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Abstract
Collaborative consumption proposes fruitful avenues to achieve profitability and ensure environmental sustainability, becoming a paramount global concern. In the current study, the purpose is to investigate and pick up the constructs of mindful consumption, ego-involvement, and social norms and determine the primary motivations for Chinese consumers to act sustainably. To investigate the moderating role of platform trust and the mediating role of impulsive buying tendency among the relationships of mindful consumption, ego-involvement, and social norms regarding buying second-hand clothing consumption intentions. PLS-SEM statistical approach has been used to investigate the model relationships by incorporating a two-step approach through the SmartPLS3 statistical package. Online survey methodology was adopted to collect data from Chinese buyers of second-hand clothing of Xian Yu and Zhuan Zhuan online platforms. The study has proved the significant impact of mindful consumption, ego-involvement, and social norms on buying intentions of second-hand clothing. Furthermore, the study also supported the moderating role of platform trust and mediating role of impulsive buying tendency. Although the moderating and mediating impact remain insignificant on mindful consumption, as perceived. Theoretical and practical implications are given in accordance with the study.
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Introduction
Humanity is undergoing more nuanced threats due to the rising number of environmental hazards and disasters. Humans have started surrounding themselves with material belongings to reflect their societal status and high-end thoughts (Dhandra, 2019). In turn, the change in humans is changing the environment. Humans are polluting this planet at a high pace that 1 day when the last tree will cut down, we will realize what we did with ourselves. As technology is progressing day by day, we are polluting our planet at the same speed, and in the name of our needs, we are depleting our resources (Wamsler & Brink, 2018). So, the scholars and practitioners of the current era started speaking about this issue and raised the concept of sustainability to save the planet from disability and preserve it for future generations (Jung et al., 2020). Since established environmental response approaches are unable to resolve them, new measures, and social mores are needed to stimulate a profound change toward sustainability (Yang & Ha-Brookshire, 2019). Burgeoning demand for resources has led to a significant and probably irreversible loss to life diversity. And it would be easier to reach sustainability by mechanisms that are less reliant on the consumption of new products, specifically apparel (Jung et al., 2020).

The founder of New York’s Wearable Collections says that disposing of clothes by flinging away is a massive waste of money that harms the environment (Tan, 2016). Textile processing damages the atmosphere by creating hazardous waste to eliminate second-hand clothing (SHC) (Bjurbäck, 2015). The reuse of SHC promotes sustainability, and in the
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21st century, a new phenomenon well embraced all over the world (Becker-Leifhold & Iran, 2018; Gan et al., 2011; Narts.org, 2017). Studies on the used clothing have revealed that SHC delivers consumers environmental, socio-economic (Watson et al., 2016), financial (Xu et al., 2014), and psychological (Tian et al., 2001) benefits. Consumers around the globe have built an increasing demand for SHC as a response to these benefits, and the trend is expected to rise in the coming years (Kestenbaum, 2017). That inference seems more realistic in the Chinese setting because 26 million tons of old clothing end up in manure every year (ChinaWaterRisk, 2011). As estimated by China Circular Economy Association (CACE), China created 20.7 million tons of textile waste in 2011. Of which only 3 million tons were recycled or reused (Qdaily.com, 2016; Chen et al., 2020; Gu et al., 2020); Xu et al. (2014) say a significant amount of SHC potential exists but is compromised by individuals’ behavior. As “China’s Sharing Economic Growth Report” 2016 estimated that China’s prospective idle SHC market would be around RMB 400 billion, substantially greater than the current transport sharing market of around RMB 150 billion (Yicai.com, 2016).

Globalism has pushed the demand for fashionable/branded clothing to the highest levels during the last few years (Jung et al., 2020). Fashion clothing production/consumption is depleting natural resources and causing unwieldy hazardous waste (Becker-Leifhold & Iran, 2018; Pedersen & Andersen, 2015). Effective/efficient resource use is one of the major challenges the apparel industry faces amid the textile waste. Therefore, new sustainable business concepts and consumption habits are developed to maximize the product life cycle (Dhandra, 2019). Collaborative consumption (CC) has emerged as an evolving sustainable business strategy that includes different business models of sharing instead of buying (Becker-Leifhold & Iran, 2018). Amid this CC development, SHC selling sites are becoming prevalent (Mhango & Niehm, 2005). The current research looks at the SHC selling sites in the apparel industry as the main business model for CC. It proposed a profitable avenue for SHC sites to achieve profitability and help ensure environmental sustainability (Jung et al., 2020). In China alone, many SHC sites like; Xian Yu, Zhan Zhan, etc., providing online platforms to buyers/sellers. However, the related theoretical and empirical literature is still inadequate to demonstrate aspects of customers’ behavioral intentions toward SHC platforms (Luo et al., 2020).

Literature circumscribed the motivating factors influencing the intention to buy SHC; however, it still does not understand why and how such factors contribute to buying intentions (Luo et al., 2020). Recent developments in psychology and neuroscience believe mindful consumption will open new pathways to sustainability (Milne et al., 2020). However, the role of mindful consumption in environmental mitigation has been overlooked, and related academic studies barely emerged. We suggest that mindful consumption can promote sustainable adaptation to the environment (Dhandra, 2019). Chu et al. (2019) work un wraps this issue. It presents an interconnecting viewpoint that mindful consumption affects Chinese consumers, a characteristic of Chinese culture based on Confucius belief, which is associated with the Chinese form of Buddhism (Milne et al., 2020). Our work focuses on the idea that people are actively engaged with the physical world (Gupta & Ogden, 2006), care about natural, economic, and social sustainability, and demonstrate behavior that reduces damage to nature. At the same time, the literature lacks an extensive investigation about consumers’ mindful consumption behavior (Milne et al., 2020), especially in buying SHC.

