Isabel T. Strubel

The impact of indignation on Fairtrade support[1]

Kurzfassung: Die Nahrungsmittelproduktion wirkt sich stark auf die Umwelt sowie Lebens- und Arbeitsbedingungen weltweit aus. Daher kommt fairem Handel mit Lebensmitteln eine Schlüsselrolle für nachhaltige Entwicklung und dauerhaften, positiven Frieden zu. Um fairen Handel fördern zu können, muss man verstehen, was Menschen dazu bewegt, diesen, auch über Kaufverhalten hinaus, zu unterstützen. Die Befunde einer Fragebogenstudie (*N* = 124) zeigen, dass die gerechtigkeitsbezogene Emotion Empörung über eigennützige Motive und personale Normen hinaus zur Erklärung von Kaufintentionen sowie Engagementbereitschaften beiträgt. Dabei ist sowohl Empörung über Ungerechtigkeit im Handel als auch Empörung über den fairen Handel bedeutsam. Dies zeigt, dass Gerechtigkeitsmotive auf affektiver Ebene einen vielversprechenden Hebel bilden, um fairen Konsum zu fördern und Empörung über den fairen Handel ernst zu nehmen ist.

Abstract: Food production has a high impact on the environment, on working and living conditions worldwide. Therefore Fairtrade of groceries has a key role for sustainable development and lasting positive peace. In order to encourage Fairtrade, it is important to understand what motivates people to support it, also beyond their purchases. The findings of a survey study (N = 124) show that the justice-based emotion indignation adds to the explanation of purchasing intentions and the willingsness to support Fairtrade beyond self-interested motives and personal norms. Both, indignation about unfairness in trade and about Fairtrade prove to be influential. This shows that justice motives can on an affective level serve as a promising lever to foster fair consumption and that indignation about Fairtrade should be taken seriously.

1.   Fairtrade, sustainable development and peace

Food production has a high environmental impact in terms of water and land-use, as well as greenhouse gas emissions (Ivanova et al., 2016). In addition, food production has a high social value and is economically important: more than a quarter of the world's population is employed in agriculture, mainly producing food, with much higher percentages in developing countries (FAO, 2018b). Food processing and distribution offer additional employment. Food production is particularly central to the economies of the least developed countries providing income opportunities for disadvantaged population groups and export earnings (FAO, 2018a, b). The scale of food trade has grown rapidly in the last decades (FAO, 2018b) linking, among others, food consumption in Western countries with environmental as well as working and living conditions in developing countries. Sustainable food consumption is therefore highly relevant for sustainable development worldwide.

Fairtrade particularly conforms to the concept of sustainable development in the food sector as it is even stated in its definition: "Fairtrade is a trading partnership (…) that seeks greater equity in international trade. It contributes to sustainable development by offering better trading conditions to, and securing the rights of, marginalized producers and workers" (World Fairtrade Organization, n.d.). To reach this goal, Fairtrade conforms to standards that incorporate social, economic and environmental criteria. They embrace (1) prices that cover at least the production cost, (2) an additional Fairtrade Premium aimed at investing in community projects, (3) access to advance credit, (4) long-term trading partnerships, (5) decent working conditions and the ban of forced labor and child labor (6) ecological requirements like minimizing the use of pesticides, protection of forests and efficient energy use (Fairtrade International, 2019). A third-party certification process that awards the Fairtrade label assures that these requirements are met.

Sustainable development that requires among others sustainable consumption patterns is a basic precondition for durable peace (Harris & Mische, 2006). Natural resources are a frequent conflict item in non-violent and violent conflicts (HIIK, 2019). Ecological degradation is likely to cause or reinforce conflicts about shrinking natural resources (Mildner, Lauster & Wodni, 2011), especially if it interacts with unequal resource distribution (Homer-Dixon, 1994). Poverty and social injustice constitute further risk factors for violent conflicts (Fearon & Laitin, 2003; Justino, 2009; Opotow, 2012). Environmental sustainability, respect for human rights and promoting social justice however foster a culture of peace (United Nations General Assembly, 1999). Fairtrade particularly advocates these aspects.

Peacebuilding was a driving force of the early Fairtrade movement and continues to be of importance in the trade of products from conflict and post-conflict zones (Davenport & Low, 2015). Additionally, Fairtrade also contributes to decrease structural violence and thereby fosters positive peace. Structural violence is a form of violence caused

---

by social structure or social institutions that harms people by preventing them from meeting their fundamental basic needs (Galtung, 1969). Positive peace is defined as the absence of such violence (ibid.).

Fairtrade aims to contribute to positive peace in several ways (Paulsen, 2014): (1) It alleviates poverty of marginalized producers and workers and offers them humane living conditions (Tallontire, 2015). (2) Marginalized producers and workers, often women and/or ethnic minorities, mainly do not have the possibility to influence their working and living conditions. Fairtrade offers the producers and workers democratic participation and fosters self-determination (Lyon, 2015; Smith, 2015). This also facilitates further political participation. (3) Living and working conditions in developing countries are generally less favorable than in developed countries. Fairtrade aims to contribute to better living and working conditions in developing countries, to sensitize people in developed countries to these inequalities and to influence politics in developed countries towards more fairness especially in trade.

The global market for Fairtrade products is constantly growing. Since 2006, when it was at approximately 1.6 billion euros, it has more than quintupled reaching approximately 8.5 billion euros in 2017 (Fairtrade International, 2018; FLO International, 2007). However, the market shares of Fairtrade products are still small. Even in Switzerland and Sweden, the countries with the highest share of the market for Fairtrade products worldwide, they account for less than 2% of their total market, in Germany their market share is at about 0.5% (Lernoud & Willer, 2017). In addition, actions that support the Fairtrade movement and its political goals beyond the individual purchase of fairly traded products, are important to effectively raise awareness and change the conditions of trade on the macro level. Such actions include campaigning and volunteering.

Supporting sustainable development and contributing to positive peace, the consumption of Fairtrade products and the support of Fairtrade as a movement constitute desirable objectives. To date, however, consumers only choose Fairtrade products to a very limited extent and little is known about the motives for Fairtrade support beyond individual consumption. Commitments that go beyond the purchase of certain products are however particularly efficient to promote Fairtrade as they may foster changes on the macro-level. At the same time purchases are also considered in the study to assure the link to extant research. In order to foster Fairtrade, it is necessary to understand what leads people to support Fairtrade. As Fairtrade intends to promote more justice in trade and the impact of affective variables has so far been neglected, the influence of the justice-based moral emotion indignation is particularly considered in this research.

2.   Research on individual Fairtrade consumption and support

Previous research on individual behavior in the context of Fairtrade has focused on consumption and concentrates around six aspects: (1) the willingness to pay for Fairtrade products, (2) barriers to the purchase of Fairtrade products, (3) the impact of knowledge and information on Fairtrade consumption, (4) sociodemographic factors, (5) consumer identity, and (6) the influence of moral factors and values (Andorfer & Liebe, 2012; Strubel, 2019).

Resarch on the willingness to pay for Fairtrade products focuses on the cost-benefit-relation and examines the product price as central explanatory variable for the purchase of Fairtrade products. Even though a higher product price generally reduces the probabilty that a product is chosen, people are willing to pay a moderate to considerable price premium for Fairtrade products compared to conventional products (e.g. Basu & Hicks, 2008; Carlsson, García & Löfgren, 2010; De Pelsmacker, Driesen & Rayp, 2005; Grunert, Hieke & Wills, 2014; Langen, 2011; Loureiro & Lotade, 2005). The amount of the premium varies as a function of the consumer segment (Langen, 2011), attitudes (Loureiro & Lotade, 2005), norms (Carlsson et al., 2010) and information (De Pelsmacker et al., 2005).

The price premium people are willing to pay for Fairtrade products is, however, often below the actual premium. Consequently the price of Fairtrade products constitutes a central barrier to their purchase (Andorfer & Liebe, 2015; Uusitalo & Oksanen, 2004). Further barriers are the reduced availability of Fairtrade products compared to conventional products (Sunderer & Rössel, 2012; Uusitalo & Oksanen, 2004), perceived shortcomings in product quality (Chatzidakis, Hibbert & Smith, 2007; Wright & Heaton, 2006) and specticism about the efficiency and the trustworthiness of the Fairtrade system (Chatzidakis et al., 2007; De Pelsmacker & Janssens, 2007).

