

# Empirical Evidence on the Construct Validity and Reliability of an Instrument Assessing Antecedents to Willingness to Pay a Premium: A Pilot Study

Normaziah Che Musa<sup>1\*</sup>  and Baharudin Kadir<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Faculty of Business, UNITAR International University, Malaysia*

\**normaziah@unitar.my*

## Abstract

Research on sustainable and green consumption behaviour has been widely studied, including within the Malaysian context. However, there has been limited research on sustainable labelling on packaged food among Malaysian consumers. Therefore, there is a limited questionnaire specifically tailored to this sustainable labelling on packaged food products. A pilot test was carried out to support an investigation into the antecedents of consumers' WTPP for sustainably labelled packaged food. Based on Signaling Theory and Diffusion of Innovation Theory, a conceptual framework comprising six constructs was formulated. In total, 34 questionnaire items were adopted or adapted from prior studies. Responses from 30 working adults were evaluated to assess the measurement instrument. All six constructs used to examine the antecedents of WTPP, Altruistic Concerns (AC), Biospheric Concerns (BC), Egoistic Concerns (EC), Perceived Credibility (PC), Perceived Relative Advantage (PRA), and WTPP, demonstrated strong internal consistency. At this pilot study stage, internal consistency reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and corrected item-total correlations. Their alpha values are 0.899, 0.913, 0.904, 0.901, 0.860, and 0.890, respectively, exceeding the recommended minimum threshold of 0.70. In addition, the corrected item-total correlations for all items were above 0.30, confirming that each item contributes meaningfully to its respective construct and is psychometrically sound. These pilot results indicate the questionnaire items are suitable for use in future research and may offer useful evidence to inform sustainable labelling policies, certification standards, and incentives that promote greener manufacturing among Malaysian producers.

**Keywords:** environmental concern, perceived credibility, perceived relative advantage, sustainable labelling, willingness to pay a premium



## 1. Introduction

Rising concerns about climate change in recent years have contributed to the increase in consumer sensitivity towards their purchase decisions (Leggen, 2023). Aligned with “SDG 12: Responsible consumption and Production”, consumers are increasingly willing to purchase products that are considered sustainably produced and processed (Lestari & Nita, 2021; Ut-tha et al., 2021; Vicente et al., 2021). Meanwhile, producers are also placing greater emphasis on conveying their sustainability initiatives in the process of development and production of the product (Shahidi Hamedani et al., 2025; Zhang & Yin, 2025). The use of sustainable labelling on product packaging helps consumers to identify the environmentally friendly options, and at the same time, signals the producers’ sustainability efforts. However, the certification processes come with additional costs, which are often reflected in the final product prices (Fanasch & Frick, 2020; Singh et al., 2023).

Past research has investigated the willingness to pay a premium for green, eco-friendly, and sustainable products in general (Al Mamun et al., 2018, 2023; Bastounis et al., 2021; Lestari & Nita, 2021; Oesman, 2021; Singh et al., 2023; Wei et al., 2018). Limited research has been done to examine the role of sustainable labels on packaged food products, especially in emerging markets, particularly Malaysia. In the effort to measure the antecedents of Malaysian consumers’ WTPP for sustainably labelled packaged food, it is crucial to analyze the validity and reliability of the adopted or adapted research instruments by conducting a pilot study (Khanal & Chhetri, 2024). The validation process includes face validity, content validity, and construct validity, through expert review, pre-testing, and a pilot study to confirm the clarity and contextual relevance of the instruments, thus reducing the measurement errors (Masuwai et al., 2024). Accordingly, the objective of this pilot study is to evaluate the validity and reliability of the adopted and adapted instruments developed to study the antecedents of WTPP for packaged food products with sustainable labels.

Table 1 below provides a summary of the variables adopted and adapted, their reference sources, the corresponding reliability value of the construct, and the Likert-scale format used in the source literature.