DeCharms (1968) classified this trend as linked to ego-involvement, a condition in which self-esteem is challenged, and action is driven by a desire to maintain or improve self-esteem as the driver of SHC buying intentions (Carpenter, 2019). This research considers that consumers with a deep concern for the natural environment and economic and social well-being may show ego-involvement in shaping SHC buying intentions. Studies indicate individuals who exhibit ecological concerns are mindful consumers (Milne et al., 2020) and more likely to buy SHC. It is credence that social norms affect mindful customers (Noble et al., 2009). That is, young Chinese consumers show concern for the environment, and this concern is shared by relatives, friends, and social media so that social norms may be an essential factor in SHC buying intentions (Okur & Saricam, 2019; Xu et al., 2014). Chan and Wong (2012) claim that clothing is a part of belongings in Chinese culture and accentuates the extended self. Shared clothing with close relatives as a gift to underline the importance of the gift-giver-receiver relationship. Because of this cultural significance of SHC, our work aims to investigate whether ego-involvement, mindful consumption, and social norms are the critical influencers of SHC buying intentions. Previous studies lack considering these constructs to demonstrate comprehensively. Therefore, such constructs need to be studied from a sustainability perspective.

SHC platforms are becoming prevalent (Mhango & Niehm, 2005), where platform trust boosts users’ buying intentions (Liu & Tang, 2018). By reducing online perceived risks, trust in the platform directly affects consumer repurchase intentions (Califf et al., 2020). If consumers believe that online platforms are truthful, efficient, and fulfill their commitments (Botsman & Rogers, 2011), they are more likely to buy from them (Califf et al., 2020). However, platform trust may improve the propensity for impulsive buying. Impulsive buying tendency is considered a manifestation of general impulsiveness (Badgaiyan et al., 2016). Users aimlessly scrolling pictures of SHC on a website and then choosing to buy as an effect of trust of a website will be called impulsive buying tendency for the platform (Jung et al., 2020).

Talking about constructs of mindful consumption, ego-involvement, and social norms, it is difficult to find any
research which explains their positive relations toward buying intentions of SHC. Based on such a gap in the literature, the present study applies the attitude-intention-behavior theory to understand the phenomenon. Furthermore, it will make us understand how these factors influence SHC buying intentions. The research will also investigate the moderating role of platform trust and the mediating effect of impulsive buying tendency as the state of impulse buying tendency will eventually arise due to the trust of the platform. The motive behind conducting this study is to understand the significance of consumers’ behavioral intentions for environmental protection and concern to prevent ecological damages through changing their buying choices in the CC perspective. Therefore, the present study’s aim will be twofold; to investigate the impact of mindful consumption, ego-involvement, and social norms on buying intentions of SHC. To examines moderating role of platform trust and the mediating role of consumers’ impulsive buying tendency.

Literature Review

Second-Hand Clothing (SHC) Market in China

The textile industry’s rapid growth is one reason for China’s air pollution and water pollution (Zhang et al., 2010). Approximately 65% of global clothing is produced in China (Chinawaterrisk.org, 2011). About 90% of them have been made of mixed material; therefore, burning/dumping would emit harmful material that will cause contamination in the atmosphere (Zhang, 2013). In China, the importation of SHC is forbidden (Mofcom.gov.cn, 2002). Surprisingly, the phenomenon earned constant attention from the Chinese government in the 12th and 13th 5-year development plans (Miit.gov.cn, 2017). Economic benefit plays an essential role in SHC consumption in the Chinese context rather than environmental concern (Khan & Rundle-Thiele, 2019). Similarly, Chu et al. (2019) asserts that Chinese consumers adopted government incentives to adopt environmental-friendly care rather than environmental issues as a motivator for adoption, indicating that reasons for adopting SHC may be other than economic gain and environmental concerns only. Research also reflects the popularity of online shopping amongst young Chinese consumers (Li et al., 2017). On the other side, Xu et al. (2014) claim that young Chinese consumers are more worried about the environment and view SHC as a way to protect the environment. Khan and Rundle-Thiele (2019) contradict Xu et al. (2014) by saying that Chinese consumers are inspired to buy SHC for fashion, prestige, and often saving money. Cervellon et al. (2012) warn Chinese consumers usually hate to wear clothes used by anyone else. However, researchers later noticed a positive shift in the behavior of buying SHC, particularly among young Chinese consumers (He, 2015), as they want to follow global trends and worry about environmental protection.

Collaborative Consumption (CC)

The conception of CC is an emerging business approach from a sustainability perspective, which includes different business models based on sharing instead of owning (Becker-Leihold & Iran, 2018). More interesting is how the conception of sharing economy is changing people’s perceptions about consumption and ownership (Belk, 2014; Hamari et al., 2016). Hamari et al. (2016) have investigated enjoyment and sustainability activities as the significant motivating factors for CC participation. The renting, trading, bartering, swapping, and lending of products, services, and immaterial resources in the marketplace are included in this approach (Belk, 2014; Jiang & Tian, 2018). Because of CC’s rising trend, second-hand goods platforms are becoming prevalent (Luo et al., 2020; Mhango & Niehm, 2005). CC is listed in “Time Magazine” as one of the “10 Ideas That Will Change the World” (Walsh, 2011). Therefore, it is considered a substitute for sustainable consumption mode (Botsman & Rogers, 2011).

Based on CC’s conception, Botsman and Rogers (2011) grouped several examples into three broader categories. Foremost is “product service systems” firms and individuals that offer goods to other consumers as services instead of selling. This system enables privately owned goods of people to be rented or shared with needy individuals; therefore, it has changed the mindset of the people to use rather than own (i.e., Didi, Airbnb). The second is “redistribution markets”; it facilitates the transaction of used goods from where these are no longer needed to where these are needed for use or reuse. It includes the platforms for second-hand sales and bartering (i.e., Xian Yu, Zhuan Zhuan; in China). The third is “collaborative lifestyles,” a network that facilitates and promotes exchanging and sharing intangible goods, that is, skills, time, space, and money among people with similar nature/thoughts/needs (Perlacia et al., 2017). Scholars introduced these three prevalent CC systems (Becker-Leihold & Iran, 2018; Iran & Schrader, 2017). However, the present paper concentrates solely on “redistribution markets,” which includes sharing (without cash transfer), and selling (with cash transfer) of used or SHC among consumers. The rapid industrial revolution has generated challenges of managing the increased waste of manufacturing, so the redistribution markets are helping to resell/reuse the used/old goods instead of treating their waste. Moreover, a 10% increase in sales of SHC can save about 4% water, 3% carbon emissions, and 1% per ton of garments waste (ChinaWaterRisk, 2011). Therefore, redistribution markets are significantly helping in reducing waste generation.

