

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Differentiating emotions in the theory of planned behaviour: evidence of improved prediction in relation to sustainable food consumerism

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1942446> since 2024-04-22T15:36:02Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1108/BFJ-05-2023-0357

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



**Differentiating Emotions in the Theory of Planned Behaviour:
Evidence of Improved Prediction in Relation to Sustainable Food Consumerism**

Journal:	<i>British Food Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	BFJ-05-2023-0357.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Fairtrade, Solidarity Purchasing Groups, Self-related emotions, Social emotions, Pro-active emotions, Theory of Planned Behaviour

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

Differentiating Emotions in the Theory of Planned Behaviour:

Evidence of Improved Prediction in Relation to Sustainable Food Consumerism

Abstract

Purpose: The Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) and its extensions are often used to explain intentions to perform sustainable behaviours. Emotions can provide the impetus for action and should be considered in high-involvement situations, such as sustainable food purchase decisions. Therefore, the aim of this research work was to investigate whether the addition of different types of emotions (self-related, social, pro-active) to TPB main constructs - attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control - improves the explanation of intention to make two sustainable food purchase choices: purchase Fairtrade (FT) products and purchase through Solidarity Purchasing Groups (SPGs).

Methodology: Stepwise regression models were run to explain the intention to purchase FT products (Study 1; $N = 240$) and the intention to purchase through SPGs (Study 2; $N = 209$).

Findings: Results show that emotions increase the predictive validity of the TPB model. The study also highlights the importance to distinguish between different types of emotions. Among those considered, in both studies only pro-active emotions play a significant role in predicting food purchasing intention. Results encourage further investigation of the role of emotions in TPB-based models for predicting sustainable food purchase choices.

Originality: Differently from previous studies that considered emotions in extension of the TPB model to explain sustainable behaviours, the present work analysed separately the role of three different kinds of emotions (self-related, social, pro-active) in explaining sustainable food behaviours.

Keywords: Fairtrade; Solidarity Purchasing Groups; Self-related emotions; Social emotions; Pro-active emotions.

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

1. Introduction

Sustainable and ethical food consumerism can be defined as “conscious ways of consumption that incorporates sustainability, but also human rights, animal welfare, and fair working conditions” (Hain, 2017, p. 74) by considering economic, social and environmental factors (World Bank, 2003).

It encompasses a variety of consumption behaviours (Hain, 2017) that relate to multiple dimensions expressed in the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs; United Nations; <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>). These behaviors range from choosing goods produced under environmentally and animal friendly conditions as well as fair labour practises, to selecting purchasing methods that *per se* ensure a reduced environmental impact and fair compensation for producers. These goals can be pursued by choosing Fairtrade (FT) certified products or by purchasing through Solidarity Purchasing Groups (SPGs).

FT production certification aims to help producers in developing countries to achieve better trading conditions (Raynolds *et al.*, 2007; Ruggeri *et al.*, 2021). FT certification guarantees that products have been realized in compliance with rules that regulate the entire supply chain, from the production to the commercialization, including that producers receive fair payment and that they have a voice in the decision-making process of the organizations (Fairtrade International, 2011; Ruggeri *et al.*, 2021). FT products can be purchased both in specialized shops and increasingly, in dedicated departments, in large-scale distribution.

Consumers’ ethical and sustainable behaviours can also be oriented toward local producers by choosing to purchase foods through Solidarity Purchasing Groups (SPGs). SPGs are set up by citizens who cooperate to buy food (or other commonly used goods) collectively and directly from producers at a fair price for both parties, in order to counteract the effects of inequalities of the industrial production system (Corsi and Novelli, 2016; Maestriperi *et al.*, 2018). Usually, SPGs also follow some rules aimed at respecting the environment (considering transport and packaging) and solidarity between group members and producers, as ethical principles seem to prevail over economic reasons

1 DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

2
3 53 in this purchasing habit (Corsi and Novelli, 2016). Moreover, this type of consumption creates
4
5 54 favourable conditions for exchanges and relationships among buyers, since it requires the
6
7
8 55 organization for the purchase, transport, and redistribution of products.
9
10 56 The need for sustainability-oriented consumerism has been highlighted by the United Nations 2030
11
12 57 Agenda (Gillani and Kutaula, 2018), and awareness of this issue is increasing (Baiardi and Morana,
13
14 58 2020; Eurobarometer, 2021). However, this awareness is not always decisive for the adoption of
15
16
17 59 sustainable food consumption. Indeed, several studies show a gap between awareness of the need for
18
19 60 sustainability and the actual adoption of sustainable behaviours in everyday life (e.g., Shaw *et al.*,
20
21 61 2016; Terlau and Hirsch, 2015). Understanding which dimensions (e.g., values; Coppola *et al.*, 2017)
22
23
24 62 sustain these behaviours is important for promoting them. Several studies have examined predictors
25
26 63 of ethical and sustainable consumer behaviour within the framework of the Theory of Planned
27
28 64 Behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) and its extensions (e.g., Arvola *et al.*, 2008; Dionysis *et al.*, 2022; Dowd
29
30 65 and Burke, 2013), while less research (e.g., Berki-Kiss and Menrad, 2022; Hain, 2017; Moons and
31
32
33 66 De Pelsmacker, 2012; Russell *et al.*, 2017) has explored the possible influence of emotions on the
34
35 67 adoption of such kind of behaviours. In the present work we will focus on the possible role of different
36
37
38 68 kinds of emotion in TPB-based models for predicting sustainable food purchase choices.
39
40 69

41
42 70 **2. Literature review**

43
44 71 **2.1 The Theory of Planned Behaviour and its extensions**

45
46 72 The Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB; Ajzen, 1991) maintains that behavioural intention, defined
47
48 73 as the readiness to perform a behaviour, is the direct antecedent of behaviour. Behavioural intention,
49
50
51 74 in turn, is determined by attitude (ATT), subjective norm (SN), and perceived behavioural control
52
53 75 (PBC); the latter factor may also moderate the effect of ATT and SN on intention (La Barbera and
54
55
56 76 Ajzen, 2020a; 2021). ATT toward a particular behaviour is determined by beliefs about the possible
57
58 77 outcomes of that behaviour. SNs are determined by a person's beliefs about the opinions of relevant
59
60

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

others regarding a specific behaviour. Finally, PBC is determined by beliefs about factors which may hinder or facilitate a particular behaviour (Ajzen, 2020).

According to the TPB, measuring the three major factors (i.e., ATT, SN, PBC) should be sufficient to have a reliable prediction of behavioural intention, which in turn is the main predictor of behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). This is known as the sufficiency principle. Therefore, scholars interested in extending the TPB model are expected to show the incremental validity of their model compared to the original one (Fishbein and Ajzen 2010). Several authors (e.g., Ajzen, 2015; Arvola *et al.*, 2008; Spence *et al.*, 2018) highlighted different dimensions which can integrate the classical determinants of behavioural intention, such as behavioural frequency, habit strength, knowledge and trust.

2.2 Emotions in the TPB model

In food research, the studies that explored the issue of adding affect/emotion-based measures to TPB models tended to consider emotions in a very general way, without a clear theoretical framework, to focus on a single emotion/affect, and generally fail to demonstrate the incremental validity of the extended TPB model they propose over the original TPB (e.g., Graham-Rowe *et al.*, 2015; Russell *et al.*, 2017; Tønnesen and Grunert, 2021). However, emotions play an important role in decision making and, in particular, consumers' choices (Jose and Kuriakose, 2021; Moons and De Pelsmacker, 2012; Pfister and Böhm, 2008) and should be considered in predicting food sustainable behaviours since food consumption is strictly joint to emotional dimensions (Brückner *et al.*, 2023; Edwards *et al.*, 2013; Köster and Mojet, 2015).

Emotion, conceptualized as “a reaction to an object or an event [...] comprise both a feeling and cognitive component” (Russell *et al.*, 2017, p. 109) and can provide an impetus for action (Forgas, 1994; Lazarus, 1991; Russell *et al.*, 2017). The central role of emotions in predicting behaviour was already highlighted by Triandis (1977) and underlined by other scholars (Moons and De Pelsmacker, 2012; Perugini and Bagozzi, 2001; Pham, 1998), especially in high-involvement situations. In some works, emotions have been considered as predictors of behaviour, sometimes as antecedents of the

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

classical TPB components, sometimes as direct antecedents of behavioural intention (De Pelsmaecker *et al.*, 2017; Moons and De Pelsmaecker, 2012; Perugini and Bagozzi, 2001). Also with respect to pro-environmental behaviours, some studies (e.g., Berki-Kiss and Menrad, 2022; Duran *et al.*, 2011) emphasize the importance of emotions among the predictors of the TPB model. However, most studies that considered emotions as predictors of sustainable or ethical behaviour, have focused on anticipated feelings of guilt (Nawijn and Biran, 2019) or, in the positive case, pride (Antonetti and Maklan, 2014; Onwezen *et al.*, 2014; Peloza *et al.*, 2013; Russell *et al.*, 2017). The focus on anticipated emotions in sustaining goal-directed behaviour is emphasized in particular by Perugini and Bagozzi (2001): the anticipation of positive emotions associated with fulfilment of a desired goal contributes to explain the intention to act. Notwithstanding, focusing on the two emotions of guilt and pride alone may fall short in light of the wide and varied range of possible emotions (e.g., Roseman, 2013; Shuman *et al.*, 2017). Other scholars, such as Berki-Kiss and Menrad (2022), consider different kinds of emotional feelings referred to four possible functions (information, speed, relevance, commitment) in their measurement of emotions, although analyse the impact of the emotional dimensions on the intention of pro-social purchasing as a whole construct.

Beside these considerations, sustainable and ethical food consumerism is a complex behaviour that brings into play different dimensions of emotions as it is at the crossroads between the personal dimension, in terms of advantages and benefits of this type of behaviour, and the social dimension, in terms of the influence of significant others. As Hareli and Parkinson (2008) argue, emotions can be divided into social and non-social. Although much of emotions have a social component since their ontogenetic development occurs in social relations (e.g., family context), the criteria that these scholars propose to identify true social emotions are that their antecedent appraisals were “developed to address issues relating to other people, including social comparison, the consideration of norms and social judgments as responsibility and deservingness” (Hareli and Parkinson, 2008, p. 138). Emotions such as shame, guilt, embarrassment, contempt, pride, envy, and admiration can be placed in this category. Social emotions also have the practical function of guiding social behaviours (Hareli

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

and Parkinson, 2008). Thus, they were the most considered kind of emotions in predicting ethical and sustainable behaviours (Arvola *et al.*, 2008; Onwezen *et al.*, 2014; Russell *et al.*, 2017; Schneider *et al.*, 2017). Thomas *et al.* (2009) referred to “pro-social” emotions to explain the activation towards a social issue, specifically the reduction of inequality. Among the pro-social emotions, in particular, they indicated “guilt” as the emotion that pushes to do “the right thing” (Thomas *et al.*, 2009, p. 317). Further works (Geiger and Keller, 2018; Pfattheicher *et al.*, 2016) focalized on the role of other pro-social emotions as compassion and empathy in fostering sustainable behaviours.

Yet, other types of emotions can be involved in predicting sustainable consumption behaviours. Namely, these behaviours may be guided by emotions which Hareli and Parkinson (2008) describe as related to one’s self-evaluation or well-being. Similarly, Roseman’s (2013) analysis of “self-conscious” emotions felt toward the self and involving one’s identity, suggests that the adoption of sustainable food consumption behaviours can be oriented by feelings of satisfaction (or frustration) when behaving coherently with one’s sense of identity and values. In line with this consideration, some works (e.g., Elsantil and Hamza, 2019; Wang and Wu, 2016) examine both other-oriented (or “public”) and self-oriented (or “private”) self-conscious emotions in predicting sustainable consumerism and show that both kinds of emotions influence the willingness to adopt sustainable consumer behaviours.

Emotions also have a crucial role in driving action based on the outcomes of the emotion-antecedent appraisals (Roseman, 2013). One important dimension in driving action is the appraised positive or negative valence of the emotion-eliciting situations, which induces attraction and moving towards in the first case, repulsion and avoiding in the second case. Several works consider indeed both the positive and the negative pole of emotional dimensions. For instance, Son *et al.* (2022) consider positive and negative emotions as “information” that contributes to develop positive or negative attitudes towards a behaviour and thus, to sustain or hinder its effective enactment.

Another important dimension is the appraisal of high versus low control over a given situation and, consequently, the development of more active (as anger or involvement) versus more passive (as fear

1 DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

2
3 156 or happiness) emotions. More in general, emotions related to the perception of positive valence and
4
5 157 high control provide energy and motivation to act (Roseman, 2013), and can thus play an important
6
7
8 158 role in predicting behavioural intention.

9
10 159 From the reviewed literature it emerges that social emotions – especially guilt and pride - have been
11
12 160 considered in some extensions of the classical TPB model in order to enhance the prediction of ethical
13
14
15 161 and sustainable consumption (Antonetti and Maklan, 2014). However, to our knowledge, self-related
16
17 162 emotions and emotions sustaining actions (pro-active emotions) have not yet been considered in
18
19 163 extended TPB models. Previous works that inserted emotions as extension of the TPB model to
20
21
22 164 explain the intention to adopt sustainable behaviours considered emotion as a unique theoretical
23
24 165 construct or examined only one single emotion (e.g., “environmental protection emotion”, Lavuri,
25
26 166 2022). Thus, in the present work, we propose to distinguish between three kinds of emotions - self-
27
28
29 167 related emotions, social emotions, and pro-active emotions - and to consider these different kinds of
30
31 168 emotions in predicting behavioural intention to adopt sustainable and ethical food consumerism.

32
33 169
34
35 170 **3. Overview of the work**

36
37
38 171 The aim of the current work is to assess whether the addition of emotion-based factors to a standard
39
40 172 TPB model would improve the prediction of intention to perform sustainable food purchasing
41
42 173 choices, and whether the intentions to perform different sustainable purchasing behaviours (namely,
43
44
45 174 purchasing FT products or purchasing food through SPGs) are influenced by three different kinds of
46
47 175 emotions: self-related, social and pro-active emotions. The theoretical model that guided our research
48
49 176 work is represented in Figure 1.

50
51 177
52
53
54 178 - FIGURE 1. Theoretical model of determinants of intention to perform sustainable food purchasing
55
56 179 behaviours

57
58 180
59
60

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

The investigation was conducted by two studies using online questionnaires and focusing on purchasing FT food products (Study 1) and purchasing food through SPGs (Study 2).

The research design of both studies was developed in accordance with the Italian Legislative Decree 101/2018 on protection of personal data and conformed to the provisions of the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki (as revised in Fortaleza, 2013). All ethical guidelines for human research were followed. The questionnaire was provided with a cover letter that openly described the research purpose and explicitly stated the anonymity of data collection and treatment, and the voluntary nature of participation. All participants signed an informed consent form.

To assess the understandability of the questionnaire and its compilation time, before the administration both versions (i.e., the one focusing on purchasing FT food products and the other focusing on purchasing food through SPGs) were pre-tested with a group of 10 consumers each.

For the analyses we used the software SPSS Statistic v.27 for Windows.

3. Study 1

3.1 Aims and hypotheses

In the first study, we aimed to test whether the addition of emotion-based factors increased the predictive power of a TPB-model in relation to the intention to buy FT food products. Drawing on previous research, the following hypothesis was formulated:

Hp1: The prediction of intention to purchase FT products is improved introducing in the TPB model self-related, social, and pro-active emotions.

3.2 Material and methods

3.2.1 Participants and procedure

The investigation took place in Italy, before the Covid-19 pandemic. The presentation of the study and the link to the online questionnaire were disseminated through the mailing lists of several FT shops, social networks and newsletters, as well as through the personal contacts of the research team.

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

The questionnaire was filled in by 300 respondents, but 60 were excluded as they missed at least one of the multi-item scales under investigation. The final sample consists of 240 participants. Most of them were female (73.8%) and their average age was 38.95 ($SD = 12.66$). A consistent part of them were unmarried (44.3%) and the great part had no children (59.9%). For more details about participants' characteristics, see Table I, column Study 1 - FT.