*Table 1: Summary of variables, their Sources, Reliability Value, Number of adopted and adapted questions, and Likert-scale points*

| Variable name         | Source                   | Reliability | Number of Adopted & Adapted Questions | Scales  |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|---------|
| WTPP                  | Al Mamun et al. (2023)   | 0.855       | 4                                     | 7-point |
|                       | Bhutto et al. (2021)     | 0.832       | 1                                     | 5-point |
|                       | Bushara et al. (2023)    | 0.715       | 1                                     | 5-point |
|                       | Al Mamun et al. (2018)   | 0.980       | 1                                     | 5-point |
|                       | Wei et al. (2018)        | 0.938       | 1                                     | 7-point |
| Environmental Concern | Wesley Schultz (2001) in | EC: 0.92    | 4                                     | 7-point |
|                       | Cruz & Manata (2020)     | AC: 0.91    | 4                                     | 7-point |
|                       |                          | BC: 0.95    | 4                                     | 7-point |
| PRA                   | Stachewicz (2011)        | 0.870       | 8                                     | 5-point |
| PC                    | Moussa & Touzani (2008)  | 0.847       | 6                                     | 7-point |

Adopted and adapted instruments should be reliable and valid for further analysis (Hair et al., 2019). Validity and reliability of the questionnaires are a vital part of quantitative research (Masuwai et al., 2024). To overcome the measurement error, validity and reliability must be established before the commencement of the research (Masuwai et al., 2024). By conducting this pilot study, the empirical result will be able to quantify the measurability of questionnaires, ensuring the questions being asked permit valid inferences to be made.

The constructs on environmental concerns were adopted from Schultz (2001). One example of items on environmental concerns is “I am more concerned about the environmental problems because of the consequences for the people in my country” (Code: AC1). The PC instruments were adapted from Moussa & Touzani (2008). One example of the instrument is “I can rely on the claims made by the sustainable labels on the packaging” (Code: PC1). The PRA instruments were adapted from Stachewicz(2011), bearing questions such as “Choosing packaged food products with a sustainable label allows me to make better choices more quickly” (Code: PRA4). Lastly, the items for WTPP are adapted from a few different authors, namely Al Mamun et al.(2018, 2023), Bhutto et al. (2021), Bushara et al.(2023), and Wei et al. (2018). One example of WTPP questions is “I am willing to pay a higher price for packaged food products with sustainable labels than similar products without sustainable labels.” (Code: WTPP 2). The PRA constructs were measured using a five-point Likert Scale, while the rest of the constructs, such as AC, BC, EC, PC, and WTPP, were measured using a seven-point Likert scale, in accordance with the scale format used in the original studies. The survey concluded with items to collect information on sociodemographic information of the respondents.

Content validity and face validity will indicate whether a measurement instrument is truly accurate and represents the construct of interest (Masuwai et al., 2024). It also refers to the degree to which a measure

captures all aspects of a given construct. In this pilot study, content and face validity were initially examined qualitatively through evaluations by subject-matter experts. The expert reviewers were chosen based on pre-defined criteria, including more than twenty years of experience in academia and substantial experience in social research. The selection of two academic experts was based on judgmental sampling. This judgmental sampling approach is appropriate, as the experts were chosen based on their relevant knowledge and subject expertise (Sekaran & Bougie, 2010). The two academic professors evaluated the face and content validity of the questionnaires to ensure that the items were appropriate and sufficiently reflected the intended content. Based on the feedback from the two experts, revisions were made to the questionnaires.

To further assess the face and content validity, a pre-test was conducted. Five relevant respondents, comprising industry experts and academics, were not only chosen to answer the questionnaire but also to check the grammar, spelling, language, content, and sentence construction. The instruments need to be evaluated to ensure they are effective and fit to measure the intended research objectives (Masuwai et al., 2024). Administration of the questionnaire was done by distributing Google Forms. Consents were secured from the industry experts and academics before the review process began. Based on the feedback given, the instruments were refined further to improve clarity and maintain the relevance of the study context.

Following these improvements, the instruments were then distributed to potential respondents as a pilot study. Thirty responses were collected, and the analysis was done quantitatively using Cronbach's alpha for the six constructs to assess the internal consistency of the construct. Based on Table 1, the sources for each instrument were demonstrated in the second column, next to the variable name, as well as the reliability value of adopted or adapted questionnaires, and the scale (in points) used. This pilot study employed a combination of five-point and seven-point scales for two primary reasons. First, to preserve the integrity of the adopted measurement items, the original scale formats were maintained. Second, the mixed scales employed in the questionnaire will reduce respondents' tendency to use repetitive response patterns across all sections of the survey questionnaire, which can artificially inflate covariance due to the measurement method rather than true relationships among variables. This procedural strategy is recommended by Podsakoff et al. (2003) in Cheah et al. (2018) to address common method variance (CMV) in PLS-SEM analysis.

