

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Chapter 4 presents the results of the analyses which were conducted in order to answer the three research questions. In the first part the findings of the integrative research review that are relevant for the development of a Framework of Ethical Consumption Goals are introduced. General findings are summarized but also differences and commonalities of ethical consumption guided by labels (organic) and purchasing local products are presented.

As a second outcome of the integrated research review the potential perceived relationships between the target criteria as identified in part one are presented. Hence, these linkages are assessed against the background of the theoretical framework of Bechmann (1978) and furthermore trade-offs, barriers to ethical consumption and synergetic effects between different FCMs are described.

4.1 Framework of Ethical Consumption Goals

The following section introduces goals of ethical consumption that are linked to products labelled as organic, as well as the motives behind the purchasing of locally produced food items. Several studies that deal with the analysis of the respective shopping motives are presented and analysed. Lastly, the compiled ethical goals of consumption are linked through a comprehensive, hierarchical framework.

4.1.1 General findings

All assessed qualitative studies provide insights into consumers' preferences in accordance with the ethical motives of the FCQ. Except for Religion, all categories are brought up in all studies.

The amount of information referring to the number of consumer statements differs quite strongly among the studies, which is likely due to the different research settings, the applied methods and the various numbers of respondents. Since it is not the aim of this study to obtain representative results in a quantitative manner, but to openly

explore the variety of ethical consumption goals, it is yet possible to gather a wide array of goals that consumers attach to organic and local purchasing(cf. Appendix I).

The consumers' statements reflect the perception of different levels of ethical consumption goals, which complies with the theoretical approach of Schulte (2003) who suggests a hierarchical structure of target criteria. General topics correspond to the FCMs (Animal welfare, Environmental protection, Political values etc.) and come up as relevant in all studies. Additionally, individual statements of consumers do not only refer to these general concerns but many are more differentiated and include sub-topics (e.g. energy concerns, pollution etc.) which are again differentiated on more specific levels of individual concerns (e.g. transportation distances, on-season production, avoiding wastes etc.).

For example the respondents in many studies mention animal welfare (e.g. Bingen et al., 2011; Roininen et al., 2006; Zepeda et al. 2006; Zepeda & Deal, 2009; etc.) as a relevant driver for their purchase decisions while others differentiate for example between the animals' living conditions or their health (e.g. Harper & Makatouni, 2002; Makatouni, 2002). Other interviewees describe their concerns even more detailed and refer to the slaughtering methods, the massive use of antibiotics or the distances that animals are transported (Hjelmar, 2011). This hierarchical structure of statements can also be demonstrated with the example of Environmental protection. This FCM finds expression by respondents in several studies (e.g. Chang & Zepeda, 2005; Berlin et al, 2009; Harper & Makatouni, 2002; Hill & Lynchhaun, 2002; Roininen et al., 2006; etc.). In other studies it is distinguished between concerns of pollution (Roininen et al., 2006) or wasting energy (Zepeda et al., 2006). Also very explicit driving motives such as the reduction of the application of pesticides (e.g. Hjelmar, 2011; Makatouni, 2002) or the avoidance of specific toxins (Zepeda & Leviten-Reid, 2004) are brought up by several participants.

In many cases the assessment of the studies for the ethical FCMs reveals that consumer statements are often ambiguously. While a respondent might for example mention that shorter transportation distances are an important consumption goal it can still be unclear, which is the underlying FCM. As the collected statements in Appendix I show, the shorter transportation distance for example could be relevant with regard to

animal welfare, energy or pollution concerns. This example shows also that non-ethical goals, such as the quality or the price of a product can be underlying reasons for purchasing-decisions. In the study of Roininen et al. (2006) for example respondents appreciate shorter transportation distances because they associate it with freshness and a lower price. In other words: An ethical consumption motive can be expressed even though the driving force for the final purchase-decision is not necessarily an ethical FCM.

Furthermore, some studies show that the respondents are not always clear on the concepts that are behind organic production or purchasing locally. The interviewees' confusion shows for example through expecting organic products to be produced on small farms (e.g. Harper & Makatouni, 2002; Zepeda et al., 2006) or by assuming that local production incorporates sustainable and environmentally friendly production methods (e.g. Roininen et al. 2006; Zepeda & Leviten-Reid, 2004). Besides, the respondents are often not only confused about the definition of organic or local, but they refer to phrases that reflect a very broad and general interpretation of the chosen purchasing options such as: "I have this general idea that organic farming is better for the world than traditional farming" (Hjelmar, 2011: 339) or "Locally produced will often trigger a thought in my head, this could be fresher and better than something not locally produced" (Zepeda & Leviten-Reid, 2004: 3).

