Practice what you preach!?

- A study of the gap between attitude and behaviour towards organic milk.

Lev som du lär!?

- En studie av gapet mellan attityd och beteende mot ekologisk mjölk
Abstract

The trend of environmentally friendly consumption permeates our whole society and the general attitude towards the consumption of it is strongly positive. However, the existence of an attitude-behaviour gap became clear to us since the actual green consumption does not reflect the positive attitude. In this thesis focus is on one specific product - organic milk. Therefore, the purpose of this thesis is to explain the dissonance between attitude and behaviour towards organic milk. In order to reach our purpose we chose to perform a pilot study targeting students at the University of Linköping. Both qualitative and quantitative methods have been used in the collection of data. It has been done using a survey and interviews. We were able to establish the existence of an attitude-behaviour gap towards organic milk amongst students at the university, and that this gap in fact arises before an intention to buy organic milk is even formed. Since a behavioural intention is not formed, an actual corresponding behaviour will not occur. The attitude-behaviour gap is explained by the fact that other factors than attitude influence the formation of the intention. In this case the factors strongly counteracting the attitude are consumer habits, social influence, to what extent the consumer feels an ethical obligation to buy organically and whether the consumer identifies herself with the issue. Together, these factors are so strong that they succeed in neutralizing the positive attitude.
Sammanfattning


Både kvantitativa och kvalitativa metoder i form av en enkätundersökning och intervjuer har använts i insamling av empirisk data. Vi kunde fastställa att det finns en dissonans mellan attityd och beteende mot ekologisk mjölk bland studenterna på universitet, och även att dissonansen uppkommer redan innan en intention att köpa har bildats. Detta attityd-beteende gap förklaras av att andra faktorer än attityd spelar in i bildandet av intentionen. I detta fall motverkas den starkt positiva attityden av faktorer såsom konsumentens vanor, social påverkan, graden av upplevd etisk förpliktelse mot att köpa ekologiskt och huruvida konsumenten idenfierar sig med frågan. Dessa faktorer är så pass starka att attitydens effekt neutraliseras och gapet uppstår.
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We introduce our chosen field of study by presenting background facts, a discussion behind our purpose and our questions. The KRAV certification, some helpful definitions of terms and a disposition will also be presented.

1.1 Background
During the last ten or fifteen years the climate debate has soared to be a discussed and engaging topic in both public and private discussions. It has received attention both on international political agendas, e.g. the Kyoto-protocol in 1997, the up-coming climate meeting in Copenhagen in December 2009, and in cultural circles, e.g. the film “An inconvenient truth” by former American Vice President Al Gore, which focuses on his work to reduce the global warming.¹ During the last couple of years there has also been an increase in information and reports about the actual impacts of the greenhouse effects, i.e. the global warming process. All this attention and information has contributed to a growing interest in the market for more ethical and environmentally friendly consumption. During the last 5 years, the sales have increased by almost 100% each year.²

The trend of “green” and ethical consumption permeates our whole society, from the consumption of clothes made by ecological cotton to restaurants serving courses made by locally produced groceries. Even though the environmental movement nowadays is not as strong as it was in the beginning of the 1990s, it is still altering consumer habits.³

The concern for the environment is reflected in several areas of our daily life and not least in the concept of environmentally friendly consumption of food. Research has shown that the production of food is responsible for approximately 25% of all discharges of greenhouse gases, something which has contributed to the growing interest in organic food.⁴ Since the beginning of the century, we have seen a strong trend towards organic consumption in Sweden, and an increasing demand and interest for organically produced groceries.⁵

¹ http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0497116/
² Friman 2009: 89
³ Brown & Wahlers 1998: 39
⁴ Hedenus & Wirsenius 2008
⁵ http://www.e24.se/branscher/konsumentvaror/artikel_95491.e24
In Sweden, and many other western countries, consumers can enter almost every grocery store and find products that are labelled with brands such as KRAV or fair-trade etc. that guarantees a certain level of ethically or environmentally friendly production.