## 2. Methodology

This pilot study adopted a cross-sectional methodology to examine the variable of interest. Responses from 30 working adults were sampled, which is considered adequate for assessing internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha, item-total correlations, and inter-item correlation analysis (Bujang et al., 2024; Khanal & Chhetri, 2024). Working adults in Malaysia were chosen because they frequently serve as one of the decision makers within households (Qi et al., 2024), thus making them a relevant

demographic to examine their consumption behaviour. As the chosen respondents in this pilot study are aligned with the characteristics of the target population in the main study, the responses are expected to exhibit a high degree of homogeneity with the target population, thereby enhancing the validity and accuracy of the results of this pilot study (Masuwai et al., 2024). SPSS 29.0 was used to analyze the data.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1 Demographic Characteristics

The demographic analysis of the respondents is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents (n = 30)

| Variable        | Category          | Frequency (n) | Percent (%) | Variable                   | Category            | Frequency (n) | Percent (%) |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------|
| Gender          | Male              | 14            | 47.0        | Household Income (Monthly) | Below RM5,999       | 12            | 40.0        |
|                 | Female            | 16            | 53.0        |                            | RM6,000- RM11,999   | 8             | 27.0        |
| Occupation      | Full-time student | 7             | 23.0        |                            | RM12,000 - RM17,999 | 7             | 17.0        |
|                 | Employee          | 19            | 63.0        |                            | RM18,000 and above  | 2             | 7.0         |
|                 | Self-employed     | 3             | 10.0        |                            | Other               | 3             | 10.0        |
|                 | Other             | 1             | 3.0         | Age Group                  | 18-29 years         | 15            | 50.0        |
| Education Level | SPM               | 1             | 3.0         |                            | 30-41 years         | 6             | 20.0        |
|                 | Certificate/Pre-U | 1             | 3.0         |                            | 42-53 years         | 8             | 27.0        |
|                 | Diploma/STPM/STAM | 8             | 27.0        |                            | 54-65 years         | 1             | 3.0         |
|                 | Bachelor's        | 9             | 30.0        | Ethnicity                  | Malay               | 17            | 57.0        |
|                 | Master's          | 8             | 27.0        |                            | Chinese             | 2             | 7.0         |
|                 | Doctorate         | 3             | 10.0        |                            | Indian              | 7             | 23.0        |
|                 |                   |               | Other       |                            | 4                   | 13.0          |             |

Table 2 shows that the respondents had an almost equal number between men (47%) and women (53%). Sixty-three percent of the respondents worked in the private sector, while 23 percent were full-time students pursuing tertiary education. Most respondents had tertiary education, where 30% hold bachelor's degrees, 27% hold master's degrees, and 10% hold doctorate degrees. The focus of this study is younger working adult respondents (70% are below 41 years old) with higher education, following the assumption that these respondents are more environmentally conscious and would choose products with eco-labels in their consumption (Alam et al., 2023). This group of respondents is found to exhibit more awareness of sustainability-related matters too (Filho et al., 2024). The result of the household

income shows that 44% of the respondents receive between RM6,000 to RM17,999 monthly. A study by Hamilton et al. (2019) found that higher-income individuals are willing to pay more for products with a sustainable label. Another finding also reinforces the result that consumers prefer products with sustainable labels (Ma et al., 2022). Malays made up 57% of the respondents, followed by 23% Indians, 7% Chinese, and 10% other. The composition reflects Malaysia's diversity and representation of different cultural perspectives in consumption behaviour. As a conclusion, the respondents' demographic categories align with the typical Malaysian family structure, which substantiates the representativeness of the sample.

### 3.2 Descriptive Statistics

Table 3. Constructs' Descriptive Statistics ( $n = 30$ )

| Construct                          | Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (SD) | Scale Type     |
|------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Altruistic Concern (AC)            | 5.9833   | 0.93064                 | 7-point Likert |
| Biospheric Concern (BC)            | 5.7583   | 0.99239                 | 7-point Likert |
| Egoistic Concern (EC)              | 5.8917   | 1.10189                 | 7-point Likert |
| Perceived Credibility (PC)         | 5.4167   | 0.96366                 | 7-point Likert |
| Perceived Relative Advantage (PRA) | 4.0417   | 0.63681                 | 5-point Likert |
| Willingness to Pay Premium (WTPP)  | 4.6875   | 0.95240                 | 7-point Likert |

