

Department of Social Research
University of Helsinki
Finland

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDIES ON ETHICAL FOOD CHOICE

Jaana-Piia Mäkineniemi

ACADEMIC DISSERTATION

To be presented, with the permission of the Faculty of Social Sciences of
the University of Helsinki, for public examination in Auditorium XII,
University main building, on the 11th of June 2016, at 10 am.

Helsinki 2016

Publications of the Faculty of Social Sciences 12 (2016)
Social Psychology

© Jaana-Piia Mäkinieni

Cover: Riikka Hyypiä & Hanna Sario

Photo: "Tomato" by Devanath at Pixabay licensed under Creative Commons CC0

Distribution and Sales:

Unigrafia Bookstore

<http://kirjakauppa.unigrafia.fi/>

books@unigrafia.fi

PL 4 (Vuorikatu 3 A) 00014 Helsingin yliopisto

ISSN 2343-273X (Print)

ISSN 2343-2748 (Online)

ISBN 978-951-51-1069-5 (Paperback)

ISBN 978-951-51-1070-1 (PDF)

Unigrafia, Helsinki 2016

ABSTRACT

Ethical food choice is a concrete everyday action to promote sustainability in term of supporting workers' rights, animal welfare and environmental food production, and the local economy. The more that is known about the phenomenon, and especially about the barriers and the drivers, the more chance there is of promoting the consumption of ethical food.

The main aim of this dissertation is to enhance understanding of the dimensions of ethical food choice in general, and specifically with regard to climate-friendly choices. It is assumed that at least two theoretical perspectives, namely moral decision-making (e.g. The issue-contingent model ethical decision making) and food-choice behaviour (e.g. The Food Choice Questionnaire) are necessary for a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon, thus both are presented and integrated in this dissertation.

The data for the dissertation was collected in two time phases from two different questionnaires distributed among different informants. The participants in both phases were young adults, namely university students from Finland, Denmark and Italy. Both qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection (e.g., the word-association task and the Moral Intensity of Climate Change scale) and analysis (e.g., content and hierarchical regression analysis) were used.

The dissertation constitutes four sub-studies. The following specific research questions were addressed in the sub-studies: What kind of everyday ideas and lay views about ethical and unethical food do young adults from Finland, Denmark and Italy have? (Sub-study I); How and to what extent do the five moral foundations emerge in food-related moral thinking? (Sub-study II); How is the perceived moral intensity of climate change related to young adults' climate-friendly food choices in Finland? (Sub-study III): What barriers to choosing climate-friendly food do young adults in Finland perceive, and how do these barriers relate to their climate-friendly food choices? (Sub-study IV).

The findings of Sub-study I indicate that various dimensions are associated with the ethicality of food, such as naturalness, healthiness and equality. Ethical foods were seen, for instance, as natural, healthy and local, produced in ways that support equality and animal welfare, whereas unethical foods were perceived as unnatural, unhealthy and global, produced without attention to equality and animal welfare. The following core questions in determining the ethicality of food arose from the study: Is the food required or prohibited according to ethical rules and principles? Is it produced in an environmentally friendly way and in harmony with nature? What kind of health effects does it have?

The main results of Sub-study II concerned the emergence of five moral foundations in the word association data, which indicates that foundations

are also relevant dimensions in food-related moral thinking. Of these, Harm/Care, Purity/Sanctity and Fairness/Reciprocity were the most relevant. Further, as expected, there were differences based on gender, political orientation and country of origin in the endorsement of the moral foundations. For instance, women and supporters of right-wing politics achieved higher scores on Purity/Sanctity than in the respective reference categories.

The findings of Sub-study III imply that moral intention and perceived moral intensity, namely perceiving climate change as probable and serious, are the most important factors associated with climate-friendly food choice. Perceived moral intensity influenced moral evaluation and the intention to make climate-friendly food choices in particular. In addition, climate-friendly food choice was seen as a morally loaded phenomenon in that making such choices tended to be considered a morally right action.

According to the results of Sub-study IV, the most relevant barriers perceived by the respondents to hinder climate-friendly food choice were a high price, poor supply, lack of knowledge and perceived difficulty in making such choices. However, as the further analysis revealed, the barriers that had the strongest inhibiting effect were disbelief in any such effects, the desire to maintain the same eating habits, lack of time and difficulty. Hence, there was a discrepancy between perceived and actual barriers.

The current dissertation enhances understanding of ethical-food-choice behaviour in bringing to light new findings related to this topical theme, and also in presenting and testing some new measurements (e.g., the Moral Intensity of Climate Change scale) and methods (e.g., the word-association task). The main limitations include social-desirability bias, which is common with sensitive topics such as eating and morality, and the use of student samples.

The practical implications are considered in the Discussion (Chapter 6). For instance, it is suggested that moral dimensions related to ethical food options could be highlighted in the marketing, as well as the added value of an ethical (food) option compared to a conventional option. It is also suggested, for example, that it would be useful in future studies to put more emphasis on the promotion of ethical food choice.

TIIVISTELMÄ

Eettisillä ruokavalinnoilla on mahdollista edistää vastuullisuutta, työntekijöiden oikeuksia sekä huolehtia eläinten hyvinvoinnista, luonnon kestävästä hyödyntämisestä ja paikallisten ruoantuottajien toimeentulosta. Ymmärrys siitä, miten ihmiset tekevät eettisiä ruokavalintoja ja, mitkä tekijät estävät ja edistävät niitä, voi auttaa lisäämään eettistä ruoankulutusta.

Tämän väitöstutkimuksen päätavoitteena on syventää ymmärrystä siitä, miten eettisiä ruokavalintoja, kuten ilmastomyönteisiä ruokavalintoja, tehdään. Perusoletuksena on, että eettisten ruokavalintojen ymmärtäminen ja käsitteellistäminen edellyttää teoreettisten näkökulmien – käytännössä ainakin moraalista päätöksentekoa sekä ruoanvalintaa kuvaavien mallien – yhdistämistä, kuten tehdään tutkimuksen johdannossa.

Tutkimuksen kyselyaineistot on kerätty kahtena eri ajankohtana, kahdelta eri vastaajaryhmältä. Vastajat olivat nuoria aikuisia yliopisto-opiskelijoita vaihdellen vain Suomesta tai Suomesta, Tanskasta ja Italiasta. Aineistonkeruussa ja sen analyysissä käytettiin sekä laadullisia että määrällisiä menetelmiä, kuten sana-assosiaatio-menetelmää, sisällönanalyysiä sekä erilaisia regressioanalyyskejä.

Väitöskirja koostuu neljästä eri osatutkimuksesta, joissa vastataan seuraaviin tutkimuskysymyksiin: Millaisia arkikäsitteitä nuorilla suomalaisilla, tanskalaisilla ja italialaisilla nuorilla aikuisilla on eettisestä ja epäeettisestä ruoasta? (Study I), Miten ja missä määrin viisi moraaliperustaa ilmenee ruokaan liittyvässä moraalijattelussa? (Study II), Miten ilmastonmuutoksen koettu moraalinen intensiteetti liittyy ilmastomyönteisiin ruokavalintoihin? (Study III) ja Millaiset tekijät estävät ilmastomyönteisiä ruokavalintoja? (Study IV).

Ensimmäinen osatutkimus osoitti, että ruoan eettisyyteen liitetään useita ulottuvuuksia, kuten luonnollisuus, terveellisyys tai oikeudenmukaisuus. Eettistä ruokaa pidetään muun muassa luonnollisena, terveellisenä, paikallisena sekä oikeudenmukaisesti tuotettuna ja eläinten oikeudet huomioivana. Epäeettistä ruokaa määrittävät taas esimerkiksi epäluonnollisuus, epäterveellisyys, globaalius sekä piittaamattomuus eläinten hyvinvoinnista tai tuotannon oikeudenmukaisuudesta. Keskeisiä kysymyksiä, kun ruokien eettisyyttä arvioidaan ovat esimerkiksi: Onko ruoka sallittu vai kielletty moraalisääntöjen mukaan?, Onko se tuotettu ekologisesti ja luontoa kunnioittaen vai ei? sekä Millaisia vaikutuksia sillä on terveyteen?

Toisen osatutkimuksen päätulosten mukaan viisi moraaliperustaa esiintyvät ruokaan liittyvässä moraalijattelussa. Aineistossa olennaisimpia moraaliperustoja olivat Vahingoittaminen/Huolenpito, Pyhyys/Puhtaus sekä Reiluus/Vastavuoroisuus. Oletusten mukaisesti perustojen esiintymisessä oli eroja eri sukupuolten, poliittisten kantojen ja eri maalaisten välillä. Esimerkiksi naisten, italialaisten ja oikeistopoliittikkaa kannattavien

assosiaatioissa esiintyi useimmin Pyhyys/Puhtaus-moraaliperustaa kuin muilla.

Kolmannen osatutkimuksen tulokset viittaavat siihen, että aikomukset ja ilmastonmuutoksen pitäminen todennäköisenä ja vakavana ongelmana ovat vahvimmin yhteydessä ilmastomyönteisiin ruokavalintoihin. Edelleen tulokset osoittivat, että ilmastonmuutoksen pitäminen moraalisesti intensiivisenä eli todennäköisenä ja vakavana oli yhteydessä siihen, pitikö ilmastomyönteisiä ruokavalintoja moraalisesti oikeina ja siihen, aikoiko tehdä niitä. Ilmastomyönteisiä ruokavalintoja pidettiin yleisesti oikeina eli moraalisesti latautuneina tekoina.

Neljännessä osatutkimuksessa (Study IV) havaittiin, että olennaisimmat esteet vastaajien mielestä ilmastomyönteisille ruokavalinnoille olivat korkea hinta, huono saatavuus, tiedonpuute sekä hankaluus. Toisaalta, kun tarkasteltiin tilastollisesti, mitkä esteet olivat yhteydessä vähäisempiin ilmastomyönteisiin ruokavalintoihin, keskeisimpiä olivat epäusko, halu syödä totutulla tavalla, ajanpuute sekä hankaluus. Vastaajien tärkeimmiksi kokemat ja ruokavalintoja analyysien perusteella selvimmän vähentävät esteet, poikkesivat siis toisistaan.

Tämä väitöstutkimus tuottaa uutta tietoa eettisistä ruokavalinnoista. Siinä on kehitetty myös uusia tutkimusmenetelmiä ja mittareita. Tutkimuksen päärajoitukset koskevat opiskelija-aineistojen käyttöä sekä mahdollista taipumusta vastata kyselyissä sosiaalisesti suotavalla tavalla (eng. social desirability bias), mikä voi liittyä erityisesti niin sanottuihin sensitiivisiin aiheisiin, kuten syömiseen tai moraaliin.

Tutkimustulosten perusteella näyttää siltä, että eettisiä ruokavalintoja voitaisiin edistää niiden moraalisia ulottuvuuksia ja niistä saatavaa lisäarvoa korostamalla. Tulevaisuudessa olisi hyvä tutkia erityisesti sitä, miten eettisiä ruokavalintoja voidaan lisätä erilaisin keinoin.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to my supervisor Professor Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman for good guidance and especially for her constant patience and subtle encouragement. Thank you for having confidence in me.

I am indebted to the co-authors of the articles of my thesis: Michelle Pieri, Anna-Maija, and especially Annukka Vainio. It was a pleasure to work and carry out research with you. Hopefully we will find ways to continue our co-operation.

I would like to thank the external examiners of the dissertation, Professor Jaan Valsiner and Director of Research Pirjo Honkanen, for their constructive comments, as well as the anonymous reviewers and editors who have helped to improve the article manuscripts. Further, I am honoured to have Professor of Food culture Johanna Mäkelä as my opponent in the public thesis defence.

The dissertation was funded in its different stages by NordForsk (NorFa), the Finnish Cultural Foundation, and the Finnish Doctoral Program in Social Sciences (SOVAKO). In addition, I thank the University of Helsinki for Chancellor's traveling grant, for a dissertation completion grant and for support toward the printing costs of the dissertation, and the Finnish-Danish Cultural Foundation for a traveling grant.

A number of people helped me with the dissertation without any formal compensation. To name a few, Auri Lyly collected the first dataset in Finland and Hanne Themsén assisted with the questionnaire development and back translations in Denmark. Henrik Høgh-Olesen with his personnel organized the data collection at the University of Aarhus in Denmark. Karin Guldbæk-Ahvo helped with the Danish language and Francesca Carrozza did the preliminary categorization for the Italian data. Further, my thanks go to Jyrki Ollikainen for (psycho) statistical consultancy and Anneli Portman for kindly assisting with the back translation procedures in the second data collection. I am most grateful for your contribution.

For me, social psychology is a source of constant inspiration. Therefore, I wish to express my gratitude for those who helped me to discover this "perfect match": namely my psychology teacher Leena Juntunen at Lappajärvi upper secondary school, my first social psychology teacher Marja Ahokas at the Open University of the University of Helsinki, and Klaus Helkama, Professor Emeritus in social psychology at the University of Helsinki.

I also wish to thank all those peer social psychologists in Helsinki, Tampere, and Kuopio as well as my current and former colleagues at work and studies who have supported me in various ways: offering new opportunities, helping me, allowing me to use office spaces, inspiring me,

sharing desperate moments, assuming responsibility for my duties during my study leave and showing me by concrete examples that it is possible to complete a dissertation.

Finally, my greatest debt is to Tapio for his commitment to our life together and for his support over the years. Touko and Kerttu, your lives have always been interwoven with my journey in social psychology. I hope I can, in turn, help you to find your path and inspiration.

CONTENTS

Abstract.....	3
Tiivistelmä	5
Acknowledgements	7
Contents.....	9
List of original publications	11
Abbreviations	12
1 Introduction.....	13
2 Dimensions of ethical food choice.....	16
2.1 Ethical and moral issues	16
2.2 Ethical decision-making	24
2.3 Food-choice behaviour	28
2.4 Ethical food choices: Drivers and barriers	34
2.5 A summary of the theoretical framework.....	43
3 The aims of the study.....	45
4 Methods	48
4.1 The Participants.....	48
4.2 Measures	51
4.3 Data analysis	55
5 Results	58
5.1 How are ethical and unethical foods viewed?	58
5.2 How do moral foundations emerge in food-related moral thinking?	61
5.3 Does moral intensity promote climate-friendly food choices?	63
5.4 What barriers inhibit climate-friendly food choice?	65
6 Discussion.....	67

6.1	Lay views on ethical and unethical food	67
6.2	Moral foundations and ethical food choice	70
6.3	Moral intensity and ethical food choice	73
6.4	Barriers inhibiting climate-friendly food choice	75
6.5	Limitations	77
6.6	Practical implications	80
7	References	84

LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

This thesis is based on the following publications:

I Mäkiniemi, J-P., Pirttilä-Backman, A. M., & Pieri, M. (2011). Ethical and unethical food. Social representations among Finnish, Danish and Italian students. *Appetite*, 56(2), 495–502.

II Mäkiniemi, J-P., Pirttilä-Backman, A-M., & Pieri, M. (2013). The Endorsement of the Moral Foundations in Food-Related Moral Thinking in Three European Countries. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 26(4), 771–786

III Mäkiniemi, J-P., & Vainio, A. (2013). Moral intensity and climate-friendly food choices. *Appetite*, 66, 54–61.

IV Mäkiniemi, J-P., & Vainio, A. (2014). Barriers to climate-friendly food choices among young adults in Finland. *Appetite*, 74, 12–19.

The publications are referred to in the text by their roman numerals. The articles are reprinted with the kind permission of the copyright holders Elsevier and Springer.

ABBREVIATIONS

c.f.	confer; compare to
e.g.	exempli gratia; as an example
FCQ	Food Choice Questionnaire
i.e.	id est; that is, in other words
MFQ	Moral Foundations Questionnaire
MFT	Moral Foundations Theory
MICCS	Moral Intensity of Climate Change Scale
PMIS	Perceived Moral Intensity Scale
TEMS	The Eating Motivation Survey
TPB	Theory of Planned Behaviour

1 INTRODUCTION

All cultures have socially constructed rules and norms regarding 'bad' and 'good', 'wrong' and 'right' foods and ways of eating. It is argued that these norms and moral beliefs stem from religious beliefs, for example (Gert, 2015). Inherent in divergent religions are norms and rules about eating: Catholics consider gluttony a venial sin, and Muslims are forbidden to eat pork (Lupton, 1996; Kittler & Sucher, 2004). Food has recently become a more prominent subject of moral debate (Korthals, 2007; Singer & Mason, 2007), and it has been suggested that the moral discourse of what we should and should not eat is now stronger than ever (Askegaard et al., 2014).

The current change could also be interpreted as a process of cultural moralisation in which morally neutral objects and activities become morally loaded – or more morally loaded. This usually means that action (e.g., smoking) is considered morally wrong, and is morally judged. Moreover, people who engage in a morally wrong action may be judged as morally reprehensible in social interaction, which in turn may strengthen feelings of moral and social pressure, and guilt. Once an activity has been moralised, changes tend to occur. For instance, governments may act to limit or prohibit wrong action, healthcare facilities support the right action, scientific communities promote research on the issue, and individuals may express disgust and irritation towards people who act wrongly. (Rozin et al., 1997; Rozin, 1999) However, given that food and eating have a long morally loaded history, it may be more accurate to refer to the current change/shift as a cultural re-moralisation process of food and eating.

Themes such as sustainability, genetic modification, animal welfare and meat substitution have entered into expert as well as everyday moral discourses (e.g., Pluhar, 2010; Schösler, de Boer, & Boersema, 2012; Toft, 2012). The latest themes seem to include the use of nanotechnology in food production, and insect eating (c.f. Deroy, Reade, & Spence, 2015), for example. Meat replacements such as cultured (i.e. grown in the laboratory or in-vitro) have also provoked moral discussion.

Some topics and foods seem to attract more attention and are morally more strongly debated, more heavily loaded and more controversial than others. For example, it has been shown that environmental and 'green' food choices, such as 'buying organic and local' dominate the North American ethical food discourse, whereas hunger, social justice and agricultural labour are not such prominent issues (Johnston, Szabo, & Rodney, 2011). However, given the lack of cross-national comparisons it is not clear whether these themes also dominate ethical discourses in other nations. This is in line with the notion that ethical consumer studies in general rarely focus on how culture influences ethical consumption (Papaoikonomou, Ryan, & Valverde, 2011; Pecoraro & Uusitalo, 2014).

It seems that the above-mentioned re-moralisation process has brought about an increase in the consumption of ethical food. For instance, Fairtrade sales in Finland grew by 35 per cent between 2013 and 2014 (Fairtrade Finland, 2015), and the organic sector in the EU has been developing rapidly during the last 10 years (European Commission, 2013). However, there is no evidence of any kind of causal relationship between cultural moralisation and the increase in consumption levels.

Ethical consumption could be defined as consumption based on conscious choices related to moral beliefs and, more concretely, as the purchasing and use of products and resources according not only to personal desires but also to ideas about what is right and good in a moral sense (Johnston et al., 2011). In practice, ethical consumption may manifest in divergent consumption practices such as boycotting, participating in anti-consumption events, cutting down on or simplifying consumption, and making sustainable choices (Papaoikonoumou, Ryan, & Valverde, 2011).

In the context of ethical food consumption this may translate into practices such as boycotting unethical food brands, companies and market chains, demonstrating for GMO-free areas or against factory farming, and cutting down food consumption by simplifying food choices, not buying too much, and avoiding luxury and non-essential food products, for example (c.f. Pecoraro & Uusitalo, 2014). Finally *individuals can become ethical food consumers by intentionally choosing more ethical or sustainable instead of conventional food products* (Papaoikonoumou et al., 2011). The main focus in the current dissertation is on ethical food choice as one type of ethical-food-consumption practice.

The term sustainable food consumption and the concept of ethical food consumption have some common features and associations. For instance, as noted above, selecting sustainable foods is one way of being an ethical food consumer (c.f. Papaoikonoumou et al., 2011). Although there is no agreed definition of sustainable food production or consumption, there is quite strong consensus that the current global food system is not sustainable. The system has been criticised for not providing proper nutrition to everyone, for the serious biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation, and for the significant contribution of food production and consumption to the acceleration of global warming, for example (FAO, 2012).

According to the British Sustainable Development Commission (2005), a sustainable food product is safe, healthy and nutritious for consumers, and provides a viable livelihood for farmers, processors and retailers whose employees enjoy a safe and hygienic working environment; respects the environment in its production and processing while reducing energy consumption and bringing wider environmental benefits; respects animal health and welfare while producing affordable food for all sectors of society; and supports rural economies and the diversity of rural cultures, such as in emphasising local products.

In sum, sustainable (food) consumption is a wide concept focusing on multiple perspectives such as the economy (e.g., promoting a viable livelihood), society (e.g., safe working environments) and the environment (e.g., ecosystem conservation). However, it seems that the most prominent perspective in studies of sustainable eating is that of the environment. In practice, sustainable food consumption is associated or equated in many empirical studies with pro-environmental food purchasing and 'green' eating (e.g., Worsley, Wang, & Burton, 2015; Moser, 2015), which also includes the consumption of organic (e.g., Thøgersen, 2010) and climate-smart (e.g., Tjärnemo & Sjö Dahl, 2015) food and mainstreaming plant-based diets (e.g., Beverland, 2014).

Although divergent concepts have been developed and the extent of ethical consumption has been calculated, not many studies focus on how ordinary people understand, view and define ethical foods (with the exception of Johnston et al., 2011). Further, although the drivers of and barriers against ethical food options such as organic food have been intensively studied (e.g., Thøgersen, 2010), there is quite a limited understanding of how people in general make ethical food choices. The aim in the four sub-studies comprising the current doctoral dissertation was therefore to enhance understanding of how people make ethical, and specifically climate-friendly food choices.

2 DIMENSIONS OF ETHICAL FOOD CHOICE

This chapter is about how people make ethical food choices. I discuss some theoretical constructs and models from the fields of moral psychology and food choice. First, I describe the kind of issues and concerns that are usually understood as moral (2.1). Second, I introduce a general model of moral decision-making (2.2). Third, I identify the basic motives behind food-choice behaviour and how they relate to ethical motives and beliefs (2.3). Fourth, I give examples of previous findings concerning the drivers and barriers of particular ethical foods (2.4). Finally, I summarise these dimensions, which constitute the theoretical framework of the study (2.5).

2.1 ETHICAL AND MORAL ISSUES

In the previous chapter I defined ethical food consumption as a conscious decision to make consumption choices for reasons to do with moral beliefs. Ethical consumption is also described as a phenomenon that invites consumers to consider their everyday practices from moral perspectives (Pecoraro & Uusitalo, 2014). In the following I describe in more detail what these moral beliefs and perspectives might be.

Special features of morality

Moral beliefs could be understood as socially shared beliefs about what bad/wrong and good/right are, and what ordinary people think should or should not be done according to a code of conduct put forward by a particular society or group. Further, morals and morality often refer especially to codes that involve avoiding and preventing harm to others. Ethics, on the other hand, is referred to as the philosophical study of morality, which systematises, defends and recommends, for example. (Gert, 2015.)

Morals and ethics tend to be used interchangeably in food studies and moral psychology, and the differences are not discussed (c.f. Jones, 1991). The use of concepts such as moralisation, moral intensity and ethical concern follows the original formulations in the current dissertation. Hence, although the terms ethics and ethical are used, the phenomenon is still studied in descriptive rather than philosophical terms. The aim is to understand what ordinary people think about the phenomenon.

Thus, by definition, morality is a socially shared convention that refers to a shared code of conduct, and to preventing harm to others, for example. Relations with other human beings are clearly an essential aspect of morality,

which requires the presence of a group of people who share, at least to some degree, the notion of what is moral, and what is morally right and wrong. Such a socially shared view is not consensual, however, and there are differences between individuals and between subgroups. (Leach, Bilali, & Pagliaro, 2014.) Further, even if people have shared or consensual views of moral norms that govern behaviour (e.g., what is right action in a particular situation), it does not necessarily mean that they see the same moral norms or perspectives as equally relevant, or are as willing to follow them (Carnes, Lickel, & Janoff-Bulman, 2015).

Moreover, acknowledging or perceiving prevailing moral norms may result in social pressure to act accordingly, and invoke feelings of guilt. People seem to have strategies for resisting social and moral pressure and being judged as immoral according to moral norms regarding healthy eating, for example. In practice, one could emphasise that food choice is a totally personal and autonomic choice, or one could be sceptical of a 'presented' moral ideology (Delaney & McCarthy, 2014), for example. Hence morality is, by definition and its nature, a social phenomenon, and therefore a meaningful topic for a study in the field of social psychology.

Moral beliefs are assumed to differ from other similar psychological constructs such as attitudes, conventions and norms in that they are experienced more objectively and as universally true, and are considered more motivating or even obligatory (Turiel, 1983; Skitka, 2010). It seems that people are able to distinguish between moral and social conventions from an early age (Turiel, 1983). Morality is typically described as something beyond convention, as something more objective. However, there seems to be variation across different kinds of moral beliefs in terms of how objective they are perceived to be, and it has been suggested that the degree of perceived social consensus regarding a moral belief positively influences its perceived objectivity (Goodwin & Darley, 2012). Hence, beliefs reflecting a high social consensus are perceived more objectively (c.f. Jones 1991).