1.2 Problem discussion

We (the authors) believe that the general attitude amongst our friends and family is very positive toward organic and ethical products, but is this reflected in the actual consumption of them? In an article from 2007 we found that only 1% of all sales in Sweden are of ethical products.\(^6\) In a survey made by the grocery chain Coop in 2008, 89% of the panel claims that they think it is important to buy organic products, and 76% say that they definitely would like to buy more organic products, but in contrast to this only 2.3% of total sales of groceries are organic.\(^7\) Here we can observe an obvious dissonance between attitude towards organic products, and the actual behaviour.

In order to investigate this dissonance further, we wanted to focus on a product that is well-known, available to all Swedes, and an everyday commodity. After careful consideration we chose to focus on organic milk, this for several reasons. Milk is a product that is used by a vast majority of the Swedish population; it is well-known and available in most stores, even small ones like petrol stations and kiosks. Since organic milk is already a well established product on the market, in fact the most purchased organic product in Sweden,\(^8\) we concluded that it is a well-known product amongst the population.

We will perform a pilot study at the University of Linköping (LiU). Since it is one of the learning institutes with most students in Sweden we consider it to be representative for all students in Sweden. The university has many different fields of studies; ranging from humanities, business, economy, engineering, medical etc. which contributes to a mix of students with different backgrounds. Targeting today’s students can give a better understanding of tomorrow’s consumption.

\(^6\) Malmstedt 2007
\(^7\) Coop : 16
\(^8\) KRAV's marknadsrapport 2009: 14
Through this investigation, with the help of theories and empirical data we will answer the question:

- What can explain the gap between attitude and behaviour towards organic milk?

In our attempt to answer this question we have identified three sub-questions. By answering these we will reach a conclusion and an answer to our question.

- What is the attitude towards organic milk?
- What is the behaviour towards organic milk?
- What is the relation between the attitude and the behaviour?

1.2.1 Purpose
The purpose with this study is to investigate attitudes towards organic milk, examine how the attitude matches the behaviour and identify explanatory factors to this relation.

1.3 KRAV certification
The KRAV label is the most famous symbol for organically produced food in Sweden, known by 98% of the Swedish population. The label is the only Swedish certification organ, and it was established in 1985 in order to create a well trusted label for organic products and facilitate for consumers to identify the organic options. A product labelled with this certification has been produced according to good standards regarding animal care, social responsibility and environmental issues. For instance, chemical pesticides cannot be used in the production, the use of artificial additives is limited and producers need to show good animal care, giving the animals an as natural up-bringing as possible. Apart from good animal care, producers need to be socially responsible in the production, offering good working conditions etc. KRAV labelled products follow EU rules and regulations concerning ecological production, but KRAV takes their regulatory framework one step further in order to always be in a leading position.

---

9 KRAVs marknadsrapport 2009: 2
10 Furemar 2004: 18
11 http://www.krav.se/sv/Om-KRAV/Fakta-om-KRAV/
12 http://www.krav.se/sv/Om-KRAV/
13 Wall Ellström 2009
Although the KRAV logotype is signalling that a product has been produced according to the KRAV standards, it says nothing about the quality of the product, this is left up to the producer to ensure.14

1.4 Definitions of terms

Ecological: Ecological agriculture is characterized by stimulation of the natural process in order to avoid chemical pesticides.15 Since KRAV is the most common ecological certification in Sweden16, we will equalize KRAV with ecological.

Ecological food: Food produced without chemical pesticides or artificial fertilizer.17

Organic: We use organic as a synonym to ecological, which is a more common definition in Swedish terms.

Organic milk: We define organic milk as milk labelled with KRAV. Arla is the world’s biggest provider of organic dairy products. Other big producers selling organic milk in Sweden are Skånemejerier, Norrmejerier and Milko.18

Conventional milk: Milk that is not certified by KRAV.

Green consumer: A person consuming organically

1.5 Disposition

In chapter 2 we present the theories chosen to help us answer our questions. The theories explain consumer behaviour, and decision-making, especially towards food. In chapter 3 we present selected previous research in order to give the reader a more profound understanding of the subject. In chapter 4 we describe the methods used to attain our primary data and the performance of the actual collecting of the data, this in order to give credibility to the data. In chapter 5 we present the results from our collection of empirical data. In chapter 6 we analyse the results by connecting them to our theories and discussing the outcome. In chapter 7 a short conclusion of the analysis is given, and the thesis is finalized with chapter 8 where we present our own suggestions for bridging the gap and some thoughts about further research.