Table 3 demonstrates descriptive statistics for each of the constructs. Basically, the means for all constructs indicated that the mean for environmental concerns (AC = 5.9833, BC = 5.7583, and EC = 5.8917), perceived credibility (PC = 5.4167), perceived relative advantage (PRA = 4.041), and WTPP (4.6875), are above the mid-point based on the seven-point or five-point Likert scales, which is consistent with findings from the previous literature. (Cruz & Manata, 2020; Singh et al., 2023). The results indicate that most of the respondents perceived sustainability-labelled packaged foods are more environmentally friendly (Minh Vu et al., 2022), relatively better than those without sustainable labels (Hosseinikhah Choshaly, 2019), the labels are credible (Moussa & Touzani, 2008; Singh et al., 2023), and they are willing to pay more for the products (Al Mamun et al., 2018, 2023; Wei et al., 2018).

### 3.3 Reliability and Instrument Robustness

Cronbach's alpha coefficient is used to measure internal consistency. In social science research, Constructs' internal consistency values above 0.80 are preferable, and values higher than 0.7 are considered acceptable (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Hair et al., 2019). As displayed in Table 4, all constructs indicated values exceeding the 0.70 recommended threshold. BC showed the highest reliability ( $\alpha=0.913$ ), followed by EC ( $\alpha=0.904$ ), PC ( $\alpha=0.901$ ), AC ( $\alpha=0.899$ ), WTPP ( $\alpha=0.890$ ), and PRA ( $\alpha=0.860$ ). These results are consistent with prior studies done on sustainability-related measures

by Moussa and Touzani (2008) and Singh et al. (2023). The findings validate that the instrument developed to assess the antecedents of the WTPP is reliable and suitable for further comprehensive data collection.

*Table 4. Constructs' Reliability Statistics (n = 30)*

| Construct                          | No. of Items | Cronbach's Alpha ( $\alpha$ ) | Interpretation |
|------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Altruistic Concern (AC)            | 4            | 0.899                         | Good           |
| Biospheric Concern (BC)            | 4            | 0.913                         | Good           |
| Egoistic Concern (EC)              | 4            | 0.904                         | Good           |
| Perceived Credibility (PC)         | 6            | 0.901                         | Good           |
| Perceived Relative Advantage (PRA) | 8            | 0.860                         | Good           |
| Willingness to Pay Premium (WTPP)  | 8            | 0.890                         | Good           |

### 3.3.1 Item-Total Statistics

#### *Willingness to Pay a Premium*

*Table 5: Item analysis of WTPP (n=30)*

| Item  | Range Inter-Item Correlation | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item - Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted | Action |
|-------|------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------|
| WTPP1 | 0.054 – 0.493                | 32.6333                    | 48.240                         | 0.371                              | 0.909                            | Retain |
| WTPP2 | 0.452 – 0.793                | 32.7667                    | 45.702                         | 0.739                              | 0.871                            | Retain |
| WTPP3 | 0.271 – 0.719                | 33.0333                    | 44.033                         | 0.729                              | 0.870                            | Retain |
| WTPP4 | 0.493 – 0.748                | 32.9333                    | 43.651                         | 0.822                              | 0.862                            | Retain |
| WTPP5 | 0.054 – 0.700                | 32.8000                    | 47.476                         | 0.548                              | 0.887                            | Retain |
| WTPP6 | 0.362 – 0.748                | 32.8667                    | 44.395                         | 0.823                              | 0.863                            | Retain |
| WTPP7 | 0.216 – 0.680                | 32.6667                    | 44.092                         | 0.621                              | 0.882                            | Retain |
| WTPP8 | 0.279 – 0.793                | 32.8000                    | 43.545                         | 0.796                              | 0.864                            | Retain |

As shown in Table 5, the Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted for eight WTPP items range between 0.862 to 0.909, which suggests that all items strengthen the internal consistency and are deemed reliable, as they are well above the cut-off of 0.70 (Hair et al., 2019; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The adjusted item-total correlations for the eight items exceeded the suggested threshold of 0.30, indicating that the items exhibit strong internal consistency (Al Mamun et al., 2023; Ramu et al., 2023). Accordingly, all eight items were retained.

