



This is an author produced version of a paper published in  
European Journal of Horticultural Science.

This paper has been peer-reviewed but may not include the final publisher  
proof-corrections or pagination.

Citation for the published paper:

Fernqvist, F. and Ekelund, L. (2013) Consumer Attitudes towards Origin  
and Organic - The Role of Credence Labels on Consumers' Liking of  
Tomatoes. *European Journal of Horticultural Science*. Volume: 78, Number: 4,  
pp 184-190.

Access to the published version may require journal subscription.

Published with permission from: Eugen Ulmer GmbH & Co.

Epsilon Open Archive <http://epsilon.slu.se>

1 **FINAL DRAFT: Consumer attitudes towards origin and organic - the role of**  
2 **credence labels on consumers' liking of tomatoes**

3 F. Fernqvist<sup>1)</sup> and L. Ekelund<sup>1)</sup>

4 (<sup>1)</sup>Department of Work Science, Business Economics and Environmental Psychology,  
5 Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Alnarp, Sweden)

6 **Key words:** *Lycopersicon esculentum* - consumer panel - attitudes – credence  
7 attributes – labelling - taste - horticultural marketing

8

9 **The final version of the paper is published in:**

10 Fernqvist, F. & Ekelund, L. (2013). Consumer attitudes towards origin and organic –  
11 The role of credence labels on consumers' liking of tomatoes. *European Journal of*  
12 *Horticultural Science*, 78(4), 184-190.  
13

14

15 **Summary**

16 The tomato is one of the most popular vegetables in Europe, but since the introduction  
17 of modern production systems much attention has been paid to the issue 'lack of  
18 taste'. Consumers' experienced taste and quality, however, are not only dependent on  
19 attributes of the tomato such as taste and texture, but also on product appearance and  
20 labels signalling credence (*e.g.* origin and production method) and personal factors  
21 such as attitudes affecting consumers' quality experience. In this paper we  
22 hypothesise that credence labels (*i.e.* 'Swedish', 'Dutch' and 'Organic') have an effect  
23 on consumers' experienced liking of taste and total impression of tomatoes, and that  
24 attitudes towards those labels are correlated with experienced quality.

25 Through a taste assessment with a consumer panel, we found a significant difference  
26 in liking of taste between tomatoes labelled 'Dutch' (M=4.54, SD=1.68) and tomatoes

27 labelled 'Swedish' (M=5.88, SD=1.70) and 'Organic' (M=6.05, SD=1.70),  
28 respectively. As for overall impression, tomatoes labelled 'Dutch' (M=4.24, SD=1.74)  
29 received lower grades than 'Swedish' (M=5.59, SD=1.76) and 'Organic' (M=6.00,  
30 SD=1.63). We found that attitudes towards origin are significantly correlated with  
31 liking of taste of tomatoes labelled 'Swedish' in a positive direction and 'Dutch' in a  
32 negative direction. We also found that positive attitudes towards organic products are  
33 positively correlated with liking of tomatoes labelled 'Organic'. The hypotheses are  
34 accepted and theoretical and practical implications are discussed.

## 35 **Introduction**

36 The tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.) is one of the most popular vegetables in  
37 the European Union with an average annual consumption of 12 kg per person and a  
38 total production of over 15 million tonnes (EUROSTAT 2008). While the Swedish  
39 tomato consumption has increased, the domestic market shares during the main  
40 production season (April-October) have fallen from 43 to 26% between 1998 and  
41 2008, with imports coming mainly from the Netherlands (TJÄRNEMO et al. 2010).  
42 Less than 4% of the Swedish greenhouse tomato area consists of organic production  
43 (SWEDISH BOARD OF AGRICULTURE 2007). Although consumption increases, 'lack of  
44 taste' has become a reason for consumer dissatisfaction (BRUHN et al. 1991;  
45 FERNQVIST and HUNTER 2012), as the industry has been focusing on yields,  
46 resistance, product homogeneity, durability and a low price (FRIEDLAND 2006;  
47 EKELUND and JÖNSSON 2011).  
48 Consumers' quality perceptions can be based upon intrinsic or extrinsic attributes, or  
49 cues, of a product (OLSHAVSKY 1985) and consumer products have been categorised  
50 as search, experience, or credence goods based on different types of quality attributes  
51 available to the consumer (NELSON 1970; DARBY and KARNI 1973). Experience (e.g.