Knowledge and information about Fairtrade products and the Fairtrade system mostly foster the consumption of Fairtrade products (Becchetti & Rosati, 2007; De Pelsmacker et al., 2005; De Pelsmacker & Janssens, 2007). A lack of knowledge and information adversely affects their purchase (Pedregal & Ozcaglar-Toulouse, 2011; Uusitalo & Oksanen, 2004). Information that stresses the systemic impact of Fairtrade is particulalry effective (Stoefs & Mathijs, 2009).

The findings on the influence of sociodemographic characteristics are not completely consistent. Most studies, however, document that being female, being highly educated and earning well positively correlate with Fairtrade purchase and the willingness to pay for Fairtrade products (e.g., Loureiro & Lotade, 2005; Vecchio & Annuniata, 2015). The correlaions are mostly small though.

In research on consumer identity it is assumed that people use consumption to express who they are and to exert political influence. Qualitative studies show that the consumption of sustainable products is highly identity-relevant.

Fairtrade consumption is used to construct and affirm a self-concept as a morally good person and to express discontent with current consumption patterns (Adams & Raisborough, 2010; Varul, 2009). Additionally the wish for uniqueness fosters Fairtrade consumption (Halepete, Littrell & Park, 2009).

Fairtrade consumption is related to the endoresement of universalistic values (De Ferran & Grunert, 2007; Doran, 2009). These values include appreciation for the welfare of all people, the protection of the environment and social justice (Schwartz, 1994). Benevolence values and to a lesser extent self-determination and hedonic values have also been linked to Fairtrade consumption (De Ferran & Grunert, 2007; Doran, 2009; Ma & Lee, 2011).

The influence of moral motives on Fairtrade consumption has mostly been examined using the framework of the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991). According to this established expactany-value theory, behavioral intention is influenced by attitudes, perceived behavioral control and subjective norm. Behavioral intention and perceived behavioral control then constitute proximal predictors of manifest behavior. To explain Fairtrade behavior, this framwork has successfully been extended with the constructs self-identity and moral norm. Self-identity captures the centrality of ethical concerns for the self-identity, and moral norm the perceived moral obligation to act in a certain way. These additional constructs both account for incremental variance in the intention to buy Fairtrade products (De Leeuw, Valois & Houssemand, 2011; Shaw & Shiu, 2002; Shaw, Shiu & Clarke, 2000).

The few studies that have adressed the impact of moral motives independently of the theory of planned behavior show that personal norms constitute a relevant predictor for Fairtrade consumption (Andorfer & Liebe, 2015; Sunderer & Rössel, 2012), that belief in a just world fosters Fairtrade consumption when producers are perceived as very needy and Fairtrade is judged as efficient (White, MacDonnell & Ellard, 2012), that consumers care about relative deprivation when purchasing Fairtrade products (Basu & Hicks, 2008) and that Fairtrade consciousness has a positive impact on Fairtrade consumption (Sunderer & Rössel, 2012). This Fairtrade consciousness includes the judgement that producers are exploited in conventional trade, the feeling of indigation in light of bad working conditions and the wish to contribute to fairer trade.

The research on behavior in the context of Fairtrade has nearly exclusively focused on the purchase of these products. Other means of supporting Fairtrade, like recommendations, activism and volunteering, have only rarely been considered. Morrell and Jayawardhena (2010) examined word of mouth recommendation and social advocacy as criteria besides purchasing but only included sociodemographic variables as predictors and a case study on Fairtrade support demonstrated that Fairtrade support goes beyond the purchase of these products (Wheeler, 2012).

The influence of justice-related variables, even though justice is namely linked to Fairtrade, has only partially been examined. The role of emotions for Fairtrade consumption has to date mostly been neglected. Merely the study by Sunderer & Rössel (2012) included indignation. The impact of this emotion was however not examined more precisely as it formed only one component of a more comprehensive variable. Moral emotions have however been shown to be influential in other fields of sustainble action.

3. The importance of moral emotions, justice and responsibility for sustainable action

3.1 Why do people (not) act sustainably?

There is consensus about the importance of sustainable development, yet people often do not act accordingly. The concept of the socio-ecological dilemma can help to explain why acting sustainably is so hard (Hardin, 1968): acting sustainably often involves some degree of effort, discomfort and personal sacrifice without generating immediate personal benefits. It is rather the community that profits form these actions in the long-term and only if a sufficient number of people is acting sustainably. Consuming common ressources however profits the individual whereas the damage caused is socialized and often not directly visible. Buying organically grown grocery, for example, is typically more expensive for the consumer than buying conventionally grown one. The whole community, however, benefits from its advantages, among others in form of the preservation of biodiversity. Damages caused by conventional agricultre, for example as more energy is required, are socialized and might appear temporally and spatially shifted (Vlek & Keren, 1992). The individual consumer however immeditalty benefits of a lower price.

To overcome this dilemma, it is necessary that people assume responsibility for the common good and act accordingly (Hardin, 1968; Kals, 1996). Psychologically, responsibilty can manifest itself as a so called personal norm (Schwartz, 1977). A personal norm is an internalized conception about what is right and implies a feeling of personal moral obligation to act that way. In contrast to social norms that consist of expectations anchored in social groups and are enforced by social sanctions, personal norms operate independently of social or material rewards or punishments (ibid.).

As effective sustainable action requires the cooperation of lots of people which is influenced by justice norms and perceptions, justice perceptions are crucial in the context of the described dilemma (Blamey, 1998; Fehr & Schmidt, 1999). Additionally, the temporal and spatial shift between the costs and benefits of sustainable behavior raise

questions of justice (Pawlik, 1991). Therefore, in addition to responsibility, justice is a suitable starting point for the understanding of sustainbale action.

3.2 Responsibility, justice and moral emotions

Responsibility refers to the consequences of actions and omissions that are causaly attributable to an individual (Birnbacher, 2001; Jonas, 1984). Whereas ex-post responsibility means the attribution of and liability for past action, ex-ante responsibility denotes a moral or legal obligation to act in the interest of another person, species or cause (ibid.). This responsibility for what ought to be done can manifest as a personal norm and act as a motive (Schwartz, 1977). According to the norm activation model the perception of a need or a problem is necessary to activate according personal norms (ibid.). The perception of injustice can be regarded as such a problem and contribute to the activation of personal norms that counteract the injustice (Schwartz, 1975).

The psychology of justice, that deals with the subjective perception and experience of justice, furnishes evidence that the former have a strong impact on human action (Sabbagh & Schmitt, 2016). There are numerous indications that justice is in many cases not regarded as a mean to achieve other goals but as an end in itself (e.g. Fetchenhauer & Huang, 2004; Kals & Russell, 2001). This argues in favor of the existence of a justice motive that operates independently of self-interest.

The high relevance of justice does not only manifest cognitively, e.g. via personal norms, but is also reflected in the intense emotional experience of injustice. Indignation is considered as the prototypical affective reaction to experienced injustice and motivates to restore justice. Indignation may be conceived of as a so called moral emotion. These are emotions, that are experienced when moral norms are violated and that motivate moral behavior (Haidt, 2003; Weiner, 2006). In accordance with cognitive emotion theory, they are based on an evaluation of the situation and indicate that moral standards beyond sef-interest are at stake. They include judgements of what is right and wrong, considerations of ought and should and they are essentially determined by attributions of control and responsibility. Besides indignation, guilt, contempt, anger, shame, compassion and gratitude constitute moral emotions (ibid.).

Indignation is the reaction to the violation of moral demands by someone who is held morally responsible for this violation (Dwyer, 2003; Weiner, 2006). Therefore indignation indicates that a moral norm of high personal importance has been violated (Haidt, 2003). As the perception of injustice implies that personal justice norms have been violated by another person or agent, it is accompanied by the experience of indignation. The other way round, indignation is an indicator for the psychological existence of corresponding justice norms and the perception of injustice (Montada, 1998). Indignation is experienced regardless of whether subjects are affected by the injustice or its consequences (Dwyer, 2003) and motivates to restore justice independent of own interests (Haidt, 2003; Kals, 1996; Kals & Russell, 2001).

3.3 Contributions of responsibility, justice and moral emotions to the explanation of sustainable action

The impacts of responsibility, justice, and moral emotions on sustainable action have mostly been examined within the framework of the norm activation model, the exteneded theory of planned behavior and the model of responsible enviornmental action. Irrespectivley of the framework, these variables have proven to be influential predictors of sustainable action.