-TABLE I-

3.2.2 Measures

In Study 1, we focused on intention to purchase FT food products. TPB constructs were measured following the guidelines provided by Fishbein and Ajzen (2010). Intention was measured by three items: "When I have a choice, I buy FT products"; "I am willing to pay more for FT products"; "I always recommend my friends to buy FT products", rated on a 7-point Likert response scale [1=Completely false; 7 = Completely true]. The items were averaged into a single score: the higher the score, the higher the intention to purchase FT food products (Cronbach's alphas are provided in Table II). Three single-item scales with 7-point response format were employed to measure attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control: "In general, my attitude toward buying FT products is: [-3 = unfavourable; +3 = favourable]"; "Most people who are important to me think I should buy FT products: [-3 = unlikely; +3 = likely]"; "For me, buying FT products is: [-3 = difficult; +3 = easy]". The higher the values, the more favourable the attitude, the higher the perceived normative support, and the perceived behavioural control. To simplify comparisons with other variables, the response scale was recoded in 1 to 7 values, where 1 = -3; 7 = +3.

Emotions towards buying FT food were measured with three sets of *ad hoc* items. Participants were asked to report how they feel when purchasing FT products on 7-point semantic-differential scales. In the identification of the couples of emotions, we took in mind, where possible, the three dimensions of pleasure-displeasure (or "negative-positive"; Roseman, 2013; Shuman *et al.*, 2017), arousal-no

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

arousal, and dominance-submissiveness indicated by Russell and Mehrabian (1977), in relation to the following three kinds of emotions:

- 1) Self-related emotions: self-satisfaction (satisfied with me - dissatisfied with me), frustration (frustrated - fulfilled), contentment (content - discontent), happiness (happy - sad)
- 2) Social emotions: guilt (guilty - with a clear conscience), contempt (despised - appreciated), blame (blameworthy - esteemed), pride (proud - disappointed)
- 3) Pro-active emotions: hope (hopeful - resigned), commitment (involved - indifferent).

Answers to the items were recoded such that the negative pole of the scale was associated to lower values, the positive one to higher values.

3.2.3 Preliminary analyses

We ran an explorative factor analysis (EFA) on the 10 items measuring emotional feelings when purchasing an FT product. We used the Generalized Least Square Method, more suitable for non normal distribution of data. The KMO and Bartlett's test showed that the data were suitable for an exploratory factor analysis, KMO = .935; Bartlett's $\chi^2 = 1772.58$, $df = 45$, $p < .001$ (Shrestha, 2021). The analysis extracted only one factor with eigenvalue > 1 , explaining 62.23% of total variance. All items loaded onto the single factor with loadings $> .70$. Therefore, we calculated an average score for the whole emotion scale, and average scores for the three subscales theoretically distinguished. In the following analyses, we compared the predictive validity of the emotion scale as a whole vs. the three subscales.

3.3 Results

Table II provides means and standard deviations of the study variables as well as correlations among them.

-TABLE II-

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

In order to assess whether emotions would improve the predictive validity of a traditional TPB model as regards the intention to purchase FT food products, a stepwise regression model was run. In the first step, intention to purchase FT products was regressed on the three TPB major constructs (ATT, SN, PBC). The model explained a significant proportion of variance ($R^2 = .659$). All three TPB constructs exerted a significant effect on intention (Table III, Step 1). The single measure of emotions (Em Tot) was entered as an explanatory variable in the second step: the additional variance explained was significant ($\Delta R^2 = .009$) and so was the effect of emotions (Table III, Step 2). In the third step, the single measure of emotions was excluded from the model, and the three measures of emotions (Em Soc, Em Self, Em Pro) were entered: the additional variance explained in participants' intention ($\Delta R^2 = .015$) was significant. The effect of pro-active emotions was significant, whereas the effect of self-related and social emotions was not (Table III, Step 3).

-TABLE III-

3.4 Discussion

The results show that the regression model based on the original TPB explains a significant and substantial amount of the variance in participants' intention to purchase FT food products. Nevertheless, the introduction of emotions as a single factor slightly increased the explained variance. In the third step, the single factor representing emotions was removed, while the three different emotion dimensions were included in the regression model: In this case, the proportion of explained variance was also significantly larger than in step 1 (original TPB model). These results support Hp1. Moreover, of the three different types of emotions, the results indicate that only pro-active emotions have a significant impact on purchase intention for FT products.

4. Study 2

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

4.1 Aims and hypotheses

In Study 2, we tested whether the incremental validity of adding emotion-based factors to a TPB-model was confirmed in relation to a different behaviour in the realm of ethical consumerism, namely buying food through SPGs. We formulated the following hypothesis:

Hp2: The prediction of intention to purchase through SPGs is improved introducing in the TPB model self-related, social, and pro-active emotions.

4.2 Material and methods**4.2.1 Participants and procedure**

The questionnaire was completed in electronic form via Qualtrics, before Covid-19 pandemic. The link was forwarded by e-mail to the network of SPGs in different Italian territories. Moreover, for the dissemination of the questionnaire, it was also possible to take advantage of the contribution of a magazine focused on ethical and environmental issues ("Terra Nuova"), which dedicated an article on its web portal presenting the research and the link for the online survey. Two hundred and nine participants completed the survey while 56 questionnaires were excluded as they missed at least one of the multi-item scales under investigation. Most participants were female (69.9%) and their average age was 45.6 ($SD = 11.18$). Most were married (66.8%) and had children (68.6%): this is coherent with the fact that through the SPGs are usually bought quantity of products suitable for families of three/four people at least. For more details about participants' characteristics, see Table 1, column Study 2 - SPGs.

4.2.2 Measures

In Study 2, the same measures of Study 1 were used, replacing, in each item, "FT products" with "through the SPGs".

4.2.3 Preliminary analyses

1 DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

2
3 311 Also in Study 2, we first ran an EFA on the 10 items measuring emotional feelings when purchasing
4
5 312 through SPGs. Data were factorable, KMO = .857; Bartlett's $\chi^2 = 636.63$, $df = 45$, $p < .001$). Using
6
7 313 the Generalized Least Square Method, only one factor with eigenvalue > 1 was extracted, accounting
8
9
10 314 for 48.51% of the total variance. All items loaded onto the single factor with loadings $> .55$. Therefore,
11
12 315 we calculated an average score for the whole emotion scale and average scores for the three subscales
13
14 316 theoretically distinguished. As for Study 1, in the following analyses, we compared the predictive
15
16
17 317 validity of the emotion scale as a whole vs. the three subscales.
18

19 318
20
21 319 **4.3 Results**

22
23
24 320 Table IV provides means and standard deviations of the study variables as well as correlations among
25
26 321 them.
27

28 322
29
30
31 323 -TABLE IV-

32
33 324
34
35 325 Similarly to Study 1, a stepwise regression model was used for testing whether the measures of
36
37
38 326 emotions would improve the predictive validity of a traditional TPB model as regards intention to
39
40 327 purchase food products through SPGs. In the first step (intention to purchase through SPGs regressed
41
42 328 on the three TPB major constructs -ATT, SN, PBC-), the model explained a significant proportion of
43
44 329 variance ($R^2 = .32$); ATT and PBC were significantly associated with intention, whereas the effect of
45
46
47 330 SN was marginal (Table V, Step 1). In the second step (addition of the single measure of emotions),
48
49 331 the additional variance explained ($\Delta R^2 = .02$) was significant compared to Step 1 and the single
50
51 332 emotion score was significantly associated with intention (Table V, Step 2). In the third step (entering
52
53
54 333 of the three measures of theoretically distinguished emotions and excluding the single measure of
55
56 334 emotions), the additional variance explained in participants' intention ($\Delta R^2 = .035$) was significant.
57
58 335 The effect of pro-active emotion was significant, whereas the effect of self-related and social
59
60 336 emotions was not (Table V, Step 3).

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

-TABLE V-

4.4 Discussion

Overall, results of the Study 2 are very similar to those of the Study 1, and provide support to Hp2. Adding emotions to a traditional TPB-based model significantly increases the proportion of explained variance in participants' intention to buy through SPGs. Similar to Study 1, the three different emotional factors perform slightly better than the single emotional factor in terms of variance explained. Finally, pro-active emotions are again the only ones, among the three kinds of emotions considered, to be significantly associated with intention to buy food products through SPGs.

5. General discussion and conclusions

Within the theoretical framework of the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB, Ajzen, 1991; Fishbein and Ajzen, 2010), this research aimed to analyse the determinants of intention to make sustainable food consumption choices by adding different kinds of emotions to the traditional TPB model. Considering sustainable food consumption as a conscious purchasing choice that takes into account the impact on the environment, animal welfare and producers' working conditions (Hain, 2017; Tallontire *et al.*, 2001), we focused on two sustainable behaviours: purchasing Fairtrade (FT) food products and purchasing food through Solidarity Purchasing Groups (SPGs). In the TPB model, the intention to perform a behaviour is primarily explained by the attitude towards the behaviour, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control. Several scholars (e.g., Ajzen, 2015; Arvola *et al.*, 2008; Spence *et al.*, 2018) added other possible determinants (e.g., habit strength, knowledge, trust) to this model. However, emotions were less frequently considered among antecedents, although some previous work identified consumers' emotions as important predictors of ethical consumerism intentions (Arvola *et al.*, 2008; Berki-Kiss and Menrad, 2022; Dowd and Burke, 2013; Schneider *et al.*, 2017) and food consumption (Edwards *et al.*, 2013; Köster and Mojet, 2015). Given the wide

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

range of emotional feelings (e.g., Roseman, 2013; Shuman *et al.*, 2017), in the present work we distinguished between three conceptually distinct types of emotions in predicting intention to make sustainable food consumption choices: self-related, social and pro-active emotions.

In two studies involving 240 and 209 participants, respectively, we analysed the determinants of the intention to purchase FT food products and the intention to purchase food through SPGs entering the three kinds of emotions in addition to attitude, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control in stepwise regression models. Since exploratory factor analyses suggested considering emotions as a single factor, we ran the stepwise regression models either with emotions as a whole or as three separate factors to understand the difference between the two strategies and the empirical usefulness of distinguishing between the three emotion types.

The results of the two studies provide support to the research hypotheses. Indeed, the hypothesis that adding emotions to the original TPB model improves the prediction of intention to perform sustainable behaviours was confirmed for both purchases of FT products (Study 1) and purchases through SPGs (Study 2): the three classical antecedents of the TPB model explained a significant proportion of the variance, but the addition of emotions significantly improved the regression models with an additional explained variance ranging from 1.5% to 3.5% when three emotion types were considered separately. This result is even more interesting because it is robust with respect to two different behaviours. Moreover, it is not the same to consider emotions as a whole or as three separate dimensions (self-related, social, and pro-active emotions). In both studies, the incremental validity of the model with the three separate factors was higher compared to the model including the single emotional factor.

The distinction between three different types of emotions allows for a more detailed understanding of the relationship between emotions and the behavioural intentions measured in the studies. Overall, pro-active emotions seem to be the class of emotions that plays a more relevant role in predicting the purchase intention for FT products and through SPGs, while self-related and social emotions did not predict the intention to purchase FT food products or to purchase food through SPGs. This is an

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

unexpected result. Some previous studies (e.g., Elsantil and Hamza, 2019; Wang and Wu, 2016) suggested that self-oriented and other oriented emotions predict the willingness to adopt sustainable consumer behaviours. However, in these studies pro-active emotions were not jointly considered. Our work is innovative in this respect but it does not allow us to make a timely comparison with previous results; thus, future studies are necessary.

Considering the three classical antecedents of the TPB, the influence of subjective norms on the intention of purchasing through SPGs was marginal, while it was high for the intention to purchase FT products. This is quite surprising since subjective norms represent the “perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform the behaviour” (Ajzen, 1991, p. 188). Purchasing through SPGs necessarily requires the organization of a group to purchase and redistribute products. One might expect, therefore, that group members would have influenced each other at the time of recruitment and would continue to influence each other to carry out this purchasing choice. Thus, the social dimension should be a central component of this behaviour, but neither subjective norms nor social emotions appeared to be relevant in predicting purchase intention via SPGs. One possible explanation for this result could be that ethical consumer behaviour is guided by a mix of selfish and altruistic beliefs and motivations. In the case of purchasing food through SPGs, behaviour could be guided by more individual/egoistic considerations (such as those related to health and the low price of the products purchased) prevailing on social motivations (see also Verneau *et al.*, 2019).

5.1 Limitations

The measurement of the three classical antecedents of the TPB model (attitude, subjective norms, perceived behavioural control) performed by single items can be considered the main limitation of this work. Even if an increasing number of scholars (e.g., Allen *et al.*, 2022; Berki-Kiss and Menrad, 2022; Gogol *et al.*, 2014; Oluka *et al.*, 2014) consider the use of single-item measures as adequate, the most common practice is to use composite measures made of at least three items for each

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

theoretical construct whose validity and internal consistency can be assessed. In future research, instruments made up with more items measuring these three theoretical dimensions should be used.

Also, the distribution of several study variables' frequency is relevantly skewed – which is very common in TPB-based studies (see Fishbein and Ajzen, 2010). This characteristic of the dataset prevents an accurate analysis of the TPB factors interactions, suggesting some caution in interpreting the results, especially as regards the lack of influence of subjective norms on intention (La Barbera and Ajzen, 2020a, 2021; Yzer and van den Putte, 2014).

It should further be pointed out that the two studies were conducted before the Covid-19 pandemic. This global event could have influenced the beliefs (Dudek and Śpiwak, 2022; Foti and Timpanaro, 2021; George and Nair, 2022) which determine attitudes, norms and perceived control (e.g., De Leeuw *et al.*, 2015; La Barbera and Ajzen, 2020b) which, in turn, can influence ethical purchasing intentions. Future research could fruitfully follow this intriguing path.

Finally, the convenience samples involved in the present studies represent another important limitation, which suggests caution in generalizing the current studies' findings to other contexts without further research.

Despite these limitations, the present work offers several contributions to the line of research on predictors of intention to make ethical food purchase choices. Specifically, the results of the two studies show that the addition of emotions to the three classical antecedents of the TPB, contributes significantly to the explanation of ethical purchasing intentions. To date, studies that consider emotions in extended versions of the TPB model are not very common (e.g., Berki-Kiss and Menrad, 2022; Moons and De Pelsmacker, 2012; Perugini and Bagozzi, 2001), and they generally do not provide a comparison between the original TPB-based model, and the “augmented” one they propose, thus failing to assess the incremental validity of the new model and the importance of the added factors (Graham-Rowe *et al.*, 2015; Russell *et al.*, 2017). Especially for ethical and sustainable food consumerism, very few works (e.g., Berki-Kiss and Menrad, 2022; Duran *et al.*, 2011) have considered several kinds of emotions. This is quite surprising given that the ethical and sustainable

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

behaviours of purchasing FT products and purchasing through SPGs are aimed at increasing personal and social wellbeing, both locally and for the planet as a whole (Yamoah *et al.*, 2016). Emotions associated to self-perception, to social relationships and to the perception of personal control can be deeply involved in the decision to engage in this type of behaviours.

5.2 Conclusions and implications

The consideration of different kinds of emotions, namely self-related, social and pro-active emotions, in extending the TPB model, represents the innovative contribution of the present work. In addition, results show that only pro-active emotions play a significant role in predicting ethical and sustainable food purchase intentions. Pro-active emotions were operationalized in terms of hope and commitment, emotions that provide an “impetus for action” (Lazarus, 1991) and motivation to move towards a goal-congruent situation (Roseman, 2013). More than the self-related and social dimensions of emotions, the emotional activation seems to play a key role in guiding sustainable purchase intentions. Certainly, future research should deepen the pattern of the relationships between different kinds of emotions by using also qualitative methods such as interviews or focus groups involving consumers. In addition, future research could examine the role of emotions in their various manifestations in predicting intention to perform other ethical behaviours, in line with Berki-Kiss and Menrad (2022).

