OXFORD JOURNAL
OF STUDENT
SCHOLARSHIP

Green Trust and Purchase Intention for Green/Clean Beauty Products: A Survey of Women Consumers in Ahmedabad, India

Tanya Parikh
tanyaparikh5@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examines the association between green trust and purchase intention for green and clean beauty products among women consumers in Ahmedabad, India. Of 185 responses received, 22 respondents who identified as male were excluded, giving a descriptive sample of 163 and an analytic sample of 158 for the regression. Using a structured questionnaire, the study measures green trust, green perceived risk, green perceived value, environmental and health consciousness, and green purchase intention through validated Likert-scale items. Multiple linear regression shows that environmental and health consciousness ($\beta = 0.509$, $p < .001$) and green trust ($\beta = 0.355$, $p < .001$) are significant independent predictors of purchase intention, while green perceived risk shows no significant independent effect once these are controlled for. Green trust and green perceived risk are not significantly correlated ($r = -0.006$, 95% CI [-0.162, 0.150]); this fails to support a sequential trust-risk pathway rather than contradicting it, and because green perceived risk is not itself a significant predictor of purchase intention in this sample, it cannot be characterized as a separate antecedent. Green perceived value was collected but not hypothesised. Entering it as a fourth predictor in an exploratory model raises explained variance to 62% and reduces the green trust coefficient to 0.202, which remains significant; green trust and green perceived value correlate at $r = 0.706$, so the size of the trust coefficient depends on whether value is modelled alongside it. Purchase intention is positive across all measured dimensions. Willingness to pay a premium for a trusted product records a mean of 3.74 on a five-point scale, which indicates modest agreement, and the item is conditional on trust and hypothetical in form. The sample is also affluent. This finding qualifies rather than overturns assumptions of price resistance in this category. The findings offer practical implications for green beauty brands seeking to build trust and purchase intention among women consumers in this segment through health-anchored messaging and certification.

Keywords: Green Trust, Green Purchase Intention, Environmental and Health Consciousness, Green Perceived Risk, Greenwashing

1. INTRODUCTION

The beauty and personal care sector has undergone a significant shift in the last decade as consumers become more aware of sustainability, ingredients and the environment. One of the biggest trends affecting the beauty sector is the surge of green and clean beauty products, which are those that are touted as natural, organic, non-toxic, cruelty-free and good for the environment. The transformation of this is part of a wider cultural trend of conscious consumption, which involves consumers not only buying a product, but also signaling values that resonate with their health and ecological issues (Ottman, 2011; Peattie, 2010). Grand View Research (2023), a commercial market-research provider, valued the global organic personal care market at USD 15.98 billion in 2022 and projected a compound annual growth rate of 5.2% to 2030.

This is a phenomenon that is especially significant in India. The Indian beauty and personal care industry is seeing a rise in demand for clean label products with a digitally empowered and health-conscious consumer base. Category awareness among urban Indian consumers has risen alongside this growth, a pattern documented by Sharma and Kushwaha (2019). As beauty and personal care products are mainly the domain of the female customer, women are becoming more critical while making their buying decisions, not only for the efficacy of the product but also for the ethical sourcing of the raw materials, transparency in the labelling process and credible brand communication (Joshi & Rahman, 2015). Social media and influencer marketing have widened awareness of green beauty in India (Mishra & Sharma, 2021).

But a problem is present in the green beauty market: the practice of greenwashing, in which brands are deceiving or making exaggerated claims about the green credentials of their products (Delmas & Burbano, 2011). This can lead to a huge loss of consumer trust. Hameed et al. (2021) concluded that greenwashing behavior significantly lowered consumers' green trust and their purchase intention. As the credibility of green claims is questioned, consumer trust becomes an important factor to purchase intention. Trust in this context involves trusting the brand, believing product claims to be true, and depending on the integrity of the manufacturer (Mayer et al., 1995; Morgan & Hunt, 1994).

Trust has always been a primary mediator between product perception and actual purchase behaviour in the academic literature related to consumer behaviour and marketing (Gefen et al., 2003; Pavlou, 2003). This is consistent with Chen and Chang (2013), who found that green trust positively and significantly influences green purchase intention. When it comes to buying a product, women in the present market where there are many ambiguous claims have to rely on brand or product trust for their decision (Kim & Chung, 2011; Chen, 2010).

This study aims to investigate whether green trust (consumer confidence in green/clean beauty brands in terms of credibility, environmental performance and reliability) has an impact on purchasing intention of green and clean beauty products. The general theory is based on Chen's (2010) Green Trust model which is located in the trust literature that was established by Mayer et al. (1995), Morgan and Hunt (1994) and the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). Based on the results of this study, it is hoped that this study will give some contribution to the academic world and practical application in brand strategy in the ever-changing green beauty market in India (Follows & Jobber, 2000; Wu & Chen, 2014). To fill in these gaps, the present study attempts to answer the following two research questions:

RQ1: To what extent is green trust associated with purchase intention for green/clean beauty products among women consumers in Ahmedabad, India?

RQ2: To what extent are green perceived risk and environmental/health consciousness associated with purchase intention for green/clean beauty products among women consumers in Ahmedabad, India, and are green trust and green perceived risk associated with one another?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Green/ Clean Beauty

The concept of 'green beauty' has its roots in the broader discourse on sustainable consumption and environmental marketing. In general, green beauty products are those formulated with natural, organic and/or less processed ingredients; made in a way that is better for the environment; and marketed with a moral stance, including no animal testing or sustainable packaging (Ottman, 2011). A market-research report from Mintel (2022), a commercial provider, describes 'clean beauty' as a newer and contested term for products formulated without ingredients regarded as harmful to humans, even where those products are not formally organic. The boundaries between the 'green' and 'clean' are still not clear in the marketplace discourse, causing consumers' confusion and multiple unverified product claims (Delmas & Burbano, 2011).

Researchers like Peattie (2010) and Charter and Polonsky (2017) have studied the development of green marketing and how the consumer expectation of green marketing is moving from niche interest to mainstream. In the beauty space in particular, the global clean beauty market has been forecast to expand significantly, and Asia-Pacific region, including India, to be a high growth geography (Grand View Research, 2023). The expansion of this category is always stressed in literature as being driven by the female consumer (Pudaruth et al., 2015). Additionally, Moser (2015) stated that the gender is an important variable in green consumption research, because women have better attitudes towards the environment and are more likely to behave in a pro-environmental way when buying products than men.

Factors like increasing disposable income of urban women, rising health awareness and growing regulation of harmful cosmetic ingredients have all contributed to the trend of green beauty consumption in India (Joshi & Rahman, 2015; Sharma & Kushwaha, 2019). Additionally, the Ayurvedic and herbal beauty segment, which is a precursor to the modern green beauty movement, is deeply resonant in Indian culture, adding to the receptivity of its consumers for plant-based and natural formulations (Mishra & Sharma, 2021). But Bhatia and Kapoor (2022) alerted that with this rising interest, the absence of a standardised definition of 'green' and 'clean' beauty in India does create a fertile ground for misleading marketing.

2.2 Consumer Trust

The concept of trust has received a considerable amount of theoretical attention from psychology, economics, and marketing. Morgan and Hunt (1994), in their seminal work on relationship marketing, defined trust as the confidence that a partner is reliable and possesses integrity. Mayer et al. (1995) presented a very influential trust model that includes three dimensions – ability (competence), benevolence (positive intention toward the other party), and integrity (adherence to acceptable principles). This three dimensional framework is widely used in the field of consumer behaviour and informs the trust literature this study draws on. The present study, however, operationalizes Green Trust as a single unidimensional composite (Chen, 2010) rather than testing Mayer et al.'s three-dimensional structure; Chen's construct, not Mayer et al.'s framework, is therefore the operative theoretical model for the analysis that follows, with Mayer et al. (1995) serving as conceptual background.