Variables of responsibility are at the core of the norm activation model. According to this model, activated personal norms, that manifest themselves as feelings of moral obligation, predict altruistic action (Schwartz, 1977). The personal norms, already existing or newly constructed in the situation, are activated by the perception of need, injustices or problems, control beliefs, efficacy beliefs and the internal ascription of responsibility. The denial of responsibility on the other hand can neutralise personal norms (ibid.). Personal norms that are based on stable value structures and that concern subjectivly important fields of action are particularly influential (ibid.).

The norm activation model, though originally developped for the explanation of helping behavior, has successfully been applied to various kinds of sustainable action like recycling (Park & Ha, 2014), waste reduction (Ebreo, Vining & Christancho, 2003), energy behaviors (van der Werff & Steg, 2015) and the purchase of environmentally friendly products (Onwezen, Antonides & Bartels, 2013). The norm activiation model sucessfully predicts intentions (e.g. Park & Ha, 2014), the willingness to take action (e.g. de Groot & Steg, 2009) and manifest behavior (e.g., Sunderer & Rössel, 2012). The personal norm variable, which is at the core of the model, substantially correlates with environmentally friendly intentions and behavior. In a meta analysis Bamberg and Möser (2007) report pooled correlations of $r = .59$ for intentions and of $r = .39$ for behavior.

Personal norms have also been successfully integrated in the theory of planned behavior to explain sustainable action. Originally, the theory of planned behavior assumes that people are motivated by selfinterest and choose what gives them the highest benefit (Bamberg & Möser, 2007; Lindenberg & Steg, 2007). This approach is not

completely appropriate for the understanding of moral acts like sustainable action, that are not purely self-interested. Therefore personal norms have been included in this framework to capture this actions more adequately. The inclusion of personal norms improves the explanation of intentions for actions that contain moral considerations in general and sustainable action in particular (Bamberg & Möser, 2007; Park & Ha, 2014; Rivis, Sheeran & Armitage, 2009).

It has been shown that moral emotions, particularly pride and guilt, affect sustainable action (White, Habib & Hardisty, 2019). Collective guilt, for exemple, influences the impact of a carbon footprint feedback on support for a proenvironmental group (Mallett, Melchiori & Strickroth, 2013) and pro-environmental behavior is positively related to pride and negatively to guilt (Bissing-Olson, Fielding & Iyer, 2016). Pride and guilt are both strongly related to responsibility: Pride is experienced when someone feels responsible for a positive outcome whereas guilt stemms from the recognition of responsibility for negative outcomes or violations of norms (Haidt, 2003; Lerner & Keltner, 2000; Weiner, 2006).

These Moral emotions have also successfully been included in modified theory of planned behavior and norm activation models to predict sustainable action: Anticipated feelings of guilt and pride have been shown to mediate between ascription of responsibility and personal norm (Han, 2014) and between personal norm and intentions (Onwezen et al., 2013). Anticipated guilt feelings further uniquely contribute to the explanation of intention to act conservationally (Kaiser, 2006). Feelings of ecological guilt prove to predict personal ecological norms (Hunecke, Blöbaum, Matthies & Höger, 2001).

The metaanalysis by Bamberg an Möser (2007) confirms the influence of guilt. The authors show by meta-analytical structural equation modelling that feelings of guilt significantly predict personal norm, attitude and perceived behavioral control and mediate between problem awareness and pro-environmental intention. They conclude that these results stress the importance of analysing the impact of moral emotions in the field of pro-environmental behavior in the future. Whereas the responsibility-related emotions pride and guilt have been considered in several studies, the influence of the justice-related moral emotion of indignation has rarely been examined.

One exeception is research in the context of the model of responsible environmental action, that has been developped for this specific context. It integrates ideas of the norm activation model and the theory of planned behavior and includes justice-related cognitions and emotions and thus also indignation (Kals, 1996). The model successfully explains high shares of variance in the willingness for continued proenvironmental commitments, a variable conceptualized as a commitment to a whole class of behaviors and a valid predictor of manifest behavior (Montada, Kals & Becker, 2007). Justice variables including indignation prove to be very influential (Kals, 1996; Kals & Russell, 2001).

4. Research questions

In spite of the manifest importance of justice and moral emotions in the context of sustainable action, and the obvious connection between Fairtrade and justice, these variables have only rarely been considered when analyzing Fairtrade support. Justice-related cognitions may have been included indirectly as they may have influenced personal norms but justice-related emotions have been nearly completely neglected. This is also true for possible adverse effects of justice-related emotions when Fairtrade is perceived as unfair. Consequently important factors driving or hindering Fairtrade consumption might have been overlooked.

In addition nearly all extant studies focus on Fairtrade purchase without considering actions that support Fairtrade consumption beyond the individual shopping behavior. Such actions, including gathering informations, campaigning and volunteering might be particulalry effective in raising awareness and in changing the conditions on the macro level, e.g. the legislation (Grunwald, 2010; Montada et al., 2007).

The present study aims to fill this gap as it analyses Fairtrade consumption and the willingness to support Fairtrade from a motivpluralistic view that considers indignation as justice-related emotion in addition to approved self-interested motives and personal norms. The study thus aims to answer the following questions:

(1) To what extent can the willingness to support Fairtrade be explained by prescriptive norms, traditional purchasing motives and personal norm?

(2) Does indignation about unfairness in trade contribute to the explaination of the intention to purchase Fairtrade groceries and of the willingness to support Faitrade beyond motives of self-interest and moral norms?

(3) Does indignation about Fairtrade further add to the explanation of these variables?

5. Method

5.1 Procedure and participants

To answer these questions an online survey was conducted in a German convenience sample. Participants were mainly recruited via social networks, a press release and worldshops. Furthermore, participants were asked to forward the link to other potential participants. To also recruit people that are not interested in sustainable consumption per se, the participants were given the chance to win vouchers in a lottery. Overall 124 useable questionnaires were obtained. With the exception of personal norm to support Fairtrade and perscriptive social norm to support Fairtrade, the same variables were measured in a second survey (N = 781). These data were used to cross-validate all common scales. To validate the intention and willingness variable the respondents were surveyed a second time about three months after the initial survey. Forty-one respondents participated again. The responses were matched via a personal code.

The participants of the first survey (N = 124) were 70.2% women and 27.4% men (2.4% missing values). Women were thus clearly overrepresented what corresponds to the fact that they are mostly responsible for the purchase of groceries in the household. The mean age was 42.20 years (SD = 17.86) and reached from 19 to 76 years. With 45.2% of the participants having completed university and another 36.3% with Abitur, high educational levels are clearly overrepresented. In the sample, 60 participants indicated a membership in a worldshop or a Fairtrade initiative. This group is thus also largely overrepresented in the sample. Respondents that participated in the second survey did not significantly differ from those who did not.

5.2 Measures

All psychological constructs were measured on a six-point Likert-type rating scale ranging from 1 (typically: does not apply at all) to 6 (typically: fully applies). To avoid invalid forced answers and early dropout (Stieger, Reips & Voracek, 2007), respondents were not forced to answer every item. This lead to a very moderate percentage of missing values per item between 0 und 4,0% for the independent variables. Additional missing values, between 7.3 and 30.6% per item, occured in the items of the intention scale as explained below. Missing values ware imputed with the expectation maximation (EM) algorithm implemented in NORM (Schafer & Graham, 2002). This algorithm requires at least ignorable missingness. It can be assumed that this precondition is met as all variables, except the dependet variables, are included in the alogrithm for the imputation of the missing values in the independent variables and as the missing values in the intention items are missing by design (Graham, 2012). The internal consistencies of the scales indicate predominantly good reliabilities and are reported below. All measures used in this research are provided in Appendix 1. The results of exploratory factor analysis demonstrate reasonable discriminant validity (Appendix 2, 3). The personal norm item is not loading on a separate factor which is probably due to the fact that it is a single item measure. The correlations (Table 1) however show that personal norm is sufficiently different from the other constructs.

Measures were taken to prevent social desirably answering behavior (e.g., by anonymous data gathering, giving the information that there are no "right" answers, instructing to answer spontaneously). In addition, this bias was controlled by the German short version of the BIDR impression management scale (Musch, Brockhaus & Bröder, 2002). Three items were measured but excluded from further analysis as they did not load on a common factor and reduced the internal consistency of the scale. The remaining seven items are reported in Appendix 1.