Aside from the ethical and non-ethical FCMs, also other motives are identified. These can mostly be described as social consumption goals that incorporate issues of relationships, trust, care for others and social interaction. These motives are mentioned by consumers of organic as well as local products. Even though these consumption goals do not match any category of the FCQ, nor do they fit the additional ethical goals of Fairness and Local/regional Production, this finding indicates that both purchasing options are related to social aspects as well. Therefore social consumption goals are added to the framework as a new FCM with the title 'Social embeddedness'. Thereby the relevance of social values in the decision-making process of ethically motivated consumers can be considered.

4.1.2 Goals of organic consumption

The assessment of nine studies that deal with consumer preferences for organically labelled food products against the background of the FCQ leads to the following results with respect to the single FCMs.

As it was mentioned in the previous section, all ethical FCMs, except Religion are reflected in at least one of the selected studies. All non-ethical FCMs find consideration. The most prevalent ethical consumption goals that consumers refer to are Animal welfare and Environmental protection: In all studies respondents make statements on both issues, yet on different hierarchical levels.

Political values do play a role for respondents in a small number of studies. So, in some cases it is declared that consuming organic products is a way of making a political statement. This can be for example against globalized and industrialized agriculture or against structural changes in rural areas which involve the disappearance of smaller farms (e.g. Chang & Zepeda, 2005; Harper & Makatouni, 2002; Zepeda et al., 2006). In the study of Hjelm (2011) the consumption of organic products is furthermore linked to acting responsible with regard to society. However, the issue of consumer responsibility does not necessarily have to be seen in a political context but could also be related to social values, such as the responsibility for coming generations and the individual ambition to care for the own family (Hjelm, 2011).

The FCM Local/regional production is also mentioned in several studies (Harper & Makatouni, 2002; Hjelm, 2011; Stolz et al., 2009; Zepeda et al., 2006). In this category the respondents do not differentiate between many specific motives. Instead, local production as a general motive on the highest hierarchical level is stated to be a relevant consumption goal. Supporting smallholder farmers and preserving traditional values are mentioned as sub-categories of the intention to support the local community (Harper & Makatouni, 2002; Hjelm, 2011).

Fairness is mentioned in two studies (Harper & Makatouni, 2002; Zepeda et al., 2006), with 'working conditions' and 'trade conditions' as differentiated motives in this category of FCMs.

Lastly, the previously introduced FCM of Social embeddedness finds consideration in several studies (Hill & Lynchhaun, 2002; Hjelm, 2011; Makatouni, 2002; Zanolini & Naspetti, 2002; Zepeda et al., 2006; Zepeda & Deal, 2009). It is expressed as a desire for altruism and relationship with others, knowing the farmer or producer and the reliance on certifications as a substitute for personal trust. Additionally, also the consumers' desire to act responsible in order to preserve the ecology for coming generations is described as a target criteria for purchasing organic products (Hjelm, 2011). Other pressing issues in the category of consumer responsibility are the need to care for the family and to be a good mother (Hill & Lynchhaun, 2002; Makatouni, 2002).

4.1.3 Ethical goals of local purchasing

In the seven studies evaluating local purchasing, all non-ethical FCMs find consideration while among the ethical FCMs again Religion is not considered as a target criterion in any study. In contrast to the consumption motives as related to organic products, the motive Animal welfare does not find such differentiated attention. It is only mentioned in three studies (Bingen et al., 2011; Roininen et al., 2006; Zepeda & Deal, 2009) and is also not specified in much detail; transportation distance and the possible spread of diseases are named, while the meaning of the latter aspect remains unclear. Environmental protection on the contrary finds comparably more consideration as a consumption goal among the respondents. The general goal and also specific sub-motives are mentioned in all studies except for the research of Chambers et al. (2007). Consumers claim to consider pollution, energy, and sustainability concerns as relevant when it comes to purchasing locally. Further differentiation is expressed through statements about the avoidance of toxins and contaminants, the saving of fuel, and shorter transportation distances (e.g. Bingen et al., 2011; Roininen et al., 2006; Zepeda & Leviten-Reid, 2004).

With respect to Political values the results are comparable to those of the organic studies. Also for the consumers of local products, their preference is linked to the intention of making a political statement against the globalized and industrialized forms of agriculture (Naspetti & Bodini, 2008; Zepeda & Deal, 2009). Bingen et al. (2011) accordingly describe the purchasing of locally produced food as an expression of a

different political self-awareness of consumers: “They discover rights and their own enhanced level of awareness about their role in the food system” (Bingen et al., 2011: 416). Other researchers (e.g. Zepeda & Deal, 2009) consider this as an “[...] evolution from organic to local” (Zepeda & Deal, 2009: 702), that is driven by consumers who perceive organic production as commercialized. Accordingly, many consumers develop a preference for locally produced products which they connect with people who care, instead of large corporations (Zepeda & Deal, 2009). The respondents aim on supporting small-scale farms, family farms and rural communities and they position themselves against the structural changes in rural areas (Bingen et al., 2009). Additionally, local purchasing is perceived as a means for achieving national food security (Zepeda & Deal, 2009).

