

Doing Right and Feeling Good: Ethical Food and the Shopping Experience

Sociological Perspectives

1–23

© The Author(s) 2019

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/0731121419855980

journals.sagepub.com/home/spx**Ethan D. Schoolman**¹ 

Abstract

Does engaging in ethical consumption make shopping more enjoyable? Or does contending with social and environmental impacts in the supermarket add stress and worry to the practice of buying food? In this paper, I contribute to debates over ethical consumption and the shopping experience by directly addressing the question: Is ethical consumption associated with more enjoyable everyday shopping, specifically where food is concerned? Based on a survey of faculty, staff, and students at a large university, I show that even when controlling for socioeconomic characteristics and for where people shop, consumers who buy a range of ethical foods are more likely to take pleasure in food shopping as a whole. In other words, doing right may lead to feeling good—and this connection may represent not just an important motivation for acting on ethical values while shopping but also an integral part of what it means to be an ethical consumer.

Keywords

ethical consumption, practice theory, sustainable food, shopping, consumer culture

Introduction

Why do people incorporate concerns about social and environmental problems into purchasing decisions—a practice commonly termed “ethical consumption”? Answers to this question have often revolved around how knowledgeable and concerned consumers might be and whether people have the resources to act on concerns they might have. Recently, however, what might be termed a “hedonic turn” in thinking about ethical consumption has complicated this picture. Following Kate Soper’s (2007) recasting of ethical consumption as a source of gratification both civic-minded and self-interested, studies have begun to examine whether people who, simply put, derive pleasure from ethical consumption are more likely to engage in it—even after accounting for other factors. Evidence so far has pointed in a clear direction: people who anticipate feeling pride, joy, or social acceptance, as a result of purchasing ethical products, are more likely to buy goods that satisfy “green,” fair trade, and other “ethical” criteria (Davies and Gutsche 2016; Ladhari and Tchegnina 2017; Oh and Yoon 2014; Shobeiri et al. 2016).

¹Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

Corresponding Author:

Ethan D. Schoolman, Department of Human Ecology, Rutgers University, Cook Office Building, Room 203, 55 Dudley Road, New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8520, USA.

Email: es808@sebs.rutgers.edu

The direction pursued by “hedonic turn” research into ethical consumption represents a welcome broadening of attention beyond consumer concerns, resources, and politics. And the proposed role of hedonic emotion in prompting acts of ethical consumption has frequently been validated by recent studies. But these very findings lead to a further implication that actually conflicts with other research that casts the overall experience of ethical consumption in a quite different light. Specifically, if engaging in ethical consumption makes available to people a special source of satisfaction while shopping, then it would appear to follow that people who regularly engage in ethical consumption might enjoy shopping more, other things being equal, than people who do not. But the idea that ethical consumption makes shopping more enjoyable, while supported by some studies, has been disputed by others, which find that ethical consumption is frequently stressful, confusing, and anxiety-producing (AbiGhannam and Atkinson 2016; Connolly and Prothero 2008; Johnstone and Tan 2015). To the extent that this second literature on “stressful ethical consumption” is correct, it would be reasonable to conclude that everyday shopping that includes ethical consumption might actually be less enjoyable than shopping which does not. Research associated with “stressful ethical consumption” thus urges precisely the opposite view of the larger emotional experience of being an ethical consumer, as compared with research associated with the “hedonic turn.” And so far, no study has been conducted that highlights these conflicting interpretations of the relationship between everyday shopping and ethical consumption or attempts to adjudicate between them.

In this paper, I contribute to these debates over ethical consumption and the experience of shopping by directly addressing the question: Is ethical consumption associated with more enjoyable everyday shopping, specifically where food is concerned? Based on a large-scale survey of faculty, staff, and students at an American university, I show that even when controlling for socioeconomic characteristics and, crucially, for where people shop, consumers who buy a range of ethical foods are more likely to take pleasure in food shopping as a whole. In other words, “feeling good” about doing something that seems “right” in an ethical sense may hold true not just for the moment of a particular act. Rather, positive feelings related to an act performed in part for ethical reasons may extend to the larger stretch of time in which these momentary, individual acts are contained. This connection may represent, as researchers have begun to conclude, an important motivation for acting on ethical values while shopping. And these findings make sense in light of contemporary “practice theory,” which holds that seemingly discrete acts, like putting a locally sourced or fair trade product in one’s grocery cart, ought to be seen as embedded in, and both influencing and influenced by, multi-element practices like going shopping for food (Reckwitz 2002; Warde 2005). But further research with more diverse populations, and more kinds of ethical goods, is needed before the complex contours of the relationship between ethical consumption and the hedonic content of everyday shopping can be considered fully drawn.

Values and Resources as Determinants of Ethical Consumption

Over the past 15 years, explanations of why people engage in ethical consumption have generally focused on the ethical and political views and the socioeconomic resources of consumers. Ethical consumption, most studies have concluded, occurs when consumers are knowledgeable and concerned about social and environmental problems (Austgulen 2016; Baek 2010; Elliott 2013; Gotlieb and Cheema 2017; Maniatis 2016; Shah et al. 2007), can afford the price premium typically associated with “ethical” products (Baek 2010; Gotlieb and Cheema 2017; Micheletti and Stolle 2005; Neilson and Paxton 2010; Newman and Bartels 2011), and are able to draw on pre-existing repertoires of political action to form an understanding of themselves as effective political actors in the realm of personal consumption (Baek 2010; Baumann, Engman, and Johnston 2015; Willis and Schor 2012). Implicit in this substantial body of research is an underlying appreciation of consumption activity as a species of “planned behavior” or “reasoned action” (Addis

and Holbrook 2001; Shobeiri et al. 2016; Yazdanpanah and Forouzani 2015). When questions about ethical consumption are strained through a model of the consumer as rational satisfier of preferences, the ethical consumer appears as a person who, having determined that her normative convictions would recommend that she purchase products with particular qualities, will go ahead and do so if she possesses the requisite socioeconomic resources and is accustomed to thinking of herself as a political actor.

Ethical values, socioeconomic resources, and political experience have thus emerged as central to efforts to account for ethical consumption. Two aspects of existing studies, however, suggest a more complex and even ambiguous relationship between these factors and that which they are being called upon to explain. First, there is substantial variation in the frequency with which consumers, both educated and not, practice ethical consumption—and reasons for this variation are not well understood (Schoolman 2016). Most major periodic surveys—such as the General Social Survey and Eurobarometer—do not inquire whether individuals buy products for ethical or political reasons more than once or twice a year. But studies using proprietary data have found that approximately 10 to 15 percent of all consumers regularly incorporate social or environmental concerns into purchasing decisions—a number that suggests that many people with a college degree are sporadic but not regular ethical consumers (Cowe and Williams 2000; Tallontire, Erdenechimeg, and Blowfield 2001). Similarly, studies of university students in Brazil, Canada, and Europe (Barcellos, Teixeira, and Venturini 2014; Stolle, Hooghe, and Micheletti 2005) have found that while large pluralities or a majority had chosen products based on ethical considerations at least once in the past year, between just 10 and 20 percent took political or ethical reasons into account “always,” “often,” or “nearly every time they go shopping.”

Most importantly, the absolute amount of variation in ethical consumption explained in existing models ranges from small to, at best, modest. In one study that used data from a survey specifically designed to examine determinants of ethical consumption, socioeconomic variables explained less than 15 percent of the variance in “political consumerism” (Shah et al. 2007). In other studies, between 5 and 10 percent of the variance in purchasing “green” or “socially responsible” products was explained by all factors (Andersen and Tobiasen 2004; Diamantopoulos et al. 2003). Models utilized in some more recent studies have been expanded to encompass such factors as political engagement and ways of engaging with online communities, and the addition of these variables has led to as much as 30 percent of variance in political consumerism being explained (Gotlieb and Cheema 2017; Willis and Schor 2012). But at this point, existing survey-based research, with its preponderant focus on the values, resources, and political practices of individual consumers, has not fully accounted for variation in ethical consumption.

The Role of Hedonic Experience

Perhaps because the values, resources, and political participation of consumers seem ultimately insufficient as explanators of ethical consumption, a new direction has received increasing attention from researchers. Since the early 1980s, theorists of consumer psychology and consumer culture have pushed to accord the *experience* of consumption—“fantasies, feelings, and fun,” in the memorable words of Morris B. Holbrook and Elizabeth C. Hirschman (1982)—a status equal to that of actual product features in the conscious and unconscious decision-making calculus of consumers. It was Kate Soper (2007, 2008), however, who first offered a robust articulation of the idea that consumption decisions made ostensibly with the public interest in mind might show roots equally deep in an “alternative” sense of enjoyment on a purely emotional level. For Soper, pondering the ethical implications of typical shopping errands was less interesting, and a shallower example of “alternative hedonism,” than reducing one’s shopping altogether. But Soper allowed that ethical consumption while shopping could proceed from both altruistic motives and a fortifying sense of pride, moral satisfaction, and social belonging. More recently, building on

the notion of “alternative hedonism,” a number of studies have made the argument that the propensity of a given consumer to engage in acts of ethical consumption may depend not just on what this person thinks about the issue at hand, or what he or she can afford to spend, but also on how the very act of buying an “ethical” product might *feel* (Davies and Gutsche 2016; Salazar, Oerlemans, and van Stroe-Biezen 2013; Shobeiri et al. 2016). What might be termed the “hedonic turn” in theorizing about ethical consumption takes seriously the notion that people tend to do what feels good, at least in part *because* it feels good, in addition to whatever wider social benefits might also be envisioned.