14 http://www.krav.se/sv/System/Spraklankar/In-English/The-KRAV-label/
15 http://www.konsumentverket.se/mallar/sv/artikel.asp?lngCategoryId=1266&lngArticleId=477
16 http://www.konsumentverket.se/mallar/sv/artikel.asp?lngCategoryId=1266&lngArticleId=477
17 http://www.konsumentverket.se/mallar/sv/artikel.asp?lngCategoryId=1266&lngArticleId=477
18 KRAVs marknadsrapport 2009: 15-17
2. Theory

We introduce the theories we have chosen in order to analyse our empirical data and reach a conclusion to our problem. We give a brief presentation of the theories, and a summary where we present our own analytical model which shows how we intend to utilize the theories.

2.1 The development of consumer behaviour theories

When it comes to consumer behaviour, the basic theory is based on three aspects; consumer preferences, budget restraints and consumer choice. The theory stipulates that a consumer is rational and chooses rationally when consuming products in order to “maximize the satisfaction they can achieve, given the limited budget available to them”. The traditional view of consumer theory is that all products give a certain amount of utility to the consumer, this utility given by the utility function $U = U(x,y)$. It is assumed that all products are the same; give the same utility.

The traditional way of interpreting consumer behaviour was further developed by Lancaster (1966) in his article “A new approach to consumer theory”. He added the ideas that the characteristics of the product are what bring utility to the consumer, not the product itself. Another development of the traditional consumer utility function was made by Becker in his theory about social economics. He added a new variable to the function, called “social capital” (S). This variable adds the influences from a person’s surroundings to that person’s utility. The utility function with the addition of social capital being: $U = U(x,y;S)$. This gives that a person’s utility of a product depends on whether others also consume the product.

The assumptions of the “rational consumer” are continuously being developed and extended. For example, Parment (2006) states that there has been a change in consumer behaviour the last decades; from consumption based on rational criterions to consumption based on emotional criterions. Emotional characteristics such as brand, design, appearance, etc are playing a larger role in targeting consumers.
Another way of altering the traditional views of consumer theory and consumer behaviour is the mixing of psychology and economics. Award winning economist Rabin emphasizes the concept of *behavioural economics*, which is a relatively new approach to consumer choice theory, but an approach that has been growing in importance during the last decade.\(^{26}\) It is a modification of the economic assumption regarding maximization of utility\(^{27}\), where the inclusion of psychological models in the traditional neoclassical economic theories opens up the possibility to explore certain human behaviours that is not directly applicable to the theory.\(^{28}\) According to Rabin, economists *should* include psychology to explain behaviour that differs from the usual assumptions,\(^{29}\) in order to capture the parts of the human nature that are excluded from the more mathematical and logical economical models.\(^{30}\) The approach of mixing psychology and economics has also been utilized by Becker. He analyses social issues, normally not considered by economists, with the help of economic ideas. Becker puts focus on the question of what maximizes a person’s utility. Like Lancaster, Becker states that it is not simply done by maximizing the number of material things a person can have, but that the characteristics of the things are what counts.\(^{31}\)

### 2.2 Consumer behaviour

Psychologists often assume that a person’s behaviour is guided by the person’s attitude towards the behaviour.\(^{32}\) At the same time another assumption is that in many cases there is a discrepancy between the stated attitude and the actual behaviour.\(^{33}\) The most widely cited example of the discrepancy between attitude and behaviour is a study by Stanford professor LaPiere from 1934 who concluded this dissonance.\(^{34}\)

---

\(^{26}\) Rabin 2002: 657  
\(^{27}\) Rabin 1998: 11  
\(^{28}\) Rabin 2002: 659  
\(^{29}\) Rabin 2002: 658  
\(^{30}\) Rabin 2002: 672  
\(^{31}\) Becker 1993: 385 - 390  
\(^{32}\) Armitage & Christian 2003: 187  
\(^{33}\) Armitage & Christian 2003: 187 - 188  
\(^{34}\) Armitage & Christian 2003: 187 - 188
2.2.1 The theory of planned behaviour