As it could be expected the FCM Local/regional production incorporates a variety of different consumption goals on all hierarchical levels. Consumers in all studies declare the general motive of local consumption as their goal. Additionally, many respondents differentiate between several objectives that are behind their intention to support the community. Economic benefits for the people, the producers and the region as a whole are mentioned in six out of seven studies (e.g. Berlin et al., 2009; Bingen et al., 2011; Chambers et al., 2007; Roininen et al., 2006, Zepeda & Leviten-Reid, 2004; Zepeda & Deal, 2009). The purchasing of local products is moreover driven by the perception that certain food products from certain regions are better and the belief that local foods are adding to the uniqueness of a region (Zepeda & Deal, 2009). These two perceptions indicate that consumers might be unsure about the concepts of local food and locality food. Lastly, it can be observed that consumers do not express any concern over a potentially different origin of ingredients of processed products that claim to be local.

Fairness finds consideration in the studies of Berlin et al. (2009) and Zepeda and Deal (2009). Respondents refer to the treatment of workers, their safety and the need to protect workers from exploitation.

Regarding the Social embeddedness, the respondents make differentiated comments referring to the sub-categories ‘Trust’, ‘Interaction with producers’ and ‘Interaction with consumers’ in five out of seven studies (Berlin et al, 2009; Bingen et al., 2011; Roininen et al, 2006; Zepeda & Deal, 2009; Zepeda & Leviten Reid, 2004). Among the motives are e.g. the entertainment of visiting a farmers market, the social interaction with producers and the informational interaction with producers (Zepeda & Deal, 2009; Zepeda & Leviten Reid, 2004). Apart from that, trust is derived from knowing the farmer, regional origin and the transparency and integrity of products (e.g. Berlin et al., 2009; Bingen et al., 2011; Zepeda & Leviten-Reid, 2004).

4.1.4 Framework of Ethical Consumption Goals

Summarizing the results that are described in the previous two chapters the findings are graphically illustrated in the following Table 5.

Table 1: Framework of Ethical Consumption Goals

Ethical Consumption Goals		
Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Animal welfare	Living conditions	Appropriate feed (no GMOs)
		Appropriate space
		Humane slaughter
		Shorter transportation distances
	Animal health	Less/no antibiotics
		Less/no hormones
		Avoid diseases
	Animal treatment	Respect animals rights
		Take responsibility for animals
		Less cruelty in animal treatment
		Happy animals
	Environmental protection	Pollution/degradation concerns
Avoiding soil degradation/bad treatment of land		
Water pollution		
Avoiding wastes		
Avoiding toxins/contaminants		
Shorter transportation distances		
Energy concerns		Food miles
		Saving energy
		Shorter transportation distances
Sustainability/respect for the environment		Regenerative production processes
		Seasonality
		Concerns about GMOs/No GMOs
		Shorter transportation distances
Political values	Statement against industrialized agriculture	National food security
		Consumer responsibility
	Statement against structural change	Supporting small farms/family farms
		Supporting rural communities
Local/regional production	Locational advantages	Specific regions for specific foods
		Adds uniqueness to a region
	Supporting the local community	Supporting small farms/family farms
		Preserving traditional values in the countryside
		Support local producers/people
		Support local economy
Fairness	Working conditions	No worker exploitation
		Farm worker safety
	Trade conditions	Fairness

Source: Own illustration

The analysis of the consumers' statements reveals that with regard to Level 1 both purchasing options are associated with all ethical FCMs except for Religion. The latter is accordingly not represented in Table 5. The relevant ethical FCMs are categorized as general consumption goals (Level 1) which are differentiated into two more levels (Level 2 and Level 3).

All categories that are distinguished on Level 2 refer to target criteria that matter to both groups: organic and local consumers. The titles for the sub-categories are derived from statements that are repeatedly made by respondents. The categories for Level 2 contain more detailed information than the goals on Level 1, but they are even further differentiated on Level 3. The consumption goals on Level 3 are the most detailed and explicitly differentiated statements that are made by respondents in the assessed studies. Technically and theoretically according to Schulte (2003) a further differentiation of Level 3 into a Level 4 would be possible (e.g. appropriate feed could be differentiated for the content of feed, the place of production of the feed, the way that the feed is fed to the livestock etc.). However, in this review none of the respondents refers to consumption goals in a more detailed way than represented through Level 3 of the framework.