Empirical findings seem generally to support the view that moral beliefs differ from other beliefs, and that the moral dimension "makes a difference" or has "added value" in human behaviour (Leach et al., 2014). For instance, it has been found that ethically motivated vegetarians - compared to those who are health-motivated - have stronger vegetarian convictions, consume fewer animal-based products and remain vegetarian longer (Hoffman, Stallings, Bessinger, & Brooks, 2013), and that people who perceive climate change as a moral issue are significantly more concerned about it (Markowitz, 2012). Further, there is evidence that (positive) moral norms (e.g., I want to do the morally right thing) add predictive power to the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) with regard to organic food choice, for instance (e.g., Dean, Raats, & Shepherd, 2008; Dean, Raats, & Shepherd, 2012).

Moreover, when people search for information about another person they seem to highlight that person's morality. Hence, perceptions of moral character seem to be of strong significance in the formation of impressions

(Goodwin, Piazza, & Rozin, 2014). People also seem to be less tolerant of moral disagreements than they are of other kinds of disagreement: perceptions of the objectivity of a moral belief may predict discomfort with a person who disagrees with that belief (Goodwin & Darley, 2012).

Broadening the concept of a moral domain

As suggested above, morality is not totally consensual by nature, and this also concerns what is included in a so-called moral domain. A moral domain refers to issues and actions that are considered to be moral and morally loaded. Issues and actions perceived as belonging to the moral domain in one culture or sub-culture may be viewed as belonging to the social or personal domain in another (Sverdlik, Roccas, & Sagiv, 2012). It was found in a Finnish study, for example, that religiousness was clearly related to domain differentiation: highly religious adolescents belonging to a conservative Laestadian group perceived all the presented rule transgressions (e.g., allowing the sale of wine in food shops) as moral, and consequently made less distinction between morality and social convention than those who were not highly religious (Vainio, 2003; Vainio, 2011). Further, it seems that groups vary in the inclusiveness of the targets to which moral concerns are applied: concern about justice may be applied to all people including out-group members in some groups, whereas in others such concern applies mainly to in-group members (Helkama, 2009a; 2009b; Schwartz, 2007; Sverdlik et al., 2012), for example.

What kind of issues do ordinary people include in the moral domain? There are few studies that give an answer to this question. It is commonly suggested in studies on the attributes and traits that characterise moral persons and exemplars that these attributes indirectly reflect which issues are seen as moral. According to the findings, “the moral person” is deemed to be particularly just, brave and caring (e.g., Walker & Hennig, 2004), and trustworthiness and justice are the traits that are considered the most moral (Leach et al., 2014). Thus, these findings seem to indicate indirectly and implicitly that care and justice, at least, belong to the moral domain. In another preliminary study, 100 Israeli adults were asked to consider a list of 56 value items from the Schwartz Value Survey (1992) and to judge whether or not they were moral values. Of the ten basic values benevolence, universalism, conformity, tradition and security were most frequently classified as moral (Schwartz, 2007; Sverdlik et al., 2012). This indicates that not all values are moral values on the one hand, and that the moral domain seems to be wide in scope on the other.

In practice, most researchers define morality and the issues that belong to the moral domain based on philosophical texts or older theories. Accordingly, there is a lack of studies in which the respondents were able to define morality and moral issues without restrictions and preselected options, or in which the aim was to better understand lay definitions of

morality. Meanwhile, there is continuing debate among academics on what should be included in the moral domain (e.g., Kugler, Jost, & Noorbaloochi, 2014; Suhler & Churchland, 2011).

Views about issues that are considered moral, and consequently included in the moral domain in moral (social) psychology have broadened in recent decades. As early as in the 1980s Carol Gilligan (1982) criticised Lawrence Kohlberg (1984), who is arguably the most influential moral psychologist, for his justice-based definition of morality on the grounds that it represented masculine morality, men's morality, and that women have a different voice, namely a caring voice. Although "the greatest debate in the recent history of moral psychology" (Haidt & Kesebir, 2010) broadened perceptions of moral issues, empirical findings in general do not support Gilligan's basic claim concerning gender differences (Jaffee & Hyde, 2000).

A step towards a broader, namely threefold understanding of the moral domain was taken in the 1990s with the introduction of the theory of three moral codes (i.e. the "Big Three" of morality): Autonomy, Community and Divinity (Shweder, Much, Mahapatra, & Park, 1997). One of the basic assumptions behind the theory is that justice/harm-based morality, which emerged and is intensively studied in Western cultures, does not capture the whole spectrum of the moral domain, and that moral norms are relative to the culture – not universal. The Autonomy code covers issues such as harm, rights and justice, and concerns the protection of individual rights (c.f. Care by Gilligan, 1982; Justice by Kohlberg, 1984). The Community code includes aspects such as duty, hierarchies, and interdependence, and focuses on the obligations engendered through participation in a community. Finally, the Divinity code constitutes themes such as sanctity, tradition and natural law. (Shweder et al. 1997) Empirical findings in general have confirmed the presence of three moral codes in different nations (for a review see Jensen, 2008), although a few between-country (e.g., US vs. Philippines, UK vs. Brazil) and within-country differences (e.g., religious liberals vs. religious conservatives) in their application have been identified (Vasquez, Keltner, Ebenbach, & Banaszynski, 2001; Vainio, 2003; Guerra & Giner-Sorolla, 2010).

The American social and cultural psychologist Jonathan Haidt and his colleagues put forward a five-fold view of the moral domain in the 2000s (Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009; Graham, Nosek, Haidt, Iyer, Koleva, & Ditto, 2011; Graham et al., 2012; Haidt & Joseph, 2004; Haidt & Graham, 2007; Haidt, Graham, & Joseph, 2009). Their aim was to explore more deeply why morality varied across cultures and yet had similarities. Further, they claimed that previous social-psychological definitions of morality had led to a narrow focus on moral issues, namely on harm and fairness (Haidt & Kesebir, 2010).

The Theory of Moral Foundations

Moral Foundations Theory (MFT) posits that people hold moral intuitions and concerns about at least five different foundations. The theory was built mainly on earlier works on evolutionary and anthropological approaches to morality, including Shweder et al.'s (1997) contribution mentioned above (Haidt & Kesebir, 2010; Graham et al., 2013).

According to the theory there are five types of moral issues or foundations, originally named Harm/Care, Fairness/Reciprocity, Ingroup/Loyalty, Authority/Respect and Purity/Sanctity (e.g., Haidt & Kesebir, 2010). They have been slightly updated recently and are now known as Care/Harm, Fairness/Cheating, Loyalty/Betrayal, Authority/Subversion and Sanctity/Degradation (Moral Foundations.org, 2015). However, the changes from the original seem to be quite minor: MFT is now more like a developing project than a stable theoretical formulation. The original formulations of the constructs are used in the current dissertation because they were in use at the time of the data collection and when the manuscript was in preparation.

The moral foundations can be re-grouped as two 'latent/meta' foundations: Individualising and Binding. The former includes Harm/Care and Fairness/Reciprocity, with a general focus on the rights and welfare of individuals. More specifically, Harm/Care emphasises the suffering of others and incorporates virtues such as compassion, care and avoiding harm (c.f. Care in Gilligan, 1982; Autonomy in Shweder et al., 1997). Fairness/Reciprocity, in turn, includes concerns such as justice and fairness/unfairness, highlighting the fact that people have certain rights that should be upheld in social interactions (c.f. Justice in Kohlberg, 1984; Autonomy in Shweder et al., 1997).

The group of Binding foundations incorporates the rest, namely Ingroup/Loyalty, Authority/Respect and Purity/Sanctity. The main emphasis is on group-binding loyalty, duty and self-control. More specifically, Ingroup/Loyalty includes concerns related to obligations associated with group membership, such as allegiance, loyalty and patriotism (c.f. Community in Shweder et al., 1997), whereas Authority/Respect incorporates aspects such as respect and obedience, the obligations associated with and the maintenance of social order and hierarchical relationships (c.f. Community in Shweder et al., 1997). Finally, Purity/Sanctity includes themes related to bodily activities and religious notions, the implication being that the body and certain aspects of life are sacred. It also incorporates virtues, such as chastity, wholesomeness and the control of desires (c.f. Divinity in Shweder et al., 1997). (Graham et al., 2009; Haidt & Graham, 2007; Haidt et al., 2009; Haidt & Kesebir, 2010.)

One of the basic assumptions behind MFT is that moral foundations are innately evolutionary and intuitive mechanisms, and therefore universal. On the other hand, it is assumed that there are differences between groups and

cultures in their implementation attributable to prevailing social and cultural factors (Joseph, Graham, & Haidt, 2009; Haidt & Kesebir, 2010). First of all, it seems from various empirical findings that political orientation in particular differentiates the endorsement of a moral foundation. More specifically, people who identify themselves as liberals (or left-leaning) seem more prone to endorsing Individualising foundations (i.e. Harm/Care; Fairness/Reciprocity), whereas those who identify themselves as conservative (or right-leaning) tend to put more emphasis on Binding foundations in their moral thinking (i.e. Ingroup/Loyalty; Authority/Respect; Purity/Sanctity) (Graham et al., 2009; Kim, Kang, & Yun, 2012; van Leeuwen, & Park, 2009; McAdams, Albaugh, Farber, Daniels, Logan, & Olson, 2008; Nilsson & Erlandsson, 2015).

The association between the endorsement of moral foundations and political orientation seems to very robust across cultures (for a review see Graham et al., 2013). The above-mentioned findings are also in line with the results of value studies indicating that universalism and benevolence, which as values are conceptually close to Fairness/Reciprocity and Harm/Care, are associated with a left orientation whereas conformity and tradition, which are conceptually close to Authority/Respect and Ingroup/Loyalty, imply a right-wing orientation (Purko, Schwartz, & Davidov, 2011). However, it seems from the latest studies that the association between political orientation and moral foundation endorsement may be mediated by other factors such as a preference for equality and system justification tendency (e.g., Nilsson & Erlandsson, 2015).

Further, the results of a large, web-based, cross-cultural comparative study indicated that Eastern participants (e.g., from South Asia and East Asia) showed higher endorsement of Ingroup/Loyalty and Purity/Sanctity (i.e. Binding foundations) than Western participants (e.g., from the US and Western Europe) (Graham et al., 2011; Graham et al., 2013). It was also shown that Koreans achieved higher scores on Purity/Sanctity than US respondents (Kim et al., 2012).

Although there is a growing body of research on moral foundations within different countries, also outside of the US (e.g., Sweden, see Nilsson & Erlandsson, 2015), and the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ) has been translated into various languages (Moral Foundations.org, 2015), there still seems to be a lack of between-country comparative studies comparing European nations in terms of endorsement. One of the aims in Study II of the current dissertation was to narrow this gap.

Third, some studies have identified gender differences in the endorsement of moral foundations. For example, women in the above-mentioned web dataset scored more highly than men on Harm/Care, Fairness/Reciprocity and Purity/Sanctity, whereas men scored barely but significantly more highly on Ingroup/Loyalty and Authority/Respect (Graham et al., 2011). Further, in a qualitative study of the narratives of American respondents, women achieved higher scores than men on

Harm/Care (McAdams et al., 2008). As mentioned above, empirical findings in general do not indicate that a Care orientation, which conceptually corresponds to the Harm/Care foundation, is more prevalent among women (Jaffee & Hyde, 2000; Juujärvi, 2005). Hence, findings regarding the association between gender and moral-foundation endorsement contradict earlier findings regarding moral thinking. However, it is worth noting that there are not many MFT studies that integrate gender or other demographics into the analysis, the main emphasis having been on differences in political orientation. There is thus a need for studies that also integrate demographic information other than political orientation into the analysis.

The MFT is criticised in many respects. In the following I discuss only the criticisms that relate most closely to the current dissertation. Hence I do not go into detail about criticisms related to the assumptions of theories that are not discussed here, such as the intuitionism assumption (for a review of the criticisms see Graham et al., 2013; Moral Foundations.org, 2015; Saltzstein & Kasachkoff, 2004).

One of the main criticisms concerning the fivefold nature of the moral domain (i.e. five moral foundations) concerns the number and the nature of the foundations. It is suggested on the one hand that there are too few, and on the other that some of them should be eliminated. For instance, it has been proposed that Binding foundations are not proper candidates for moral foundations at all, given the empirical evidence indicating a positive association with intergroup hostility and support for discrimination. Accordingly, foundations with conceptual roots in authoritarianism and social dominance should not be considered moral issues or included in moral theory, but should rather be regarded as amoral (i.e. not related to morality) or immoral (i.e. morally wrong). (Kugler et al., 2014.)

However, as I understand the term moral domain, not all the issues it incorporates are necessarily morally right and some may be morally wrong. Hence, in-group favour, for example, could be seen as both a morally relevant, loaded (moral) question and an immoral (i.e. morally wrong, evil) issue/question. In this sense the moral domain is not restricted to issues that are considered morally right or moral virtues but also incorporates morally relevant, or morally loaded issues. In fact, this shows that not all researchers necessarily share the same view of morality or the moral domain (c.f. Vainio, 2005).

On the other hand, it is also argued that MFT omits some basic moral concerns such as industry and modesty, industry being understood as a strong 'work ethic', the repudiation of laziness and the disapproval of shirking and free-riding, whereas modesty is valued in societies with norms proscribing overtly calling attention to achievements, status and wealth, for example (Suhler & Churchland, 2011). This suggestion is in line with claims that the above-mentioned theory of basic human values (Schwartz, 1992), which also includes moral values, omits work-related values (e.g., Myrsky & Helkama, 2001). I also acknowledge the likelihood that there are more than

five moral foundations, which may not be easily identifiable with current research methods and questionnaires, as I explain in more detail later.

The basic instrument for measuring the endorsement of moral foundations is the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ) (Graham et al., 2013; Moral Foundations.org, 2011a; 2015). Although the MFQ is rarely criticised and disputed, I suggest that there are some problematic aspects that should also be noted.

The first relates to the fact that respondents are not explicitly asked to evaluate the moral relevance of the aspects they usually consider in divergent decision situations. In practice, they are asked to think about situations when they are deciding whether something is *right or wrong* – not whether it is *morally* right or wrong. This could be seen as a shortcoming given Turiel’s (1983) argument that the moral domain has specific features beyond social conventions and personal considerations, and that by definition moral decision-making differs from other decision-making in that it includes a moral dimension (Tenbrunsel & Smith-Crowe, 2008). Consequently, I am not sure whether it can be assumed with certainty that the MFQ measures moral considerations given that respondents are asked to focus on right and wrong decisions, and not explicitly on moral decisions.

Second, the MFQ seems to measure some kind of ‘general’ moral thinking. Respondents are asked to evaluate the relevance of several concerns (e.g., suffering emotionally) for example, but the evaluation is connected to general situations (“When you decide whether *something* is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations (e.g. suffering emotionally) relevant to your thinking?”) rather than to any specific object or moral dilemma (Moral Foundations org, 2011a; 2015). This could be a limitation given the body of findings attesting to the contextual and situational nature of moral thinking. For instance, the basic assumption in Jones’ (1991) theory of moral decision-making is that the process is issue-dependent, in other words it is influenced by the moral intensity of the issue. It has also been shown that the type of moral dilemma not only predicts one’s moral orientation, but also affects the complexity of real-life moral thinking (Juujärvi 2005; Myyry & Helkama, 2007), for example.

Finally, although the MFQ captures a wide range of moral issues and concerns, it is restrictive in nature in that respondents select from predetermined options, when in fact there may be unidentified others. Although the developers of the theory are very willing to find new potential moral foundations, it is not easy to identify new candidates with the current measurement system. However, this is a common feature of scales used in questionnaires: the respondent simply responds, and does not develop anything new. There is thus an apparent need for new methodological openings that are not restrictive in nature, especially if new candidates are being sought. Study II in the current dissertation aims to narrow this gap.

2.2 ETHICAL DECISION-MAKING

The discussion in the previous section concerned the kinds of beliefs, questions and issues that are usually considered moral. Presumably, food-related decisions that somehow reflect such moral beliefs or concerns (e.g., the five moral foundations) are considered morally loaded or as having a certain moral dimension. My focus in this section is on moral decision-making, which is a process in which individuals resolve moral dilemmas and questions, and act accordingly (Guy, 1990). When the dilemma relates to food and eating, one can speak of food-related moral decision-making.

It is suggested that a prerequisite for moral decision-making is that the decision maker is morally aware, and consequently that there is a moral dimension. On the other hand, the decision-making process could be characterised as amoral (i.e. without a moral dimension) if the decision maker does not consider or “recognize” the moral dimension, or moral load, of the situation, issue or object. (Tenbrunsel & Smith-Crowe, 2008.) Hence, it is a prerequisite of food-related moral decision-making that there is a food-related moral dimension: for example, a particular food choice may be judged as morally right or morally wrong in public discussion, and therefore has become morally loaded. It is worth highlighting the fact that a moral-decision-making process does not necessarily end up in a morally right decision: it is ‘only’ a morally loaded decision in nature (c.f. the critique of the MFT presented above).

As far as I know, there is no theoretical model specifically describing food-related ethical decision-making, although there are models for both general (e.g., Rest, 1984;1986; for a review see Myyry, 2003) and specific moral-decision- making such as those focusing specifically on moral decisions in work or organisational settings (e.g., Ferrell & Gresham, 1985; Trevino, 1986; Jones, 1991). In the following I introduce T M Jones’s (1991) ethical-decision-making model, which is used in the current dissertation in the context of ethical food choice, namely climate-friendly food choice (Study III).

Having compiled a synthesis of existing moral-decision-making models (e.g., Rest, 1984; 1986; Trevino, 1986) Jones (1991) identified four steps in the process, namely Recognising a moral issue, Moral judgment, Moral intent, and Moral behaviour. More specifically, recognising a moral issue involves perceiving a moral dimension to the action or issue, and recognising one’s own role as a moral agent; moral judgment refers to the process of making and justifying such judgments in terms of what is morally right and what is morally wrong in a particular situation; and moral intent and moral behaviour refer to the intention to act according to a moral judgment, and the resulting behaviour. (Jones, 1991.)

What is special to Jones’s (1991) issue-contingent model is the key proposition that moral decision-making is issue-contingent, in other words that every issue can be characterised in terms of its moral intensity, some

issues being perceived as more intensive than others. Further, the perceived moral intensity of an issue influences the moral-decision-making process, as do other individual and situational factors (e.g., group dynamics).

More precisely, moral intensity influences all steps in the moral-decision-making process: issues of high moral intensity are recognised as moral issues more frequently than issues of low moral intensity and elicit more sophisticated moral reasoning; moral intent is established more frequently when issues of high as opposed to low moral intensity are involved; and moral behaviour is observed more frequently when issues of high as opposed to low moral intensity are involved. (Jones, 1991.)

The moral intensity of an issue has been broken down into six components, namely: *The magnitude of the consequences*; *Social consensus*; *Effect probability*; *Temporal immediacy*; *Proximity*; and *Effect concentration*. The magnitude of the consequences could be defined as the total harm (or benefit) to victims (or beneficiaries) of the particular moral act. Social consensus refers to the level of agreement on rightness or wrongness regarding the issue or action. Effect probability refers to the evaluation of whether or not the act in question will take place and cause harm (or benefit). The temporal immediacy of the moral issue, in turn, is the supposed length of time between the present and the onset of the consequences of the moral act. Proximity describes the decision maker's feeling of nearness (social, cultural, psychological or physical) to the act in question. Finally, effect concentration is an inverse function of the number of people affected by an act of a given magnitude: it is high if a small number of people are significantly affected and low if a large number of people are slightly affected. (Jones, 1991.)

In general, empirical findings support the key assumption that moral thinking is issue-contingent, and that the moral intensity of an issue influences moral decision-making (e.g., Barnett, 2001; Bennett, Anderson, & Blaney, 2002; Frey, 2000; McMahan & Harvey, 2007; Singhapakdi, Vitell, & Kraft, 1996). However, there does not appear to be support for the six-component structure of the moral-intensity dimension, there being inconsistent results regarding the number of intensity components, for example (e.g., May & Pauli, 2002; McMahan & Harvey, 2006; Ng, White, Lee, & Moneta, 2009; Valentine & Silver, 2001). Interestingly, some components of moral decisions seem to be more influential than others. As an example, Barnett (2001) found in his study of work-related moral actions that perceived social consensus influenced the recognition of a moral issue, moral judgment and moral intentions, whereas perceived temporal immediacy, for example, did not have any effect on decision-making. According to Barnett (2001), this indicates that (social) perceptions of how society feels about issues affect ethical decision-making.

Although the Issue-contingent model was originally developed and is mostly used for measuring moral decision-making in organisational contexts (Jones, 1991), it shares many features with the Theory of Planned Behavior

(TPB), which is commonly used to study food choices (e.g., Honkanen & Young, 2015), ethical consumption and a wide variety of other behaviours (Ajzen, 2012).

Simply put, the TPB posits that intentions (e.g., I intend to buy ethical food next time) and perceptions of control over behaviour (e.g., If I want to I can easily buy ethical food) predict behaviour (e.g., buying ethical food). Further, attitude toward behaviour (e.g., For me, buying ethical food is a beneficial choice), perceived subjective norms (e.g., Most people who matter to me think I should buy ethical food) and the above-mentioned perceptions of control predict intentions. (Ajzen, 2012.)

Intention and behaviour are clearly key components in both models. The social consensus component (Issue-contingent-model), which describes the consensus or agreement on the rightness or wrongness of the action, is also conceptually close to the component of perceived subjective norms (e.g., Most people who matter to me think I should buy ethical food; TPB). Further, including moral dimensions such as moral obligation in particular as an extension to the TPB also roughly covers the components moral recognition and moral evaluation (Issue-contingent model). On the other hand, perceptions of control over behaviour and attitudes towards specific behaviour are not included in the Issue-contingent model at all. (Ajzen, 2012; Jones, 1991.)

Previous research indicates that it could be useful to include moral obligation in the TPB model in addition to the basic components. In this context, moral obligation (e.g., I would feel guilty if I did not buy ethical food or I feel a moral obligation to make an ethical choice) would seem to be a relevant extension given its proven association with food choice on several levels, such as GM foods, fair trade, ready-made foods, sustainable seafood/fish stocks and organic food (Dowd & Burke, 2013; Dean et al., 2012 for review; Honkanen & Young, 2015). In addition, a positive moral attitude or moral norm (e.g., I feel I am doing the morally right thing when buying ethical food) and ethical identity (e.g., I think of myself as someone who is concerned about ethical issues), seems to increase the predictive power of TPB in sustainable food purchasing (Dowd & Burke, 2013) and organic food consumption (Dean et al., 2012).

Hence, the Issue-Contingent Model or original TPB model do not necessarily have the power comprehensively to describe behaviour related to ethical food choice. I also suggest that there may be relevant processes in food-related moral decision-making (i.e. ethical food choice) other than those mentioned above, such as moral compensation, moral (self-) licensing and moral satisfaction.

Both moral compensation and moral licensing are based on the assumption that moral behaviour is a kind of homeostatic system aimed at achieving a balance, which in practice means that people have divergent strategies for reconciling their past morally 'bad' actions with 'good' actions (or even vice versa). For example, a healthy and therefore good breakfast can

compensate for previous unhealthy and therefore bad snacking. It seems that the compensation (i.e. 'right' eating) helps to handle the guilt and anxiety arising from 'wrong' eating. (Delaney & McCarthy, 2014) Conversely, previous good and moral behaviour may give people permission to make selfish or hedonistic decisions in the future without fear of being positioned as immoral (Monin & Jordan, 2009), and this is known as moral licensing.

Moreover, it seems that ethical food choice is not only a nutritional choice, but also serves to give moral satisfaction (Bratanova, Vauclair, Kervyn, Schumann, Wood, & Klein, 2015). Moral satisfaction arises from having made a morally right choice, and also seems to be linked to personal values, and according to empirical evidence is greater when people are consuming ethical foods in line with their values. For example, those who strongly endorse altruistic values experience higher satisfaction when consuming fair-trade (vs. conventional) food, and those who strongly endorse pro-environmental values obtain more satisfaction from consuming ecologically sustainable (vs. conventional) options (Bratanova et al., 2015).

Finally, most models of moral decision-making share the basic assumption that decision-making tends to be an individual, cognitive and deliberate process governed by reason. However, this assumption can be criticised given the emotional, situational, intuitive and social aspects of moral decision-making (e.g., Cottone, 2001; Gaudine & Thorne, 2001; Graham et al., 2013; Haidt, 2001). Hence, it seems that moral emotions (e.g., shame, guilt and compassion) play a role in food-related moral decision-making, and that people sometimes intuitively arrive at a conclusion, knowing what is a morally right or morally wrong action without deep reflection. Moreover, many social aspects in addition to the above-mentioned factors (e.g., moral judgement and moral licensing), such as other people's needs or opinions influence the maker of a moral decision.

