CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS

It is the goal of this chapter to evaluate the results of the study in the context of ethical consumption and the respective theoretical background. Therefore, the outcomes of the integrated research review are discussed with regard to the research questionsand furthermore examined in the context of other research work. Finally,it is argued if the findings of this study are applicable for a modified scoring modelthat evaluates ethical consumption goals.

5.1 Framework of Ethical Consumption Goals

Research Question 1 aims on the identification of ethical consumption goals that consumers relate either to products that arelabelled organic or purchased locally. In line with this Question 2 intends to close the gap between the two different purchasing options through a comprehensive hierarchical Framework of Ethical Consumption Goals. The comparison and adjacent summary of the relevant ethical target criteria ina frameworkstructure provides the option of using the gathered data for the respective scoring model.

First of all, the results clearly confirm that ethical consumers as defined and described in several research works indeed value and appreciatevarious ethical motives when it comes to purchasing decisions (e.g. Carrington et al., 2014; Memery et al., 2012; Starr, 2009; etc.). While the consumers with a preference for organic products and those who prefer to purchase locally are assessed independently from each other in the majority of studies, this paper brings both groups together and treats them as one group of ethical consumers. Thereby the representation of all combinations of ethical consumption goals in the modified scoring modelis facilitated, regardless of the usually chosen shopping option of the consumer. Hence, the model holds the opportunity to provide the ethical consumer with a certain shopping option or product that matches the respective ethical priorities while leaving out potential predetermined preferences for a certain purchasing option.

The FCQ, of Steptoe et al. (1995) and Lindman and Väänänen(2000) provides a useful guideline to assess consumers' consumption goals with regard to food products. It enables a structured reflection on nine non-ethical and three ethical FCMs. Still, the extension of the ethical dimension of the FCQ with two more motives as done in this study appears to be reasonable. The categories Local/regional production and Fairness are addressed by respondents of both consumer groups (cf.chapter 4.1.4, Table 5) and thus cannot be neglected in their relevance for the choice of a certain product. Another field of factors that influence food choice according to the results of this study are social factors. These are not considered in the FCQ until now but proof to be of relevance for consumers.

According to the results of this study all FCMs are described as relevant by consumers except for the factor Religion. This in turn matches the findings of Zepeda and Deal (2009), askingin their study explicitly for the relevance of religion for the purchase decision in favourof organic and local food products. They could also not reveal any linkage between religion and the purchasing of organic or local food as perceived by consumers. The Framework of Ethical Consumption Goalsexclusively represents all FCMs that are described as relevant by consumers as well as all related sub-topics that are brought up by the respondents (cf.chapter 4.1.4, Table 5).This is according to Fetzer (2014) a necessary precondition to facilitate a comprehensive scoring modelwhich is able to depict all ethically motivated consumersand their respective consumption goals.

Through the collection of consumer statements it becomes furthermore clear that peopleusually do not address the entirety of ethical issues with the same level of interest.Instead, priorities are made as also Carrington et al. (2014) point out. Thiscan be deduced from the varying levels of differentiation in consumer statements as it is summarized in the hierarchical Framework of Ethical Consumption Goals. In accordance with this approach itcan be observed that the depth of the consumers' reflection depends on individual prioritieswhich correlate with the depth of concern for certain consumption goals. For example, someone could explicitly mention 'slaughtering methods' as relevant for his purchase decisions, but would refer to the FCM Environmental protection only in terms of a general concern.Consequently, if the

framework is supposed to be applicable for each individual consumer to express relevant priorities and concerns, it needs to represent all hierarchical levels of ethical consumption goals that are present. In this study three levels of differentiation are identified and hence integrated in the framework. While Schulte (2003) describes the possibility to add a fourth hierarchical level to the structure, thisdepth of differentiation is not found in this study. Still, from a technical viewpoint the option of extending the framework should be considered, in case consumers that will actually use the scoring model express additional consumption goals (cf.chapter 6).