52 taste or satisfaction) and credence attributes (trust and beliefs) are transformed into  
53 search attributes often in the form of labels signalling for example nutritional value,  
54 food safety, ethics or trust (CASWELL and PADBERG 1992; CASWELL and MOJDUSZKA  
55 1996). In a conceptual model of the consumer quality perception process (STEENKAMP  
56 1990), judgements of perceived quality emerge in a contextual setting consisting of  
57 comparative, personal and situational factors, explaining how quality cues affect  
58 perceived quality through the intervening role of quality attributes. The Theory of  
59 Reasoned Action (FISHBEIN and AJZEN 1975) and the extended Theory of Planned  
60 Behaviour (AJZEN 1991) use attitudes and subjective norms to predict intended  
61 behaviour. An attitude can be described as a learned predisposition and based upon  
62 beliefs about the object. However, it does not predispose the person to perform a  
63 specific behaviour (FISHBEIN and AJZEN 1975), which is often referred to as the  
64 attitude-behaviour gap (VIERMIER and VERBEKE 2006). Using the framework of  
65 STEENKAMP (1990), we assume that attitudes (or the underlying beliefs) can be used  
66 to predict experienced quality of food. Labels signalling country of origin (COO)  
67 (DRANSFIELD et al. 2005; EKELUND, FERNQVIST and TJÄRNEMO 2007) and organic  
68 production (JOHANSSON et al. 1999; EKELUND, FERNQVIST and TJÄRNEMO 2007;  
69 GRANKVIST et al. 2007; POELMAN et al. 2008) have been shown to have strong effects  
70 on consumers' quality perceptions of food. In the case of Sweden, the national organic  
71 label 'KRAV' is known by 98% of the Swedish consumers (KRAV 2012), while the  
72 label of EU-organic is recognised by only 20% (ANDERSSON and EKELUND 2012).  
73 The purpose of this paper is to explore consumer attitudes towards two of the most  
74 common credence attributes connected to tomato - country of origin and organic  
75 production – thus focusing on the effect of different labels on consumers hedonic  
76 liking (taste) and overall impression of tomatoes. The Swedish KRAV-label is used as

77 the organic label, due to its strong signal value, and Swedish and Dutch are used as  
78 labels of origin, due to them being the main competing countries of origin during the  
79 Swedish production season. The alternatives, thus, represent those that the consumer  
80 meets in an every-day shopping situation. Based on the theory of the quality  
81 perception process (STEENKAMP 1990) we test the hypotheses that (a) labels signalling  
82 credence attributes affect consumers' perceived taste (either positively or negatively),  
83 and that (b) experienced taste and quality impression of labelled tomatoes are  
84 correlated with positive (or negative) attitudes towards those labels, or what they  
85 represent.

## 86 **Material and Methods**

87 The material consists of a consumer panel evaluation of tomatoes and a consumer  
88 survey including background data of the respondents and a package of questions  
89 regarding consumer attitudes. The assessments were made at a centralised location on  
90 the campus of the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences in Alnarp, and a  
91 convenience sample was recruited from the general public and university staff and  
92 students. In total 97 respondents, none of who were involved in vegetable production  
93 or research, completed the tomato taste evaluation and questionnaire.

### 94 ***Consumer panel - questionnaire***

95 The consumers in the panel received a questionnaire including questions regarding a)  
96 gender; b) age; c) consumption frequency; d) general satisfaction with purchased  
97 tomatoes; and e) reasons for dissatisfaction with tomato purchases. Following the  
98 usual supply in an ordinary supermarket during the Swedish season, the respondents  
99 also marked; f) which type of tomato (*i.e.* 'on-the-vine', 'cherry and cocktail  
100 varieties', 'single round', 'organic', 'plum varieties') they usually buy. The final part  
101 of the questionnaire was a scheme of 17 attitude items (statements) to be graded on a

102 9-graded hedonic scale where the end-points were marked (1) totally disagree and (9)  
103 totally agree, comprising aspects like attitudes towards taste, appearance, colour,  
104 origin, production method, price and place of purchase. The specific questions are  
105 presented in the results section (Table 1).