The precise nature of the relationship between hedonic feelings and apparently public-spirited consumption practice has been specified in a range of ways by those researchers who have begun to make it a centerpiece of expanded explanations of ethical consumption. For instance, Jong-Chul Oh and Sung-Joon Yoon (2014) separate “positive affection”—described as the experience of “positive emotions, such as happiness, pleasure or delight”—from “altruism,” “attitude,” and “subjective norms” in their model of factors contributing to the intention to engage in ethical consumption (p. 282). Similarly, Riadh Ladhari and Nina Michèle Tchetgna (2017) theorize that people who experience pride, joy, happiness, and enthusiasm from buying fair trade products will be more likely to actually pursue this action, when compared to people with similar values and resources but a diminished emotional connection to buying fair trade. In both these studies, hedonic satisfaction, measured in a number of different ways, was found to be strongly associated with the intent to engage in ethical consumption.

A principal preoccupation of researchers involved in developing Soper’s hypothesis, and especially in extending the idea of alternative hedonism to typical shopping routines, has been to delineate as specifically as possible what might give rise to positive emotions associated with purchasing ethical products. One possibility, of course, is that virtue is its own reward—that people feel good about doing something which they believe might do good in the world (Davies and Gutsche 2016; Hain 2017; Perera, Auger, and Klein 2018; Szmigin and Carrigan 2005). However, consumers might derive a sense of pride in their own authenticity or even a kind of “thievish joy” (Walz, Hingston, and Andehn 2014) from seeing themselves as resisting a dominant capitalist paradigm. Ethnographic work in stores such as Whole Foods Market has emphasized the sensory pleasures of shopping environments that combine material abundance with warm assurances that patrons are making the world a better place (Johnston 2008; Johnston and Szabo 2010). But ethical consumption likely has the greatest hedonic promise, according to several studies, when consumers anticipate gaining, or believe themselves to be living up to, the approbation of peers (Atkinson 2012; Elliott 2013; Salazar et al. 2013; Schaefer and Crane 2001). Whether the peers that consumers have in mind consist of friends, family, or like-minded participants in disperse, online communities, the feeling that one’s esteem for others might be returned in kind represents a potent source of emotional satisfaction. This hedonic reward, in turn, has newly been portrayed as a key—and, in many prior survey-based studies, overlooked—driver of engaging in often expensive and sometimes inconvenient acts of ethical consumption.

Do People Who Engage in Ethical Consumption Enjoy Shopping More?

Recent work on hedonic emotion and ethical consumption, as exemplified by the studies discussed above, has focused on the idea that the former could lead to the latter in the context of decisions about whether to buy specific products, like fair trade coffee or clothing. In other words, the main hypothesis being developed and tested has been that people who associate ethical consumption, in the context of particular objects and acts, with emotional gratification, are more likely, other things being equal, to actually engage in ethical consumption.

At least one theoretical approach to understanding the realm of personal consumption, however, could be read as suggesting that this laser-like focus on the hedonic appeal of discrete acts of ethical purchasing risks missing the forest for the trees. According to authors working within the framework of practice theory, actions that appear distinct, or which at least can be analyzed independently of one another, are often better understood as interrelated elements of larger “practices” that give this school of thought its name (Giddens 1984; Reckwitz 2002; Warde 2005). In Andreas Reckwitz’s (2002) oft-cited definition, a “practice” is a “routinized type of behavior which consists of several elements, interconnected to one another,” and which “represents a pattern which can be filled out by a multitude of single and often unique actions reproducing the practice” (pp. 249–50). Thus, when Elizabeth Shove (2003) writes about sustainability challenges presented by washing machines, her motivating question is not simply how often an environmentally minded person might perform the seemingly discrete action of washing one’s clothes. Rather, Shove puts the act of running the washer in dialogue with other actions related to how clothes are worn, how appliances and detergents are chosen, and how household labor is allotted. The emergent aggregate of all these actions, and others, Shove writes, is the *practice* of laundering. And this overall practice stretches well beyond what might be of primary interest to those worried about its impact on the environment.

Practice theory lays the groundwork for a provocative further implication of the main conclusion so far supported by hedonic turn studies of ethical consumption. Arriving at this implication involves a two-step argument, and in outlining this argument, I will focus on everyday shopping for food, as that is the subject of the data considered later in this paper. First, it can be argued that everyday shopping for food—grocery shopping—constitutes a practice in the sense of Reckwitz’s definition. To be sure, there is significant variation in the broad outlines of shopping routines across individual consumers—differences that are in many cases related to gender, household size, income, or employment status (Cairns and Johnston 2015; Koch 2012). Nor is the routine of grocery shopping performed exactly the same way each time by a given person. But it is not wrong to say that most people have a small number of stores where they go food shopping most of the time and a certain routine about when shopping happens and how one goes about buying foodstuffs once one is actually in a particular store (DeVault 1991; Koch 2012; Koch and Sprague 2014; MacKendrick 2018). Grocery shopping is a routine built up of many parts—not just actions in the store but also actions taken to plan meals and errands, as well as material objects and ways of thinking and feeling. Moreover, grocery shopping is not necessarily more complex than other concepts that researchers have treated and analyzed as practices (Halkier, Katz-Gerro, and Martens 2011). Like “motoring” for work or pleasure (Warde 2005), cooking and washing (Shove and Warde 2002; Truninger 2011), and managing waste in an office setting (Hargreaves 2011), everyday shopping for food can be understood as a “practice” as generally conceptualized within practice theory.

Second, thinking of grocery shopping as a routinized assemblage of actions, emotions, and objects makes it possible also to think of actions specifically related to buying ethical food as “elements”—to again use Reckwitz’s terminology—that are nested, for ethical consumers, within this larger practice. And when discrete acts of ethical consumption are situated within an overall practice in this way, a new hypothesis begins to take shape. Specifically, if buying ethical products is associated with positive, hedonic emotions (for a number of reasons), then it may be that people who regularly engage in ethical consumption actually *enjoy shopping more*, other things being equal, than people who do not. In other words, emotions that existing studies suggest are associated with individual acts of ethical consumption may also become bound up with the shopping practices with respect to which these acts constitute just one or a few elements out of many.

In sum, when seen through the lens of practice theory, it would appear that positive hedonic emotions associated with or leading to discrete acts of ethical consumption ought also be

apparent within the larger practice—grocery shopping—in which these acts are embedded. This is an hypothesis that, while foreshadowed in some qualitative studies, has not been explicitly articulated or evaluated in survey-based studies that I have, above, placed within the hedonic turn literature. But it is a reasonable conclusion to draw, and an hypothesis which would lend itself to quantitative testing, when hedonic turn research into ethical consumption is considered in light of what practice theory holds to be true about the embeddedness of actions within larger routines.

A Contrasting Idea: Stressful Ethical Consumption

It is the goal of the rest of this paper to evaluate the hypothesis that ethical consumption is associated with more enjoyable shopping. Before continuing to the analysis of survey data, however, it is important to draw attention to a second group of studies that portrays the hedonic content of ethical consumption quite differently from most research discussed so far. In 2008, Connolly and Prothero showed that being a “green consumer” can involve healthy emotional doses not just of moral satisfaction but also of indecision, fear, and even despondency over whether one’s actions might actually make a difference. The simple act of deciding on dog food, for one interviewee in Connolly and Prothero’s study, calls up uncomfortable images of suffering broiler hens. This person ultimately purchases dog food made with free-range chicken, but admits to feeling “really stupid” for doing so (Connolly and Prothero 2008:133).

Similar to Connolly and Prothero’s idea of “stressful ethical consumption,” a number of studies have raised pointed and important questions about whether ethical consumption might be more—or less—than simply an empowering and enjoyable thing to do. People who want to buy more expensive and hard-to-attain ethical goods feel badly about themselves—and worried for their families—when they cannot always afford or spare the time to do so (Brown 2009; Cairns and Johnston 2015; Koch 2012). Understanding why some products may be better for the environment opens up the unsettling realization that one may have little choice but to continue to buy many other things that pose dangers not just to the planet but also to one’s personal health (MacKendrick 2018; Pecoraro and Uusitalo 2014; Valor, Antonetti, and Carrero 2018). Discerning truly “green” products from green pretenders in real-world retail settings is laborious and difficult (Johnstone and Tan 2015; Schoolman 2016), especially for people who may be skeptical about the environmental wisdom of buying any kind of new product, rather than simply doing without (Fuentes 2014). And real-world retail settings tend to heighten the challenge of making an “ethical choice,” as the ubiquity of greenwashing and sheer number of products on offer can easily overwhelm (AbiGhannam and Atkinson 2016; Lehner 2015).

The combined message of all of these studies represents a powerful reason to question the hypothesis arrived at in the previous section: that engaging in ethical consumption might make everyday shopping more enjoyable. In fact, given the many challenges that ethical consumption clearly poses, it is at least possible that the opposite may be true: the more one makes ethical consumption a priority, the more unpleasant everyday shopping might become.

So far in this paper, two main groups of studies have been discussed: those that link ethical consumption to hedonic reward, on one hand, and those concerned with “stressful ethical consumption,” on the other. Juxtaposed with one another, these efforts give rise to different and dueling ideas about how being an ethical consumer might shape the overall emotional content, the “feel,” of everyday shopping. One way to move this debate forward would be to use survey data to attempt to characterize the relationship between ethical consumption of some particular category of good and how people experience everyday shopping for this good. The goal of the rest of this paper is to undertake this kind of investigation.