Intentions to purchase Fairtrade groceries (four items, α = .80): Participants were asked how probable it was that they would choose Fairtrade products when buying chocolate, coffee or tea, bananas and sugar in the following months. Respondents who indicated that they generally didn't buy a certain product were not asked this question for the corresponding product with the exception of coffee which was then replaced by tea. The four products were chosen according to their importance for the Fairtrade market and to the results of a first study that was conducted as part of the same research project (Strubel, 2019). In this repertory-grid study, respondents had rated a larger set of grocieres according to the subjective importance sustainbale characterists had for their purchase of those products. In order to reasonably represent the range of different grocery products, the choice of the products hab been based on the categories of a national nutrition database (Max Rubner Institut, 2010) and the most important and typical product from each category had been chosen. The ratings were used to cluster the products. The products included in the intention varibale were chosen to represent these clusters as far as possible and according to their importance for Fairtrade.

The operationalisation of buying intentions with probablity measures has successfully been applied in the context of sustainable consumption (e.g. Shaw et al., 2000). The wording corresponded to the one chosen by Shaw and collegues (2000).

	AM	SD	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 Impression management	3.37	0.85	124	.67	-.14	-.19*	-.08	.14	-.24**	-.28**	-.26**	.14	-.28**	-.22*	-.39*	-.37*
2 Prescriptive norm (support)	4.04	1.30	124		.95	.73**	.06	-.19*	.47**	.54**	.39**	-.16	.51**	.30**	.53**	.32*
3 Prescriptive norm (purchase)	3.99	1.21	124			.97	.06	-.11	.50**	.46**	.39**	-.21*	.49**	.28**	.33*	.16
4 Traditional purchasing motives	4.90	0.68	124				.72	-.09	.12	.15	.20*	-.01	.20*	.20*	.24	.33*
5 Importance of low price	3.38	1.34	124					-	-.26**	-.17	-.23*	.21*	-.35**	-.45**	-.58**	-.57**
6 Personal norm (support)	4.27	1.71	124						-	.75**	.65**	-.52**	.74**	.65**	.50**	.63**
7 Personal norm (purchase)	4.74	1.30	124							-	.62**	-.50**	.73**	.63**	.46**	.57**
8 Indignation about unfairness in trade	5.34	0.95	124								.92	-.47**	.63**	.58**	.24	.41*
9 Indignation about Fairtrade	2.71	1.17	124									.74	-.50**	-.55**	-.29	-.51**
10 Willingness to support Fairtrade	4.31	1.13	124										.87	.72**	.73**	.76**
11 Intention to purchase Fairtrade groceries	4.26	1.47	124											.80	.64**	.86**
12. Actual Fairtrade support	3.26	1.40	41												.86	.77**
13. Purchase of Fairtrade groceries	3.85	1.49	41													.76

* .01 < p < .05; ** p<.01.

Table 1: Means, standard deviations, correlations and internal consistencies (in italics) of the variables

Purchase of Fairtrade grocery (four items, α = .76): In the second survey, respondents were asked how often they had purchased fairly traded coffee (/tea), bananas, chocolate and sugar when they went shopping for these products in the past three months.

Willingness to support Fairtrade (eight items, α = .87): This variable was measured based on the concept of willingness of continued commitment (Montada et al., 2007). It includes the willingness to seek information about Fairtrade, to financially support Fairtrade via purchases and donations, to support campaigns promoting Fairtrade and to volunteer in favor of Fairtrade. In order to obtain a well-balanced survey, the willingness to support goals that interfere with Fairtrade, which will not be treated in this article, was also assessed. This variable will not be analysed in this article as the assessed predictors were chosen to explain Fairtrade support and are supposed to only weakly contribute to the explaination of interfering goals. As there were no exisiting items for the particular field of Fairtrade support the items were newly formulated.

Actual Fairtrade support (eight items, α = .86): This variable was measured in the second survey and assessed whether the respondents had supported Fairtrade in the past three months in the way describend in the items of the scale above.

Prescriptive norm to purchase Fairtrade groceries (four items, α = .97) and to support Fairtrade (four items, α = .95): Both scales refer to people who are important to the participants. Such items have been commonly used in past research (e.g. Ozcaglar-Toulouse, Shiu & Shaw, 2006). In the present study it was assessed in how far the participants agreed that these people think that they should (1) buy Fairtrade groceries, groceries whose producers have been fairly paid and treated and groceries that support people in developing countries, (2) contribute to more justice in trade, support and commit oneself to Fairtrade and advocate for more justice towards producers in developing countries. In principal axis analysis with varimax rotation these prescriptive norms load on two factors as expected.

Traditional purchasing motives (4 items, α = .74): The scale assessed the importance of four traditional benefit-related purchasing motives: high quality, freshness, taste and healthiness. These motives were obtained from the

above mentioned repertory-grid study where they had together with low price been to most mentioned benefit-related motives (Strubel, 2019). The importance of a low price did not load with the other four items and was therefore assesed as a single item.

Indignation about injustice in trade (three items, α = .92) and indignation about Fairtrade (three items, α = .74): The scale assessed the indignation about unfair wages, exploitation and bad working conditions on the one hand and about disadvantages for regional products and social pressure on the other hand. In the absence of adequante exisiting scales they ware newly constructed analogously to the indignation items used by Kals and Russel (2001). In principal axis analysis with varimax rotation these items load on two factors as expected.

Personal norm (two times one item): Two personal norm variables were assessed: the personal norm to purchase Fairtrade groceries and the personal norm to support Fairtrade. In accordance with Schwartz (1977) they were measured as feeling of obligation. In order to avoid highly redundant items or to confound this variable with moral emotions like guilt they were assessed with one item each.

6. Results

Hierarchical regression analyses were computed to answer the research questions. Willingness to support Fairtrade and intention to buy Fairtrade groceries served as criterion variables. The analyses are based on the EM-imputed data set but differ at most slightly from the results obtained with multiply imputed data. To account for social desirability bias, the impression management scale was entered in the first step. Prescriptive norm, traditional purchasing motives, the importance of low price and personal norm werde entered in the second step. These variables explain 53% of variance in the willingness to support Fairtrade beyond impression management (Table 2, step 2). More than half of the variance in the willingness variable can thus be explained by these variables (question 1), a similar extent as in the intention to purchase Fairtrade groceries (Table 3, step 2). In both cases personal norms prove to be particularly influential.

Step	Variable	B	SE B	β	r	R^2	Adj. R^2	ΔR^2	VIF
1						.08	.07	.08**	
	Constant	5.56	0.40						
	Impression management	-0.37	0.12	-.28**	-.28**				
2						.60	.59	.53**	
	Constant	1.56	0.67						
	Impression management	-0.08	0.08	-.06	-.28**				1.10
	Prescriptive norm (support)	0.12	0.06	.14	.51**				1.43
	Trad. purchasing motives	0.14	0.10	.08	.20**				1.03
	Importance of low price	-0.17	0.05	-.20*	-.35**				1.06
	Personal norm (support)	0.52	0.06	.59**	.74**				1.53
3						.63	.62	.03**	
	Constant	0.69	0.70						
	Impression management	-0.05	0.08	-.04	-.28**				1.11
	Prescriptive norm (support)	0.11	0.06	.12	.51**				1.44
	Trad. purchasing motives	0.10	0.10	.06	.20**				1.05
	Importance of low price	-0.15	0.05	-.18**	-.35**				1.08
	Personal norm (support)	0.41	0.07	.47**	.74**				2.00
	Indignation about unfairness in trade	0.27	0.09	.23**	.63**				1.71
4						.65	.63	.01*	
	Constant	1.32	0.76						
	Impression management	-0.06	0.08	-.05	-.28**				1.11
	Prescriptive norm (support)	0.13	0.06	.15*	.51**				1.50
	Trad. purchasing motives	0.13	0.10	.08	.20**				1.06
	Importance of low price	-0.14	0.05	-.16**	-.35**				1.10
	Personal norm (support)	0.36	0.07	.41**	.74**				2.31
	Indignation about unfairness in trade	0.22	0.09	.19**	.63**				1.83
	Indignation about Fairtrade	-0.14	0.07	-.14*	-.50**				1.52

* .01 < p < .05; **p<.01

Table 2: Hierarchical multiple regression analysis predicting willingness to support Fairtrade

To examine the additional influence of indignation about unfairness in trade (question 2), this variable was included in the third step of hierarchical regression analysis for the willingness and the intention variable. Indignation about unfairness in trade explains additional 3% of variance in the willingness to support Fairtrade and in the intention to purchase Fairtrade groceries (Table 2, 3). The bivariate correlations between indignation about unfairness in

trade and the willingness to support Fairtrade ($r = .63$) and intention to purchase Fairtrade groceries ($r = .58$) are high.