Looking at the different levels in Table 5, it is shown by colours (green=organic, blue=local, white=both) which consumption goals are mentioned by consumers of either organic or local food products, or by both. The figure thereby illustrates that consumers of both groups consider all FCMs on Level 1 and 2 as relevant consumption goals. Furthermore, it is visualized that consumers who purchase organically labelled products differentiate their consumption goals in detail with regard to the motive of Animal welfare. Consumers with a preference for locally produced food items make explicit distinctions of their consumption goals when it comes to Environmental protection and Local/regional production. The FCMs Political values and Fairness are similarly differentiated by both consumer groups

Table 6 summarizes the statements that are found in the category of other consumption goals. The integrative literature review reveals that not only ethical and non-ethical consumption goals matter to ethically motivated consumers but also that many respondents refer to social aspects when they make purchase decisions as previously described (Appendix I). As a result Table 6 depicts this category, which is hereinafter referred to under the terminology Framework of Social Consumption Goals.

Table 2: Framework of Social Consumption Goals

Social Consumption Goals		
Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Social embeddedness	Trust	Knowing the farmer
		Transparency/Integrity
		Certification
		Regional origin
	Interaction with producers	Preserving traditional knowledge
		Entertainment/Ambiance of FM
		Informational interaction with producers
		Social interaction/relationships with producers
	Interaction with consumers	Creates social networks/relationships
		Lifestyle (Vegetarian/vegan etc.)
		Feeling of membership
		Entertainment/Ambiance of FM
	Responsibility	Care for future generations
		Care for the family
		Help poor producers/farmers

Source: Own illustration

It shows that both groups of ethically motivated consumers consider the aspects Trust and Interaction with producers and consumers as relevant. Both groups differentiate more specific motives such as ‘Knowing the farmer’ and ‘Social relationships’. Anyhow, for the consumers with a preference for purchasing local products also the ambiance at farmers’ markets and social and informational interaction with producers and other shoppers matters (Zepeda & Leviten-Reid, 2004; Zepeda & Deal, 2009). Trust is developed not only through certification as it is the case with organic products, but also regional origin, more transparency and knowing the farmer can generate trust, as a respondent in the study of Berlin et al. (2009) says: “I think local

is more safe. [...] It's more like how many hands have been involved in that food getting it to me" (Berlin et al., 2009: 271).

Besides this, consumers express a feeling of responsibility for others. As respondents describe it, the responsibility is mostly felt for the family: "[...] I started to become aware of what kind of food my family and I should be eating" (Hill & Lynchhaun, 2002: 533) or specifically for children: "[...] before we had children we just bought the cheapest. Now we need to take health considerations, we also bought less organic products before" (Hjelmar, 2011: 340).

4.2 Relationships between target criteria

The analysis of the different research papers does not only facilitate the collection of consumer statements on their ethical consumption goals as related to organic and locally produced food items but also enables their description as target criteria for a scoring model. In theory these target criteria can be either regarded as independent or interdependent factors.

The following chapter accordingly assesses potential value-based relationships between the respective target criteria as perceived and expressed by consumers. The theoretical approach of Bechmann (1978) is applied as a framework in order to identify the different types of relationships. Thereby barriers towards ethical consumption, trade-offs that consumers make in order to achieve their individual aims, and synergetic effects where certain consumption goals are mutually supportive, are also captured.

4.2.1 General findings

The integrated research review leads to three main results with regard to the perceived relationships between the target criteria of the Framework of Ethical Consumption Goals:

1. Not all relationship types as suggested by Bechmann (1978) are found. Instead additional types of linkages are perceived by consumers.
2. Relationships are rarely perceived between ethical target criteria only. Instead consumers also refer to linkages between the following components:

- ethical and non-ethical target criteria
- social target criteria and ethical/non-ethical target criteria
- local/organic and ethical target criteria
- local and organic

These findings are described and explained in detail in the following passages and examples are given to illustrate each result.

4.2.2 Relationship types

In accordance with the theoretical options of a scoring model, the assessment of the qualitative studies considers four possible types of perceived relationships. These are: 1.Substitutability, 2.Competition, 3.Complementarity and 4.Indifference (Bechmann, 1978).

Anyhow,not all of these relationships are considered as relevant bythe consumersin the reviewed studies. Indifference and Substitutability are not mentioned by any consumer as a characteristic type of relationship between target criteria. The focus lies instead on the two remaining relationship types. Theissue of Competition is described in 12 out of 15 articles andComplementarity isreferred to in all 15 publications (Appendix III).Furthermore, the analysis reveals that while Bechmann (1978) provides a clear definition of the respective relationships, it appears that consumers describe the concepts more openly. Additionally, it is observed that they perceive not only a reduction or an increase on the value level but that certain criteria can exclude each other. Hereinafter this observed concept is referred to as ‘Exclusion’ and it is added as additional relationship type in Table 7.