2.3 FOOD-CHOICE BEHAVIOUR

Ethical food choice is not only a moral decision but also a nutritional choice. I argue, therefore, that it is necessary to combine theoretical understanding from the fields of food-choice behaviour and moral decision-making to obtain a comprehensive view of the dimensions of this phenomenon. In line with this thinking, ethical motives are integrated into some of the general models related to food choice.

Food choice is a complex function comprising biological, learned, sociocultural and material-economic factors (Renner, Sproesser, Strohbach, & Schupp, 2012). The main factors that are considered to influence the choice of food fall into three groups: first, food-related factors deriving from the physical or chemical properties of the food, sensory attributes and nutrient content; second consumer-related factors such as personal and physiological characteristics; and third, environmental/situational factors such as economic, cultural and social issues. (Risvik, Rødbotten, & Olsen, 2006; Shepherd, 2001.)

The motives behind food choice

The Food choice Questionnaire (FCQ), which is one of the most commonly used and comprehensive, measurements of food-choice behaviour, distinguishes nine guiding motives: health, mood, convenience, sensory appeal, natural content, price, weight control, familiarity and ethical concerns (Steptoe, Pollard, & Wardle, 1995). The strongest motives are generally assumed to be price, sensory appeal, natural content and health (Steptoe et al., 1995; Markovina et al., 2015).

Although there seems to be some international consensus concerning the relative importance of food-choice motives, there are also differences (e.g., Prescott, Young, O'Neill, Yau, & Stevens, 2002; Eertmans, Victoir, Notelaers, Vansant, Van den Bergh, 2006; Markovina et al., 2015). For instance, in a comparison among nine European countries, price was ranked the strongest motive in five countries, namely Spain, Greece, Ireland, Portugal and the Netherlands; sensory appeal was ranked first in three countries, namely Norway, Germany and the UK; and natural content was considered the most important motive in Poland. (Markovina et al., 2015)

The FCQ also takes into account the fact that people make food choices based on their moral beliefs. In practice, ethical concern is considered one of the motives, and was measured in the original formulation of the FCQ in the following three items: It comes from countries I approve of politically; It has the country of origin clearly marked; and It is packaged in an environmentally friendly way. For instance, respondents are asked to rate how important it is to them that the food they eat on a typical day comes from countries they approve of politically, on a scale ranging from not at all important to very important. (Steptoe et al., 1995.)

Lindeman and Väänänen (2000) argued that the ethical-concern dimension in the original FCQ was too limited, and developed a more extensive version comprising 11 items. The new scale includes dimensions such as ecological welfare (constituted of subscales for animal welfare and environmental protection), political values and religion. Although this certainly was a significant extension, the original version is still widely used (e.g., Fotopoulos, Krystallis, Vassallo, & Pagiaslis, 2009; Januszewska, Pieniak, & Verbeke, 2011; Milošević, Žeželj, Gorton, & Barjolle, 2012). The extended scale tends to be applied in studies focusing on sustainable food as a choice (e.g., Dowd & Burke, 2013; Honkanen, Verplanken, & Olsen, 2006; Vanhonacker, Van Loo, Gellynck, & Verbeke, 2013), the assumption being that ethical concerns might be a stronger motive in this case.

Another criticism in addition to Lindeman and Väänänen's (2000) point discussed above about the scope of ethical concerns is the lower internal consistency of the original dimension compared to the other FCQ dimensions (e.g., Fotopoulos et al., 2009).

In combination these findings indicate that the original formulation does not necessarily adequately cover food-related ethical concerns, and that the selected items do not constitute a meaningful set. Given the rising trends in the consumption of ethical food, which may indicate that ethical concern as a food-choice motive has also become more prevalent, there is clear need for a good measurement scale covering this dimension.

The FCQ is not the only model for studying food-choice behaviour (see Renner et al., 2012 for a review). The Eating Motivation Survey (TEMS), for example, comprises a total of 15 motivational factors: liking the food (i.e. palatability), visual appeal (i.e. presentation), pleasure (i.e. enjoyment through food), affect regulation (i.e. choice based on a negative affective state), need/hunger (i.e. physiological needs), sociability (i.e. social needs), social norms (i.e. fulfilling others' expectations), social image (i.e. self-presentation), weight control (i.e. dietary restrictions), health (i.e. increasing wellness), price (i.e. financial reasons), convenience (i.e. minimising effort), habit (i.e. familiarity and routines), maintaining traditions (i.e. eating habits and customs) and concern for nature (i.e. preference for natural foods). The strongest motives (most likely to trigger eating behaviour) seem to be: Liking, Habits, Need & Hunger and Health (Renner et al., 2012.), but given the newness of the scale there is not yet an extensive body of research.

Ethical motives are not explicitly included in the TEMS, although concern for nature in particular has some common features with the FCQ's ethical concern. The items on the Natural Concern scale of the TEM stem from Lindeman and Väänänen's (2000) Ecological Welfare subscale as well as the original FCQ (Steptoe et al., 1995). The scale also incorporates statements related to fair trade and organic food, which are often considered ethical options (c.f. Chapter 2.4).

The TEMS Natural Concern scale comprises five items: I select certain foods because they are fair trade; I select certain foods because they are

organic; I select certain foods because they are natural (e.g., not genetically modified); I select certain foods because they are environmentally friendly (e.g., production, packaging, transport); I select certain foods because they do not contain harmful substances (e.g., pesticides, hazardous pollutants, antibiotics). Unlike the original (FCQ) and the modified ethical-concern scale (Lindeman & Väänänen, 2000), the TEMS scale makes no mention of political, religious or animal-welfare concerns, clearly focusing on natural and environmental matters.

In sum, ethical concerns and motives appear to influence food choice in general, but are not necessarily presented comprehensively in the measurements (c.f. Lindeman & Väänänen, 2000). They are clearly not among the most influential motives (Markovina et al., 2015; Renner et al., 2012; Steptoe et al., 1995), being considered less relevant than convenience, health, sensory appeal and price, for example (e.g., Fotopoulos, et al., 2009; Prescott et al., 2002). However, consumer groups such as vegetarians are presumably more likely to endorse ethical motives than the ‘average’ person when making food choices, and the above-mentioned findings do not necessarily apply to them.

Food-choice motives may be related and inter-connected. For instance, ethical and so-called general (i.e. other than ethical) motives may contradict and conflict with each other (Johnston et al., 2011), and general motives may weaken the influence of ethical motives. For example, a high price is considered a barrier in terms of choosing ethical food (e.g., Feldmann & Hamm, 2015; Hjelmar, 2011), and health concerns may act as barriers to more ethical plant-based diets in that many people overestimate the health benefits of meat and are therefore reluctant to reduce their meat consumption (Beverland, 2014). It has also been shown that those scoring low on environmental concern expect organic food to taste worse than conventional food (Schuldt & Hannahan, 2013).

However, it seems that ethical motives may also boost or enhance the effect of other motives. There is some evidence supporting the idea that moral evaluations interact with taste evaluations. Hence, when one food product is presented as a more ethical option than another, even if the products are exactly the same the taste of the ethical option is considered better (Bratanova et al., 2015). This reflects findings that foods with a fair trade label reportedly taste better than the same foods with no such label, although they are otherwise identical (Lotz, Christandl, & Fetchenhauer, 2013), and that foods with organic labels are estimated as to be lower in calories and higher in fibre (i.e. healthier) than foods with no such label (Lee, Shimizu, Kniffin, & Wansink, 2013). It is suggested that previous results can be attributed to the halo effect, which is a specific type of confirmation bias wherein positive evaluations in one area cause ambiguous or neutral areas to be viewed positively (Lee et al., 2013). These results also indicate that whether or not a food item is categorised as morally loaded or morally right (c.f. moral evaluation) may also influence any sensory evaluation, and

consequently that the labelling of ethical foods may be a crucial aspect in promoting them.

Food cultures

Different geographical and climatic conditions, as well as various social, national and historical aspects have modified specific food cultures. Food culture can be understood as the food traditions and culinary habits of individuals in a collective context, and includes a variety of dimensions such as identity, morality, politics, economics, the market and language (Bergflødt, Amilien, & Skuland, 2012).

Food culture is manifest in many ways. First of all, food-related dislikes and aversions seem to be culturally learned to some extent (Risvik et al., 2006). For instance, insects are part of the diet in some cultures, but are perceived as highly disgusting in most Western societies: this also illustrates how culture influences which objects are perceived as food (Tan, Fischer, Tinchon, Stieger, Steenbekkers, & van Trijp, 2015). Various cooking styles and food traditions develop within nations, regions and cultures, such as Italian Parmesano cheese, Finnish Carelian Pasties and Spanish Serrano ham, and are often associated with a cultural and national heritage. Moreover there appears to be wide variation in many food-related issues and beliefs, such as security concerns, the perceived importance of food quality, origins and brands in food-choice situations, the recognition of logos (e.g., fair trade and organic) and attitudes to GM foods, even in Europe (Special Eurobarometer 389, 2012; Special Eurobarometer 341, 2014). Consumer trust in food also seems to differ between countries (Halkier, Holm, Domingues, Magaouda, Nielsen, & Terragni, 2007; Kjærnes, Harvey, & Warde, 2007), as do the food-choice motives described above (e.g., Markovina et al., 2015).

The extent to which food culture is seen as constituting a national culture (e.g., the Finnish food culture) or as a combination of various national cultures (e.g., Scandinavian or Mediterranean) seems to depend on circumstances or perceptions. However, there are some mappings that group together and categorise similar cultures based on empirical data. First, it has been suggested that religion-rooted differences exist between Protestant and Catholic cultures with regard to hedonistic food behaviour. This proposition is largely based on the findings of Rozin, Fischler, Imada, Sarubin and Wrzesniewski (1999) indicating that Protestant American food-related thinking is connected to concerns about health and diet, as well as to moral responsibility for health and body shape. Catholic French thinking, on the other hand, is more strongly connected to hedonism and the enjoyment of food.

Askegaard and Madsen (1998) also differentiated between an ascetic, European Protestant-German food culture incorporating guilt feelings about over-indulgence and hedonism, and a European Catholic-Latin culture in

which pleasure is the one of the key choice motives. The authors further describe the Protestant-German culture as relatively tradition-oriented, based on solid meals and shunning fast food and unhealthy products, whereas the Catholic-Latin culture is characterised by less interest in health and dieting, and more importance is attached to enjoyment (i.e. hedonism).

Conversely, when Italian (mainly Catholic) and Finnish (mainly Protestant) university students were compared with regard to their enjoyment of food the Finns achieved significantly higher scores (Mäkiniemi, Bäckström, Ahola, Pieri, & Pirttilä-Backman, 2014). In other research, differences between the USA and France have been attributed not only to differences between Protestant and Catholic cultures (c.f. Rozin et al., 1999), but also to differences in perceptions, namely perceived associations between tastiness and healthiness. It seems from the empirical findings that the healthy-tasty association predominates food perceptions in France, whereas the unhealthy-tasty association is prominent in the USA. In other words, healthy foods are perceived as tasty in France, and as not tasty in the USA. (Werle, Trendel, & Ardito, 2013.) However, the extent to which these differences originally stem from religious ideologies is not clear.

A Southern-Northern grouping has also been used to categorise European food cultures, and there are some features in common with previously-mentioned grouping. It is assumed that the Northern food culture is highly influenced by periods of scarcity and poverty, thus food has become associated with necessity rather than pleasure or taste in northern parts of Europe. This is assumed to be attributable to the climate and short growing season, but is also heightened by the Puritan Lutheran ethos (a form of the Protestant ethos). Thus, food has for a long time been associated with nutrition and health in the north. It is further suggested that there are divergent cultural attitudes towards regional foodstuffs between Northern and Southern Europe. The association between territory, tradition and quality is taken as self-evident in the Southern food culture with its wealth of local and regional food, whereas the association is weaker in Northern Europe. (Parrot, Wilson, & Murdoch, 2002.) Studies I and II in the current dissertation compare university students from Finland, Denmark and Italy: the first two nations represent Northern Protestant food cultures, whereas Italy represents a Southern Catholic culture.

Food cultures always incorporate various subcultures in which people are differently engaged. Thus, divergent groups of people even in the same national food culture may perceive food and eat it very differently. The relative importance of food-choice motives seems to differ between groups, for example. It was found in a TEMS study that women placed more relevance on affect regulation and body weight in particular than men, and younger women prioritised palatable food more highly than older ones, who in turn placed more relevance on health and natural concerns as motives in their choice of food. Moreover, overweight and obese participants had higher scores for weight control, affect regulation and social norms. (Renner et al.,

2012.) It was further found in a Finnish population-based survey that higher education and a higher income were associated with a higher vegetable/fruit intake and a lower consumption of energy-dense foods. In addition, those with lower incomes considered price and/or familiarity more important, whereas those with higher incomes placed more importance on health concerns. (Konttinen, Sarlio-Lähteenkorva, Silventoinen, Männistö, & Haukkala, 2013.)

In sum, these findings indicate that different motives and beliefs motivate food-choice behaviour, and they are likely to differ between cultures, nations and certain groups of people such as between males and females and socio-economic groups. It is likely that choice behaviour is similar in the case of ethical food.

2.4 ETHICAL FOOD CHOICES: DRIVERS AND BARRIERS

In the previous section I introduced models of moral decision-making and food choice that in combination account for how people make moral decisions regarding food, in other words how they make ethical food choices.

In the following I discuss some previous findings on the drivers and barriers connected with specific products that tend to be considered ethical, namely fair trade, local, organic and climate-friendly foods. The aim is to introduce some of the key barriers and drivers rather than to give a comprehensive description of them all, which I suggest will give a broad view of ethical food choice, and might facilitate the identification of the general and food-specific features.

The choice of local, fair trade and organic food was scrutinised more closely given that they are generally considered ethical food options (e.g., Long & Murray, 2013; Bratanova et al., 2015). Climate-friendly (i.e. climate-smart) food could be referred to as an ethical choice, since eco-eating and limiting meat intake having been identified as prominent elements in lay people's ethical eating repertoires (Johnston et al., 2011) and vegetarian diet seems to be a common way of life for consumers of ethical food (Pecoraro & Uusitalo, 2014). Altogether these actions could be seen as a concrete way of eating in a more climate-friendly or climate-smart way (Garnett, 2008; Tjärnemo & Sjö Dahl, 2015).

General and specific aspects of ethical food choice

There seem to be shared features that may jeopardise ethical food choice in general, such as habitual behaviour, and the gap between a positive attitude towards ethical food and actually selecting and eating it.

Ethical food choice is often described as conscious and rational, although in practice food-choice behaviour seems to be strongly habitual and reflexive: in other words people do not think about it, they just buy food and consume it because this is what they normally do (Hjelmar, 2011; van't Riet, Sijtsema, Dagevos, & De Bruijn, 2011). Hence, adopting of a new diet (e.g., one that is more climate-friendly) may well require a change in habitual shopping and eating behaviour. The required change is smaller the closer the current diet is to the new one, and requires less effort.

Habits can be understood as learned acts that are triggered by the environment, and which are mainly outside of conscious awareness. It seems that those with a strong habit of eating in a certain way are not willing to acquire information about alternatives: in other words they are less interested in other options. Habitual behaviour also seems to be heavily dependent on situational cues, and a stable context enhances habituation. Moreover, intentions seem to be poorer predictors of habituated behaviour than situational cues. (van't Riet et al., 2011.) Hence, existing eating habits

(i.e. I eat meat every day) that do not support the ethical food option (e.g., a vegetarian dish) may constitute a barrier to ethical choice.

Another apparently common feature in ethical food choice is the identified gap between knowledge and action. People may have very positive attitudes towards ethical options, for example, but may not act accordingly. This raises certain fundamental questions. Why do people not choose sustainable or ethical food more often? What are the key barriers and how one can promote more ethical and sustainable choice making? (e.g., Chatzidakis, Hibbert, & Smith, 2007; Carrington, Neville, & Whitwell, 2010; Bray, Johns, & Kilburn, 2011; Thøgersen & Schrader, 2012.)

Although some of the drivers and barriers seem to be common, ethical foods do not appear to constitute a homogenous group, but have specific features. For example, whereas concern about climate change may not be very relevant to proponents of fair trade food, it may be highly relevant in promoting environmental, climate-smart food choices (c.f. Gifford, 2011).

Moreover, ethically minded food consumers do not necessarily support all ethical foods: consumers of local food, for example, have been found to disregard organic (Denver & Jensen, 2014) and fair trade foods (Long & Murray, 2013), which indicates that ethical-food-choice behaviour may be issue- or product-contingent. Then again, there may be a general tendency to support alternative food-production practices (i.e. local, organic and non-GM food) that stems from a deep interest in and frequent information searches on food issues (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). In line with this, an association has been found between high levels of concern for environmental and animal-rights issues and a positive attitude to organic foods (Honkanen, Verplanken & Olsen, 2006). Further, in another study those respondents who recognized the benefits of organic products also had higher preferences for local products (Denver & Jensen, 2014).

In addition, there are inherent paradoxes, tensions and contradictions associated with different ethical foods that may make such food choices challenging, and ethical concerns may need to be prioritised. For example, organic food may be foreign in origin, or local food may not necessarily be produced in a pro-environment way (c.f. Pecoraro & Uusitalo, 2014). Further, large, global corporations with questionable histories related to social justice also offer fair trade options nowadays (Long & Murray, 2013).

Furthermore, making an ethical food choice may require good knowledge of production methods and processes (e.g., about the key differences between conventional and organic farming) and trust in food experts (e.g., if the fair trade compensation process is trustful). Contradictory expert opinions may reduce the perceived trustworthiness of ethical options. With regard to organic food production, for example, there is some disagreement among experts and academics regarding environmental effects such as whether organic farming is more or less greenhouse-gas-intensive than conventional farming (Garnett, 2008).

Finally, it should be noted that moral qualities and concerns are attached to foods other than those mentioned above, such as healthy foods (e.g., Delaney & McCarthy, 2014; Weibel, Messner, & Brügger, 2014), ready-made, (e.g., Olsen, Sijtsema, & Hall, 2010; Jackson & Viehoff, 2016) and fast (e.g., McPhail, Chapman, & Beagan, 2011) food, breast milk (e.g., Spencer, Greatrex-White & Fraser, 2015) and genetically modified foods (e.g., Frewer et al., 2013). This indicates that the 'moral space' of food may be more extensive than the specific ethical foods mentioned above (c.f. Delaney & McCarthy, 2014). It may be that ethical food choice embraces a variety of options.

Fair trade food choice: drivers and barriers

In a nutshell, Fair Trade promotes improvement in the living and working conditions of small-scale producer cooperatives and workers in developing countries. Fair trade Labelling Organizations (FLO) monitor certification and licence the use of the Fair Trade trademark. Typical fair trade food products include coffee, tea, bananas, chocolate, honey and sugar. (Fairtrade International, 2015.) The options are clearly limited, and it is not possible to restrict one's diet to fair trade food, which is one of the special features that distinguish these products from other ethical foods discussed here.

It has been shown in previous studies that personal (moral) values, for example, are associated with fair trade consumption. More specifically, there seems to be a positive association between values such as equality and social justice and universalism and fair trade consumption behaviour (e.g., Ladhari & Tchegnina, 2015). Values related to universalism (i.e. concern for the welfare and interests of others) tend to be considered moral values (Schwartz, 2007; Vaclair, 2009), and connected conceptually with the Fairness/Reciprocity moral foundation (c.f. MFT; Sverdlik et al., 2012).

Moral norm and moral obligation have also been associated with purchasing fair trade foods (e.g. de Leeuw, Valois, & Houssemand, 2011; de Leeuw, Valois, Morin, Schmidt, 2014). For instance, it was found in a survey of fair trade coffee that its consumption was associated with trust in fair trade, price perceptions and personal moral obligation. Specifically, the respondents who trusted Fair Trade organisations to distribute money to small-scale producers and felt a moral obligation to purchase fair trade products reported more fair trade consumption, whereas those who believed that the options were too expensive reported lower consumption. (Andorfer & Liebe, 2015.)

Moreover, (moral) identity functions seem to be relevant in the selection of fair trade options. Fair trade consumption is considered an expression of commitment to acting like a morally good person (Adams & Raisborough, 2010), hence those who identified strongly with all humanity, in other words had a global identity, were more likely to consume fair trade produce (Reese & Kohlmann, 2015). Given the above-mentioned findings concerning moral

values, moral obligation and moral identity, it could be said that fair trade is a morally loaded phenomenon, and could constitute an ethical food choice.

A specific challenge in terms of promoting fair trade consumption is that the purchasing decision involves high levels of uncertainty and trust: consumers cannot easily or directly control production standards given that production is usually at a distance. Thus, the standards and labels of fair trade products are important in terms of giving necessary and trustful information about the production process. However, it has been shown that European consumers do not necessarily recognise the fair trade logo. For instance, only 36 per cent of EU citizens recognised the logo and there were significant differences between nations: 81 per cent of those surveyed in the UK recognised it compared with a mere three per cent in Spain (Special Eurobarometer 389, 2012). Unawareness of the logo may act as a key barrier to a fair trade choice, therefore the quality of the label information could be a crucial factor (c.f. Andorfer & Liebe, 2012; Rousseau, 2015).

Organic food choice: drivers and barriers

Specific organic farming methods are used in the production of organic foods. Typical organic farming practices include strictly limiting the use of chemical synthetic pesticides and synthetic fertilizers as well as livestock antibiotics, restricting food additives and processing, prohibiting the use of genetically modified organisms, raising livestock in free-range, open-air systems and providing them with organic feed, and using animal-husbandry practices as appropriate to different livestock species (European Commission, 2015).

It has been found in various studies that the primary reasons for buying organic food relate to health and nutrition concerns and superior taste perceptions, which could be considered egoistic reasons/motives. Following these are environmental concerns, concerns about food safety and animal welfare, and a willingness to support the local economy, which are known as altruistic/ethical motives. (Andersen, 2011; Hjelmar, 2011; Hughner, McDonagh, Prothero, Shultz, & Stanton, 2007.) It seems that both egoistic and altruistic motives may influence ethical food choice, and ethical food may be selected for egoistic and hedonistic reasons. Thus, different and sometimes even opposing orientations seem to motivate organic food choice: some people choose it because of health concerns, some because they want to protect nature or animals, and others for hedonistic reasons (Klößner, 2011). One could well ask whether the choices are still ethical if the motives are purely egoistic or hedonistic.

Moreover, with regard to personal (moral) values, it has been shown that positive attitudes to organic foods and universalism are related (Klößner, 2011). As mentioned above, universalism has also been associated with fair trade choices (Ladhari & Tchetgna, 2015). However, it seems that the relation between personal values and a preference for organic food tends to be weak

and indirect, and mediated by beliefs about organic food (e.g., that it is healthier, tastes better or is more environmentally friendly) (Klößner, 2011).

Food choice, including ethical food choice, always happens in a social context: people often select and cook for others, for example. However, it has been found in the context of organic food shopping that this kind of social embeddedness is silent. When shoppers with children make organic food choices they consider, for example, whether the children like it or not. Further, some parents feel that they should take responsibility for their children's health, which especially motivates them to buy organic produce. (Hjelmar, 2011.) This is in line with findings showing that, in general, consumers of organic food are female, with children living in the household (Hughner et al., 2007).

On the other hand, the key reasons for not consuming organic foods include their perceived higher price, the limited availability, a lack of trust in the labels or in the authorities, poor promotion or insufficient marketing as well as sensory defects (e.g., imperfections in organic fruit). Satisfaction with current non-organic food options is also likely to diminish the willingness to take the organic option (c.f. the habitual nature of food choice). (Hughner et al., 2007; Andersen, 2011; Hjelmar, 2011.)

Local food choice: drivers and barriers

There is no agreed, single or uniform definition of local food or of its geographical scope. It is likely that consumers and producers have various perceptions of what the 'local food' label implies. Local foods are commonly regarded as those promoting social, environmental (mainly associated with short transportation) and economic wellbeing in a region. The term 'local' also tends to be understood as the opposite of 'global', but where local region ends and global begins is a subjective evaluation depending on the context and purpose. Hence, food from one's own country, such as Finnish food, might in some cases be categorised as a local option.

Local food is officially defined in Finland as locally produced food that promotes the local economy, employment and the food culture of the region concerned, has been produced and processed from raw material found in that region, and is marketed and consumed there (Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Finland, 2013). Local food can be bought in special food markets or directly from farms, and also to some extent in ordinary food shops depending on the product, and how local food is defined.

