceived corporate
29 social responsibility on providing healthful foods and nutrition information with health-
30 consciousness as a moderator. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 37,
31 29-37.
32
- 33 Lotz, S., Christandl, F., & Fetchenhauer, D. (2013). What is fair is good: Evidence of
34 consumers' taste for fairness. *Food Quality and Preference*, 30(2), 139-144.
35
- 36 Lu, L., Bock, D., & Joseph, M. (2013). Green marketing: what the Millennials buy.
37 *Journal of Business Strategy*, 34(6), 3-10: 10.1108/JBS-05-2013-0036
38
- 39 Moisander, J. (2007). Motivational complexity of green consumerism. *International*
40 *Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31, 404-409.
41
- 42 Muñiz, J., & Fonseca-Pedrero, E. (2019). Ten steps for test development. *Psicothema*,
43 31(1), 7-16: 10.7334/psicothema2018.291
44
- 45 Muralidharan, S., Rejón-Guardia, F., & Xue, F. (2016). Understanding the green buying
46 behavior of younger millennials from India and the United States: a structural equation
47 modeling approach. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 28, 54–72.
48
- 49 Muralidharan, S., & Xue, F. (2016). Personal networks as a precursor to a green future:
50 A study of “green” consumer socialization among young millennials from India and
51 China. *Young Consumers*, 17(3), 226-242.
52
- 53 Naderi, I., & Van Steenburg, E. (2018). Me first, then the environment: Young
54 millennials as green consumers. *Young Consumers*, 19(3), 280-295.
55
- 56 Nguyen, M. T. T., Nguyen, L. H., & Nguyen, H. V. (2019). Materialistic values and
57 green apparel purchase intention among young Vietnamese consumers. *Young*
58 *Consumers*, 20(4), 246-263: 10.1108/YC-10-2018-0859
59
60

- 1
2
3 Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
4
5 Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York,
6 NY: McGraw-Hill.
7
8 Osbaldiston, R., & Sheldon, K. M. (2003). Promoting internalized motivation for
9 environmentally responsible behavior. A prospective study of environmental goals.
10 *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 23*, 349-357.
11
12 Otto, S., & Kaiser, F. G. (2014). Ecological behavior across the lifespan: Why
13 environmentalism increases as people grow older. *Journal of Environmental*
14 *Psychology, 40*, 331-338.
15
16 Peattie, K. (2010). Green consumption: behavior and norms. *Annual Review of*
17 *Environment and Resources, 35*(1), 195-228.
18
19 Pelletier, L., Baxter, D., & Huta, V. (2011). *Personal autonomy and environmental*
20 *sustainability*. In V. Chirkov, R. Ryan, & K. Sheldon (Eds.). *Personal autonomy in*
21 *cultural contexts: Global perspectives on the psychology of agency, freedom, and*
22 *people's well-being* (257-278). New York, NY: Springer.
23
24 Pelletier, L. G., Tuson, K. M., Green-Demers, I., Noels, K., & Beaton, A. M. (1998).
25 "Why are you doing things for the environment? The Motivation toward the
26 Environment Scale (MTES). *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28*, 437-468.
27
28 Rana, J., & Paul, J. (2017). Consumer behavior and purchase intention for organic food:
29 A review and research agenda. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 38*, 157-
30 165: 10.1016/j.jretconser.2017.06.004
31
32 Renaud-Dubé, A., Taylor, G., Lekes, N., Koestner, R., & Guay, F. (2010). Adolescents'
33 motivation toward the environment: Age-related trends and correlates. *Canadian*
34 *Journal of Behavioural Science, 42*(3), 194.
35
36 Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological*
37 *needs in motivation, development and wellness*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
38
39 Saleem, M. A., Eagle, L., & Low, D. (2018). Market segmentation based on eco-
40 socially conscious consumers' behavioral intentions: Evidence from an emerging
41 economy. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 193*(20), 14-27.
42
43 Seguin, C., Pelletier, L. G., & Hunsley, J. (1998). Toward a model of environmental
44 activism. *Environment and Behavior, 30*, 628-652: 10.1177/001391659803000503
45
46 Sharma, M., & Joshi, S. (2019). Brand sustainability among young consumers: An
47 AHP-TOPSIS approach. *Young Consumers, 20*(4), 314-337: 10.1108/YC-12-2018-0914
48
49 Sheldon, K. M., Wineland, A., Venhoeven, L., & Osin, E. (2016). Understanding the
50 motivation of environmental activists: A comparison of self-determination theory and
51 functional motives theory. *Ecopsychology, 8*(4), 228-238: 10.1089/eco.2016.001
52
53 Skjong, R., & Wentworth, B. H. (2001). Expert judgment and risk perception.
54 *Proceedings of the International Offshore and Polar Engineering Conference, 4*, 537-
55 544.
56
57 Sobhanifard, Y. (2018). Hybrid modelling of the consumption of organic foods in Iran
58 using exploratory factor analysis and an artificial neural network. *British Food Journal,*
59 *120*(1), 44-58: 10.1108/BFJ-12-2016-0604
60