The theory of planned behaviour by Ajzen (1991) explains human intentions and predicts a possible behaviour in a specific situation.\(^{35}\) It is based on the assumption that a person is rational and makes systematic use of the information available and considers the consequences of her actions.\(^{36}\) The theory of planned behaviour (henceforth TPB) has got a strong empirical support from earlier research although its validity is still a debated issue. The strength of the TPB is its broad applicability into different fields of study.\(^{37}\)

According to the theory, before carrying out a certain behaviour a person forms an intention about the behaviour. This intention will transform into the actual behaviour intended. If there is an intention to act in a specific way, the prediction that this behaviour will take part is correct.\(^{38}\) The strength of the intention is formed by the three determinants; *Attitude*, *Subjective norm* and *Perceived behavioural control*.\(^{39}\) The importance of each of those three varies with different situations.\(^{40}\) According to Ajzen these determinants are influenced by background factors such as values, gender, emotions, age, education, socio-economic status and knowledge.\(^{41}\)

**Attitude**

Ajzen defines the first determinant of intention, *attitude*, as “*a disposition to respond favourably or unfavourably to an object, person, institution or event*”, but in the model of TPB, attitude is defined as the attitude towards a *behaviour*, not towards an object.\(^{42}\) The difference here being for example that the attitude towards democracy can differ from the attitude towards voting in a particular election. In the TPB, attitude towards a behaviour is determined by *behavioural beliefs* about what the consequences of the specific behaviour might be.\(^{43}\) On predicting behaviour, attitude strength is regarded as a key factor, and the stronger the attitude towards a behaviour is, the more precise is the prediction.\(^{44}\)

---

\(^{35}\) Ajzen 1991: 181

\(^{36}\) Ajzen 2005: 117


\(^{38}\) Ajzen 2005: 99 - 101

\(^{39}\) Ajzen 1991: 179-211

\(^{40}\) Ajzen 2005: 119

\(^{41}\) Ajzen 2005: 134

\(^{42}\) Ajzen 2005: 3

\(^{43}\) Ajzen 2005: 85

\(^{44}\) Armitage & Christian 2003: 188
Subjective norm

The second determinant of intention is the *subjective norm*, defined by Chang (1998) as a person’s “perception that most people who are important to him think he should or should not perform the behaviour in question”\(^{45}\), i.e. there is perceived societal pressure to perform or not perform a specific behaviour.\(^{46}\) The subjective norm is explained by *normative beliefs* which are with what probability the society and the reference group, e.g. friends, family etc., \(^{47}\) will approve or disapprove of performing a certain behaviour.\(^{48}\) According to Becker, a behaviour is indirectly influenced by others since their attitude and behaviour determines the relative prices of goods. Culture and social norms play a role in why we behave in a certain way.\(^{49}\) Becker also states that social influence and a product are complements to each other, meaning that an increase in social capital towards a product also raises the demand for this product and the marginal utility a person experiences from consuming it.\(^{50}\) Influences from others can be directly reflected in a person’s behaviour; a person may *copy* the behaviour of others if he thinks that they have got more information about the product.\(^{51}\) This is also stated by Solomon in his definition of two types of social influence; *informational social influence* that occurs when a behaviour is imitated since it appears to be the right way to act and *normative social influence* that occurs when a person is motivated to mimic a behaviour because she thinks it can yield reward such as social approval or money.\(^{52}\)

Perceived behavioural control

The third determinant of intention is the *perceived behavioural control*. It is the individual’s own perception about being able to carry out a behaviour,\(^{53}\) and is explained by *control beliefs*, beliefs about the level of difficulty or ease of performing a behaviour. The beliefs can be influenced by an individual’s own experiences about a behaviour but also by observed experiences of others.\(^{54}\)