### 106 *Consumer panel - taste evaluation*

107 Four tomatoes were part of the experiment evaluating the effects of different labels on  
108 hedonic liking. These were labelled ‘Organic’, ‘Swedish’ and ‘Dutch’, while a fourth  
109 (reference) tomato received a randomised three-digit number. The tomatoes were all  
110 of the same variety ‘Arvento’ (Rijk Zwaan); identical single round tomatoes harvested  
111 in the red ripening stage, collected from a local grower (WP-Grönt, Malmö) and  
112 stored for two days at room temperature (20°C). In addition to these four tomatoes,  
113 the participants received four samples of another variety, so that identical tomatoes  
114 were not presented after each other. The tomatoes were tested in a design made up by  
115 two blocks consisting of A-D (four varieties not part of this experiment) and E-H (the  
116 four ‘Arvento’ tomatoes of the same origin, but with different labels), which were  
117 altered so that two tomatoes from the same block were never presented right after  
118 each other. The serving order was altered between six sessions to overcome order and  
119 learning effects and the probability of sensory fatigue. All tomatoes except the three  
120 tomatoes labelled ‘Swedish’, ‘Dutch’ and ‘Organic (KRAV)’ were given randomized  
121 three-digit numbers, which were different between the serving rounds. The tomatoes  
122 were served separately on paper plates marked with labels or number. Each panellist  
123 received a quarter of a tomato cut into three slices, and each tomato was judged  
124 separately. Parameters analysed are: (a) liking of the tomato taste; (b) overall  
125 impression of the tomato. The attributes were evaluated on a 9-point hedonic scale  
126 (LAWLESS and HEYMANN 2010). The panellists had a break between each serving

127 when they received water and unflavoured crackers to neutralise the taste. After the  
128 sensory evaluation, the respondents filled in the form with background and attitude  
129 questions.

### 130 ***Statistical analysis***

131 Data were analysed with analysis of variance regarding tomato taste and overall  
132 impression, and correlations between taste and attitudes. Consumer survey questions  
133 regarding attitudes were analysed through principal component analysis (PCA). All  
134 analyses were made using SPSS.

## 135 **Results**

### 136 ***Consumer survey***

137 Out of 97 respondents, 64% were female and 33% male. Mean age was 54 years,  
138 ranging between 19 and 80. 75% indicated that they consumed tomatoes three times a  
139 week or more. A majority of the consumers indicated that they were very satisfied  
140 (11%) or satisfied (70%) with their tomato purchases, while 18% were generally  
141 dissatisfied. 66% of the respondents indicated too little taste as the main reason for  
142 dissatisfaction, followed by 29% finding them too hard, 25% too expensive, 24%  
143 grainy in texture, 19% too soft, 19% they never ripen, and 9% bad appearance (the  
144 total response rate exceeds 100%, since the respondents could indicate up to three  
145 alternatives). Tomatoes ‘on-the-vine’ were the most frequently purchased type of  
146 tomato indicated by 48%, followed by cherry and cocktail varieties (24%), single  
147 round (21%), organic (13%) and plum varieties (5%) (up to two alternatives could be  
148 chosen).

149 *Attitudes*

150 The respondents graded 17 attitudinal questions on a hedonic scale between 1 (totally  
151 disagree) and 9 (totally agree) (Table 1). The grading for each item (statement) is  
152 grouped into three segments, where the lowest grades (1-3) indicate a negative  
153 attitude (disagree), the highest grades (7-9) indicate a positive attitude (agree), and the  
154 indications in between (4-6) represent ‘neutral’ answers or an indifferent attitude  
155 (Table 1). Out of the 97 respondents, 88 answered all the attitudinal questions, while  
156 the response rate on the individual attitudinal questions was between 90 and 94. The  
157 statement receiving the highest scores was ‘good taste is important’, with a mean of  
158 8.46 and 96% indicating the highest grades, followed by positive attitudes towards  
159 local produce (M=7.48) and positive attitude towards Swedish produce (items N and  
160 O). The items A and B show that our respondents prefer sweet tomatoes to acidic  
161 ones. Item C shows that 60% find it important that the tomatoes are red at the time of  
162 purchasing and item G that 43% of the respondents find a nice and attractive  
163 appearance important. 53% of the respondents find that tomatoes from the open-air  
164 market taste better than those bought in the supermarket. The view on price differed  
165 between three groups of similar size. A new factor of consumer attitude towards  
166 Swedish, ‘SWE’, was created by the mean of the attributes concerning origin (H, N,  
167 O, and L, M with reversed scales), (M=6.91, with 57% indicating a strong positive  
168 attitude towards Swedish). Similarly, a new factor of consumer attitude towards  
169 Organic, ‘ORG’, was made by the mean of the factors concerning organic (I, P)  
170 (M=5.63, with 37% showing a strong positive attitude towards organic). The  
171 attitudinal data are illustrated in Table 1, where they are also divided into three sub-  
172 categories of origin, production method and hedonic and other statements. The items  
173 of the new factor ‘SWE’ show a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.77, and the corresponding



174 factor for 'ORG' is 0.73, indicating reliable scales following the recommendations of  
175 an alpha value above 0.7 (NUNALLY 1978).