The practical implications of these findings should also be considered. Promoting sustainable and ethical food purchasing decisions may be important for consumers to feel empowered to contribute to human and planetary well-being through small but significant behaviours. The attention to sustainability is an issue that can no longer be ignored (Vallaey, 2018), for the survival of humanity and the safeguard of the planet, starting from the Agenda 2030 defined by the United Nations. Identifying dimensions that could play a role in promoting these behaviours, in addition to the classic predictors of the TPB model, could be helpful in developing interventions to support them. In particular, one can focus on the role that pro-active emotions may play in promoting sustainable

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

purchase behaviours. To activate such emotions and thus encourage the adoption of sustainable behaviours, different types of interventions can be developed for both current adult consumers and young citizens who are future consumers. For actual consumers, information campaigns could be designed to highlight the human and environmental benefits of careful purchasing choices: Kim *et al.* (2019), for example, show that emotional messages to environmentally friendly behaviour can be more effective than purely informative messages because they also induce emotional activation. Other possible tools to trigger emotions that promote sustainable behaviour are games and gamification: Ahmed and Johnson (2021) propose a review of practises to guide emotions in information seeking to promote sustainable behaviours. Even if children are not yet responsible for their family's food purchasing behaviour, they will be, and maintaining intentions toward future sustainable behaviour is critical. To this end, both formal and informal educational interventions can be proposed: Tillmanns (2020), for example, suggests developing educational interventions based on stimulating emotions through influential images or messages to trigger profound changes toward sustainability.

References

- Ahmed, A., and Johnson, F. (2021), "Gamification as a Way of Facilitating Emotions During Information-Seeking Behaviour: A Systematic Review of Previous Research", Toeppe, K., Yan, H., Chu, S.K.W. (Eds) *Diversity, Divergence, Dialogue: 16th International Conference, iConference 2021, Beijing, China, March 17–31, 2021, Proceedings, Part II* 16, Springer International Publishing, pp. 85-98. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71305-8_7
- Ajzen, I. (1991), "The theory of planned behavior", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 50 No. 2, pp. 179-211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Ajzen, I. (2015), "Consumer attitudes and behavior: the theory of planned behavior applied to food consumption decisions", *Italian Review of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 70 No. 2, pp. 121-138. <https://doi.org/10.13128/REA-18003>

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

- Ajzen, I. (2020), "The theory of planned behavior: Frequently asked questions", *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, Vol. 2 No. 4, pp. 314-324. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.195>
- Allen, M.S., Iliescu, D., and Greiff, S. (2022), "Single item measures in psychological science", *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, Vol. 38 No.1, pp. 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000699>
- Antonetti, P., and Maklan, S. (2014), "Feelings that make a difference-How guilt and pride convince consumers of the effectiveness of sustainable consumption choices", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 124 No. 1, pp. 117-134. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1841-9>.
- Arvola, A., Vassallo, M., Dean, M., Lampila, P., Saba, A., Lähteenmäki, L., *et al.* (2008), "Predicting intentions to purchase organic food: The role of affective and moral attitudes in the theory of planned behavior", *Appetite*, Vol. 50, pp. 443-454. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2007.09.010>
- Baiardi, D., and Morana, C. (2020), "*Climate change awareness: Empirical evidence for the European Union*". Center for Research on Pensions and Welfare Policies (CeRP). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3513061> (accessed 20 December 2022)
- Berki-Kiss, D., and Menrad, K. (2022), "The role emotions play in consumer intentions to make pro-social purchases in Germany—An augmented theory of planned behavior model", *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, Vol. 29, pp. 79-89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2021.09.026>
- Brückner, K., Emberger-Klein, A., and Menrad, K. (2023), "The Role of Emotions in Food-Related Decision-Making: A Choice-Based Conjoint Analysis of Yogurt Preferences", *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, Vol. 29 No. 6, pp. 177-196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10454446.2023.2227575>
- Coppola, A., Verneau, F., Caracciolo, F., and Panico, T. (2017), "Personal values and pro-social behaviour: The role of socio-economic context in fair trade consumption", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 119 No. 9, pp. 1969-1982. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-10-2016-0474>
- Corsi, A. and Novelli, S. (2016), *The value of the participation in Solidarity Purchasing Groups (SPGs): an empirical analysis in Piedmont*. Paper presented at Fifth AIEAA Congress, June 16-17,

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

2016, Bologna, Italy 242305, Italian Association of Agricultural and Applied Economics (AIEAA).

Available at: <https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.242305> (accessed 10 December 2022)

De Leeuw, A., Valois, P., Ajzen, I., and Schmidt, P. (2015), "Using the theory of planned behavior to identify key beliefs underlying pro-environmental behavior in high-school students: Implications for educational interventions", *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, Vol. 42, pp. 128-138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.03.005>

De Pelsmaeker, S., Schouteten, J.J., Gellynck, X., Delbaere, C., De Clercq, N., Hegyi, A., Kuti, T., Depypere, F. and Dewettinck, K. (2017), "Do anticipated emotions influence behavioural intention and behaviour to consume filled chocolates?", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 119 No. 9, pp. 1983-1998. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-01-2016-0006>

Dionysis, S., Chesney, T., and McAuley, D. (2022), "Examining the influential factors of consumer purchase intentions for blockchain traceable coffee using the theory of planned behavior", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 124 No.12, pp. 4304-4322. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-05-2021-0541>

Dowd, K., and Burke, K.J. (2013), "The influence of ethical values and food choice motivations on intentions to purchase sustainably sourced foods", *Appetite*, Vol. 69 No. 1, pp. 137-144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2013.05.024>

Dudek, M., and Śpiewak, R. (2022), "Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Sustainable Food Systems: Lessons Learned for Public Policies? The Case of Poland", *Agriculture*, Vol.12, No. 1, p 61. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture12010061>

Duran, M., Alzate, M., Lopez, W., and Sabucedo, J. (2007), "Emotions and proenvironmental behavior", *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 287-296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rlp.2015.09.006>

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

Edwards, J.S., Hartwell, H.J., and Brown, L. (2013), "The relationship between emotions, food consumption and meal acceptability when eating out of the home", *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 22-32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2013.04.004>

Elsantil, Y., and Hamza, E.A. (2019), "The impact of self-conscious emotions on willingness to pay for sustainable products", *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 77-90. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.729>

Eurobarometer (2021), "Eurobarometer Survey: Europeans consider climate change to be the most serious problem facing the world". Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_21_3156 (accessed 20 November 2022)

Fairtrade International (2011), *Explanatory document for the Fairtrade trade standard*. Available at: http://www.fairtrade.net/fileadmin/user_upload/content/2011-12-29_Explan_Doc_GTS_EN.pdf (accessed 10 November 2022)

Fishbein, M., and Ajzen, I. (2010), *Predicting and changing behavior: The reasoned action approach*. Psychology Press, New York, NY.

Forgas, J.P. (1994), "Sad and guilty? Affective influences on the explanation of conflict in close relationships", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 66 No. 1, pp. 56-68. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.66.1.56>

Foti, V.T., and Timpanaro, G. (2021), "Relationships, sustainability and agri-food purchasing behaviour in farmer markets in Italy", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 123 No. 13, pp. 428-453. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-04-2021-0358>

Geiger, S.M., and Keller, J. (2018), "Shopping for clothes and sensitivity to the suffering of others: The role of compassion and values in sustainable fashion consumption", *Environment and Behavior*, Vol. 50 No. 10, pp. 1119-1144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916517732109>

George, A., and Nair, A.S. (2022), "Reflections on Green Purchase Behaviour in the Era of COVID-19: A Conceptual Framework", *Vision*, 09722629221087363. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09722629221087363>

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

Gillani, A., and Kutaula, S. (2018), "An introduction to special issue: sustainability and ethical consumerism", *Management Decision*, Vol. 56 No. 3, pp. 511-514. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-03-2018-949>

Gogol, K., Brunner, M., Goetz, T., Martin, R., Ugen, S., Keller, U., ... and Preckel, F. (2014), "'My questionnaire is too long!' The assessments of motivational-affective constructs with three-item and single-item measures", *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, Vol. 39 No. 3, pp. 188-205. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2014.04.002>

Graham-Rowe, E., Jessop, D.C., and Sparks, P. (2015), "Predicting Household Food Waste Reduction Using an Extended Theory of Planned Behavior", *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, Vol. 101, pp. 194-202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2015.05.020>.

Gregory-Smith, D., Smith, A., and Winklhofer, H. (2013), "Emotions and dissonance in 'ethical' consumption choices", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 29 No. 11-12, pp. 1201-1223. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2013.796320>

Hain, M. (2017), "How good products make you feel: The underlying emotions of ethical consumerism", *Maastricht University Journal of Sustainability Studies*, Vol. 3, pp. 73-81.

Hareli, S., and Parkinson, B. (2008), "What's social about social emotions?", *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, Vol. 38 No. 2, pp. 131-156. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.2008.00363.x>

Jose, H., and Kuriakose, V. (2021), "Emotional or logical: Reason for consumers to buy organic food products", *British food journal*, Vol. 123 No. 12, pp. 3999-4016. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-10-2020-0916>

Kim, W.H., Malek, K., and Roberts, K.R. (2019), "The effectiveness of green advertising in the convention industry: An application of a dual coding approach and the norm activation model", *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, Vol. 39, pp. 185-192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2019.04.007>

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

Köster, E.P., and Mojet, J. (2015), “From mood to food and from food to mood: A psychological perspective on the measurement of food-related emotions in consumer research”, *Food research international*, Vol. 76, pp. 180-191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2015.04.006>

La Barbera, F., and Ajzen, I. (2020a), “Control interactions in the theory of planned behavior: Rethinking the role of subjective norm”, *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 401. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v16i3.2056>

La Barbera, F., and Ajzen, I. (2020b), “Understanding support for European integration across generations: A study guided by the theory of planned behavior”, *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 437-457. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v16i3.1844>

La Barbera, F., and Ajzen, I. (2021), “Moderating role of perceived behavioural control in the theory of planned behavior: A preregistered study”, *Journal of Theoretical Social Psychology*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 35-45. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jts5.83>

Lavuri, R. (2022), “Organic green purchasing: Moderation of environmental protection emotion and price sensitivity”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 368, p. 133113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.133113>

Lazarus, R. S. (1991), “Cognition and motivation in emotion”, *American Psychologist*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 352–367. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.46.4.352>

Maestripieri, L., Giroletti, T., and Podda, A. (2018), “Solidarity Purchasing Groups in Italy: A critical assessment of their effects on the marginalisation of their suppliers”, *The International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 393-412. <https://doi.org/10.48416/ijsaf.v24i3.7>

Moons, I., and De Pelsmacker, P. (2012), “Emotions as determinants of electric car usage intention”, *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 28 No. 3-4, pp. 195-237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2012.659007>

Nawijn, J., and Biran, A. (2019), “Negative emotions in tourism: a meaningful analysis”, *Current Issues in Tourism*, Vol. 22 No. 19, pp. 2386-2398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1451495>

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

Oluka, O.C., Nie, S., and Sun, Y. (2014), "Quality Assessment of TPB-Based Questionnaires: A Systematic Review", *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 9 No. 4, p. e94419. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094419>

Onwezen, M.C., Bartels, J., and Antonides, G. (2014), "The self-regulatory function of anticipated pride and guilt in a sustainable and healthy consumption context", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 53-68. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.1991>

Peloza, J., White, K., and Shang, J. (2013), "Good and guilt-free: The role of self-accountability in influencing preferences for products with ethical attributes", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 77 No. 1, pp. 104-119. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.11.0454>

Perugini, M., and Bagozzi, R.P. (2001), "The role of desires and anticipated emotions in goaldirected behaviours/Broadening and deepening the Theory of Planned Behaviour", *British Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 40, pp. 79-98. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466601164704>

Pfattheicher, S., Sassenrath, C., and Schindler, S. (2016), "Feelings for the suffering of others and the environment: Compassion fosters proenvironmental tendencies", *Environment and behavior*, Vol. 48 No. 7, pp. 929-945. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916515574549>

Pfister, H.R., and Böhm, G. (2008), "The multiplicity of emotions: A framework of emotional functions in decision making", *Judgment and decision making*, Vol. 3 N.1, pp. 5-17. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1930297500000127>

Pham, M.T. (1998), "Representativeness, relevance, and the use of feelings in decision making", *Journal of consumer research*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 144-159. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209532>

Raynolds, L.T., Murray, D.L., and Wilkinson, J. (Eds.). (2007), *Fair trade: The challenges of transforming globalization*, Routledge, London.

Roseman, I.J. (2013), "Appraisal in the emotion system: Coherence in strategies for coping", *Emotion Review*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 141-149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073912469591>

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

- Ruggeri, G., Corsi, S., and Nayga, R.M. (2021), “Eliciting willingness to pay for fairtrade products with information”, *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 87, p. 104066. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2020.104066>
- Russell, J.A. and Mehrabian, A. (1977), “Evidence for a three-factor theory of emotions”, *Journal of research in Personality*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 273-294. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566\(77\)90037-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566(77)90037-X)
- Russell, S.V., Young, C.W., Unsworth, K. L., and Robinson, C. (2017), “Bringing habits and emotions into food waste behaviour”, *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, Vol. 125, pp. 107-114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2017.06.007>
- Schneider, C.R., Zaval, L., Weber, E.U., and Markowitz, E.M. (2017), “The influence of anticipated pride and guilt on pro-environmental decision making”, *PloS one*, Vol. 12 No. 11, p. e0188781. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0188781>
- Shaw, D., McMaster, R., and Newholm, T. (2016), “Care and commitment in ethical consumption: An exploration of the ‘attitude–behaviour gap’”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 136 No. 2, pp. 251-265.
- Shrestha, N. (2021), “Factor analysis as a tool for survey analysis”, *American Journal of Applied Mathematics and Statistics*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 4-11. <https://doi.org/10.12691/ajams-9-1-2>
- Shuman, V., Clark-Polner, E., Meuleman, B., Sander, D., and Scherer, K.R. (2017), “Emotion perception from a componential perspective”, *Cognition and Emotion*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 47-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2015.1075964>
- Son, J., Nam, C., Diddi, S. (2022), “Emotion or Information: What Makes Consumers Communicate about Sustainable Apparel Products on Social Media?”, *Sustainability*, Vol. 14, p. 2849. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14052849>
- Spence, M., Stancu, V., Elliott, C.T., and Dean, M. (2018), “Exploring consumer purchase intentions towards traceable minced beef and beef steak using the theory of planned behaviour”, *Food Control*, Vol. 91, pp. 138-147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2018.03.035>

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

- Tallontire, A., Rentsendorj, E., and Blowfield, M. (2001), "Ethical consumers and ethical trade: a review of current literature" (NRI Policy Series 12). Retrieved from <https://gala.gre.ac.uk/id/eprint/11125/>
- Terlau, W., and Hirsch, D. (2015), "Sustainable consumption and the attitude-behaviour-gap phenomenon-causes and measurements towards a sustainable development", *International Journal on Food System Dynamics*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 159-174. <https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.208880>
- Thomas, E.F., McGarty, C., & Mavor, K.I. (2009), "Transforming 'apathy into movement': The role of prosocial emotions in motivating action for social change", *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 310-333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868309343290>
- Tillmanns, T. (2020), "Learning sustainability as an effect of disruption", *Environmental Education Research*, Vol.26 No.1, pp.14-26, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2019.1682125>
- Tønnesen, M.T., and Grunert, K.G. (2021), "Social-psychological determinants of young consumers' consumption of pork", *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 93, p. 104262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2021.104262>
- Triandis, H.C. (1977), *Interpersonal Behavior*. Brooks/Cole Pub. Co, Monterey, CA.
- Vallaey, F. (2018), "Defining social responsibility: A matter of philosophical urgency for universities", Retrieved from: <http://www.guninetwork.org/resources/he-articles/defining-social-responsibility-a-matter-of-urgency-for-philosophy-and-universities>.
- Verneau, F., La Barbera, F., Amato, M., and Sodano, V. (2019), "Consumers' concern towards palm oil consumption: An empirical study on attitudes and intention in Italy", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 121 No. 9, pp. 1982-1997. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-10-2018-0659>
- Wang, J., and Wu, L. (2016), "The impact of emotions on the intention of sustainable consumption choices: evidence from a big city in an emerging country", *Journal of cleaner production*, Vol. 126, pp. 325-336. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.03.119>