The first level of the framework represents the FCMs which are considered as relevant by both groups of respondents. Also at Level 2 the purchasing goals of both groups completely correspond. Anyhow, there are considerable differences regarding the third level of the hierarchical structure. Here, the consumers of organically labelled products show a strong preference for issues of animal welfare by giving quite differentiated responses when describing their purchasing motives. This is similarly revealed in a study on additional ethical consumption goals among organic consumers by Zander and Hamm (2010), where animal welfare and regional production pose the issues of highest interest. Furthermore, the results of this study show thatthe FCM Local/regional production matters to organic consumers but is of less interest compared to Animal welfare.Respondents that appreciate local purchasing express less differentiated concern for the motive Animal welfare but focus instead on Environmental protection, Local production and Fairness. Thisfinding is in line with the theory of the “local trap” which states that consumersoften perceive locally produced products as more beneficial for the environment and the people and also as more socially just than agricultural production on comparably larger scales (Hallett, 2012). Even though, the definition of the term local is often unclear as the integrated research review reveals, the perception of purchasing locally is almost always positively (Berlin et al., 2009; Hallett, 2012).At the same time the results of this study show that also the meaning of organic is not quite clear for many respondents in the analysedresearch papers despite the rules and regulations that are implemented in specific laws and guidelinesof labelling agencies (cf. chapter 4.2.3).

While the selected respondents for this research project are characterised as ethically motivated consumers in the respective research papers they are not automatically showing an in-depth knowledge about the products that they purchase. Instead, the two purchasing concepts are unclear for manyinterviewees. Consequently, local purchasing and organic are often merged in the respondents' perception and sometimes even mixed with other ideas of consumption.So, local purchasing is for example associated with concepts of organic and fair trade as well as with ideas of eating healthier (Bingen et al., 2011: 416). Or as Berlin et al. (2009) phrase it: "[…] the concepts of local, small-scale and organic were often blended in people's minds" (Berlin et al., 2009: 271). Especially confusing for consumers is the purchasing of products directly at a farm or at a farmers' market since many consumers then automatically assume that the offered products are organic (Stolz et al., 2009: 177).In another study consumers distinguish between local and organic but these distinctions are based on the respondents' subjective perceptions and opinions and not on their ability to define each concept separately. Additionally, as Schleenbecker and Hamm (2013) point out, the information that is available to consumers is not necessarily objective and thus the knowledge remains shallow or is misguided.

These findings can be seen in accordance with the VBN theory in the way that personal beliefs under influence of the norms of society are transferred by consumers into their own, individual norms (Stern, 2000). Anyhow, as this study illustrates, these norms are not necessarily a final construct in the consumers' minds but develop and change over time and with experience. So, for example social contacts, television programmes or certain literature can have influence on the consumers' knowledge (e.g. Harper & Makatouni, 2002; Hjelmar, 2011) and consequently the formation of habits that guide his behaviour.

Still, as the results of this study reveal, it can be assumed that beliefs are not easily affected by an increase in knowledge. The morals and thus individual norms proof to be quite stable over time in contrast to the purchasing behaviour of respondents. Several researchers describe a shift of consumers from organic towards purchasing locally (e.g. Adam & Salois, 2010; Berlin et al., 2009). As Berlin et al. (2009) assume and as it is also reflected in the results, this is often the case because

consumers relate small-scale farms and local production with organically labelled products. Anyhow, since production schemes for items with organic label tend to grow towards industrial size and consumers are aware of this tendency, those who do not agree with this development often change to purchasing locally "[…] as a more holistic and authentic substitute for organic" (Adam & Salois, 2010: 333). This supports the idea that while the general set of motives of ethically motivated consumers, thus their beliefs, remains relatively fixed over time, a change in the perception of the production schemes might lead to a change in priorities and thus in the choice for a certain purchasing option. In summary, a scoring model that depicts all relevant ethical goals and which assesses producers and their products under the same criteria holds the opportunity to provide the consumer with valuable information regardless of the perception of organic and local in the public or the individual depth of knowledge.