In the case of purchasing a product, consumer trust refers to both brand and product claim trust and also store and Internet trust where the product is purchased (Pavlou, 2003). In the study of Gefen et al. (2003) trust in the online shopping environment, three dimensions of trust (competence, benevolence, and integrity) were found to be significant predictors of consumer willingness to purchase, with integrity trust being the strongest predictor. In the literature, there's one more level of trust identified for green products, which is often referred to as 'green trust'. A green trust is a willingness to rely on a product, service or brand based on the belief or expectation about its environmental performance, grounded in its credibility, benevolence, and ability (Chen, 2010). According to the results of Chen and Chang (2013), green trust has a positive and significant impact on green purchase intention and the greenwashing has a significant and negative impact on the relationship between green trust and green purchase intention.

The initial theory of 'market for lemons' (Akerlof, 1970) is relevant to the understanding of trust in the green beauty context: when its quality cannot be determined before purchase, usually as in the case of credence goods like organic cosmetics, consumers resort to trust signals such as brand reputation, third-party certifications and peer recommendations to alleviate the information asymmetry. Dwyer et al. (1987) highlighted the fact that trust is not merely a stable attribute, but a dynamic construct, which develops over time through a series of positive consumer-brand interactions; building on this, Keller (1993) has proved that trust, as a part of brand equity, directly affects the attitude of choice behaviour and willingness to pay.

2.3 Purchase Intention in the Green Beauty Context

Purchase intention is the consumer's stated intention to make a purchase in the future (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). It is an important predictor of real purchase action, and is used extensively as a proxy in consumer research as it has proven to be valid in predicting purchase action (Ajzen, 1991). Regarding green consumption, purchase intention has been explored from the perspectives of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM; Davis, 1989), the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB; Ajzen, 1991), and the Value-Belief-Norm theory (VBN; Stern, 2000).

Specifically with relation to green beauty products, studies have identified attitudes towards environmental sustainability, subjective norm, perceived behavioural control and trust in eco-labels as important predictors for purchase intention (Pudaruth et al., 2015; Moser, 2015). Kim and Chung (2011) determined that the knowledge and health consciousness of consumers significantly impacted their purchase intention of green cosmetics as it concerns the American female consumers, and Joshi and Rahman (2015) emphasized the value orientation and social influence on the Indian consumers. Eze and Ndubisi (2013) further established that environmental concern and perceived product value jointly impact green purchase intention, with trust acting as a moderating variable.

In the literature, willingness to pay a price premium for green beauty products has become a key aspect of purchase intention. Follows and Jobber (2000) found that consumers with stronger environmental values were more willing to pay a premium for environmentally responsible products than consumers with weaker environmental values. Hameed et al. (2021) later reiterated this in the South Asian scenario stating that those who trust a brand's green claims become less sensitive to price and are more likely to buy the product.

2.4 Trust and Purchase Intention: A Review of the Relationship

Significant research has been conducted on the link between trust and purchase intent. In e-commerce literature, trust has been consistently shown to reduce perceived risk and increase purchase intention (Gefen et al., 2003; Pavlou & Fygenson, 2006). Pavlou and Fygenson (2006) adapted the Theory of Planned Behaviour to show that consumer trust directly increases purchase intention, and indirectly increases purchase intention by suppressing perceived risks. Trust becomes even more important as a cognitive and affective link between awareness and buying intention in the context of sustainable products in which there is a high degree of information asymmetry and greenwashing is common (Chen & Chang, 2013).

Delmas and Burbano (2011) pointed out that greenwashing can lead to a loss of consumer trust, at the brand level as well as at the category level, and that it is therefore essential to communicate in a sincere and credible green manner. They identify two main greenwashing behaviours, ambiguous statements and misleading visual imagery, which together give a useful taxonomy of how trust is undermined. Wu and Chen (2014) studied organic cosmetics among Taiwanese women consumers and found that brand credibility mediates the relationship between green brand image and purchase intention. The mediation was full. Green brand image raised purchase intention through the credibility it established, and no significant direct path remained once credibility was accounted for. Brand credibility sits close to green trust conceptually, though the two are measured as distinct constructs.

Loureiro and Kaufmann (2012) examine brand love and show that, together with consumer satisfaction, it explains brand loyalty and purchase intention for cosmetic products. Bhatia and Kapoor (2022) conducted a study on the Indian market, and discovered that third-party eco-certifications (such as ECOCERT, COSMOS, USDA Organic) significantly boosted consumer confidence in green beauty products, and that the confidence created was significantly more influential than awareness and perceived value alone, in predicting purchase intention. Together, these results indicate the critical role of trust in the decision-making process for green beauty purchases and the primary focus of the current research.

2.5 Hypotheses

The literature reviewed above supports three expectations about purchase intention for green and clean beauty products. Chen and Chang (2013) found that green trust raises green purchase intention, and the trust literature reviewed in Section 2.2 points the same way. Akerlof (1970) described the information asymmetry that makes credence goods difficult to evaluate before purchase, and Pavlou and Fygenson (2006) reported that perceived risk suppresses purchase intention. Kim and Chung (2011) found that health consciousness drives green cosmetics purchasing among female consumers, and Joshi and Rahman (2015) reported a comparable role for value orientation among Indian consumers.

A fourth question follows from Pavlou and Fygenson (2006), who modelled trust as acting on purchase intention partly by suppressing perceived risk. Whether green trust and green perceived risk stand in that sequential relationship, or vary independently of one another, can be examined directly in these data.

These expectations were tested as null hypotheses. Each is stated below in the form in which its decision is reported in Table 4.3.4.

H01: There is no significant relationship between Green Trust and Green Purchase Intention.

H02: There is no significant relationship between Green Perceived Risk and Green Purchase Intention.

H03: There is no significant relationship between Environmental & Health Consciousness and Green Purchase Intention.

H04: There is no significant association between Green Trust and Green Perceived Risk.

H01 addresses RQ1. H02, H03, and H04 address RQ2. All four are tested in Section 4.3.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study uses a descriptive and predictive (cross-sectional survey) design to address the research questions presented above; as a single cross-sectional self-report survey, it can establish statistical association and prediction but not causal influence, and language throughout this paper has been revised accordingly. The study is founded on the positivist paradigm that sets the assumption that consumer behaviour and the relationships between variables are measurable objectively (Bryman, 2016).

The data were gathered using a structured questionnaire of validated scales from previous studies (Mayer et al., 1995; Chen, 2010; Ajzen, 1991) with five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

The target population was women aged 18 years and above, resident in urban Ahmedabad, India, with knowledge of green and clean beauty products and prior purchase of them. Snowball sampling was employed, and the survey was distributed via the researcher's school network and women's community groups. The instrument applied no screening logic to enforce these criteria, so respondents who did not meet them were able to complete the survey and are retained in the descriptive sample. A total of 185 responses were received. A gender-identification item was added to the instrument after data collection had begun and was answered by 58 respondents; 22 of these identified as male and were excluded, giving a descriptive sample of 163. The remaining 127 responses predate the item and were retained on the assumption that recruitment through women-only channels reached female respondents, an assumption that could not be independently verified. This is discussed further as a limitation in Section 6. The sample of 163 is sufficient for the multivariate statistical techniques used here as per Hair et al. (2019). Item-level response rates for the six Environmental and Health Consciousness items ranged from 157 to 158 out of 163. Five respondents did not answer any of the six items and were excluded when composite scores were formed; three respondents each missed a single item and had their composite calculated from the remaining five. This yields the analytic N = 158 used in the regression reported in Section 4.3, which differs from the descriptive sample of N = 163 reported elsewhere.