Research Design

Source and Scope of Data

The hypothesized connection between ethical consumption and increased enjoyment of shopping was tested using survey data collected at a large, public university in the Midwestern United States. Specifically, from 2009 to 2011, the Graham Sustainability Institute at the University of Michigan coordinated an “integrated assessment” of university policies and practices related to campus sustainability. As part of the integrated assessment process, it was decided that indicators were needed not just for the environmental impacts of large-scale institutional actions, but also for the “culture of sustainability” on campus. On the basis of this recommendation, the Graham Institute launched the Sustainability Cultural Indicators Program (SCIP)—a multiyear effort to collect information on knowledge, dispositions, and behaviors related to sustainability.

The centerpiece of SCIP was a longitudinal survey of faculty, staff, and students at the university’s main campus in Ann Arbor, a small city about an hour southwest of Detroit. The SCIP survey was designed to encompass several distinct areas of sustainability, including transportation, energy, waste, and food. For the first wave of the SCIP survey, data were collected from random samples of both full-time undergraduate and graduate students and benefits-eligible staff and faculty at all schools, departments, and offices. Respondents completed the survey online during the month of October, 2012. Potential survey respondents were contacted several times through email and direct mail. Response rates for the three categories of respondents were relatively high: 40.6 percent for all students, 39.8 percent for staff, and 48.9 percent for faculty.

Dependent Variable

So far in this paper, it has been discussed how different groups of existing studies can be seen as arguing both for (the hedonic turn school) and against (the stressful ethical consumption school) a positive relationship between ethical consumption and enjoyable shopping. Owing to the topics covered in the SCIP survey, empirical work for this paper is aimed at ascertaining the actual nature of this relationship specifically in the realm of food. That is, the analyses described below are motivated by the question: Do people who engage in ethical consumption of food enjoy everyday grocery shopping more than people who do not? An item was included in the 2012 SCIP survey with the specific goal of capturing the emotional experience of shopping for groceries. All respondents—with the exception of undergraduate students living in university residence halls—were asked, “In general, how do you feel about food shopping?” and then directed to select one of three statements: (1) “I enjoy food shopping,” (2) “I don’t feel either positively or negatively about food shopping,” and (3) “I don’t like going food shopping.” The dependent variable for all analyses for this study is a binary (dummy) variable for whether a respondent stated that he or she “enjoys food shopping”; the reference group therefore consists of all respondents who stated that they feel either neutrally or negatively about food shopping. As the dependent variable being considered is binary in nature, its relationship to various independent variables was evaluated using logistic regression models.

Independent Variables of Main Interest

SCIP collected data on a wide range of practices and behaviors related to sustainability. For this paper, because the dependent variable described above captures sentiments around food shopping, the main explanatory variables used in the predictive models are those which were designed to capture whether and how often respondents purchased different kinds of “ethical food.”

The SCIP survey asked each respondent—again, excepting undergraduate students living in university residence halls, and therefore taking meals at university facilities—how often, over the past year, he or she had bought each of five different kinds of food: (1) “locally grown or locally processed food,” (2) “organic food,” (3) “fair trade food,” (4) “food from humanely treated animals,” and (5) “fish from sustainable fisheries.” For each question, respondents were able to choose among the following answers: “never,” “rarely,” “sometimes,” “most of the time or always,” or “I don’t know.” For humane animal products and sustainable fish, respondents who self-identified as noneaters of animal products for moral or dietary reasons were not asked to provide an answer regarding purchasing frequency. These five survey items provided the basis for five different categorical (ordinal) variables, each of which represented the purchasing practices of respondents with respect to one kind of ethical food. Consequently, five different regression models were constructed; in each model, the concept of ethical consumption was operationalized using one, and only one at a time, of these five categorical variables. In addition, a sixth regression model was constructed in which the main independent variable was an ethical consumption index calculated by taking the mean of the five variables for purchasing each separate type of ethical food.

In each of the first five regression models for this paper, the relationship of the binary dependent variable to the categorical independent variable for ethical consumption is evaluated by comparing how the predicted log of the odds (or odds) of being someone who “enjoy[s] food shopping” changes for each possible value of the ethical consumption variable, relative to the baseline value for this variable. The presence of an “I don’t know” option for the ethical consumption questions made determining the appropriate baseline value for these variables less straightforward than is usually the case. Three possible approaches were explored. First, respondents who selected “I don’t know” for a particular ethical consumption question (say, buying local food) were treated as missing data for the corresponding variable and therefore were not included in the regression model where this variable was used. However, in examining survey results, it was apparent that a substantial number of respondents chose the “I don’t know” option for the ethical consumption questions. For instance, among the sample of 2,166 faculty and staff, 33 respondents indicated they “never” bought local food, while 89 respondents marked “I don’t know”; 202 respondents “never” bought fair trade food, against 556 who marked “I don’t know”; and 131 “never” bought humane food, against 577 who marked “I don’t know.” Regression models using the coding scheme just described, then, had significantly fewer cases to work with, as many respondents were dropped from consideration. More importantly, from a conceptual point of view, respondents who specifically reported that they “[did] not know” how often they engaged in ethical consumption were arguably revealing something important about their consumption practices. Dropping these respondents from analyses would have meant ignoring this information.

With these shortcomings in mind, the second approach to using the ethical consumption independent variables was to treat “I don’t know” as the baseline category. Results from all five regression models using this approach revealed no significant difference in the odds of “enjoy[ing] food shopping” between people who reported never engaging in a particular kind of ethical consumption and people who reported not knowing. Moreover, when “I don’t know” was treated as the baseline category, the odds of enjoying food shopping *were* significantly different for people who reported either “sometimes” or “most of the time or always” engaging in a particular kind of ethical consumption for four out of the five regression models. Based on these results, a compelling case can be made that people who selected the “I don’t know” option for, for instance, buying local food were *not* people who make an effort to buy local food with some regularity but are simply not sure if they are actually accomplishing this objective. Rather, the “I don’t know” group appears more likely to be people who *do not* regularly make an effort to buy local food, but selected “I don’t know” to account for the possibility that, in their estimation, they might sometimes end up buying local food, if only by accident.

With these arguments in mind, the third approach to using the ethical consumption independent variables was to recode “never” and “I don’t know” responses as a unitary “‘never’ or ‘I don’t know’” response. This combined category was then used as the baseline value in regression models. This approach recognizes the conceptual overlap between these possible responses, while permitting larger sample sizes. Models using this approach are reported below. Models using the first two approaches are included as online Supplementary Material to this paper, so that the full range of ways to interpret these data can be considered. The sixth regression model, where the independent variable for ethical consumption is a continuous index, is based on the coding scheme used in the first five models.

Control Variables

Additional variables were included in multivariate models to account for the possibility that food shopping might be more enjoyable for people who are better positioned, in terms of socioeconomic resources, and who may have fewer familial responsibilities and demands on their time. Importantly, some survey questions were asked of faculty and staff, but not of students, and so not all control variables were available for all respondents. For this reason, regression models were estimated and are reported first for faculty and staff and then separately for students.

For faculty and staff, the potentially confounding effects of several factors were taken into account. First, it is reasonable to hypothesize that shopping might be more enjoyable and less stressful for people with a relatively high degree of financial freedom—people who are not worried about simply making ends meet. Second, women continue to be subjected to strong social expectations around planning and conducting the family’s shopping. For many women, these expectations not only contribute to significant emotional stress but also take a physical toll when demanding shopping routines are sandwiched between other layers of one’s personal and professional life (Cairns and Johnston 2015; DeVault 1991; Koch 2012; MacKendrick 2018). Third, Kate Cairns and Josée Johnston (2015) in particular argue that sensory pleasures sometimes associated with shopping can be diminished when the needs, desires, and preferences of other people—especially family members—must be kept in the forefront of one’s mind. In other words, shopping for a family, with all the responsibilities entailed in that role, is a qualitatively different experience than shopping for oneself.

Based on these considerations, regression models for faculty and staff included categorical control variables for (1) household income (\$99,000 or less; between \$100,000 and \$199,000; \$200,000 or more), (2) household size (one-person household, two-person household, three-person household, four-person household or larger), and (3) age (29 years or younger; 30–49 years; 50 years or older). A dummy variable for gender (identifying as female) was also included. These measures of the concepts just discussed are not ideal; perhaps most significantly, the survey question about household size did not enable respondents to distinguish between children, partners, and other household members, and no other question about marital status or number of children was included in the survey. I discuss in greater detail the limitations of these measures later in this paper. Among the control variables for faculty and staff regression models, age and gender were also available to be included in regression models for students.

Finally, it was important to account, as far as possible, for the fact that the experience of shopping can be shaped by the physical environment in which it takes place. Generally speaking, feelings of engaging in acts of leisure are highly context-dependent: the same sorts of activities may feel like a chore in one kind of place, but a treat in another (Henderson and Frelke 2000). With respect to the question occupying this paper, it seems reasonable to expect that people might enjoy food shopping more when the store being patronized is itself seen as beautiful, welcoming, attentive, and selective, as opposed to bland, dull, stressful, or worse (Cairns and Johnston 2015; Connolly and Prothero 2008; Johnston 2008; Koch 2012). With the confounding potential, with

respect to inquiries into the hedonic experience of grocery shopping, of store environments in mind, all respondents were asked to name the “store or market” where they shopped for food most often. More than 120 unique venues were named by respondents, but the vast majority of respondents—more than 95 percent—indicated that they mostly shopped for food in one of about 20 different stores. On the basis of this survey item, a categorical variable was created, which controlled for food shopping in 12 different stores and kinds of stores; the reference category was the Kroger grocery store chain, which was the preferred venue for food shopping of 27.4 percent of faculty and staff.