Step	Variable	B	SE B	β	r	R^2	Adj. R^2	ΔR^2	VIF
1						.05	.04	.05*	
	Constant	5.51	0.53						
	Impression management	-0.37	0.12	-.22**	-.22**				
2						.52	.50	.48**	
	Constant	2.19	0.95						
	Impression management	-0.06	0.11	-.04	-.22**				1.08
	Prescriptive norm (purchase)	-0.07	0.09	-.06	.28**				1.35
	Trad. purchasing motives	0.22	0.14	.10	.20**				1.02
	Importance of low price	-0.31	0.07	-.29**	-.45**				1.08
	Personal norm (purchase)	0.60	0.08	.59**	.65**				1.46
3						.55	.53	.03**	
	Constant	1.00	1.01						
	Impression management	-0.02	0.11	-.01	-.22**				1.10
	Prescriptive norm (purchase)	-0.10	0.09	-.08	.28**				1.36
	Trad. purchasing motives	0.16	0.14	.08	.20**				1.05
	Importance of low price	-0.30	0.07	-.27**	-.45**				1.09
	Personal norm (purchase)	0.46	0.09	.46**	.65**				2.02
	Indignation about unfairness in trade	0.37	0.13	.24**	.58**				1.82
4						.59	.56	.04**	
	Constant	2.32	1.05						
	Impression management	-0.03	0.11	-.02	-.22**				1.10
	Prescriptive norm (purchase)	-0.07	0.09	-.06	.28**				1.38
	Trad. purchasing motives	0.21	0.13	.10	.20**				1.06
	Importance of low price	-0.28	0.07	-.26**	-.45**				1.10
	Personal norm (purchase)	0.37	0.09	.36**	.65**				2.24
	Indignation about unfairness in trade	0.27	0.13	.18*	.58**				1.92
	Indignation about Fairtrade	-0.29	0.09	-.23**	-.55**				1.47

* .01 < p < .05; **p<.01

Table 3: Hierarchical multiple regression analysis predicting intention to purchase Fairtrade groceries

Finally, indignation about Fairtrade, included in the fourth step, further explains 1% of incremental variance in the willingness and 4% of incremental variance in the variance in the intention variable. The bivariate correlations between indignation about Fairtrade an these criterion variables are high ($r = -.50$ resp. $r = -.55$).

Intention to purchase Fairtrade groceries correlates with $r = .86$ with reported actual purchase of Fairtrade groceries several months later. The correlation between the willingness to support Fairtrade and reported actual Fairtrade support is also very high ($r = .73$). These results support the prospective validity of the intention and willingness.

7. Discussion

7.1 Summary

The present study examined (1) to what extent the willingness to support Fairtrade can be explained by self-intereted motives and moral motives that act on a cognitive level, operationalized as moral norm, (2) whether indignation about unfairness, as moral emotion that captures justice motives on an affective level, adds to the explanation of this willingness and of intention to purchase Fairtrade groceries beyond the mentioned cognitive variables and (3) whether indignation about Fairtrade also contributes to the explanation of this willingness and intention.

The results of a survey study conducted to this end, show that the willingness to support Fairtrade can be explained by the included variables to a relevant extent. The amount of variance explained and the influenes of the respective variables are similar to the regression on the intention to purchase Fairtrade grocery: the higher the personal norm and the lower the importance of low grocery prices, the higher the willingness and intentions in favor of Fairtrade.

Even though high shares of variance are explained by the cognitive variables, indignation about unfairness in trade significantly contributes to the explanation of the criterion variables beyond these variables. This points to a high importance of justice appraisals in the context of Fairtrade and indicates that it is worthwhile to consider this moral emotion when trying to understand Fairtrade related behavior. These results are in line with the importance of

justice-related variables in the field of sustainability (Kals, 1996) and the extant results on the influcne of moral motives on Fairtrade consumption (De Leeuw et al., 2011; Shaw et al., 2000; Sunderer & Rössel, 2012).

Indignation about Fairtrade further contributes to the explanation of the two criterion variables. This is in line with research on belief in a just world that shows that justice motives can hinder behavior in favor of Fairtrade (White et al., 2012) and contribute to the justifiaction of societal injustice (Jost & Hunyaday, 2005).

Overall the regression coefficients in the regression on willingness to support Fairtrade and on intention to purchase Fairtrade groceries follow quite similar patterns. Compared to intentions to purchase Fairtrade groceries, prescriptive norm is more influential for the willingness to support Fairtrade wheres indignation about Fairtrade and the importance of a low price are less important as barriers.

7.2 Limitations

The limitations of the study are mostly due to the measures and the fact that all data are self-report data. In the absence of suitable validated scales for the field of Fairtrade, most measures had to be adapted or even newly constructed for this study. To still assure the greatest possible validity, new items were either based on a qualitative study that was conducted within the same research project or theoretical considerations. Further measures that weren taken include a pretest, a cross-validation and the longitudinal validation of the criterion variables. The single item measure for moral norm was used to avoid redundancy and confoundation with affective constructs like guilt. This however adverly affects the evaluation of the measuring accuracy of this variable. Even though the choice of the products caputred by the intention-scale was lead by the results of a qualitative study and the importance of the corresponding products within the Fairtrade market, it cannot be excluded that this variable does not accurately reflect consumer's intentions to purchase Fairtrade groceries across all potential product categories. Given the high importance of bananas, cacoa, coffee, tea and sugar that account together with cotton and flowers for 90% of producers in the Fairtrade system (Fairtrade International, 2018) the findings concerning the intention variable are in any case relevant.

The article is entirely based on self-report data which might lead to common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003). Besides social desirability bias, consistency motives and implicit theories about the objectif of the study may contribute to this effect (ibid.). Most variables of interest in this study however can only be assessed as self-report as they are not accessible from outside. Actual purchases, commitments and volunteering might also be assessed with other methods. For economic reasons this was not possible in this study but would be desirable for the further validation of the findings. To reduce common method bias, various measures have been taken. Social desirability bias has been controlled for, measures that might be prone to consistency effects have been placed with the highest possible lag in the questionnaire and the behavioral variables have been validated longitudinally in the research project. Finally the study was integrated in a multimethodal research project. The fact that different methods lead to consistent findings (cf. Strubel, 2019) speaks in favor of their validity.

7.3 Implications

The findings are relevant for a better understanding of Fairtrade consumption and support and allow for the formulation of some implication for their encouragement.

The study shows that indignation is influential in explaining purchasing intentions and the willingness to support Fairtrade beyond variables of self-interest and personal norms that may include cognitive justice appraisales. This stresses that justice motives should not only be considered on a cognitive but also on an affective level.

Indignation constitutes a promising starting point to foster Fairtrade consumption and support. This moral emotion is influenced by ascriptions of responsibility but first of all based on the perception of injustice (Weiner, 2006). This perception can among others be influenced by media coverage, information at the point of purchase and private discussions. Indignation as emotional reaction to this perception has a very strong motivational potential to righten injustices. But there may also arise indignation about sustainable consumption, for example if it is perceived to lead to other injustices or to threaten individual freedom. Due to the strong behavioral impact of this emotion, interventions that provoque indignation should always be well thought-out to avoid adverse effects. Indignation about Fairtrade should be taken very seriously as it constitutes a relevant barrier to Fairtrade support.

If injustices are highlighted, it is additionally important to stress that it is possible to effectively counter them. This may be achieved by giving more information about the effect of the purchase on injustice or by giving feedback about already achieved justice-related improvements. Otherwise people might reframe the situation instead of acting in order to protect their belief that the world is a just place. This is particularly true for people with a very strong justice motive (Lerner, 1980).