176

177 Table 1 is inserted here

178

179 A principal component analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation and Kaiser

180 Normalisation was made, to test if the 17 attitude statement items could be reduced to

181 a smaller set of dimensions. The outcome revealed six clearly distinguishable factors

182 with eigenvalues >1, explaining a cumulative 67.8% of the variance, as shown in

183 Table 2. The first factor (16.9% of variance explained) consisted of statements

184 concerning attitudes towards Swedish origin, local production and place of purchase

185 (items N, O, J, H, Q). The second factor (12.8%) concerned production method (items

186 E, I and P). Factors three (10.8%) and four (9.6%) contained items of hedonic

187 statements, price and appearance, while the fifth factor (9.0%) concerned attitudes

188 towards imports in relation to domestic produce. The last factor (8.7%) contained two

189 items concerning taste preferences; sweet and acidic taste. The analysis shows that,

190 similarly to what is presented in Table 1, attitudes concerning origin and production

191 method, respectively, are distinguishable from other attitude variables. Place of

192 purchase and attitude towards local production also seem to be related to domestic

193 origin.

194

195 Table 2 is inserted here

196

197 ***Taste evaluation***

198 The taste assessment was completed by 97 respondents and a one-way between-group  
199 analysis showed a statistically significant difference in ‘liking of taste’ at the  $p < 0.05$   
200 level in grading between the four tomatoes:  $F(3, 384) = 15.9$ ,  $p = 0.000$ , with a  
201 calculated eta square = 0.11 showing a medium effect (COHEN 1988). Tukey HSD  
202 indicated that the mean grade for the tomato labelled ‘Dutch’ ( $M = 4.54$ ,  $SD = 1.68$ ) was  
203 significantly lower than for the tomatoes labelled ‘Swedish’ ( $M = 5.88$ ,  $SD = 1.70$ ),  
204 ‘Organic’ ( $M = 6.05$ ,  $SD = 1.70$ ) and the reference tomato ( $M = 5.55$ ,  $SD = 1.61$ ), whereas  
205 there were no significant differences between the latter three (Table 3). There was a  
206 significant difference in ‘overall impression’ at the  $p < 0.05$ :  $F(3, 384) = 18.0$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ,  
207 with an eta square = 0.12, showing a medium, near large, effect (COHEN 1988). Tukey  
208 HSD indicated that the mean grade for the tomato labelled ‘Dutch’ ( $M = 4.24$ ,  $SD = 1.74$ )  
209 was significantly lower than for the tomatoes labelled ‘Swedish’ ( $M = 5.65$ ,  $SD = 1.76$ ),  
210 ‘Organic’ ( $M = 6.00$ ,  $SD = 1.63$ ) and the reference tomato ( $M = 5.34$ ,  $SD = 1.86$ ). The  
211 tomato labelled ‘Organic’ also received significantly higher grades than the reference  
212 tomato, but not than the tomato labelled ‘Swedish’ (Table 3). The results show that  
213 we can accept our first hypothesis, that credence attributes affect taste experiences,  
214 but with no difference between the two attributes Swedish and Organic.

215 ***Correlating taste with attitudes***

216 Our second hypothesis was that a positive attitude towards credence attributes (*i.e.*  
217 country-of-origin and organic) is positively correlated with liking for tomatoes  
218 labelled ‘Swedish’ and ‘Organic’ as compared with unlabelled tomatoes or tomatoes  
219 labelled ‘Dutch’. To test this hypothesis we made correlations between the new  
220 factors of attitude towards Swedish, ‘SWE’, and attitude towards organic, ‘ORG’, and  
221 the results of experienced taste and overall impression in our taste assessment. The

222 results (Table 3) show a significant correlation between attitude towards Swedish and  
223 liking of taste of tomatoes labelled ‘Swedish’ and labelled ‘Organic’ on the 0.05-  
224 level. The attitude towards Swedish and the experienced overall impression were  
225 significantly and positively correlated with the tomatoes labelled ‘Swedish’ and  
226 labelled ‘Organic’ at the 0.01-level, and negatively correlated with the tomato labelled  
227 ‘Dutch’ at the 0.05-level. The strength in these cases is below 0.3, indicating a weak  
228 correlation. In one case, the organic label concerning overall impression, the r-value is  
229 between 0.3 and 0.5 (0.35), indicating a moderate correlation. The combined factor of  
230 attitude towards organic ‘ORG’ is positively correlated with experienced liking of  
231 taste, and overall impression of tomatoes labelled ‘organic’ at the 0.01-level (Table 3).  
232 In all cases, the strength of the relationships is weak, with an r-value below 0.3.