A response rate could not be calculated because the number of respondents invited was not tracked during data collection; only the 185 responses actually received were recorded. Following Hair et al.'s (2019) minimum-sample-size guidance for multiple regression ($N \geq 50 + 8m$, where m is the number of predictors), the three-predictor model reported here requires a minimum of 74 cases, which the analytic sample of 158 comfortably exceeds, consistent with standard survey-research sample-size guidance (Malhotra, 2020). A Harman's single-factor test was conducted on all 29 Likert items: an unrotated principal components analysis shows the first factor accounts for 42.6% of total variance, below the 50% threshold conventionally used to flag common method variance as a substantial concern. Harman's single-factor test is a weak diagnostic. It detects only severe common method variance and cannot rule out more moderate levels, so this result should be read as an absence of gross contamination rather than as evidence that method variance is absent. Discriminant validity was assessed using the proportion of item variance explained by the first unrotated component of each construct, which serves as an approximation to average variance extracted rather than a substitute for it, since no confirmatory factor model was

estimated. Values were 72.5% for Green Trust, 74.1% for Green Perceived Value, 66.2% for Environmental and Health Consciousness, and 73.0% for Green Purchase Intention. The highest squared correlations between constructs were .50 for Green Trust with Green Perceived Value and .50 for Environmental and Health Consciousness with Green Purchase Intention. Each construct's variance-explained figure exceeds the squared correlations involving it, which is consistent with discriminant validity under the Fornell-Larcker logic, though a confirmatory factor analysis would be required to establish it properly. The full questionnaire is provided in Appendix A to allow replication.

Descriptive statistics were used to analyse quantitative data. Before hypothesis testing, Cronbach's alpha was used to check the internal consistency of all five constructs and all of them were greater than .70 (conventional value): Green Perceived Value α = .912, Green Perceived Risk α = .865, Green Trust α = .936, Environmental & Health Consciousness α = .895, and Green Purchase Intention α = .924), thus supporting the use of the composite (mean) scores for hypothesis testing. Multiple linear regression was used to test the hypotheses.

4. ANALYSIS

4.1 Demographics of the Respondents

The demographic profile below is reported for the full analytic sample (N = 163). As noted in Section 3, gender was not directly measured for 127 of these 163 respondents (78%) and was instead inferred from the recruitment channel.

Sr. No.	Particular	Percentage of Respondents
1.	**Age of Respondents**	
	18–24 years	4.3
	25–34 years	8.0
	35–44 years	16.6
	45–54 years	47.2
	55 years and above	23.9
	Total	**100**
2.	**Education of Respondents**	
	High school or below	1.8
	Undergraduate (pursuing or completed)	25.8
	Postgraduate (pursuing or completed)	47.9
	Professional degree (e.g., CA, MBA, LLB)	24.5
	Total	**100**
3.	**Occupation of Respondents**	

	Student	2.5
	Salaried employee	11.0
	Self-employed / Business owner	63.8
	Homemaker	20.2
	Others	2.5
	Total	**100**
4.	**Monthly Household Income of Respondents**	
	Less than ₹25,000	1.8
	₹25,001 – ₹50,000	3.1
	₹50,001 – ₹1,00,000	6.1
	More than ₹1,00,000	45.4
	Prefer not to say	43.6
	Total	**100**
5.	**Marital Status of Respondents**	
	Single / Unmarried	11.7
	Married	85.3
	Other	3.1
	Total	**100**

Note. Income was reported by 92 of 163 respondents; 43.6% selected "prefer not to say." Income was not entered into any analysis and is reported for sample description only. Percentages are rounded to one decimal place and may not sum to exactly 100.

A total of 163 women were retained in the final analytic sample. As seen in the above table, the selected sample represented mainly middle-aged, well-educated, married women, largely self-employed or business owners, a profile consistent with a professional women's community network.

4.2 Primary analysis of the questionnaire

4.2.1 Respondents Understanding of green/clean beauty products

Description	**Percentage**
Products made with natural or environmentally friendly ingredients	36.2
Products free from harmful chemicals and toxins	28.8
Products that are cruelty-free, organic, or sustainably produced	31.9
Products marketed as eco-friendly but similar to regular cosmetics	0.6

Not sure about the meaning of green/clean beauty products	2.5
Total	**100**

4.2.2 Duration of Usage of Green/Clean Beauty Products

Duration of Usage	**Percentage of Respondents**
Less than 6 months	8.6
6 months – 1 year	10.4
1 – 3 years	23.3
More than 3 years	30.1
I have not used them	27.6
Total	**100**

4.2.3 Frequency of Purchase of Clean/Green Beauty Products

Frequency of Purchase	**Percentage of Respondents**
Once a year or less	23.9
2–4 times a year	42.3
5–12 times a year	12.3
More than 12 times a year	4.9
Never	16.6
Total	**100**

The target population was defined in Section 3 as women who had knowledge of and had purchased green/clean beauty products. In the analytic sample, 45 respondents (27.6%) report never having used these products and 27 (16.6%) report never purchasing them, both outside the stated criteria; these respondents were retained rather than excluded so that non-adopters' attitudes could still inform the descriptive profile of the category, and this retention is treated as a limitation in Section 6. The two figures do not fully align: 45 report never using the products while only 27 report never purchasing them, implying up to 18 respondents purchase a category they have not personally used, most plausibly through purchasing on behalf of family members, a pattern common in household beauty and personal-care spending that this survey did not probe further.

4.2.4 Most used category of Clean/Green Beauty Products by Respondents

Category of Product	**Percentage of Respondents**

Skincare (cleanser, moisturizer, serum, sunscreen)	73.0
Haircare (shampoo, conditioner oil)	55.8
Personal care (body wash deodorant, oral care)	36.8
Makeup / Cosmetics (foundation, lipstick, eye makeup)	27.0
Fragrances	11.7
Total (of respondents selecting each category)	**204.3)**

This is a multiple-response item on which respondents could select as many product categories as applied to them; the percentages sum to 204.3%, implying respondents selected 2.04 categories on average.

4.2.5 Primary source of information about green/clean beauty products

Source	**Percentage of Respondents**
Social media / Influencers	27.6
Friends / Family	22.1
Online reviews / Blogs	16.6
Advertisements (TV, print, digital)	6.7
Dermatologist / Professional recommendation	21.5
In-store browsing / Retail staff	5.5
Total	**100**

4.2.6 Monthly Expenditure on Green/Clean Beauty Products by Respondents

Monthly Expenditure	**Percentage of Respondents**
Less than ₹500	12.3
₹500 – ₹1,000	14.1
₹1,001 – ₹2,500	25.8
₹2,501 – ₹5,000	26.4
More than ₹5,000	21.5
Total	**100**

This table offers no ₹0 or "not applicable" band; consequently, the 27 respondents who report never purchasing (Section 4.2.3) are nonetheless recorded here as spending some amount on the category. This is acknowledged as an instrument design limitation in Section 6.

Note. Percentages are rounded to one decimal place and may not sum to exactly 100.

4.2.7 Opinions About Green Perceived Value (GPV)

Statement About Green Perceived Value (GPV)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
	5	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	
I choose green/clean beauty products because they are less harmful to my health compared to conventional products	62	55	33	3	10	3.96
I feel I am making the right choice by purchasing green/clean beauty products because of their positive environmental impact	40	65	44	5	9	3.75
Overall, I believe green/clean beauty products deliver more benefits than conventional alternatives	38	54	53	10	8	3.64
Green/clean beauty products provide good value for money considering their environmental benefits	22	54	65	16	6	3.43
The environmental functions and performance of green/clean beauty products meet my expectations	18	52	71	15	7	3.36

The table shows that there is an overall positive yet moderate opinion about green/clean beauty products. The strongest opinion exists for health-related safety, since the products are perceived as significantly safer compared to alternative options. There is also a considerable level of environmental concern, where the consumers believe that they make an environmentally positive impact through buying such products. Low levels of agreement are observed regarding value for money and performance of the products.

