













data were not normal ,so Non- parametric test has been done. In Non- parametric test Men-Whitney test and Kurscol's Walles test has been conducted. Correlation analysis was done to check the relation between the predictors and dependent variables. Multiple regression analysis was used for testing hypothesis. ANOVA was used to check the overall fitness of model. The result of analysis has been properly tabulated, analyzed and interpreted.

## **Regression Model**

$$Y=a+b_1X_1+b_2X_2+b_3X_3$$

Where

Y= Consumer Purchasing Intension

X1=Cost Effectiveness

X2=Benefit

X3=Promotional Strategy

## **Inferential statistics**

Based on the study framework, this study attempts to test the following alternative hypothesis:

H1: Gender has a direct significant impact on consumer's purchasing intension towards Green product.

H2: Education has a direct significant impact on consumer's purchasing intension towards Green product.

H3: Occupation has a direct significant impact on consumer's purchasing intension towards Green product.

H4: Cost effectiveness has a direct significant impact on consumer's purchasing intension towards Green product.

H5: Benefit has a direct significant impact on consumer's purchasing intension towards Green product.

H6: Promotional Strategy has a direct significant impact on consumer's purchasing intension towards Green product.

## IV. Results and Conclusion

### Demographic profile

The table 1 depicts the demographic profile of the respondents which includes information on Gender, Education, Occupation, features and Information. As the Gender of respondents is concerned, 67.7% is female and 32.3% is male. Education wise, SIC/see, undergraduate, graduate, masters level respondents are 0.7%, 15.6%, 55.9%, 22.9% respectively. Occupation wise student, job holder, un-employed, business, others respondents are 30.2%, 32.3%, 1.4%, 32.6%, 3.5% respectively. Features wise Healthy and Safe, Made with natural ingredients, Energy efficiency, Eco friendly packaging, Reusable respondents are 29.9%, 14.2%, 17.4%, 14.9%, 23.6% respectively. Information wise, Advertisement, Word of mouth, Friends, Past experience, Shopper Response respondents are 39.6%, 17.4%, 13.5%, 18.8%, 10.8% respectively.

**Table No.1 Respondents Profile**

#### Gender

Demographic variables	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	195	67.7
Male	93	32.3
Total	288	100.0
<b>Education</b>		
SLC/SEE	2	0.7
Undergraduate	45	15.6
Graduate	161	55.9
Master level	66	22.9
Total	288	100.0
<b>Occupation</b>		
Student	87	30.2
Job holder	93	32.3
Unemployed	4	1.4
Business	94	32.6
Other	10	3.5
Total	288	100.0



<b>Features</b>		
Healthy and Safe	86	29.9
Made with natural ingredients	41	14.2
Energy efficiency		
Eco friendly packaging	50	17.21
Reusable	43	14.9
Total	68	23.6
	288	100.0
<b>Information</b>		
Advertisement	144	39.6
Word of Mouth	50	17.4
Friends	39	13.5
Past Experience	54	18.8
Shopper Response	31	10.8
Total	288	100.0

## Reliability Test

The reliability of used measurement scales were tested using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The overall reliability of the response on 4 variables has been tested by using Cronbach's alpha. Cronbach's alpha of all 4 variables Consumer Purchase Intension, Cost Effectiveness , Benefit And Promotional Strategy which is .806,0.727,0.813,0.779 Respectively which is acceptable and it indicates that the internal consistency of variables is good. (Cortina, 1993)

**Table 2: Reliability Test**

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha
Consumer Purchase Intension	.806
Cost Effectiveness	.727
Benefit	.813
Promotional Strategy	.779

Note: Table 2. Reliability test has been adopted from output of Data Analysis

**Table 3: Descriptive Statistics**

Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Cost Effectiveness	288	8.2951	1.30653
Benefit	288	14.8715	3.65891
Promotional Strategy	288	12.1458	2.10845

The table 3 shows the descriptive statistic of the response of participants towards the factor under study. The mean value of Cost Effectiveness, Benefit, Promotional Strategy are 8.2951, 14.8715, 12.1458 respectively which is near to 4 (labeled agree in measurement scale). This indicates that the response of Consumer Purchasing Intension with Cost Effectiveness, Benefit and Promotional Strategy is inclined towards agree. All the independent variables have standard

Statements	Consumer Purchase Intension
Mann-Whitney U	8455.500
Wilcoxon W	27565.500
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.343

deviation above 1. It means that the mean result is not accurate. The mean value of Benefit is reported highest as 14.8715. This shows that the Benefit is greater determinants for affecting consumers purchasing intension towards green product.