Copyright © by Chiang Mai University
All rights reserved

Table 3: Perceived relationship types

Value Level (Bechmann, 1978)	Value Level(This study)	Example
COMPETITION		
The value of target B is reduced if at the same time also target A is achieved	Benefits of one target criteria outweigh the benefits of another target criteria	The benefits of local production might outweigh the benefits of animal health
COMPLEMENTARITY		
The value of the achievement of target B increases if also target A is achieved	Benefits are increased -if certain target criteria are fulfilled	The benefits of local purchasing increase if also less energy for transportation is wasted.
EXCLUSION		
<i>Exclusion is not described as a relationship type</i>	Benefits are only perceived if certain target criteria are fulfilled – No benefits are perceived if certain target criteria are not fulfilled	Organic is only perceived as beneficial if the producer is known by the consumer – Environmentally conservation is perceived as not beneficial , if the producer is not a small-scale farmer

Source: Own illustration based on Bechmann, 1978

In all cases where the respondents describe their consumption goals as related to the purchasing options of organic and/or local, they refer to a complementary relationship. Usually the benefits of the respective purchasing concept are increasing with the fulfillment of the target criterion that is especially relevant to the individual consumer. These positive relationships between purchasing concepts and ethical target criteria are described already in chapter 4.1.4 and are ultimately depicted in the Framework of Ethical Consumption Goals (Table 5).

Competitive relationships in the sense that the perceived value of one target criterion is reduced if another target criterion is achieved are also described in several studies. These relationships are not illustrated through the Framework of Ethical Consumption Goals due to their negative character. Examples can be found in several studies and they mostly relate to non-ethical target criteria that compete with the purchasing concepts of local or organic (Appendix III). More detailed results on the perception of competitive relationships between ethical and other target criteria and examples for relationships between several other components are described in the following sections.

Besides the typical competitive or complementary relationships, where the value of one target criteria increases or decreases depending on the other, there are also perceptions of linkages that have an excluding character. Accordingly, a consumer perceives an organic product only as beneficial if he knows the farmer personally and if he furthermore has direct insights into the conditions at the farm (Stolz et al., 2009). For this respondent the criteria are positively related but only if both of them are fulfilled at the same time. If one criterion is not fulfilled - in this case 'knowing the farmer' - the relationship becomes competitive in a way that the other criterion is overruled. In other words: It only matters to the consumer that a product is organic if it is locally and hence transparently produced; otherwise the fact that it is produced under the organic production scheme becomes completely irrelevant.

In other cases the exclusion of criteria is expressed the other way around. So for consumers it is sometimes the case that they actually perceive no benefit of the

respective purchasing option at all if a certain target criterion is not fulfilled. For example in the research work of Hjelmar (2011) someone states: “[...] (M)any products are called organic even if they are transported from New Zealand or Chile. That doesn’t seem right when you might as well can harvest them right here” (Hjelmar, 2011: 339). In this case a specific ethical value that is linked to organic products appears to be in conflict with the transportation around the globe. The same is described by a respondent who finds that the transportation of products over long distances is contradicting the very basic principle of sustainability as it is associated with organic products (Zepeda et al., 2006). This is also found by Stolz et al. (2009), where long ways of transportation are perceived as contradictive to organic labels in general. Similarly respondents in the study of Chang and Zepeda (2005) explain that growing or feeding GMOs does not match the concept of organic. Also the availability of e.g. fruit that is not in season is considered negatively and as a contradiction to organic production schemes.

In all these cases the consumer experiences a conflict of consumption goals. Consequently priorities are set, which can either result in a competitive relationship or in an ultimate exclusion with regard to the valuing of the respective target criteria.

4.2.3 Relationship components

As it was pointed out in the literature review the relationships that are of interest for a scoring model of ethical consumption goals are those between different ethical FCMs on Level 1 and Level 2 of the hierarchical framework. Despite this basic premise the results of the integrated research review reveal that there are only few remarks made by consumers which link ethical target criteria with each other. Instead there are clearly more statements available which demonstrate the perception of linkages between ethical consumption goals and various other components.

1. Ethical target criteria

With regard to complementary types of relationships, where the perceived value of each target criterion is somehow positively correlated with the other, six consumer statements can be identified (Table 8). Other types of relationships between ethical target criteria are not perceived by any consumer.