Furthermore, the weighted means have revealed even clearer results with values ranging from 3.36 to 3.96, which means that there is an overall moderate to positive opinion about the products. In particular, the highest mean (3.96) is associated with the health benefits, whereas the second one (3.75) is linked to the positive environment impact. This means that these issues serve as the main factors encouraging people to choose green/clean beauty products.

4.2.8 Opinions About Green Perceived Risk (GPR)

Statement About Green Perceived Risk (GPR)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly	Mean

					Disagree	
	5	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	
It is difficult for me to verify whether a beauty product is genuinely green/clean	24	60	48	25	6	3.44
I worry that green/clean beauty brands might be engaging in greenwashing (making misleading environmental claims	14	42	59	41	7	3.09
There is a chance that green/clean beauty products will not perform as well as they claim	4	56	58	37	8	3.07
I am concerned that green/clean beauty products may not deliver the results I expect	4	50	48	47	14	2.90
Purchasing green/clean beauty products feels risky because the higher price may not be justified	9	32	63	50	9	2.89

The results show moderate levels of perception about the risks associated with the use of green/clean beauty products. The highest level of agreement is with the difficulty of identifying if the product is indeed green or clean. Issues relating to greenwashing among brands show that consumers are somewhat suspicious of environmental branding practices. Concerns over product efficacy and efficiency are moderate. Finally, perceptions over price and effectiveness risks have the lowest levels of agreement because few feel that the price and/or product itself does not justify its value.

4.2.9 Opinions About Green Trust (GT)

Statements about Green Trust (GT)	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Mean**
	5	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	
I feel confident about the safety of green/clean beauty products for long-term use	14	63	67	14	5	3.41
I trust eco-labels and certifications (for example organic, cruelty-free, vegan) on beauty products	14	71	53	16	9	3.40
I trust the ingredient information provided on green/clean beauty product labels	10	64	63	19	7	3.31

The environmental reputation of a green/clean beauty brand meets my expectations	7	52	85	13	6	3.25
I trust that green/clean beauty products are genuinely environmentally friendly	11	47	73	26	6	3.19
Green/clean beauty brands keep their promises about environmental commitments	7	36	89	25	6	3.08
I believe the environmental claims made by green/clean beauty brands are generally trustworthy	6	37	91	22	7	3.08

Respondents have moderately positive attitudes about the credibility, safety, and environmental commitment of green/clean beauty products. A significant number of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they trusted the safety of green/clean beauty products for prolonged use, and even eco-labels and certification like organic, cruelty-free, and vegan had high means. Similarly, trust in ingredient information and environmental reputation of green/clean beauty products was moderately high.

4.2.10 Opinions About Green Purchase Intention (GPI)

Statements About Green Purchase Intention (GPI)	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Mean**
	5	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	
I intend to repurchase green/clean beauty products that I have been satisfied with	41	83	32	3	4	3.94
I would recommend green/clean beauty products to friends and family	36	80	41	2	4	3.87
I intend to purchase green/clean beauty products in the near future	26	90	41	2	4	3.81
I will choose green/clean beauty products over conventional alternatives when available	33	74	44	8	4	3.76
I am willing to pay a premium price for green/clean beauty products that I trust	27	87	35	7	7	3.74
I plan to increase my spending on green/clean beauty products	10	69	72	8	4	3.45

The table above shows that respondents have a positive attitude towards buying and supporting green/clean beauty products, consistently across all six items measured. A high number of respondents have indicated that they were planning to repurchase the green/clean beauty products that they had found satisfactory and will also recommend these products to their friends and families. Several respondents indicated their intention to buy green/clean beauty products in the very near future, prefer these products over other types, and are willing to pay a premium price for products they trust. The only lower-scoring item concerned increasing overall spending on green/clean beauty products.

The weighted average mean scores also revealed purchase intentions of respondents for green/clean beauty products. The highest mean score is for the intention to repurchase green/clean beauty products that satisfy their needs (3.94), followed by their intentions to recommend green/clean beauty products to other people (3.87) and purchase these items in the near future (3.81).

4.2.11 Opinions About Environmental Concern & Health Consciousness

Statement	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Mean**
	5	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	
I prefer beauty products that contain fewer harmful chemicals	61	64	22	3	8	4.06
Health concerns are a major reason I choose green/clean beauty products	52	57	40	3	5	3.94
I check ingredient lists before buying beauty products to ensure they are safe	43	63	34	12	5	3.81
I am concerned about the environmental impact of beauty and personal care products	27	60	58	8	5	3.61
I actively look for beauty products that are environmentally sustainable	20	63	60	8	6	3.53
Environmental issues influence my choice of beauty products	21	51	61	18	7	3.39

Unlike the other four constructs, whose items were each answered by all 163 respondents, the six items above were answered by between 157 and 158 respondents each. Five respondents did not answer any of the six items and were excluded when the composite score was formed. Of the 158 retained for this construct, 155 answered all six items and three answered five, each missing a different item; composite

scores for those three were formed from the five items answered. Repeating the regression on complete cases only (N = 155) produced substantively unchanged results ($R^2 = .596$; Green Trust $\beta = 0.367$; Green Perceived Risk $\beta = 0.079$; Environmental and Health Consciousness $\beta = 0.502$), so the composite-scoring rule does not affect the conclusions reported here. The five respondents excluded for answering none of the scale differ from those retained on Green Trust (M = 1.91 against 3.29, p = .016) and not on the other three constructs. Their exclusion cannot materially affect estimates at this sample size, but the missingness is not independent of trust and is noted as a limitation. This yields the analytic N = 158 used for this construct in the regression reported in Section 4.3, distinct from the descriptive N = 163 used elsewhere in this section.

The table shows that participants are highly concerned about health and environment issues with the use of beauty products. Participants strongly agreed on preferring beauty products with lesser harmful chemicals, and health concerns affect their decisions to buy green/clean beauty products. Moreover, many participants check the ingredient lists to make sure that they are safe.

The item means show similar results. The highest mean score is for products with fewer harmful chemicals (4.06), followed by health concerns affecting the decision-making process (3.94), and then checking the ingredient list for safety purposes (3.81). Moderate mean scores are given to concern about the environmental effects of beauty products (3.61) and the preference for environmentally sustainable products (3.53).

4.3 Hypothesis

Hypotheses H01-H03 examine the independent contribution of Green Trust, Green Perceived Risk, and Environmental & Health Consciousness on Green Purchase Intention and these hypotheses are tested using multiple linear regression (Tables 4.3.1 and 4.3.2). H04 is testing a conceptually different question: whether Green Trust is related with Green Perceived Risk or not—that is, whether they act as independent or overlapping antecedents of GPI or not—than asking whether either of them predicts GPI directly. Such a distinction is important for the trust-risk sequential models presented in Section 5 (Pavlou & Fygenson, 2006): GT and GPR are not significantly correlated, indicating that the two seem to be independent. An independent relationship is not evidence that trust operates by reducing perceived risk; that sequential mechanism would itself require a significant association, which is absent here. For this reason Pearson correlation rather than regression is used for H04 (Table 4.3.3), as it is a test of a relationship between two predictors and not the prediction of an outcome.