One of the key drivers supporting local foods is that they are commonly perceived very favourably, as having a better taste and a superior quality, which in turn is frequently linked with freshness and healthiness, for example. Local food products also tend to be perceived as reliable, safe and easier to trace, and as supportive of the local economy and community. (Carpio & Isengildina-Massa, 2009; Denver & Jensen, 2014; Roininen, Arvola, & Lähteenmäki, 2006; Feldmann & Hamm, 2015 for a review.) In

this context, studies have shown that consumers buy local food for a range of reasons, including environmental concerns, health reasons, perceptions of high quality, enjoyment of shopping at local outlets, and support for local farmers, economies and communities (e.g. Kirwan, 2004). Interestingly, unlike organic food, local food is not necessarily perceived as expensive, and consumers seem to be willing to pay a premium for it (Denver & Jensen 2014; Feldmann & Hamm, 2015).

There also seems to be some demographic variation in the consumption of local food. The most involved consumers seem to be older, wealthier people who live in rural areas, and therefore may have a deeper attachment to the local region, but there are contradictory findings regarding gender differences in the preference for local food. Buyers also seem to value family time and are willing put effort into shopping and food preparation, and they seem to find enjoyment in cooking as well as satisfaction in shopping for local food (c.f. moral satisfaction). On the other hand, key barriers to buying local food include poor availability and difficulties in distinguishing between local and conventional options. Inconvenience (e.g., time needed) and high price have also been shown to diminish the willingness to buy local food. (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015)

Climate-friendly food choice: drivers and barriers

Climate-friendly (i.e. climate smart/er) food choice is aimed at to decreasing the amount of greenhouse gases and consequently mitigating climate change. In general, climate-friendly food-production and consumption practices are less energy intensive than other options. In practice, such choices entail cutting down on animal products, especially red meat (i.e. beef) and dairy, and avoiding food waste and transportation from far that requires heavy fuel use (i.e. preferring local food), for example. (Garnett, 2008.)

In fact, organic food production in general is considered a climate-friendly option in terms of reducing the need for agrochemicals, the production of which requires high quantities of fossil fuel. Organic agriculture is also able to sequester carbon in the soil. (FAO, 2015; consult Garnett, 2008 for critics.) Eating and consuming less, especially alcohol, soft drinks and unhealthy or non-nutritious food products in general, is considered a climate-smart option, whereas eating pork, beef, lamb, poultry, cheese, rice, butter and French fries are considered non-friendly choices (Garnett, 2008; Korkala, Hugg, & Jaakkola, 2014). However, a more climate-friendly or climate-smarter diet does not necessarily require a drastic change in eating habits: adopting recommendations for healthy eating instead of following an average diet may has positive climate effects (Hallström, Röö, & Börjesson, 2014; Saxe, Larsen, & Mogensen, 2013).

Although the research on drivers and barriers in the context of climate-friendly food choice is in its infancy, there are some reviews and studies

focusing on barriers that hinder climate actions in general (e.g., Gifford, 2011; Swim et al., 2009).

I suggest that at least some of these barriers may be relevant in this context. First of all, one of the key barriers to climate action relates to how climate change per se is perceived (e.g., de Boer, Witt, & Aiking, 2016; Vainio & Paloniemi, 2013; Vainio, Mäkinen, & Paloniemi, 2014): when it is perceived as uncertain, distant, not personally relevant, not risky and something that is not under one's behavioural control, for example, climate-friendly action is not likely to happen (c.f. Gifford, 2011). Reflecting this notion, a strong relationship has been found among Europeans between perceiving climate change as a serious problem and reporting action to mitigate it (Special Eurobarometer 409, 2014). It has also been shown that those who perceive climate change as a moral issue have significantly higher levels of concern about it (Markowitz, 2012). However, climate change is an abstract, complex phenomenon, which could constitute a barrier to perceiving it as morally significant (Markowitz & Shariff, 2012).

Another influential barrier hindering general climate actions relates to the perceived responsibility for tackling climate change. Europeans, for example, tend to see it as the responsibility of national governments (48%) and business and industry (41%). In fact, only one in four Europeans (25%) think they have any personal responsibility. Moreover, it seems that the groups of people among Europeans that are most likely to take personal actions (which include preferring local and seasonal food) are aged between 40 and 54, are highly educated, in managerial positions and with a stable financial situation. (Special Eurobarometer 409, 2014.)

Given that reducing meat consumption is seen as among the most influential climate-friendly food-choice actions (de Boer, 2016; Garnett, 2008; Hallström et al., 2014; McMichael, Powles, Butler, & Uauy, 2007), in the following I discuss some of the relevant barriers and drivers.

Concrete ways of reducing meat consumption include adopting a more or totally plant-based, vegetarian diet, replacing meat with vegetable-based meat substitutes, for example. One possibility in the future may be to replace traditional muscle-type meat with a cultured, synthetic and laboratory-grown substitute (Verbeke et al., 2015). However, reducing meat consumption tends to be perceived as an especially difficult and complex lifestyle and habit change. Consequently, numbers of vegetarians and vegans are low in Western countries such as Finland (c.f. Vinnari, 2010).

Multiple barriers against reducing meat eating and adopting a plant-based diet have been identified, such as the enjoyment of meat, existing eating routines (i.e. habits), health conceptions, and difficulties in preparing plant-based food (Pohjolainen, Vinnari, & Jokinen, 2015). It has also been shown that consumers commonly underestimate the environmental influence of meat production (de Boer, 2016; Tobler, Visschers, & Siegrist, 2011b; Vanhonacker et al., 2013).

One of the key barriers relates to fundamental conceptions and beliefs about the superior health benefits of meat and animal-based protein: meat is often perceived as necessary for survival (Rothgerber, 2014). Nevertheless, it has been shown that a well-balanced plant-based diet has true nutritional value, and may even have positive health effects (Hallström et al., 2014), given that the intake of animal-based protein, which is associated with many diseases, is too high in most Western countries. Thus, depending on the composition of the current diet, reducing meat consumption could have health benefits if its replacement has sufficient nutritional content (Beverland, 2014).

Identity functions may also influence how plant-based diets and those who follow them are perceived and judged, and consequently how willingly they are adopted. There is empirical evidence that meat eating is commonly associated with masculinity, power and wealth, and even with patriotic national identity, whereas plant-based diets are associated with weakness, femininity and poverty (Beverland, 2014). It has also been shown that vegetarians are perceived as more virtuous and less manly than omnivores (Ruby & Heine, 2011), which might diminish the willingness to adopt such a diet among those who do not identify with plant-based eaters as a group.

A preference for a plant-based diet often stems from an unwillingness to eat animals and a concern for animal welfare. However, there does not seem to be strong (moral) concern about the welfare of animals in Finland, for example. This might reflect the fact that the rearing of animals for meat production nowadays goes on in isolation on farms, and the link between the product and the slaughter of an animal is not salient in everyday life (c.f. Schösler, de Boer, & Boersema, 2012). Nevertheless, most people would not wish to harm animals, and have developed certain strategies to handle uncomfortable emotions (e.g., guilt) and thoughts (e.g., it is morally wrong) that may arise if they eat meat on the one hand and wish no harm to animals on the other (the meat paradox).

People use various techniques such as avoidance, dissociation and denial to ease the (cognitive) dissonance that may arise in such situations. This allows them to handle the (meat) paradox, and makes them less willing to eat less meat due to animal-welfare concerns. More concretely, avoidance means, for example, that ordinary people do not think about animals in the context of factory farming, and farms are isolated from their everyday lives. Dissociation refers to a process whereby the animal is dissociated from the meat product through the use of different names for the animal and its flesh/meat (e.g., cow vs. beef) and the production of meat products that no longer resemble the animal (e.g., whole grilled chicken vs. chicken nuggets), for example (Rothgerber, 2014). In this connection, it has also been shown that categorising an animal as food alters its perceived capacity to suffer, and such animals are even perceived as less susceptible to suffering, which in turn reduces any moral concerns (Bratanova, Loughnan, & Bastian, 2011). Denial of animal pain reflects the belief that animals do not feel pain when

raised and killed for meat, and denial of animal thought reflects the belief that animals are very different from humans (Loughnan, Haslam, & Bastian, 2010; Rothgerber, 2014).

So-called pro-meat justification is also used to counter the meat paradox, such as, “Animals are meant to be eaten”, “God intended us to eat animals” and “I enjoy eating meat” (Rothgerber, 2014). The major justifications are that meat eating is natural (e.g., human beings are natural meat eaters), necessary (e.g., a healthy diet includes meat), normal (e.g., it is abnormal for humans not to eat meat) and enjoyable (e.g., meat tastes good). Such rationalisation appears to be associated with meat-eating behaviour. For instance, it has been reported that respondents who tend to endorse the above-mentioned forms of rationalisation are less likely to think about reducing their consumption of animal products, tend to consume meat often, and are highly committed to eating meat in the future. (Piazza et al., 2015.)

Moreover, the shared view of a proper meal – and a typical meal format – in many cultures includes meat as a main dish. Accordingly, many people are used to cooking meat-based food, and are not similarly familiar with vegetarian cooking (Beverland, 2014; Pohjolainen et al., 2015).

Further, as long as meat-based eating is predominant, adopting a plant-based diet can affect social relations. Many traditional holiday celebration meals are meat-dominated, for example, and refusing to eat the food could be taken as an insult and cause tension. Moreover, vegetarian eating is frequently seen as an identity statement or as marginal and deviant behaviour – not as normal or conventional eating. Not everybody wants to be different and to use his or her dietary choice to make a statement. (Beverland, 2014.) It has also been suggested that the presence of vegetarians may remind others about the dissonance and the meat paradox, which in turn may arouse feelings of guilt and the expression of negative attitudes towards ‘threatening’ vegetarians (i.e. moral pressure: Rothgerber, 2014).

Finally, institutional factors are major barriers in terms of reducing meat consumption. Many development economies are significant producers and exporters of meat, and these industries play an important and consistent role in the creation of economic wealth, jobs and the national identity. Economic evaluation of plant-based diets is rare, and people commonly see vegetables as expensive and as food for the elite. (Beverland, 2014.)

In sum, it seems that the key drivers and motives of plant-based dietary preferences are concerns about animal welfare, the environment and health, and abhorrence of meat (sensory evaluation) (see Ruby & Heine, 2011 for a review).

2.5 A SUMMARY OF THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

It is generally posited in the current dissertation that one way of acting like an ethical food consumer is to make ethical food choices (c.f. Chapter 1, Papaioikounomou et al., 2011.). According to previous findings, typical ethical foods are organic, local, fair-trade and pro-environmental, and include climate-friendly options. However, experts and academics tend to categorise and define foods as ethical, and little is known about the views of ordinary people.

On the one hand, it is stated that ethical food choice is a moral decision that inherently includes components of moral decision-making such as moral recognition, evaluation, intent and behaviour (Chapter 2.2). It is also assumed that the perceived moral intensity of an issue affects the whole decision-making process (Jones, 1991), and that other factors and processes such as perceived moral obligation, perceptions of behavioural control, ethical identity, as well as moral satisfaction, licensing and compensation, emerge (Ajzen, 2012; Delaney & McCarthy, 2014; Down & Burke, 2013).

On the other hand, it is posited that ethical food choice is not only a moral decision but also a food choice (Chapter 2.3). In other words, factors and motives that influence ‘normal’ food choice are also relevant in ethical food choices. According to previous findings, the main factors that influence food choice fall into three groups: food-related, consumer-related and environment/situation-related (Risvik et al., 2006; Shepherd, 2001). Generally, the strongest motives seem to be price, sensory appeal, natural content and health (Steptoe et al., 1995; Markovina et al., 2015).

It is assumed that both theoretical perspectives, namely moral decision-making and food-choice behaviour, are necessary for a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon (i.e., how people make ethical food choices). Interestingly, ethical motives are not among the most influential food choice motives (Fotopoulous et al., 2009; Prescott et al., 2002), but it seems that the “moral dimension” has strong influence on human behaviour, since moral beliefs are inherently more motivating and compelling than other beliefs (e.g., Skitka, 2010; Turiel, 1983).

Moreover, the motives related to ethical and other food choice, such as health, mood, convenience, sensory appeal and price, seem to be highly related and inter-connected (Steptoe et al., 1995; Renner et al., 2012). For instance, ethical food choices can be made for health reasons, but price concerns may be a barrier. It is also suggested that ethical food choices are always made in a social and cultural context, and are influenced by the prevailing food culture.

Finally, general and specific barriers and drivers seem to affect ethical food choice (Chapter 2.4). Presumably, a better understanding of these drivers and barriers could help to promote ethical eating.

In general, it seems that personal (moral) values (e.g., universalism), felt moral obligation or norm, felt responsibility, trust in the production process,

animal-welfare concerns, environmental concerns, a willingness to support the local economy, perceived high quality and healthiness, among other things, may have a boosting effect (e.g., Hjelmar, 2011), whereas an unwillingness to change diet, not identifying with consumers of ethical food, inconvenience, poor availability and perceived higher prices constitute some of the barriers (e.g., Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). However, thus far quite little is known about the barriers and drivers of climate-friendly food choice.

3 THE AIMS OF THE STUDY

The main aim in the present dissertation is to enhance understanding of ethical-food-choice behaviour in general and with regard to climate-friendly food choice in particular.

The first study (Study I) focused on the types of food that are considered to have a moral dimension (i.e. moral recognition, Jones, 1991), and are also evaluated and defined as morally right and morally wrong by lay people (i.e. moral evaluation, Jones, 1991). This is a significant aspect given that most previous studies rely on methods that do not allow respondents freely to decide what they consider moral questions, although it has been acknowledged that overly restricted definitions of morality may exclude relevant information (Blasi, 1990; Vainio, 2005), and that academics and experts tend to define ethical foods. Thus, the aim in this study was to narrow these gaps by focusing on lay views of ethical and unethical foods.

The second study (Study II) examined, the extent to which the five moral foundations (e.g., Graham et al., 2013; Haidt & Kesebir, 2010) emerged in food-related moral thinking, and whether there were differences in their endorsement by gender, country or political orientation. The study is the first one in which the MFT is utilised in the context of food and eating, and it also indirectly yields information as to whether the fivefold view of the moral domain is a valid conceptualisation in the food context. The basic assumption is that moral foundations may well be relevant in ethical-food-choice situations in that they may influence what is considered morally loaded food in terms of Jones's (1991) moral-decision-making model.

The third study (Study III) investigated the influence of the perceived moral intensity of an issue on ethical food choice (c.f. Jones, 1991), namely whether the perceived moral intensity of climate change could promote climate-friendly food choice as a type of food-related moral decision. It is known that dimensions such as felt moral obligation, moral concerns and moral values may promote sustainable food choice (e.g., Dean et al., 2012). The aim of the study was to enhance understanding of the potential predictive power of 'moral intensity' as one type of moral dimension in climate-friendly food choice. A further, indirect contribution is to shed light on the extent to which climate-friendly food choices are perceived as morally intensive.

The main aim in the fourth study (Study IV) was to identify barriers in the context of ethical food choice, namely those that hinder climate-friendly choices. This could be considered an important study topic given the wide attitude-behaviour gap related to choosing ethical food (e.g., Carrington et al., 2010): knowing about the barriers may help to lower them. It is known from previous studies that ethical food choices are motivated and hindered by various factors, such as animal-welfare concerns and poor availability.

However, given the non-reflective and habitual nature of food-choice behaviour people are not necessarily aware of the barriers (e.g., Hjelmar, 2011; van 't Riet et al., 2011). Moreover, there is a lack of intensive research on barriers related to climate-friendly food choice, and the current study specifically aims to narrow this gap.

The research questions and hypotheses addressed in the sub-studies

Study I.

Research question: *What kind everyday ideas and lay views about ethical and unethical food do young adults from Finland, Denmark and Italy have? How common are these lay views (i.e. social representations) in the three case countries, and which are the most relevant?*

Study II.

Research question: *How and to what extent do the five moral foundations emerge in food-related moral thinking, and how are gender, political orientation and country of origin (i.e. Finland, Denmark or Italy) connected to their endorsement in food-related moral thinking?*

The hypotheses were based on previous studies on the endorsement of moral foundations (e.g., Graham et al., 2013; Haidt & Kesebir, 2010):

H1: Women and supporters of left-wing parties will have higher scores on Harm/Care and Fairness/Reciprocity than men and right-wing party supporters.

H2: Men and supporters of right-wing parties will have higher scores on Ingroup/Loyalty and Authority/Respect than women and supporters of left-wing parties.

H3: Italians will have higher scores than the Finnish and Danish respondents on Purity/Sanctity, and women will have higher endorsement scores than men.

Study III.

Research question: *How is the perceived moral intensity of climate change related to young adults' climate-friendly food choices in Finland?*

The hypotheses were based on previous studies on moral decision-making (e.g., Jones, 1991):

H1. The perceived moral intensity of climate change increases the evaluation of climate-friendly food choices as morally right actions.

H2. The perceived moral intensity of climate change reinforces an individual's intentions to make climate-friendly food choices.

H3. The perceived moral intensity of climate change increases the likelihood of making climate-friendly food choices.

H4. Moral evaluation reinforces the intention to make climate-friendly food choices.

H5. The intention to make climate-friendly food choices increases the likelihood of making such choices.

Study IV.

Research question: *What barriers to choosing climate-friendly food do young adults in Finland perceive, and how do these barriers relate to their choice?*

The hypotheses were based on previous studies:

H1. Given the evidence that women are more willing than men to engage in environmental action in general (e.g., Arnocky & Stroink, 2011), they are also likely to perceive fewer barriers.

H2. Given that vegetarians do not need to change their existing habits as drastically as others (e.g., van 't Riet et al., 2011), those following a vegetarian diet are more likely to perceive fewer barriers to climate-friendly food choices.

H3. Given the non-reflective nature of food-choice behaviour (e.g., Hjelmars, 2011), the order of relevance of the perceived barriers to climate-friendly food choice might differ from the relative strength of their association with self-reported food choice.

4 METHODS

The data for this dissertation was collected in two time phases by means of the two different questionnaires. The first data collection took place in 2005, and the data was used in Studies I and II, whereas the second set was collected in 2011 and the data was used in Studies III and IV.

Both of the questionnaires were presented to the respondents in their native languages, the first one in Finnish, Danish and Italian (Studies I and II), and the second only in Finnish (Studies III and IV).

In all the data-collection situations, information about informed consent was given beforehand, mainly orally but also briefly in writing on the first page of the questionnaire. All the study procedures followed the ethical codes of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Ethics. No prior ethical approval was required. Participation was voluntary and the respondents were not compensated.

4.1 THE PARTICIPANTS

Studies I and II

The first dataset collected in 2005 was used in Studies I and II. A total of 403 students from Finland, Italy and Denmark filled in the questionnaire during their psychology and social psychology lessons at the University of Helsinki, the University of Milano-Bicocca and the University of Aarhus. Only students of social and behavioural sciences are included in the current analysis.

The questionnaire included various measures such as the word-association task and items eliciting socio-demographic information (e.g., gender, birth year and political orientation). The questionnaire also incorporated other scales such as the Social Representations of New Foods scale (Bäckström, Pirttilä-Backman, & Tuorila, 2004) and the food-expert evaluation task and other rating tasks, the results of which are reported elsewhere (e.g., Mäkinie mi et al., 2014).

Although the same questionnaire was used in Study I and Study II, the participants were not identical. Therefore, for the purposes of Study II the 32 respondents who had not produced any relevant associations in terms of moral foundations were excluded (see the original article for a more detailed explanation; Mäkinie mi et al., 2013). Accordingly, the total number of respondents in Study II was 371. The basic demographic information on the participants is given in Table 1 (Study I) and Table 2 (Study II).

Table 1*Study I: Characteristics of the sample (N= 403)*

	Finland		Denmark		Italy	
	n = 162		n =111		n =130	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Gender						
Female	121	74.7	85	76.6	104	80.0
Male	41	25.3	26	23.4	26	20.0
Age						
Mean	25.2		25.9		20.3	
SD	5.2		4.2		7.3	
Missing	1					
Living environment						
Mostly urban	114	70.4	43	38.7	87	66.9
Urban and rural	40	24.7	29	26.1	17	13.1
Mostly rural	8	4.9	39	35.1	23	17.7
Missing					2	1.5
Relationship						
In a relationship	69	42.6	26	23.4	58	44.6
Single	93	57.4	85	76.6	71	54.6
Missing					1	0.8
Children						
Yes	10	6.2	14	12.6	1	0.8
No	140	86.4	97	87.4	129	99.2

Table 2*Study II: Characteristics of the sample (N= 371)*

	Finland		Denmark		Italy	
	n=154		n=99		n=118	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Gender						
Female	114	74.0	73	73.7	96	81.4
Male	40	26.0	26	26.3	22	18.6
Age						
Mean	24.8		26.2	26.5	20.4	17.3
SD	5.3		7.5	7.6	4.4	3.7
Missing	1					
Political orientation						
Left	90	58.4	43	43.4	24	20.3
Centre	6	3.9	29	29.3	27	22.9
Right	18	11.7	18	18.2	6	5.1
Missing	40	26.0	9	9.1	61	51.7

Studies III and IV

The second data set collected in 2011 was used in Studies III and IV. A total of 350 students of social and behavioural sciences from Finland filled in the questionnaire during one of the lessons in the “Introduction to social psychology” and “Current trends in Social Sciences” courses at the University of Helsinki and the University of Tampere, respectively. Most of the participants were in their first or second year of study for a Bachelor’s degree. The questionnaire included various measures related to climate change and moral thinking. Some other scales were included such as the Food System Justification scale (Vainio et al., 2014), but the results are not reported here. Table 3 gives the basic demographic information about the participants.

Table 3*Study III: Characteristics of the sample (N= 350)*

	Finland	
	N=350	
	n	%
Gender		
Female	280	80.0
Male	69	19.7
Missing	1	0.3
Age		
Mean	24.0	
SD	7.05	
Diet		
Vegan/Vegatarian	50	14.3
Pescetarian	23	6.6
Meat-based	277	79.1

4.2 MEASURES

Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used to collect data for the current dissertation, as described generally in the following sections, and in more detail in the original articles.

The back-translation procedure was used when the original measures or parts of them were translated from English or Finnish into other languages (i.e. translated expressions and items were translated back into the original language and then compared and modified if necessary to increase the validity; Brislin, 1970). In practice, native Italian and Danish speakers who could also speak English and who were familiar with the data-collection methods assisted with the development of the first questionnaire (e.g., with the translation and back-translation process). A qualified bilingual translator helped with the translation of the measurements used in the second questionnaire.

Demographic variables (Studies I, II, III and IV)

The respondents' *country of origin* was identified based on the data-collection location, and was not asked separately. Between-country differences are analysed in Studies I and II.

In terms of *gender* the respondents were asked to indicate whether they were female or male. Between-gender differences are analysed in Studies II and IV.

They were also asked to indicate their birth year. *Age* at the time of the data collection was used as a covariate in Study II.

Political orientation was elicited in the first questionnaire based on an open-ended question: "Which political party's ideology is closest to your own?" The respondents were asked to write their answer on one short line. For the purposes of Study II the named parties were re-grouped based on Nordsieck's (2011) description of European political parties as left, centrist and right wing, and consequently the respondents were categorised as supporters of left-wing, central or right-wing parties. In the second questionnaire respondents were asked to indicate to which political orientation on the left-right continuum they felt closest, on a seven-point scale (1 = very left wing – 7 = very right wing).

The respondents were asked to describe their *diet* in their own words (Studies III & IV), given the growing variety of diets and the fact that young adults may be especially interested in divergent trends. The descriptions were assigned to one of two groups for the purposes of Study IV. The first group constituted vegans, vegetarians and those with vegetarian diets that included dairy products and/or eggs, and was called "vegetarian diet". The second group covered diets including meat and/or fish and was labelled "other diets".

The word-association task (Studies I & II)

Word-association tasks typically require people to produce (i.e. write down) associations with specific stimuli, including words, pictures or photographs (Sakki, Mäkineniemi, Hakoköngäs, & Pirttilä-Backman, 2014). The general aim is to explore views, concepts, (social) representations and other aspects of thinking.

These tasks are used to some extent in food studies (e.g., Graca, Oliveira, & Calheiros, 2015; Roininen et al., 2006; Rozin, Kurzer, & Cohen, 2002) and in studies of both social representations (e.g., Dany, Urdapilleta, & Monaco 2014; Lin, He, Jin, Tao, & Jiang, 2013; Moloney, Hall & Walker, 2005; Wagner, Valencia, & Elejabarrieta, 1996) and food-related social representations (e.g., Mouret, Monaco, Urdapilleta, & Parr, 2013).

In the current dissertation, as part of the first questionnaire, the respondents were asked to write down the first five words, ideas or concepts that came to their mind when they thought of the stimulus words “Ethical food/Morally right food” and “Unethical food/Morally wrong food.” Below both stimulus words were empty lines on which they were asked to write their answers. The task construction followed the suggestions of Wagner (1997), which are generally in line with other commonly used procedures (e.g., Dany et al., 2014; Lin et al., 2013; Moloney et al., 2005). Two different versions of the association task were used to identify context-sensitive and non-context-sensitive elements of social representations of ethical and unethical food. In practice the order of the presented stimulus words differed between versions. Both versions are described in more detail in the original articles (Mäkineniemi et al., 2011).