All analyses were carried out using Stata/MP 15. Before finalizing models, a number of possible interaction effects were considered—for instance, the relationship of shopping venue to shopping enjoyability might vary by age or gender. Accounting for potential interaction effects did not substantively change the main findings of regression models, however, with respect to the main effects of ethical consumption on the shopping experience. For this reason, interaction effects were not included in final analyses.

Results

Table 1 reports descriptive statistics for all categorical variables; the mean of the ethical food consumption index, the only noncategorical variable, was 2.494 for faculty and staff and 2.153 for students, and its standard deviation was .725 and .775, respectively. Table 2 reports the results of regression analyses for faculty and staff. Table 3 reports the results of regression analyses for students. Model 1a (in Table 2) and Model 1b (in Table 3) report the results of models where the main explanatory variable of interest is the frequency of purchasing local food; Model 2a and Model 2b report results of the same models, substituting organic food for local; Model 3a and Model 3b, substituting fair trade food; Model 4a and Model 4b, substituting humane food; and Model 5a and Model 5b, substituting sustainable fish. Model 6a and Model 6b report the results of models where the main explanatory variable of interest is the ethical food consumption index. For the purpose of balancing clarity with brevity in the presentation of findings, only the saturated regression models are included in this paper.

Results of all analyses support the hypothesis that purchasing “ethical” or “sustainable” foods is associated with experiencing shopping for food as enjoyable. Specifically, regression models indicate that buying any type of ethical food “most of the time or always,” and all but one type of ethical food “sometimes,” is associated with increased likelihood of feeling positively about food shopping, generally speaking. For instance, being a faculty or staff member who “sometimes” purchases local food (Model 1a), as opposed to being someone who either “never” purchases local food or “doesn’t know” how often one makes this kind of purchase, is associated with a .467 increase ($p < .05$) in the natural log of the odds—equivalent to a 59.5 percent increase in the odds—of being someone who also enjoys food shopping. Respondents who buy local food “most of the time or always” are even more likely—for this group, the increase in the log of the odds is 1.020 ($p < .001$), and in the odds is 177.4 percent—to enjoy food shopping. The direction and statistical significance of this relationship holds true for all types of ethical food. For all respondents to the SCIP survey, people who “most of the time or always” buy local, organic, fair trade, or humane food, or fish from sustainable fisheries, are more likely to experience grocery shopping as a hedonically enjoyable activity. Moreover, for each additional point on the ethical food consumption index, faculty and staff are 68.5 percent more likely, and students 51.1 percent more likely, to profess to enjoy everyday shopping for food.

Somewhat surprisingly, only one of the socioeconomic control variables included in regression analyses for faculty and staff was consistently and strongly significant in the expected direction across models. Regardless of which type of food was being considered as the object of

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics (All Variables Are Categorical).

	Faculty and staff		Students	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Feelings about shopping				
Negative	448	21	306	13.2
Neutral	771	36.1	687	29.5
Positive	919	43	1,332	57.3
Buys local food				
Never or does not know	120	5.6	406	19.7
Rarely	176	8.2	362	17.6
Sometimes	1,417	66.3	1,046	50.8
Most of the time or always	424	19.8	246	11.9
Buys organic food				
Never or does not know	144	6.8	342	16.6
Rarely	428	20.1	434	21.1
Sometimes	1,147	53.8	963	46.7
Most of the time or always	414	19.4	321	15.6
Buys fair trade food				
Never or does not know	750	35.3	858	42
Rarely	394	18.6	449	22
Sometimes	827	39	607	29.7
Most of the time or always	152	7.2	128	6.3
Buys humane food				
Never or does not know	701	34.7	871	45.2
Rarely	256	12.7	372	19.3
Sometimes	771	38.1	496	25.7
Most of the time or always	295	14.6	188	9.8
Buys sustainable fish				
Never or does not know	794	41.3	967	56.5
Rarely	260	13.5	308	18
Sometimes	639	33.3	329	19.2
Most of the time or always	228	11.9	109	6.4
Age				
29 years or younger	235	11.1	2,192	95.4
Between 30 and 49 years	1,078	51.1	103	4.5
50 years or older	798	37.8	2	0.1
Sex				
Male	937	45.1	1,096	47.1
Female	1,142	54.9	1,232	52.9
Household income				
\$99,000 or less	950	46.8	n/a	n/a
Between \$100,000 and \$199,000	721	35.5	n/a	n/a
\$200,000 or more	360	17.7	n/a	n/a
Household size				
One-person household	293	14	n/a	n/a
Two-person household	734	35	n/a	n/a
Three-person household	416	19.8	n/a	n/a
Four-person household or more	655	31.2	n/a	n/a

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Group	Faculty and staff		Students	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Undergraduate student	n/a	n/a	1,909	82
Graduate student	n/a	n/a	419	18
Staff	1,067	49.8	n/a	n/a
Faculty	1,076	50.2	n/a	n/a
Shops for food mostly at				
Kroger	588	27.4	910	39.1
“Big box” retail store (Walmart, Target, or Meijer)	514	24	860	36.9
Whole Foods Market	188	8.8	94	4
Busch’s	235	11	34	1.5
Trader Joe’s	109	5.1	113	4.9
Membership warehouse store (Costco or Sam’s Club)	47	2.2	54	2.3
Hiller’s Market	89	4.2	21	0.9
Co-op grocery store	55	2.6	45	1.9
Small, independent grocery store located in the city of Ann Arbor	65	3	33	1.4
Plum Market	74	3.5	7	0.3
Farmers’ market, CSA, or farmstand	36	1.7	30	1.3
Other store (including drugstores)	97	4.5	80	3.4

Note. CSA = community-supported agriculture.

ethical purchasing, older people were less likely than younger people to describe themselves as enjoying food shopping. For instance, among faculty and staff, respondents between 30 and 49 years were between 55 and 60 percent less likely (across Models 1a–5a) than respondents aged 29 years or younger to say that they enjoyed shopping. The age variable had a similar relationship with enjoying shopping among students, although there were too few students in the oldest age category to estimate an effect. But among faculty and staff, neither identifying as female nor household size had a statistically significant effect, at the $p < .05$ level, on the probability of enjoying shopping. The sole exception to this general finding was the largest household group (four people or more) in Model 5a. In Models 1a, 4a, and 6a, however, the effect of shopping for the largest households was “significant” at the $p < .1$ level. This result is suggestive of a relationship that, at least for this population, may be relatively weak, but in the expected direction. Female students, unlike female faculty and staff, were significantly more likely across all models to say that they enjoyed food shopping.

Finally, faculty and staff who shopped for food mainly at Whole Foods Market, farmers’ markets, farmstands, or through a community-supported agriculture (CSA) membership were all more likely than people who shopped mainly at Kroger, according to most models, to experience food shopping as enjoyable. The same was true, in two models, for people who shopped mainly at Plum Market—a Whole Foods Market competitor with a several locations in southeast Michigan.

Table 2. Regression Models for Faculty and Staff.