Green Perceived Value (GPV) was not the subject of a stated hypothesis. It was entered as a fourth predictor alongside GT, GPR, and EHC in an exploratory supplementary regression on the same N = 158 sample, prompted by its central place in the Chen and Chang (2013) framework on which this paper draws. The expanded model improves fit ($R^2 = .624$, adjusted $R^2 = .615$, $F(4,153) = 63.57$, $p < .001$, versus $R^2 = .592$ for the three-predictor model). GPV is itself a significant predictor ($\beta = 0.271$, $p < .001$), and EHC retains the largest standardised coefficient ($\beta = 0.435$, $p < .001$); Green Trust's coefficient drops but remains significant ($\beta = 0.202$, $p = .006$), consistent with GPV and GT sharing meaningful variance ($r = .706$, Table 4.3.3b) rather than each being fully independent. GPR remains non-significant ($\beta = 0.072$, $p = .156$). Variance inflation factors for GT and GPV (2.11 and 2.25 respectively) remain below the

conventional threshold of 5, so multicollinearity does not undermine the model. These results support treating GPV as a candidate predictor in future specifications, consistent with its central role in the Chen and Chang (2013) framework.

Table 4.3.1. Model summary for the multiple regression testing H01–H03 (GPI regressed on GT, GPR, and EHC).

R	**R^2**	**Adjusted R^2**	**F**	**df1**	**df2**	**p**	**N**
0.770	0.592	0.584	74.43	3	154	<0.001	158

Table 4.3.2. Regression coefficients for predictors of Green Purchase Intention (standardized variables, N = 158).

Predictor	**β**	**SE**	**t**	**p**	**95% CI**
Constant	0.000	0.051	0.00	1.000	[-0.101, 0.101]
Green Trust (GT)	0.355	0.061	5.846	<0.001	[0.235, 0.475]
Green Perceived Risk (GPR)	0.079	0.052	1.505	0.134	[-0.025, 0.183]
Environmental & Health Consciousness (EHC)	0.509	0.062	8.270	<0.001	[0.387, 0.630]

Table 4.3.3. Pearson correlation testing H04 (relationship between Green Trust and Green Perceived Risk, N = 158).

Variables	**Pearson r**	**95% CI**	**p**
Green Trust – Green Perceived Risk	-0.006	[-0.162, 0.150]	0.939

The zero-order relationships among the constructs are reported below as a full Pearson correlation matrix across all four predictor and outcome constructs, together with variance inflation factors.

Table 4.3.3b. Pearson correlation matrix for all constructs (N = 158). Composite scoring for Environmental and Health Consciousness follows the rule stated in Section 4.2.11.

	GPV	**GPR**	**GT**	**GPI**	**EHC**
GPV	—	0.066 (p = .411)	0.706 (p < .001)	0.667 (p < .001)	0.572 (p < .001)
GPR	0.066 (p = .411)	—	-0.006 (p = .939)	0.159 (p = .046)	0.162 (p = .043)
GT	0.706 (p < .001)	-0.006 (p = .939)	—	0.620 (p < .001)	0.522 (p < .001)
GPI	0.667 (p < .001)	0.159 (p = .046)	0.620 (p < .001)	—	0.707 (p < .001)
EHC	0.572 (p < .001)	0.162 (p = .043)	0.522 (p < .001)	0.707 (p < .001)	—

Table 4.3.3c. Variance inflation factors for the predictors entered in the regression (Table 4.3.1).

Predictor	**VIF**
Green Trust (GT)	1.39
Green Perceived Risk (GPR)	1.04
Environmental & Health Consciousness (EHC)	1.43

Green Perceived Risk correlates negligibly with Green Trust (r = -0.006, p = .939) and with Green Perceived Value (r = 0.066, p = .411), and only weakly with Environmental & Health Consciousness (r = 0.162, p = .043), sharing at most 2.6% of variance with any predictor in the model. The zero-order correlation between Green Perceived Risk and Green Purchase Intention is itself weak (r = 0.159, p = .046). The reduction from this weak bivariate association to the non-significant partial effect reported in Table 4.3.2 (β = 0.079, p = .134) is therefore not attributable to shared variance with Green Trust, and only marginally attributable to shared variance with Environmental & Health Consciousness. All variance inflation factors are well below the conventional threshold of 5, indicating multicollinearity does not account for the result either. The more defensible reading is that Green Perceived Risk, as measured here, simply does not independently predict purchase intention in this sample once the other two constructs are accounted for.

Table 4.3.4 summarizes the hypothesis decisions based on the statistics above.

Hypothesis	**Null Hypothesis (H_0)**	**Standardized β / Pearson r**	**p-value**	**Result**
H01	There is no significant relationship between Green Trust and Green Purchase Intention.	β = 0.355	<0.001	Reject H_0
H02	There is no significant relationship between Green Perceived Risk and Green Purchase Intention.	β = 0.079	0.134	Fail to Reject H_0
H03	There is no significant relationship between Environmental & Health Consciousness and Green Purchase Intention.	β = 0.509	<0.001	Reject H_0
H04	There is no significant association between Green Trust and Green Perceived Risk.	r = -0.006	0.939	Fail to Reject H_0

As the regression results show, Green Trust (β = 0.355, p < .001) and Environmental & Health Consciousness (β = 0.509, p < .001) are significant factors that have an independent effect on Green Purchase Intention, leading to rejection of the corresponding null hypotheses H01 and H03. However, Green Perceived Risk is not a significant independent predictor of Green Purchase Intention when Green Trust and Environmental & Health Consciousness are controlled for (β = 0.079, p = .134) so the null hypothesis H02 is not rejected.

H02, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between Green Perceived Risk and Green Purchase Intention, is not rejected in this multivariate test. A weak but statistically significant zero-order Pearson correlation does exist between Green Perceived Risk and Green Purchase Intention (r = 0.159, p = .046; Table 4.3.3b). As Table 4.3.3b and the accompanying variance inflation factors show, this weak bivariate association shares negligible variance with Green Trust (r = -0.006) and only marginal variance with Environmental & Health Consciousness (r = 0.162), so shared variance with the other two predictors is at best a partial explanation for why the coefficient becomes non-significant once they are controlled for. The more defensible conclusion is that Green Perceived Risk, as measured here, does not independently predict purchase intention in this sample. Overall, Green Trust and Environmental & Health Consciousness exhibit an independent, significant relationship with purchase intention, with the larger standardized coefficient belonging to Environmental & Health Consciousness; because their 95% confidence intervals overlap (Table 4.3.2), the data do not establish that this difference is statistically significant. The relationship between Green Trust and Green Perceived Risk is also non-significant (r =

-0.006, p = .939), which means that in the current study no significant correlation is detected between consumer trust towards green/clean beauty products and perceived risk.

5. DISCUSSION

These results give an empirical account of the relationship between trust and purchase intention in the Indian green and clean beauty market. They support the expectations drawn from Chen (2010) and Ajzen (1991), and they add contextual detail specific to Indian consumers.

Environmental and Health Consciousness carries the largest standardised coefficient of the three predictors of Green Purchase Intention (β = 0.509, p < .001). Its confidence interval overlaps that of Green Trust, and no formal test of the difference between the two coefficients was conducted, so both are established as significant predictors and Environmental and Health Consciousness has the larger point estimate. The EHC data showed that the preference for products with less harmful chemicals (mean 4.06) and health-related purchase motives (mean 3.94) were higher than the purely environmental motives (mean 3.39-3.61). This health-centric attitude is consistent with that of Moser (2015) and Joshi and Rahman (2015), which found that for the Indian consumer, the primary motivators for buying green beauty products are personal health benefits and not environmental altruism. It also reflects the broader pattern identified by Mishra and Sharma (2021), wherein health consciousness functions as a gateway entry point for green beauty consumption in emerging markets.