The willingness to support Fairtrade also includes items on volunteering. According to the functional approach to volunteering, volunteering serves certain functions for individuals. A match between individual motives and the

volunteer work helps to recruit new volunteers, predicts volunteers' satisfaction and fosters sustained volunteering (Clary et al., 1998). It is therefore to be expected that volunteering that is motivated by indignation and the underlying perception of injustices can be fostered when these motives are served by the volunteer work. It may thus be useful to give (potential) volunteers the possibility to effectively express indignation about unfairness in trade via the volunteering (e.g. in campaigns) und to provide them with Feedback about the success of their work with respect to the reduction of injustice.

As described above, sustainable action underlies a dilemma structure. To overcome this dilemma, it is particularly important to know that other people are willing to commit themselves to sustainability. Volunteering and all kinds of support beyond individual purchasing behavior are particularly important to show people who are not yet commited to this cause that a lot of people are. This may lead to norm changes and reinforce the believe that own efforts to act sustainably are not exploited and void.

In general, commitments beyond the shopping counter can very effectively contribute to sustainable development as volunteers and campaigners act as multipliers and change the overall conditions of consumption on the macro level (e.g. legislature) (Grunwald, 2010). Such commitments, that are often situated between formal volunteering and private action, are widely underresearched. This study aimed to contribute to the understanding of such commitments in the field of Fairtrade. In light of the necessitiy of sustainable development for the preservation of human livelihoods it is important to further analyze such commitments in the field of Fairtrade and sustainability in general.

References

Adams, M. & Raisborough, J. (2010). Making a difference: Ethical consumption and the everyday. The British Journal of Sociology, 61(2), 256-274.

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 50(2), 179-211.

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.

Andorfer, V. A. & Liebe, U. (2012). Research on fair trade consumption—A review. Journal of Business Ethics, 106(4), 415-435.

Bamberg, S. & Möser, G. (2007). Twenty years after Hines, Hungerford, and Tomera: A new meta-analysis of psycho-social determinants of pro-environmental behaviour. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 27, 14-25.

Basu, A. K. & Hicks, R. L. (2008). Label performance and the willingness to pay for Fair Trade coffee: A cross-national perspective. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 32(5), 470-478.

Becchetti, L. & Rosati, F. C. (2007). Global social preferences and the demand for socially responsible products: Empirical evidence from a pilot study on fair trade consumers. The World Economy, 30(5), 807-836.

Birnbacher, D. (2001). Philosophical foundations of responsibility. In Auhagen, A. E. & Bierhoff, H. W. (eds.), Responsibility. The many faces of a social phenomenon. London: Routledge. 9-22.

Bissing-Olson, M. J., Fielding, K. S. & Iyer, A. (2016). Experiences of pride, not guilt, predict pro-environmental behavior when pro-environmental descriptive norms are more positive. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 45, 145-153.

Blamey, R. (1998). The activation of environmental norms. Extending Schwartz's Model. Environment and Behavior, 30(5), 676-708.

Carlsson, F., García, J. H. & Löfgren, Å. (2010). Conformity and the demand for environmental goods. Environmental and resource economics, 47(3), 407-421.

Chatzidakis, A., Hibbert, S. & Smith, A. P. (2007). Why people don't take their concerns about fair trade to the supermarket: The role of neutralization. Journal of Business Ethics, 74(1), 89-100.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J. & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(6), 1516–1530.

Davenport, E. & Low, W. (2015). Fair trade, peace and development in conflict zones. In Raynolds, L. T. & Bennett, E. A. (eds.), Handbook of Research on Fair Trade. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. 355-371.

De Ferran, F. & Grunert, K. G. (2007). French fair-trade coffee buyers' purchasing motives: An exploratory study using means-end chains analysis. Food Quality and Preference, 18(2), 218-229.

De Groot, J. & Steg, L. (2009). Morality and prosocial behavior: The role of awareness, responsibility, and norms in the norm activation model. The Journal of Social Psychology, 149(4), 425-449.

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 Pelsmacker, P., Driesen, L. & Rayp, G. (2005). Do consumers care about ethics? Willingness to pay for fair-trade coffee. Journal of consumer affairs, 39(2), 363-385.

De Pelsmacker, P. & Janssens, W. (2007). A model for fair trade buying behaviour: The role of perceived quantity and quality of information and of product-specific attitudes. Journal of business ethics, 75(4), 361-380.

Doran, C. J. (2009). The role of personal values in fair trade consumption. Journal of Business Ethics, 84(4), 549-563.

Dwyer, S. (2003). Moral development and moral responsibility. The Monist, 86(2), 181-199.

Ebreo, A., Vining, J. & Christancho, S. (2003). Responsibility for environmental problems and the consequences of waste reduction: A test of the norm-activation model. Journal of Environmental Systems, 29(3), 219-244.

Fairtrade International (2018). Working together for fair and sustainable trade. Annual Report 2017 – 2018. URL (last access August 2019): https://files.fairtrade.net/publications/2017-18_FI_AnnualReport.pdf

Fairtrade International (2019). Fairtrade Standard for Small-scale Producer Organizations. URL (8, 2019): https://files.fairtrade.net/standards/SPO_EN.pdf

FAO (2018a). The state of agricultural commodity markets 2018. Agricultural trade, climate change and food security. URL (last access September 2019): http://www.fao.org/3/I9542EN/i9542en.pdf

FAO (2018b). World Food and Agriculture – Statistical Pocketbook 2018. URL (last access September 2019 2019): http://www.fao.org/publications/card/en/c/CA1796EN

Fearon, J. D., & Laitin, D. D. (2003). Ethnicity, insurgency, civil war. American Political Science Review, 97(1), 75-90.

Fehr, E. & Schmidt, K. M. (1999). A theory of fairness, competition, and cooperation. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 114(3), 817-868.

Fetchenhauer, D. & Huang, X. (2004). Justice sensitivity and distributive decisions in experimental games. Personality and Individual Differences, 36, 1015-1029.

FLO International (2007). Shaping global partnerships. Annual Report 2006/07. URL (Last access September 2019): https://files.fairtrade.net/publications/2006-07_FI_AnnualReport.pdf

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace and peace research. Journal of Peace Research, 6(3), 167-191.

Graham, J. W. (2012). Missing data: Analysis and design. New York: Springer.

Grunert, K. G., Hieke, S. & Wills, J. (2014). Sustainability labels on food products: Consumer motivation, understanding and use. Food Policy, 44, 177-189.

Grunwald, A. (2010). Wider die Privatisierung der Nachhaltigkeit. Warum ökologisch korrekter Konsum die Umwelt nicht retten kann. [Against Privatization of Sustainability – Why Consuming Ecologically Correct Products Will Not Save the Environment] GAIA, 19(3), 178-182.

Haidt, J. (2003). The moral emotions. In Davidson, R. J., Scherer, K. R. & Goldsmith, H. H. (eds.), Handbook of affective sciences. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 852-870.

Halepete, J., Littrell, M. & Park, J. (2009). Personalization of fair trade apparel: Consumer attitudes and intentions. Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, 27(2), 143-160.

Han, H. (2014). The norm activation model and theory-broadening: Individuals' decision-making on environmentally-responsible convention attendance. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 40, 462-471.

Hardin, G. (1968). The tragedy of the commons. Science, 162, 1243-1248.

Harris, I. & Mische, P. (2006). On the relationship between peace education and environmental education. Journal for the Study of Peace and Conflict, 2005 -2006 annual edition, 1-13.

HIIK (2019). Conflict Barometer 2018. Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research. URL (9, 2019) https://hiik.de/konfliktbarometer/aktuelle-ausgabe/

Homer-Dixon, T. (1994). Environmental scarcities and violent conflict: Evidence from cases. International Security, 19(1), 5-40.

Hunecke, M., Blöbaum, A., Matthies, E. & Höger, R. (2001). Responsibility and environment: Ecological norm orientation and external factors in the domain of travel mode choice behavior. Environment and Behavior, 33(6), 830-852.

Ivanova, D., Stadler, K., Steen-Olsen, K., Wood, R., Vita, G., Tukker, A. & Hertwich, E. G. (2016). Environmental Impact Assessment of Household Consumption. Journal of Industrial Ecology, 20(3), 526-536.

Jonas, H. (1984). Das Prinzip Verantwortung. Versuch einer Ethik für die technologische Zivilisation [The imperative of responsibility. In search of an ethics for the technological age]. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Jost, J. T. & Hunyady, O. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of system-justifying ideologies. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14(5), 260-265.Justino, P. (2009). Poverty and violent conflict: A micro-level perspective on the causes and duration of warfare. Journal of Peace Research, 46(3), 315-333.