Based on these findings the development of a modified scoring model for ethical consumption goals that combines the attributes that are associated with organic and local purchasing appears as a feasible approach. Because no matter if consumers are able or not able to clearly distinguish between the actual concepts of local and organic they associate certain ethical consumption goalssimilarly with both options. They strive for the fulfilment of those goals and despite a lack of knowledge or in contrast because of a very specific knowledge they decide for the one or the other option (Berlin et al., 2009). If the model is thus able to provide a high level of objectivity in the evaluation of producers, it can cope with a lack of knowledge on the consumer side and save the user the costs of an immense research effort (cf. chapter 2.4).

As another result of the integrated research review it turns out that not only ethical consumption goals are drivers for the purchasingof organic and local products butsocial factors are apparentlyrelevant goals too.In accordance with Hinrichs (2000) and Winter (2003) the term social embeddedness covers various forms of social ties, relationship structures, as well as issues of trust and responsibility which are all depicted in the Framework of Social Consumption Goals (cf. chapter 4.1.4, Table 6). Similar to the Framework of Ethical Consumption Goals a hierarchical structure is applied where respondents' statements according to their level of differentiation fit in. Even though both consumer groups describe themselves as driven by social motives,

local production with shorter supply chains where the number of middlemen and agents is minimized, creates a level of personal trust that is quite different from buying in the supermarket guided by organic labels.In accordance with the theory of theprincipal-agent problem, which describes the issue of uneven distribution of information in economic transactions, the alleged transparency of directly being in contact with the producer (principal) is much higher for the consumer (agent) if the supply chain is shorter. A case where other agents, such as retailers, middlemen or the salesperson in the supermarket influence the situation in turn increases the problem. Due to different levels of power and conflicting goals of the different agents in a supply chain the amount of problems increases with the number of agents. Hence, issues such as threats to food safety or quality deficits are expected to be more likely to occur the more agents are involved. In turn a shorter supply chain creates trust for consumers (Ciliberti et al., 2011; Feldmann & Hamm, 2015).Zepeda and Deal (2009) summarize this attitude of the respondents as a way of viewing local farmers as parental figures who behave responsibly, take care of their customers and only produce and sell safe and nutritious food items.

While social factors are often associated with schemes of purchasing locally, such as shopping at farmers' markets or participating in community-supported agriculture (e.g. Hinrichs, 2000), the results of this study show that also consumer of organic products consider social criteria as consumption goals. Social factors are thus not only relevant in the setting of purchasing products directly at the producer. Instead, issues such as for example personal interaction with the farmer, taking care of one's own family or the creation of new social networks are also driving forces when purchasing organically labelled goods.Anyhow, in these cases trust is not necessarily created through a shortened supply chain but through the organic label which stands for constant monitoring and the surveillance of the entire supply chain for compliance with organic standards.

The previous examples show that social consumption goals play a crucial role for purchasing decisions which is additionally emphasized in the following chapter under the perspective of relationships between target criteria. The subsequent technical relevance of social target criteria for the modified scoring model will be discussed in section 5.3.

5.2 Relationships between consumption goals

According to Bechmann (1978) the modified scoring modelgenerally holds the option to incorporateperceived and technical relationships between target criteria of a framework. Research Question 3 therefore focuses on the identification of potentiallinkages between target criteria and their evaluation with regard to the applicability for the model. In accordance with the methodological approach of exploring consumers' attitudes and motives, the technical linkages between target criteria are excluded from this research and only perceived relationships on the value level are considered.

In order to assess the perceived relationships between target criteria the concept of Bechmann (1978) is used, which implies that there are four different types of relationships. But out of these four, just two types are identified in the integrated research review: Competition and Complementarity (cf. chapter 2.5 and 4.2.2). Indifferent relationships presumably do not find consideration by consumers due to their characteristic of irrelevance in the assessed research works. Relationships where one criterion is perceived to have the equal value for the consumer as another criterion are also not described by respondents. Instead, it appears that single target criteria are either negatively (competition) or positively (complementarity) related. Furthermore, it is observed that in several cases respondents describe relationships that are characterized by exclusion: There is no interdependence perceived since only one target criteria is desired and exclusively preferred. The concept of Bechmann (1978) is thus not necessarily complete or does always fit the actual perceived relationships.