One benefit of this method is that most respondents like it and it maintains their interest, therefore the response rates tend to be high. It is also easy and quick to answer. Furthermore, the respondents’ own definitions are respected and people can freely decide what to think and write, which is not the case when there are pre-selected response options (e.g., questionnaire items). Moreover, the word-association method appears to be free from the intent to communicate some particular, organised discourse (Szalay & Deese, 1978).

It is also suggested that spontaneously created responses may be associated with a lower social-desirability bias (i.e. the tendency to produce ‘socially correct’ answers), which relates in particular to sensitive topics such as eating and morality. The weakness of the method is the fact that many of the responses constitute single words, word pairs or short sentences that do not contain very much information. The material is therefore very limited, and given the short replies is easy to over- or misinterpret. (Sakki et al., 2014.)

The moral intensity of climate change (Study III)

The Moral Intensity of Climate Change Scale (MICCS) was developed for the purposes of Study III by the two authors. The scale is based on the 12-item Perceived Moral Intensity Scale (PMIS), which is commonly used to assess moral intensity (e.g., Singhapakdi et al., 1996; Frey, 2000; McMahan & Harvey, 2006). However, the novelty of the MICCS lies in the fact that it is specifically targeted at measuring the moral intensity of climate change. In addition, six new items were developed.

Clark and Watson's (1995) suggestions were taken into account in the item-development phase, and all the content that was shared between the original and novel scale was translated and back-translated. All eighteen items (e.g., Most people disagree about the right way to act with regard to climate change) of the MICCS are presented in the original article (Mäkinen & Vainio, 2013).

An exploratory factor analysis using the Maximum Likelihood Method with orthogonal Varimax rotation was used to explore the dimensionality of the scale. A three-factor solution with a total of 42 per cent of the variance explained was adopted, based on eigenvalues, scree plots and interpretability. The Cronbach's alphas of the factors indicated acceptable internal consistency (from $\alpha = 67$ to $\alpha = 90$).

Moral evaluation of climate-friendly food choice (Study III)

The participants were asked to evaluate on a seven-point (totally morally wrong – totally morally right) whether “Making climate-friendly food choices” was a morally wrong or a morally right action.

The moral intention to make climate-friendly food choices (Study III)

The participants were asked to indicate on a seven-point scale (highly unlikely – highly likely) how likely they were to make climate-friendly food choices (a) during the next six months and (b) during the next five years. A mean score, based on both scales, was created to measure climate-friendly food-choice intentions. The Cronbach's alpha indicated high internal consistency ($\alpha = 92$).

Climate friendly food choice (Study III and Study IV)

A novel scale for measuring climate-friendly food choice was developed by the two authors of the studies, who were not aware of any previous scale measuring this phenomenon. The authors developed the items after reviewing and consulting previous studies focusing on the climatic effects of food choices (Carlsson-Kanyama & González, 2009; Fiala, 2008; Popp,

Lotze-Campen, & Bodirsky, 2010; York & Gossard, 2004). Clark and Watson's (1995) suggestions were taken into account in the item-development phase.

The participants were asked to indicate how frequently they acted with a view to mitigating climate change, such as "I try to select foods that have as minimal a negative climatic effect as possible" and "I try to limit food waste." A seven-point scale (1 = never - 7 = almost daily to daily) was used. All six items that were included in the analysis are presented in the original articles (Mäkiniemi & Vainio, 2013; Mäkiniemi & Vainio, 2014). The Cronbach's alpha indicated high internal consistency of the constructed mean scores ($\alpha = .90$)

Barriers to climate-friendly food choice (Study IV)

The authors of the study developed a scale for measuring barriers to climate-friendly food choice, not being aware of any existing scale. They consulted previous research on the predictors of pro-environmental behaviour, climate-friendly behaviour and food-choice behaviour during the scale-development process (e.g., Lindeman & Väänänen, 2000; Lorenzoni, Nicholson-Cole, & Whitmarsh, 2007; Renner et al., 2012; Steptoe et al., 1995; Tobler, Visshers, & Siegrist, 2011a), as well as suggestions put forward by Clark and Watson (1995).

The participants were asked to evaluate how relevant they found the eleven presented reasons in explaining why they did not make climate-friendly food choices, on a six-point scale (completely irrelevant to completely relevant), e.g., "I don't believe they have an effect on the climate," and "I do not have enough knowledge about them". The Cronbach's alpha indicated good internal consistency of the scale ($\alpha = .73$). All the items that were used are presented in the original article (Mäkiniemi & Vainio, 2014).

4.3 DATA ANALYSIS

In the following I introduce the main analyses described in the sub-studies of the current dissertation. More detailed information is given in each original article.

The word associations in Study I

The analysis of the word associations in Study I constituted two main steps, namely content and structural analysis. The procedures are described in more detail in the original article (Mäkiniemi et al., 2011; see also Wagner, Hansen, & Kronberger, 2014).

The aim of the inductive (i.e. data-driven) content analysis was to identify the content and main themes of lay thinking about ethical and unethical food. At first the association material for each country was kept and coded separately based on the similarity of meaning of the produced associations. The data was not translated for this phase, the first categorisations being made in the original languages. The first author of the study categorised the Finnish and Danish data, and a native Italian research assistant coded the Italian data. The codes were then further merged into larger categories following the suggestions put forward by Wagner, Kronberger, Valencia and Duarte Pereira (2006). The results of the first phase of the categorisation process were then translated into English and brought to a joint meeting, in which the two categorisations were presented and compared. This led to the development of the shared categorisation system. Two researchers produced the final categorisation after negotiating the interpretations in order to ensure similarity among the choices.

The aim of the structural analysis was to identify the structure of everyday thinking about ethical and unethical food, and more specifically to identify the core, diffusional and peripheral elements. Three methods were used, all of which are applied in the structural approach to social representations: namely frequency of evocation, the order of evocation and contextual manipulation (Moloney et al., 2005; Sá, 1996; Wagner et al., 1996; Vergés & Bastounis, 1994). The rationale behind this combination lies in the assumption that the core elements are the most frequently mentioned, the first to be evoked (mentioned at the beginning of the response process) and the most resistant to change in contextual manipulation (Abric, 2001; Sá, 1996).

The word associations in Study II

The word associations elicited in Study II were analysed in three steps. The first entailed theory-driven qualitative coding in which the associations were grouped into five moral foundations; a moral endorsement score was calculated for each respondent in the second step; and covariance analysis was used in the third step to compare endorsement of the moral foundations between the groups.

The first author developed the coding system, having consulted the following material: Haidt & Joseph 2004; Haidt & Graham 2007; McAdams et al., 2008; the MFQ, The Moral Foundations dictionary and the Moral Foundations Sacredness Scale (Moral Foundations org., 2011a;b;c; 2015). The categorisation system is presented in detail in the original article (see Mäkineniemi et al., 2013). To ensure reliability for the coding coders were trained, and two independent coders carried out two pilot tests, as Lombard, Snyder-Duch and Bracken (2002) suggest. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion. The results of the inter-coder reliability test indicated very good reliability (Cohen's Kappa = 0.91). Finally, the whole data set was coded for evidence of the five moral foundations. Each association was assigned to one moral foundation, so the coding was exclusive in nature.

The second step was to calculate the moral-foundation-endorsement score for each person. In order to assess the degree of individual endorsement of each of the five foundations, each respondent was assigned a value that reflected the proportion of each foundation in his or her ethical and unethical associations. The number of ethical associations representing each of the foundations was divided by all of the ethical associations produced by the respondent. A similar procedure was used for the corresponding unethical foundations and the result was added to the values of the ethical foundations.

Finally, repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to assess the extent to which the endorsement of the moral foundations differed in the whole data. A series of one-way analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) was then conducted to test the hypotheses concerning the assumed group differences. Because the Italian respondents were significantly younger than the Finnish and Danish respondents, age was used as a covariate in the analysis.

Statistical analysis in Study III

Exploratory factor analysis was used to explore the dimensionality of the MICCS, as explained above. Before the mean scores for each main variable were calculated the scores were re-coded so that the higher scores indicated increased levels of the phenomenon measured. Following this procedure the means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients of the main variables were calculated. Multiple linear regression and hierarchical regression

analyses were used to test the hypotheses, following Barnett's (2001) example.

Statistical analysis in Study IV

The means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients of the main variables were calculated, then the mean differences concerning the perceived relevance of the barriers were analysed by an independent-samples t-test. Multiple regression analysis was used to assess the effects of the perceived barriers on climate-friendly food choices. The perceived barriers were analysed as separate items because the item inter-correlations were quite low and exploratory factor analysis did not indicate a meaningful factor structure.

5 RESULTS

This chapter presents the main results of each sub-study. More detailed statistical information, such as means, standard deviations and correlations are given in the four original articles included in this dissertation.

5.1 HOW ARE ETHICAL AND UNETHICAL FOODS VIEWED?

The aim of Study I was to explore by means of a word-association task the concerns and lay views of young adults related to ethical and unethical food. This was assumed also to indicate indirectly which foods are 'recognised' as moral (c.f. moral recognition and evaluation in Jones, 1991). The data was subjected to data driven content and structural analysis.

The content of the lay views

The qualitative content analysis yielded the following 14 main categories: required/prohibited, natural/unnatural and healthy/unhealthy food, equality/inequality, good animal welfare/poor animal welfare, local/global, rules and descriptions. Twelve of the categories emerged as oppositional and dichotomous. The main categories and their subcategories are presented in the original article, together with the number of associations belonging to each category (Mäkiniemi et al., 2011).

The required/prohibited dichotomy indicated that certain foods are considered morally acceptable (e.g., vegetables) and others morally unacceptable (e.g., high-fat food), and there was also some ambivalence. For example, meat was viewed as both ethical and unethical.

The local/global dichotomy reflected the distance between the consumer and the food production. According to the associations belonging to this category, ethical food is produced very close to the consumer: at home, in the neighbourhood or in the country of origin, for example. Unethical food is mainly associated with global mass production.

The relationship between human beings and nature is the major theme within the natural/unnatural dichotomy. It seems that the more intensive the human involvement in food production is, the more unethical is the particular food or production method perceived to be.

The healthy/unhealthy dichotomy included associations and beliefs focusing on the nutritional value of food and the effects of eating on health.

The unequal distribution of food in the world is the key theme of the equality/inequality dichotomy and is mainly associated with poverty and the vast income gap between the rich and the poor.

The good animal welfare/poor animal welfare dichotomy focuses on the relationship between human beings and animals in food production.

The rules category is non-oppositional and reflects the fact that moral evaluations are guided by social and individual norms and principles such as religion, culture and food-related ideologies.

The descriptions category comprises description and evaluation: people actively take different standpoints with regard to ethical and unethical food, and evaluate them from various perspectives such as taste and trustfulness.

Although all the categories appeared in all three countries, their contents and those of the subcategories were not identical. Within the local/global dichotomy, for instance, the Finns mentioned associations with food patriotism and domestic food more often than the others, and within the natural/unnatural dichotomy the Italians tended to produce more associations with natural and chemical-free food, whereas the Danes and the Finns focused more on organic food.

The structure of the lay views

The structural analysis identified core, diffusional and peripheral elements of the lay views, which differed in structure. For example the number of core elements differed in the four countries.

The most relevant core elements/categories of the ethical food associations among the Finnish respondents were Required and Natural, and the core elements of the unethical food associations were Prohibited, Unnatural and Global.

Among the Danish respondents the core elements of the ethical associations were Required, Natural and Healthy, and those of unethical associations were Prohibited and Unnatural.

The respective associations among the Italian participants were Required, Descriptions, Natural and Healthy on the ethical side, and Prohibited foods on the unethical side.

The above results concerning the core ethical and unethical elements in all three countries indicate the particular relevance of the required/prohibited, natural/unnatural and healthy/unhealthy categories in moral thinking about food.

Conclusion

In sum, it could be concluded from the main results of Study I that various dimensions are associated with the ethicality of food, such as naturalness, healthiness and equality. More specifically, ethical food was perceived as natural, healthy and local, produced in ways that support equality and animal welfare, whereas unethical food was seen as unnatural, unhealthy and global, produced with no consideration for equality and animal welfare.

On the one hand, the identified descriptions and dimensions seem to be quite common, shared by Finns, Italians and Danes. On the other hand, however, they are not similarly relevant in each country, and the content differs. Finally, the following core questions attached to the ethicality of food seem the most relevant: Is the food required or prohibited according to the rules and accepted principles? Is it produced in an environmentally friendly way and in harmony with nature? What are the health effects?

5.2 HOW DO MORAL FOUNDATIONS EMERGE IN FOOD-RELATED MORAL THINKING?

The aim of Study II was to assess the extent to which the five moral foundations, namely Harm/Care, Fairness/Reciprocity, Ingroup/Loyalty, Authority/Respect and Purity/Sanctity, emerged in food-related moral thinking, and the associations of gender, political orientation and country of origin with the endorsement of these foundations in the current data. The data was subjected to theory-driven qualitative analysis, variance analysis and a series of covariance analyses.

Endorsement of the moral foundations

The respondents produced 1,948 associations that reflected moral foundations. All five foundations appeared in the data, indicating their relevance in food-related moral thinking, and supporting the fivefold view of the moral domain as suggested in the MFT. The most dominant moral foundations in the whole data were Harm/Care, Purity/Sanctity and Fairness/Reciprocity.

Gender and endorsement of the moral foundations

It was proposed based on the results of previous studies that women would achieve higher scores than men on Harm/Care, Fairness/Reciprocity and Purity/Sanctity, whereas men would score more highly on Ingroup/Loyalty and Authority/Respect.

The findings confirmed the presence of gender differences in the endorsement of the moral foundations. As expected, women achieved significantly higher scores ($M=0.48$) than men on Purity/Sanctity ($M=0.32$, $p=.005$). Unexpectedly, however, men achieved slightly but significantly higher scores ($M=0.43$) on Fairness/Reciprocity than women ($M=0.32$, $p=.044$), and no gender differences were identified in the endorsement of other foundations.

Hence, only the hypothesis that women would achieve higher scores than men on the endorsement of the Purity/Sanctity foundation was supported.

Political orientation and endorsement of the moral foundations

It was posited that political orientation is related to endorsement of the moral foundation, and that supporters of left-wing parties will achieve higher scores on Harm/Care and Fairness/Reciprocity (i.e. Individualising foundations), whereas right-wing supporters will score more highly on Ingroup/Loyalty, Authority/Respect and Purity/Sanctity (i.e. Binding foundations). The respective hypotheses (H1 and H2) only concerned the

differences between supporters of left-wing and right-wing parties because centrist parties were not considered as a separate group in previous studies.

The analyses identified differences between political-party supporters in endorsement of the moral foundation, thereby supporting previous findings. Supporters of left-wing parties ($M=0.42$) achieved significantly ($p=.007$) higher scores than supporters of central parties ($M=0.23$) on Fairness/Reciprocity. Centrist supporters ($M=0.91$) achieved significantly ($p=.031$) higher scores on Harm/Care than supporters of right-wing parties ($M=0.65$), and supporters of right-wing ($M=0.54$) and central ($M=0.55$) parties achieved significantly ($p=.001$) higher scores on Purity/Sanctity than leftist supporters ($M=0.34$). Unexpectedly, no differences according to political affiliation were identified in endorsement of the Ingroup/Loyalty foundation.

Hence, although there were significant differences among the three foundations, only one hypothesis was fully substantiated: supporters of right-wing parties achieved higher scores than supporters of left-wing parties on Purity/Sanctity.

Country of origin and endorsement of the moral foundation

It was assumed that there would be country differences in endorsement of the Purity/Sanctity foundation, but not of the other foundations. It turned out that Italians ($M=0.65$) achieved significantly ($p<.001$) higher scores on Purity/Sanctity than Finns ($M=0.28$) and Danes ($M=0.44$), and Danes achieved significantly higher scores than Finns. Unexpectedly, significant country differences related to Harm/Care, Fairness/Reciprocity and Ingroup/Loyalty also emerged.

Hence, the result supported the hypothesis that Italians will have higher scores than the Finnish and Danish respondents on Purity/Sanctity (H_3).

Conclusion

In sum, the main results of Study II indicate the presence of all five moral foundations in food-related moral thinking. The most dominant moral foundations in the data as a whole were Harm/Care, Purity/Sanctity and Fairness/Reciprocity. In accordance with the MFT, there were differences in endorsement based on gender, political orientation and country of origin, although some findings were unexpected.

However, only three posited statements were fully supported, namely: “Women will have higher endorsement scores than men on Purity/Sanctity”; “Supporters of right-wing parties will achieve higher scores on Purity/Sanctity than supporters of left-wing parties”; and “Italians will have higher scores on Purity/Sanctity than the Finnish and Danish respondents”.

5.3 DOES MORAL INTENSITY PROMOTE CLIMATE-FRIENDLY FOOD CHOICES?

The aim of Study III was to measure, by means of regression analysis, how perceptions of the moral intensity of climate change relate to climate-friendly food choice, in line with Jones's (1991) Issue Contingent Model of Ethical Decision Making.

Moral decision-making related to climate-friendly food choice

It was posited that moral evaluations strengthen intentions to make climate-friendly food choices (H4), and that such intentions increase the likelihood of making such choices (H5).

The results of the hierarchical regression analysis indicate a significant association between evaluating climate-friendly food choices as a morally right action (i.e. moral evaluation) and the intention to make climate-friendly food choices in the future (i.e. moral intention) only when three dimensions of moral intensity had not been entered into the analyses: the significant effect disappeared when the moral-intensity dimensions were integrated.

More specifically, moral evaluation explained five per cent of the variance in intention (Step 1), and the moral-intensity dimensions explained an additional 22 per cent of the variance (Step 2: $R^2\text{-change} = .22$, $F^{\text{Change}}(3, 340) = 33.20$, $p < .001$). Hence, moral evaluation was not a statistically significant predictor of the intention to make climate-friendly food choices in the final model, and H4 was only partly supported.

Moreover and as expected, moral intention was significantly associated with a high frequency of climate-friendly food choices (i.e. moral action). The effect remained when components of moral intensity were integrated into the analysis. In particular, moral intention explained 65 per cent of the variance in climate-friendly food choice in Step 1. A significant increase in the explained variance resulted when the moral-intensity components were integrated in Step 2, although they only explained an additional two per cent of the variance in moral action ($R^2\text{-change} = .02$, $F^{\text{Change}}(3, 341) = 4.95$, $p < .001$). Hence, moral intention was also a statistically significant predictor of climate-friendly food choice in the final model, thereby supporting H5.

The effect of the perceived moral intensity of climate change on decision-making

The results of the exploratory factor analysis identified three main dimensions/components of the perceived moral intensity of climate change: Probable Seriousness of the Consequences, Social Consensus and Proximity, instead of the original six components formulated by Jones (1991). It was suggested that perceived moral intensity is associated with the steps in moral decision-making, namely evaluation (H1), intention (H2) and action (H3).

The results of the regression analyses related to the effects of the moral-intensity dimensions on moral decision-making indicate that Probable Seriousness of the Consequences predicted all three steps, namely moral evaluation (i.e. perceiving climate-friendly food choices as morally right), moral intention (i.e. intending to make climate-friendly food choices in the future) and moral action (i.e. making climate-friendly food choices), and consequently was the most influential dimension.

More specifically, the moral-intensity dimensions together predicted 12 per cent of the variance in moral evaluation ($R^2 = .12$, $F(3, 341) = 15.77$, $p < .001$), but the Probable Seriousness of Consequences was the only statistically significant predictor. Hence, H1 was supported only with regard to one dimension.

The moral-intensity dimensions explained an additional 22 per cent of the variance in intention ($R^2\text{-change} = .22$, $F^{\text{Change}}(3, 340) = 33.20$, $p < .001$) when the effect of moral evaluation was controlled for (Step 2). Two of them, namely the Probable Seriousness of Consequences and Proximity, were statistically significant predictors of the intention to make climate-friendly food choices. Hence, H2 was supported only with regard to two of the dimensions.

Together, the moral-intensity dimensions predicted only an additional two per cent of the variance in moral action ($R^2\text{-change} = .02$, $F^{\text{Change}}(3, 341) = 4.95$, $p < .001$) when the effect of moral intention was controlled for, and the Probable Seriousness of Consequences was the only statistically significant predictor of action. Hence, H3 was supported only with regard to one dimension of moral intensity.

Conclusion

In sum, the results of Study III indicate that moral intention and the perceived moral intensity of climate change, namely perceiving climate change as probable and serious, are the most important factors associated with climate-friendly food choice. The perceived moral intensity of climate change influenced moral evaluation and the intention to make climate-friendly food choices in particular.

Unexpectedly, Social Consensus was not related to any moral decision-making steps, and Proximity predicted only the moral intention. In addition, it seems that climate-friendly food choices are considered a morally loaded phenomenon given that making such choices was almost unanimously considered a totally morally right action (i.e. the mean of moral evaluation was 6.53 on a scale of 1-7). Hence, climate-friendly food choices could be considered ethical food choices, as suggested in Chapter 1 of this dissertation.

5.4 WHAT BARRIERS INHIBIT CLIMATE-FRIENDLY FOOD CHOICE?

The aim of Study IV was to identify the barriers young adults in Finland consider the most relevant in terms of making climate-friendly food choices, and to find out whether the barriers perceived as most relevant differ from those that have the greatest effect on self-reported climate-friendly food choice. A further objective was to measure the association with diet and gender by means of t-tests and regression analysis.

The barriers perceived/evaluated as the most relevant

The most relevant barriers to climate-friendly food choice perceived by all the respondents were high price (M=4.21), poor supply (M=3.15), lack of knowledge (M=3.07), and perceived difficulty in making such choices (M=2.95).

Barriers and gender

The men perceived the following barriers as significantly ($p < .01$) more relevant than the women did: wanting to maintain one's eating habits (M=3.29; M=2.54) and disbelief in the climate effects of food choices (M=2.43, M=1.90). Unexpectedly, the women perceived high prices (M=3.84; M=4.30) and poor supply (M=2.80; M=3.23) as significantly ($p < .05$) more relevant than the men did.

Hence, hypothesis (H1) stating that women are likely to perceive fewer barriers than men was only supported in the case of two barriers, namely convenience and disbelief, which the women considered significantly less relevant.

Barriers and diet

On the whole, the vegetarians perceived the barriers as significantly ($p < .001$) less relevant than the non-vegetarians (M=2.06; M=2.45), specifically considering lack of knowledge (M=2.28; M=3.21), high price (M=3.46; M=4.33), lack of time (M=2.14; M=2.83), difficulty (M=2.50; M=3.02), unhealthiness (M=1.35; 1.42) and an unwillingness to change eating habits (convenience) (M=2.16; M=2.78) significantly less relevant.

Hence, the hypothesis (H2) that those following a vegetarian diet are more likely than others to perceive fewer barriers to climate-friendly food choice was supported.

The barriers that had an effect on climate-friendly food choice

According to the analyses, the barriers that had the strongest inhibiting effect on climate-friendly food choice were disbelief (i.e. I don't believe food choice affects the climate), an unwillingness to change eating habits (i.e. I always like to eat the same food), lack of time and difficulty (i.e. It is too difficult to make climate-friendly food choices). Unexpectedly, poor supply increased the likelihood of making climate-friendly food choices, whereas other barriers inhibited it. Table 4 in the original article gives the summary of the multiple regression analysis.

The relationship between perceived and influential barriers

The barriers that had the highest inhibiting effect on climate-friendly food choice (i.e. disbelief, convenience, lack of time and difficulty) differed from those that the respondents perceived as the most relevant (i.e. high price, poor supply, lack of knowledge and difficulty).

High price, for example, which was perceived as the most relevant barrier, had only a weak effect, and although perceived as barriers, bad taste and poor supply turned out to have a positive association.

Hence, hypothesis (H3) stating that the order of relevance of the perceived barriers to climate-friendly food choice might differ from the relative strength of their association with self-reported food choice, was fully supported.

Conclusion

According to the findings of Study IV, high price was perceived as the most relevant barrier to climate-friendly food choice, followed by poor supply, lack of knowledge, and difficulty in making climate-friendly choices. However, the barriers that hindered the participants from making such choices were different. The discrepancy may reflect the unconscious nature of choosing food. Furthermore, there were gender and dietary differences related to the perceived relevance of the barriers, as expected.

6 DISCUSSION

The main aim in this dissertation was to enhance understanding of behaviour related to ethical food choice in general, and to climate-friendly food choice in particular. It seems that at least two theoretical perspectives, namely models of moral decision-making and of food choice, are needed to shed light on the dimensions and aspects of this phenomenon.

The consumption of ethical food has increased in recent years (e.g., European Commission, 2013; Fair Trade Finland, 2015) but there is a wide gap between having a positive attitude towards it and eating it (e.g., Carrington et al., 2010). Choosing to eat ethical food is a concrete way of practising sustainability on a daily basis and supporting workers' rights, animal welfare, environmental sustainability and the local economy, for example. The more people know about the phenomenon, especially about the barriers to and drivers of ethical food choice, the easier it should be to promote these actions more effectively.