**Environmental Concerns***Table 6a: Item analysis of BC (n=30)*

| Item | Range Inter-Item Correlation | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item - Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted | Action |
|------|------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------|
| BC1  | 0.632 - 0.862                | 17.4333                    | 8.185                          | 0.788                              | 0.900                            | Retain |
| BC2  | 0.669 - 0.862                | 17.3333                    | 9.126                          | 0.829                              | 0.877                            | Retain |
| BC3  | 0.632 - 0.910                | 17.2333                    | 9.564                          | 0.805                              | 0.887                            | Retain |
| BC4  | 0.657 - 0.910                | 17.1000                    | 9.610                          | 0.813                              | 0.885                            | Retain |

From Table 6a, all corrected items-total correlations for the four BC items were above 0.78, surpassing the 0.30 threshold (Ramu et al., 2023). Each item improved the internal consistency of the BC, with the ‘Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted’ values ranging from 0.877 to 0.900, which were lower than the overall alpha of 0.913 if any of the items were deleted. As a result, the scale demonstrated good reliability, and all four items were kept (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Hair et al., 2019).

*Table 6b: Item analysis of EC (n=30)*

| Item | Range Inter-Item Correlation | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item - Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted | Action |
|------|------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------|
| EC1  | 0.708 - 0.713                | 17.7667                    | 9.702                          | 0.785                              | .890                             | Retain |
| EC2  | 0.680 - 0.760                | 18.0000                    | 11.379                         | 0.794                              | .873                             | Retain |
| EC3  | 0.708 - 0.760                | 17.5333                    | 11.775                         | 0.823                              | .866                             | Retain |
| EC4  | 0.680 - 0.755                | 17.4000                    | 12.248                         | 0.790                              | .879                             | Retain |

As indicated in Table 6b, all corrected item-total correlation values were over 0.78, exceeding the suggested minimum cutoff of 0.30 (Ramu et al., 2023) for four EC items. The ‘Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted’ values (ranging from 0.866 to 0.890) confirmed that each item contributed positively to the internal consistency of the scale, as deleting any of the items resulted in a lower than the construct’s overall alpha value of 0.904. Therefore, all four items in the EC construct were maintained, as they showed that they are all reliable (Hair et al., 2019; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

*Table 6c: Item analysis of AC (n=30)*

| Item | Range Inter-Item Correlation | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item - Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted | Action |
|------|------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------|
| AC1  | 0.594 - 0.816                | 18.1667                    | 7.937                          | 0.789                              | 0.864                            | Retain |
| AC2  | 0.536 - 0.816                | 18.3000                    | 7.390                          | 0.813                              | 0.856                            | Retain |
| AC3  | 0.536 - 0.759                | 17.5333                    | 9.499                          | 0.688                              | 0.902                            | Retain |
| AC4  | 0.677 - 0.771                | 17.8000                    | 7.407                          | 0.834                              | 0.847                            | Retain |

As shown in Table 6c, all values for Corrected Item-Total Correlations were above 0.68, exceeding the minimum value of 0.30, which means all items were strong indicators of the overall construct and should be retained (Ramu et al., 2023). The Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted values for all four items will be below the overall Cronbach's Alpha of 0.899 for AC, signifying that each item contributes to the construct reliability. Therefore, all four AC items were retained (Hair et al., 2019; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

### ***Perceived Relative Advantage (PRA)***

*Table 7: Item analysis of PRA (n=30)*

| Item | Range Inter-Item Correlation | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item - Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted | Action |
|------|------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------|
| PRA1 | 0.046 – 0.724                | 28.1000                    | 20.507                         | 0.571                              | 0.846                            | Retain |
| PRA2 | 0.086 – 0.626                | 28.3333                    | 20.437                         | 0.512                              | 0.854                            | Retain |
| PRA3 | 0.328 – 0.761                | 28.2333                    | 20.047                         | 0.785                              | 0.826                            | Retain |
| PRA4 | 0.315 – 0.631                | 28.4333                    | 18.737                         | 0.662                              | 0.836                            | Retain |
| PRA5 | 0.252 – 0.529                | 28.6333                    | 19.895                         | 0.550                              | 0.851                            | Retain |
| PRA6 | 0.329 – 0.761                | 28.1667                    | 20.075                         | 0.795                              | 0.825                            | Retain |
| PRA7 | 0.086 – 0.711                | 28.1000                    | 21.197                         | 0.543                              | 0.849                            | Retain |
| PRA8 | 0.046 – 0.711                | 28.3333                    | 21.264                         | 0.522                              | 0.851                            | Retain |

As demonstrated in Table 7, the Corrected Item Total values range from 0.52 to 0.80, well above the minimum recommended threshold of 0.30 (Ramu et al., 2023). The Cronbach Alpha if Item Deleted values for the PRA construct range between 0.825 to 0.854, which means that if any item were deleted, it would result in a lower alpha than the construct alpha of 0.860, demonstrating that all items contribute positively to the reliability of the PRA construct. The analysis confirmed that the PRA construct exhibited high internal consistency, justifying the decision to maintain all eight items.