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

- World Bank (2003), “*World development report 2003: Sustainable development in a dynamic world: Transforming institutions, growth, and quality of life*”, The World Bank. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1596/0-8213-5150-8> (accessed 20 December 2022)
- Yamoah, F.A., Duffy, R., Petrovici, D., and Fearne, A. (2016), “Towards a framework for understanding fairtrade purchase intention in the mainstream environment of supermarkets”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 136 No. 1, pp. 181-197. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2509-9>
- Yzer, M., and Van Den Putte, B. (2014), “Control perceptions moderate attitudinal and normative effects on intention to quit smoking”, *Psychology of Addictive Behaviours*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 1153–1161. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0037924>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

TABLES

Table I. Demographic Features of the Study 1 and Study 2 Samples

		Study 1 (FT)	Study 2 (SPGs)
		N = 240	N = 209
Gender	Female	73.8%	69.9%
	Male	26.3%	30.1%
Age	Less or equal to 25 years old	16.4%	16.4%
	26-40 years old	39.1%	39.1%
	41-55 years old	31.9%	31.9%
	More than 55 years old	12.6%	12.6%
Marital status	Unmarried	44.3%	24.5%
	Married/cohabiting	45.1%	66.8%
	Divorced/separated/widow/er	10.6%	8.6%
Children	Yes	40.1%	68.6%
	No	59.9%	31.4%
Household income	Less than 1.200€	22.2%	9.1%
	From 1.201€ to 2.000€	35.7%	31.3%
	From 2.001€ to 3.000€	23.5%	41.9%
	More than 3.000€	18.6%	17.7%
Profession	Entrepreneur/manager/senior official	4.7%	5.3%
	Freelance professionals	6.8%	9.6%
	Teacher	5.1%	11.5%
	Office workers	34.6%	34.1%
	Salesperson or craftsman	3.8%	6.7%
	Workman/woman	1.7%	5.8%
	Housekeeper	3.0%	5.8%
	Student	13.7%	2.4%
	Unemployed	5.6%	3.4%
	Retired	3.8%	6.3%
	Other	17.1%	9.1%

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

Table II. Correlations, Means and Standard Deviations for the Study 1 Variables

N=240	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Int FT	-							
2. ATT	.714**	-						
3. SN	.446**	.315**	-					
4. PBC	.674**	.528**	.333**	-				
5. Em Tot	.502**	.521**	.327**	.339**	-			
6. Em Soc	.387**	.406**	.275**	.257**	.943**	-		
7. Em Self	.483**	.512**	.315**	.315**	.955**	.850**	-	
8. Em Pro	.566**	.562**	.332**	.409**	.860**	.714**	.759**	-
α	.92	-	-	-	.86	.86	.88	.85
<i>M</i>	5.28	6.25	4.64	5.38	5.54	5.46	5.59	5.58
<i>SD</i>	1.59	.97	1.57	1.54	1.00	1.02	1.04	1.27

** $p < .001$

Note: Int FT: Intention to purchase FT products; ATT: Attitude towards purchasing FT products; SN: Subjective Norms; PBC: Perceived behavioural control; Em Tot: Emotion scale as a whole; Em Soc: Social emotions; Em Self: Self-related emotions; Em Pro: Pro-active emotions

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

Table III. Stepwise Regression Model of the Intention to Purchase FT Products

	Step 1		Step 2		Step 3	
	β	p	β	p	β	p
ATT	.463	<.001	.414	<.001	.388	<.001
SN	.177	<.001	.158	<.001	.154	<.001
PBC	.370	<.001	.365	<.001	.352	<.001
Em Tot	-	-	.111	.015	-	-
Em Soc	-	-	-	-	-.070	.340
Em Self	-	-	-	-	.072	.366
Em Pro	-	-	-	-	.147	.020
	$R^2 = .659$		$\Delta R^2 = .009$		$\Delta R^2 = .015$	
	$F(3, 236) = 152.02, p < .001$		$F(1, 235) = 6.05, p = .015$		$F(3, 233) = 3.69, p = .013$	

Note: ATT: Attitude towards purchasing FT products; SN: Subjective Norms; PBC: Perceived behavioural control; Em Tot: Emotion scale as a whole; Em Soc: Social emotions; Em Self: Self-related emotions; Em Pro: Pro-active emotions

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

Table IV. Correlations, Means and Standard Deviations for the Study 2 Variables

N=209	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Int SPGs	-							
2. ATI	.508**	-						
3. SN	.226**	.140*	-					
4. PBC	.386**	.339**	.233**	-				
5. Em Tot	.262**	.270**	.113	.027	-			
6. Em Soc	.196**	.196**	.061	-.073	.912**	-		
7. Em Self	.241**	.275**	.121	.145*	.912**	.720**	-	
8. Em Pro	.292**	.264**	.121	-.010	.821**	.653**	.649**	-
α	.82	-	-	-	.85	.78	.82	.73
<i>M</i>	5.52	6.50	4.96	5.71	5.44	5.26	5.62	5.44
<i>SD</i>	1.15	.67	1.41	1.22	.83	.89	.90	1.05

** $p < .001$

Note: Int SPGs: Intention to purchase through SPGs; ATI: Attitude towards purchasing through SPGs; SN: Subjective Norms; PBC: Perceived behavioural control; Em Tot:

Emotion scale as a whole; Em Soc: Social emotions; Em Self: Self-related emotions; Em Pro: Pro-active emotions

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

Table V. Stepwise Regression Model of the Intention to Purchase Through SPGs

	Step 1		Step 2		Step 3	
	β	p	β	p	β	p
ATT	.417	<.001	.376	<.001	.364	<.001
SN	.115	.056	.101	.089	.096	.104
PBC	.214	<.001	.227	<.001	.258	<.001
Em Tot	-	-	.143	.018	-	-
Em Soc	-	-	-	-	.076	.395
Em Self	-	-	-	-	-.092	.313
Em Pro	-	-	-	-	.196	.017
$R^2 = .32$			$\Delta R^2 = .02$		$\Delta R^2 = .035$	
$F(3, 203) = 31.53, p < .001$			$F(1, 202) = 5.73, p = .018$		$F(3, 200) = 3.63, p = .014$	

Note: ATT: Attitude towards purchasing through SPGs; SN: Subjective Norms; PBC: Perceived behavioural control; Em Tot: Emotion scale as a whole; Em Soc: Social emotions; Em Self: Self-related emotions; Em Pro: Pro-active emotions




FIGURE 1. Theoretical model of determinants of intention to perform sustainable food purchasing behaviours
254x190mm (96 x 96 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Minor Revision

General comment: As one paper is describing output of two studies, I would suggest renaming “study” in to the “phase” throughout the manuscript. For example: “Phase 1” instead of “Study 1” and “Phase 2” instead of "Study 2".

➔ Thank you for your suggestion, yet we still reckon that keeping the distinction between Study 1 and Study 2 makes the paper more readable. Please note that they are two different studies, with different samples. Phase 1 and 2 may be more suitable for Time 1 and Time 2 of a longitudinal work.

Also, the structure of the paper is quite unusual which makes it difficult to follow the line. Therefore, please restructure the content as proposed below in the specific comments.

Specific comments:

Page 6: “3. Aim and hypothesis of the study” instead of “3. Overview of the work” and transfer the text on hypotheses of both studies here.

Page 7: After the first paragraph ending as “...and pro-active emotions.” New subtitle “4. Material and methods” should be given. Immediately after it place “4.1 Research design”. After that Aims and hypotheses of both studies should be merged and presented under the new section as described above “3. Aim and hypothesis of the study”. The same goes for “3.2.1 Participants and procedure” which should be merged under the new subtitle described above “4.1 Research design” and later where possible please marge outcomes of both studies under the same chapter. If doing so text like it is now under 4.2.2 will not be necessary anymore. Also, the discussion for study 2 is quite short in comparison to the discussion for study 1. So, the new order of subchapters would be like this:

- 3 Aim and hypothesis of the study
- 4 Material and methods
 - 4.1 Research design
 - 4.2 Participants and procedure
 - 4.3 Measures
 - 4.4 Preliminary analyses
- 5 Results
 - 5.1 Phase 1
 - 5.2 Phase 2
- 6 Discussion
 - 6.1 Limitations
- 7 Conclusions and implications

I am sure you will be capable of text redistribution into the new order as proposed above.

➔ As the two studies are autonomous, as regards both the kind of sustainable purchasing behavior and the samples, we preferred to keep their description distinguished. Nevertheless, we tried to streamline the methods and results sections of the two studies, in order to avoid any redundancy.

Page 16 Line 31-60: I see this text more in the discussion section then in the conclusions. Also, because conclusions are already quite extensive.

→ Thank you, we moved this part to the General discussions section.

Tables should be numbered with Arabic not Latin numbers.

→ Please note that the Journal's Instructions for authors read: "Tables should be typed and submitted in a separate file to the main body of the article. The position of each table should be clearly labelled in the main body of the article with corresponding labels clearly shown in the table file. Tables should be numbered consecutively in Roman numerals (e.g. I, II, etc.)."

Table IV: The records in the first column should be aligned in one and not two lines, as is the case now with the text in 1st , 6th and 7th line.

→ Thank you, we aligned them in one only line each.

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?:

Compared to previous research this one incorporated emotions into the extension of the theory of planned behavior model to elucidate sustainable behaviors. Authors examined the influence of three distinct types of emotions (self-related, social, proactive) in explicating sustainable food behaviors.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?:

The paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources.

→ Thank you

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?:

The theory is sufficiently described. However, the sections on methodology need to be reorganized to make them clearer and easier for the reader to follow

→ As said above, we tried to reduce redundancy in order to be clearer both in the methods and results sections.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?:

Like for the methodology section also results sections needs to be partly reorganized to make them clearer. More about reorganization in the specific comments to the authors. The conclusion should be shorter and part of the text should be transferred to the discussion.

→ As said above, we tried to reduce redundancy in order to be clearer both in the methods and results sections

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?:

Despite the limitations clearly described by the authors, the study adds further insight to the research on predictors of intention to make ethical food purchase choices.

→ Thank you

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Yes

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments

One paragraph should be rewrite:

This is very unclear: there is mixt-up of behaviour and production methods in relation to SDG. This has to be changed.

It includes a variety of consumption behaviours (Hain, 2017) that refer to several dimensions expressed in the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs; United Nations; <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>), ranging from environmentally and animal-friendly production methods, to purchasing products that ensure fair working conditions and compensation for producers. These goals can be pursued by choosing Fairtrade (FT) certified products or by purchasing through Solidarity Purchasing Groups (SPGs).

→ Thank you. We proposed a different formulation:

"It encompasses a variety of consumption behaviours (Hain, 2017) that relate to multiple dimensions expressed in the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs; United Nations; <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>). These behaviors range from choosing goods produced under environmentally and animal friendly conditions as well as fair labour practises, to selecting purchasing methods that per se ensure a reduced environmental impact and fair compensation for producers"

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?:

Yes, paper provide significant new contribution to the TBP model by introduction of three groups of emotions – proactive, social and self-related. This approach is new because before emotions are rarely considered as a factor in this model to predict purchase decision. Also, the emotions were

considering as one general factor/group, nobody took in consideration a different group of emotions as a different influential factor. This is very important to get detailed information what is behind sustainable purchase behaviour and how to use it to promote such behaviour facilitating development of sustainable businesses.

→ Thank you

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?:

The relevant literature was considered and literature review is done very well pointing out arguments that are important to understand research approach and concept.

→ Thank you

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: The methodology applied is very sound. It is based on very known theoretical approach and theory behind definition of different group of emotions is well explained. The research instrument is well prepared, but the sampling method can be changed into either face to face interview or maybe focus groups. The one scale measurement of attitudes, social norms and perceived behaviour control is unusual and it is weakness of this methodological approach. But, authors are aware of those limitations - it is clearly stated as limitation.

→ Thank you for these suggestions and comments! In future research it would be interesting to use also some qualitative methods to further deepen the pattern of relationships between different kinds of emotions and ethical and sustainable food purchase intentions. In this line we added in the following sentence in the 'Conclusions and implications' section (lines 453-455):

Certainly, future research should deepen the pattern of relationships between different kinds of emotions by using also qualitative methods such as interviews or focus groups involving consumers.

We are aware that the one scale measurement of attitudes, social norms and perceived behavioural control presents a limitation. However, a growing number of scholars find it appropriate to use single-item psychometric measures, especially to reduce the length of questionnaires (Allen et al., 2022; Gogol et al., 2014). Indeed, the use of the TPB model requires the measurement of numerous constructs, making the questionnaire lengthy, and this seems to be a hindrance to completion (Oluka et al., 2014). It is not uncommon in studies about TPB model to find single-item measures (e.g. Lawton et al., 2009). We further discussed this point and added the pertinent references.

Allen, M.S., Iliescu, D., and Greiff, S. (2022), "Single item measures in psychological science", *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, Vol. 38 No.1, pp. 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000699>

Gogol, K., Brunner, M., Goetz, T., Martin, R., Ugen, S., Keller, U., ... and Preckel, F. (2014), "My questionnaire is too long! The assessments of motivational-affective constructs with three-item and single-item measures", *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, Vol.39 No.3, pp. 188-205. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2014.04.002>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Lawton, R., Conner, M., and McEachan, R. (2009), “Desire or reason: Predicting health behaviors from affective and cognitive attitudes”, *Health Psychology*, Vol. 28 No.1, p. 56-65. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013424>

Oluka, O.C., Nie. S., and Sun. Y. (2014), “Quality Assessment of TPB-Based Questionnaires: A Systematic Review”, *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 9 No. 4, p. e94419. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094419>

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?:

Yes. The results are explained in very well. Maybe it could be useful to additionally find connection between results and with findings available in literature to explain why two groups of emotions (social and self-related) had no significant influence on sustainable purchasing behaviour. It was not expected to see as a result. So, that is why it is always recommended to consider literature to try to find explanation. The explanation is given partly in conclusion as well. Additional effort will improve quality of research.

- ➔ Thank you for this suggestion. We underlined that this result was unexpected, as other studies that considered social and self-related emotions showed influence of these latter on the intention of sustainable behaviors. Notwithstanding, these studies did not examine them as extensions of the TPB model. Moreover, they did not consider jointly pro-active emotions. Our work, thus, is innovative in this respect. However, this does not allow us to make a timely comparison with previous results.
To find an explanation for our results, future studies are necessary.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?:

Paper clearly identifies implication of research, but one part (side) of it is missing. There is no recommendations how to use this proactive emotions that influence sustainable purchase behaviour and how to strength appearance of those emotions during the purchase session. What can be done to use these emotions to facilitate sustainable purchase behaviour. These proactive emotions are connected with knowledge about FT and SPGs products. It is important to provide wide set of clear, easy to understand information about purchase benefits - contribution to the prevention of further climate change, contamination of different kinds, waste etc. This should be elaborated in more details to upgrade quality of paper.

- ➔ Thank you for your suggestion. We developed practical implication in the text underling the urgency of promoting the adoption of sustainable behaviors, for people and the planet. Even if our results do not enable us to assume that knowledge about FT products and SPGs can solicit the activation of pro-active emotions, we delineated possible kinds of intervention aimed at improving adoption of sustainable purchasing habits both in actual and future consumers (e.g., emotional messages, gamification, disruptive learning education activities).

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.:

Quality of communication is very high.