Likewise, it can be observed that all relationships which are mentioned link items that can be found on all levels of the Framework of Ethical Consumption Goals – including Level 3. Thus, the consumers do not express the perception of any relationship between different ethical values, but between the different levels of one ethical FCM. The only exception is the perceived linkage between seasonality and locational advantages which connects two different target criteria, namely Environmental protection and Local/regional production.

Table 4: Relationships between ethical target criteria

Ethical – Ethical
Complementarity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less/no pesticides – ecology/environmental protection • Seasonality – locational advantages • Short transportation distances – animal welfare • Short transportation distances – respectful treatment of the environment • Short transportation distances – less wasting of fuel

Source: Own illustration

In the studies of Makatouni (2002) and Zanoli and Naspetti (2002) the respective research results indicate that consumers perceive a complementary relationship between the avoidance of chemicals/pesticides and benefits for the ecology/environmental balance. A consumer in another study emphasizes that although the production in a certain area is generally appreciated due to locational advantages, it would be even better if seasonality is considered: “Seasonality is important. At the same time territoriality is important in Italy [...]” (Naspetti & Bodini, 2008: 114). The same respondent claims: “For me it’s wrong to try to produce out of season [...]” (Naspetti & Bodini, 2008: 114) which demonstrates that seasonality might also be perceived as a criterion for the exclusion of certain products, even if other target criteria are fulfilled.

Some consumers cherish short transportation distances of either produce or animals, because this positively affects animal welfare, reduces the waste of fuel and is a sign of treating the environment responsibly (Roininen et al., 2006; Zepeda & Leviten-Reid, 2004).

2. Ethical and non-ethical target criteria

The assessment of perceived relationships between ethical and non-ethical target criteria shows that in 13 out of the 15 studies consumers refer to such linkages. Competition as well as complementarity is perceived. The results are depicted and sorted according to the type of relationship in the following Table 9.

Table 5: Relationships between ethical and non-ethical target criteria

Ethical – Non-Ethical	
Competition	Complementarity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seasonality – choice of products 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Animal welfare – premium price Animal welfare – food safety Animal welfare – quality/taste Animal living conditions – health Avoidance of antibiotics (animals) – health Avoidance of pesticides – health Environmental conservation/protection – health Avoidance of environmental/soil degradation – price Short transportation – freshness Short transportation – lower price Short supply chain – quality Seasonality – taste/quality

Source: Own illustration

As Table 9 shows, the perceived relationships link ethical target criteria of different levels of the framework with non-ethical target criteria. Animal welfare for example is representing Level 1 of the framework while animal living conditions can be found on Level 2 and the avoidance of antibiotics is on Level 3 in the hierarchy. Hence, consumers state that they value e.g. Animal Welfare or the associated sub-categories

positively if also non-ethical criteria such as e.g. health benefits, food safety or the quality of the product are improved. Their concern is expressed in a more or less differentiated way, which translates into target criteria on the different hierarchical levels of the framework.

Short transportation distances of animals or produce are technically beneficial from an ethical perspective even if the consumer does not directly express an ethical motivation. For this reason short transportation distance is considered as ethical FCM in the Framework of Ethical Consumption Goals (cf. Table 5) and as such it is positively linked to non-ethical FCMs. In terms of complementary relationships Chambers et al. (2007) reveal that consumers appreciate a shorter travelling distance of local food or shorter supply chains for reasons of better quality (i.e. freshness). This is also portrayed by Naspetti & Bodini (2008) who point out that “[...] short-travel distances is perceived as a proxy of freshness” (Naspetti & Bodini, 2008: 116). In the study of Roininen et al. (2006) consumers connect short transportation to a lower price and better taste.

Regarding the competitive relationships only seasonality as linked to the choice of products is mentioned by consumers. Respondents in the study of Chambers et al. (2007) explain that purchasing products in season only, would limit their choice, in a way that makes them in turn purchase imported products: “We wouldn’t have bananas for starters if we didn’t import vegetables” (Chambers et al., 2007: 211).

3. Social target criteria and ethical/non-ethical target criteria

The analysis of ethical consumption goals reveals that social factors can play a crucial role for the process of making purchase decisions. Table 10 illustrates how the respondents in the chosen studies perceive the relationships between the respective social consumption goals and ethical target criteria.

Table 6: Relationships between social and ethical target criteria

Social – Ethical	
Competition	Complementarity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust – organic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust – the product origin is known • Trust – small-scale farming • Care for the family – no pesticides • Responsibility for future generations – conservation of the environment
Exclusion	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust – organic • Not knowing the farmer – organic 	

Source: Own illustration

The relationships that positively link local or organic with social consumption goals are already depicted in Table 6, the Framework of Social Consumption Goals, and are therefore not repeated here. However, there are positive linkages described which do not address the purchasing concepts themselves, but which consider more differentiated relations on the three levels of the framework.