### ***Perceived Credibility (PC)***

Examination of Cronbach's alpha in Table 8 revealed that values are between 0.865 and 0.898. Deleting any of the items will reduce the Cronbach alpha value for the PC construct, which is now at 0.901, implying that the removal of any of the items will reduce the reliability of the construct. The Corrected Item-Total Correlations also demonstrate that all items exceed the 0.30 recommended by Ramu et al. (2023). As such, it is confirmed that all items significantly contribute to the internal consistency as well as reliability of the construct.

*Table 8: Item analysis of Perceived Credibility (PC) (n=30)*

| Item | Range Inter-Item Correlation | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item - Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted | Action |
|------|------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------|
| PC1  | 0.498 – 0.779                | 27.3000                    | 23.114                         | 0.807                              | 0.872                            | Retain |
| PC2  | 0.466 – 0.625                | 26.9667                    | 25.344                         | 0.668                              | 0.892                            | Retain |
| PC3  | 0.493 – 0.625                | 27.1000                    | 22.921                         | 0.707                              | 0.888                            | Retain |
| PC4  | 0.466 – 0.605                | 27.0000                    | 25.034                         | 0.624                              | 0.898                            | Retain |
| PC5  | 0.574 – 0.841                | 27.0667                    | 22.892                         | 0.852                              | 0.865                            | Retain |
| PC6  | 0.468 – 0.841                | 27.0667                    | 22.754                         | 0.742                              | 0.882                            | Retain |

#### 4. Discussion

This pilot study's result demonstrates that the adopted and adapted instruments to measure the constructs for broader research on antecedents of WTPP for sustainably labelled food packaged products meet the established reliability standards. All six constructs tested in this pilot study, namely AC, BC, EC, PC, PRA, and WTPP itself, are considered methodologically robust, as they show good internal consistency, ensuring the applicability of the instruments for a larger-scale empirical analysis. The Cronbach alpha value exceeds 0.70 for all constructs, as recommended by Hair et al. (2019). As demonstrated by the lower Cronbach alpha value, if any of the items are removed, it means that deleting any of the items will reduce the strength of the constructs. In addition, the value of Corrected Item-Total Correlations in this pilot study exceeds 0.30, as stated by Ramu et al. (2023). Therefore, it is confirmed that all measurement items need to be maintained, as they are psychometrically sound and fit for use in future empirical research.

#### 5. Conclusion and Recommendation

This pilot study confirms that the adapted and adopted instruments exhibit acceptable reliability and are methodologically robust, as all constructs exhibit Cronbach alpha values above 0.7. This pilot study's result demonstrated that the instruments on the antecedents influencing WTPP for packaged food bearing sustainable labels are fit for broader empirical research. Nevertheless, to further strengthen the feasibility of the instruments, further empirical work is encouraged to validate the items by assessing the content validity index (CVI) of the questionnaire, using confirmatory factor analysis for the items, test-retest reliability, or discriminant validity testing for a stronger scale development. The availability of these empirically validated measurement tools can support the government's formulation of sustainable labelling policy, a third-party certification standard on sustainable labelling, and green manufacturing incentives aimed at improving the country's competitiveness in the global green economy.

## **Acknowledgements**

The authors extend sincere appreciation to UNITAR International University and all parties who contributed, either directly or indirectly, to the completion of this pilot study.

## **Conflicts of Interest**

Authors declare that they have no conflict of interest in the conduct of this research.

## **Funding**

This research received no external funding.

## **Ethics Approval and Informed Consent**

Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all respondents. The study complied with standard research ethics principles.