	Model 1a		Model 2a		Model 3a		Model 4a		Model 5a		Model 6a	
	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds Ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio
Local food												
Buys ethical food												
Rarely	0.157 (0.268)	1.170 (0.313)	0.093 (0.215)	1.097 (0.236)	0.266† (0.137)	1.304† (0.179)	0.424** (0.157)	1.527** (0.240)	0.035 (0.158)	1.036 (0.164)		
Sometimes	0.467* (0.220)	1.595* (0.351)	0.387† (0.200)	1.473† (0.295)	0.571*** (0.116)	1.771*** (0.205)	0.422*** (0.117)	1.525*** (0.179)	0.483*** (0.120)	1.622*** (0.194)		
Most of the time or always	1.020*** (0.243)	2.774*** (0.674)	0.582* (0.230)	1.790* (0.412)	0.984*** (0.210)	2.674*** (0.562)	0.742*** (0.167)	2.100*** (0.351)	0.830*** (0.174)	2.292*** (0.399)		
Ethical food consumption index												
Age												
Between 30 and 49 years	-0.574*** (0.162)	0.563*** (0.091)	-0.586*** (0.161)	0.557*** (0.090)	-0.518*** (0.162)	0.595*** (0.096)	-0.542** (0.167)	0.582** (0.097)	-0.609*** (0.178)	0.544*** (0.097)		
50 years or older	-0.742*** (0.169)	0.476*** (0.081)	-0.690*** (0.168)	0.502*** (0.084)	-0.665*** (0.169)	0.514*** (0.087)	-0.594*** (0.173)	0.552*** (0.096)	-0.754*** (0.184)	0.470*** (0.087)		
Female	0.013 (0.096)	1.013 (0.097)	0.047 (0.095)	1.048 (0.100)	0.065 (0.096)	1.067 (0.102)	0.026 (0.099)	1.027 (0.101)	0.115 (0.100)	1.121 (0.112)		
Household income												
Between \$100,000 and \$199,000	-0.166 (0.113)	0.847 (0.096)	-0.182 (0.112)	0.834 (0.094)	-0.205† (0.114)	0.815† (0.093)	-0.161 (0.116)	0.852 (0.099)	-0.162 (0.120)	0.850 (0.102)		
\$200,000 or more	-0.143 (0.147)	0.867 (0.128)	-0.157 (0.147)	0.855 (0.125)	-0.199 (0.148)	0.820 (0.121)	-0.189 (0.151)	0.828 (0.125)	-0.195 (0.154)	0.823 (0.127)		
Household size												
Two-person household	-0.204 (0.151)	0.815 (0.123)	-0.196 (0.150)	0.822 (0.124)	-0.181 (0.152)	0.834 (0.127)	-0.204 (0.157)	0.815 (0.128)	-0.210 (0.161)	0.810 (0.130)		
Three-person household	-0.141 (0.167)	0.869 (0.145)	-0.113 (0.166)	0.893 (0.148)	-0.112 (0.167)	0.894 (0.149)	-0.144 (0.172)	0.866 (0.149)	-0.200 (0.177)	0.818 (0.145)		
Four-person household or more	-0.284† (0.162)	0.752† (0.122)	-0.265 (0.161)	0.767 (0.124)	-0.243 (0.162)	0.785 (0.127)	-0.285† (0.167)	0.752† (0.126)	-0.345* (0.172)	0.709* (0.122)		
Shops for food mostly at												
"Big box" retail store (Walmart, Target, or Meijer)	0.086 (0.129)	1.090 (0.141)	0.091 (0.129)	1.095 (0.141)	0.071 (0.130)	1.074 (0.139)	0.064 (0.132)	1.066 (0.141)	-0.042 (0.138)	0.959 (0.132)		
Whole Foods Market	0.460* (0.185)	1.584* (0.293)	0.422* (0.196)	1.526* (0.300)	0.359† (0.189)	1.431† (0.271)	0.441* (0.198)	1.555* (0.308)	0.387† (0.202)	1.472† (0.298)		

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

	Model 1a		Model 2a		Model 3a		Model 4a		Model 5a		Model 6a	
	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds Ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio
Busch's	0.302 [†] (0.167)	1.353 [†] (0.225)	0.310 [†] (0.166)	1.364 [†] (0.226)	0.275 [†] (0.167)	1.317 [†] (0.220)	0.326 [†] (0.169)	1.386 [†] (0.234)	0.307 [†] (0.174)	1.359 [†] (0.236)	0.273 (0.176)	1.314 (0.232)
Trader Joe's	0.017 (0.224)	1.018 (0.228)	-0.037 (0.225)	0.964 (0.217)	-0.170 (0.228)	0.844 (0.193)	-0.118 (0.235)	0.889 (0.209)	-0.152 (0.237)	0.859 (0.204)	-0.240 (0.243)	0.787 (0.191)
Membership warehouse store (Costco or Sam's Club)	0.469 (0.319)	1.598 (0.510)	0.420 (0.318)	1.523 (0.485)	0.428 (0.319)	1.535 (0.490)	0.580 [†] (0.330)	1.786 [†] (0.589)	0.437 (0.324)	1.548 (0.502)	0.540 (0.337)	1.716 (0.578)
Hillier's Market	0.184 (0.247)	1.202 (0.296)	0.155 (0.246)	1.167 (0.287)	0.093 (0.249)	1.097 (0.273)	0.123 (0.253)	1.131 (0.286)	0.151 (0.256)	1.163 (0.297)	0.044 (0.262)	1.045 (0.273)
Co-op grocery store	0.425 (0.304)	1.529 (0.465)	0.510 [†] (0.306)	1.666 [†] (0.510)	0.329 (0.307)	1.389 (0.427)	0.404 (0.331)	1.498 (0.496)	0.649 [†] (0.342)	1.914 [†] (0.655)	0.359 (0.359)	1.432 (0.515)
Small, independent grocery store located in the city of Ann Arbor	0.354 (0.286)	1.425 (0.407)	0.432 (0.285)	1.540 (0.439)	0.342 (0.289)	1.408 (0.407)	0.352 (0.295)	1.422 (0.419)	0.463 (0.300)	1.589 (0.477)	0.198 (0.309)	1.219 (0.377)
Plum Market	0.570 ^{**} (0.267)	1.768 ^{**} (0.472)	0.604 [†] (0.272)	1.830 [*] (0.498)	0.503 [†] (0.268)	1.653 [†] (0.444)	0.537 [†] (0.275)	1.712 [†] (0.470)	0.389 (0.279)	1.476 (0.412)	0.332 (0.286)	1.394 (0.398)
Farmers' market, CSA, or farmstand	0.764 [†] (0.394)	2.147 [†] (0.846)	1.003 [*] (0.389)	2.726 ^{**} (1.062)	0.916 [*] (0.390)	2.500 ^{**} (0.976)	1.124 [*] (0.438)	3.078 ^{**} (1.348)	0.932 [*] (0.424)	2.540 [*] (1.077)	0.906 [†] (0.467)	2.475 [†] (1.155)
Other store (including drugstores)	0.006 (0.237)	1.006 (0.238)	0.070 (0.236)	1.073 (0.253)	0.100 (0.236)	1.105 (0.261)	0.074 (0.242)	1.077 (0.261)	0.003 (0.243)	1.003 (0.244)	0.062 (0.251)	1.064 (0.267)
Constant	-0.137 (0.276)	0.872 (0.241)	0.011 (0.264)	1.011 (0.267)	-0.017 (0.210)	0.983 (0.207)	-0.012 (0.215)	0.988 (0.212)	0.201 (0.220)	1.222 (0.269)	-0.751 ^{**} (0.278)	0.472 ^{**} (0.131)
Pseudo r ²	.0334	.0334	.0274	.0274	.0348	.0348	.0317	.0317	.0384	.0384	.0441	.0441
Observations	1,976	1,976	1,973	1,973	1,962	1,962	1,874	1,874	1,779	1,779	1,709	1,709

Note. Standard errors in parentheses. CSA = community-supported agriculture.

[†]p < .1. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 3. Regression Models for Students.

	Model 1b		Model 2b		Model 3b		Model 4b		Model 5b		Model 6b	
	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio
Local food												
Organic food												
Fair trade food												
Humane food												
Sustainable fish												
Coef.												
Odds ratio												
Local food	0.331* (0.148)	1.393* (0.206)	0.106 (0.148)	1.112 (0.164)	0.295* (0.121)	1.343* (0.163)	0.067 (0.127)	1.070 (0.136)	0.305* (0.137)	1.356* (0.186)	0.413*** (0.075)	1.511*** (0.113)
Sometimes	0.429*** (0.122)	1.536*** (0.187)	0.554*** (0.132)	1.740*** (0.229)	0.447*** (0.114)	1.564*** (0.179)	0.358*** (0.120)	1.431*** (0.172)	0.459*** (0.138)	1.583*** (0.219)	-0.568* (0.237)	0.567* (0.134)
Most of the time or always	0.873*** (0.189)	2.395*** (0.454)	0.715*** (0.177)	2.044*** (0.363)	0.583*** (0.224)	1.792*** (0.400)	0.402* (0.189)	1.494* (0.283)	0.840*** (0.252)	2.317*** (0.583)	n/a	1.329** (0.139)
Ethical food consumption index												
Age												
Between 30 and 49 years	-0.489* (0.220)	0.613* (0.135)	-0.421† (0.221)	0.656† (0.145)	-0.441* (0.219)	0.643* (0.141)	-0.482* (0.227)	0.618* (0.141)	-0.559* (0.233)	0.572* (0.133)	0.284** (0.105)	0.777* (0.090)
50 years or older	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a			
Female	0.378*** (0.094)	1.459*** (0.137)	0.357*** (0.094)	1.429*** (0.135)	0.394*** (0.093)	1.482*** (0.139)	0.359*** (0.096)	1.432*** (0.138)	0.322** (0.102)	1.380** (0.141)	0.284** (0.105)	1.329** (0.139)
Shops for food mostly at												
"Big box" retail store (Walmart, Target, or Meijer)	-0.180† (0.103)	0.835† (0.086)	-0.173† (0.104)	0.841† (0.087)	-0.160 (0.104)	0.852 (0.088)	-0.164 (0.106)	0.848 (0.090)	-0.281* (0.113)	0.755* (0.085)	-0.252* (0.115)	0.777* (0.090)
Whole Foods Market	0.670* (0.267)	1.954* (0.521)	0.586* (0.271)	1.796* (0.486)	0.673* (0.269)	1.960* (0.527)	0.592* (0.273)	1.808* (0.493)	0.591† (0.305)	1.805† (0.551)	0.429 (0.309)	1.535 (0.474)
Busch's	0.186 (0.388)	1.204 (0.467)	0.009 (0.383)	1.009 (0.386)	0.156 (0.379)	1.169 (0.443)	-0.030 (0.389)	0.970 (0.377)	-0.070 (0.403)	0.933 (0.376)	-0.069 (0.418)	0.933 (0.390)