\(^{45}\) Chang 1998: 1826
\(^{46}\) Ajzen 2005: 118
\(^{47}\) Schiffman & Kanuk 2004: 330 - 332
\(^{48}\) Ajzen 1991: 195
\(^{49}\) Becker & Murphy 2000: 3
\(^{50}\) Becker & Murphy 2000: 9
\(^{51}\) Becker & Murphy 2000: 10
\(^{52}\) Solomon, Bamossy, & Askegaard 1999: 277
\(^{53}\) Ajzen 2005: 125
\(^{54}\) Ajzen 2005: 125
Chang claims that the perception of whether a person has resources will affect their intention to perform the behaviour as well as the actual performance of the behaviour.\footnote{Chang 1998: 1827} According to Armitage et al., “the easier a behaviour is, the more likely one will intend to perform it”.\footnote{Armitage & Christian 2003: 191}

Similar to the perceived behavioural control is the theory of \textit{Internal and external locus of control} by Rotter. Rotter (1966) means that individuals view reasons for a specific outcome in two different ways, internal and external. An outcome can be subject to his or hers own behaviour and personal characteristics (internal) or it can be a function of factors such as luck, fate, chance and it can be under the control of others (external). \footnote{Rotter 1990: 489}

\subsection*{2.2.2 Adding self-identification and ethical obligation}

Many researchers have found evidence that the addition of a “moral” factor, a so-called \textit{ethical obligation}, to the TPB model predicts the behaviour more accurately. The factor is added to capture the individual’s perception of right and wrong.\footnote{Shaw, Shiu, & Clarke 2000: 882}

The factor of \textit{self-identification} is also added as an independent factor to the model to capture how a specific product or concept has made an impact on the consumer’s self-identification. Researchers have shown that the factor should not be seen as a part of any of the other determinants; it has a high rate of significance as an independent factor.\footnote{Sparks & Shepherd 1992: 395} It is shown that if an issue becomes important to a consumer so that she identifies herself with it, the intention and behaviour towards it will change, e.g. if she identifies herself as an green consumer she will consume organically.\footnote{Shaw, Shiu, & Clarke 2000: 882}

\subsection*{2.2.3 The theory of neutralization}

The theory of neutralization explains how a person can have an opinion and then act against it. The theory was originally used by Sykes and Matza (1957) to explain criminal behaviour,\footnote{Sykes & Matza 1957: 667} it is also in this context it has been used most frequently.\footnote{Chatzidakis, Hibbert, & Smith 2007: 90} The essence of the theory is that a
criminal can justify her behaviour by “neutralizing” the impact or effect it has. By learning the techniques of neutralization a criminal can believe in the normative system and its rules, at the same time as she is violating them, because she can explain the violations as “acceptable”, although they are norm-breaking. The theory, in short, “describes a process of restoring equilibrium without changing attitude”.

In the construction of the theory, Sykes and Matza identified five different techniques of neutralization:

1) **Denial of responsibility** – the person takes no responsibility for her actions; on the contrary she blames factors outside of her control, e.g. influences from friends and family or the social framework of her surroundings.

2) **Denial of injury** – the person claims that nobody got hurt by her behaviour, that she did not cause any harm, e.g. she just “borrowed” a car (instead of stealing). This technique also includes the attitude that her behaviour did not make a difference or have an impact.

3) **Denial of victim** – the person justifies her behaviour by claiming that it was the right thing to do considering the circumstances, e.g. some sort of revenge or punishment towards the victim, or that there is no victim of her actions.

4) **Condemning the condemners** – the person focuses on the people condemning her instead of on herself, e.g. she can accuse them of being hypocrites for condemning her when they themselves are involved in other non-normative behaviours.

5) **Appeal to higher loyalties** – e.g. the person is caught in a situation that needs to be resolved by behaviour that violates the norm, e.g. if she acts in a certain way to protect her friends or family, or if she is following other norms that to her are more important.

Even though the theory of neutralization was developed towards criminal behaviour, earlier research has shown that the theory can be applied to various consumer behaviours.