So, while it can be noticed that the ethical consumption goals for consumers of organic and local products often overlap there are also cases where the respondent refers to an exclusive compliance with just one of the purchasing concepts. This is true for the linkages between the two purchasing concepts and non-ethical consumption goals such as Price, Sensory Appeal, Convenience etc. The consumer's limit of budget for example leads to the exclusion of the possibility to purchase organic food products. This observation indicates that ethical consumption goals are justifiably regarded as added value in contrast to basic value as Schleenbecker and Hamm (2013) suggest. The basic value of a product refers to its quality which in turn incorporates health and nutrition. Ethical values on the contrary are additional benefits, positive circumstances or even enabling factors for the achievement of the basic goals.

In line with this theory,Table 13 illustrates that certain non-ethical FCMs are competing with the perceived positive value of purchasing an organic or locally produced product. This can be for example the case if a consumer prefers organic products but often perceives them as less tasty compared to conventional products. Then these motives can turn out to be excluding at a certain point, which means that the basic value weighs out the added value when it comes to a purchase decision.As for the example the consumer has made the experience that a certain organic product never matches his expectations in terms of taste and therefore excludes the product form the shopping list. Still, as the results reveal, not only quality plays a crucial role but also other factors such as budget, time or convenience can outweigh ethical concerns. They are thus in line with several previous studies (e.g. Bingen et al., 2011; Chambers et al., 2007; Chang & Zepeda, 2005; etc.) that identify non-ethical FCMs such as Price, Health or Convenience as limiting factors with regard to ethical food choice (cf. chapter 4.2.3, Table 13)

In line with this, the issue of time and convenience rules out the option of purchasing organic products as this interviewee describes: "[…] you don't want to go running around to a hundred different places, so I tend not to shop very much, and when I do, I just run around Coles and get as much as I can." (Chang & Zepeda, 2005:162). Even though the consumption of organic is perceived as beneficial, there are factors that make it impossible for consumers to always achieve this consumption goal. In the study

of Bingen et al. (2011) this strategy is described as an avoidance strategy in contrast to confrontative strategies. While confrontative strategies aim on mastering the competition between the consumption goals through finding substitutes for example, avoidance strategies result in the abandonment or neglect of a certain consumption goal, which is described as exclusion in this study. Overall avoidance strategies are not mentioned by respondents with reference to any constellation of relationship components. Only the perceived linkages between the purchasing concepts and non-ethical FCMs are partly characterized by avoidance mechanisms (cf. chapter 4.2.3, Table 13). This finding is consistent with the result of Bingen et al. (2011) that consumers with a preference for an ethical purchasing concept are willing to solve conflicts with other consumption goals through the substitution with products that share as many similar characteristics as possible.The neglect or exclusion is thus foremost an option if the conflict cannot be solved through a substitute because for example the budget is limited. Due to the overlap and similarities between ethical consumption goals related to organic and local purchasing as described before, it can be assumed that both options might substitute each other, even though none of the respondents in the assessed studies explicitly makes such a statement.

While relationships between single ethical consumption goals are rarely described by respondents, a majority of statements relates specific ethical target criteria with non-ethical criteria(cf. chapter 4.2.3, Table 9). Respondents claim that they care about e.g. Animal welfare and Environmental protection whereas their predominant purchasing motives are identified as concerns of Health and product quality, thus basic values of the product. In these cases consumers describe ethical target criteria as their consumption goals but they moreoverindicate that this is not primarily due to ethical concern. More specifically the respective ethical consumption goals are named, but regarded as conditions or circumstances that facilitate the achievement of certain non-ethical consumption goals. Hence, ethical target criteria such as Animal welfare and Environmental protection and the non-ethical FCMs Health and quality (e.g.Sensory appeal, Natural Content) can be a positive reinforcement for each other and are thus positively related.