233 Table 3 is inserted here

## 234 **Discussion**

235 Our results show that tomato taste is a major concern, as previously described by  
236 FERNQVIST and HUNTER (2012). When asked to evaluate statements, a majority of the  
237 respondents found ‘Swedish’ tomatoes tastier than ‘imports’, and ‘organic’ tastier  
238 than conventional. A majority, 57%, showed a strong positive attitude towards  
239 ‘Swedish’, while 37% showed a strong positive attitude towards ‘organic’. ‘Imports’  
240 was considered more negative. In the taste assessment, tomatoes with a ‘Dutch’ label  
241 received significantly lower grades than unlabelled reference tomatoes and tomatoes  
242 labelled ‘Swedish’. This indicates a negative COO-effect of imports compared with  
243 domestic, which is also the case in many other countries (VERLEGH, STEENKAMP and  
244 MEULENBERG 2005). Also in previous taste evaluations carried out in 1994, 1995 and  
245 2004, Swedish consumers ranked tomatoes labelled ‘Swedish’ higher than identical  
246 tomatoes with other COO labels. Imported tomatoes were considered inferior while

247 there was little perceived taste difference between ‘Swedish’ and ‘organic’ (EKELUND  
248 1996; EKELUND, FERNQVIST and TJÄRNEMO 2007; KLINTMAN et al. 2008). The  
249 negative experienced taste due to a Dutch label seems to be constant over time, but  
250 has apparently not impeded the increase of Dutch imports. In a real shopping  
251 situation, there are no ‘anonymous’ tomatoes, since EU regulations state that country  
252 of origin must be presented at point-of-purchase (SWEDISH BOARD OF AGRICULTURE  
253 2012). Nearly a third of our consumers indicated that they strongly agree with the  
254 statement that organic tomatoes taste better than conventional ones, and the tomatoes  
255 labelled ‘Organic’ received the highest score for taste. The ‘organic’ consumers, the  
256 frequent buyers of organic tomatoes, were 13% of the respondents, while at the same  
257 time 37% had strongly positive attitudes towards organic produce. The result confirms  
258 the gap between positive attitudes towards organic and behaviour as discussed by  
259 VERMEIR and VERBEKE (2006).

260 Even though our correlations between liking and attitudes were weak, our analysis  
261 showed that positive attitudes towards Swedish are positively correlated with  
262 experienced taste and overall impression of the tomato labelled ‘Swedish’. It also  
263 showed a negative correlation with the tomato labelled ‘Dutch’ concerning the overall  
264 impression. Positive attitudes towards organic were positively correlated with both  
265 ‘liking of taste’ and ‘overall impression’ of tomatoes labelled ‘Organic’, but not with  
266 taste and impression regarding the tomatoes labelled ‘Swedish’, ‘Dutch’ or the  
267 reference tomato. POELMAN et al. (2008) showed similar results by exploring the  
268 influence of information of organic production and fair trade on hedonic and analytic  
269 judgements. Also positive attitudes towards Swedish are correlated with a positive  
270 taste and overall impression of tomatoes labelled ‘Organic’. This suggest that there is  
271 a general belief among consumers that ‘organic tastes better’, not only specific for

272 heavy organic consumers, or consumers with a strong positive attitude towards  
273 organic. LEA and WORSLEY (2005) showed that a majority of consumers believed  
274 organic food tastes better than conventional food, and taste has been shown, among  
275 food safety and health, to be the primary motive for buying organic (MCEACHERN and  
276 MCCLEAN 2002). However, the most frequently purchased type of tomato among our  
277 respondents is ‘on-the-vine’ tomato, a type not commonly produced in Sweden, but  
278 imported from the Netherlands. Thus, if the preference for ‘on-the-vine’ is stronger  
279 than for Swedish, consumers will choose the Dutch products. Nearly two thirds of our  
280 respondents strongly agree that ‘on-the-vine’ tastes better than ordinary single round,  
281 which could indicate that the type of tomato is more important than origin. Further  
282 studies are recommended, as we have a limited sample size of consumers not  
283 representing a national average and the assessment was carried out in the main tomato  
284 production district. Further, the study focused on taste and labels and not a real-life  
285 purchasing situation, where size, shape, price and other search attributes are available  
286 and where tomatoes may carry more than one type of credence attribute (*e.g.* brands,  
287 health labels, certifications) and taste may vary between varieties and types.