---

63 Sykes & Matza 1957: 667 - 669
64 Sykes & Matza 1957: 667 - 669
65 Chatzidakis, Hibbert, & Smith 2007: 94
66 Sykes & Matza 1957: 667 - 669
67 Sykes & Matza 1957: 667 - 669
68 Sykes & Matza 1957: 667 - 669
69 Sykes & Matza 1957: 667 - 669
70 Sykes & Matza 1957: 667 - 669
71 Sykes & Matza 1957: 667 - 669
instance it has been applied to consumer behaviour by e.g. Strutton et.al in the context of shoplifting,\(^{72}\) and by Chatzidakis et.al in the context of ethical consumer behaviour.\(^{73}\)

### 2.3 Consumer decision-making

As we have shown earlier, many different aspects must be taken into account when explaining or predicting a person’s behaviour. One important part in the chain of determining behaviour is the actual decision-making process, the moment when the consumer actually decides how to behave. The traditional way of theorizing the consumer decision-making process is the rational view – that consumers are rational and make their decisions based on collected information about the product they want to purchase.\(^{74}\) According to this theory a consumer passes several stages before making the actual decision; problem-recognition, information search, evaluation of alternatives, product choice and outcomes. According to some researchers this theory does not cover all purchases; on the contrary a consumer has multiple strategies to choose from when making a purchase decision. Which of these strategies will be used is depending on the amount of effort the consumer is willing to put into the decision.\(^{75}\)

To access the different levels of effort put into a decision, researchers often use a scale ranging from low consumer involvement to high consumer involvement, or low-cost products to high-cost products, where one end is characterized by habitual decision-making, the other by extended problem-solving and the middle by limited problem-solving.\(^{76}\)

Extended problem-solving includes the types of decisions that can be studied through the theory of the rational consumer and the stages of decision-making. These decisions are often important for the consumer’s self-identification, and are based on careful collecting of information and evaluation. In limited problem-solving the decisions are formed by using specific decision rules, and a less extended collecting of information.\(^{77}\)

\(^{71}\) Chatzidakis et. al 2004: 527-544  
\(^{72}\) Strutton, Vitell, & Pelton 1994: 253-260  
\(^{73}\) Chatzidakis et. al 2004: 527-544  
\(^{74}\) Solomon, Bamossy, & Askegaard 1999: 207 - 208  
\(^{75}\) Solomon, Bamossy, & Askegaard 1999: 207 - 208  
\(^{76}\) Solomon, Bamossy, & Askegaard 1999: 207 - 208  
\(^{77}\) Solomon, Bamossy, & Askegaard 1999: 207 - 208
Habitual decision-making does not involve any collecting of information, the purchase is standardized and the consumer puts in as little effort as possible.78 According to Kotler, the habitual buying behaviour is characterized by little consumer effort and low brand loyalty.79 According to Becker, habitual behaviour also depends on earlier behaviour and a person is more likely to behave in a certain way if she has done so before.80 Kotler also states that products such as food and cleaning products are so-called non-durable and convenience products. They are bought often, consumed quickly and the amount of effort put into the decision-making is little.81

2.4 Food choice

As Maslow states in his hierarchy of needs, once basic physiological needs are fulfilled, the individual can intend to fulfil other requirements.82 Food is one of our basic needs for surviving, and a need that in our part of the world is easily fulfilled. Therefore, when making food choices in the developed part of the world, the decision-making process is influenced by other needs such as social or creative, aspects that can have an impact on our buying-decisions.83 Choosing as a mechanism is defined as “making up one’s mind with regard to a particular object, action or state of affairs in a context of alternatives (where) the particular choice is”, and food choice is both an outcome of a decision process and a mechanism in the process of reaching that outcome.84

Every day consumers make food choices under different constraints imposed by cultural, social, geographical, nutritional or economical factors. Choosing what food to consume has an effect not only on the individual health, experience etc. but also on e.g. the state of the economy, balance of trade and the agricultural sector, and even though these food choices are of importance, little is known about food consumption except that “consumers are conservative in their consumption given the abundance of food available”.85

78 Solomon, Bamossy, & Askegaard 1999: 207 - 208
79 Kotler 2005: 278
80 Becker & Murphy 2000: 17
81 Kotler 2005: 540 - 541
82 Evans, Jamal & Foxall 2006: 7 - 9
83 Evans, Jamal & Foxall 2006: 7 - 9
84 Marshall 1995: 6
85 Marshall 1995: 11
Consumers state that the sensory characteristics of food, such as smelling, touching, seeing etc. is the most important factor in their choice of food, however it appears that non-sensory attributes of foods, such as the absence of food additives, nutritional value, health issues and how the food is produced are becoming more and more important.\textsuperscript{86}