This can be demonstrated with several examples of statements of organic consumers who often regard animal welfare as a highly relevant consumption goal as the first part of the research had already shown. Thus, Stolz et al. (2009) for example refer to cases where less antibiotics and better feed for (organic) chicken are not only preferred for altruistic motives such as more humane rearing conditionsfor the animals. Instead the primary concernis that these eggs are perceived as having a better taste and as being healthier. Also, in the study of Harper & Makatouni (2002) the connection between the FCMs Animal welfare and Sensory Appeal (i.e. taste) is emphasized by different organic consumers who express that appropriate living conditions of animals positively affect the overall quality of the food products (i.e. meat and eggs). One of the respondents made this point very clear: "You are what you eat…happy animals produce healthy products" (Harper & Makatouni, 2002: 295).

In other cases the consumers' alignment with ethical values appears to be a technical side effect of the consumers' primary intention to achieve a certain non-ethical consumption goal (i.e. Health). For example, Chang & Zepeda (2005) describe that all consumers in their study are concerned about "[…] the level of concentration of chemicals in the food" (Chang & Zepeda, 2005: 162) but only one respondent connects this issue also to the goal of Environmental protection. Also, a preference for a better quality of meat products can have the side effect of improved animal welfare as this consumer describes: "[…] organic meat tastes better, it has a different quality. The animals have had another life, more exercise, no antibiotics, not pumped with water." (Hjelmar, 2011: 338). Even though the consumers in these cases do not present ethical consumption goals as primary reasons for their purchasing decisions, ethical target criteria are despite not clearly valued but technically fulfilled.

While these examples support the conclusion that especially the ethical FCM Animal welfare needs to be seen as a "[…] multi-level construct, which has both a nutritional (physiological) and social (or symbolic) component" (Harper & Makatouni, 2002: 297), the results of the integrated research review show that also other ethical consumption goals fulfil these criteria. The assessment of the relationships between ethical target criteria and non-ethical target criteria shows that also the avoidance of pesticides and the conservation of the environment are perceived as valuable in relation

to health concerns (cf. chapter 4.2.3, Table 9). Furthermore, a shorter supply chain is declared as an indicator for better product quality. At the same time, social motives are perceived to be positively linked to the same ethical target criteria. Avoiding pesticides is a means of protecting the family and knowing the origin of a product comes along with a high level of trust in its quality and safety (cf. chapter 4.2.3, Table 10).

Apart from this the consumption goal Health needs to be further examined in its definition according to Steptoe et al. (1995). The researchers describe it as a purely egoistic concern with example items such as "Keeps me healthy" or "Is good for my skin/teeth/hair/nails/etc." (Steptoe et al., 2009: 272). In contrast,the results of this study show that also altruistic motives can be connected with health concerns. These find representation through social consumption goals such as taking care of the family, the children or even future generations. These are in turn connected to the avoidance of pesticides and a preference for ecological production systems which creates the idea that the respective products are then beneficial for the health. Similar findings are described by Hill and Lynchhaun (2002) who mention that "(c)oncerns about health problems such as eczema in children or GM foods, have caused some families to convert to an organic diet […]" (Hill & Lynchhaun, 2002: 533). Despite this tendency of consumers to link health and social target criteria, there is no evidence found that health is a motive of ethical concern in a way that consumers are motivated to protect mankind in general of physical harm. Concerns are always related to the own family and in the broadest sense related to the own descendants.

Looking at the relationships between local and organic as purchasing concepts it turns out that in several cases consumers regard labels as less trustworthy than direct contact with the producer (e.g. Berlin et al., 2009; Chang & Zepeda, 2005; Naspetti & Bondini, 2008; etc.). The results of this study with regard to ethical motives that are associated with social target criteria underline this finding. Respondents declare on the one hand that organic products are in competition, and often in the inferior position, with conventional or local products when it comes to the question of trustworthiness. Moreover, the perceived characteristics of local purchasing such as knowing the product origin and small-scale farming are seen as complementary with an increased level of trust (cf. chapter 4.2.3, Table 10). Consumers are thus willing to make purchasing

decisions that are based on relationships rather than on facts as they are provided by labelling standards which corresponds with the findings of Chen and Scott (2014) and Holloway and Kneafsey (2000).This indicates that while the consumption goals related to organic and local are similar, the social component and explicitly the level of trust are a key factor in the decision-making process of consumers with a preference for local purchasing.