→ Thank you

Reviewer: 3

Recommendation: Major Revision

Dear Authors,

Overall, this is an interesting topic, especially in the context of extending the TPB model to explain sustainable food behaviours.

In my opinion, the manuscript is well and simply written, clearly expresses its arguments, and is suitable for the target audience of the journal considering the above comments.

→ Thank you a lot for your feedback.

→

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes, compared to previous studies, the novelty of this work is that emotions are considered as a new construct in extending the TPB model to explain sustainable food behaviour.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?:

Yes. Important literature in the study area is included in the manuscript, adequate for the interested reader to have an understanding of the subject. What is missing is new-recent studies in the area and more references regarding the methodology applied.

The authors use and provide only 1 reference from BFJ in the list of references.

→ Thank you for your comment. We updated literature research with new-recent studies and we considered, specifically, some works from BFJ:

Coppola, A., Verneau, F., Caracciolo, F., & Panico, T. (2017). Personal values and pro-social behaviour: The role of socio-economic context in fair trade consumption. *British Food Journal*, 119(9), 1969-1982. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-10-2016-0474>

De Pelsmaeker, S., Schouteten, J.J., Gellynck, X., Delbaere, C., De Clercq, N., Hegyi, A., Kuti, T., Depypere, F. and Dewettinck, K. (2017), "Do anticipated emotions influence behavioural intention and behaviour to consume filled chocolates?", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 119 No. 9, pp. 1983-1998. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-01-2016-0006>

Dionysis, S., Chesney, T., & McAuley, D. (2022). Examining the influential factors of consumer purchase intentions for blockchain traceable coffee using the theory of planned behaviour. *British Food Journal*, 124(12), 4304-4322. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-05-2021-0541>

Dudek, M., and Śpiewak, R. (2022), "Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Sustainable Food Systems: Lessons Learned for Public Policies? The Case of Poland", *Agriculture*, Vol.12, No. 1, p 61. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture12010061>

1
2
3 Elsanitil, Y., and Hamza, E.A. (2019), "The impact of self-conscious emotions on willingness to pay for
4 sustainable products", *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 77-90.
5 <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.729>
6
7 Foti, V.T. and Timpanaro, G. (2021), "Relationships, sustainability and agri-food purchasing
8 behaviour in farmer markets in Italy", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 123 No. 13, pp. 428-
9 453. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-04-2021-0358>
10
11 Geiger, S.M., and Keller, J. (2018), "Shopping for clothes and sensitivity to the suffering of others:
12 The role of compassion and values in sustainable fashion consumption", *Environment and*
13 *Behavior*, Vol. 50 No. 10, pp. 1119-1144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916517732109> Jose, H., &
14 Kuriakose, V. (2021). Emotional or logical: Reason for consumers to buy organic food
15 products. *British food journal*, 123(12), 3999-4016. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-10-2020-0916>
16
17 Lavuri, R. (2022), "Organic green purchasing: Moderation of environmental protection emotion and
18 price sensitivity", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 368, p. 133113.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.133113>
20
21 Nawijn, J., and Biran, A. (2019), "Negative emotions in tourism: a meaningful analysis", *Current Issues*
22 *in Tourism*, Vol. 22 No. 19, pp. 2386-2398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1451495>
23
24 Nawijn, J., and Biran, A. (2019), "Negative emotions in tourism: a meaningful analysis", *Current Issues*
25 *in Tourism*, Vol. 22 No. 19, pp. 2386-2398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1451495>
26
27 Son, J., Nam, C., Diddi, S. (2022), "Emotion or Information: What Makes Consumers Communicate
28 about Sustainable Apparel Products on Social Media?", *Sustainability*, Vol. 14, p. 2849.
29 <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14052849>
30
31 Tillmanns, T. (2020), "Learning sustainability as an effect of disruption", *Environmental Education*
32 *Research*, Vol.26 No.1, pp.14-26, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2019.1682125>
33
34
35

36 3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other
37 ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well
38 designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?:
39
40 The paper has some weaknesses in methodology that need further investigation before a
41 convincing contribution can be made.
42 The paper is quite poorly structured, making it difficult to follow the results and the methodology
43 used.
44 My main concern in this paper is the measurement of the three classic antecedents of the TPB
45 model (attitude, subjective norms, perceived behavioural control) by single items.
46 According to Ajzen's theory, at least three items are required to measure each construct. If you use
47 a smaller number of statements, you must justify this clearly and well.
48
49 → Following the advice and the highly relevant theoretical position expressed, we have
50 furtherly discussed this point in the limitation section both in general on psychometric
51 methodology and specifically on studies conducted within the TPB model framework. It is
52 interesting to note, however, that a growing number of scholars find it appropriate to use
53 single-item psychometric measures, especially to reduce the length of questionnaires (Allen
54 et al., 2022; Gogol et al., 2014). Indeed, the use of the TPB model requires the
55 measurement of numerous constructs, making the questionnaire lengthy, and this seems to
56 be a hindrance to completion (Oluka et al., 2014). It is not uncommon in studies about TPB
57 model to find single-item measures (e.g. Lawton et al., 2009).
58
59
60

In any case, we acknowledge that future studies should be conducted with multiple item instruments in order to ascertain the validity and internal consistency of the measures.

Allen, M.S., Iliescu, D., and Greiff, S. (2022), "Single item measures in psychological science", *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, Vol. 38 No.1, pp. 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000699>

Gogol, K., Brunner, M., Goetz, T., Martin, R., Ugen, S., Keller, U., ... and Preckel, F. (2014), "My questionnaire is too long! The assessments of motivational-affective constructs with three-item and single-item measures", *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, Vol.39 No.3, pp. 188-205. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2014.04.002>

Lawton, R., Conner, M., and McEachan, R. (2009), "Desire or reason: Predicting health behaviors from affective and cognitive attitudes", *Health Psychology*, Vol. 28 No.1, p. 56-65. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013424>

Oluka, O.C., Nie, S., and Sun, Y. (2014), "Quality Assessment of TPB-Based Questionnaires: A Systematic Review", *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 9 No. 4, p. e94419. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094419>

Suggestion to authors: using SEM or PLS would probably allow you to get much more out of your data and gain a different insight into the role of each variable. It would also be interesting to see the factor loadings (were items removed from the scales? which items were used?).

Please consider this in future submissions/revisions of this paper, or at least a justification of why only simple regressions were used in this paper.

- ➔ Thank you for this suggestion. However, as discussed in the previous comment, we measured the three classic antecedents of the TPB model (attitude, subjective norms, perceived behavioural control) by single items. Therefore, there is no measurement model to assess with CFA/SEMs in this regard. Overall, we think that regression analysis is more suitable. Please consider also that several studies which use an extended TPB model to explain the intention to perform sustainable behavior choose the same method. Some examples are:

Geiger, S.M., and Keller, J. (2018), "Shopping for clothes and sensitivity to the suffering of others: The role of compassion and values in sustainable fashion consumption", *Environment and Behavior*, Vol. 50 No. 10, pp. 1119-1144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916517732109>

La Barbera, F., Amato, M., Rivero R., and Verneau, F. (2022). "Social Emotions and Good Provider Norms in Tackling Household Food Waste: An Extension of the Theory of Planned Behavior" *Sustainability* 14, no. 15: 9681. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14159681>

Dean, M., Raats, M. M., & Shepherd, R. (2012). The role of self-identity, past behavior, and their interaction in predicting intention to purchase fresh and processed organic food. *Journal of applied social psychology*, 42(3), 669-688. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00796.x>

Finally, we ran instead an explorative factorial analysis for the emotion scale, as it has not been used before. We provided factor loadings of the one-factor solution in supplementary materials (Tables IS and IIS).

More data about survey is needed, in which year the data was collected.

- ➔ We added that our studies were conducted before the Covid-19 pandemic: this represent a further limitation of our work. We added this point to the limitations section. Future works

should analyse if this global event modified intention to perform these sustainable purchasing behaviors.

Whether the survey instrument (questionnaire) has been pre-tested

→ Yes, thank you. We added this information: please see line 189-191.

How were data treated prior to analysis?

→ We specified that no complete questionnaires with at least one of the multi-item scales under investigation were excluded before starting the analyses: 60 questionnaires for Study 1 and 56 for study 2, respectively.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?:

It should be clear from the results of the first study what percentage of the variance is explained by the extended model compared to the original TPB model.

Assessment of TPB model of the intention to purchase sustainable food is missing, it should be shown graphically.

→ In the original manuscript full results were already provided in the text (pp.10-11) and Table 3, study 1, and pg. 13 and Table 5, study 2.

However, following your suggestions, we reported the proportion of the explained variance of all three steps of the regression analyses also in the text.

Finally, even if we cannot provide a graphical assessment of our regression models, as suggested by another anonymous reviewer, we added the figure of the conceptual model we tested in the paper.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?:

Even though some implications of the research are presented, they could be more elaborated in the paper.

→ Following this suggestion, the implications section has been enriched, underlining the urgency of promoting the adoption of sustainable behaviors, for people and the planet. Even if our results do not enable us to assume that knowledge about FT products and SPGs can solicit the activation of pro-active emotions, we delineated possible kinds of intervention aimed at improving adoption of sustainable purchasing habits both in actual and future consumers (e.g., emotional messages, gamification, disruptive learning education activities

Reviewer: 4

Recommendation: Reject

The paper should be reviewed both in the way it is written and the results presented. It should include the conceptual model tested.

→ We added a figure depicting the conceptual model tested in the paper.

I think that is quite insufficient to simply analyse if the change in variance when emotions are INCLUDED is significant. You should try to discuss more which ones are more influence and why

→ Thanks, we discussed this point at lines: 281-282; 347-348; 390-395. In addition, Tables III and V show the β values of each dimension in the stepwise regression models for Study 1 and Study 2 respectively.

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?:

The subject has some originality although is not new. It would be better if the authors could updated the literature review concerning the use of emotions in a extended TPB model.

→ Thank you. We updated the review with the most recent empirical evidences and theoretical proposals in the field of TPB and emotions research, as you can see through the text and in the reference list, e.g.:

De Pelsmaeker, S., Schouteten, J.J., Gellynck, X., Delbaere, C., De Clercq, N., Hegyi, A., Kuti, T., Depypere, F. and Dewettinck, K. (2017), "Do anticipated emotions influence behavioural intention and behaviour to consume filled chocolates?", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 119 No. 9, pp. 1983-1998. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-01-2016-0006>

Dionysis, S., Chesney, T., and McAuley, D. (2022), "Examining the influential factors of consumer purchase intentions for blockchain traceable coffee using the theory of planned behavior", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 124 No.12, pp. 4304-4322. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-05-2021-0541>

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?:

The paper is a bit confusing to read. Knowing that author's language is not English, some verification should be made to this aspect. As said before, the authors did not present a novel literature review

→ As said, we updated the literature, furthermore we carefully conducted a major revision of the language.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?:

It does not seem to me that the methodology is correct. Seems that the authors mistake the hypothesis with research questions.

- Unfortunately, the reviewer's comment is too general and unspecified, so that it is was not possible to address it directly. However, since the current version of the paper was deeply and extensively revised, there are reasons to think the reviewer's concern was addressed in a meaningful way.

It is not clear at what point the emotions are added to the original TPB model (actually, the variables are included, not added) in the different steps). It is not clear which variable of the TPB model is influenced by emotions (I would imagine, the ATT or PBC).

- In the original manuscript full results were already provided in the text (pp.10-11) and Table 3, study 1, and pg. 13 and Table 5, study 2. In any case, we emphasized the different additions in the Step 2 and Step 3 of the regression models, respectively of the emotions as unique factor and as three separate factors (after excluding the unique factor of step 2). As we used regression model, we considered only direct effects of the different dimensions (ATT, PBC, SN and emotions) on Int and did not examine influence of emotions on ATT, PBC, SN.

I was expecting to see a figure (or several) with the conceptual model.

- We added the figure of the conceptual model we tested in the paper.

I think the author should review deeply the methodology applied and presentation of results

- As said before, the current version of the paper was deeply and extensively revised: we hope the reviewer's concern was addressed in a meaningful way.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?:

No. The results are confusing and presented not on a clear way. Also, I do not think that the conclusions withdrawn are in accordance with the results presented despite the fact that they are correct by common sense. As recognized, it is a deep limitation measuring each component of the TPB by a single item. No strong values and conclusions can be withdrawn. According to literature, authors should have at least 3!

- We already acknowledged that this is a limitation, we deeply discussed the point (lines 413-417).

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?:

The paper does not give any indication of how the theory can be put into practice

- The implications section has been enriched, underlining the urgency of promoting the adoption of sustainable behaviors, for people and the planet. Even if our results do not enable us to assume that knowledge about FT products and SPGs can solicit the activation of pro-active emotions, we delineated possible kinds of intervention aimed at improving adoption of sustainable purchasing habits both in actual and future consumers (e.g., emotional messages, gamification, disruptive learning education activities

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.:

Should be English and scientific writing reviewed. For example. If the sample in both studies is the same, there's no need to repeat the explanation in both points

→ We carefully checked the English form through the text.

As a note, the reviewer's comment about the sample is quite surprising: throughout the text it has been made very clear that the 2 studies have been conducted with two different samples with different numbers of participants. Also, the characteristics of the different samples are fully listed in Table 1. Hence, it is hard to understand how the reviewer could have had this kind of doubt.

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

Differentiating Emotions in the Theory of Planned Behaviour:

Evidence of Improved Prediction in Relation to Sustainable Food Consumerism

Abstract

Purpose: The Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) and its extensions are often used to explain intentions to perform sustainable behaviours. Emotions can provide the impetus for action and should be considered in high-involvement situations, such as sustainable food purchase decisions. Therefore, the aim of this research work was to investigate whether the addition of different types of emotions (self-related, social, pro-active) to TPB main constructs - attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control - improves the explanation of intention to make two sustainable food purchase choices: purchase Fairtrade (FT) products and purchase through Solidarity Purchasing Groups (SPGs).

Methodology: Stepwise regression models were run to explain the intention to purchase FT products (Study 1; $N = 240$) and the intention to purchase through SPGs (Study 2; $N = 209$).

Findings: Results show that emotions increase the predictive validity of the TPB model. The study also highlights the importance to distinguish between different types of emotions. Among those considered, in both studies only pro-active emotions play a significant role in predicting food purchasing intention. Results encourage further investigation of the role of emotions in TPB-based models for predicting sustainable food purchase choices.

Originality: Differently from previous studies that considered emotions in extension of the TPB model to explain sustainable behaviours, the present work analysed separately the role of three different kinds of emotions (self-related, social, pro-active) in explaining sustainable food behaviours.

Keywords: Fairtrade; Solidarity Purchasing Groups; Self-related emotions; Social emotions; Pro-active emotions.