\textbf{2.4.1 Food Quality model}

The Food Quality model, developed by Grunert (2002), is used to explain a consumer’s food choice by two factors; expected quality and experienced quality. According to Grunert, consumers make their buying decisions based on these qualities. Expected quality is formed before the actual consumption, when the consumer has no experience or information about certain characteristics of the product, e.g. taste. The experienced quality is formed when the consumer consumes the product, and the relationship between these two qualities then shapes the consumer’s thoughts about the product, which determines whether the consumer will want to consume it.\textsuperscript{87}

The expected quality is formed by intrinsic characteristics (taste, colour, etc.)\textsuperscript{88} and extrinsic characteristics (price, branding etc.)\textsuperscript{89}. These characteristics are often used to form the expectations, even though the consumer is aware that they might not be accurate signals of the experienced quality. Products with a special brand are easier to form expectations about for a customer, since they can relate to earlier experiences with the brand. A quality label can also help consumers form a cue about non-branded products.\textsuperscript{90}

The experienced and expected quality of a product is determined by three quality dimensions; search, experience and credence. The first two can be established by the consumer himself; search quality can be found in the store in the form of physical appearance and experience quality can be established after consumption of the product. The third dimension, credence quality, deals with characteristics that the consumer cannot assert himself, like whether a product decreases the risk for diseases or is organically produced. The consumer has to trust the information from others; researchers, labelling etc., since these characteristics cannot be

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{86} Shepherd, Magnusson, & Sjödén 2005: 352
\item \textsuperscript{87} Grunert 2002: 275-285
\item \textsuperscript{88} Schiffman & Kanuk 2004: 188
\item \textsuperscript{89} Schiffman & Kanuk 2004: 188
\item \textsuperscript{90} Grunert 2002: 275-285
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
concluded from consuming the product. Credence qualities are becoming more important as the interest from consumers in e.g. production processes is increasing. In the case of credence quality, communication is the main component for the consumer to form an expectation. Two main factors determine the effect the communication has on the consumer, namely credibility of the information and ability to process it.\textsuperscript{91}

*Credibility* is generally low when it comes to advertising about food, and here the use of quality labels has been successful when distributing information about the product. Research has shown that there are differences in credibility between countries that use many different labels and countries with one main label. *Ability* to process refers mainly to the knowledge needed to be able to understand what the information means, e.g. to understand that a product that has been enriched with e.g. omega-3 fat is actually good for you.\textsuperscript{92}

2.5 Summary

We found the theory of planned behaviour early on in our search for relevant theories. Since it focuses on the relationship between attitude and intention/behaviour we found it to be very interesting and useful, and started to explore it and other theories connected to it more deeply. By studying several scientific articles we concluded that in our model it was relevant to expand the TPB with two precedents, in addition to attitude, subjective norm and perceived behavioural control, namely self-identification and ethical obligation. These factors would help capture all elements relevant to us.

Since our focus lies in the dissonance between attitude and intention/behaviour of the consumer in the case of buying organic milk, we also searched for theories to explain this occurrence. The food quality model analyses the consumer’s buying decision with the help of different qualities the consumer associates with the product, something that is very relevant when trying to answer our question. The model can be of help when explaining why a consumer does not buy organic milk. We also found the theory of neutralization which is a theory that can be applied to the TPB model to give explanations as to why a consumer can have a positive attitude towards something – but then act against it. We also use theories of consumer decision-making to find possible explanations to our problem in the actual decision-
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making process. These theories will be used to explain the attitude-behaviour gap. We do not yet know where in the model the gap exists, whether it is between attitude and intention or intention and behaviour. This will be established with the help of our collected empirical data.

To give a full picture of how we intend to use these theories we have made our own analytical model (see figure 1).