Second-Hand Clothing (SHC) Buying Intentions

The literature on consumer behavior typically describes human behavior by considering intentions as the base (Ajzen, 2005). Intentions are supposed to capture driving forces
influencing human behavior. Ajzen (2001) describes the intentions as “indications of how hard people are willing to try, how much effort they are planning to exert, to perform the behavior.” Lindblom and Lindblom (2018) similarly demonstrated that intentions are the conscious motivation of an individual to exert an effort to employ a particular behavior. The stronger the intentions are to engage in a particular behavior, the greater probability of its performance (Ajzen, 2001; Lindblom & Lindblom, 2018). Furthermore, intentions are the more reliable predictor of human behavior. CC and consumers’ intentions might be assumed to have a comparatively straightforward relationship (Lindblom & Lindblom, 2018). Ajzen (2005) has described that the more individuals have a positive attitude toward a particular behavior, the stronger they intend to perform it.

Similarly, if a customer has a favorable perception about CC of SHC, more likely they have intentions to engage in this behavior (Luo et al., 2020). However, scholars agreed, several other factors may influence intentions (Ajzen, 2001). Ajzen (2005) has also argued that human behavioral intentions are ultimately their actual behavior; humans tend to behave what they actually intend to conduct (Lindblom & Lindblom, 2018). Indeed, consumer behavior literature has proved the solid relationship between intentions and behavior. Moreover, Ma and Li (2018) have found a significant shift in buying intentions of SHC among Chinese consumers, especially in the youngsters, having more concerns for environmental protection in line with the global trend. Rising environmental concerns among Chinese consumers ultimately enhance the need to utilize the SHC to contribute to environmental protection, indirectly decreasing the demand for new clothing manufacturing.

**Mindful Consumption**

Mindful means having awareness, taking notice of what is going on in the inner and outer world of oneself, without hesitating to have information or feelings of do not wish/like to be true. Zinn (1994) defined mindfulness as “paying attention in a particular way: on purpose, in the present moment, and non-judgmentally.” The purpose of the concept is to evoke positive emotions in individuals directly and enhance the feelings of affection and kindness for self and others (Dhandra, 2019). Researchers recommend that objectives, wants, motives, desires, and actions for the pursuit are not always based on deliberate thoughts and conscious choices (Milne et al., 2020; Neal et al., 2006). Instead, it is human habits to respond to dispositions by environment automatically, or human precedes actions that reflect much of his everyday life (Ericson et al., 2014). The conception of mindfulness is also associated with improved self-control (Friese et al., 2012), which may be helpful in situations where individuals/consumers are needed to choose between sustainable and persuasive unsustainable behaviors (Milne et al., 2020). Therefore, mindfulness decreases automaticity and encourages compassion, enhanced self-control, and pro-environmental values, this mental training can also promote the transformation of pro-environmental consumers’ intentions into sustainable behavior (Dhandra, 2019). Brown and Kasser (2005) investigated that happier human concerned sustainability, their intrinsic values and mindfulness are related to greater well-being and ecological behaviors.

Consumer behavior has a measurable facet of consumer behavior, which seems to matter in reality (Wamsler & Brink, 2018). There is also an intangible facet of the mentality about the behaviors, beliefs, and perceptions underlying consumption actions (Dhandra, 2019). The mentality matters in two crucial ways: attitudes and values affect consumer preferences, and they also decide how the impact from consumption is perceived, thus increasing or decreasing the probability of a related nature’s further consumption (Milne et al., 2020). To address the issue of over-consumption effectively, both actions and attitudes need to change. This transition can be accomplished through the adoption of mindful consumption. Chu et al. (2018) have demonstrated that the conception of mindful consumption has emerged from the Buddhist tradition. It can enhance awareness and enable people to focus and persistently refocus on their fundamental well-being and needs. Milne et al. (2020) demonstrated mindful consumption as the application of mindfulness.

People living a voluntarily simple life probably endorse intrinsic values, leading and encouraging sustainable behavior, and well-being. Ultimately, people are more motivated and enthusiastic toward buying and using SHC from a CC perspective (Luo et al., 2020). Amel et al. (2009) concluded that mindful consumption would be more related to sustainable behavior. They investigated in their survey related to self-reported sustainable green behavior concerning “acting with awareness” (Jin et al., 2019). It is also investigated that acting with awareness and sustainable behavior are correlated (Jacob et al., 2009). Therefore, people’s mindful consumption behavior will significantly enhance their buying intentions of SHC (Dhandra, 2019). Geiger et al. (2019) examination connects mindful consumption to SHC. Our work tests the assumption that mindful consumption would generate SHC buying intentions in Chinese consumers. Therefore, the study proposes the following hypothesis.

H1: Mindful consumption has a positive association with buying intentions of second-hand clothing.

**Ego-Involvement**

Ego-involvement is known to be one of the elided essential constructs of TPB (theory of planned behavior); it is one of the leading causes for existing research account of this concept (Conner et al., 1999). Ego-involvement could be described as “the significance and importance of a person’s concern, as exposed by its commitment and strength for that particular concern” (Sereno & Mortensen, 1969). Research
shows that ego-involvement in performing a particular behavior is correlated with individual value and firmness (Sharma et al., 2020). Some studies believe that ego-involvement is behavior-related persistence of participation (Sanchez-Franco, 2009). It is evident from previous research that ego-involvement is related to the extent that a person feels that the performance of a particular behavior is essential and meaningful, premised on the benefits and intrinsic values (Lai & Chen, 2011). So, SHC’s ego-involvement may consider customers’ degree of involvement in purchasing SHC based on their preferences, internal beliefs, and interests. Both ego-involvement and enduring involvement are similar concepts (Sánchez-Franco et al., 2011). The highly involved users have progressing claims and are more expected to develop online service preferences and commit to the online SHC platform. Such behavioral preferences lead them to have faith in SHC platforms that facilitate sustainability and ecological behavior.