1
2
3 Statista (2019). Millennial population of the United Kingdom (UK) in 2018, by age.
4 Retrieved from [https://www.statista.com/statistics/630938/uk-millennial-population-by-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/630938/uk-millennial-population-by-age/)
5 [age/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/630938/uk-millennial-population-by-age/) (accessed 3 June 2020).
6

7 Tagkaloglou, S., & Kasser, T. (2018). Increasing collaborative, pro-environmental
8 activism: The roles of motivational interviewing, self-determined motivation, and self-
9 efficacy. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 58, 86–92:
10 10.1016/j.jenvp.2018.06.004
11

12 Taufique, K. M. R., & Vaithianathan, S. (2018). A fresh look at understanding green
13 consumer behavior among young urban indian consumers through the lens of theory of
14 planned behavior. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 183(10), 46-55:
15 10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.02.097
16

17 Testa, F., Sarti, S., & Frey, M. (2019). Are green consumers really green? Exploring the
18 factors behind the actual consumption of organic food products. *Business Strategy and*
19 *the Environment*, 28(2), 327-338: 10.1002/bse.2234
20

21 Thøgersen, J. (2004). A cognitive dissonance interpretation of consistencies and
22 inconsistencies in environmentally responsible behavior. *Journal of Environmental*
23 *Psychology*, 24, 93-103.
24

25 Thøgersen, J. (2006). Norms for environmentally responsible behaviour: An extended
26 taxonomy. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 26, 247-336.
27

28 Thøgersen, J. (2010). Country differences in sustainable consumption: The case of
29 organic food. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 30(2), 171-185: 10.1177/0276146710361926
30

31 Van der Werff, E., Steg, L., & Keizer, K. (2013). It is a moral issue: The relationship
32 between environmental self-identity, obligation-based intrinsic motivation and pro-
33 environmental behaviour. *Global Environmental Change*, 23(5), 1258-1265.
34

35 Vassallo, M., Scalvedi, M. L., & Saba, A. (2016). Investigating psychosocial
36 determinants in influencing sustainable food consumption in Italy. *International*
37 *Journal of Consumer Studies*, 40(4), 422–434.
38

39 Venhoeven, L., Bolderdijk, J., & Steg, L. (2013). Explaining the paradox: How
40 proenvironmental behaviour can both thwart and foster well-being. *Sustainability*, 5,
41 1372-1386.
42

43 Vermeir, I., & Verbeke, W. (2006). Sustainable food consumption: Exploring the
44 consumer ‘attitude – behavioural intention’ gap. *Journal of Agricultural and*
45 *Environmental Ethics*, 19(2), 169–194: 10.1007/s10806-005-5485-3
46

47 Vermillion, L. J., & Peart, J. (2010). Green marketing: making sense of the situation.
48 *Allied Academies International Conference: Proceedings of the Academy of Marketing*
49 *Studies*, 15(1), 68-72.
50

51 Villacorta, M., Koestner, R., & Lekes, N. (2003). Further validation of the motivation
52 toward the environment scale. *Environment and Behavior*, 35(3), 486-505.
53

54 Watkins, L., Aitken, R., & Ford, J (2019). Measuring and enhancing children’s
55 sustainable consumption and production literacy. *Young Consumers*, 20(4), 285-298:
56 10.1108/YC-11-2018-0880
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Webb, D., Soutar, G. N., Mazzarol, T., & Saldaris, P. (2013). Self-determination theory
4 and consumer behavioural change: Evidence from a household energy-saving behavior
5 study. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 35, 59–66: 10.1016/j.jenvp.2013.04.003
6

7 Wiederhold, M., & Martinez, L. F. (2018). Ethical consumer behaviour in Germany:
8 The attitude-behaviour gap in the green apparel industry. *International Journal of*
9 *Consumer Studies*, 42(4), 419–429: 10.1111/ijcs.12435
10

11 Willer, H., & Lernoud, J. (2016). The world of organic agriculture 2016: Statistics and
12 emerging trends. *Research Institute of Organic Agriculture. FiBL and IFOAM Organics*
13 *International*.
14

15 Willer, H., Lernoud, J., & Schlatter, B. (2014). Current statistics on organic agriculture
16 worldwide: Organic area, producers and market. The world of organic agriculture:
17 Statistics and emerging trends 2014. *FiBL-IFOAM Report*. 34-124.
18

19 Wray-Lake, L., Flanagan, C., & Osgood, D. W. (2010). Examining trends in adolescent
20 environmental attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors across three decades. *Environment and*
21 *Behavior*, 42(1), 61-85.
22

23 Yadav, R., & Pathak, G. S. (2016). Intention to purchase organic food among young
24 consumers: Evidences from a developing nation. *Appetite*, 96, 122–128.
25

26 Yazdanpanah, M., & Forouzani, M. (2015). Application of the theory of planned
27 behaviour to predict Iranian students' intention to purchase organic food. *Journal of*
28 *Cleaner Production*, 107, 342–352.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Technical data.