In the following I discuss the main findings of the study, and give some pointers for further research. Finally, I point out the main limitations, and consider the practical implications of the results.

6.1 LAY VIEWS ON ETHICAL AND UNETHICAL FOOD

The main aim of Study I was to explore everyday views on and social representations of ethical and unethical food, focusing especially on the content and the structural elements. This was considered important given the tendency in previous studies to rely on researchers rather than respondents to define ethical foods, and the consequent lack of clarity as to whether lay people and experts or researchers would come up with similar definitions.

The qualitative content analysis yielded categories and dimensions describing the content of associations with ethical and unethical food, which included required/prohibited, natural/unnatural and healthy/unhealthy food, equality/inequality, good animal welfare/poor animal welfare, local/global, rules and descriptions. For example, ethical food was considered natural, healthy and local, produced in ways that support equality and animal welfare, whereas unethical food was perceived as unnatural, unhealthy and global, produced with no regard for equality and animal welfare. (Mäkiniemi et al., 2011.)

It is commonly acknowledged that a prerequisite for a moral decision is that the moral dimension of the particular object is perceived or recognised (Jones, 1991; Tenbrunsel & Smith-Crowe, 2008). It could thus be assumed that the current findings may reflect the types of food that are considered or recognised as ethical or morally loaded. The most typical ethical-food options

within the current data could be described as fair trade, local, organic and pro-environmental (c.f. equality/inequality, local/global, natural/unnatural categories), and as sustainable food options according to the British Sustainable Development Commission's (2005) proposed definition. This indicates that ethical foods are also perceived as sustainable, which supports the notion that one way to act as an ethical consumer is to make sustainable food choices (Papaoikonomou et al., 2011). Hence, the terms sustainable food and ethical food share certain features (see Chapter 1).

However, the results also showed that moral dimensions are associated with food types other than those mentioned above, which is in line with the notion that moral qualities and concerns are attached to healthy food, readymade food and fast food (Delaney & McCarthy, 2014; Jackson & Viehoff 2016; McPhail et al., 2011; Olsen et al., 2010), for example. It is also indicative of the fact that the 'moral space' of food is extensive and includes food that is not necessarily defined as ethical in academic research. On this basis, therefore, I suggest that ethical food and sustainable food should not be treated as identical concepts, even though they seem to overlap (c.f. British Sustainable Development Commission, 2005). In particular, although the concept of ethical food includes a variety of sustainable options, it may extend further to incorporate various kinds of food and diet that have become moralised in everyday social interactions. Hence, the lay definition of ethical food seems broader than definitions academics tend to use, which should be taken into account in future studies.

Further, it seems that at least some of the identified categories also give information about the process of choosing ethical food. For instance, some of the categories reflect typical motives and concerns related to health and animal welfare, highlighting their role in everyday food choices. In addition, the descriptions category reflects the way in which ethical and unethical foods are described and evaluated: they are seen as expensive or cheap, tasting good or bad, trustworthy or non-trustworthy, and favourable or unfavourable, for example, just like any other food. These findings support the notion that ethical concerns interact with other factors (e.g., taste, and familiarity) that motivate food choices, as Steptoe et al. (1995) suggest, and reflect the claim made at the beginning of the current dissertation that theories of moral psychology and food-choice behaviour should be integrated to obtain a broad picture of the phenomenon.

There were country differences in the structural composition of lay views (i.e. social representations) on ethical and unethical food: in other words different categories were considered the core, most relevant issues in different countries. As an example, the Danes and the Italians rated 'healthy' as a core category in comparison with the Finns who put it in a peripheral position. Together these results complement findings suggesting that there are various differences in food-related thinking even between European countries (e.g., Special Eurobarometer 389, 2012), and imply that there is

also cultural variation in food-related moral thinking (e.g., Haidt & Kesebir, 2010; Sverdlik et al., 2012) even between Western, European populations.

The current findings also support the notion that the ethical-concern dimension does not necessarily adequately cover the motives that drive ethical food choice. The original FCQ measures ethical concern on the following three items: Comes from countries I approve of politically; Has the country of origin clearly marked; Is packaged in an environmentally friendly way (Step toe et al., 1995). These items seem to be associated with the natural/unnatural and local/global categories identified in Study I, but not with others. Hence, the current findings support Lindeman and Väänänen's (2000) attempt to develop a broader scale. Given the increase in consumption of ethical food, possibly indicating the growing influence of ethical concern as a food-choice motive, there is a need to develop or update the dimension in the original FCQ. According to the latest research, for example, food packaging has quite a minor but often overestimated environmental influence (Lea & Worsley, 2008; Tobler et al., 2011b). Hence, the item "Is packed in an environmentally friendly way" could be considered misleading and even irrelevant.

Study I was among the first to focus on lay views of ethical and unethical food. Its novelty value lies in the use of methodology that is uncommon in the field of moral psychology, i.e. word association method. The method facilitates the study of morality in a way that respects lay respondents' definitions of the term. In other words, the researcher's definition does not dominate or restrict the responses. This is a significant point given the suggestion that researchers' definitions may sometimes be too restrictive and exclusive (c.f. Blasi 1990; Vainio 2005). A further strength of Study I is the culture-sensitive nature of the cross-national qualitative coding (content analysis). The procedure is also presented in Wagner, Hansen, & Kronberger, 2014.

6.2 MORAL FOUNDATIONS AND ETHICAL FOOD CHOICE

The aim of Study II was to explore the extent to which the five moral foundations (e.g., Graham et al., 2013) that are assumed to be the key dimensions of morality also emerge in food-related everyday thinking. It is suggested that moral foundations may be relevant in ethical food choice in that they may guide perceptions of food as morally loaded, or recognised as moral in Jones's (1991) moral-decision-making model.

The main results indicate that all moral foundations are present in food-related moral thinking. However and interestingly, Purity/Sanctity was more highly endorsed in the current study than in previous studies that were not connected to any specific topic but focused on so-called general moral thinking. There were also differences in endorsement based on gender, political orientation and country, as suggested elsewhere. However, not all the hypotheses were supported.

The MFT with its five types of moral questions or concerns is under development as a theoretical framework. Some suggestions for theory development arising from the current study concern the methods but also apply to research on moral psychology in general.

First of all, the findings of Study II support the MFT in that all five moral foundations emerged in the association data. This strengthens the claim that morality should be conceptualised broadly including at least five types of moral questions, which in turn might require methodological innovations based on a wider understanding. For instance, theories that are commonly used to describe the development of moral thinking such as those developed by Kohlberg (1984) and Gilligan (1982) focus mainly on Harm/Care and Fairness/Reciprocity (Sverdlik et al., 2012), which do not necessarily fully capture current thinking on the phenomenon (development of moral thinking) and thus there is a need for new models and methods (c.f. Jensen, 1997; 2008; 2011).

Second, it is suggested that there may be more foundations, such as Industry and Modesty (Suhler & Churchland, 2011), and Liberty/Oppression (Iyer, Koleva, Graham, Ditto, & Haidt, 2012), to add to the five existing ones. By definition, Liberty/Oppression reflects the feelings of reactance and resentment people have towards those who dominate them and restrict their liberty in accordance with the following statements: "People should be free to do as they want"; "I think everyone should be free to do as they choose, as long as they do not restrict the freedom of others"; and "People should be free to decide what norms or traditions they wish to follow". (Iyer et al. 2012.)

Interestingly, when the association data was coded in categories representing each moral foundation, some associations related to free autonomous decisions were allocated to a miscellaneous category (e.g., individual choice and convictions). These associations seem to reflect the fact

that food-related moral decisions are associated with the freedom to make food choices based on individual convictions or personal values. The Liberty/Oppression foundation had not been introduced when the categorisation system was developed for the purposes of Study II, but the findings seem to support its existence. However, the number of related associations in the data was very small, so the finding is indicative. There were no associations related to Industry/Modesty, possibly because it is not as relevant in food-related moral thinking as in other domains such as work-related moral thinking.

Third, thus far in previous studies on the endorsement of moral foundations political orientation tends to be measured on a liberal-conservative spectrum, which is not widely used in everyday political discussion in Finland, for example. However, it has been suggested that political orientation should be studied in a way that suits the particular culture, reflecting the common threads in everyday political discussions (c.f. Kim et al., 2012; Nilsson & Erlandsson, 2015). The respondents in Study II, therefore, were asked to name the party that reflected their political opinions most strongly, and depending on their answers were coded as supporters of the left, the centre or the right. Given that there were three different countries and quite different political cultures, it was very difficult to recode the respondents identically, or even to find a categorisation system in which all the countries were included. This illustrates the challenges related to cross-national and cross-cultural comparative research such as reported in Studies I and II: one needs to respect country-specific aspects, but at the same time to find something general and comparative.

The results of Study II showed differences in the endorsement of moral foundations between supporters of centrist parties and supporters of the right and the left. This indicates that the tendency to support centrist politics could be a significant factor that should be taken into account in future studies, especially in countries in which it is a relevant aspect of political identification. Similarly, developers of the MFT have broadened their studies to include Libertarians, a prominent ideological group in US politics that is underrepresented in earlier MFT studies. Libertarians are conservative on economic issues (e.g., against government regulation of free markets) but liberal on social issues (e.g., against government intrusion into private matters). (Iyer et al., 2012.) Consequently, it is very difficult for Libertarians to indicate their political orientation on a conservative-liberal dimension. Blasi (1990) suggested that adopting overly restricted definitions of morality could lead to the exclusion of relevant aspects of the phenomenon. Similarly, overly restricted understanding and assessment in studies of political orientation may result in significant notions and even groups of people being left outside the study scope.

Fourth, the findings of Study II imply that moral thinking is issue-contingent, as Jones (1991) suggests, The Purity/Sanctity foundation turned out to be a more dominant theme in the current study than in previous

studies (e.g., Graham et al., 2011; Graham et al., 2013), for example, which could indicate that it is a more relevant dimension in food-related moral decision-making than in general moral thinking.

As described in more detail in Chapter 2.1, the MFQ measures so-called general moral thinking. In practice, people are asked to think about situations in which they have to decide whether something is right or wrong thus their decisions are not targeted on a specific matter such as food or diet (e.g., whether meat eating is right or wrong). It might therefore be useful to make comparisons between general moral endorsement (MFQ) and specific endorsements that could be targeted on particular issues or decisions, such as those related to ethical food choice. With this type of comparative study design it may be possible to determine whether or not the use of moral foundations is issue-contingent. In other words, new issue-specific measures should be developed. This suggestion is in line with previous findings implying that the nature of moral dilemmas can affect the complexity of real-life moral thinking (Juujärvi 2005; Myyry & Helkama, 2007). In fact, there have been quite a few attempts to determine whether and in what sense moral thinking is similar or different in various domains.

Finally, the findings of Study II indicate country differences in four of the five moral foundations, meaning that there are country differences within Europe. Most previous MFT studies compared countries and cultures with more obvious differences, such as South Korea and the United States (Kim et al., 2012). The results of the current study highlight the fact that even quite similar national cultures such as Finland and Denmark, both of which represent Scandinavian cultures, may differ in terms of moral-foundation endorsement. It is acknowledged that studies on ethical consumption in general rarely focus on the cultural influences (Papaoikonomou et al., 2011). It could be concluded from this statement and the findings of the present dissertation that cross-national and cross-cultural ethical studies on ethical consumption should be promoted.

In sum, the novelty value of Study II is on the methodological level. The word associations were re-grouped following a theory-driven qualitative coding process developed especially for the current study. This could be considered a methodological innovation given the lack of qualitative studies based on Moral Foundations theory, which largely relies methodologically on the MFQ. It was also a first attempt to use word association as a method for studying the endorsement of food-related moral foundations, or of moral foundations related to a specific topic or issue.

6.3 MORAL INTENSITY AND ETHICAL FOOD CHOICE

The aim of Study III was to explore whether the moral intensity of an issue could be a relevant, new moral dimension in promoting ethical food choice, namely whether the perceived moral intensity of climate change is associated with climate-friendly food choice. To measure this we first developed two novel scales, the Moral Intensity of Climate Change Scale (MICCS) and the Climate-friendly Food Choice Scale: at the time of the data collection there was a lack of scales related to climate-friendly actions and moral perceptions of climate change.

It could be concluded from previous studies that, on the one hand, ethical concerns and moral values are not among the most relevant food-choice motives (e.g., Steptoe et al., 1995), but on the other hand it has been shown that the 'moral dimension' may have added value especially in the choice of sustainable food. For example, moral obligation, a positive moral attitude and ethical identity appear to be associated with the purchasing of sustainable food (e.g. Dean et al., 2008; Dean et al., 2012; Dowd & Burke, 2013). It has also been suggested that, in general, moral beliefs are inherently more motivating and compelling than other beliefs (e.g., Skitka, 2010; Turiel, 1983). Reflecting these assumptions, the moral intensity of an issue was presented in the study as a potential new moral dimension that could be relevant in the context of ethical food choice, specifically with regard to climate-friendly food.

The results of Study III indicate that the moral intensity of climate change, in other words the perceived Probable Seriousness of the Consequences, is related to moral decision-making regarding climate-friendly food. In fact, it was associated with all the steps in moral decision-making, namely evaluation, intention and action. In other words, people who perceive climate change as probable and serious are more willing to make climate-friendly food choices. This finding is in line with views suggesting that perception of climate change is associated with climate action (e.g., Gifford, 2011; Vainio & Palomäki, 2013).

Some of the results contradicted earlier findings, specifically with reference to Social Consensus, which in the current study was not as influential a predictor of moral decision-making as in previous studies (e.g., Barnett, 2001). This could relate to the fact that Jones's (1991) model tends to be used in organisational settings with a view to enhancing understanding of work-related moral decision-making. Hence, the above-mentioned result may indicate that the basic dynamics of moral decision-making as a process may differ between domains such as organisational behaviour and food-choice behaviour. This is in line with the findings reported in Study II (i.e. Purity/Sanctity were more highly endorsed than in earlier studies), and with the view that moral decision-making is issue-contingent. However, it is likely that Social Consensus was not an influential predictor of climate-friendly food choice given that there was not a strong social consensus regarding

climate change, and that experts have divergent and contradictory views (Anderegg, Prall, Harold, & Schneider, 2010; Oreskes, 2004).

According to the results of Study III, the intention to make climate-friendly food choices in the future was the strongest predictor of current climate-friendly food choice. However, given that the design was correlational, and past behaviour was measured, it seems that those who intended to make climate-friendly food choices in the future had made their choice in the past. It is frequently stated that when a certain type of behaviour is habituated, intentions are poorer predictors of the corresponding behaviour than situational factors (van't Riet et al., 2011). Thus, the strong intention-behaviour association identified in the present study may indicate that climate-friendly food choice is currently non-habituated action. However, intentionally selecting climate-friendly options is quite a new way of acting as a sustainable consumer, and presumably not many people have developed stable habits accordingly. This is in line with findings (for a review see van't Riet et al., 2011) suggesting that an action that is new or infrequent is guided by deliberate intentions, whereas when it has become highly habitual intentions have little effect. Hence, habit strength moderates the relationship between intentions and behaviour: the stronger the habit, the weaker the intention-behaviour relationship, and intentions guide future behaviour more strongly when habits are weak (e.g., Danner, Aarts & de Vries, 2008).

Finally, the novelty value of Study III relates, first, to the fact that it was one of the first to use the Jones (1991) model of moral decision-making in the context of food-choice behaviour, and focused on the moral intensity of climate change. Second, two novel scales were developed and tested. Third, it is worth highlighting the fact that we studied self-reported behaviour and not just intentions: questionnaires used in studies on moral decision-making do not necessarily elicit information on actual behaviour (c.f. McMahon, 2002).

6.4 BARRIERS INHIBITING CLIMATE-FRIENDLY FOOD CHOICE

The focus in Study IV was on the factors that hinder climate-friendly food choice, namely how the barriers are perceived and how they are associated with the choice of climate-friendly food.

Previous studies on the barriers that inhibit ethical food choice (see Chapter 2.4) point to a lack of research especially in the context of climate-friendly food, although there have been studies on reducing of meat eating, which is one of the most influential ways of behaving in a more climate-friendly way (e.g., Schösler et al., 2012).

Research on climate-friendly eating was still in its infancy at the time of the data collection, so we were not able to locate any scale for measuring the barriers that inhibit climate-friendly food choice. We therefore developed a new one for the purposes of Study IV.

The key results of the study indicate that the respondents perceived high price, poor supply, lack of knowledge and difficulty in making choices as the most relevant barriers, whereas poor supply, wanting to maintain the same eating habits, disbelief in the climate effects of food choice, and lack of time had the biggest effects on the choices.

The findings illustrate how so-called general motives such as price and taste may appear and act as barriers to climate-friendly food choice, but there are also specific barriers such as disbelief in any climate effects. Thus, climate-friendly food choice as an ethical action has some specific features, but also some shared elements with food choice in general, and with other ethical options. For instance, one shared barrier to choosing local and climate-friendly food seems to be inconvenience (e.g., time needed) (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015).

There were some differences between perceived and actual barriers, which may indicate that people make food choices without reflection (i.e. they are not aware of the drivers and motives), and this also applies to ethical food choice. Interestingly, it seems from the findings of Study III that a lack of reflexivity does not necessarily indicate that the action is also habituated, although habituated/habitual and unreflective are often assumed to belong together (e.g., van 't Riet et al., 2011). More specifically, the finding in Study III that moral intentions were strong predictors of climate-friendly food choice, may imply that such choice is not highly habituated given suggestions that intentions guide (future) behaviours more strongly when habits are weak (e.g., Danner et al., 2008; van 't Riet et al., 2011).

Thus, in general the findings seem to indicate that climate-friendly food choice may also be a weakly habituated (Study III) and non-reflexive action (Study IV). This could relate to the novelty of the phenomenon and the concepts: the phenomenon is unfamiliar and no stable habits have, as yet, developed. However, some previous findings also seem to support the notion that both convenience and a tendency to avoid reflection, as well as reflection

in itself, may surface together in ethical food choices (e.g., purchasing organic food) (Hjelmar, 2011). Presumably there are also transitions from reflection to non-reflection or habitual action, and vice versa. For instance, one can make a deeply reflective decision to adopt a vegetarian diet, but develop very stable habits in following the diet, thus the action becomes routinized and non-reflective. There is clearly a need for more research to shed light on the process of ethical food choice. What is role of reflection in an ethical decision? How do stable habits supporting ethical food choices develop?

There were also gender and dietary differences in perceptions of barriers. The implication is that there are food sub-cultures related to gender and diet, for example, which is in line with the findings of Study I and earlier studies (e.g., Special Eurobarometer 389, 2012). The dietary differences also suggest that ethical options that are close to existing eating habits are easier to adopt. Given that the current student sample was fairly homogenous, and female-dominated, it might be wise in future studies on ethical food to identify different consumer groups and segments, and to find out whether the barriers and drivers differ in the case of climate-friendly food choice versus other ethical options.

In sum, the novelty value of Study IV lies in the fact that it was among the first to explore the barriers inhibiting climate-friendly food choice, and introduced a novel measurement for this purpose. Previous studies have identified some barriers, but the current study also adds knowledge about the relevance order. Presumably, enhancing understanding of the barriers inhibiting climate-friendly food choice should help to promote climate-friendly eating. The practical implications of this study are discussed in Chapter 6.6.

6.5 LIMITATIONS

There are two main limitations that concern all the sub-studies, namely a social-desirability bias and the use of student samples. Other limitations related to each study are presented in the original articles.

Social-desirability bias refers to a general tendency among individuals to present themselves favourably with regard to socially accepted standards (Chung & Monroe, 2003), which means that respondents may base their answers on social expectations rather than their real beliefs. It emerges to some extent in all survey studies and could be considered a type of self-presentation tactic that human beings adopt. On the other hand, it is acknowledged that social desirability bias could constitute a serious threat to the validity of research findings, particularly when sensitive topics such as eating, drinking or sexual behaviour are being studied (van de Mortel, 2008; Randall & Fernandes, 1991). Given that social desirability bias relates to the tendency among people to present themselves positively in accordance with prevailing social norms, it is very likely to emerge in the context of ethical food choice, which is a morally loaded action: people are morally judged based on what they eat in social situations, for example (Stein & Nemeroff, 1995).

Social desirability bias was not explicitly controlled for in this dissertation, but it was probably present to some extent. The participants may have reported making more climate-friendly food choices than they did in practice, for example, as well as stronger intentions to do so (Study III and Study IV), given that prevailing social norms may favour that kind of behaviour. However, there does not seem to be a clear consensus or accepted social norms in the case of climate change (see the results of Study III as well as Anderegg, et al., 2010 and Oreskes, 2004), thus it is likely that bias is less of a problem in this study than it would otherwise be.

It is also likely that bias is less evident in Studies I and II given their reliance on word association, a method that captures intuitive and spontaneous responses and therefore is probably not highly sensitive to social desirability. It could be assumed that spontaneous responses are less reflective and therefore not – at least consciously - adjusted to social expectations. Consequently, this could increase the value of the method in research on sensitive issues such as ethics and eating (c.f. Sakki et al., 2014).

Although it is impossible to eliminate social desirability bias totally, some researchers include a separate ‘Social Desirability’ scale in their questionnaires in an attempt to detect and control for it. This identifies respondents who score highly on social desirability during the analysis phase, and their responses to the other parts of the questionnaire may be disregarded or given reduced weighting. However, this procedure is not considered totally unproblematic. It is also possible to control for bias in basic data-collection procedures. For instance, guaranteed anonymity has been associated with lower levels of social-desirability bias (Randall &

Fernandes, 1991; van de Mortel, 2008.) The participants contributing to the current dissertation were able to answer totally anonymously, the groups were large and the data collector was not known to the informants, hence the procedures should not have fostered self-presentation motives.

The second main limitation concerns the use of student samples. All the participants were university students, specifically students of social and behavioural sciences. Although this is commonly acknowledged as a clear limitation of any study, participant pools in the field of psychology largely comprise Western undergraduates, and even leading scientific journals publish findings claiming to generalise the results of research conducted among undergraduates to “humans” or “people” (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010).

The main weakness of student samples relates to the generalizability and consequently the external validity of the results. In other words, the main concern is whether and to what extent the findings are generalizable to a wider target population, which usually means a representative adult population. It is often claimed that student samples do not correspond with national representative adult samples. It was found in a meta-analysis of response homogeneity and effect size, for instance, that the responses of the students were slightly more homogenous than those of non-students, both within and across scales, and that there were unsystematic differences in effect size between the student and non-student samples: the implication is that claims of generalizability should be made with caution (Peterson, 2001).

On the other hand, student samples have been shown to reflect the basic structural characteristics of a country, and to show intercultural differences (Flere & Lavrič, 2008; Straus, 2009). It has also been suggested that if a study is based on a well-defined theory with clearly elaborated predictions or hypotheses, and if the findings confirm the predictions, the results may be somewhat generalizable to a target population (see Bello, Leung, Radebaugh, Tung & van Witteloostuijn, 2009).

There were three main reasons why students were used in the current study. First, it is a typical practice in the human and social sciences in general, largely because of accessibility, convenience and low cost: cost was a factor in the current dissertation project given that there was no separate funding for the data collection. Second, Studies I and II in particular included cross-national comparison, for which according to Lyons and Chryssochhou (2001) it is advisable to locate subgroups in each country that are as similar as possible. It is assumed that students representing the same study fields are likely to be similar and comparable from that perspective, and accordingly quite appropriate for cross-national comparisons. This is in line with the previously mentioned notion that student samples can be used to identify intercultural differences (e.g., Straus, 2009). The third reason for using student samples is that they represent young adults, which was a relevant group in this case, especially in Studies III and IV relating to climate-friendly action. Young adults constitute an interesting consumer

group from the perspective of climate-friendly consumption. It has been shown that better educated and younger individuals express stronger pro-environmental attitudes than less well-educated and older individuals (see Studies III & IV; e.g., Dietz, Stern, & Guagano, 1998; Dunlap, Van Liere, Mertig, & Jones, 2000; Franzen & Meyer, 2010), which could indicate that they are more interested in the topic and may well know more about climate-friendly food choices than nonstudent groups. In some cases a high knowledge level could be seen as a clear benefit, as a lack of requisite knowledge to respond adequately to research questions may threaten the internal validity of the study. On the other hand, most university students (at least in Finland) have quite limited economic resources than the wider population, which may influence their perceptions of which barriers are relevant, for instance (see Study IV).

The student respondents in the current dissertation were from the social and behavioural sciences, and do not necessarily represent university students in general. There is evidence of variation in attitudes to food between students in different fields. It has been shown among Finnish university students, for example, that those studying the natural sciences and technology have more positive attitudes towards GM foods, and higher levels of adherence to technology regarding new foods, than students in other fields such as the social sciences (Saher, Lindeman, & Hursti, 2006; Mäkinen et al., 2014).