## References

- Al Mamun, A., Naznen, F., Yang, Q., Ali, M. H., & Hashim, N. M. H. N. (2023). Modelling the significance of celebrity endorsement and consumer interest on attitude, purchase intention, and willingness to pay a premium price for green skincare products. *Heliyon*, *9*(6), e16765. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e16765>
- Al Mamun, A., Syed Ali Fazal, Ahmad, G., Yaacob, M. R., & Mohamad, Mohd. R. (2018). Willingness to Pay for Environmentally Friendly Products among Low-Income Households along Coastal Peninsular Malaysia. *Sustainability*, *10*(5), 1316. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10051316>
- Alam, S. S., Wang, C.-K., Masukujjaman, M., Ahmad, I., Lin, C.-Y., & Ho, Y.-H. (2023). Buying Behaviour towards Eco-Labelled Food Products: Mediation Moderation Analysis. *Sustainability*, *15*(3), 2474. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032474>
- Bastounis, A., Buckell, J., Hartmann-Boyce, J., Cook, B., King, S., Potter, C., Bianchi, F., Rayner, M., & Jebb, S. A. (2021). The Impact of Environmental Sustainability Labels on Willingness-to-Pay for Foods: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Discrete Choice Experiments. *Nutrients*, *13*(8), 2677. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu13082677>
- Bhutto, M. H., Shaikh, A. A., & Sharma, R. (2021). Factors Affecting the Consumers' Purchase Intention and Willingness-to-Pay More for Electric-Vehicle Technology. *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Electronic Business.*, 1–14. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/356665297\\_Factors\\_Affecting\\_the\\_Consumers'\\_Purchase\\_Intention\\_and\\_Willingness-to-Pay\\_More\\_for\\_Electric-Vehicle\\_Technology\\_Full\\_Paper](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/356665297_Factors_Affecting_the_Consumers'_Purchase_Intention_and_Willingness-to-Pay_More_for_Electric-Vehicle_Technology_Full_Paper)
- Bujang, M. A., Omar, E. D., Foo, D. H. P., & Hon, Y. K. (2024). Sample size determination for conducting a pilot study to assess reliability of a questionnaire. *Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics*, *49*(1), e3. <https://doi.org/10.5395/rde.2024.49.e3>
- Bushara, M. A., Abdou, A. H., Hassan, T. H., Sobaih, A. E. E., Albohnayh, A. S. M., Alshammari, W. G., Aldoreeb, M., Elsaed, A. A., & Elsaied, M. A. (2023). Power of Social Media Marketing: How Perceived Value Mediates the Impact on Restaurant Followers' Purchase Intention, Willingness to Pay a Premium Price, and E-WoM? *Sustainability*, *15*(6), 5331. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15065331>
- Cheah, J.-H., Memon, M. A., Chuah, F., Ting, H., & Ramayah, T. (2018). ASSESSING REFLECTIVE MODELS IN MARKETING RESEARCH: A COMPARISON BETWEEN PLS AND PLS<sub>c</sub> ESTIMATES. *International Journal of Business and Society*, *19*(1), 139–160.
- Cruz, S. M., & Manata, B. (2020). Measurement of Environmental Concern: A Review and Analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 363. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00363>

- Fanasch, P., & Frick, B. (2020). *The value of signals: Do self-declaration and certification generate price premiums for organic and biodynamic wines?* 249.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119415>
- Filho, W. L., Trevisan, L. V., Dinis, M. A. P., Ulmer, N., Paço, A., Borsari, B., Sierra, J., & Salvia, A. (2024). Fostering students' participation in the implementation of the sustainable development goals at higher education institutions. *Discover Sustainability*, 5(1), 22.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-024-00204-7>
- Hair, J. F., L.D.S. Gabriel, M., Da Silva, D., & Braga Junior, S. (2019). Development and validation of attitudes measurement scales: Fundamental and practical aspects. *RAUSP Management Journal*, 54(4), 490–507. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RAUSP-05-2019-0098>
- Hamilton, R. W., Mittal, C., Shah, A., Thompson, D. V., & Griskevicius, V. (2019). How Financial Constraints Influence Consumer Behavior: An Integrative Framework. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 29(2), 285–305. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1074>
- Hosseinihah Choshaly, S. (2019). Applying innovation attributes to predict purchase intention for the eco-labeled products: A Malaysian case study. *International Journal of Innovation Science*, 11(4), 583–599. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJIS-04-2019-0038>
- Khanal, B., & Chhetri, D. B. (2024). A Pilot Study Approach to Assessing the Reliability and Validity of Relevancy and Efficacy Survey Scale. *Janabhawana Research Journal*, 3(1), 35–49.  
<https://doi.org/10.3126/jrj.v3i1.68384>
- Leggen, L. N. (2023). *Green Brand Image in Digital Retail—A research on Green Labeling Impact on Willingness to Pay* [Catolica Portugese].  
<https://repositorio.ucp.pt/bitstream/10400.14/41335/1/203278143.pdf>
- Lestari, M. R., & Nita, A. (2021). The Influence of Sustainable Product's Attributes Toward the Willingness to Pay for Sustainable Product. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, 6(8), 542–551. <https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v6i8.981>
- Ma, X., Liu, Z., Meng, T., Florkowski, W. J., & Mu, Y. (2022). Impact of Food Sustainability Labels on the Price of Rice in Online Sales. *Foods*, 11(23), 3781.  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/foods11233781>
- Masuwai, A., Zulkifli, H., & Hamzah, M. I. (2024). Evaluation of content validity and face validity of secondary school Islamic education teacher self-assessment instrument. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2308410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2308410>
- Minh Vu, Q., Kai Liao, Y., Thi, Y., Nu To Truong, G., Minh Binh Nguyen, P., & Wu, W.-Y. (2022). The Influence of Personality Traits on Intention to Purchase Green Products. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 13(1).  
<https://doi.org/10.4018/IJSSMET.298675>