Ethical consumption goals are clearly embedded in complex relationships with ethical, social and non-ethical FCMs. It is difficult to capture the network of linkages because the goals of consumption are not only subject to individual preferences but they are also numerous and multi-facetted. The results of the assessment of relationships between target criteria clearly demonstrate that consumer statements underlie the risk of social bias. Consumers with a preference for organic or locally purchased products tend to integrate the ethical issue into their self-identity. This in turn creates a win-win situation, where ethical motives merge with social goals and both aims of consumption can be achieved through the purchase of an organic or local product. Ethical consumption can thus be regarded as a form of identity (Berlin et al., 2009).

5.3 Technical applicability for amodified scoring model

In the study of Fetzer (2014) the modified scoring modelis assessedas a proper tool to match ethical preferences of consumers with the ethical performance of regional and local producers. In order to be able to compare and evaluate the alignment of both aspectsa questionnaire for the producers,which is based on the framework of target criteria, is used. The author moreoverassumes that the criteria regarded as relevant by consumers on the lowest and most differentiated level are measurable with an ordinal scale. Furthermore, the criteria are assumed to be equally measurable during an assessment of ethical criteria at any agricultural enterprise.

But according to the results of the integrated research review the consumers often do not differentiate their consumption goals into specific units that are unambiguously. So, for example consumers in eight out of nine studies referring to organic consumption describe Animal welfare as important FCM. They refer to living conditions and also the living space of the animals but none of the respondents makes more detailed specifications. This in turn creates a vague picture of the actual meaning

of many consumption goals, which corresponds with the imprecise knowledge about organic or local production schemes as described earlier. It is therefore necessary that during the set-up of the model the target criteria as formulated by consumers are translated into measurable criteria that can actually be assessed at the place of production. Fetzer (2014) suggests that criteria are measured in an ordinal scale which allows consumers to rank ethical consumption goals according to their relevance when a purchasing decision is made. The rank is then translated into a numerical value that represents the weight of each criteria in the consumers' perception. Moreover,it is assumed that producers can also be assessed in a similar way through volunteers or self-reporting by producers, which reveals a crucial issue:The evaluation of the producers' compliance with ethical standards needs to be based on facts and measurable criteria for organic and also local producers in order to provide a reliable result for consumers.

This leads to further practical issues regarding the applicability of the model such as the question if local producers would undergo an intensive assessment, similar to a certification process for a label without being accreditedafterwards. Additionally, producers might not perceive an assessment oriented on e.g. organic standards as necessary, since the consumers still purchase their products based on the effects of social-embeddedness. Lastly, it might be difficult to recruit volunteers who are willing to perform an assessment as intensive as a certification process without any compensation.

For the technical applicability of the scoring model it therefore needs to be reconsidered how the producers can be evaluated in order to provide consumers with trustworthy and objective results. Consumers seem not to demand precise information on e.g. rearing conditions or feed types as the results of this research reveal because they are very concerned with ethical issues in a broader way. They express a general desire for the fulfilment of ethical production schemes and value many different ethical criteria positively. Still, the decision-making process relies strongly on factors that create trust such as a label or personal contactwith the producer instead of gathering information and deepening knowledge. As a result, the modified scoring model needs to close this gap between actual information demand and assessment procedure of producers. During the use of the scoring model the consumer will not be able to assess

the products, the label, or the producer by himself but entirely relies on a proper assessment through the provider of the tool. Hence, the model needs to establish a certain trustworthiness itself especially if the low level of knowledge on the consumer side is considered (cf. chapter 5.1).

An approach to cope with this problem might be a higher level of transparency. The future users of the scoring modelneed to be informed about the way that information is gathered (e.g. consumer volunteers, food activists, self-reporting through farmers etc.)and the exact factors that are assessed. Especially important for the credibility of the scoring model is that consumers are provided with an insight into the scaling procedures and the corresponding level of assessment. The model should disclose in detail which values are behind the different ranks that the user of the model can chose.