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

	Model 1b		Model 2b		Model 3b		Model 4b		Model 5b		Model 6b	
	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio	Coef.	Odds ratio
	Local food		Organic food		Fair trade food		Humane food		Sustainable fish		Odds ratio	
Trader Joe's	0.326 (0.226)	1.386 (0.313)	0.262 (0.228)	1.299 (0.296)	0.354 (0.229)	1.424 (0.326)	0.434 [†] (0.239)	1.544 [†] (0.368)	0.172 (0.249)	1.187 (0.296)	0.017 (0.258)	1.017 (0.262)
Membership warehouse store (Costco or Sam's Club)	-0.150 (0.300)	0.860 (0.258)	-0.223 (0.301)	0.800 (0.241)	-0.160 (0.300)	0.852 (0.256)	-0.259 (0.304)	0.772 (0.234)	-0.277 (0.315)	0.758 (0.239)	-0.254 (0.316)	0.776 (0.246)
Hillier's Market	1.310* (0.639)	3.706* (2.367)	1.191 [†] (0.637)	3.289 [†] (2.097)	1.377* (0.638)	3.962* (2.529)	1.215 [†] (0.642)	3.371 [†] (2.165)	0.992 (0.656)	2.696 (1.769)	0.943 (0.658)	2.568 (1.689)
Co-op grocery store	0.605 (0.376)	1.832 (0.689)	1.191 [†] (0.637)	3.289 [†] (2.097)	1.377* (0.638)	3.962* (2.529)	1.215 [†] (0.642)	3.371 [†] (2.165)	0.992 (0.656)	2.696 (1.769)	0.943 (0.658)	2.568 (1.689)
Small, independent grocery store located in the city of Ann Arbor	0.334 (0.396)	1.396 (0.553)	0.299 (0.393)	1.349 (0.531)	0.275 (0.397)	1.316 (0.523)	0.580 (0.428)	1.786 (0.765)	0.463 (0.429)	1.589 (0.682)	0.342 (0.458)	1.408 (0.644)
Plum Market	0.303 (0.775)	1.353 (1.049)	0.149 (0.776)	1.161 (0.901)	0.241 (0.775)	1.272 (0.986)	0.613 (0.877)	1.846 (1.619)	0.290 (0.929)	1.337 (1.242)	0.150 (0.929)	1.162 (1.079)
Farmers' market, CSA, or farmstand	0.412 (0.451)	1.509 (0.680)	0.528 (0.446)	1.695 (0.756)	0.508 (0.450)	1.663 (0.747)	0.899 [†] (0.509)	2.457 [†] (1.249)	0.696 (0.572)	2.006 (1.147)	0.564 (0.571)	1.757 (1.003)
Other store (including drugstores)	-0.081 (0.277)	0.922 (0.255)	-0.140 (0.280)	0.870 (0.243)	-0.100 (0.277)	0.905 (0.251)	0.050 (0.290)	1.051 (0.305)	0.142 (0.310)	1.152 (0.358)	0.107 (0.314)	1.113 (0.349)
Constant	-0.232 [†] (0.125)	0.793 [†] (0.099)	-0.230 [†] (0.131)	0.794 [†] (0.104)	-0.113 (0.102)	0.893 (0.091)	-0.002 (0.104)	0.998 (0.104)	0.069 (0.106)	1.071 (0.113)	-0.601*** (0.178)	0.548*** (0.097)
Pseudo r ²	.0353	.0353	.0376	.0376	.0330	.0330	.0305	.0305	.0357	.0357	.0398	.0398
Observations	2,029	2,029	2,029	2,029	2,013	2,013	1,898	1,898	1,685	1,685	1,630	1,630

Note. Standard errors in parentheses. CSA = community-supported agriculture.
[†]p < .1. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Discussion and Conclusion

As one sociologist has written about why people express political views in different ways, “activists [are] principled actors as well as instrumental ones . . . [and] their instrumental calculations [are] always tempered by their cultural commitments” (Polletta 2008:81). It may as well be said that ethical consumers are emotional actors as well as principled ones, for whom doing right is made easier when it also feels good. Soper, among others, emphasizes that people tend to do what they enjoy, *because* they enjoy it—and that self-interest in one’s own gratification is still self-interest, even if the gratification in question comes from actions whose civic virtue is central to their nature. From this idea, and from like-minded studies associated with what I have termed a “hedonic turn,” springs the central hypothesis explored in this paper. Namely, if ethical consumers have open to them an “alternative” hedonic dimension over and above the hedonistic appeal of consumption in general, then people who regularly purchase ethical products may enjoy shopping more than those who do not.

With this hypothesis in mind, the first and most straightforward contribution of this paper is to offer support for the idea that engaging in ethical consumption may lead to stronger hedonic emotions being associated with shopping, at least where shopping for food is concerned. Indeed, regression results offer fairly strong validation of the implication derived earlier from hedonic turn studies. Across a range of ethical foods, more frequent ethical consumption had a statistically significant, positive relationship with experiencing food shopping as an enjoyable activity, even while controlling for demographic characteristics and shopping venue.

On the whole, the findings of this paper provide justification for continued investigation into the role that emotions and experiences play in motivating and otherwise contributing to ethical consumption. One reason for the potential importance of this avenue of research is its relevance to social movements that seek to bring about social change through shifting how regular people participate in systems of production and consumption, broadly speaking. Advocates of environmentally friendly or fair trade food can do little, for instance, to directly boost the socioeconomic resources of potential consumers. Given these limitations, efforts to lower the price, increase the availability, and improve labeling systems for ethical products have been among the most widespread strategies to promote ethical consumption.

The results of this study suggest that emphasizing the potential of ethical consumption to endow something as quotidian as grocery shopping with an extra layer of hedonically rich experience may be another way to incentivize consumers to incorporate social and environmental concerns into everyday purchasing routines. In this sense, highlighting the personally gratifying aspects of becoming a patron of ethical products may harmonize with a thesis that researchers have explored more widely in the context of ethical consumption *outside* of retail shopping environments. From receiving fresh produce through community-supported agriculture cooperatives (Thompson and Coskuner-Balli 2007) to subscribing to a philosophy of “slow food” (Davolio and Sassatelli 2014), minimizing the environmental and social impacts of meeting material needs has been shown to attract adherents in part for how these undertakings *feel*—in their collective joyfulness, their capacity to delight—as well as for what they might accomplish in the wider world. The relationship proposed in this paper, between enjoying food shopping and buying various forms of ethical food, might be seen as another incremental step toward connecting the dots between the ethics of what we buy and how we feel about shopping.

More broadly, the findings of this paper show the continued importance of the concept of alternative hedonism for theorizing ethical consumption. In her essays, Soper (2007, 2008) offers the example of commuting to work by bicycle rather than by car and learning to value the exercise and fresh air of the former rather than the swiftness and controlled environment of the latter. Implicit in this example is the idea that finding joy in things that benefit other people does not necessarily happen without significant effort; creature comforts are comforting, and they are hard

to give up. Similarly, ethnographic accounts of challenges faced by ethical consumers show that making ethical choices while grocery shopping is a habit that must be consciously cultivated. If Soper's work is any guide, it seems likely that finding new ways to take pleasure in what is initially hard and strange is part of the process of integrating ethical consumption into one's shopping routines. By learning that it feels—or can feel—good to buy ethical products, people turn their internal emotional reward systems toward ends that transcend, paradoxically, “just” feeling good. It is this practice, this powerful but often unconscious link between helping acts and hedonic feelings, whose imprint shapes the survey findings presented above.

Although the quantitative findings of this study are relatively strong, the data and methods used carry important limitations, which ultimately raise questions that can only be resolved through future research. Importantly, the analyses conducted above do not speak conclusively to the issue of the direction of causality, or even if any causal relationship exists between how people experience shopping and whether they engage in ethical consumption. The concept of financial resources, for instance, was operationalized as household income; but this measure does not account for other sources of wealth or other draws on resources that families experience. So, it could still be that survey respondents who reported buying relatively expensive ethical foods—especially organic and fair trade—are also enjoying food shopping more because they have greater resources at their disposal. Or perhaps people who are already predisposed to enjoy food shopping buy ethical food in part because of this fact—and so, the direction of causality hypothesized above would be reversed (Schoolman 2016). The relationship between the two phenomena could also be dialectical and self-reinforcing, with ethical consumption making shopping more enjoyable, which in turn leads people to want to spend more time shopping, which creates more opportunities to practice ethical consumption, until a positive feedback loop develops.

Indeed, questions of causality are notoriously difficult to resolve through analysis of cross-sectional survey data. It is for this reason, among others, that this study has been purposely framed as an effort to open new avenues for thinking about the consequences of the hedonic qualities of ethical consumption. Ideally, future research will be able to build on the theorized mechanisms and exploratory findings discussed above and use a range of data sources to address issues of causality in a thoughtful way.

However, there is another way of looking at the results of this study. Viewed through the lens of practice theory, unsettled questions about causality may appear less an issue in need of resolution than a consequence of the richness of the relationship between the shopping experience and buying ethical products. Moreover, making theoretical space for the complex, even messy way that elements are bound together in practices may represent an important corrective to research that I have characterized above as making a “hedonic turn.” Most hedonic turn studies so far published, because they employ precise measures of consumer attitudes and behaviors in the context of surveys about specific products, risk giving the impression that ethical consumption can be divorced from its context in larger and more intricate shopping routines. But fundamental to practice theory is the idea that discrete acts are embedded in broader practices and that it makes little sense to speak of elements of a practice—whether actions, emotions, thoughts, or material objects—either in isolation from one another or as related through a predictable temporal sequence. Consequently, being an ethical consumer cannot be reduced to those miniscule moments when one actually plucks from the store shelf a product that accords with one's ethical views. Indeed, ethnographic accounts of locavores, “greens,” downshiftners, and other activist consumers (e.g. Carfagna et al. 2014; Lorenzen 2012; Schor 2011) show that being an ethical consumer is better described as a lifestyle of interrelated practices, rather than as a series of discrete, independent choices. What this study suggests is that this lifestyle may include both the particular choices, and, it would seem, a certain general way of feeling about the practice of shopping.