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

1. Introduction

Sustainable and ethical food consumerism can be defined as “conscious ways of consumption that incorporates sustainability, but also human rights, animal welfare, and fair working conditions” (Hain, 2017, p. 74) by considering economic, social and environmental factors (World Bank, 2003). It encompasses a variety of consumption behaviours (Hain, 2017) that relate to multiple dimensions expressed in the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs; United Nations; <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>). These behaviors range from choosing goods produced under environmentally and animal friendly conditions as well as fair labour practises, to selecting purchasing methods that *per se* ensure a reduced environmental impact and fair compensation for producers. These goals can be pursued by choosing Fairtrade (FT) certified products or by purchasing through Solidarity Purchasing Groups (SPGs). FT production certification aims to help producers in developing countries to achieve better trading conditions (Raynolds *et al.*, 2007; Ruggeri *et al.*, 2021). FT certification guarantees that products have been realized in compliance with rules that regulate the entire supply chain, from the production to the commercialization, including that producers receive fair payment and that they have a voice in the decision-making process of the organizations (Fairtrade International, 2011; Ruggeri *et al.*, 2021). FT products can be purchased both in specialized shops and increasingly, in dedicated departments, in large-scale distribution. Consumers’ ethical and sustainable behaviours can also be oriented toward local producers by choosing to purchase foods through Solidarity Purchasing Groups (SPGs). SPGs are set up by citizens who cooperate to buy food (or other commonly used goods) collectively and directly from producers at a fair price for both parties, in order to counteract the effects of inequalities of the industrial production system (Corsi and Novelli, 2016; Maestripietri *et al.*, 2018). Usually, SPGs also follow some rules aimed at respecting the environment (considering transport and packaging) and solidarity between group members and producers, as ethical principles seem to prevail over economic reasons

1 DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

2
3 53 in this purchasing habit (Corsi and Novelli, 2016). Moreover, this type of consumption creates
4
5 54 favourable conditions for exchanges and relationships among buyers, since it requires the
6
7
8 55 organization for the purchase, transport, and redistribution of products.
9
10 56 The need for sustainability-oriented consumerism has been highlighted by the United Nations 2030
11
12 57 Agenda (Gillani and Kutaula, 2018), and awareness of this issue is increasing (Baiardi and Morana,
13
14 58 2020; Eurobarometer, 2021). However, this awareness is not always decisive for the adoption of
15
16
17 59 sustainable food consumption. Indeed, several studies show a gap between awareness of the need for
18
19 60 sustainability and the actual adoption of sustainable behaviours in everyday life (e.g., Shaw *et al.*,
20
21 61 2016; Terlau and Hirsch, 2015). Understanding which dimensions (e.g., values; Coppola *et al.*, 2017)
22
23
24 62 sustain these behaviours is important for promoting them. Several studies have examined predictors
25
26 63 of ethical and sustainable consumer behaviour within the framework of the Theory of Planned
27
28 64 Behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) and its extensions (e.g., Arvola *et al.*, 2008; Dionysis *et al.*, 2022; Dowd
29
30 65 and Burke, 2013), while less research (e.g., Berki-Kiss and Menrad, 2022; Hain, 2017; Moons and
31
32
33 66 De Pelsmacker, 2012; Russell *et al.*, 2017) has explored the possible influence of emotions on the
34
35 67 adoption of such kind of behaviours. In the present work we will focus on the possible role of different
36
37
38 68 kinds of emotion in TPB-based models for predicting sustainable food purchase choices.
39
40 69

41
42 70 **2. Literature review**

43
44 71 ***2.1 The Theory of Planned Behaviour and its extensions***

45
46 72 The Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB; Ajzen, 1991) maintains that behavioural intention, defined
47
48 73 as the readiness to perform a behaviour, is the direct antecedent of behaviour. Behavioural intention,
49
50
51 74 in turn, is determined by attitude (ATT), subjective norm (SN), and perceived behavioural control
52
53 75 (PBC); the latter factor may also moderate the effect of ATT and SN on intention (La Barbera and
54
55
56 76 Ajzen, 2020a; 2021). ATT toward a particular behaviour is determined by beliefs about the possible
57
58 77 outcomes of that behaviour. SNs are determined by a person's beliefs about the opinions of relevant
59
60

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

others regarding a specific behaviour. Finally, PBC is determined by beliefs about factors which may hinder or facilitate a particular behaviour (Ajzen, 2020). According to the TPB, measuring the three major factors (i.e., ATT, SN, PBC) should be sufficient to have a reliable prediction of behavioural intention, which in turn is the main predictor of behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). This is known as the sufficiency principle. Therefore, scholars interested in extending the TPB model are expected to show the incremental validity of their model compared to the original one (Fishbein and Ajzen 2010). Several authors (e.g., Ajzen, 2015; Arvola *et al.*, 2008; Spence *et al.*, 2018) highlighted different dimensions which can integrate the classical determinants of behavioural intention, such as behavioural frequency, habit strength, knowledge and trust.

2.2 Emotions in the TPB model

In food research, the studies that explored the issue of adding affect/emotion-based measures to TPB models tended to consider emotions in a very general way, without a clear theoretical framework, to focus on a single emotion/affect, and generally fail to demonstrate the incremental validity of the extended TPB model they propose over the original TPB (e.g., Graham-Rowe *et al.*, 2015; Russell *et al.*, 2017; Tønnesen and Grunert, 2021). However, emotions play an important role in decision making and, in particular, consumers' choices (Jose and Kuriakose, 2021; Moons and De Pelsmacker, 2012; Pfister and Böhm, 2008) and should be considered in predicting food sustainable behaviours since food consumption is strictly joint to emotional dimensions (Brückner *et al.*, 2023; Edwards *et al.*, 2013; Köster and Mojet, 2015).

Emotion, conceptualized as “a reaction to an object or an event [...] comprise both a feeling and cognitive component” (Russell *et al.*, 2017, p. 109) and can provide an impetus for action (Forgas, 1994; Lazarus, 1991; Russell *et al.*, 2017). The central role of emotions in predicting behaviour was already highlighted by Triandis (1977) and underlined by other scholars (Moons and De Pelsmacker, 2012; Perugini and Bagozzi, 2001; Pham, 1998), especially in high-involvement situations. In some works, emotions have been considered as predictors of behaviour, sometimes as antecedents of the

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

classical TPB components, sometimes as direct antecedents of behavioural intention (De Pelsmaecker *et al.*, 2017; Moons and De Pelsmacker, 2012; Perugini and Bagozzi, 2001). Also with respect to pro-environmental behaviours, some studies (e.g., Berki-Kiss and Menrad, 2022; Duran *et al.*, 2011) emphasize the importance of emotions among the predictors of the TPB model. However, most studies that considered emotions as predictors of sustainable or ethical behaviour, have focused on anticipated feelings of guilt (Nawijn and Biran, 2019) or, in the positive case, pride (Antonetti and Maklan, 2014; Onwezen *et al.*, 2014; Peloza *et al.*, 2013; Russell *et al.*, 2017). The focus on anticipated emotions in sustaining goal-directed behaviour is emphasized in particular by Perugini and Bagozzi (2001): the anticipation of positive emotions associated with fulfilment of a desired goal contributes to explain the intention to act. Notwithstanding, focusing on the two emotions of guilt and pride alone may fall short in light of the wide and varied range of possible emotions (e.g., Roseman, 2013; Shuman *et al.*, 2017). Other scholars, such as Berki-Kiss and Menrad (2022), consider different kinds of emotional feelings referred to four possible functions (information, speed, relevance, commitment) in their measurement of emotions, although analyse the impact of the emotional dimensions on the intention of pro-social purchasing as a whole construct.

Beside these considerations, sustainable and ethical food consumerism is a complex behaviour that brings into play different dimensions of emotions as it is at the crossroads between the personal dimension, in terms of advantages and benefits of this type of behaviour, and the social dimension, in terms of the influence of significant others. As Hareli and Parkinson (2008) argue, emotions can be divided into social and non-social. Although much of emotions have a social component since their ontogenetic development occurs in social relations (e.g., family context), the criteria that these scholars propose to identify true social emotions are that their antecedent appraisals were “developed to address issues relating to other people, including social comparison, the consideration of norms and social judgments as responsibility and deservingness” (Hareli and Parkinson, 2008, p. 138). Emotions such as shame, guilt, embarrassment, contempt, pride, envy, and admiration can be placed in this category. Social emotions also have the practical function of guiding social behaviours (Hareli

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

and Parkinson, 2008). Thus, they were the most considered kind of emotions in predicting ethical and sustainable behaviours (Arvola *et al.*, 2008; Onwezen *et al.*, 2014; Russell *et al.*, 2017; Schneider *et al.*, 2017). Thomas *et al.* (2009) referred to “pro-social” emotions to explain the activation towards a social issue, specifically the reduction of inequality. Among the pro-social emotions, in particular, they indicated “guilt” as the emotion that pushes to do “the right thing” (Thomas *et al.*, 2009, p. 317). Further works (Geiger and Keller, 2018; Pfattheicher *et al.*, 2016) focalized on the role of other pro-social emotions as compassion and empathy in fostering sustainable behaviours.

Yet, other types of emotions can be involved in predicting sustainable consumption behaviours. Namely, these behaviours may be guided by emotions which Hareli and Parkinson (2008) describe as related to one’s self-evaluation or well-being. Similarly, Roseman’s (2013) analysis of “self-conscious” emotions felt toward the self and involving one’s identity, suggests that the adoption of sustainable food consumption behaviours can be oriented by feelings of satisfaction (or frustration) when behaving coherently with one’s sense of identity and values. In line with this consideration, some works (e.g., Elsantil and Hamza, 2019; Wang and Wu, 2016) examine both other-oriented (or “public”) and self-oriented (or “private”) self-conscious emotions in predicting sustainable consumerism and show that both kinds of emotions influence the willingness to adopt sustainable consumer behaviours.

Emotions also have a crucial role in driving action based on the outcomes of the emotion-antecedent appraisals (Roseman, 2013). One important dimension in driving action is the appraised positive or negative valence of the emotion-eliciting situations, which induces attraction and moving towards in the first case, repulsion and avoiding in the second case. Several works consider indeed both the positive and the negative pole of emotional dimensions. For instance, Son *et al.* (2022) consider positive and negative emotions as “information” that contributes to develop positive or negative attitudes towards a behaviour and thus, to sustain or hinder its effective enactment.

Another important dimension is the appraisal of high versus low control over a given situation and, consequently, the development of more active (as anger or involvement) versus more passive (as fear

1 DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

2
3 156 or happiness) emotions. More in general, emotions related to the perception of positive valence and
4
5 157 high control provide energy and motivation to act (Roseman, 2013), and can thus play an important
6
7
8 158 role in predicting behavioural intention.

9
10 159 From the reviewed literature it emerges that social emotions – especially guilt and pride - have been
11
12 160 considered in some extensions of the classical TPB model in order to enhance the prediction of ethical
13
14
15 161 and sustainable consumption (Antonetti and Maklan, 2014). However, to our knowledge, self-related
16
17 162 emotions and emotions sustaining actions (pro-active emotions) have not yet been considered in
18
19 163 extended TPB models. Previous works that inserted emotions as extension of the TPB model to
20
21
22 164 explain the intention to adopt sustainable behaviours considered emotion as a unique theoretical
23
24 165 construct or examined only one single emotion (e.g., “environmental protection emotion”, Lavuri,
25
26 166 2022). Thus, in the present work, we propose to distinguish between three kinds of emotions - self-
27
28
29 167 related emotions, social emotions, and pro-active emotions - and to consider these different kinds of
30
31 168 emotions in predicting behavioural intention to adopt sustainable and ethical food consumerism.

32
33 169
34
35 170 **3. Overview of the work**

36
37
38 171 The aim of the current work is to assess whether the addition of emotion-based factors to a standard
39
40 172 TPB model would improve the prediction of intention to perform sustainable food purchasing
41
42 173 choices, and whether the intentions to perform different sustainable purchasing behaviours (namely,
43
44
45 174 purchasing FT products or purchasing food through SPGs) are influenced by three different kinds of
46
47 175 emotions: self-related, social and pro-active emotions. The theoretical model that guided our research
48
49 176 work is represented in Figure 1.

50
51 177
52
53
54 178 - FIGURE 1. Theoretical model of determinants of intention to perform sustainable food purchasing
55
56 179 behaviours

57
58 180
59
60

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

The investigation was conducted by two studies using online questionnaires and focusing on purchasing FT food products (Study 1) and purchasing food through SPGs (Study 2).

The research design of both studies was developed in accordance with the Italian Legislative Decree 101/2018 on protection of personal data and conformed to the provisions of the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki (as revised in Fortaleza, 2013). All ethical guidelines for human research were followed. The questionnaire was provided with a cover letter that openly described the research purpose and explicitly stated the anonymity of data collection and treatment, and the voluntary nature of participation. All participants signed an informed consent form.

To assess the understandability of the questionnaire and its compilation time, before the administration both versions (i.e., the one focusing on purchasing FT food products and the other focusing on purchasing food through SPGs) were pre-tested with a group of 10 consumers each. For the analyses we used the software SPSS Statistic v.27 for Windows.

3. Study 1

3.1 Aims and hypotheses

In the first study, we aimed to test whether the addition of emotion-based factors increased the predictive power of a TPB-model in relation to the intention to buy FT food products. Drawing on previous research, the following hypothesis was formulated:

Hp1: The prediction of intention to purchase FT products is improved introducing in the TPB model self-related, social, and pro-active emotions.

3.2 Material and methods

3.2.1 Participants and procedure

The investigation took place in Italy, before the Covid-19 pandemic. The presentation of the study and the link to the online questionnaire were disseminated through the mailing lists of several FT shops, social networks and newsletters, as well as through the personal contacts of the research team.

1 DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

2
3 207 The questionnaire was filled in by 300 respondents, but 60 were excluded as they missed at least one
4
5 208 of the multi-item scales under investigation. The final sample consists of 240 participants. Most of
6
7
8 209 them were female (73.8%) and their average age was 38.95 ($SD = 12.66$). A consistent part of them
9
10 210 were unmarried (44.3%) and the great part had no children (59.9%). For more details about
11
12 211 participants' characteristics, see Table I, column Study 1 - FT.

13
14
15 212
16
17 213 -TABLE I-

18
19 214
20
21
22 215 3.2.2 Measures

23
24 216 In Study 1, we focused on intention to purchase FT food products. TPB constructs were measured
25
26 217 following the guidelines provided by Fishbein and Ajzen (2010). Intention was measured by three
27
28
29 218 items: "When I have a choice, I buy FT products"; "I am willing to pay more for FT products"; "I
30
31 219 always recommend my friends to buy FT products", rated on a 7-point Likert response scale
32
33 220 [1=Completely false; 7 = Completely true]. The items were averaged into a single score: the higher
34
35 221 the score, the higher the intention to purchase FT food products (Cronbach's alphas are provided in
36
37
38 222 Table II). Three single-item scales with 7-point response format were employed to measure attitude,
39
40 223 subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control: "In general, my attitude toward buying FT
41
42 224 products is: [-3 = unfavourable; +3 = favourable]"; "Most people who are important to me think I
43
44
45 225 should buy FT products: [-3 = unlikely; +3 = likely]"; "For me, buying FT products is: [-3 = difficult;
46
47 226 +3 = easy]". The higher the values, the more favourable the attitude, the higher the perceived
48
49 227 normative support, and the perceived behavioural control. To simplify comparisons with other
50
51
52 228 variables, the response scale was recoded in 1 to 7 values, where 1 = -3; 7 = +3.
53
54 229 Emotions towards buying FT food were measured with three sets of *ad hoc* items. Participants were
55
56 230 asked to report how they feel when purchasing FT products on 7-point semantic-differential scales.
57
58
59 231 In the identification of the couples of emotions, we took in mind, where possible, the three dimensions
60
232 of pleasure-displeasure (or "negative-positive"; Roseman, 2013; Shuman *et al.*, 2017), arousal-no

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

arousal, and dominance-submissiveness indicated by Russell and Mehrabian (1977), in relation to the following three kinds of emotions:

- 1) Self-related emotions: self-satisfaction (satisfied with me - dissatisfied with me), frustration (frustrated - fulfilled), contentment (content - discontent), happiness (happy - sad)
- 2) Social emotions: guilt (guilty - with a clear conscience), contempt (despised - appreciated), blame (blameworthy - esteemed), pride (proud - disappointed)
- 3) Pro-active emotions: hope (hopeful - resigned), commitment (involved - indifferent).

Answers to the items were recoded such that the negative pole of the scale was associated to lower values, the positive one to higher values.

3.2.3 Preliminary analyses

We ran an explorative factor analysis (EFA) on the 10 items measuring emotional feelings when purchasing an FT product. We used the Generalized Least Square Method, more suitable for non normal distribution of data. The KMO and Bartlett's test showed that the data were suitable for an exploratory factor analysis, KMO = .935; Bartlett's $\chi^2 = 1772.58$, $df = 45$, $p < .001$ (Shrestha, 2021). The analysis extracted only one factor with eigenvalue > 1 , explaining 62.23% of total variance. All items loaded onto the single factor with loadings $> .70$. Therefore, we calculated an average score for the whole emotion scale, and average scores for the three subscales theoretically distinguished. In the following analyses, we compared the predictive validity of the emotion scale as a whole vs. the three subscales.