So trust is for example perceived to increase if the locational origin of a product is known: “I prefer to buy yoghurt produced in the area close to the city where I live, therefore it is surely fresh” (Naspetti & Bodini, 2008: 114). Also, if it originates from a small-scale farm the same effect is described (Naspetti & Bodini, 2008). The aspect of environmental conservation and protection is positively related to taking over responsibility for future generations as well as avoiding pesticides is beneficial if a consumer wants to take care for the family (Hjelmar, 2011; Makatouni, 2002).

For competitive relationships a respondent mentioned that the perceived value of organic products can be decreased if the trust in the label is shaken: “[...] (T)he Soil Association, which I always thought were very stringent but apparently they are not! And I wonder whether the organic products that we are consuming are also meeting one or two categories [...]” (Harper & Makatouni, 2002: 296). This competitive relationship can also be perceived in a way that it becomes excluding as it is the case in the study of Zepeda and Deal (2009), where the lack of trust is referred to as a reason not to buy organic products. Also, in the study of Stolz et al. (2009) a similar competitive relationship is mentioned. Here one respondent clearly describes that even though he

appreciates organic production, a product (i.e. eggs) that is purchased directly at a farm has a higher value to him, because he knows the farmer. Moreover, the described competitive relationship might merge into a form of exclusion because he also mentions that he would not buy organic eggs if they are sold at a certain supermarket and thus the social component of trust is not sufficiently fulfilled (Stolz et al., 2009: 174).

As the integrated research review reveals, consumers do perceive relationships between social and non-ethical target criteria. These solely complementary relations are listed in Table 11.

Table 7: Relationships between social and non-ethical target criteria

Social – Non-Ethical
Complementarity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certification – convenience • Knowing the farmer – freshness • Knowing the farmer – food safety • Food safety for the family – local

Source: Own illustration


Purchasing motives related to the quality and safety of the respective food products are complementarily related to personal relationships with producers. Several consumer statements underline this finding: A respondent in one study of Italian consumers declares for example: “I buy eggs from the farmer because I am sure they are fresh” (Naspetti & Bodini, 2008: 114). Similarly a respondent in another study states: “[...] (T)he closer to home it is, the safer you’re ultimately going to be” (Zepeda & Deal, 2009: 702). Or this organic consumer, who declares “[...] I don’t worry as much if it doesn’t say organic lettuce, but if it says it was grown locally, I figure they won’t have to use too much amendments” (Berlin et al., 2009: 270). This statement indicates that locally purchased products are perceived as safer and are hence a means of taking care of the family. Another consumer of local products describes this link directly: “I think hard about the food that goes into my child’s body. I want something that is doing no harm” (Bingen et al., 2011: 414).

4. Local/organic and ethical/non-ethical target criteria

The majority, of perceived relationships connects the purchasing options with ethical and non-target criteria. The complementary relationships between local and organic and ethical target criteria are equivalent to the ethical consumption goals as portrayed in the framework in Table 5 (cf. chapter 4.1.4).

Furthermore, consumers refer to competitive relationships between local or organic purchasing and ethical consumption goals as Table 12 shows.

Table 8: Relationships between Local/organic and ethical target criteria

Local/organic – ethical	
Competition	Complementarity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organic – long transportation distances (environmental protection/animal welfare) • Organic – large corporate farms (political values) • Organic – contamination by neighbouring farms • Organic&Local – seasonality 	 <i>(see chapter 4.1.4, Table 5)</i>

Source: Own illustration

The concept of organic labelling appears to be in conflict and hence competition with long transportation distances for reasons of animal welfare and environmental protection. Besides also “[...] the emergence of large corporate organic farms (and), the possibility of contamination from neighbouring conventional farms [...]” (Chang & Zepeda, 2005: 160) lead to a decrease in the perceived value of organic products.

The issue of seasonality can be perceived in a negative way related to local purchasing as well as organic products. If a product is certified organic and it is available even though it is out of season, this is regarded as contradicting the principles of organic according to the findings of Stolz et al. (2009). With regard to local purchasing, seasonality poses a problem to consumers because not all food items are available at all times, so that certain coping strategies need to be developed in order to solve the conflict (Bingen et al., 2011).

The purchasing concepts local and organic are furthermore positively and negatively related to non-ethical target criteria as Table 13 shows.