288 The results indicate that taste is a major concern among the consumers and that two of  
289 the major credence attributes of tomatoes signalled through labels have an effect on  
290 perceived taste and quality. The findings strengthen the theory that perceived quality  
291 is affected by personal factors such as attitudes. Our hypotheses that credence labels  
292 affect perceived taste and that experienced taste and overall quality impression are  
293 correlated with the attitudes towards those labels, are accepted. Strong COO-effects  
294 on consumer liking of food have previously been shown, and this evidence is  
295 strengthened by our results. From a marketing perspective, as diversification on the  
296 tomato market has evolved at an increasing speed, and competition similarly become

297 stronger, the actors are forced to strengthen their competitiveness and market position.  
298 An organic consumer segment has been identified, suggesting that diversification to  
299 satisfy consumers with different preferences may be a market strategy. Clear  
300 signalling of origin, and taste, in accordance with consumers' positive attitudes  
301 towards domestic produce is another way to position against bulk tomatoes. Thus, the  
302 findings may have implications for the industry and marketers.

### 303 **Acknowledgements**

304 Thanks are due to The Swedish Research Council Formas for financing through the  
305 project Consumer values and involvement in organic food, focusing on fresh organic  
306 vegetables.

### 307 **References**

- 308 AJZEN, I. 1991: The theory of planned behavior. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Dec.* **50**, 179-  
309 211.
- 310 ANDERSSON, M. and L. EKELUND 2012: Konsumenter om märken på mat. Information  
311 eller förvirring? Fact sheet 2012:3, Faculty of Landscape Planning, Horticulture and  
312 Agricultural Science, Alnarp, Sweden.
- 313 BRUHN, C. M., N. FELDMAN, C. GARLITZ, J. HARWOOD, E. IVANS, M. MARSHALL, A.  
314 RILEY, D. THURBER and E. WILLIAMSON 1991: Consumer perceptions of quality:  
315 Apricots, Cantaloupes, Peaches, Pears, Strawberries, and Tomatoes. *J. Food Quality*  
316 **14**, 187-195.
- 317 CASWELL, J.A. and E.M. MOJDUSZKA 1996: Using Informational Labeling to  
318 Influence the Market for Quality in Food Products. *Am. J. Agr. Econ.* **78**, 1248-1253.
- 319 CASWELL, J.A. and D.I. PADBERG 1992: Toward a More Comprehensive Theory of  
320 Food Labels. *Am. J. Agr. Econ.* **74**, 460-468.

321 COHEN, J.W. 1988: Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.  
322 Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, USA.

323 DARBY, M. and E. KARNI 1973: Free Competition and the Optimal Amount of Fraud.  
324 J. Law Econ. **16**, 67-88.

325 DRANSFIELD, E., T.M. NGAPO, N.A. NIELSEN, L. BREDAHL, P.O. SJÖDÉN, M.  
326 MAGNUSSON, M.M. CAMPO and G.R. NUTE 2005: Consumer choice and suggested  
327 price for pork as influenced by its appearance, taste and information concerning  
328 country of origin and organic pig production. Meat Sci. **69**, 61-70

329 EKELUND (AXELSON), L. 1996: Demand and Supply Factors on the Market for  
330 Organic Vegetables: the Case of Sweden. Acta Hort. **429**, 367-375.

331 EKELUND, L., F. FERNQVIST and H. TJÄRNEMO 2007: Consumer preferences for  
332 domestic and organically labelled vegetables in Sweden. Acta Agr. Scand. C-F. E. **4**,  
333 229-236.

334 EKELUND, L. and H. JÖNSSON 2011: How does Modernity Taste? Tomatoes in the  
335 Societal Change from Modernity to Late Modernity. Culture Unbound **3**, 439-454.

336 EUROSTAT 2008: Statistics in focus 60/2008 - Fruit and vegetables:  
337 fresh and healthy on European tables.

338 FERNQVIST, F. and E. HUNTER 2012: Who's to Blame for Tasteless Tomatoes? The  
339 Effect of Tomato Chilling on Consumers' Taste Perceptions. Eur. J. Hort. C. **77**,  
340 193-198.