6.6 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

One of the key challenges related to ethical and sustainable eating concerns its promotion. A shift towards more sustainable diets could lead to the more equal treatment of workers and better animal welfare, and decrease the amount of greenhouse gases, for example (c.f. the British Sustainable Development Commission's (2005) definition of sustainability). How, then, might the identified gap between attitudes and actual behaviour (e.g., Thøgersen & Schrader, 2012) be narrowed? The gap is particularly wide in so-called high-cost situations in which sustainable or ethical choice requires significant effort, and there are no facilitating situational conditions such as good availability and perceived quality of sustainable options (Moser, 2015).

Nevertheless, it is possible to put forward some practical suggestions based on the findings of the current dissertation. The practical implications stem mainly from the results of Studies III and IV, whereas Studies I and II raised more theoretical and methodological issues as described earlier. The two main suggestions with regard to the promotion of ethical food choice are, first to incorporate a moral dimension into persuasive communication and second, to lower the barriers, especially in high-cost situations.

The findings of Study III highlight the fact that the perceived moral intensity of climate change had some effect on climate-friendly food choice, which indicates that more emphasis should be placed on the moral dimensions of sustainable issues in public discussion and marketing, for example. The results indicate that the Probable Seriousness of Consequences dimension could be used to good effect in the promotion of climate-friendly choices, to which it was most strongly related. In practice, it could be focused on more explicitly in media discussion. How likely is it that climate change is causing harm? What kind of harm is it, and how will it affect people?

Although highlighting the moral dimensions of ethical and sustainable choices in public and social discussion could be a useful strategy, it should not increase the incidence of negatively loaded moralisation, meaning that people are morally judged by their 'wrong' food choices, because that would presumably strengthen resistance or even promote counteraction. However, there are contradictory findings suggesting that collective guilt may promote climate-friendly action in some cases (e.g., Ferguson & Branscombe, 2010), and guilt may promote moral compensation (see Delaney & McCarthy, 2014). On the other hand, Markowitz and Sharif (2012) propose that it would be more useful to bolster recognition of climate change as a morally loaded issue, highlighting positive norms such as gratitude and hope and motivating action through positive appeals. It is not possible to validate such assumptions on the basis of the current study. However, it would be interesting in future studies to explore the extent to which moral intensity can be promoted, and the relative effectiveness of neutral, positive and negative messages.

The findings of Study II indicate that food-related moral questions are perceived from divergent moral perspectives (i.e. moral foundations), some of which differ in relevance by gender or political-party affiliation. Consequently, multiple moral frames should be used when the moral dimension of any food is emphasised given that not all frames are similarly relevant to all groups, and not all groups recognise the moral dimension (e.g. Vainio, 2003). For example, those who promote environmentally friendly food consumption, such as climate-friendly eating, by highlighting its moral dimensions should be aware that supporters of right-wing politics tend to be less interested in environmental and climate action and (e.g. Feygina, Jost, & Goldsmith, 2010; Jacquet, Dietrich, & Jost, 2014), and have been shown to endorse binding moral foundations more strongly than supporters of left-wing politics (e.g. Haidt & Graham, 2007). Hence, use should be made of binding moral foundations (i.e. Authority/Respect, Ingroup/Loyalty and Purity/Sanctity), which do not feature so often in the promotion of pro-environmental actions, because they may ‘resonate’ among right-wing-party supporters. This suggestion is in line with findings showing that persuasive appeals and messages designed to tap moral foundations preferred by liberals as well as conservatives strengthen the intention to make sustainable choices (Kidwell, Farmer, & Hardesty, 2013).

It could be concluded from the results of the studies discussed in Chapter 2.4 and the findings of the current dissertation that several barriers hinder ethical and sustainable food choice, such as perceived higher prices, the unwillingness to change dietary habits, inconvenience, poor availability and not identifying with consumers of ethical food. Given the results of Study IV indicating that habit (i.e. wanting to maintain the same eating habits) and disbelief in the climatic effects of food consumption had the strongest inhibiting effect on climate-friendly food choice, it might be wise to focus on minimising the effect of these barriers in particular. However, in comparison with more structural aspects such as availability, price and informative or persuasive labelling, both barriers are very difficult to lower from the outside given their focus on individuals’ personal attitudes, behaviour/habits and thinking. It would clearly be useful to draw on existing behaviour-change techniques, which are already used in promoting the adoption of healthier behaviour (see for review e.g. Hankonen, 2011).

It would be essential to develop and guarantee various facilitating situational conditions, such as improving the availability and quality of sustainable options. The ethical and sustainable option should not be a high-cost alternative: it should be a part of everyday life that does not require extra effort or resources. It would be particularly interesting to study so-called ordinary consumers who decide to make their diet more sustainable and are able to maintain that change, and to explore the factors that hinder and boost their everyday choices.

Knowing the barriers and eliminating them is one way to support ethical food choice. The drivers should also be intensively studied, given the impossibility of eliminating all barriers, and the fact that many people need motivation and inspiration (i.e. drivers) for their actions. It is known that animal welfare and environmental concerns, a willingness to support the local economy, perceived high quality and healthiness, for example, may boost ethical food choice (e.g., Klöckner, 2011), and should be highlighted more in marketing and public discussion. For instance, the health benefits of reducing meat consumption could be more clearly explained. The process of moral satisfaction (Bratanova et al., 2015) could also act as a motivator or driver, at least in some contexts. Attempts should be made to create situations in which people can attach positive emotions, such as moral satisfaction and enjoyment, to the consumption of ethical food (i.e. delivering superior and hedonistic experiences to ethical consumers). Also, it may be that some people do not identify with ethical consumers, and see the ethical option as something strange that does not suit them. It may therefore be useful in promoting ethical foods to ensure that individuals are able to identify with people used advertisements, for example, and with those who speak in public about such issues.

Finally, given the evidence from previous studies that ethical concerns may not be the key motivators of food choice, I suggest combining them with other motives in the promotion of ethical food. Typical food-choice motives include health, mood, convenience, sensory appeal, natural content, price, weight control, familiarity and ethical concerns (Steptoe et al., 1995), the strongest of which are price, sensory appeal, natural content and health (Markovina et al., 2015; Steptoe et al., 1995). Price perception is also a strong motive but, as the results of previous studies and of Study IV in this dissertation show, price is perceived as a relevant barrier inhibiting ethical food choice. Although the ethical option, such as buying seasonal vegetables, tends to be more expensive, it may well also be an economically wise choice compared to meat. However, more effort could be put into marketing and labelling to highlight the added value of an ethical compared to a conventional option: what the consumer gets out of this extra investment. This would also support feelings of moral satisfaction: the consumer is doing something good, not just paying extra.

Given that health concerns are known to motivate the choice of organic food, for example, and are among the most influential food-choice motives, they could be integrated more deeply into the promotion of ethical food. As mentioned above, reducing meat consumption tends to have positive effects on health (Hallström et al., 2014) in that people generally eat too much meat. Moreover, habits and convenience influence food choices, to the detriment of climate-friendly and other ethical choices (e.g., Feldmann & Hamm, 2015), and should be taken into account in promoting the ethical option. As mentioned, people generally seem to want to keep their eating habits, and prefer the easy option.

It is typically believed that choosing ethical food requires extra effort and money. However, this is not always the case. Most importantly, there should be more information about the options (e.g. climate friendly options; de Boer et al., 2016) and practical guidance on how to integrate ethical and sustainable elements into existing habits. Small steps such as these should be presented positively as meaningful options that could have a big influence in the long run.

7 REFERENCES

- Abric, J. C. (2001). A structural approach to social representations. In K., Deaux & G., Philogène (Eds.), *Representations of the social: Bridging theoretical traditions* (pp. 42-47). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Adams, M., & Raisborough, J. (2010). Making a difference: ethical consumption and the everyday. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 61(2), 256-274.
- Ajzen, I. (2012). The Theory of Planned Behavior. In P. A. M. Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*, Vol. 1 (pp. 438–459). London, UK: Sage.
- Anderegg, W. R., Prall, J. W., Harold, J., & Schneider, S. H. (2010). Expert credibility in climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(27), 12107-12109.
- Andersen, A. H. (2011). Organic food and the plural moralities of food provisioning. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 27(4), 440-450.
- Andorfer, V. A., & Liebe, U. (2012). Research on fair trade consumption—A review. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 106(4), 415-435.
- Andorfer, V. A., & Liebe, U. (2015). Do information, price, or morals influence ethical consumption? A natural field experiment and customer survey on the purchase of Fair Trade coffee. *Social Science Research*, 52, 330-350.
- Arnocky, S., & Stroink, M. L. (2011). Gender differences in environmental concern and cooperation: The mediating role of emotional empathy. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 16(9), 1-14.
- Askegaard, S., & Madsen, T. K. (1998). The local and the global: exploring traits of homogeneity and heterogeneity in European food cultures. *International Business Review*, 7(6), 549-568.
- Askegaard, S., Ordabayeva, N., Chandon, P., Cheung, T., Chytкова, Z., Cornil, Y., Corus, C., Edell, J. A., Mathras, D., Junghans, A. F., Brogaard Kristensen D., Mikkonen, I., Miller, E.G., Sayarh, N. & Werle, C. (2014). Moralities in food and health research. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 30(17-18), 1800-1832.
- Barnett, T. (2001). Dimensions of moral intensity and ethical decision making: An empirical study. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31(5), 1038-1057.
- Bello, D., Leung, K., Radebaugh, L., Tung, R. L., & Van Witteloostuijn, A. (2009). From the editors: Student samples in international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40(3), 361-364.
- Bennett, R. M., Anderson, J., & Blaney, R. J. (2002). Moral intensity and willingness to pay concerning farm animal welfare issues and the implications for agricultural policy. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 15(2), 187-202.
- Bergflødt, S., Amilien, V., & Skuland, S. E. (2012). Nordic Food Culture (s) – Thoughts and perspectives by way of introduction. *Anthropology of food*, (S7).
- Beverland, M. B. (2014). Sustainable eating: mainstreaming plant-based diets in developed economies. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 34(3), 369-382.

- Blasi, A. (1990). How should psychologists define morality? or, The negative side effects of philosophy's influence on psychology.! In T. E. Wren, (Ed.), *The moral domain: Essays in the ongoing discussion between philosophy and the social sciences* (pp. 38-70). Cambridge, MA, US: The MIT Press.
- de Boer, J., de Witt, A., & Aiking, H. (2016). Help the climate, change your diet: A cross-sectional study on how to involve consumers in a transition to a low-carbon society. *Appetite*, *98*, 19-27.
- Bratanova, B., Loughnan, S., & Bastian, B. (2011). The effect of categorization as food on the perceived moral standing of animals. *Appetite*, *57*(1), 193-196.
- Bratanova, B., Vauclair, C. M., Kervyn, N., Schumann, S., Wood, R., & Klein, O. (2015). Savouring morality. Moral satisfaction renders food of ethical origin subjectively tastier. *Appetite*, *91*, 137-149.
- Bray, J., Johns, N., & Kilburn, D. (2011). An exploratory study into the factors impeding ethical consumption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *98*(4), 597-608.
- British Sustainable Development Commission. (2005). *Sustainability implications of the little red tractor scheme*. Report for the Sustainable Development Commission. London, UK: Sustainable Development Commission. Retrieved from <http://www.sd-commission.org.uk/data/files/publications/050119%20Sustainability%20implications%20of%20the%20Little%20Red%20Tractor%20scheme.pdf>
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *1*(3), 185-216.
- Bäckström, A., Pirttilä-Backman, A. M., & Tuorila, H. (2004). Willingness to try new foods as predicted by social representations and attitude and trait scales. *Appetite*, *43*(1), 75-83.
- Carlsson-Kanyama, A., & González, A. D. (2009). Potential contributions of food consumption patterns to climate change. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, *89*(5), 1704-1709.
- Carnes, N. C., Lickel, B., & Janoff-Bulman, R. (2015). Shared Perceptions Morality Is Embedded in Social Contexts. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *41*(3), 351-362.
- Carpio, C. E., & Isengildina-Massa, O. (2009). Consumer willingness to pay for locally grown products: The case of South Carolina. *Agribusiness*, *25*(3), 412-426
- Carrington, M. J., Neville, B. A., & Whitwell, G. J. (2010). Why ethical consumers don't walk their talk: Towards a framework for understanding the gap between the ethical purchase intentions and actual buying behaviour of ethically minded consumers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *97*(1), 139-158.
- Chatzidakis, A., Hibbert, S., & Smith, A. P. (2007). Why people don't take their concerns about fair trade to the supermarket: The role of neutralisation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *74*(1), 89-100.
- Chung, J., & Monroe, G. S. (2003). Exploring social desirability bias. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *44*(4), 291-302.
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological assessment*, *7*(3), 309.
- Cottone, R. R. (2001). A social constructivism model of ethical decision making in counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *79*(1), 39-45.

- Danner, U. N., Aarts, H., & Vries, N. K. (2008). Habit vs. intention in the prediction of future behaviour: The role of frequency, context stability and mental accessibility of past behaviour. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *47*(2), 245-265.
- Dany, L., Urdapilleta, I., & Monaco, G. L. (2014). Free associations and social representations: some reflections on rank-frequency and importance-frequency methods. *Quality & Quantity*, *49*(2), 489-507.
- Dean, M., Raats, M. M. and Shepherd, R. (2008). Moral Concerns and Consumer Choice of Fresh and Processed Organic Foods. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *38*(8), 2088-2107.
- Dean, M., Raats, M. M., & Shepherd, R. (2012). The Role of Self-Identity, Past Behavior, and Their Interaction in Predicting Intention to Purchase Fresh and Processed Organic Food. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *42*(3), 669-688.
- Delaney, M., & McCarthy, M. B. (2014). Saints, sinners and non-believers: The moral space of food. A qualitative exploration of beliefs and perspectives on healthy eating of Irish adults aged 50-70. *Appetite*, *73*, 105-113.
- Denver, S., & Jensen, J. D. (2014). Consumer preferences for organically and locally produced apples. *Food Quality and Preference*, *31*, 129-134.
- Deroy, O., Reade, B., & Spence, C. (2015). The insectivore's dilemma, and how to take the West out of it. *Food Quality and Preference*, *44*, 44-55.
- Dietz, T., Stern, P. C., & Guagano, G. A. (1998). Social structural and social psychological bases of environmental concern. *Environment and Behavior*, *30*(4), 450-471.
- Dowd, K., & Burke, K. J. (2013). The influence of ethical values and food choice motivations on intentions to purchase sustainably sourced foods. *Appetite*, *69*, 137-144.
- Dunlap, R., Liere, K. V., Mertig, A., & Jones, R. E. (2000). Measuring endorsement of the new ecological paradigm: A revised NEP scale. *Journal of Social Issues*, *56*(3), 425-442.
- Eertmans, A., Victoir, A., Notelaers, G., Vansant, G., & Van den Bergh, O. (2006). The Food Choice Questionnaire: Factorial invariant over western urban populations?. *Food Quality and Preference*, *17*(5), 344-352.
- European Commission, (2013). *Facts and figures on organic agriculture in the European Union*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets-and-prices/more-reports/pdf/organic-2013_en.pdf
- European Commission, (2015). *Organic farming*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/organic/organic-farming/what-is-organic-farming/index_en.htm
- Fairtrade Finland, (2015). *Reilun kaupan myynti kasvoi 35 prosenttia*. (eng. Fairtrade sales grew by 35 per cent). Retrieved from <http://www.reilun kauppa.fi/medialle/uutiset/uutinen/article/reilun-kaupan-tuotteiden-myynti-kasvoi-35-prosenttia/>
- Fairtrade International, (2015). *Aims of Fairtrade standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.fairtrade.net/>
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) (2012). *Sustainable diets and biodiversity. Directions and solutions for policy, research and action*. Retrieved from <http://www.fao.org/docrep/016/i3004e/i3004e.pdf>

- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) (2015). *Organic Agriculture*. Retrieved from <http://www.fao.org/organicag/oa-faq/oa-faq6/en/>
- Feldmann, C., & Hamm, U. (2015). Consumers' perceptions and preferences for local food: A review. *Food Quality and Preference*, *40*, 152-164.
- Ferguson, M. A., & Branscombe, N. R. (2010). Collective guilt mediates the effect of beliefs about global warming on willingness to engage in mitigation behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *30*(2), 135-142.
- Ferrell, O. C., & Gresham, L. G. (1985). A Contingency Framework for Understanding Ethical Decision Making in Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, *49*, 87-96
- Feygina I., Jost J. T., Goldsmith R. E. (2010). System justification, the denial of global warming, and the possibility of "system-sanctioned change. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.*, *36*, 326-338.
- Fiala, N. (2008). Meeting the demand: An estimation of potential future greenhouse gas emissions from meat production. *Ecological Economics*, *67*(3), 412-419.
- Flere, S., & Lavrič, M. (2008). On the validity of cross-cultural social studies using student samples. *Field methods*, *20*(4), 399-412.
- Fotopoulos, C., Krystallis, A., Vassallo, M., & Pagiaslis, A. (2009). Food Choice Questionnaire (FCQ) revisited. Suggestions for the development of an enhanced general food motivation model. *Appetite*, *52*(1), 199-208.
- Franzen, A., & Meyer, R. (2010). Environmental attitudes in cross-national perspective: A multilevel analysis of the ISSP 1993 and 2000. *European Sociological Review*, *26*(2), 219-234.
- Frewer, L. J., van der Lans, I. A., Fischer, A. R., Reinders, M. J., Menozzi, D., Zhang, X., & Zimmermann, K. L. (2013). Public perceptions of agri-food applications of genetic modification—a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, *30*(2), 142-152.
- Frey, B. F. (2000). The impact of moral intensity on decision making in a business context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *26*(3), 181-195.
- Garnett, T. (2008). *Cooking up a storm. Food, greenhouse gas emissions and our changing climate*. Guildford, UK: Food Climate Research Network, Centre for Environmental Strategy, University of Surrey. Retrieved from http://www.fcrn.org.uk/sites/default/files/CuaS_web.pdf
- Gaudine, A., & Thorne, L. (2001). Emotion and ethical decision-making in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *31*(2), 175-187.
- Gert, B., (2015). "The Definition of Morality". In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Fall 2015 Edition. Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/index.html>.
- Gifford, R. (2011). The dragons of inaction: Psychological barriers that limit climate change mitigation and adaptation. *American Psychologist*, *66*(4), 290-302.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA, US: Harvard University Press.
- Goodwin, G. P., & Darley, J. M. (2012). Why are some moral beliefs perceived to be more objective than others? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(1), 250-256.

- Goodwin, G. P., Piazza, J., & Rozin, P. (2014). Moral character predominates in person perception and evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106*(1), 148.
- Graça, J., Oliveira, A., & Calheiros, M. M. (2015). Meat, beyond the plate. Data-driven hypotheses for understanding consumer willingness to adopt a more plant-based diet. *Appetite, 90*, 80-90.
- Graham, J., Haidt, J., Koleva, S., Motyl, M., Iyer, R., Wojcik, S. P., & Ditto, P. H. (2013). Moral foundations theory: The pragmatic validity of moral pluralism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 47*, 55-130.
- Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*(5), 1029-1046.
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(2), 366-385.
- Guerra, V. M., & Giner-Sorolla, R. (2010). The community, autonomy, and divinity scale (CADS): A new tool for the cross-cultural study of morality. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 41*(1), 35-50.
- Guy, M. (1990). *Ethical Decision Making in Everyday Work Situations*. New York, US: Quorum Books.
- Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: a social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review, 108*(4), 814-834.
- Haidt, J., & Graham, J. (2007). When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral intuitions that liberals may not recognize. *Social Justice Research, 20*(1), 98-116.
- Haidt, J., & Joseph, C. (2004). Intuitive ethics: How innately prepared intuitions generate culturally variable virtues. *Daedalus, 133*(4), 55-66.
- Haidt, J., Graham, J., & Joseph, C. (2009). Above and below left-right: Ideological narratives and moral foundations. *Psychological Inquiry, 20*(2-3), 110-119.
- Haidt, J., & Kesebir, S. (2010). *Morality*. In S. Fiske, D. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey, (Eds.) *Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol 2*, 5th Edition (pp. 797-832). Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons.
- Halkier, B., Holm, L., Domingues, M., Magaúda, P., Nielsen, A., & Terragni, L. (2007). Trusting, complex, quality conscious or unprotected? Constructing the food consumer in different European national contexts. *Journal of Consumer Culture, 7*(3), 379-402.
- Hallström, E., Röö, E., & Börjesson, P. (2014). Sustainable meat consumption: a quantitative analysis of nutritional intake, greenhouse gas emissions and land use from a Swedish perspective. *Food Policy, 47*, 81-90.
- Hankonen, N. (2011). *Psychosocial processes of health behaviour change in a lifestyle intervention: Influences of gender, socioeconomic status and personality*, Research, 51. (Doctoral thesis, University of Helsinki, Faculty of Social Sciences, Social Psychology, Helsinki, Finland). Retrieved from <https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/24850/psychoso.pdf?sequence=3>
- Helkama, K. (2009a). Ingroup and outgroup in morality and moral development. In I. Jasinskaja-Lahti & T.-A. Mähönen (Eds.) *Identities, acculturation and intergroup relations. The cornerstones of intercultural encounters*. Helsinki, FI: Gaudeamus.

- Helkama, K. (2009b). *Moraalin psykologia: Hyvän ja pahan tällä puolen* (eng. Moral psychology: This side of good and evil). Helsinki, FI: Edita.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world?. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2-3), 61-83.
- Hjelmar, U. (2011). Consumers' purchase of organic food products. A matter of convenience and reflexive practices. *Appetite*, 56(2), 336-344.
- Honkanen, P., Verplanken, B., & Olsen, S. O. (2006). Ethical values and motives driving organic food choice. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 5(5), 420-430.
- Honkanen, P., & Young, J. A. (2015). What determines British consumers' motivation to buy sustainable seafood?. *British Food Journal*, 117(4), 1289-1302.
- Hoffman, S. R., Stallings, S. F., Bessinger, R. C., & Brooks, G. T. (2013). Differences between health and ethical vegetarians. Strength of conviction, nutrition knowledge, dietary restriction, and duration of adherence. *Appetite*, 65, 139-144.
- Hughner, R. S., McDonagh, P., Prothero, A., Shultz, C. J., & Stanton, J. (2007). Who are organic food consumers? A compilation and review of why people purchase organic food. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 6(2-3), 94-110.
- Iyer, R., Koleva, S., Graham, J., Ditto, P., & Haidt, J. (2012). Understanding libertarian morality: The psychological dispositions of self-identified libertarians. *PLoS ONE*, 7(8), e42366.
- Jaffee, S., & Hyde, J. S. (2000). Gender differences in moral orientation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(5), 703-726.
- Jacquet, J., Dietrich, M., & Jost, J. T. (2014). The ideological divide and climate change opinion: "top-down" and "bottom-up" approaches. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5.
- Jackson, P., & Viehoff, V. (2016). Reframing convenience food. *Appetite*, 98, 1-11.
- Januszewska, R., Pieniak, Z., & Verbeke, W. (2011). Food choice questionnaire revisited in four countries. Does it still measure the same?. *Appetite*, 57(1), 94-98.
- Jensen, L. A. (1997). Culture Wars: American Moral Divisions Across the Adult Lifespan. *Journal of Adult Development*, 4, 107-121.
- Jensen, L. A. (2008). Through two lenses: A cultural–developmental approach to moral psychology. *Developmental Review*, 28(3), 289-315.
- Jensen, L. A. (2011). Autonomy, community, and divinity: The cultural development of three fundamental moral ethics. *Zygon*, 46, 150-167.
- Johnston, J., Szabo, M., & Rodney, A. (2011). Good food, good people: Understanding the cultural repertoire of ethical eating. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 11(3), 293-318.
- Jones, T. M. (1991). Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent model. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(2), 366-395.
- Joseph, C. M., Graham, J., & Haidt, J. (2009). The end of equipotentiality: A moral foundations approach to ideology-attitude links and cognitive complexity. *Psychological Inquiry*, 20(2-3), 172-176.
- Juujärvi, S. (2005). Care and justice in real-life moral reasoning. *Journal of Adult Development*, 12(4), 199-210.

- Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., & Hardesty, D. M. (2013). Getting liberals and conservatives to go green: Political ideology and congruent appeals. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *40*(2), 350-367.
- Kim, K. R., Kang, J. S., & Yun, S. (2012). Moral intuitions and political orientation: similarities and differences between South Korea and the United States. *Psychological Reports*, *111*(1), 173-185.
- Kirwan, J. (2004). Alternative strategies in the UK agro-food system: interrogating the alterity of farmers' markets. *Sociologia Ruralis*, *44*(4), 395-415.
- Kittler, P. G., & Sucher, K. P. (2004). *Food and Culture*, 4th edition. Toronto, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson.
- Kjærnes, U., Harvey, M., & Warde, A. (2007). *Trust in food: A comparative and institutional analysis*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Klößner, C. A. (2011). Should I buy organic food? A psychological perspective on purchase decisions. In M. Reed (Ed.), *Organic Food and Agriculture - New Trends and Developments in the Social Sciences* (pp. 39-62). Rijeca, HR: InTech. Retrieved from <http://cdn.intechweb.org/pdfs/25732.pdf>
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages*, Vol. 2. New York, US: Harper & Row.
- Kontinen, H., Sarlio-Lähteenkorva, S., Silventoinen, K., Männistö, S., & Haukkala, A. (2013). Socio-economic disparities in the consumption of vegetables, fruit and energy-dense foods: the role of motive priorities. *Public health nutrition*, *16*(05), 873-882
- Korkala, E. A., Hugg, T. T., & Jaakkola, J. J. (2014). Awareness of Climate Change and the Dietary Choices of Young Adults in Finland: A Population-Based Cross-Sectional Study. *PLoS ONE*, *9*(5), e97480.
- Korthals, M. (2007). The Ethics of Food Production and Consumption. In L., Frewer, L. & H., Van Trijp (Eds.), *Understanding consumers of food products* (pp. 624-642). Cambridge, UK: Woodhead Publishing.
- Kugler, M., Jost, J. T., & Noorbaloochi, S. (2014). Another Look at Moral Foundations Theory: Do Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation Explain Liberal-Conservative Differences in "Moral" Intuitions?. *Social Justice Research*, *27*(4), 413-431.
- Ladhari, R., & Tchegnana, N. M. (2015). The influence of personal values on Fair Trade consumption. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *87*, 469-477.
- Lea, E., & Worsley, A. (2008). Australian consumers' food-related environmental beliefs and behaviours. *Appetite*, *50*(2), 207-214.
- Leach, C.W., Bilali, R., Pagliaro, S. (2014). Groups and Morality. In J.F. Dovidio & J. Simpson (Eds.), *APA Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 2: Group and Intergroup Processes (pp.123-149). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association
- Lee, W. C. J., Shimizu, M., Kniffin, K. M., & Wansink, B. (2013). You taste what you see: Do organic labels bias taste perceptions?. *Food Quality and Preference*, *29*(1), 33-39.
- de Leeuw, A. D., Valois, P., & Houssemand, C. (2011). Predicting the intentions to buy fair- trade products: The role of attitude, social norm, perceived behavioral control, and moral norm. *OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development*, *2*(10), 77-84.
- de Leeuw, A., Valois, P., Morin, A. J., & Schmidt, P. (2014). Gender Differences in Psychosocial Determinants of University Students'

- Intentions to Buy Fair Trade Products. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 37(4), 485-505.
- Van Leeuwen, F., & Park, J. H. (2009). Perceptions of social dangers, moral foundations, and political orientation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(3), 169-173.
- Lin, F., He, D., Jin, Y., Tao, Y., & Jiang, Z. (2013). Mapping the central structure core in social representation of pain. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43(9), 1931-1945.
- Lindeman, M., & Väänänen, M. (2000). Measurement of ethical food choice motives. *Appetite*, 34(1), 55-59.
- Lombard, M., Snyder-Duch, J., & Bracken, C. C. (2002). Content analysis in mass communication. *Human Communication Research*, 28(4), 587-604.
- Long, M. A., & Murray, D. L. (2013). Ethical consumption, values convergence/divergence and community development. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 26(2), 351-375.
- Lorenzoni, I., Nicholson-Cole, S., & Whitmarsh, L. (2007). Barriers perceived to engaging with climate change among the UK public and their policy implications. *Global environmental change*, 17(3), 445-459.
- Lotz, S., Christandl, F., & Fetchenhauer, D. (2013). What is fair is good: Evidence of consumers' taste for fairness. *Food Quality and Preference*, 30(2), 139-144.
- Loughnan, S., Haslam, N., & Bastian, B. (2010). The role of meat consumption in the denial of moral status and mind to meat animals. *Appetite*, 55(1), 156-159.
- Lupton, D. (1996). *Food, the body and the self*. London, UK: Sage.
- Lyons, E., & Chrysochoou, X. (2001). Cross Cultural Research Methods. In, G. M. Breakwell, S. Hammond, & C. Fife-Schaw (Eds.), *Research Methods in Psychology*, 2nd ed. (pp. 143-146). London, UK: Sage.
- Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Finland. (2013). *Lähiuokaa – totta kai! Hallituksen lähiuokaohjelma ja lähiuokasektorin kehittämisen tavoitteet vuoteen 2020*. (eng. Local food - of course! Government's local food program and objectives of the local food sector development until 2020). Retrieved from <http://www.mmm.fi/attachments/lahiruoka/6GeZ7N4oG/LahiruokaohjelmaFI.pdf>
- Markovina, M., Stewart-Knox, B.J., Rankin, A., Gibney, M., de Almeida M.D.V., Fischer, A., Kuznesof, S.A., Poinhos, R., Panzone, L., Frewer, L.J. (2015). Food4Me study: Validity and reliability of Food Choice Questionnaire in 9 European countries. *Food Quality and Preference*, 45, 26-32.
- Markowitz, E. M., & Shariff, A. F. (2012). Climate change and moral judgement. *Nature Climate Change*, 2(4), 243-247.
- Markowitz, E. M. (2012). Is climate change an ethical issue? Examining young adults' beliefs about climate and morality. *Climatic Change*, 114(3-4), 479-495.
- May, D. R., & Pauli, K. P. (2002). The role of moral intensity in ethical decision making a review and investigation of moral recognition, evaluation, and intention. *Business & Society*, 41(1), 84-117.
- McAdams, D. P., Albaugh, M., Farber, E., Daniels, J., Logan, R. L., & Olson, B. (2008). Family metaphors and moral intuitions: how conservatives and liberals narrate their lives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(4), 978-990.

- McMahon, J. M., & Harvey, R. J. (2006). An analysis of the factor structure of Jones' moral intensity construct. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 64(4), 381-404.
- McMahon, J. M., & Harvey, R. J. (2007). The effect of moral intensity on ethical judgment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 72(4), 335-357
- McMahon, J. M. (2002). *An analysis of the factor structure of the Multidimensional Ethics Scale and a Perceived Moral Intensity Scale, and the effects of moral intensity on ethical judgment*. (Doctoral thesis, Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, USA). Retrieved from <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-05232002-30110/unrestricted/McMahon.ETD2.pdf>
- McMichael, A. J., Powles, J. W., Butler, C. D., & Uauy, R. (2007). Food, livestock production, energy, climate change, and health. *The Lancet*, 370(9594), 1253-1263.
- McPhail, D., Chapman, G. E., & Beagan, B. L. (2011). "Too much of that stuff can't be good": Canadian teens, morality, and fast food consumption. *Social Science & Medicine*, 73(2), 301-307.
- Milošević, J., Žeželj, I., Gorton, M., & Barjolle, D. (2012). Understanding the motives for food choice in Western Balkan Countries. *Appetite*, 58(1), 205-214.
- Moloney, G., Hall, R., & Walker, I. (2005). Social representations and themata: The construction and functioning of social knowledge about donation and transplantation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44(3), 415-441.
- Monin, B., & Jordan, A. H. (2009). The dynamic moral self: A social psychological perspective. In D. Narvaez & D. Lapsley (Eds.), *Personality, identity, and character: Explorations in moral psychology* (pp. 341-354). New York, US: Cambridge University Press.
- Moral Foundations org. (2011a). *Moral foundations questionnaire*. Retrieved from <http://www.moralfoundations.org/questionnaires>
- Moral Foundations org. (2011b). *Moral foundations dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://www.moralfoundations.org/othermaterials>
- Moral Foundations org. (2011c). *Moral foundation sacredness scale*. Retrieved from <http://yourmorals.org/haidtlab/mft/index.php?t=questionnaires>
- Moral Foundation.org. (2015). *Moral Foundations Theory*. Retrieved from <http://www.moralfoundations.org/>
- van de Mortel, T.F. (2008). 'Faking it: social desirability response bias in self-report research'. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 25(4), 40-48.
- Moser, A. K. (2015). Thinking green, buying green? Drivers of pro-environmental purchasing behavior. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 32(3), 167-175.
- Mouret, M., Monaco, G. L., Urdapilleta, I., & Parr, W. V. (2013). Social representations of wine and culture: A comparison between France and New Zealand. *Food Quality and Preference*, 30(2), 102-107.
- Myry, L. (2003). *Components of morality. A Professional Ethics Perspective on Moral Motivation, Moral Sensitivity, Moral Reasoning and Related Constructs Among University Students*. (Doctoral thesis, University of Helsinki, Faculty of Social Sciences, Social Psychology, Helsinki, Finland). Retrieved from <http://ethesis.helsinki.fi/julkaisut/val/sosps/vk/myry/componen.pdf>

- Myyry, L., & Helkama, K. (2001). University students' value priorities and emotional empathy. *Educational Psychology, 21*(1), 25–40.
- Myyry, L., & Helkama, K. (2007). Socio-cognitive conflict, emotions and complexity of thought in real-life morality. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 48*(3), 247-259.
- Mäkinieemi, J. P., Bäckström, A., Ahola, S., Pieri, M., & Pirttilä-Backman, A. M. (2014). Social representation of new foods among European students. *British Food Journal, 116*(12), 1921-1930.
- Ng, J., White, G. P., Lee, A., & Moneta, A. (2009). Design and validation of a novel new instrument for measuring the effect of moral intensity on accountants' propensity to manage earnings. *Journal of Business Ethics, 84*(3), 367-387.
- Nilsson, A., & Erlandsson, A. (2015). The Moral Foundations taxonomy: Structural validity and relation to political ideology in Sweden. *Personality and Individual Differences, 76*, 28-32.
- Nordsieck, W. (2012). *Parties & Elections. The database about parliamentary elections and political parties in Europe*. Retrieved from <http://www.parties-and-elections.eu/>
- Olsen, N. V., Sijtsema, S. J., & Hall, G. (2010). Predicting consumers' intention to consume ready-to-eat meals. The role of moral attitude. *Appetite, 55*(3), 534-539.
- Oreskes, N. (2004). The scientific consensus on climate change. *Science, 306*(5702), 1686-1686.
- Papaoikonomou, E., Ryan, G., & Valverde, M. (2011). Mapping ethical consumer behavior: Integrating the empirical research and identifying future directions. *Ethics & Behavior, 21*(3), 197-221.
- Parrott, N., Wilson, N., & Murdoch, J. (2002). Spatializing quality: regional protection and the alternative geography of food. *European Urban and Regional Studies, 9*(3), 241-261.
- Pecoraro, M. G., & Uusitalo, O. (2014). Conflicting values of ethical consumption in diverse worlds—A cultural approach. *Journal of Consumer Culture, 14*(1), 45-65.
- Peterson, R. A. (2001). On the use of college students in social science research: Insights from a second-order meta-analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research, 28*(3), 450-461.
- Piazza, J., Ruby, M. B., Loughnan, S., Luong, M., Kulik, J., Watkins, H. M., & Seigerman, M. (2015). Rationalizing meat consumption. *The 4Ns. Appetite, 91*, 114-128.
- Piurko, Y., Schwartz, S. H., & Davidov, E. (2011). Basic Personal Values and the Meaning of Left-Right Political Orientations in 20 Countries. *Political Psychology, 32*(4), 537–561.
- Pluhar, E. B. (2010). Meat and morality: Alternatives to factory farming. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics, 23*(5), 455-468.
- Pohjolainen, P., Vinnari, M., & Jokinen, P. (2015). Consumers' perceived barriers to following a plant-based diet. *British Food Journal, 117*(3), 1150-1167.
- Popp, A., Lotze-Campen, H., & Bodirsky, B. (2010). Food consumption, diet shifts and associated non-CO₂ greenhouse gases from agricultural production. *Global Environmental Change, 20*(3), 451-462.
- Prescott, J., Young, O., O'Neill, L., Yau, N. J. N., & Stevens, R. (2002). Motives for food choice: a comparison of consumers from Japan, Taiwan, Malaysia and New Zealand. *Food Quality and Preference, 13*(7), 489-495.

- Randall, D. M., & Fernandes, M. F. (1991). The social desirability response bias in ethics research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 10(11), 805-817.
- Reese, G., & Kohlmann, F. (2015). Feeling global, acting ethically: Global identification and fairtrade consumption. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 155(2), 98-106.
- Renner, B., Sproesser, G., Strohbach, S., & Schupp, H. T. (2012). Why we eat what we eat. The Eating Motivation Survey (TEMS). *Appetite*, 59(1), 117-128.
- Rest, J. (1984). The *major components of morality*. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Morality, Moral Development and Moral Behavior* (pp. 24-38). New York, US: Wiley.
- Rest, J. (1986). *Moral Development – Advances in Research and Theory*. New York, US: Praeger.
- van't Riet, J., Sijtsma, S. J., Dagevos, H., & De Bruijn, G. J. (2011). The importance of habits in eating behaviour. An overview and recommendations for future research. *Appetite*, 57(3), 585-596.
- Risvik, E., Rødbotten, M., & Olsen, N. V. (2006). Cross-cultural dimensions in food choice: Europe. In L. Frewer & H. van Trijp (Eds.), *Understanding Consumers of Food Products* (pp. 298-315). Cambridge, UK: Woodhead Publishing.
- Roininen, K., Arvola, A., & Lähteenmäki, L. (2006). Exploring consumers' perceptions of local food with two different qualitative techniques: Laddering and word association. *Food Quality and Preference*, 17(1), 20-30.
- Rothgerber, H. (2014). Efforts to overcome vegetarian-induced dissonance among meat eaters. *Appetite*, 79, 32-41.
- Rousseau, S. (2015). The role of organic and fair trade labels when choosing chocolate. *Food Quality and Preference*, 44, 92-100.
- Rozin, P., Markwith, M., & Stoess, C. (1997). Moralization and becoming a vegetarian: The transformation of preferences into values and the recruitment of disgust. *Psychological Science*, 8(2), 67-73.
- Rozin, P. (1999). The process of moralization. *Psychological Science*, 10(3), 218-221.
- Rozin, P., Fischler, C., Imada, S., Sarubin, A., & Wrzesniewski, A. (1999). Attitudes to food and the role of food in life: Comparisons of Flemish Belgium, France, Japan and the United States. *Appetite*, 33(2), 163-180.
- Rozin, P., Kurzer, N., & Cohen, A. B. (2002). Free associations to "food:" the effects of gender, generation, and culture. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36(5), 419-441.
- Ruby, M. B., & Heine, S. J. (2011). Meat, morals, and masculinity. *Appetite*, 56(2), 447-450.
- Sá, C. P. (1996). *The central nucleus approach to social representations*, Vol. 2. UK: Methodology Inst. London School of Economics and Political Science. Retrieved from <http://www.lse.ac.uk/methodology/pdf/QualPapers/CELISO-Core-periphery.pdf>
- Saher, M., Lindeman, M., & Hursti, U. K. K. (2006). Attitudes towards genetically modified and organic foods. *Appetite*, 46(3), 324-331.
- Sakki, I., Mäkinen, J.-P., Hakoköngäs, E., & Pirttilä-Backman, A.-M. (2015). Miten tutkia sosiaalisia representaatioita? (eng. How to study social representations?). *Sosiaalilääketieteellinen Aikakauslehti*, 51(4), 317-329.

- Saltzstein, H. D. & Kasachkoff, T. (2004). Haidt's Moral Intuitionist Theory: A Psychological and Philosophical Critique. *Review of General Psychology*, 8(4), 273-282.
- Saxe, H., Larsen, T. M., & Mogensen, L. (2013). The global warming potential of two healthy Nordic diets compared with the average Danish diet. *Climatic Change*, 116(2), 249-262.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 25 (pp. 1-65). New York, US: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2007). Universalism values and the inclusiveness of our moral universe. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 38(6), 711-728.
- Schösler, H., de Boer, J., & Boersema, J. J. (2012). Can we cut out the meat of the dish? Constructing consumer-oriented pathways towards meat substitution. *Appetite*, 58(1), 39-47.
- Schuldt, J. P., & Hannahan, M. (2013). When good deeds leave a bad taste. Negative inferences from ethical food claims. *Appetite*, 62, 76-83.
- Shepherd, R. (2001). Does Taste Determine Consumption? Understanding the Psychology of Food Choice. In L., Frewer, E. Risvik, & H. Schifferstein (Eds.), *Food, People and Society: A European Perspective of Consumers' Food Choice* (pp. 117-130). New York, US: Springer-Verlag.
- Shweder, R., Much, N., Mahapatra, M., & Park, L. (1997). Divinity and the "Big Three" Explanations of Suffering. In A. Brandt & P. Rozin (Eds.), *Morality and health* (pp. 119-169). New York, US: Routledge.
- Singer, P., & Mason, J. (2007). *The ethics of what we eat: Why our food choices matter*. US: Rodale.
- Singhapakdi, A., Vitell, S. J., & Kraft, K. L. (1996). Moral intensity and ethical decision-making of marketing professionals. *Journal of Business Research*, 36(3), 245-255.
- Skitka, L. J. (2010). The psychology of moral conviction. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(4), 267-281.
- Special Eurobarometer 341, (2010). *Special Eurobarometer 341 - 73.1 on Biotechnology*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_341_en.pdf
- Special Eurobarometer 389, (2012). *Europeans' attitudes towards food security, food quality and the countryside*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_389_en.pdf
- Special Eurobarometer 409, (2014). *Climate change*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_409_en.pdf
- Spencer, R. L., Greatrex-White, S., & Fraser, D. M. (2015). 'I thought it would keep them all quiet'. Women's experiences of breastfeeding as illusions of compliance: an interpretive phenomenological study. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 71(5), 1076-1086.
- Stein, R. I., & Nemeroff, C. J. (1995). Moral overtones of food: Judgments of others based on what they eat. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 480-490.
- Steptoe, A., Pollard, T. M., & Wardle, J. (1995). Development of a measure of the motives underlying the selection of food: the food choice questionnaire. *Appetite*, 25(3), 267-284.
- Straus, M.A. (2009). The National context effect: an empirical test of the validity of cross-national research using unrepresentative samples. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 43(3), 183-205.

- Suhler, C. L., & Churchland, P. (2011). Can innate, modular “foundations” explain morality? Challenges for Haidt's moral foundations theory. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *23*(9), 2103-2116.
- Sverdlik, N., Roccas, S., & Sagiv, L. (2012). Morality across cultures: A value perspective. In M. Mikulincer & Shaver, P. R. (Eds.), *The social psychology of morality: Exploring the causes of good and evil* (pp. 219-235). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Swim, J., Clayton, S., Doherty, T., Gifford, R., Howard, G., Reser, J. ... & Weber, E. (2009). *Psychology and global climate change: Addressing a multi-faceted phenomenon and set of challenges. A report by the American Psychological Association's task force on the interface between psychology and global climate change*. Washington, US: American Psychological Association. Retrieved from <https://www.apa.org/science/about/publications/climate-change-booklet.pdf>
- Szalay, L. B., & Deese, J. (1978). *Subjective meaning and culture: An assessment through word associations*. Hillsdale, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tan, H. S. G., Fischer, A. R., Tinchin, P., Stieger, M., Steenbekkers, L. P. A., & van Trijp, H. C. (2015). Insects as food: Exploring cultural exposure and individual experience as determinants of acceptance. *Food Quality and Preference*, *42*, 78-89.
- Tenbrunsel, A. E., & Smith-Crowe, K. (2008). Ethical Decision Making: Where We've Been and Where We're Going. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *2*(1), 545-607.
- Thøgersen, J., & Schrader, U. (2012). From knowledge to action—new paths towards sustainable consumption. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, *35*(1), 1-5.
- Thøgersen, J. (2010). Country differences in sustainable consumption: The case of organic food. *Journal of Macromarketing*, *30*(2), 171-185.
- Tjärnemo, H., & Södahl, L. (2015). Swedish food retailers promoting climate smarter food choices—Trapped between visions and reality?. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *24*, 130-139.
- Tobler, C., Visschers, V. H., & Siegrist, M. (2011a). Eating green. Consumers' willingness to adopt ecological food consumption behaviors. *Appetite*, *57*(3), 674-682.
- Tobler, C., Visschers, V. H., & Siegrist, M. (2011b). Organic Tomatoes Versus Canned Beans How Do Consumers Assess the Environmental Friendliness of Vegetables? *Environment and Behavior*, *43*(5), 591-611.
- Toft, K. H. (2012). GMOs and global justice: applying global justice theory to the case of genetically modified crops and food. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, *25*(2), 223-237.
- Trevino, L. K. (1986). Ethical decision making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist model. *Academy of management Review*, *11*(3), 601-617.
- Turiel, E. (1983). *The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention*. Cambridge, US: Cambridge University Press.
- Vainio, A. (2003). *One morality - or multiple moralities?* (Doctoral thesis, University of Helsinki, Faculty of Social Sciences, Social Psychology, Helsinki, Finland). Retrieved from <https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/23521/onemoral.pdf?sequence=3>
- Vainio, A. (2005). Moraalipsykologisia näkökulmia moraalin muutokseen ja vaihteluun. (eng. Moral Psychological perspectives on morality change and variability). In A.-M. Pirttilä-Backman, M. Ahokas, L. Myyry, & S.

- Lähteenoja (Eds.) *Arvot, moraalit ja yhteiskunta* (pp. 145-166). Helsinki, FI: Gaudeamus.
- Vainio, A. (2011). Religious conviction, morality and social convention among Finnish adolescents. *Journal of Moral Education*, 40(1), 73-87.
- Vainio, A., Mäkinen, J. P., & Paloniemi, R. (2014). System justification and the perception of food risks. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 17(4), 509-523.
- Vainio, A., & Paloniemi, R. (2013). Does belief matter in climate change action?. *Public Understanding of Science*, 22(4), 382-395.
- Valentine, S., & Silver, L. (2001). Assessing the dimensionality of the Singhapakdi, Vitell, and Kraft measure of moral intensity. *Psychological Reports*, 88(1), 291-294.
- Vanhonacker, F., Van Loo, E. J., Gellynck, X., & Verbeke, W. (2013). Flemish consumer attitudes towards more sustainable food choices. *Appetite*, 62, 7-16.
- Vasquez, K., Keltner, D., Ebenbach, D. H., & Banaszynski, T. L. (2001). Cultural Variation and Similarity in Moral Rhetorics Voices from the Philippines and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(1), 93-120.
- Vauclair, C.-M. (2009). Measuring cultural values at the individual-level: considering morality in cross-cultural value research. *RAM, Revista de Administração Mackenzie*, 10(3), 60-83.
- Verbeke, W., Marcu, A., Rutsaert, P., Gaspar, R., Seibt, B., Fletcher, D., & Barnett, J. (2015). 'Would you eat cultured meat?': Consumers' reactions and attitude formation in Belgium, Portugal and the United Kingdom. *Meat science*, 102, 49-58.
- Vergès, P., & Bastounis, M. (2001). Towards the investigation of social representations of the economy: Research methods and techniques. *Everyday Representations of the Economy*. In C. Roland-Lévy, E. Kirchler, E. Penz, & C. C. Gray (Eds.), *Everyday representations of economy* (pp. 19-48). Vienna, AT: WUV-Verlag.
- Vinnari, M. (2010). *The past, present and future of eating meat in Finland*. (Doctoral thesis, University of Turku, Turku School of Economics, Turku, Finland). Retrieved from http://www.doria.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/113650/Ae3_2010.pdf?sequence=1
- Wagner, W. (1997). *Word associations in questionnaires: a practical guide to design and analysis*, 3. London, UK: Methodology Institute, London School of Economics and Political Science, (Series in Social Research Methods).
- Wagner, W., Valencia, J., & Elejabarrieta, F. (1996). Relevance, discourse and the 'hot' stable core social representations—A structural analysis of word associations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 35(3), 331-351.
- Wagner, W., Hansen, K., & Kronberger, N. (2014). Quantitative and Qualitative Research across Cultures and Languages: Cultural Metrics and their Application. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 48(4), 418-434.
- Wagner, W., Kronberger, N., Valencia, J., & Pereira, M. D. (2006). Quantitative and qualitative cross-cultural comparison: The role of cultural metrics. In J. Straub, C. Kölbl, C. Weidemann, & B. Zielke (Eds.), *Pursuit of meaning. Theoretical and methodological advances cultural and cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 293-318). Bielefeld, DE: Transcript Verlag.

References

- Walker, L. J., & Hennig, K. H. (2004). Differing conceptions of moral exemplarity: just, brave, and caring. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*(4), 629-647.
- Weibel, C., Messner, C., & Brügger, A. (2014). Completed egoism and intended altruism boost healthy food choices. *Appetite, 77*, 38-45.
- Werle, C. O., Trendel, O., & Ardito, G. (2013). Unhealthy food is not tastier for everybody: The “healthy= tasty” French intuition. *Food Quality and Preference, 28*(1), 116-121.
- Worsley, A., Wang, W. C., & Burton, M. (2015). Food concerns and support for environmental food policies and purchasing. *Appetite, 91*, 48-55.
- York, R., & Gossard, M. H. (2004). Cross-national meat and fish consumption: exploring the effects of modernization and ecological context. *Ecological economics, 48*(3), 293-302.