Table 9: Relationships between Local/organic and non-ethical target criteria

Local/organic – non-ethical	
Competition	Complementarity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organic & local – budget/price • Organic & local – availability/selection • Organic & local – time/convenience • Organic & local– quality • Organic – lack of familiarity • Organic – freshness • Organic – good taste • Organic – shelf life • Organic – high fat content • Local – quality (of conventional food) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organic & local – health • Organic & local – taste • Organic & local – quality • Local – food safety • Local –freshness • Local – low price

Source: Own illustration

Among all studies it becomes clear that in terms of complementary relationships organic and local purchasing are both positively associated with the non-ethical FCMs Health, Sensory Appeal (e.g taste, texture, etc.) and aspects of good quality(e.g. Bingen et al., 2011; Chambers et al., 2007; Chang & Zepeda, 2005; Harper & Makatouni, 2002; Hill & Lynchhaun, 2002; Hjelmar, 2011; Naspetti & Bodini, 2008; etc.). Moreover, locally purchased products are linked to food safety, freshness and also to a lower price as a respondent in the study of Chambers et al. (2007) explains: “[...] if you do manage to find these local places, you can buy more than you can get at supermarkets at a relatively good price” (Chambers et al., 2007: 210).

Looking at the negative linkages between local and organic and non-ethical target criteria both purchasing concepts are overall strongly competing with the non-ethical FCMs Price, Convenience (i.e. availability, time) and quality (i.e. Sensory Appeal, etc.). This is the case in the majority of the assessed studies (e.g. Bingen et al.,

2011; Chambers et al., 2007; Chang & Zepeda, 2005; Zepeda et al., 2006). Anyhow, the researchers concluded that while the price of products is an impediment for organic and local shoppers, it can still be overcome by attitude: “[...] shoppers deal with the price obstacle by placing healthy food higher on their list of priorities” (Zepeda & Deal, 2009: 701).

Bingen et al. (2011) refer to time as the overall limiting factor to local purchasing. Anyhow, since all participants in their study were dedicated to consuming locally they developed several coping strategies to overcome these barriers. Coping mechanisms included the trade-off with leisure activities in daily life such as regarding food related activities as a sort of hobby or avoiding eating out.

In other studies very specific issues such as, that a shorter shelf life can be a problem with organic products (Hjelmar, 2011: 338) and that organic milk is often only available with a high fat content, which would both lead to a decrease in the appreciation of the product or even the decision for another product (Stolz et al., 2009: 172). As in the examples of Hjelmar (2011) and Stolz et al. (2009), all mentioned negative relationships can have an excluding character too. So for example in the study of Chang and Zepeda (2005) availability, inconvenience, price and lacking freshness for example are declared reasons for not buying the respective organic product. Depending on the priorities of the consumer coping is hence not always sufficient and the product is consequently excluded from the shopping list.

5. Local and organic

The two purchasing options are also perceived to be linked as the respondents in several studies describe and hence relationships of all three types are mentioned.

Complementary relationships are referred to in three studies, whereof two focus on the motives behind local purchasing and one on organic consumption goals. Anyhow, in all three papers the respondents associate “[...] organic food to local origin [...]” (Naspetti & Bodini, 2008: 113), “[...] organic with smaller [...]” (Berlin et al., 2009: 271) and “[...] to being locally produced or knowing the farmer” (Zepeda et al., 2006: 390). The authors likewise conclude that the consumers merge the concepts of

local and organic and are not aware of the differences between the two (Berlin et al., 2009; Naspetti & Bodini, 2008; Zepeda et al., 2006).

For the negative relationships it is observed that local and organic compete and can furthermore mutually exclude one another. Typically, local is preferred over organic, which becomes especially clear in statements of consumers whose ethical consumption goals are linked to Political values. In these cases the motivation for local consumption originates in the perception that agriculture on an industrial scale is ethically not desirable. While from the consumers' perspective local purchasing is a means to support small-scale farming, organic has lost its credibility in this regard. Consumer statements such as "industrialization of organic agriculture, it's the race to the bottom line" (Zepeda & Deal, 2009: 702) or "I'd much rather be able to give my money straight to a farmer rather than four middlemen who are all taking their cut" (Zepeda & Deal, 2009: 702) demonstrate this perception. Furthermore, consumers express a clear preference for local over organic without specific reasoning as this example demonstrates: "I'd probably go with the small farmer. I probably wouldn't even ask him if he was organic" (Berlin et al., 2009: 271).

Only in the study of Naspetti and Bodini (2008) a respondent declares that organic and local might compete in the opposite direction if certain conditions are not fulfilled: "Since I don't know any farmer directly, and so I don't know how they work, I prefer to buy organic eggs in supermarkets [...]" (Naspetti & Bodini, 2008: 114). Thus organic can possibly also exclude local purchasing.

ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่
Copyright © by Chiang Mai University
All rights reserved