Since future behavior can be predicted significantly through past behavior, it is expected that ego-involvement directly influences users’ willingness to repeat their transactions with SHC platforms, rejecting those settings that are not in line with their preferences (Sánchez-Franco & Martin-Velicia, 2011). Hence, ego-involvement may promote enduring attachment toward the use of SHC in the CC perspective, and such enduringly and highly involved users would be more loyal to such SHC platforms. As per the existing research, ego-involvement has a connection between customers and their purchasing intentions regarding purchasing SHC online, and as ego-involvement escalates into robust commitment (Muncy & Hunt, 1984). So, this vital pledge generates a sense of responsibility and accountability for the performance of a particular behavior of buying SHC online and makes them feel guilty and negligent when failing to meet the specific behavior (Cater & Cárter, 2010; Cárter & Zabkar, 2009). We believe that consumers who are profoundly concerned about the natural environment can exhibit ego-involvement influencing SHC intentions to buy. The present research advises that ego-involvement directly affects consumers’ ability to purchase SHC online again and again (Sanchez-Franco, 2009). So, the study proposes the mentioned hypothesis:

H2: Ego-involvement has a positive association with buying intentions of second-hand clothing.

**Social Norms**

Subjective norms represent social pressure’s perceived influence on a person to execute a specific behavior, whereby the importance of behavior depends upon the approval or disapproval of others (Vahdat et al., 2021). The pressure of what other people in society think an individual should perform a particular behavior in a specific situation. For instance, does either individual’s social surroundings believe that the SHC buying decision is good or not? The normative beliefs of society influence the subjective norms, which represents the beliefs of individual that, what is considered significant and appropriate behavior in a particular situation by others, that is, family, friends, colleagues, partner, and so on that they think one should comply accordingly (Vahdat et al., 2021). Therefore, significant friends’ beliefs are weighted and evaluated on friends who buy SHC brands as a beneficial thought and how they should probably listen to others’ beliefs. The TRA (theory of reasoned action) has been demonstrated as a robust theory in several contexts. Various researchers have applied this theory to several voluntary behaviors, specifically consumer behaviors, such as purchasing consumer products (Kim et al., 2015). This theory has also been applied in online (platforms) contexts, including green products buying in the context of sustainable purchasing (Ramayah et al., 2010), buying green-energy brands (Hartmann & Apaolaza-Ibáñez, 2012), and green IT products (Mishra et al., 2014).

The TRA theory assumes that subjective behavioral norms shall influence individuals’ behavioral intentions (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1977). The influence of social factors is considered one of the imperative motivators of human behavior in online platforms of social networks (Vahdat et al., 2021). Hsu and Lin (2008) have identified the social norms and community identification as essential elements to influence society’s blog acceptance rate. Furthermore, they have also pointed out that these social norms have informational and normative influences. These influences also include the effect of online platforms’ social-support mechanisms or sharing social commerce networks, including comments, referrals, recommendations, communities, forums, reviews, and ratings, as Hajli (2012) investigated. The studies investigating social influences by social network theory identified that social ties’ intensity manipulates word of mouth referrals (Brown & Reingen, 1987; Sohn, 2009).

Cervellon et al. (2012) warn Chinese buyers usually hate to wear clothes used by anyone else. Xu et al. (2014) argued that young Chinese consumers had less experience buying SHC, primarily because of the readily available low-priced new clothing on the Chinese markets, and pointed out that Chinese society leans more toward social norms (Siau & Shen, 2003). Okur and Saricam (2019) say social standards serve as a dominant influencing factor in the buying intentions of SHC, so the study focused mainly on this construct. Furthermore, the literature emphasizes that the social norms of family encourage customers’ pro-environmental actions regarding the purchase of SHC (Valle et al., 2005). In line with this rationale and the upsurges presented in the literature, we suggest that positive social norms establish positive expectations about CC through the purchase of SHC. Therefore, the study proposed the following hypothesis:

H3: Social Norms have a positive association with buying intentions of second-hand clothing.
**Online Platform Trust (Moderator)**

Mechanisms for building online trust have been found to improve confidence and impact the first-time purchasing intentions of users (Luo et al., 2020). These virtual structures might affect the website’s quality, signal the credibility of an e-seller, and establish structural assurances, the factors influencing online trust (Doney & Cannon, 1997; Kim & Ahn, 2007). Furthermore, shoppers acquire hands-on experiences through their first transaction with an e-seller in an e-marketplace and develop their own opinions of the usefulness of such mechanisms. Such perceptions can reshape buyer trust in the e-seller and the platform, which, in turn, affects customer repurchase intentions (Luo et al., 2020). Thus, in the buying phase, the perceptions of customer usefulness rather than the online trust-building mechanisms themselves affect customers’ intentions to buy (van der Cruijsen et al., 2019).

Previous studies indicate that e-seller trust and platform trust directly affect customer repurchase intentions (Mittendorf, 2016; van der Cruijsen et al., 2019) by reducing risks. If customers believe an e-seller and platform to be honest, reliable, and fulfill their promises (Luo et al., 2020), they are more likely to buy from that same (Liu & Tang, 2018; Mittendorf, 2016). Similarly, customers are more likely to return to those places on the e-market that are reliable and always have customer interests in mind (Liu & Tang, 2018). Since the literature has investigated the direct impact of trust on repurchase intentions, we focus on how trust plays a moderating role in the online platform perspective in buying SHC. An e-marketplace forms the contextual environment in which e-sellers and customers interact and conduct transactions. The platform sets rules and policies for regulating the behavior of e-sellers and identifying the problems e-sellers face (van der Cruijsen et al., 2019).

A trusted platform should include policies and procedures to reduce online shopping ambiguity (Liu & Tang, 2018), attempting to make consumers less dependent on e-seller trust when making repurchase decisions (Fang et al., 2014). Customers can rely on a platform deserving of trust to solve issues if something goes awry. Customers may have to rely mostly on e-sellers in a less trustworthy platform to avoid potential risks such as online piracy (Fang et al., 2014). Many scholars used the trust to clarify online social commerce’s buying and recommendation (Mikalef et al., 2017). Word-of-mouth through the network’s suggestions, ratings (Mikalef et al., 2017; See-To & Ho, 2014), and feedback will help create credibility (Kim & Park, 2013), a critical factor in establishing trust in social commerce (Califf et al., 2020). Al-Shbibi and Ahmad (2016) build a TAM-based model (Davis, 1989) for illustrating the acceptance of social exchange by introducing a trust factor to describe behavioral intention. Their results suggest that trust has a relatively strong effect on behavioral intention, further confirmed by e-commerce literature (Califf et al., 2020; Luo et al., 2020). Eventually, platform trust among users can enhance their impulsive buying tendency and positively improve their intentions to buy SHC from a CC perspective (Luo et al., 2020; Vahdat et al., 2021). Therefore, the present study considers platform trust as a significant moderator in influencing the relationships of the present study’s constructs. So, study demonstrates the following hypotheses.