Besides this issue the modified scoring model appears as suitable for the evaluation of ethical criteria as related to organic and local products. While per definition both purchasing concepts are quite different, this study shows that the underlying ethical consumption goals of consumer of both product groups are very similar and characterized by much overlap. The ethical consumption goals as linked to the respective purchasing options are not contradicting or excluding each other at any point. Even though preferences for different target criteria are prominent in both groups the single ethical consumption goals as presented in the hierarchical framework do not pose barriers to each other. Although, it can be observed that consumers choose one purchasing option over the other, for example if social consumption goals are compromised, the single ethical values are not perceived to be competing, contradicting or excluding each other. As the assessment of the relationships between the ethical target criteria demonstrates, all perceived ethical target criteria are positively related. Technically, it is thus reasonable to create a scoring model that incorporates both purchasing options.

In line with this, it is also feasible to regard the FCM Local/regional production as single consumption goal despite previous research which characterizes local consumption as "[…] multi-facetted" (Hinrichs, 2003: 33) and therefore incorporating several other ethical consumption goals. This study shows that consumers with a

preference for organic products often express that local production is relevant for their purchase decision in the same way as they refer to e.g. Animal welfare or Political values. Consumers with a preference for local purchasing associate certain values with local production but distinguish these clearly from other target criteria. As statements of several consumers reveal, they clearly differentiate between e.g. Environmental protection and Local/regional production (cf. chapter 4.1.3). The FCM Local/regional production is thus associated with the idea of supporting the local community, which does not include other values such as Animal welfare etc. at all. Accordingly, the consumers with a preference for local purchasing clearly name Animal welfare as a driver for their purchasing decisions and associate this motive respectively with sub-categories that are not linked to those of Local/regional production. Hence, the FCMLocal/regional production, as suggested in this study, can be considered an independent criteria in the hierarchical Framework of Ethical Consumption Goals that does not necessarily incorporate other ethical FCMs.

Despite their relevance for food choice in general, social consumption goals cannot be included into the modified scoring model. The reasoning behind this assumption is that the purchasing preferences of consumers are strongly related to social factors. This is certainly true for respondents who declare a strong preference for local products and associate the personal contact with the farmer with a positive feeling and eventually trust (e.g. Berlin et al., 2009; cf. chapter 5.2). Under these circumstances, the ethical motives are not assessed independently of the social context anymore but either neglected or considered as automatically fulfilled (cf. chapter 4.2.2). For the modified scoring model this interdependence between social and ethical factors could overrule the basic idea that the tool holds the potential to represent consumers exclusively in the context of their ethical preferences. Contradicting this idea, the inclusion of social components into the model would imply a choice for local purchasing since most forms of direct interaction with producers or other consumers are strongly related to it (cf. chapter 4.1.4, Table 6).

The modifiedscoring model does not need to incorporatethe relationships between the ethical target criteria according to the results of this research. The perceived relationships are exclusively positive and only few are mentioned at all. This matches once more the result that the majority of consumers is not entirely aware of the actual meanings of organic labels or the concept of local purchasing. Instead, both purchasing options are not only merged and mixed up but also foremost regarded as holistic approach that enables the consumer to do the right thing. Moreover, it appears that consumers are more concerned about linkages with non-ethical and social criteria than that they perceive any relationship between single ethical target criteria.

Fetzer (2014) suggests to treat the single criteria as independent of each other. Technically of course independence is not given, but as this research shows consumers do not perceive linkages between ethical consumption goals as of much relevance. While in theory the independence of target criteria implies that they are substitutable for each other, the results shows that this requirement is not fulfilled. Consumers do not describe target criteria as substitutable with each other in a single case. This in turn leads to the conclusion thatconsumers do not arbitrarily choose a target criterion that they want to achieve but rather rank the different motives according to their personal preferences. Consequently,target criteria cannot be exchanged for each other.Anyhow, the assumption that the target criteria are independent from each other can be applied if substitutability is not implied at the same time.