Population	College students at the Faculty of Business and Economics
Population size	1695 individuals
Sample size	378 individuals
Surveying technique	CAWI (computer aided web interview)
Sampling method	Convenience sampling
Sampling error (e)	$\pm 4.53\%$
Level of significance (α)	95.5% ($p = q = .50$)
Surveying period	March 2018 to March 2019

Source: Authors.

Table 2. Questionnaire statements.

Self-determination motivations:

1. I use to make sure that the products I purchase have been obtained without the use of chemical pesticides
2. I avoid purchasing products containing artificial substances (additives, preservatives, etc.)
3. I am accustomed to searching for evidences that the products I buy have been grown with farming methods that protect and preserve the environment
4. It is of fundamental importance for me that the products I buy are labelled with any official organic certificate
5. I need to be assured that the products I purchase have been obtained without the use of chemical fertilizers
6. I use to look for indications that the products I purchase have been obtained respecting the natural growth rate of the plants
7. I am glad to know that the products I choose have been grown using cultivation methods adapted to local conditions for its optimal use
8. I seek to avoid the purchase of products containing genetically modified organisms

Personal image motivations:

9. When I buy products with any sort of organic label, I feel I am contributing to the well-being of society
10. Buying products from organic farming is a simple gesture to contribute to the preservation of the environment
11. I like to see myself as a consumer concerned about the impact of my purchases on the environment
12. When I identify a product salient because of its organic character I feel that buying it is the right thing
13. In the extent of possible, I try to contribute to the environment by purchasing organic products
14. Buying products from organic farming makes me feel good about myself
15. If close at hand, I always try to contribute to environmental causes through the purchase of certain products
16. I consider that buying products from organic farming contributes to the development of society

Social context motivations:

- 1
2
3 17. People close to me place value on the consumption of products from organic
4 farming
5 18. I am used to receiving approval comments when I purchase products from organic
6 farming
7
8 19. In a family environment it is common to acquire products from organic farming
9
10 20. Buying products from organic farming is a way of conveying your values for
11 others
12 21. Some of my friends encourage me to buy products from organic farming
13 22. I like being recognized as a consumer of organic products by others
14 23. In my educational environment, the consumption of products from organic farming
15 is warmly encouraged
16 24. People should choose products labelled with organic tags
17 25. I think that media help to raise people awareness about the importance of acquiring
18 products from organic farming
19

20 Source: Authors.
21
22

23 Table 3. Scales reliability, KMO measure, and Bartlett's Test.

Cronbach's Alpha	
Self-determination motivations	.867
Personal image motivations	.821
Social context motivations	.709
KMO and Bartlett's Test	
Keiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy	.925
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	
Approx. Chi-Squared	2775.268
df	171
Sig.	.000

26 Source: Authors.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Table 4. Factorial loadings (Varimax rotation).

Item	Self-determination dimension	Personal image dimension	Social context dimension
1	.667		
2	.720		
3	.611		
4	.639		
5	.764		
6	.598		
7	.624		
8	.610		
9		.710	
10		.693	
11		.605	
12		.713	
14		.653	
15		.527	
17			.501

18			.635
21			.752
22			.583
23			.687
Eigenvalue	4.240	3.024	2.867
Variance explained (%)	22.313	15.917	15.087

Source: Authors.

Table 5. Clusters' size.

Clusters	Cases	Percentag
<i>Amotivated</i>	87	23.02%
<i>Socially-influenced</i>	92	24.34%
<i>Self-determined</i>	98	25.92%
<i>Conscience-affected</i>	101	26.72%
Total sample	378	100.00%

Source: Authors.

Table 6. Clusters scoring.

Motivational dimensions*	<i>Amotivated</i>	<i>Socially-influenced</i>	<i>Self-determined</i>	<i>Conscience-affected</i>
Self-determination motives	-.012	.329	.830	-1.095
Personal image motives	-1.243	.126	.576	.396
Social context motives	-.369	1.239	-.701	-.131

* $p < .01$ (significance level of 99%)

Source: Authors.