3.3 Results

Table II provides means and standard deviations of the study variables as well as correlations among them.

-TABLE II-

1 DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

2
3 259
4
5 260 In order to assess whether emotions would improve the predictive validity of a traditional TPB
6
7
8 261 model as regards the intention to purchase FT food products, a stepwise regression model was run.
9
10 262 In the first step, intention to purchase FT products was regressed on the three TPB major constructs
11
12 263 (ATT, SN, PBC). The model explained a significant proportion of variance ($R^2 = .659$). All three
13
14 264 TPB constructs exerted a significant effect on intention (Table III, Step 1). The single measure of
15
16
17 265 emotions (Em Tot) was entered as an explanatory variable in the second step: the additional
18
19 266 variance explained was significant ($\Delta R^2 = .009$) and so was the effect of emotions (Table III, Step
20
21 267 2). In the third step, the single measure of emotions was excluded from the model, and the three
22
23
24 268 measures of emotions (Em Soc, Em Self, Em Pro) were entered: the additional variance explained
25
26 269 in participants' intention ($\Delta R^2 = .015$) was significant. The effect of pro-active emotions was
27
28 270 significant, whereas the effect of self-related and social emotions was not (Table III, Step 3).
29
30
31 271

32
33 272 -TABLE III-
34
35 273

36
37
38 274 **3.4 Discussion**

39
40 275 The results show that the regression model based on the original TPB explains a significant and
41
42 276 substantial amount of the variance in participants' intention to purchase FT food products.
43
44 277 Nevertheless, the introduction of emotions as a single factor slightly increased the explained variance.
45
46
47 278 In the third step, the single factor representing emotions was removed, while the three different
48
49 279 emotion dimensions were included in the regression model: In this case, the proportion of explained
50
51 280 variance was also significantly larger than in step 1 (original TPB model). These results support Hp1.
52
53
54 281 Moreover, of the three different types of emotions, the results indicate that only pro-active emotions
55
56 282 have a significant impact on purchase intention for FT products.
57

58 283
59
60 284 **4. Study 2**

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

4.1 Aims and hypotheses

In Study 2, we tested whether the incremental validity of adding emotion-based factors to a TPB-model was confirmed in relation to a different behaviour in the realm of ethical consumerism, namely buying food through SPGs. We formulated the following hypothesis:

Hp2: The prediction of intention to purchase through SPGs is improved introducing in the TPB model self-related, social, and pro-active emotions.

4.2 Material and methods**4.2.1 Participants and procedure**

The questionnaire was completed in electronic form via Qualtrics, before Covid-19 pandemic. The link was forwarded by e-mail to the network of SPGs in different Italian territories. Moreover, for the dissemination of the questionnaire, it was also possible to take advantage of the contribution of a magazine focused on ethical and environmental issues (“Terra Nuova”), which dedicated an article on its web portal presenting the research and the link for the online survey. Two hundred and nine participants completed the survey while 56 questionnaires were excluded as they missed at least one of the multi-item scales under investigation. Most participants were female (69.9%) and their average age was 45.6 ($SD = 11.18$). Most were married (66.8%) and had children (68.6%): this is coherent with the fact that through the SPGs are usually bought quantity of products suitable for families of three/four people at least. For more details about participants’ characteristics, see Table 1, column Study 2 - SPGs.

4.2.2 Measures

In Study 2, the same measures of Study 1 were used, replacing, in each item, “FT products” with “through the SPGs”.

4.2.3 Preliminary analyses

1 DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

2
3 311 Also in Study 2, we first ran an EFA on the 10 items measuring emotional feelings when purchasing
4
5 312 through SPGs. Data were factorable, KMO = .857; Bartlett's $\chi^2 = 636.63$, $df = 45$, $p < .001$). Using
6
7
8 313 the Generalized Least Square Method, only one factor with eigenvalue > 1 was extracted, accounting
9
10 314 for 48.51% of the total variance. All items loaded onto the single factor with loadings $> .55$. Therefore,
11
12 315 we calculated an average score for the whole emotion scale and average scores for the three subscales
13
14
15 316 theoretically distinguished. As for Study 1, in the following analyses, we compared the predictive
16
17 317 validity of the emotion scale as a whole vs. the three subscales.

18
19 318
20
21 319 **4.3 Results**

22
23
24 320 Table IV provides means and standard deviations of the study variables as well as correlations among
25
26 321 them.

27
28 322
29
30
31 323 -TABLE IV-

32
33 324
34
35 325 Similarly to Study 1, a stepwise regression model was used for testing whether the measures of
36
37
38 326 emotions would improve the predictive validity of a traditional TPB model as regards intention to
39
40 327 purchase food products through SPGs. In the first step (intention to purchase through SPGs regressed
41
42 328 on the three TPB major constructs -ATT, SN, PBC-), the model explained a significant proportion of
43
44
45 329 variance ($R^2 = .32$); ATT and PBC were significantly associated with intention, whereas the effect of
46
47 330 SN was marginal (Table V, Step 1). In the second step (addition of the single measure of emotions),
48
49 331 the additional variance explained ($\Delta R^2 = .02$) was significant compared to Step 1 and the single
50
51 332 emotion score was significantly associated with intention (Table V, Step 2). In the third step (entering
52
53
54 333 of the three measures of theoretically distinguished emotions and excluding the single measure of
55
56 334 emotions), the additional variance explained in participants' intention ($\Delta R^2 = .035$) was significant.
57
58 335 The effect of pro-active emotion was significant, whereas the effect of self-related and social
59
60 336 emotions was not (Table V, Step 3).

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

-TABLE V-

4.4 Discussion

Overall, results of the Study 2 are very similar to those of the Study 1, and provide support to Hp2. Adding emotions to a traditional TPB-based model significantly increases the proportion of explained variance in participants' intention to buy through SPGs. Similar to Study 1, the three different emotional factors perform slightly better than the single emotional factor in terms of variance explained. Finally, pro-active emotions are again the only ones, among the three kinds of emotions considered, to be significantly associated with intention to buy food products through SPGs.

5. General discussion and conclusions

Within the theoretical framework of the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB, Ajzen, 1991; Fishbein and Ajzen, 2010), this research aimed to analyse the determinants of intention to make sustainable food consumption choices by adding different kinds of emotions to the traditional TPB model. Considering sustainable food consumption as a conscious purchasing choice that takes into account the impact on the environment, animal welfare and producers' working conditions (Hain, 2017; Tallontire *et al.*, 2001), we focused on two sustainable behaviours: purchasing Fairtrade (FT) food products and purchasing food through Solidarity Purchasing Groups (SPGs). In the TPB model, the intention to perform a behaviour is primarily explained by the attitude towards the behaviour, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control. Several scholars (e.g., Ajzen, 2015; Arvola *et al.*, 2008; Spence *et al.*, 2018) added other possible determinants (e.g., habit strength, knowledge, trust) to this model. However, emotions were less frequently considered among antecedents, although some previous work identified consumers' emotions as important predictors of ethical consumerism intentions (Arvola *et al.*, 2008; Berki-Kiss and Menrad, 2022; Dowd and Burke, 2013; Schneider *et al.*, 2017) and food consumption (Edwards *et al.*, 2013; Köster and Mojet, 2015). Given the wide

1 DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

2

3 363 range of emotional feelings (e.g., Roseman, 2013; Shuman *et al.*, 2017), in the present work we

4

5 364 distinguished between three conceptually distinct types of emotions in predicting intention to make

6

7

8 365 sustainable food consumption choices: self-related, social and pro-active emotions.

9

10 366 In two studies involving 240 and 209 participants, respectively, we analysed the determinants of the

11

12 367 intention to purchase FT food products and the intention to purchase food through SPGs entering the

13

14

15 368 three kinds of emotions in addition to attitude, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control in

16

17 369 stepwise regression models. Since exploratory factor analyses suggested considering emotions as a

18

19 370 single factor, we ran the stepwise regression models either with emotions as a whole or as three

20

21

22 371 separate factors to understand the difference between the two strategies and the empirical usefulness

23

24 372 of distinguishing between the three emotion types.

25

26 373 The results of the two studies provide support to the research hypotheses. Indeed, the hypothesis that

27

28 374 adding emotions to the original TPB model improves the prediction of intention to perform

29

30

31 375 sustainable behaviours was confirmed for both purchases of FT products (Study 1) and purchases

32

33 376 through SPGs (Study 2): the three classical antecedents of the TPB model explained a significant

34

35 377 proportion of the variance, but the addition of emotions significantly improved the regression models

36

37

38 378 with an additional explained variance ranging from 1.5% to 3.5% when three emotion types were

39

40 379 considered separately. This result is even more interesting because it is robust with respect to two

41

42 380 different behaviours. Moreover, it is not the same to consider emotions as a whole or as three separate

43

44

45 381 dimensions (self-related, social, and pro-active emotions). In both studies, the incremental validity of

46

47 382 the model with the three separate factors was higher compared to the model including the single

48

49 383 emotional factor.

50

51 384 The distinction between three different types of emotions allows for a more detailed understanding

52

53

54 385 of the relationship between emotions and the behavioural intentions measured in the studies. Overall,

55

56 386 pro-active emotions seem to be the class of emotions that plays a more relevant role in predicting the

57

58 387 purchase intention for FT products and through SPGs, while self-related and social emotions did not

59

60 388 predict the intention to purchase FT food products or to purchase food through SPGs. This is an

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

unexpected result. Some previous studies (e.g., Elsantil and Hamza, 2019; Wang and Wu, 2016) suggested that self-oriented and other oriented emotions predict the willingness to adopt sustainable consumer behaviours. However, in these studies pro-active emotions were not jointly considered. Our work is innovative in this respect but it does not allow us to make a timely comparison with previous results; thus, future studies are necessary.

Considering the three classical antecedents of the TPB, the influence of subjective norms on the intention of purchasing through SPGs was marginal, while it was high for the intention to purchase FT products. This is quite surprising since subjective norms represent the “perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform the behaviour” (Ajzen, 1991, p. 188). Purchasing through SPGs necessarily requires the organization of a group to purchase and redistribute products. One might expect, therefore, that group members would have influenced each other at the time of recruitment and would continue to influence each other to carry out this purchasing choice. Thus, the social dimension should be a central component of this behaviour, but neither subjective norms nor social emotions appeared to be relevant in predicting purchase intention via SPGs. One possible explanation for this result could be that ethical consumer behaviour is guided by a mix of selfish and altruistic beliefs and motivations. In the case of purchasing food through SPGs, behaviour could be guided by more individual/egoistic considerations (such as those related to health and the low price of the products purchased) prevailing on social motivations (see also Verneau *et al.*, 2019).

5.1 Limitations

The measurement of the three classical antecedents of the TPB model (attitude, subjective norms, perceived behavioural control) performed by single items can be considered the main limitation of this work. Even if an increasing number of scholars (e.g., Allen *et al.*, 2022; Berki-Kiss and Menrad, 2022; Gogol *et al.*, 2014; Oluka *et al.*, 2014) consider the use of single-item measures as adequate, the most common practice is to use composite measures made of at least three items for each

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

theoretical construct whose validity and internal consistency can be assessed. In future research, instruments made up with more items measuring these three theoretical dimensions should be used. Also, the distribution of several study variables' frequency is relevantly skewed – which is very common in TPB-based studies (see Fishbein and Ajzen, 2010). This characteristic of the dataset prevents an accurate analysis of the TPB factors interactions, suggesting some caution in interpreting the results, especially as regards the lack of influence of subjective norms on intention (La Barbera and Ajzen, 2020a, 2021; Yzer and van den Putte, 2014).

It should further be pointed out that the two studies were conducted before the Covid-19 pandemic. This global event could have influenced the beliefs (Dudek and Śpiewak, 2022; Foti and Timpanaro, 2021; George and Nair, 2022) which determine attitudes, norms and perceived control (e.g., De Leeuw *et al.*, 2015; La Barbera and Ajzen, 2020b) which, in turn, can influence ethical purchasing intentions. Future research could fruitfully follow this intriguing path.

Finally, the convenience samples involved in the present studies represent another important limitation, which suggests caution in generalizing the current studies' findings to other contexts without further research.

Despite these limitations, the present work offers several contributions to the line of research on predictors of intention to make ethical food purchase choices. Specifically, the results of the two studies show that the addition of emotions to the three classical antecedents of the TPB, contributes significantly to the explanation of ethical purchasing intentions. To date, studies that consider emotions in extended versions of the TPB model are not very common (e.g., Berki-Kiss and Menrad, 2022; Moons and De Pelsmacker, 2012; Perugini and Bagozzi, 2001), and they generally do not provide a comparison between the original TPB-based model, and the “augmented” one they propose, thus failing to assess the incremental validity of the new model and the importance of the added factors (Graham-Rowe *et al.*, 2015; Russell *et al.*, 2017). Especially for ethical and sustainable food consumerism, very few works (e.g., Berki-Kiss and Menrad, 2022; Duran *et al.*, 2011) have considered several kinds of emotions. This is quite surprising given that the ethical and sustainable

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

behaviours of purchasing FT products and purchasing through SPGs are aimed at increasing personal and social wellbeing, both locally and for the planet as a whole (Yamoah *et al.*, 2016). Emotions associated to self-perception, to social relationships and to the perception of personal control can be deeply involved in the decision to engage in this type of behaviours.

5.2 Conclusions and implications

The consideration of different kinds of emotions, namely self-related, social and pro-active emotions, in extending the TPB model, represents the innovative contribution of the present work. In addition, results show that only pro-active emotions play a significant role in predicting ethical and sustainable food purchase intentions. Pro-active emotions were operationalized in terms of hope and commitment, emotions that provide an “impetus for action” (Lazarus, 1991) and motivation to move towards a goal-congruent situation (Roseman, 2013). More than the self-related and social dimensions of emotions, the emotional activation seems to play a key role in guiding sustainable purchase intentions. Certainly, future research should deepen the pattern of the relationships between different kinds of emotions by using also qualitative methods such as interviews or focus groups involving consumers. In addition, future research could examine the role of emotions in their various manifestations in predicting intention to perform other ethical behaviours, in line with Berki-Kiss and Menrad (2022).