Green Trust (GT) was also independently and significantly associated with GPI (β = 0.355, p < .001), which is the key theoretical assumption of the study. This coefficient is sensitive to model specification. Green Trust correlates at .706 with Green Perceived Value, and when value enters the model as a fourth predictor the trust coefficient falls to 0.202 while remaining significant (p = .006). The two constructs share close to half their variance. Reporting trust without value in the model attributes to trust some of what the two hold in common. The moderate GT means (3.08-3.41) suggest that consumer trust in the Indian green beauty category is not yet robust, with the highest GT for product safety and eco-label credibility and the lowest for the overall credibility of environmental claims. Trust in brand environmental commitments sits closest to neutral of all seven items, at a mean of 3.08. This aligns with Bhatia and Kapoor (2022), who showed that third-party eco-certifications serve as the strongest mechanism for consumer trust among Indian consumers, and Delmas and Burbano (2011), who found that greenwashing undermines brand and category trust. Direct concern about greenwashing is divided rather than widespread. The item mean is 3.09, marginally above the neutral midpoint, and the distribution splits three ways: 56 respondents agree or strongly agree, 48 disagree or strongly disagree, and 59 are neutral.

However, when Green Trust and Environmental & Health Consciousness were controlled for in the multiple regression, Green Perceived Risk (GPR) was not a significant, independent predictor of GPI (β = 0.079, p = .134), a materially different result from the weak but significant zero-order correlation between GPR and GPI (r = 0.159, p = .046; Table 4.3.3b). Some of the apparent bivariate relationship between GPR and purchase intention may be accounted for by variance GPR shares with the other predictors, though that shared variance is small: GPR correlates negligibly with Green Trust (r = -0.006) and only weakly with Environmental & Health Consciousness (r = 0.162; Table 4.3.3b), so shared variance alone

does not fully explain why the effect becomes non-significant, and the more defensible conclusion is that GPR simply does not independently predict purchase intention in this sample.

The most strongly rated GPR item was difficulty in verifying whether a product is truly green or clean (mean 3.44), which was in line with Akerlof's (1970) information asymmetry argument, and with Chen and Chang (2013), who found that difficulty in verifying whether a product is truly green or clean is one of the most important barriers to green purchase behaviour. Green Trust and Green Perceived Risk are not significantly correlated in this sample ($r = -0.006$, $p = .939$, 95% CI [-0.162, 0.150]). This does not establish that no relationship exists. The interval remains compatible with a small negative association of the kind that Pavlou and Fygenson (2006) describe for e-commerce, and rules out only associations of moderate size or larger. What the data fail to show is the suppression pathway that model predicts, in which higher trust lowers perceived risk. One reading is that credence goods behave differently here: because the environmental claims attached to green beauty products cannot be verified after purchase any more easily than before it, trust in a brand may not reduce the risk a consumer attaches to the category.

The Green Purchase Intention data shows a positive profile with all the six items (mean range 3.45-3.94), including the willingness to pay a higher price for trusted products (mean 3.74), which is contrary to the generally held notion that price is the main barrier to green beauty in India. This finding needs qualification on four points: a mean of 3.74 on a 5-point scale with a midpoint of 3.00 reflects modest agreement rather than enthusiasm; the item is conditional on trusting the specific product, so it cannot speak to price resistance in general; stated willingness to pay is hypothetical, and the gap between hypothetical and revealed willingness to pay is well documented in the literature; and the sample is affluent. Almost half of respondents (47.9%) already spend more than ₹2,500 a month on this category, and 45.4% report a monthly household income above ₹1,00,000. Income should be read with care, since 43.6% declined to disclose it, so that figure rests on the 92 respondents who answered, of whom 74 fall in the highest band. A sample selected on spending cannot by itself overturn a claim about price sensitivity in the wider market.

The overall results indicate that the green beauty consumer in this sample is health-motivated, moderately trusting, digitally and professionally informed, and moderately willing to pay a premium where trust is already established. The implications of this are clear for brands looking to expand in this market: health and safety messaging should be at the crux of communication strategies, with the ability to back up claims with credible eco-certifications, while social media, dermatologist endorsement and peer advocacy mechanisms should maintain long term trust and purchase engagement (Bhatia & Kapoor, 2022; Ottman, 2011; Mishra & Sharma, 2021).

The results of this study have several implications in the context of green and clean beauty brands, marketers, and policymakers in the Indian market. First, since health and safety consciousness (EHC) is the most significant determinant of green purchase intention ($\beta = 0.509$, $p < .001$), green beauty companies should focus on communicating safety information about product ingredients and their effects on health before conveying environmental information. Stressing the fact that it is free from harmful chemicals, has clear ingredient disclosure, and is recommended by dermatologists will have a stronger impact on the Indian consumer population, which is mostly health-motivated (Joshi & Rahman, 2015;

Moser, 2015). Given that roughly a fifth (21.5%) of respondents said that they would rely on brands endorsed by professionals, such as dermatologists and health professionals, it would be wise for brands to team up with these individuals.

Second, the average Green Trust (GT) scores and the genuine majority (84 of 163 respondents, mean 3.44) who find it difficult to verify whether a product is truly green or clean signal the need for some kind of credible third-party certifications, so brands can't just let the highly health-conscious consumers build trust organically. By contrast, direct greenwashing concern (mean 3.09, only 0.09 above the neutral midpoint) is more divided — 56 respondents agree or strongly agree, 48 disagree or strongly disagree, and 59 are neutral, so just over a third express concern; the verification-difficulty finding above is the stronger basis for the certification argument that follows. To establish consumer confidence, brands should strive to obtain international certifications like ECOCERT, COSMOS, or USDA Organic and prominently feature them on their packaging and digital channels (Bhatia & Kapoor, 2022). QR code-based ingredient traceability systems and blockchain-backed supply chain transparency could also help alleviate the issue of verification that consumers have as pointed out in the GPR analysis (Akerlof, 1970; Delmas & Burbano, 2011). Third, social media (27.6%), friends/family (22.1%), and dermatologist recommendations (21.5%) are, in that order, the leading information channels, underscoring the need for a multi-channel strategy that integrates an influencer marketing approach, professional endorsement and community-driven advocacy. Brands need to be careful in creating a genuine partnership with both influencers and dermatologists that is based on scientific research and not on unverified claims about being environmentally friendly that could further contribute to the greenwashing trend. While there is no evidence of any channel bias in the decisions of long-term users, it indicates that loyalty programmes, professional partnerships, and referral incentives can all maintain engagement of existing customers and open up new networks of consumers (Kapferer & Bastien, 2017; Mishra & Sharma, 2021). Kapferer and Bastien's (2017) luxury-strategy framework is invoked specifically for the affluent, middle-to-high-expenditure segment of this sample (47.9% already spending more than ₹2,500 a month on this category), where exclusivity and status-signaling dynamics they describe are more plausibly relevant to loyalty-building than they would be for the mass market as a whole.

Fourth, willingness to pay a premium for a trusted product drew modest agreement in this sample (mean 3.74 against a midpoint of 3.00). Given the affluence of the sample and the conditional wording of the item, this supports a cautious reading: price resistance may be weaker than assumed among consumers who already trust a brand and already spend in the category, and it says nothing about the wider market. Value-for-money messaging and trust-building efforts may usefully be targeted at the middle-expenditure segment (₹1,001-₹5,000 per month), which accounts for just over half of respondents in the current study. Fifth, Indian policy and regulation should consider adopting standardised and legally binding definitions of 'green' and 'clean' beauty and introducing compulsory certification for such products. Verification difficulty in the present study points to the same gap. A majority of respondents (84 of 163, mean 3.44) reported that they find it difficult to establish whether a beauty product is genuinely green or clean, and direct concern about greenwashing was divided rather than absent. The spread of definitions respondents gave in Section 4.2.1, with 36.2% naming natural ingredients and 28.8% naming freedom from harmful chemicals, is consistent with a category that carries no agreed standard. Consumers cannot resolve claims

that have no standard definition behind them. Clear regulatory frameworks would benefit consumers and ethical brands (Bhatia & Kapoor, 2022; Delmas & Burbano, 2011).