### Test for the difference in Gender with regard to factor Influencing Consumer Purchasing Intension

**Table NO 5: Mann Whitney U test based on Gender**

In the Table 4 the P value is 0.343 is more than 0.05 it means we accept Null Hypothesis. Hence we conclude that there is no significant relationship between Gender and Consumer Purchasing Intension at 5% level of significance. Hence we conclude that Gender does not effect on the Purchasing Intension of Green Product.

### Table 5: Test for the difference in Education with regard to factor Influencing Consumer Purchasing Intension

Statements	Consumer Purchase Intension
Chi-Square	1.954
Asymp. Sig.	.582

In the table 5 the P-value ( $P > 0.05$ ) is 0.582 which is more than 0.05 it means we accept Null Hypothesis. Hence we conclude that there is no significant relationship between Education and Consumer Purchasing Intension at 5% level of significance. Hence we conclude that Education does not effect on the Purchasing Intension of Green Product.

**Table 6: Test for the difference in Occupation with regard to factor Influencing Consumer Purchasing Intension**

Statements	Consumer Purchase Intension
Chi-Square	5.665
Df	4
Asymp.Sig	.226

Since ( $P > 0.05$ ) P-value is 0.582 which is more than 0.05 it means we accept Null Hypothesis. Hence we conclude that there is no significant relationship between Occupation and Consumer Purchasing Intension at 5% level of significance. Hence we conclude that Occupation does not effect on the Purchasing Intension of Green Product.

### Correlation Analysis

**Table No. 7: Inter Items Correlation**

Variables	Consumer Purchase Intension	Cost Effectiveness	Benefit	Promotional Strategy
Consumer Purchase Intension	1.000			
Cost effectiveness	.232**	1.000		
Benefit	.443**	.472**	1.000	
Promotional Strategy	.657**	.421**	.633**	1.000

Since from the above table no.7 it can be seen that the correlation analysis (r)value for all variables i.e Consumer purchase intension, Cost effectiveness, Benefit, Promotional Strategy are 0.657,0.421,0.633,1 respectively which means there is strong positive linear relationship between Consumer purchase intension, Cost effectiveness, Benefit, Promotional Strategy.

### Test of Multi Collinearity

**Table No. 8 Collinearity Statistic**

Model	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
Cost Effectiveness	.764	1.308
Benefit	.555	1.801
Promotional Strategy	.591	1.691

a. Dependent Variable: Consumer purchase intension

Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and tolerance measures the multi-collinearity among the independent variables.

It is denoted by:

$$VIF_j = 1/1-R_j^2$$

The above table shows that tolerance values are more than 0.1 and value of VIF is less than 10 in all independent variables and moderating variables. So regression model is free from multi Collinearity.

### Table 9: ANOVA

#### Multiple Regression Analysis

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	727.240	3	242.413	56.177	.000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	1225.507	284	4.315		

a. Dependent Variable: Consumers purchase Intension

b. Predictors: (Constant), Cost effectiveness, Benefit, Promotional Strategy

### Model Summary

$$Y=11.887+0.004X_1+0.068X_2+0.674X_3$$

Std Error of the Estimate (S.E) = 4.315

F value = 56.177

Correlation Coefficient (r) = 0.616

Coefficient of determination (r<sup>2</sup>) = 0.372

Table no. 9 exhibits that F- value and p- value of the model is 56.177 and 0.000 respectively which is significant at 5% level of significance. So the model is fitted linearly. R square of the model is 0.372 or 37.2% which means 37.2% of variation in consumers purchasing intension is explained by variation in independent variables (Cost Effectiveness, Benefit And Promotional Strategy) .

**Table no 10: Regression Analysis**

Model	B	Std. Error	t	Sig
Constant ( $\alpha$ )	11.887	.901	13.187	.000
Cost Effectiveness( $\beta_1$ )	.004	.107	.035	.972
Benefit ( $\beta_2$ )	.068	.045	1.520	.129
Promotional Strategy ( $\beta_3$ )	.674	.076	8.911	.000

**Model**

$$Y=11.887+0.004X_1+0.068X_2+0.674X_3$$

The result of the regression shows the value of R2 is 0.372 which means that 37.2 % variation in Consumer Purchasing Intension is explained by Cost Effectiveness, Benefit and Promotional Strategy. The rest 62.8% of Consumer Purchasing Intension is explained by .others factors.