The practical implications of these findings should also be considered. Promoting sustainable and ethical food purchasing decisions may be important for consumers to feel empowered to contribute to human and planetary well-being through small but significant behaviours. The attention to sustainability is an issue that can no longer be ignored (Vallaey, 2018), for the survival of humanity and the safeguard of the planet, starting from the Agenda 2030 defined by the United Nations. Identifying dimensions that could play a role in promoting these behaviours, in addition to the classic predictors of the TPB model, could be helpful in developing interventions to support them. In particular, one can focus on the role that pro-active emotions may play in promoting sustainable

1 DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

2
3 466 purchase behaviours. To activate such emotions and thus encourage the adoption of sustainable
4
5 467 behaviours, different types of interventions can be developed for both current adult consumers and
6
7
8 468 young citizens who are future consumers. For actual consumers, information campaigns could be
9
10 469 designed to highlight the human and environmental benefits of careful purchasing choices: Kim *et al.*
11
12 470 (2019), for example, show that emotional messages to environmentally friendly behaviour can be
13
14
15 471 more effective than purely informative messages because they also induce emotional activation. Other
16
17 472 possible tools to trigger emotions that promote sustainable behaviour are games and gamification:
18
19 473 Ahmed and Johnson (2021) propose a review of practises to guide emotions in information seeking
20
21
22 474 to promote sustainable behaviours. Even if children are not yet responsible for their family's food
23
24 475 purchasing behaviour, they will be, and maintaining intentions toward future sustainable behaviour
25
26 476 is critical. To this end, both formal and informal educational interventions can be proposed: Tillmanns
27
28 477 (2020), for example, suggests developing educational interventions based on stimulating emotions
29
30
31 478 through influential images or messages to trigger profound changes toward sustainability.
32
33 479

35 480 **References**

37
38 481 Ahmed, A., and Johnson, F. (2021), "Gamification as a Way of Facilitating Emotions During
39
40 482 Information-Seeking Behaviour: A Systematic Review of Previous Research", Toeppe, K., Yan, H.,
41
42 483 Chu, S.K.W. (Eds) *Diversity, Divergence, Dialogue: 16th International Conference, iConference*
43
44 484 *2021, Beijing, China, March 17–31, 2021, Proceedings*, Part II 16, Springer International Publishing,
45
46
47 485 pp. 85-98. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71305-8_7
48
49 486 Ajzen, I. (1991), "The theory of planned behavior", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision*
50
51 487 *Processes*, Vol. 50 No. 2, pp. 179-211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
52
53
54 488 Ajzen, I. (2015), "Consumer attitudes and behavior: the theory of planned behavior applied to food
55
56 489 consumption decisions", *Italian Review of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 70 No. 2, pp. 121-138.
57
58 490 <https://doi.org/10.13128/REA-18003>
59
60

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

- Ajzen, I. (2020), "The theory of planned behavior: Frequently asked questions", *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, Vol. 2 No. 4, pp. 314-324. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.195>
- Allen, M.S., Iliescu, D., and Greiff, S. (2022), "Single item measures in psychological science", *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, Vol. 38 No.1, pp. 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000699>
- Antonetti, P., and Maklan, S. (2014), "Feelings that make a difference-How guilt and pride convince consumers of the effectiveness of sustainable consumption choices", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 124 No. 1, pp. 117-134. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1841-9>.
- Arvola, A., Vassallo, M., Dean, M., Lampila, P., Saba, A., Lähteenmäki, L., *et al.* (2008), "Predicting intentions to purchase organic food: The role of affective and moral attitudes in the theory of planned behavior", *Appetite*, Vol. 50, pp. 443-454. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2007.09.010>
- Baiardi, D., and Morana, C. (2020), "*Climate change awareness: Empirical evidence for the European Union*". Center for Research on Pensions and Welfare Policies (CeRP). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3513061> (accessed 20 December 2022)
- Berki-Kiss, D., and Menrad, K. (2022), "The role emotions play in consumer intentions to make pro-social purchases in Germany—An augmented theory of planned behavior model", *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, Vol. 29, pp. 79-89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2021.09.026>
- Brückner, K., Emberger-Klein, A., and Menrad, K. (2023), "The Role of Emotions in Food-Related Decision-Making: A Choice-Based Conjoint Analysis of Yogurt Preferences", *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, Vol. 29 No. 6, pp. 177-196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10454446.2023.2227575>
- Coppola, A., Verneau, F., Caracciolo, F., and Panico, T. (2017), "Personal values and pro-social behaviour: The role of socio-economic context in fair trade consumption", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 119 No. 9, pp. 1969-1982. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-10-2016-0474>
- Corsi, A. and Novelli, S. (2016), *The value of the participation in Solidarity Purchasing Groups (SPGs): an empirical analysis in Piedmont*. Paper presented at Fifth AIEAA Congress, June 16-17,

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

- 2016, Bologna, Italy 242305, Italian Association of Agricultural and Applied Economics (AIEAA). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.242305> (accessed 10 December 2022)
- De Leeuw, A., Valois, P., Ajzen, I., and Schmidt, P. (2015), "Using the theory of planned behavior to identify key beliefs underlying pro-environmental behavior in high-school students: Implications for educational interventions", *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, Vol. 42, pp. 128-138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.03.005>
- De Pelsmaeker, S., Schouteten, J.J., Gellynck, X., Delbaere, C., De Clercq, N., Hegyi, A., Kuti, T., Depypere, F. and Dewettinck, K. (2017), "Do anticipated emotions influence behavioural intention and behaviour to consume filled chocolates?", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 119 No. 9, pp. 1983-1998. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-01-2016-0006>
- Dionysis, S., Chesney, T., and McAuley, D. (2022), "Examining the influential factors of consumer purchase intentions for blockchain traceable coffee using the theory of planned behavior", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 124 No.12, pp. 4304-4322. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-05-2021-0541>
- Dowd, K., and Burke, K.J. (2013), "The influence of ethical values and food choice motivations on intentions to purchase sustainably sourced foods", *Appetite*, Vol. 69 No. 1, pp. 137-144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2013.05.024>
- Dudek, M., and Śpiewak, R. (2022), "Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Sustainable Food Systems: Lessons Learned for Public Policies? The Case of Poland", *Agriculture*, Vol.12, No. 1, p 61. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture12010061>
- Duran, M., Alzate, M., Lopez, W., and Sabucedo, J. (2007), "Emotions and proenvironmental behavior", *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 287-296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rlp.2015.09.006>

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

- Edwards, J.S., Hartwell, H.J., and Brown, L. (2013), "The relationship between emotions, food consumption and meal acceptability when eating out of the home", *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 22-32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2013.04.004>
- Elsantil, Y., and Hamza, E.A. (2019), "The impact of self-conscious emotions on willingness to pay for sustainable products", *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 77-90. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.729>
- Eurobarometer (2021), "*Eurobarometer Survey: Europeans consider climate change to be the most serious problem facing the world*". Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_21_3156 (accessed 20 November 2022)
- Fairtrade International (2011), *Explanatory document for the Fairtrade trade standard*. Available at: http://www.fairtrade.net/fileadmin/user_upload/content/2011-12-29_Explan_Doc_GTS_EN.pdf (accessed 10 November 2022)
- Fishbein, M., and Ajzen, I. (2010), *Predicting and changing behavior: The reasoned action approach*. Psychology Press, New York, NY.
- Forgas, J.P. (1994), "Sad and guilty? Affective influences on the explanation of conflict in close relationships", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 66 No. 1, pp. 56-68. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.66.1.56>
- Foti, V.T., and Timpanaro, G. (2021), "Relationships, sustainability and agri-food purchasing behaviour in farmer markets in Italy", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 123 No. 13, pp. 428-453. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-04-2021-0358>
- Geiger, S.M., and Keller, J. (2018), "Shopping for clothes and sensitivity to the suffering of others: The role of compassion and values in sustainable fashion consumption", *Environment and Behavior*, Vol. 50 No. 10, pp. 1119-1144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916517732109>
- George, A., and Nair, A.S. (2022), "Reflections on Green Purchase Behaviour in the Era of COVID-19: A Conceptual Framework", *Vision*, 09722629221087363. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09722629221087363>

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

- Gillani, A., and Kutaula, S. (2018), "An introduction to special issue: sustainability and ethical consumerism", *Management Decision*, Vol. 56 No. 3, pp. 511-514. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-03-2018-949>
- Gogol, K., Brunner, M., Goetz, T., Martin, R., Ugen, S., Keller, U., ... and Preckel, F. (2014), "'My questionnaire is too long!' The assessments of motivational-affective constructs with three-item and single-item measures", *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, Vol. 39 No. 3, pp. 188-205. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2014.04.002>
- Graham-Rowe, E., Jessop, D.C., and Sparks, P. (2015), "Predicting Household Food Waste Reduction Using an Extended Theory of Planned Behavior", *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, Vol. 101, pp. 194-202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2015.05.020>.
- Gregory-Smith, D., Smith, A., and Winklhofer, H. (2013), "Emotions and dissonance in 'ethical' consumption choices", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 29 No. 11-12, pp. 1201-1223. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2013.796320>
- Hain, M. (2017), "How good products make you feel: The underlying emotions of ethical consumerism", *Maastricht University Journal of Sustainability Studies*, Vol. 3, pp. 73-81.
- Hareli, S., and Parkinson, B. (2008), "What's social about social emotions?", *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, Vol. 38 No. 2, pp. 131-156. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.2008.00363.x>
- Jose, H., and Kuriakose, V. (2021), "Emotional or logical: Reason for consumers to buy organic food products", *British food journal*, Vol. 123 No. 12, pp. 3999-4016. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-10-2020-0916>
- Kim, W.H., Malek, K., and Roberts, K.R. (2019), "The effectiveness of green advertising in the convention industry: An application of a dual coding approach and the norm activation model", *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, Vol. 39, pp. 185-192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2019.04.007>

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

- Köster, E.P., and Mojet, J. (2015), "From mood to food and from food to mood: A psychological perspective on the measurement of food-related emotions in consumer research", *Food research international*, Vol. 76, pp. 180-191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2015.04.006>
- La Barbera, F., and Ajzen, I. (2020a), "Control interactions in the theory of planned behavior: Rethinking the role of subjective norm", *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 401. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v16i3.2056>
- La Barbera, F., and Ajzen, I. (2020b), "Understanding support for European integration across generations: A study guided by the theory of planned behavior", *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 437-457. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v16i3.1844>
- La Barbera, F., and Ajzen, I. (2021), "Moderating role of perceived behavioural control in the theory of planned behavior: A preregistered study", *Journal of Theoretical Social Psychology*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 35-45. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jts5.83>
- Lavuri, R. (2022), "Organic green purchasing: Moderation of environmental protection emotion and price sensitivity", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 368, p. 133113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.133113>
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991), "Cognition and motivation in emotion", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 46 No. 4, pp. 352-367. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.46.4.352>
- Maestripieri, L., Giroletti, T., and Podda, A. (2018), "Solidarity Purchasing Groups in Italy: A critical assessment of their effects on the marginalisation of their suppliers", *The International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 393-412. <https://doi.org/10.48416/ijaf.v24i3.7>
- Moons, I., and De Pelsmacker, P. (2012), "Emotions as determinants of electric car usage intention", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 28 No. 3-4, pp. 195-237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2012.659007>
- Nawijn, J., and Biran, A. (2019), "Negative emotions in tourism: a meaningful analysis", *Current Issues in Tourism*, Vol. 22 No. 19, pp. 2386-2398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1451495>

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

- Oluka, O.C., Nie. S., and Sun. Y. (2014), "Quality Assessment of TPB-Based Questionnaires: A Systematic Review", *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 9 No. 4, p. e94419. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094419>
- Onwezen, M.C., Bartels, J., and Antonides, G. (2014), "The self-regulatory function of anticipated pride and guilt in a sustainable and healthy consumption context", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 53-68. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.1991>
- Peloza, J., White, K., and Shang, J. (2013), "Good and guilt-free: The role of self-accountability in influencing preferences for products with ethical attributes", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 77 No. 1, pp. 104-119. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.11.0454>
- Perugini, M., and Bagozzi, R.P. (2001), "The role of desires and anticipated emotions in goaldirected behaviours/Broadening and deepening the Theory of Planned Behaviour", *British Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 40, pp. 79-98. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466601164704>
- Pfattheicher, S., Sassenrath, C., and Schindler, S. (2016), "Feelings for the suffering of others and the environment: Compassion fosters proenvironmental tendencies", *Environment and behavior*, Vol. 48 No. 7, pp. 929-945. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916515574549>
- Pfister, H.R., and Böhm, G. (2008), "The multiplicity of emotions: A framework of emotional functions in decision making", *Judgment and decision making*, Vol. 3 N.1, pp. 5-17. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1930297500000127>
- Pham, M.T. (1998), "Representativeness, relevance, and the use of feelings in decision making", *Journal of consumer research*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 144-159. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209532>
- Raynolds, L.T., Murray, D.L., and Wilkinson, J. (Eds.). (2007), *Fair trade: The challenges of transforming globalization*, Routledge, London.
- Roseman, I.J. (2013), "Appraisal in the emotion system: Coherence in strategies for coping", *Emotion Review*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 141-149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073912469591>

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

- Ruggeri, G., Corsi, S., and Nayga, R.M. (2021), “Eliciting willingness to pay for fairtrade products with information”, *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 87, p. 104066. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2020.104066>
- Russell, J.A. and Mehrabian, A. (1977), “Evidence for a three-factor theory of emotions”, *Journal of research in Personality*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 273-294. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566\(77\)90037-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566(77)90037-X)
- Russell, S.V., Young, C.W., Unsworth, K. L., and Robinson, C. (2017), “Bringing habits and emotions into food waste behaviour”, *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, Vol. 125, pp. 107-114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2017.06.007>
- Schneider, C.R., Zaval, L., Weber, E.U., and Markowitz, E.M. (2017), “The influence of anticipated pride and guilt on pro-environmental decision making”, *PloS one*, Vol. 12 No. 11, p. e0188781. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0188781>
- Shaw, D., McMaster, R., and Newholm, T. (2016), “Care and commitment in ethical consumption: An exploration of the ‘attitude–behaviour gap’”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 136 No. 2, pp. 251-265.
- Shrestha, N. (2021), “Factor analysis as a tool for survey analysis”, *American Journal of Applied Mathematics and Statistics*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 4-11. <https://doi.org/10.12691/ajams-9-1-2>
- Shuman, V., Clark-Polner, E., Meuleman, B., Sander, D., and Scherer, K.R. (2017), “Emotion perception from a componential perspective”, *Cognition and Emotion*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 47-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2015.1075964>
- Son, J., Nam, C., Diddi, S. (2022), “Emotion or Information: What Makes Consumers Communicate about Sustainable Apparel Products on Social Media?”, *Sustainability*, Vol. 14, p. 2849. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14052849>
- Spence, M., Stancu, V., Elliott, C.T., and Dean, M. (2018), “Exploring consumer purchase intentions towards traceable minced beef and beef steak using the theory of planned behaviour”, *Food Control*, Vol. 91, pp. 138-147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2018.03.035>

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

- Tallontire, A., Rentsendorj, E., and Blowfield, M. (2001), "Ethical consumers and ethical trade: a review of current literature" (NRI Policy Series 12). Retrieved from <https://gala.gre.ac.uk/id/eprint/11125/>
- Terlau, W., and Hirsch, D. (2015), "Sustainable consumption and the attitude-behaviour-gap phenomenon-causes and measurements towards a sustainable development", *International Journal on Food System Dynamics*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 159-174. <https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.208880>
- Thomas, E.F., McGarty, C., & Mavor, K.I. (2009), "Transforming 'apathy into movement': The role of prosocial emotions in motivating action for social change", *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 310-333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868309343290>
- Tillmanns, T. (2020), "Learning sustainability as an effect of disruption", *Environmental Education Research*, Vol.26 No.1, pp.14-26, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2019.1682125>
- Tønnesen, M.T., and Grunert, K.G. (2021), "Social-psychological determinants of young consumers' consumption of pork", *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 93, p. 104262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2021.104262>
- Triandis, H.C. (1977), *Interpersonal Behavior*. Brooks/Cole Pub. Co, Monterey, CA.
- Vallaey, F. (2018), "Defining social responsibility: A matter of philosophical urgency for universities". Retrieved from: <http://www.guninetwork.org/resources/he-articles/defining-social-responsibility-a-matter-of-urgency-for-philosophy-and-universities>.
- Verneau, F., La Barbera, F., Amato, M., and Sodano, V. (2019), "Consumers' concern towards palm oil consumption: An empirical study on attitudes and intention in Italy", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 121 No. 9, pp. 1982-1997. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-10-2018-0659>
- Wang, J., and Wu, L. (2016), "The impact of emotions on the intention of sustainable consumption choices: evidence from a big city in an emerging country", *Journal of cleaner production*, Vol. 126, pp. 325-336. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.03.119>

DIFFERENTIATING EMOTIONS IN THE TPB MODEL

World Bank (2003), “*World development report 2003: Sustainable development in a dynamic world: Transforming institutions, growth, and quality of life*”, The World Bank. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1596/0-8213-5150-8> (accessed 20 December 2022)

Yamoah, F.A., Duffy, R., Petrovici, D., and Fearne, A. (2016), “Towards a framework for understanding fairtrade purchase intention in the mainstream environment of supermarkets”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 136 No. 1, pp. 181-197. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2509-9>

Yzer, M., and Van Den Putte, B. (2014), “Control perceptions moderate attitudinal and normative effects on intention to quit smoking”, *Psychology of Addictive Behaviours*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 1153–1161. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0037924>