6. CONCLUSION

This study explored the association between consumer trust and purchase intention for green and clean beauty products among women consumers in Ahmedabad, India, with a final descriptive sample of 163 women recruited through channels restricted to women (see Section 3), of whom 127 (78%) had their gender inferred from the recruitment channel rather than directly measured. Based on the theory of Chen (2010) and Ajzen (1991), and on the descriptive statistics, item means, reliability analysis, and multiple linear regression, the following findings are proposed, which can be used both in theory and practice in green marketing.

It also shows that Environmental and Health Consciousness (EHC) has the largest standardized coefficient among the three predictors of Green Purchase Intention (GPI) ($\beta = 0.509$, $p < .001$), followed by Green Trust (GT; $\beta = 0.355$, $p < .001$) in the Indian green beauty market. Their 95% confidence intervals overlap (GT: 0.235-0.475; EHC: 0.387-0.630), and no formal test of the difference between the two coefficients was conducted, so the data support only the claim that both are significant predictors and that EHC has the larger point estimate. However, Green Perceived Risk (GPR) was not an independent significant predictor when GT and EHC were added to the model ($\beta = 0.079$, $p = .134$), though it does show a weak but significant zero-order correlation with GPI ($r = 0.159$, $p = .046$). The non-significant relation between GT and GPR ($r = -0.006$, $p = .939$, 95% CI [-0.162, 0.150]) indicates that, in this sample, the two constructs are not measurably related; because GPR is not itself a significant predictor of purchase intention, it is not established as a separate antecedent alongside trust, and the finding is better described as a failure to support a sequential trust-risk pathway (Pavlou & Fygenson, 2006) than as a contradiction of it — the confidence interval is compatible with a small negative association of the kind that literature predicts, and rules out only associations of moderate size or larger. This points to the complex nature of consumer decision-making in credence goods markets (Akerlof, 1970).

Green Trust is statistically significant in predicting purchase intention, but the absolute value is moderate (GT means 3.08-3.41), the lowest being the general credibility of environmental claims, which is related to the greenwashing anxiety and verification difficulty that characterizes the category. This aligns with the study by Delmas and Burbano (2011), and Bhatia and Kapoor (2022), which highlighted that the first step of any brand involved in the green beauty category is to build a credible and verifiable green identity.

Green Purchase Intention was positive and consistently high across all six items measured, including modest agreement with paying a higher price for trusted products (GPI mean 3.74), a figure that should be read alongside the affluence of the sample and the hypothetical form of the item. The intention to spend more overall had a relatively low mean score (3.45) but even that was positive. Skincare is the largest domain of green/clean beauty consumption (73.0%), the leading information sources are social media (27.6%), friends/family (22.1%), and dermatologist recommendations (21.5%, third rather than joint first;

"beauticians" is not a response option in the instrument and has been removed), and the typical green/clean beauty consumer in this sample is middle-aged, highly educated, married, and self-employed or a business owner, all features of the premium market segment reported in the literature.

This study suffers from certain limitations. A restriction on generalisation of the findings is that only urban respondents in a single city, Ahmedabad, reached through the researcher's own snowball-sampling network, were surveyed. Consumer attitudes and purchase intentions are measured at one time only and can change over time. Also, responses are self-reported and may be biased or socially desirable. Gender was not directly measured for 127 of the 163 respondents (78%) due to a survey instrument change during data collection; inclusion as female was inferred from the recruitment channel rather than confirmed, which bears on the study's claims about women consumers specifically. The analytic sample used in the regression (N = 158) is smaller than the descriptive sample (N = 163) because of item-level missing data on the Environmental and Health Consciousness scale (see Sections 3 and 4.2.11). The five respondents excluded on that scale have a lower Green Trust mean than those retained (1.91 against 3.29, $p = .016$), so the missingness is not independent of trust, although five cases cannot materially affect the estimates. Approximately 27.6% of respondents reported never having used green/clean beauty products and 16.6% reported never purchasing them, falling outside the study's stated inclusion criteria; the instrument applied no screening logic and this was not corrected at the analysis stage. The monthly-expenditure item (Section 4.2.6) offered no ₹0 or not-applicable band, so non-purchasers were nonetheless recorded as spending money on the category; this is an instrument design limitation rather than a data-quality error. Green Perceived Value was collected but not hypothesised, and enters only an exploratory model reported in Section 4.3.

The practical implications detailed in Section 5 (health-anchored communication, third-party certification, multi-channel information partnerships, and regulatory standardisation) are the primary contribution of this study to green beauty brand strategy and are not repeated here to avoid duplication.

Future studies should continue this research using a longitudinal study to examine how trust and purchase intention change over time, using qualitative methods to better understand the subjective meanings which consumers ascribe to green beauty claims, and finally, using a fully self-reported, gender-screened sample to validate the composition of the sample used in the initial phase of data collection in the present study. A bigger sample size in different regions could also increase the generalisability of the results to the different types of urban and rural consumers in India.

REFERENCES

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2), 179–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Akerlof, G. A. (1970). The market for lemons: Quality uncertainty and the market mechanism. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 84(3), 488–500. https://doi.org/10.2307/1879431

Bhatia, R., & Kapoor, S. (2022). Eco-certifications and consumer trust in green beauty: Evidence from India. Journal of Sustainable Marketing, 3(1), 44–62. https://doi.org/10.51300/JSM-2022-64

Bryman, A. (2016). Social research methods (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Charter, M., & Polonsky, M. J. (Eds.). (2017). Greener marketing: A global perspective on greening marketing practice. Routledge.

Chen, Y.-S. (2010). The drivers of green brand equity: Green brand image, green satisfaction, and green trust. Journal of Business Ethics, 93(2), 307–319. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0223-9

Chen, Y.-S., & Chang, C.-H. (2013). Greenwash and green trust: The mediation effects of green consumer confusion and green perceived risk. Journal of Business Ethics, 114(3), 489–500. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1360-0

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The drivers of greenwashing. California Management Review, 54(1), 64–87. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64

Dwyer, F. R., Schurr, P. H., & Oh, S. (1987). Developing buyer–seller relationships. Journal of Marketing, 51(2), 11–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298705100202

Eze, U. C., & Ndubisi, N. O. (2013). Green buyer behavior: Evidence from Asia continents. Journal of Asian and African Studies, 48(4), 413–426. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021909613493602

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research. Addison-Wesley.

Follows, S. B., & Jobber, D. (2000). Environmentally responsible purchase behaviour: A test of a consumer model. European Journal of Marketing, 34(5/6), 723–746. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560010322009

Gefen, D., Karahanna, E., & Straub, D. W. (2003). Trust and TAM in online shopping: An integrated model. MIS Quarterly, 27(1), 51–90. https://doi.org/10.2307/30036519

Grand View Research. (2023). Organic personal care market size, share & trends analysis report. Grand View Research. https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/organic-personal-care-market

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). Multivariate data analysis (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Hameed, I., Waris, I., & ul Haq, M. A. (2021). Predicting eco-conscious consumer behavior using theory of planned behavior in Pakistan. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 28(9), 11392–11404. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-11337-x

Joshi, Y., & Rahman, Z. (2015). Factors affecting green purchase behaviour and future research directions. International Strategic Management Review, 3(1–2), 128–143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ism.2015.04.001

Kapferer, J.-N., & Bastien, V. (2017). The luxury strategy: Break the rules of marketing to build luxury brands (2nd ed.). Kogan Page.

Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. Journal of Marketing, 57(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299305700101

Kim, H.-Y., & Chung, J.-E. (2011). Consumer purchase intention for organic personal care products. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 28(1), 40–47. https://doi.org/10.1108/07363761111101930

Loureiro, S. M. C., & Kaufmann, H. R. (2012). Explaining love of a brand: Emotions and motivations. International Journal of Business Administration, 3(2), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijba.v3n2p1

Malhotra, N. K. (2020). Marketing research: An applied orientation (7th ed.). Pearson Education.

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. Academy of Management Review, 20(3), 709–734. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080335

Mintel. (2022). Clean beauty trends report 2022. Mintel Group.

Mishra, P., & Sharma, P. (2021). Green marketing: Challenges and opportunities for business. Journal of Marketing Development and Competitiveness, 15(2), 54–67.

Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. Journal of Marketing, 58(3), 20–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299405800302

Moser, A. K. (2015). Thinking green, buying green? Drivers of pro-environmental purchasing behavior. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 32(3), 167–175. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-08-2014-1099

Ottman, J. A. (2011). The new rules of green marketing: Strategies, tools, and inspiration for sustainable branding. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Pavlou, P. A. (2003). Consumer acceptance of electronic commerce: Integrating trust and risk with the technology acceptance model. International Journal of Electronic Commerce, 7(3), 101–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/10864415.2003.11044275

Pavlou, P. A., & Fygenson, M. (2006). Understanding and predicting electronic commerce adoption: An extension of the theory of planned behavior. MIS Quarterly, 30(1), 115–143. https://doi.org/10.2307/25148720

Peattie, K. (2010). Green consumption: Behavior and norms. Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 35(1), 195–228. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-032609-094328

Pudaruth, S., Juwaheer, T. D., & Seewoo, Y. D. (2015). Gender-based differences in understanding the purchasing patterns of eco-friendly cosmetics and beauty care products in Mauritius. Social Responsibility Journal, 11(1), 179–198. https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-04-2013-0049

Sharma, A., & Kushwaha, G. S. (2019). Green marketing and its impact on consumer behavior: A study with special reference to Uttarakhand. International Journal of Business and Management Research, 9(2), 123–136.

Stern, P. C. (2000). New environmental theories: Toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behavior. Journal of Social Issues, 56(3), 407–424. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00175

Wu, P. C. S., & Chen, M. L. (2014). The role of brand credibility on the relationship between green brand image and green purchase intention. International Journal of Business and Management, 9(5), 58–66.

Appendix A. Survey Instrument

Reproduced in administered order. All construct items were rated on a five-point Likert scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

Preamble as administered: This questionnaire is part of an academic research study examining how trust influences purchase intention for green/clean beauty products among women. Responses are anonymous and used solely for research purposes. There are no right or wrong answers.

Section 1. Demographic information

1. What is your age group? 18–24 / 25–34 / 35–44 / 45–54 / 55 and above

2. What is your highest level of education? High school or below / Undergraduate (pursuing or completed) / Postgraduate (pursuing or completed) / Professional degree (e.g. CA, MBA, LLB)

3. What is your current occupation? Student / Salaried employee / Self-employed or business owner / Homemaker / Other

4. What is your approximate monthly household income? Less than ₹25,000 / ₹25,001–₹50,000 / ₹50,001–₹1,00,000 / More than ₹1,00,000 / Prefer not to say

5. What is your marital status? Single or unmarried / Married / Other

5a. What is your gender? Male / Female / Other

Note. Item 5a was added to the instrument after data collection had begun and was answered by 58 of the 185 responses received. The 22 respondents who identified as male were excluded, giving the analytic sample of 163. The remaining 127 responses were collected before the item was added; their inclusion rests on the recruitment channel, as described in Section 3 and in the Limitations.

Section 2. Awareness and usage

6. Which of the following best describes green/clean beauty products according to you? Products made with natural or environmentally friendly ingredients / Products free from harmful chemicals and toxins / Products that are cruelty-free, organic, or sustainably produced / Products marketed as eco-friendly but similar to regular cosmetics / Not sure about the meaning of green/clean beauty products

7. How long have you been using green/clean beauty products? I have not used them / Less than 6 months / 6 months–1 year / 1–3 years / More than 3 years

8. How often do you purchase green/clean beauty products? Never / Once a year or less / 2–4 times a year / 5–12 times a year / More than 12 times a year

9. Which categories of green/clean beauty products do you use most? (Select all that apply) Skincare (cleanser, moisturizer, serum, sunscreen) / Haircare (shampoo, conditioner, oil) / Personal care (body wash, deodorant, oral care) / Makeup and cosmetics (foundation, lipstick, eye makeup) / Fragrances

10. What is your primary source of information about green/clean beauty products? (Select one) Social media or influencers / Friends or family / Online reviews or blogs / Dermatologist or professional recommendation / In-store browsing or retail staff / Advertisements (TV, print, digital)

11. How much do you typically spend per month on green/clean beauty products? Less than ₹500 / ₹500–₹1,000 / ₹1,001–₹2,500 / ₹2,501–₹5,000 / More than ₹5,000

Section 3. Green Perceived Value (GPV)

GPV1. Green/clean beauty products provide good value for money considering their environmental benefits.

GPV2. I feel I am making the right choice by purchasing green/clean beauty products because of their positive environmental impact.

GPV3. The environmental functions and performance of green/clean beauty products meet my expectations.

GPV4. I choose green/clean beauty products because they are less harmful to my health compared to conventional products.

GPV5. Overall, I believe green/clean beauty products deliver more benefits than conventional alternatives.

Section 4. Green Perceived Risk (GPR)

GPR1. There is a chance that green/clean beauty products will not perform as well as they claim.

GPR2. I am concerned that green/clean beauty products may not deliver the results I expect.

GPR3. I worry that green/clean beauty brands might be engaging in greenwashing (making misleading environmental claims).

GPR4. It is difficult for me to verify whether a beauty product is genuinely green/clean.

GPR5. Purchasing green/clean beauty products feels risky because the higher price may not be justified.

Section 5. Green Trust (GT)

GT1. I believe the environmental claims made by green/clean beauty brands are generally trustworthy.

GT2. I trust that green/clean beauty products are genuinely environmentally friendly.

GT3. The environmental reputation of a green/clean beauty brand meets my expectations.

GT4. Green/clean beauty brands keep their promises about environmental commitments.

GT5. I trust the ingredient information provided on green/clean beauty product labels.

GT6. I trust eco-labels and certifications (for example organic, cruelty-free, vegan) on beauty products.

GT7. I feel confident about the safety of green/clean beauty products for long-term use.

Section 6. Green Purchase Intention (GPI)

GPI1. I intend to purchase green/clean beauty products in the near future.

GPI2. I will choose green/clean beauty products over conventional alternatives when available.

GPI3. I am willing to pay a premium price for green/clean beauty products that I trust.

GPI4. I plan to increase my spending on green/clean beauty products.

GPI5. I intend to repurchase green/clean beauty products that I have been satisfied with.

GPI6. I would recommend green/clean beauty products to friends and family.

Section 7. Environmental Concern and Health Consciousness (EHC)

EC1. I am concerned about the environmental impact of beauty and personal care products.

EC2. I actively look for beauty products that are environmentally sustainable.

EC3. Environmental issues influence my choice of beauty products.

HC1. I prefer beauty products that contain fewer harmful chemicals.

HC2. Health concerns are a major reason I choose green/clean beauty products.

HC3. I check ingredient lists before buying beauty products to ensure they are safe.

Note. Twenty-nine Likert items were administered across the five constructs. Item tables in Section 4.2 present items in descending order of mean, which differs from the administered order shown here. No screening logic was applied to enforce the inclusion criteria described in Section 3.