This concluding discussion has so far been devoted to exploring possible implications of study findings. It is also crucial to recognize, however, that modest support for a positive

relationship between ethical consumption and enjoying shopping should not necessarily be taken as any kind of refutation of the concept of “stressful ethical consumption.” Statistically significant effects on the dependent variable for the most committed purchasers of ethical products do not mean that purchasing these products is free of stress or unpleasantness. Indeed, qualitatively rich and theoretically grounded descriptions of the emotional labor involved in raising an “organic child” (Cairns, Johnston, and MacKendrick 2013) or maintaining a “comprehensive routine” of precautionary consumption (MacKendrick 2018) offer visceral evidence that ethical consumption of food can be very stressful. What regression results reported in this study do imply is that for this particular population, people who frequently purchase ethical foods are more likely to enjoy shopping than people who do not. These results, in other words, speak only to relative likelihoods. They do not speak, much less raise objections, to the idea that many committed ethical consumers, when confronted with the realization that no amount of organic food can completely insulate their families from dangerous chemicals, may experience buying ethical products as an undertaking where joy, delight, and pride are layered with fear, guilt, and worry.

Other limitations to the empirical work presented above are specific to the survey instrument used. The subject of this paper is ethical consumption—that is, the practice of intentionally incorporating concerns about social and environmental problems into purchasing decisions. In the strictest sense, however, data from the SCIP survey allow only for investigation of determinants of the *purchase* of ethical products, regardless of the actual *reasons* for which such purchases are made. Local food, for instance, may be preferred for its freshness as well as, or instead of, possible benefits to the community or environment. The measures for ethical consumption used in this paper are quite similar to those used in many other studies cited above (e.g. Ladhari and Tchegna 2017; Oh and Yoon 2014). Ideally, however, future research will be better able to characterize research subjects based on their particular admixture of personal and political-ethical motivations and include appropriate considerations in analyses of quantitative data. In addition, survey respondents were asked in detail about purchasing preferences mainly regarding food and not about other kinds of goods. When feasible, data collected for future studies should be able to shed light on consumption behaviors involving more than just food.

Future survey research into the experience of ethical consumption might also find it valuable to experiment with alternative and perhaps more expansive formulations of an item or items to measure the enjoyability of food shopping. This sort of evolution in survey design might explicitly take as its starting point the idea that the relationship between ethical consumption and enjoyable shopping is likely to be stronger in certain situations or at certain times—and might not exist at all in others. For instance, a question that asked, “In general, how often do you enjoy food shopping?,” and then offered respondents an ordinal list of options, would in theory better capture context-dependent sentiments about shopping. Alternatively, a survey could present a range of scenarios for shopping (e.g. on the weekends; a “big shop”; a short errand; with or without family members accompanying), which could provide the basis for an index of shopping enjoyability.

Finally, the conclusions that can be drawn from this paper are also limited by the nature of the population studied. In particular, the survey population, though diverse, was not representative of U.S. consumers more generally. The median household income in Ann Arbor, a city of approximately 120,000 people, was \$57,697 in 2016, compared to \$55,322 in the United States as a whole. However, residents of Ann Arbor are widely seen as holding progressive views with respect to, among other things, gender equality and other social issues. A surprising finding from the SCIP survey was that, among faculty and staff, women and people with large households did not appear to find food shopping less enjoyable, when previous studies have offered reasons that they might (e.g. Cairns and Johnston 2015). One explanation for this finding could be that social norms that have historically held women responsible for shopping chores, and mothers in particular for family health, may be less extreme in Ann Arbor and places like it.

However, in regression models for students, female students *were* more likely to find food shopping enjoyable, as compared with their male peers. One important difference between students and faculty and staff at the University of Michigan is that while nearly all the latter, as just noted, reside in or near the politically liberal city of Ann Arbor, the former hail from across the Midwest and from many different parts of the country. One explanation for divergent findings for female students, as compared with female faculty and staff, could be that matriculating undergraduates bring with them more conservative views on gender roles and shopping. Specifically, students might be more likely to subscribe, if unconsciously, to the notion that shopping is “women’s work” and unpleasant—for men—to have to do. If plausible, however, this explanation is at present speculative. As with the main findings regarding ethical consumption, secondary findings regarding the relationship of gender and family roles to the experience of food shopping require further exploration with datasets encompassing a wider array of communities and individuals.

As multinational corporations have grown in influence, and as governments have stepped away from regulatory roles, policymakers, advocates, and many academics have called on individuals to imbue ostensibly “personal” behaviors with public purpose. From free-trade coffee to hybrid cars, few such areas of personal life have drawn more attention than decisions about what to buy and where to shop. This paper continues a “hedonic turn” in ethical consumption research by offering, perhaps for the first time, survey-based evidence that people who engage in ethical consumption may enjoy shopping more, other things being equal, than people who do not. In light of limitations just discussed, these conclusions must be seen as preliminary. Nevertheless, this paper makes clear that it is far from fruitless to ask how being an ethical consumer—“doing right”—might be related to “feeling good” while engaged in everyday consumption activities.

Acknowledgments

The author gratefully acknowledges the support of John Callewaert, Bob Marans, Drew Horning, and the Graham Institute at the University of Michigan, in particular for their willingness to include items pertaining to how people experience shopping on the original SCIP survey questionnaire.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

Ethan D. Schoolman  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4745-1362>

Supplemental Material

Supplemental material for this article is available online.

References

- AbiGhannam, Niveen and Lucy Atkinson. 2016. “Good Green Mothers Consuming their Way through Pregnancy: Roles of Environmental Identities and Information Seeking in Coping with the Transition.” *Consumption Markets and Culture* 19(5):451–74.
- Addis, Michela and Morris B. Holbrook. 2001. “On the Conceptual Link between Mass Customisation and Experiential Consumption: An Explosion of Subjectivity.” *Journal of Consumer Behaviour* 1(1): 50–66.

- Andersen, Jorgen Goul and Mette Tobiasen. 2004. "Who Are These Political Consumers Anyway? Survey Evidence from Denmark." Pp. 203–22 in *Politics, Products, and Markets: Exploring Political Consumerism, Past and Present*, edited by Michele Micheletti, Dietlind Stolle, and Andreas Follesdal. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Atkinson, Lucy. 2012. "Buying In to Social: Change How Private Consumption Choices Engender Concern for the Collective." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 644(1):191–206.
- Austgulen, Marthe H. 2016. "Environmentally Sustainable Textile Consumption—What Characterizes the Political Textile Consumers?" *Journal of Consumer Policy* 39(4):441–66.
- Baek, Young Min. 2010. "To Buy or Not to Buy: Who Are Political Consumers? What Do They Think and How Do They Participate?" *Political Studies* 58(5):1065–86.
- Barcellos, Marcia D., Caio M. Teixeira, and Jonas C. Venturini. 2014. "Personal Values Associated with Political Consumption: An Exploratory Study with University Students in Brazil." *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 38(2):207–16.
- Baumann, Shyon, Athena Engman, and Josée Johnston. 2015. "Political Consumption, Conventional Politics, and High Cultural Capital." *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 39(5):413–21.
- Brown, Keith R. 2009. "The Social Dynamics and Durability of Moral Boundaries." *Sociological Forum* 24(4):854–76.
- Cairns, Kate and Josée Johnston. 2015. *Food and Femininity*. London, England: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Cairns, Kate, Josée Johnston, and Norah MacKendrick. 2013. "Feeding the 'Organic Child': Mothering through Ethical Consumption." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 13(2):97–118.
- Carfagna, Lindsey B., Emilie A. Dubois, Connor Fitzmaurice, Monique Y. Ouimette, Juliet B. Schor, Margaret Willis, and Thomas Laidley. 2014. "An Emerging Eco-habitus: The Reconfiguration of High Cultural Capital Practices among Ethical Consumers." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 14(2):158–78.
- Connolly, John and Andrea Prothero. 2008. "Green Consumption: Life-politics, Risk and Contradictions." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 8(1):117–45.
- Cowe, Roger and Simon Williams. 2000. *Who Are the Ethical Consumers?* London, England: The Cooperative Bank.
- Davies, Iain A. and S. Gutsche. 2016. "Consumer Motivations for Mainstream 'Ethical' Consumption." *European Journal of Marketing* 50(7–8):1326–47.
- Davolio, Federica and Roberta Sassatelli. 2014. "Polite Transgressions? Pleasure as Economic Device and Ethical Stance in Slow Food." Pp. 83–107 in *Food Transgressions: Making Sense of Contemporary Food Politics*, edited by Colin Sage. New York: Routledge.
- DeVault, Marjorie L. 1991. *Feeding the Family: The Social Organization of Caring as Gendered Work*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Diamantopoulos, Adamantios, Bodo B. Schlegelmilch, Rudolf R. Sinkovics, and Greg M. Bohlen. 2003. "Can Socio-demographics Still Play a Role in Profiling Green Consumers?" *Journal of Business Research* 56(6):465–80.
- Elliott, Rebecca. 2013. "The Taste for Green: The Possibilities and Dynamics of Status Differentiation through 'Green' Consumption." *Poetics* 41(3):294–322.
- Fuentes, Christian. 2014. "Managing Green Complexities: Consumers' Strategies and Techniques for Greener Shopping." *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 38(5):485–92.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Gotlieb, Melissa R. and Sadia E. Cheema. 2017. "From Consumer to Producer: Motivations, Internet Use, and Political Consumerism." *Information, Communication & Society* 20(4):570–86.
- Hain, Margit. 2017. "How Good Products Make You Feel: The Underlying Emotions of Ethical Consumerism." *Maastricht University Journal of Sustainability Studies* 3:73–81.
- Halkier, Bente, Tally Katz-Gerro, and Lydia Martens. 2011. "Applying Practice Theory to the Study of Consumption: Theoretical and Methodological Considerations." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 11(1):3–13.
- Hargreaves, Tom. 2011. "Practice-ing Behaviour Change: Applying Social Practice Theory to Pro-environmental Behaviour Change." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 11(1):79–99.