Kaiser, F. G. (2006). A moral extension of the theory of planned behavior: Norms and anticipated feelings of regret in conservationism. Personality and Individual Differences, 41(1), 71-81.

Kals, E. (1996). Are proenvironmental commitments motivated by health concerns or by perceived justice? In Montada, L. & Lerner, M. (eds.), Current societal concerns about justice. New York: Plenum. 231-258.

Kals, E. & Russell, Y. (2001). Individual conceptions of justice and their potential for explaining proenvironmental decision making. Social Justice Research, 14(4), 367-385.

Langen, N. (2011). Are ethical consumption and charitable giving substitutes or not? Insights into consumers' coffee choice. Food Quality and Preference, 22(5), 412-421.

Lerner, J. S. & Keltner, D. (2000). Beyond valence: Toward a model of emotion-specific influences on judgment and choice. Cognition & Emotion, 14(4), 473-493.

Lerner, M. J. (1980). The belief in a just world. A fundamental delusion. New York: Springer.

Lernoud, J. & Willer, H. (2017). The organic and Fairtrade market 2015. In Willer, H. & Lernoud, J. (eds.), The World of Organic Agriculture. Statistics and Emerging Trends. Frick and Bonn: FiBL & IFOAM – Organics International. 143-148.

Lindenberg, S. & Steg, E. (2007). Normative, gain and hedonic goal frames guiding environmental behavior. Journal of Social Issues, 63(1), 117-137.

Loureiro, M. L. & Lotade, J. (2005). Do fair trade and eco-labels in coffee wake up the consumer conscience. Ecological Economics, 53, 129-138.

Lyon, S. (2015). Fair trade and indigenous communities in Latin America In Raynolds, L. T. & Bennett, E. A. (eds.), Handbook of Research on Fair Trade. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. 422-440.

Mallett, R. K., Melchiori, K. J. & Strickroth, T. (2013). Self-confrontation via a carbon footprint calculator increases guilt and support for a pro-environmental group. Ecopsychology, 5(1), 9-16.

Max Rubner-Institut (MRI). (2010). Bundeslebensmittelschlüssel (BLS): Version 3.0. URL (last access February 2020) www.nutritional-software.at/assets/downloads/550fe483/bls_3.0_handbuch.pdf

Mildner, S.-A., Lauster, G. & Wodni, W. (2011). Scarcity and abundance revisited: A literature review on natural resources and conflict. International Journal of Conflict and Violence, 5(1), 155-172.

Montada, L. (1998). Justice: Just a rational choice? Social Justice Research, 11(2), 81-101.

Montada, L., Kals, E. & Becker, R. (2007). Willingness for continued social commitment: A new concept in environmental research. Environment and Behavior, 39(3), 287-316.

Morrell, K. & Jayawardhena, C. (2010). Fair trade, ethical decision making and the narrative of gender difference. Business Ethics: A European Review, 19(4), 393-407.

Musch, J., Brockhaus, R. & Bröder, A. (2002). Ein Inventar zur Erfassung von zwei Faktoren sozialer Erwünschtheit. Diagnostica [An inventory for the assessment of two factors of social desirability], 48(3), 121-129.

Onwezen, M. C., Antonides, G. & Bartels, J. (2013). The norm activation model: An exploration of the functions of anticipated pride and guilt in pro-environmental behaviour. Journal of Economic Psychology, 39, 141-153.

Opotow, S. (2012). Social injustice. In D.J. Christie, D. J. (ed.), The Encyclopedia of Peace Psychology, Vol. 3. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 1023-1027.

Ozcaglar-Toulouse, N., Shiu, E. & Shaw, D. (2006). In search of fair trade: Ethical consumer decision making in France. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 30(5), 502-514.

Park, J & Ha, S. (2014), Understanding consumer recycling behavior: Combining the theory of planned behavior and the norm activation model. Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 42(3), 278-291.

Paulsen, O. (2014). Der Faire Handel und Agrar-Ethik – auch friedenspolitisch ein wichtiger Schritt [Fairtrade and agricultural ethics – an important step also in peace politics]. In Meier, U. (ed.), Agrarethik – Landwirtschaft mit Zukunft [agricultural ethics – agriculture with future]. Clenze, DE: Agrimedia-Verlag. 305-318.

Pawlik, K. (1991). The psychology of global environmental change: Some basic data and an agenda for cooperative international research. International Journal of Psychology, 26, 547- 563.

Pedregal, V. D. & Ozcaglar-Toulouse, N. (2011). Why does not everybody purchase fair trade products? The question of the fairness of fair trade products' consumption for consumers. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 35, 655-660.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y. & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method bias in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(5), 879-903.

Rivis, A., Sheeran, P. & Armitage, C. J. (2009). Expanding the affective and normative components of the theory of planned behavior: A meta-analysis of anticipated affect and moral norms. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39(12), 2985-3019.

Sabbagh, C. & Schmitt, M. (Eds.) (2016). Handbook of social justice theory and research. New York: Springer.

Schafer, J. L. & Graham J. W. (2002). Missing data: Our view of the state of the art. Psychological Methods, 7(2), 147-177.

Schwartz, S. H. (1975). The justice of need and the activation of humanitarian norms. Social Justice Research, 31(3), 111-136.

Schwartz, S. H. (1977). Normative influences on altruism. In Berkowitz, L. (ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 10. New York: Academic Press. 221-279.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? Journal of Social Issues, 50(4), 19-45.

Shaw, D. & Shiu, E. (2002). The role of ethical obligation and self-identity in ethical consumer choice. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 26(2), 109-116.

Shaw, D., Shiu, E. & Clarke, I. (2000). The contribution of ethical obligation and self-identity to the theory of planned behaviour: An exploration of ethical consumers. Journal of Marketing Management, 16(8), 879-894.

Smith, S. (2015). Fair trade and women's empowerment. In Raynolds, L. T. & Bennett, E. A. (eds.), Handbook of Research on Fair Trade. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. 405-421.

Stieger, S., Reips, U. D. & Voracek, M. (2007). Forced-response in online surveys: Bias from reactance and an increase in sex-specific dropout. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 58(11), 1653-1660.

Stoefs, E. & Mathijs, E. (2009). Framing as strategy for effective communication about Fair Trade products in Flanders. International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, 7(4), 223-234.

Strubel, I. T. (2019. Nachhaltiger Konsum, Fairer Handel und Gerechtigkeit: eine multimethodale psychologische Untersuchung gerechtigkeits- und verantwortungsbezogener Motive. Katholische Universität Eichstätt-Ingolstadt.

Sunderer, G. & Rössel, J. (2012). Morality or economic interest? The impact of moral motives and economic factors on the purchase of fair trade groceries. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 36(2), 244-250.

Tallontire, A. (2015). Fair trade and development in African agriculture In Raynolds, L. T. & Bennett, E. A. (eds.), Handbook of Research on Fair Trade. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. 372-387.

United Nations General Assembly (1999). Resolution adopted by the General Assembly
53/243 A. Declaration on a Culture of Peace. A/RES/53/243, 13.09.1999. URL (8, 2019): http://www.un-documents.net/a53r243a.html

Uusitalo, O. & Oksanen, R. (2004). Ethical consumerism: a view from Finland. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 28(3), 214-221.

Van der Werff, E. & Steg, L. (2015). One model to predict them all: Predicting energy behaviours with the norm activation model. Energy Research & Social Science, 6, 8-14.

Varul, Z. (2009). Ethical selving in cultural contexts: Fairtrade consumption as an everyday ethical practice in the UK and Germany. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 33, 183-189.

Vecchio, R. & Annunziata, A. (2015). Willingness-to-pay for sustainability-labelled chocolate: An experimental auction approach. Journal of Cleaner Production, 86, 335-342.

Vlek, C. & Keren, G. B. (1992). Behavioral decision theory and environmental risk management: Assessment and resolution of four 'survival' dilemmas. Acta Psychologica, 80, 249–278.

Weiner, B. (2006). Social motivation, justice, and the moral emotions: An attributional approach. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Wheeler, K. (2012). The practice of fairtrade support. Sociology, 46(1), 126-141.

White, K., Habib, R. & Hardisty, D. J. (2019). How to shift consumer behaviors to be more sustainable: A literature review and guiding framework. Journal of Marketing, 83(3), 22-49.