**H4:** Platform trust moderates the effects of independent variables on buying intentions of second-hand clothing.

As the platform trust will moderate the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, we further divided the hypothesis for better understanding. Moderating relationships among all the variables have been tested and reported in the results sections.

**H4a.** Platform trust is moderating the effect of mindful consumption on buying intentions of second-hand clothing.

**H4b.** Platform trust is moderating the effect of ego-involvement on buying intentions of second-hand clothing.

**H4c.** Platform trust is moderating the effect of social norms on buying intentions of second-hand clothing.

**Impulsive Buying Tendency (Mediator)**

Impulsive buying was first adequately defined well into the DuPont research (1948–1965) as an unscheduled purchase compared to actual purchases that conformed to the expected shopping lists (Xiang et al., 2016). Stern (1962) divided impulsive buying into four distinct impulsive types: pure, reminder, suggestive, and expected. Compliant with Stern’s four forms of impulsive buying concept, consumers’ purchasing behavior on SCPs (Social Commerce Platforms) could be interpreted as impulsive buying behavior (Xiang et al., 2016). Uselessly scanning clothing pictures on a platform and afterward choosing to buy an outfit would be regarded as a pure impulsive buying behavior (Alizadeh, 2019; Badgaiyan et al., 2016). Just saw an image of a beauty product on a platform and remembering that it is running out of it and buying this would be a reminder of impulsive buying (Xiang et al., 2016). A suggestive impulsive buying happens if a person buys a new shirt relying on platforms’ suggestions. Eventually, it would be an expected urge to browse pictures of items on a platform wish list but making purchases depending on discounts or promotions (Badgaiyan et al., 2016; Xiang et al., 2016). Therefore, product images, platform attributes, and user experiences on the platform could all be viewed as stimulus to impulsive buying tendency among consumers/users.

Impulsive buying practice is described by Rook and Fisher (1995) as a consumer attribute “the magnitude that an individual is prone to make unintentional, instant, and non-intellectual purchasing” (Foroughi et al., 2013; Xiang et al., 2016). Viewed as a manifestation of general impulsivity (Badgaiyan & Verma, 2014), the impulsive buying tendency was also identified as an instinctive reaction to a novel stimulus due to biological tendencies at a subconscious stage.
It has been reported that consumers with a higher impulsive buying tendency appeared to engage more in impulsive buying behavior since people with high impulsive buying tendencies felt more lack of control relative to consumers with relatively lower impulsive buying tendencies (Alizadeh, 2019; Foroughi et al., 2013). In the same way, another explanation for individuals high on impulsive buying tendency partaking in impulsive behavior was attributed to the non-intellectual thought linked with this phenomenon which is considered motivated by the need for instant gratification (Alizadeh, 2019; Xiang et al., 2016). Pressingly, findings showing that high impulsive buying tendency customers were more inclined to buy impulsively versus their low impulsive peers (Badgaiyan & Verma, 2014; Foroughi et al., 2013), such reasonably stable individual variation factor is becoming an essential aspect of impulsive buying behavior studies (Ooi et al., 2019). Furthermore, it was recorded that individuals high in impulsive buying tendency are more likely to be influenced by marketing triggers like advertising, visual cues, or promotional rewards and active in in-store scrolling, and appear to respond more often to impulsive buying impulses (Alizadeh, 2019; Foroughi et al., 2013; Ooi et al., 2019). Hence, the present study investigates the mediating role of impulsive buying tendency in the associations of study constructs in a sustainable CC perspective. So, we propose the following hypotheses.

H5: Impulsive buying tendency is mediating the effects among independent variables and buying intentions of second-hand clothing.

As the impulse buying tendency will mediate the relationship between all the independent variables, we further divided the hypothesis for better understanding. Mediating relationship among all the variables has been tested and reported in the results sections (Figure 1).

H5a. Impulsive buying tendency is mediating the effect of mindful consumption on buying intentions of second-hand clothing.
H5b: Impulsive buying tendency is mediating the effect of ego-involvement on buying intentions of second-hand clothing.
H5c: Impulsive buying tendency is mediating the effect of social norms on buying intentions of second-hand clothing.

**Methodological Aspects of the Study**

**Survey Instrument**

The online survey technique was adopted for the present study to hoard the necessary data from Chinese consumers using online platforms for shopping, especially second-hand...
goods platforms. The questionnaire was translated into Chinese with some Chinese scholars’ help and read by a Chinese professor for proofreading. The online survey was started with a question of whether respondents use an online platform for buying SHC in China. The questionnaire consisted of two parts; the foremost part represented the questions regarding the demographic information about respondents such as gender, age, education, and income level. The second part consisted of inquiries related to study constructs, including ego-involvement, mindful consumption, social norms, impulse buying tendency, platform trust, and buying intentions of SHC in the CC perspective. To ensure the survey instrument’s reliability and validity, a pilot study was conducted on 35 university students using such online platforms to buy SHC. Later the questionnaire was designed on “Wen Juan Xing,” a Chinese questionnaire developing platform. Using snowball purposive sampling techniques to get responses from anonymous people but only those who previously had second-hand buying experience. The questionnaire was distributed among respondents through social media platforms (WeChat, Weibo, QQ, etc.) to record their valuable responses. A total sum of 378 useable responses was collected. The data was collected during October and November of 2019.

Measurement

The current study has adapted the scale items from the ancestor researchers to measure the study constructs. For instance, the scale items of mindful consumption construct from Baer et al. (2006), ego-involvement from Ganesh et al. (2000) the construct of social norms from Hsu and Lin (2008), Venkatesh and Davis (2000), and the scale of buying intentions from Ajzen (2005) of SHC in CC contexts. Furthermore, the scale of impulse buying tendency has been adapted from the studies of Rook and Fisher (1995), Xiang et al. (2016) and the platform trust from the studies (Chang et al., 2017; Luo et al., 2020). The study used the 7-Point-Likert scale to measure the scale items ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7).