- Moussa, S., & Touzani, M. (2008). The perceived credibility of quality labels: A scale validation with refinement. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 32(5), 526–533.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2008.00713.x>
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* (Issue 972). McGraw-Hill Companies, Incorporated. <https://books.google.com.my/books?id=r0fuAAAAMAAJ>
- Oesman, I. (2021). Consumers' Willingness to Pay More for Eco Friendly Products (Green Products) Classification Daily Needs Products. *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Economics Engineering and Social Science, InCEESS 2020, 17-18 July, Bekasi, Indonesia*.  
Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Economics Engineering and Social Science, InCEESS 2020, 17-18 July, Bekasi, Indonesia, Bekasi, Indonesia.  
<https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.17-7-2020.2303067>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452>
- Qi, L. W., Narayana Nair, M. N., & Munusamy, K. (2024). Driving Factors of Working Adults Organic Food Purchase Intentions. *International Journal of Business and Technology Management*, 6(2), 467–478. <https://doi.org/10.55057/ijbtm.2024.6.2.41>
- Ramu, P., Osman, M., Abdul Mutalib, N. A., Aljaberi, M. A., Lee, K.-H., Lin, C.-Y., & Hamat, R. A. (2023). Validity and Reliability of a Questionnaire on the Knowledge, Attitudes, Perceptions and Practices toward Food Poisoning among Malaysian Secondary School Students: A Pilot Study. *Healthcare*, 11(6), 853. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare11060853>
- Schultz, P. W. (2001). THE STRUCTURE OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN: CONCERN FOR SELF, OTHER PEOPLE, AND THE BIOSPHERE. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 21(4), 327–339. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jevps.2001.0227>
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2010). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach* (5th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Shahidi Hamedani, S., Aslam, S., & Shahidi Hamedani, S. (2025). AI in business operations: Driving urban growth and societal sustainability. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 8, 1568210.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2025.1568210>
- Singh, P., Sahadev, S., Wei, X., & Henninger, C. E. (2023). Modelling the antecedents of consumers' willingness to pay for eco-labelled food products. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 47(4), 1256–1272. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12900>
- Stachewicz, A. B. (2011). *Measuring the perceived attributes of innovation: A study of capacitive switch technology in industrially designed user interface controls* [Eastern Michigan University]. <https://commons.emich.edu/theses/359/>

- Ut-tha, V., Lee, P.-P., & Chung, R. (2021). Willingness to Pay for Sustainable Coffee: A Case of Thai Consumers. *Sage Open*, *11*(4), 21582440211052956.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211052956>
- Vicente, P., Marques, C., & Reis, E. (2021). Willingness to Pay for Environmental Quality: The Effects of Pro-Environmental Behavior, Perceived Behavior Control, Environmental Activism, and Educational Level. *Sage Open*, *11*(4), 21582440211025256.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211025256>
- Wei, S., Ang, T., & Jancenelle, V. E. (2018). Willingness to pay more for green products: The interplay of consumer characteristics and customer participation. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *45*, 230–238. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2018.08.015>
- Zhang, H., & Yin, D. (2025). The Role of Green Marketing Strategies in Promoting Sustainable Development. *Applied Mathematics and Nonlinear Sciences*, *10*(1), 20250203.  
<https://doi.org/10.2478/amns-2025-0203>