- Henderson, Karla A. and Christopher E. Frelke. 2000. "Space as a Vital Dimension of Leisure: The Creation of Place." *World Leisure Journal* 42(3):18–24.
- Holbrook, Morris B. and Elizabeth C. Hirschman. 1982. "The Experiential Aspects of Consumption: Consumer Fantasies, Feelings, and Fun." *Journal of Consumer Research* 9(2):132–40.
- Johnston, Josée. 2008. "The Citizen-consumer Hybrid: Ideological Tensions and the Case of Whole Foods Market." *Theory and Society* 37(3):229–70.
- Johnston, Josée and Michelle Szabo. 2010. "Reflexivity and the Whole Foods Market Consumer: The Lived Experience of Shopping for Change." *Agriculture and Human Values* 28(3):303–19.
- Johnstone, Micael-Lee and Lay Peng Tan. 2015. "Exploring the Gap between Consumers' Green Rhetoric and Purchasing Behaviour." *Journal of Business Ethics* 132(2):311–28.
- Koch, Shelley L. 2012. *A Theory of Grocery Shopping: Food, Choice and Conflict*. London, England: Berg Publishers.
- Koch, Shelley L. and Joey Sprague. 2014. "Economic Sociology vs. Real Life: The Case of Grocery Shopping." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 73(1):237–63.
- Ladhari, Riadh and Nina Michèle Tchetchna. 2017. "Values, Socially Conscious Behaviour and Consumption Emotions as Predictors of Canadians' Intent to Buy Fair Trade Products." *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 41(6):696–705.
- Lehner, Matthias. 2015. "Retail Store Influence on Sustainable Consumption Behaviour." *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences* 7(4):404–23.
- Lorenzen, Janet A. 2012. "Going Green: The Process of Lifestyle Change." *Sociological Forum* 27(1):94–116.
- MacKendrick, Norah. 2018. *Better Safe than Sorry: How Consumers Navigate Exposure to Everyday Toxics*. 1st ed. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- Maniatis, Paraschos. 2016. "Investigating Factors Influencing Consumer Decision-making While Choosing Green Products." *Journal of Cleaner Production* 132:215–28.
- Micheletti, Michele and Dietlind Stolle. 2005. "Swedish Political Consumers: Who They Are and Why They Use the Market as an Arena for Politics." Pp. 145–64 in *Political Consumerism: Its Motivations, Power, and Conditions in the Nordic Countries and Elsewhere: Proceedings from the 2nd International Seminar on Political Consumerism, Oslo August 26-29, 2004*, edited by Magnus Boström, vol. 2005:517. Copenhagen, Denmark: TemaNord.
- Neilson, Lisa A. and Pamela Paxton. 2010. "Social Capital and Political Consumerism: A Multilevel Analysis." *Social Problems* 57(1):5–24.
- Newman, Benjamin J. and Brandon L. Bartels. 2011. "Politics at the Checkout Line: Explaining Political Consumerism in the United States." *Political Research Quarterly* 64(4):803–17.
- Oh, Jong-Chul and Sung-Joon Yoon. 2014. "Theory-based Approach to Factors Affecting Ethical Consumption." *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 38(3):278–88.
- Pecoraro, Maria Grazia and Outi Uusitalo. 2014. "Conflicting Values of Ethical Consumption in Diverse Worlds—A Cultural Approach." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 14(1):45–65.
- Perera, Chamila, Pat Auger, and Jill Klein. 2018. "Green Consumption Practices among Young Environmentalists: A Practice Theory Perspective." *Journal of Business Ethics* 152(3):843–64.
- Polletta, Francesca. 2008. "Culture and Movements." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 619(1):78–96.
- Reckwitz, Andreas. 2002. "Toward a Theory of Social Practices: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing." *European Journal of Social Theory* 5(2):243–63.
- Salazar, Helen Arce, Leon Oerlemans, and Saskia van Stroe-Biezen. 2013. "Social Influence on Sustainable Consumption: Evidence from a Behavioural Experiment." *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 37(2):172–80.
- Schaefer, Anja and A. Crane. 2001. "Rethinking Green Consumption." Pp. 178–95 in *Globalisation and Equity: Proceedings of the 26th Annual Macromarketing Conference*, edited by D. R. Rahtz, P. McDonagh, and D. Bouchet. Williamsburg, VA: The College of William and Mary.
- Schoolman, Ethan D. 2016. "Completing the Circuit: Routine, Reflection, and Ethical Consumption." *Sociological Forum* 31(3):619–41.
- Schor, Juliet B. 2011. *True Wealth*. London, England: Penguin Books.
- Shah, Dhavan V., Douglas M. McLeod, Eunhyung Kim, Sun Young Lee, Melissa R. Gotlieb, Shirley S. Ho, and Hilde Breivik. 2007. "Political Consumerism: How Communication and Consumption

- Orientations Drive ‘Lifestyle Politics.’” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 611(1):217–35.
- Shobeiri, Saeed, Lova Rajaobelina, Fabien Durif, and Caroline Boivin. 2016. “Experiential Motivations of Socially Responsible Consumption.” *International Journal of Market Research* 58(1):119–39.
- Shove, Elizabeth. 2003. “Converging Conventions of Comfort, Cleanliness and Convenience.” *Journal of Consumer Policy* 26(4):395–418.
- Shove, Elizabeth and Alan Warde. 2002. “Inconspicuous Consumption: The Sociology of Consumption, Lifestyles, and the Environment.” Pp. 230–51 in *Sociological Theory and the Environment: Classical Foundations, Contemporary Insights*, edited by Frederick H. Buttel, August Gijswijt, Peter Dickens, and Riley E. Dunlap. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Soper, Kate. 2007. “Rethinking the ‘Good Life’: The Citizenship Dimension of Consumer Disaffection with Consumerism.” *Journal of Consumer Culture* 7(2):205–21.
- Soper, Kate. 2008. “‘Alternative Hedonism’ and the Citizen-consumer.” Pp. 191–205 in *Citizenship and Consumption*, edited by Frank Trentmann and Kate Soper. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stolle, Dietlind, Marc Hooghe, and Michele Micheletti. 2005. “Politics in the Supermarket: Political Consumerism as a Form of Political Participation.” *International Political Science Review/Revue Internationale de Science Pol* 26(3):245–69.
- Szmigin, Isabelle and Marylyn Carrigan. 2005. “Exploring the Dimensions of Ethical Consumption.” *E—European Advances in Consumer Research* 7:608–13.
- Tallontire, Anne, Rentsendorj Erdenechimeg, and Micah Blowfield. 2001. *Ethical Consumers and Ethical Trade: A Review of Current Literature*. Chatham, England: Natural Resources Institute, University of Greenwich.
- Thompson, Craig J. and Gokcen Coskuner-Balli. 2007. “Enchanting Ethical Consumerism: The Case of Community Supported Agriculture.” *Journal of Consumer Culture* 7(3):275–303.
- Truninger, Monica. 2011. “Cooking with Bimby in a Moment of Recruitment: Exploring Conventions and Practice Perspectives.” *Journal of Consumer Culture* 11(1):37–59.
- Valor, Carmen, Paolo Antonetti, and Isabel Carrero. 2018. “Stressful Sustainability: A Hermeneutic Analysis.” *European Journal of Marketing* 52(3–4):550–74.
- Walz, Markus, Sean Hingston, and Mikael Andehn. 2014. “The Magic of Ethical Brands: Interpassivity and the Thievish Joy of Delegated Consumption.” *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization* 14(1):57–80.
- Warde, Alan. 2005. “Consumption and Theories of Practice.” *Journal of Consumer Culture* 5(2):131–53.
- Willis, Margaret M. and Juliet B. Schor. 2012. “Does Changing a Light Bulb Lead to Changing the World? Political Action and the Conscious Consumer.” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 644(1):160–90.
- Yazdanpanah, Masoud and Masoumeh Forouzani. 2015. “Application of the Theory of Planned Behaviour to Predict Iranian Students’ Intention to Purchase Organic Food.” *Journal of Cleaner Production* 107:342–52.

Author Biography

Ethan D. Schoolman is an assistant professor in the Department of Human Ecology at Rutgers University, where he conducts research on local and sustainable food systems. Dr. Schoolman teaches courses on environmental politics, sustainable food, and sociological research methods.