Analysis Techniques

The present study has used the PLS-SEM (Partial Least Squares-structural Equation Modeling) tactic to analyze the hypotheses through the SmartPLS3 statistical package, as considered the best approach for conducting the study having technology variables (Dash & Paul, 2021). The study has followed the Anderson and Gerbing (1988) suggested two-step approach and followed the steps described by Hair et al. (2019). Before analyzing the structural model, the study has reviewed and evaluated the measurement model. After validating the measurement model, the structural model has been inspected for investigating the established study hypotheses.

Results and Discussion

This portion of the study elaborates the descriptive as well as inferential statistical inspection of data. It also demonstrates the interpretations of the findings of the study.

Demographics

Table 1 demonstrates the demographic detail of respondents. The demographic characteristics of collected sample data, including gender, age, education, and income level, have shown a high diversity. Both genders have actively participated in the survey; the male ratio was more than female respondents with 240 and 138. Most of the respondents were youngsters (184 out of 378) who ranged between 18 and 25 years of age in the age category. The majority of the respondents’ education level was Bachelor (146 out of 378). Furthermore, most of the respondents fell into the middle-level income group.

The Measurement Model

The present section of the study has proved the content and construct validities of the measurement model.

Content, convergent, and discriminant validity. According to Hair et al. (2019), factor loadings of the scale items are used to authenticate the content validity aspects of constructs. As revealed in Table 2, all the scale items of study constructs have been significantly loaded on similar constructs and
have surpassed the inception level (.60), confirming the scale’s content validity (Chin & Quek, 1997; Hair et al., 2011). The reliabilities of scale items were used to validate the convergent validity of the study. The reliability of scale items includes Cronbach’s alpha (α) (representing internal reliability), composite reliability (CR), and the average variance extracted (AVE). The Cronbach’s α values are mentioned in Table 2, ranging from .755 to .822, which significantly have confirmed the internal validity of constructs as surpass the advised value of .70 by Hair et al. (2011, 2019).

The CR values of all study constructs ranged from .855 to .894 above the suggested level of .70 by Hair et al. (2019). Similarly, AVE values also surpassed the recommended value (.50) by Hair et al. (2019), ranging from .665 to .737. Hence, such findings confirmed the convergent validity of the survey instrument. PLS-SEM assesses the common method bias (Kock, 2015) and collinearity (Chin, 1998; Hair et al., 2011) issue by verifying the VIF values in the study. If the VIF values are under the threshold value of 5, there is no common method bias and collinearity (Chin, 1998; Hair et al., 2011).

The outcomes of discriminant validity have been shown in Table 3. The AVE square roots values are higher than the remaining correlation values in their rows, and such display proved the discriminant validity of study variables (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Furthermore, the model fit indices through smartPLS3 are displayed as SRMR, and the threshold value is (Henseler et al., 2014) and NFI (Lohmöller, 1990). SRMR value less than .1 is considered a good fit (Henseler et al., 2014; Hu & Bentler, 1998). NFI values above .9 usually represent an acceptable fit (Lohmöller, 1990). GoF (Goodness of Fit) analyses the overall quality of the proposed research framework. The threshold value for GoF is .36 (Wetzels et al., 2009). In Table 3, all the model fit values are above their threshold values.

Besides, the $R^2$ (Coefficient of Determination) and $Q^2$ (predictive relevance) values are given. Both values are used to prove the model’s predictive power. $R^2$ values are between 0 and 1. $R^2$ significance as .75 is considered good, .50 is deemed normal, and .25 is deemed weak (Hair et al., 2011; Henseler et al., 2009). The threshold values of $Q^2$ are .02 as petite, .15 as a medium, and .35 as large (Geisser, 1974; Stone, 1974). So, the values of $R^2$ and $Q^2$ show the high prediction power of the model.

### The Structural Model

After confirming the measurement model, the subsequent phase is to test the study’s hypotheses statements. Table 4 and Figure 2 show the causal relationships of the construct of the structural model. The results of the analysis have been proved

### Table 2. Factor Loadings, Cronbach are α, Composite reliability, Average Variance Extract.

| Constructs                  | FL  | Alpha (α) | rho_A | CR     | AVE  | VIF  |
|-----------------------------|-----|-----------|-------|--------|------|------|
| Mindful consumption         |     | .757      | 0.820 | 0.855  | 0.665| 1.635|
| MC1                         | 0.842|          |       |        |      |      |
| MC2                         | 0.719|          |       |        |      |      |
| MC3                         | 0.877|          |       |        |      |      |
| Ego involvement             |     | .822      | 0.859 | 0.892  | 0.735| 2.128|
| EGO1                        | 0.891|          |       |        |      |      |
| EGO2                        | 0.894|          |       |        |      |      |
| EGO3                        | 0.781|          |       |        |      |      |
| Social norms                |     | .773      | 0.823 | 0.867  | 0.688| 1.374|
| SN1                         | 0.687|          |       |        |      |      |
| SN2                         | 0.876|          |       |        |      |      |
| SN3                         | 0.909|          |       |        |      |      |
| Platform trust              |     | .801      | 0.844 | 0.881  | 0.713| 2.173|
| PT1                         | 0.900|          |       |        |      |      |
| PT2                         | 0.838|          |       |        |      |      |
| PT3                         | 0.791|          |       |        |      |      |
| Impulsive buying tendency   |     | .755      | 0.761 | 0.860  | 0.671| 1.484|
| IBT1                        | 0.790|          |       |        |      |      |
| IBT2                        | 0.848|          |       |        |      |      |
| IBT3                        | 0.818|          |       |        |      |      |
| Buying intentions           |     | .820      | 0.822 | 0.894  | 0.737| 1.488|
| CC1                         | 0.842|          |       |        |      |      |
| CC2                         | 0.913|          |       |        |      |      |
| CC3                         | 0.818|          |       |        |      |      |

Note. FL = factor loadings; α = internal reliability Cronbach’s alpha; CR = composite reliability; AVE = average variance extracted.
Table 3. Discriminant Validity, Model Fit, $R^2$, and $Q^2$.