341 FISHBEIN, M. and I. AJZEN 1975: Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behaviour. An  
342 Introduction to Theory and Research. Addison-Welsey Publishing Company,  
343 Reading, Massachusetts.

344 FRIEDLAND, W.H. 2006: Tomatoes: A Review Essay. Agr. Hum. Values **23**, 253-262.

345 GRANKVIST, G., H. LEKEDAL and M. MARMENDAL 2007: Values and eco- and fair-  
346 trade labelled products. *Brit. Food J.* **109**, 169-181.

347 JOHANSSON, L., Å. HAGLUND, L. BERGLUND, P. LEA and E. RISVIK 1999: Preference  
348 for tomatoes, affected by sensory attributes and information about growth conditions.  
349 *Food Qual. Prefer.* **10**, 289-298

350 KLINTMAN, M., M. BOSTRÖM, L. EKELUND and A.-L. LINDÉN 2008: *Maten märks.*  
351 *Förutsättningar för konsumentmakt. Research Report 2008:1*, Dept. of Sociology,  
352 Lund University, Lund, Sweden

353 KRAV 2012: *KRAV Marknadsrapport 2012.*

354 LAWLESS, H.T. and H. HEYMANN 2010: *Sensory Evaluation of Food – Principles and*  
355 *Practices.* 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Springer, New York.

356 LEA, E. and T. WORSLEY 2005: Australians' organic food beliefs, demographics and  
357 values. *Brit. Food J.* **107**, 855-886.

358 MCEACHERN, M.G. and P. MCCLEAN 2002: Organic purchasing motivations and  
359 attitudes: are they ethical? *International Journal of Consumer Studies* **26**, 85–92.

360 NELSON, P. 1970: Information and Consumer Behaviour. *J. Polit. Econ* **78**, 311-329.

361 NUNNALLY, J.O. 1978: *Psychometric theory.* McGraw-Hill, New York

362 OLSHAVSKY, T.W. 1985: *Perceived Quality in Consumer Decision Making: An*  
363 *Integrated Theoretical Perspective.* In J. JACOBY and C. OLSON (eds.): *Perceived*  
364 *Quality - How Consumers View Stores and Merchandise.* Lexington Books, D.C.  
365 Heath and Company, Massachusetts, 3-30.

366 POELMAN, A., J. MOJET, D. LYON and S. SEFA-DEDEH 2008: The influence of  
367 information about organic production and fair trade on preferences for and perception  
368 of pineapple. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **19**, 114-121.



369 STEENKAMP J.-B. 1990: Conceptual model of the Quality Perception Process. J. Bus.  
370 Res. **21**, 309-333.

371 SWEDISH BOARD OF AGRICULTURE 2007: Ekologisk odling av tomat,  
372 Jordbruksinformation, Report 20:2007. Retrieved 18/10/2012 at <http://www.sjv.se/>

373 SWEDISH BOARD OF AGRICULTURE 2012: Kvalitetsnormer för frukt och grönsaker.  
374 Retrieved 11/12/2012 at <http://www.sjv.se/>

375 TJÄRNEMO H., L. RYDENHEIM, G. LARSSON AND L. EKELUND 2010: Tomater och  
376 gurkor - branschen och företagen - en undersökning av konkurrenskraft, tillväxt och  
377 företagande. Technical Report 2010:2. Faculty of Landscape Planning, Horticulture  
378 and Agricultural Science, Alnarp, Sweden.

379 VERLEGH,P., J.-B. STEENKAMP and M. MEULENBERG 2005: Country-of-origin effects  
380 in consumer processing of advertising claims. Int. J. Res. Mark. **22**,127-139.

381 VERMEIR, I. and W. VERBEKE 2006: Sustainable food consumption: exploring the  
382 consumer attitude – behavioural intention gap. Journal of Agricultural and  
383 Environmental Ethics **19**, 169-94.

#### 384 **Table legends**

385 Table 1. Statements and consumer attitudes (graded from 1-totally disagree to 9-  
386 totally agree) grouped on categories.

387

388 Table 2. SPSS Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation. Consumer  
389 attitude items and factor loadings.

390

391 Table 3. Consumer assessment. Experienced taste and overall impression of labelled  
392 tomatoes and the relationship between attitudes towards Swedish and organic and  
393 liking of assessed tomatoes.