White, K., MacDonnell, R. & Ellard, J. H. (2012). Belief in a just world: Consumer intentions and behaviors toward ethical products. Journal of Marketing, 76(1), 103-118.

World Fair Trade Organization (n.d.). Definition of Fair Trade. URL (last access December 2019): https://wfto.com/fair-trade/definition-fair-trade

Wright, L.T. & Heaton, S. (2006). Fair Trade marketing: An exploration through qualitative research. Journal of Strategic Marketing, 14(4), 411-426.

The author:

Dr. Isabel T. Strubel is a postdoctoral researcher in social and organizational psychology at the Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, Germany. Her research interests include the psychology of justice, responsibility and sustainable action, the motivation of volunteering and social norms.
eMail: isabel.strubel@gmail.com

Appendix

Appendix 1: Scales and items

Scale/ Item	Label
Impression Management	IM
I sometimes tell lies if I have to	IM1
There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone	IM2
I never swear.	IM3
I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.	IM4
I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.	IM5
I have done things that I don't tell other people about.	IM6
I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.	IM7
Prescriptive social norm (support)	SNS
People who are important to me think that…	
…I should contribute to more justice in trade with developing countries.	SNS1
…I should advocate that for producers in developing countries receive fair wages.	SNS2
…I should do my best to support Fairtrade.	SNS3
…I should commit myself in favor of Fairtrade.	SNS4
Prescriptive social norm (purchase)	SNP
People who are important to me think that…	
…I should purchase fair trade grocery products.	SNP1
…I should purchase grocery products that have been produced in compliance with ethical standards.	SNP2
…I should purchase grocery products that support people in developing countries.	SNP3
…I should purchase grocery products whose producers have received fair wages for their work.	SNP4
Traditional purchasing motives	TPM
When purchasing grocery, I mainly pay attention to…	
…freshness.	TPM1
…high quality.	TPM2
…good taste.	TPM3
…healthiness.	TPM4
Importance of low price	
When purchasing grocery, I mainly pay attention to low prices.	ILP
Personal norm (support)	
I feel obliged to support Fairtrade.	PNS
Personal norm (purchase)	
I feel obliged to purchase Fairtrade grocery as often as possible.	PNP
Indignation about unfairness in trade	IUT
I am indignant….	
…that people in developing countries are exploited in international trade.	IUT1
…that people in developing countries are not paid fair wages for their work.	IUT2
…about the conditions under which a lot of people in developing countries have to work.	IUT3
Indignation about Fairtrade	IFT
I am indignant	
…when Fairtrade endangers jobs in domestic agriculture.	IFT1
…when regional products are driven out by fairly traded goods.	IFT2
…about the societal pressure to shop "morally correct".	IFT3
Willingness to support Fairtrade	WIL
In principle I am willing to…	
…support campaigns promoting Fairtrade.	WIL1
…become an active member in an organization that supports Fairtrade.	WIL2
…volunteer in a worldshop.	WIL3
… gather information about Fairtrade.	WIL4
… donate for organizations that support Fairtrade.	WIL5
… purchase fairly traded grocery even if this means higher expenses.	WIL6
…to accept to travel longer distances to purchase fairly traded grocery.	WIL7
…boycott grocery that was produced under unfair conditions.	WIL8

Scale/ Item	Label
Actual Fairtrade support	FTS
In the past three months…	
…I supported campaigns promoting Fairtrade.	FTS1
…I became an active member in an organization that supports Fairtrade.	FTS2
…I volunteered in a worldshop.	FTS3
…I gathered information about Fairtrade.	FTS4
…I donated for organizations that support Fairtrade.	FTS5
…I purchased fairly traded grocery even if this meant higher expenses.	FTS6
…I accepted to travel longer distances to purchase fairly traded grocery.	FTS7
…I boycotted grocery that was produced under unfair conditions	FTS8
Intention to purchase Fairtrade groceries	INT
When you go shopping for coffee in the next months, how likely are you to purchase fairly traded coffee?	INT1
(*If respondents answered that they didn't buy coffee, they were asked the same question for tea instead*)	
When you go shopping for bananas in the next moths, how likely are you to purchase fairly traded bananas?	INT2
When you go shopping for chocolate in the next months, how likely are you to purchase fairly traded chocolate?	INT3
When you go shopping for sugar in the next months, how likely are you to purchase fairly traded sugar?	INT4
Purchase of Fairtrade groceries	PFT
When you went shopping for coffee in the past three months, how often did you purchase fairly traded coffee? (*If respondents answered that they didn't buy coffee, they were asked the same question for tea instead*)	PFT1
When you went shopping for bananas in the past three months, how often did you purchase fairly traded bananas?	PFT2
When you went shopping for chocolate in the past three months, how often did you purchase fairly traded chocolate?	PFT3
When you went shopping for sugar in the past three months, how often did you purchase fairly traded sugar?	PFT4

Appendix 2: Factor loadings of exploratory factor analysis (Varimax rotated) of all predictor variables of willingness to support Fairtrade; factor loadings of at least .40 are printed in bold, deviations from the expected factor structure are in italics.

Items	Factor					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
SNS1	**.93**	.06	.02	.00	.03	-.09
SNS2	**.93**	.13	-.04	.03	-.02	.01
SNS4	**.91**	.20	-.09	.00	-.03	-.06
SNS3	**.85**	.26	-.11	.05	.08	-.03
IUT1	.22	**.88**	-.19	.08	.02	-.15
IUT3	.16	**.87**	-.11	.13	-.13	.09
IUT2	.24	**.85**	-.15	.11	-.11	-.11
IFT2	.01	-.21	**.80**	.02	.01	-.02
IFT1	-.11	-.31	**.77**	-.03	-.08	.20
IFT3	.02	***-.51***	**.47**	.13	-.19	.25
TPM1	.07	-.10	.04	**.82**	-.04	.00
TPM2	-.00	.14	.08	**.72**	-.02	***-.48***
TPM4	.03	-.01	-.30	**.71**	-.02	.20
TPM3	-.02	.21	.16	**.64**	.06	.00
IM5	-.14	-.31	-.21	.04	**.64**	.10
IM1	.20	-.07	.08	-.07	**.61**	-.13
IM7	-.05	.00	.29	.02	**.61**	.37
IM3	-.04	.00	.20	-.05	**-.59**	.08
IM6	-.01	.04	.16	-.17	**.54**	***.43***
IM2	-.27	-.08	***.48***	.07	**.45**	-.09
IM4	-.08	***-.47***	.19	.12	*.30*	.06
ILP	-.11	-.17	.08	.04	.00	**.83**
PNS	***.45***	***.50***	***-.45***	.11	-.09	-.04

Appendix 3: Factor loadings of exploratory factor analysis (Varimax rotated) of all predictor variables of intention to purchase Fairtrade groceries; factor loadings of at least .40 are printed in bold, deviations from the expected factor structure are in italics.

Items	Factor					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
SNP4	**.96**	.15	-.03	.01	.02	-.04
SNP2	**.94**	.09	-.04	-.06	.02	.00
SNP3	**.93**	.18	-.09	-.06	-.02	.04
SNP1	**.91**	.22	-.04	.00	.01	-.05
IUT3	.15	**.86**	-.11	-.13	.09	.05
IUT1	.28	**.83**	-.21	.05	.12	-.19
IUT2	.29	**.83**	-.13	-.09	.15	-.16
IFT2	.01	-.16	**.79**	.10	.00	-.10
IFT1	-.13	-.28	**.79**	-.01	-.04	.16
IFT3	.02	***-.45***	**.54**	-.06	.13	.19
IM7	.05	.00	.26	**.68**	.04	.29
IM1	.03	-.01	-.07	**.66**	-.08	-.18
IM5	-.17	-.28	-.25	**.64**	-.01	.08
IM6	-.09	.09	.14	**.57**	-.21	.34
IM2	-.28	-.12	.32	**.51**	.07	-.01
IM3	-.26	.10	.37	**-.50**	-.15	.08
IM4	.07	***-.43***	.25	*.31*	.08	-.11
TPM1	-.08	-.05	.05	-.04	**.82**	.04
TPM4	.05	.02	-.24	-.03	**.71**	.17
TPM2	.04	.13	.10	-.07	**.70**	***-.49***
TPM3	.03	.16	.10	.05	**.67**	-.02
ILP	-.01	-.17	.08	.07	.07	**.84**
PNP	.37	***.55***	***-.42***	-.04	.05	-.13