| Constructs                  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | Model fit |
|-----------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----------|
| 1. Buying intentions        | .859 |    |    |    |    |    |           |
| 2. Ego involvement          | .527 | .857 |    |    |    |    |           |
| 3. Impulsive buying tendency| .528 | .390 | .819 |    |    |    |           |
| 4. Mindful consumption      | .430 | .536 | .158 | .816 |    |    |           |
| 5. Platform trust           | .459 | .310 | .428 | .213 | .844 |    |           |
| 6. Social norms             | .498 | .379 | .369 | .203 | .457 | .830 |           |

GoF .517
SRMR .072
NFI .801

Table 4. Model Results.

| Hypothesis                  | Model variables | Path coefficients | $p$ Value | Decision      |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Direct effects of constructs|                 |                   |           |               |
| H1                          | MC $\rightarrow$ CC | .194*** | .000   | Accepted      |
| H2                          | EGO $\rightarrow$ CC | .263*** | .000   | Accepted      |
| H3                          | SN $\rightarrow$ CC | .191*** | .000   | Accepted      |
| Moderation effect of platform trust (H4) | |                   |           |               |
| H4a                         | MC–PT $\rightarrow$ CC | (.005) | .907   | Rejected      |
| H4b                         | EGO–PT $\rightarrow$ CC | .093*  | .031   | Accepted      |
| H4c                         | SN–PT $\rightarrow$ CC | .173*  | .003   | Accepted      |
| Mediating effect of impulsive buying tendency (H5) | |                   |           |               |
| H5a                         | MC $\rightarrow$ IBT $\rightarrow$ CC | (.072) | .326   | Rejected      |
| H5b                         | EGO $\rightarrow$ IBT $\rightarrow$ CC | .329*** | .000   | Accepted      |
| H5c                         | SN $\rightarrow$ IBT $\rightarrow$ CC | .260*** | .000   | Accepted      |

Note. MC = mindful consumption; CC = collaborative consumption intentions; EGO = ego involvement; SN = social norms; IBT = impulsive buying tendency; PT = platform trust.

***, * represents $p$ Value less than .000, .05 respectively.

the positive and significant relationship of mindful consumption, ego-involvement, and social norms with buying intentions of SHC with ($\beta = .194, p = .000$), ($\beta = .263, p = .000$), and ($\beta = .191, p = .000$) respectively. Therefore, H1, H2, and H3 have been accepted in the present study. The regression results of the survey have also proved the mediating effect of impulse buying tendency between the relationships of ego-involvement, social norms with buying intentions of SHC with ($\beta = .329, p = .000$), and ($\beta = .260, p = .000$) respectively.

However, results did not accept the mediating role of impulse buying tendency in the relationship between mindful consumption and buying intentions of SHC with ($\beta = -.072, p = .326$). Hence, the present study results have accepted the H5 and H6 except for H4 in mediating perspective.

Moreover, the results of the present study have proved the moderating effect of platform trust in the relationships of ego-involvement and social norms with buying intentions of SHC with ($\beta = .093, p = .031$) ($\beta = .173, p = .003$) respectively, but, results also have not proved the moderating role of platform trust between the relationship of mindful consumption and buying intentions of SHC with ($\beta = -.005, p = .907$); therefore, H8 and H9 are accepted, yet H7 is not accepted.

Conclusion and Implication

Implications

The current study suggested some theoretical insights for academia. Overall, the study model has proved the attitude-intention-behavior theory and validated the constructs of mindful consumption, ego-involvement, and social norms in SHC buying intentions from the Chinese perspective. The construct of mindful consumption has recently emerged as a new construct from an environmental sustainability perspective (Milne et al., 2020). The current study validated it empirically and put forwarded the
theoretical solid blocks for its theory construction. The studies on ego-involvement contain two different viewpoints (Park et al., 2011), positive (Sumaedi et al., 2015), and negative (Sereno & Mortensen, 1969). The current study has followed the second viewpoint and considered it as determinant behavior for sustainability, eventually enhancing SHC buying from the CC perspective. Furthermore, the research has proved the platform trust and impulsive buying tendency as significant moderators and mediators, respectively. The study also showed that people with mindful behavior will remain unaffected by the platform trust and impulsive buying tendency and will display healthy behavioral choices of mindful consumption aligned with the Milne et al. (2020) theoretical perspective.

Buying intentions of SHC in the perspective of CC proposes a fruitful avenue for firms to achieve profitability and help ensure environmental sustainability, which is a paramount global concern (Jin et al., 2019). Significant actions are needed at the practitioner level on both firms and market domains to facilitate mindful consumption. Marketers should incorporate experimental and innovative strategic tactics in marketing and supply chain operations (Milne et al., 2020). Every stakeholder needs some practical actions, including online platforms, firms, policymakers, advocacy groups, and NGOs, to have premeditated moves to enhance mindful consumption in the CC perspective (Jin et al., 2019). Such efforts also enhance consumers’ personal involvement in responsible buying behaviors; marketers should cater to social desirability for increasing the consumers’ ego-involvement in this phenomenon of sustainability concern. Promotional and awareness campaigns are needed to assure consumers that using SHC would not hurt their ego in society (Luo et al., 2020).