394 Table 1.

Item	Statement	Valid N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Segments <sup>c</sup>		
					Disagree (negative towards statement (1-3)	Neutral (4-6)	Agree (positive towards statement) (7-9)
<i>Origin related statements</i>							
H	Swedish tomatoes taste better than imported	92	6.38	2.45	15%	28%	57%
J	Tomatoes from the open air market taste better than from the supermarket	91	6.16	2.12	15%	32%	53%
L	I prefer imported tomatoes to Swedish ones	91	2.58	1.94	67%	30%	3%
M	There is no taste difference between Swedish and imported	90	3.91	2.16	42%	46%	11%
N	I primarily choose Swedish tomatoes if I can	91	7.18	2.24	11%	20%	69%
O	It is important to buy Swedish	91	7.43	2.04	9%	13%	78%
SWE <sup>a)</sup>	Attitude towards Swedish	89	6.91	1.56	5%	38%	57%
<i>Production method related statements</i>							
E	It is important that I know the production method	93	6.28	2.36	16%	28%	56%
I	Organic tomatoes taste better than conventional	92	5.21	2.37	22%	48%	30%
P	It is important to buy organic	91	6.07	2.46	15%	37%	47%
ORG <sup>b)</sup>	Attitude towards Organic	89	5.63	2.16	17%	46%	37%
<i>Hedonic and other statements</i>							
A	I prefer sweet tomatoes	92	6.99	1.59	3%	27%	70%
B	I prefer acidic tomatoes	91	4.30	2.18	42%	42%	16%
C	It is important that the tomatoes are fully red when I buy	93	6.45	2.15	13%	27%	60%
D	A low price is important	93	4.66	2.21	32%	41%	27%
F	Good taste is important	94	8.46	1.09	1%	3%	96%
G	A nice and attractive appearance is important	93	5.46	2.45	26%	31%	43%
K	Tomatoes 'on-the-vine' taste better than 'ordinary'	91	6.63	2.07	9%	33%	58%
Q	It is important to buy local	91	7.48	1.96	8%	14%	78%

395 <sup>a)</sup> The new item SWE consist of the items H, L (reversed scale), M (reversed scale), N and O.

396 <sup>b)</sup> The new item ORG consist of the items, I and P.

397 <sup>c)</sup> Rounded percentages are used.

398

399 Table 2.

Variables	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
N. I primarily choose Swedish tomatoes if I can	.75					
O. It is important to buy Swedish	.72					
J. Tomatoes from the open air market taste better than from the supermarket	.71					
H. Swedish tomatoes taste better than imported	.69					
Q. It is important to buy local	.42					
I. Organic tomatoes taste better than conventional		.83				
P. It is important to buy organic		.80				
E. It is important that I know the production method		.55				
K Tomatoes 'on-the-vine' taste better than 'ordinary'			.78			
F. A Good taste is important			.64			
C. It is important that the tomatoes are fully red when I buy			.59			
D. A low price is important				.77		
G. A nice and attractive appearance is important				.71		
M. There is no taste difference between Swedish and imported					.77	
L. I prefer imported tomatoes to Swedish ones					.67	
B. I prefer acidic tomatoes						.80
A. I prefer sweet tomatoes						.78
Variance explained by the factor	16.92	12.78	10.84	9.64	8.97	8.68
Cumulative variance explained	16.92	29.70	40.55	50.19	59.17	67.84

400

401

402 Table 3.

Dependent variable in consumer assessment	Tomato label	Mean grade on a hedonic scale (1-9) <sup>a</sup>	Correlation with preferences <sup>b</sup>	
			Attitude towards Swedish 'SWE' (Mean=6.91, N=89)	Attitude towards Organic 'ORG' (Mean=5.63, N=89)
Liking of taste	Dutch	4.54a	-.206	-.123
	Reference	5.55b	.170	-.034
	Swedish	5.88b	<b>.263*</b>	.045
	Organic	6.05b	<b>.258*</b>	<b>.288**</b>
Overall impression	Dutch	4.24a	<b>-.236*</b>	-.123
	Reference	5.34b	.094	-.079
	Swedish	5.65bc	<b>.296**</b>	-.060
	Organic	6.00c	<b>.350**</b>	<b>.276**</b>

403 <sup>a)</sup> Different letters indicate a significant difference P<0.05.

404 <sup>b)</sup> \*: Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); \*\*: Correlation is significant  
405 at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

406

407