**Findings**

Chi-square analysis of demographic variables and with other Independent variable with Consumer Purchasing Intension

Variables	P-value	Remark
Gender	0.343	Insignificant
Education	0.582	Insignificant
Occupation	0.582	Insignificant
Cost effectiveness	0.972	Insignificant
Benefit	0.129	Insignificant
Promotional Strategy	0.00	Significant

**Conclusion**

The study found that Cost Effectiveness, Benefit and Promotional Strategy are the major factors that influence Consumer Purchasing Intension towards Green Product. As these Factors tends to Increase the Purchasing intension toward Green product. Hence the study found that Cost Effectiveness and Benefits are not affecting on the purchase intension of the green product. It is found that the key factor that plays an important role consumer purchasing intension is

promotional strategy. So promotional strategy must be focused in order to increase the Consumer purchasing intension.

## Works Cited

1. (n.d.).
2. (n.d.). Retrieved from Explore our extensive annotated list of green purchasing related websites.: <https://www.stopwaste.org/at-work/green-purchasing/green-purchasing-benefits>
3. Addela, S. S.-Y. (2020, 06 28). CONSUMERS' INTENTION FOR GREEN PURCHASE: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS ON. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(8), 2394-5125 .
4. Chang, N. & Fong, C. (2010). Green Products Quality. In G. C. Image, *Green Customer satisfaction and Green Customer Loyalty* (pp. 2836 - 2844). nd: African Journal of Business Management.
5. cherian jand jacob,J. (2012). a study of consumers attitude towards environment friendly . *Green Marketing*.
6. Cherian, J. &. (2012). "Green Marketing. *A Study of Consumers' Attitude towards Environment Friendly*, 1913035X20100402.002.
7. cortina, J. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *JOURNAL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY*, 78(1),98.
8. Cortina, J. (1993). What is coefficient Alpha?An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of applied psychology* , 78(1), 98.
9. Gan, C., Zhiyou, M.C., Tran, D. A. Cohen & W. Xiangxiang. (2014). "Consumer attitudes toward the Purchaseof Organic Products. *Faculty of Agribusiness & Commerce*,, 15.
10. Gurusamy, P. (2013). Green Marketing-An Over View. *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, Vol-3(2), 154-.
11. Hallin, P. (. (1995). "Environmental concern and environmental behaviour in Foley, a small town in Minnesota. *Environment and Behaviour*, 27(4), 558-578.
12. Hess, E. & Timen, P. (2008). *Environmental Friendliness - A Marketing Strategy*. Internationella Handelshogskolan Hogskolan Jonkoping.: A Marketing Strategy, Master Thesis within Business Administration.
13. Johri, L M., Sahasakmontri, K.,. (1998). green marketing of cosmetic and toiletries in thailand. *journal of consumer marketing*, 15(3).
14. Khedkar, E. B. (2015). "Green Marketing. *Concept, Awareness and Linkage with Consumer Purchase decision*, 4(1), 35-43.
15. Laroche, M. B.-F. (2002). Cultural differences in environmental knowledge, attitudes and behaviours of Canadian consumers". *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*,, 19(3), 267-283.

16. Laroche, M., Bergeron, J., Tomiul, M., and Barbaro-Forleo G. . (2001). Targeting consumers who are willing to pay more for environmentally friendly products”. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 16(6), 503-520.
17. Maheshwari, A. & Malhotra, G. (2011). Green Marketing: A Study on Indian Youth. *International Journal of Management and Strategy*, 2(3), 1-15.
18. McCarty, J.A. and Shrum, L.J. (2001). “The influence of individualism, collectivism and locus of control on environmental beliefs and behaviour. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 20(1), 93-104.
19. Morwitz. ( 2012, January 1). Consumers' Purchase Intentions and their Behavior. *Foundations and Trends® in Marketing*, 7, 181-230.
20. rayhan,A.i,khan,A.I.,AND Islam,M. (2014). factors affecting green marketing in Bhangladesh. *global journal of managment and Business Research*, 14(1), 24-40.
21. Shrum, L. J., McCarthy, J. A., Lowrey, T M.,. (1995). Buyer characteristics of green consume and their implication for advertising strategy. *journal of advertising*, 24(2).
22. Thapa. (2008). *Dictionary of Marketing*. Kathmandu: Buddha Publisher and Distributor Pvt. Ltd.
23. trillo, c. (2021, may 18). *promotion strategy*. Retrieved from evinex: <https://www.evinex.com/promotion-strategy/>
24. Whitlar, D., Geurts, M., & Swenson, M. (1993). New product forecasting with a purchase intension survey. *The Journal of Business Forecasting Methods System and system*, 12(3), 1-18.
25. yamane, T. (1967). *Statistical*.
26. Yam-Tang, E. a. (1998). “Purchasing behaviours and perceptions of environmentally harmful product. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 16(6), 356-362.