Moreover, decision-makers and managers should frame socially responsible CC around consumers’ utility or value-sharing as motivation rather than only highlighting environmental concerns. Therefore, consumers actively engaged in online platforms for redistribution markets (e.g., SHC markets and donations) should be offered tax rebates and social points as rewards for their socially responsible buying behaviors. Such incredible efforts will also provide prolific avenue foundations for platform trust and consumers’ impulsive buying in the CC context. There is a need for collaborative thinking at the social level to make people aware, motivate, and appreciate using and buying SHC (Luo et al., 2020).
Consumers’ intrinsic factors, especially their personality traits, are impacting impulsive buying tendencies among them. In fact, people like to buy those goods that suit their personality. Hence, sharing attractive high-resolution images, using famous celebrities, more variety of products can enhance interaction and visual appeal among online platform users and facilitate consumers to purchase SHC impulsively (Sindermann et al., 2020). The attractive features of SHC and the need for CC should be demonstrated on the platform to increase the consumers’ cognitive, affective, and emotional aspects. Moreover, encouraging relationships between users and offering incentives for comments, feedback, and information sharing can efficiently promote online impulsive buying tendencies among consumers. On the other hand, platform trust can be improved by investing more resources to develop informative and attractive websites and establish online platforms’ credibility. These platforms’ owners must provide proper guidelines and implement effective policies about individual e-seller to satisfy users’ concerns and improve users’ perceived usefulness and trust (Califf et al., 2020; Luo et al., 2020). Providing detailed and accurate information and effectively handling users’ complaints can cultivate users’ trust and reduce users’ concerns about doing business, retention, and repeat purchases. There is a need to encourage consumers to have new methods of acquiring goods and satisfy the intrinsic need for fashion clothing by buying SHC. Developing solid collaboration and networks can enhance services’ quality and help engage the users in environmentally responsible buying behavior once they realize that their actions really matter. Consequently, the effectiveness of sustainability campaigns can be increased.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of the present study was twofold; foremost was to investigate the impact of mindful consumption, ego-involvement, and social norms on buying intentions of SHC in the CC perspective. Secondly, the study also examined the mediating role of impulsive buying tendency and the moderating role of platform trust among the relationships mentioned above. The first section demonstrated that mindful consumption (Dhandra, 2019; Jin et al., 2019; Luo et al., 2020), ego-involvement (Cater & Cater, 2010; Sanchez-Franco & Martin-Velicia, 2011), and social norms (Okur & Saricam, 2019; Siau & Shen, 2003; Valle et al., 2005) have significant relationships with buying intentions of SHC. Such findings are perfectly in line with previous studies. Ego-involvement has shown a substantial impact on buying intentions of SHC among these three independent constructs, which offers consumers’ ego-involvement is creating a significant trend toward buying intention of SHC in CC perspective to contribute toward environmental sustainability. People with ego-involvement in nature may display a tendency of buying SHC in China and vice versa. Moreover, consumers’ mindful consumption and social norms also encourage them to buy SHC to satisfy their wish to buy expensive brands and contribute to environmental sustainability. The environmental situation in China is not satisfactory because of rapid industrial development and mass industrial production.

The second section of the present study has revealed significant results. The research proved the mediating role of impulsive buying tendency among the relationships of ego-involvement and social norms with buying intentions of SHC perfectly aligned with previous studies (Alizadeh, 2019; Ooi et al., 2019; Xiang et al., 2016). However, as the study results have shown, the impulse buying tendency cannot mediate the relationship between mindful consumption and buying intentions of SHC. Somehow, such findings have generated inconsistency with previous literature. Consequently, mindful consumption behavior among Chinese consumers effectively enhances the tendency toward buying intentions of SHC directly, reflecting the practical mindful consumption nature among Chinese because of their strong mindfulness beliefs as a legacy of Buddha’s traditions. Moreover, as per the findings of the current study, the platform trust is also unable to moderate the relationship of mindful consumption and buying intentions of SHC. Such results have revealed that Chinese consumers’ mindful consumption mindset toward buying SHC does not depend upon platform trust. They are self-motivated to buy SHC from an environmental sustainability. However, findings significantly proved the moderating role of platform trust in enhancing the positive relationship of ego-involvement and social norms with buying intentions of SHC among Chinese consumers (Califf et al., 2020; Luo et al., 2020; Vahdat et al., 2021). Platform trust is contributing successfully toward CC in the environmental sustainability context. Such a constructive role of impulse buying tendency and platform trust can affect the transition of SHC from people who do not need to people in need. However, there are chances of unnecessary consumers’ buying or having free-of-cost clothing that cannot help achieve such platforms’ objective of environmental sustainability.

**Limitations and Future Research**

The limitations of the present study have opened the debate for future research. The current study model has not incorporated every possible antecedent of buying intentions of SHC in the CC perspective; a further prospective study can be conducted by combining some other essential antecedents to validate the phenomenon. The present study has collected the responses from volunteers’ and respondents could be scattered in from many different Chinese cities; future studies can employ other sampling methods to validate constructs’ relationships, or a specific city or province could have been chosen. Moreover, future studies can incorporate other mediators and moderators to investigate their significant contribution to validating the phenomenon. Researchers may include the sample unit from developed nations or underdeveloped nations for future research to validate the study model and enhance the generalizability of findings.
The present study has also opened a gateway to debating such platforms’ role in strengthening the unnecessary buying of SHC and goods; future research can consider such behavioral intentions for further investigation.

**Appendix I**

**Questionnaire**

Mindful consumption (Baer et al., 2006)

MC1 I pay attention to how my emotions affect my behavior about buying second-hand clothing.

MC3 It seems I am going on automatic to buy second-hand clothing without much awareness of what I am doing.

[Reversed scale]

MC4 I’m good at finding words to describe my feelings about second-hand clothing.

Ego-involvement (Ganesh et al., 2000)

EGO1 The brand image of the second-hand clothing plays a major role in my decision to become a user of the second-hand clothing.

EGO2 The second-hand clothing, I use says a lot about who I am.

EGO3 It is important for me to choose a second-hand clothing that feels right.

Social norms (Hsu & Lin, 2008; Venkatesh, 2000; Venkatesh & Davis, 2000)

SN1 The trend of buying second-hand clothing among people around me is increasing.

SN2 My close friends and family members would appreciate if I buy second-hand clothing.

SN3 People who are important to me think that I should use second-hand clothing.

Platform trust (Chang et al., 2017; Gefen, 2002)

PT1 Promises made by online platforms of second-hand things are likely to be reliable.

PT2 I believe online platforms of second-hand things keep my privacy information safe.

PT3 Online platforms of second-hand things (like: Xian Yu, Zhuan Zhuan) are trustworthy.

Impulsive buying tendency (Badgaiyan et al., 2016; Rook & Fisher, 1995; Xiang et al., 2016)

IBT1 While browsing, I often buy second-hand things spontaneously.

IBT2 “I see it, I buy it” describes the way I buy second-hand things online.

IBT3 I sometimes buy second-hand things because I like buying things, rather than I need them.

Buying intentions of SHC (Ajzen, 1991, 2005)

CC1 I have the intention to increase second-hand clothing consumption in the near future.

CC2 Second-hand clothing will be the central part of my consumption in the future.

CC3 I would prefer to buy second-hand clothing to reduce environmental Damage.
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