*Figure 1: Model explaining the relation of the theories used.*
3. Related research

*We present some selected research in areas related to the subject of the thesis, this in order to give the reader a better understanding of the issue.*

Much research has been done on the subject of consumer behaviour towards food, both in fields such as economy, sociology and psychology. Earlier, several studies have shown that sensory characteristics such as taste, quality, shelf-life etc. when choosing what food to consume is the most important factor.\(^93\) This assumption is being altered since modern research in different countries has shown that consumers are becoming more and more interested in food qualities that cannot be seen, tasted or smelled, (i.e the non-sensory characteristics). Qualities such as nutritional aspects, content of additives etc. and aspects such as ethically- and environmentally friendly production are becoming more popular.\(^94\)

A lot of research in the area of green consumption has already been done. For example, Coop publishes an annual report about consumer behaviour, where they investigate the consumption of organic food. They describe a gap between the attitude, which is overall positive, and the behaviour, which is that many do not consume organically. By asking members in a panel they reached the conclusion that the reason for this is price and supply of organic products.\(^95\)

According to a study made on the attitude-behaviour discrepancy towards green consumption in Sweden, it was concluded that a vast majority of Swedes are well aware of the concept of “organic food”, and this being the case in other European countries as well. According to the study, there are two main reasons for buying organic. One is concerns about the environment, the other being related to health issues.\(^96\) In Sweden, the strongest argument is linked to concerns about the environment, this being rather unique, since the aspect of health issues seems to be the biggest reason for consuming organically in other nations.\(^97\)

In a Norwegian study it was concluded that young consumers base their choice to consume organically on consideration for the environment, whereas older consumers buy organically

---
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because of consideration for their own health.\textsuperscript{98} A Swedish study concluded that a strong reason for not buying organic even though the attitude towards it is very positive is the existing price difference between conventional and organic foods.\textsuperscript{99} Research has shown that consumers are willing to pay no more then 5-10\% extra for organic products.\textsuperscript{100}

In studies of whether or not there is a difference between the sexes in regards to organic and ethical consumption the results are divided with some researchers claiming that women are more concerned than men and others stating that such a connection does not exist.\textsuperscript{101} One study shows that the most positive consumers towards the consumption of organic products are young women in big cities, whereas middle aged men in small cities are the least interested in organic consumption.\textsuperscript{102}
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4. Methodology

We present the research methods we have chosen in order to reach a conclusion to our problem. We argue the reasons for choosing these particular methods and describe our reasoning behind the construction of our survey and interview guide.

4.1 The process

When starting the process of writing this thesis, we wanted to assimilate knowledge about the subjects of consumer behaviour and attitudes. We started out by seeking information broadly about the subjects and then narrow it down to attitudes and consumer behaviour towards food and organic food in particular. This was done by studying relevant modern literature; books, scientific articles, newspaper articles and reports. By the knowledge we gained from reading about the subject we concluded which theories would be relevant as a framework and by studying the theories we learned which empirical data would be useful in order to reach a conclusion to our problem at hand. Methodology literature gave us knowledge about different research methods which could be useful in retrieving the empirical data. From this knowledge we concluded mainly to make use of primary data which we collect ourselves through both quantitative and qualitative methods. We used the two methods simultaneously in order to make use of the advantages from each one.

4.2 Research methods

In order to collect our primary data we chose to carry out a survey and a few in-depth interviews. The survey gave us a broad perspective about the attitudes and the behaviour towards our field of study and the interviews was used as a complement to the results from the survey and gave us a deeper understanding.

By performing a survey we were able to reach a large number of respondents in a relatively short period of time. We decided to use a survey instead of structured interviews, not only because of time constraints, but also because the subject in question might be regarded as sensitive and with direct closed questions being asked by interviewers there is a risk of respondents modifying answers in order to reflect themselves in a more positive way. Earlier
research has shown that respondents tend to answer more truthfully in surveys than in structured interviews.\textsuperscript{103}

We created our survey bearing in mind the main reasons for fall-offs and ways to avoid them. The survey is constructed by closed questions in order to avoid misunderstandings and as few questions as possible were used in order to make the survey short, accessible and non time-consuming.\textsuperscript{104} By handing out the surveys in person we believed that the number of fall-offs would be minimized when any un-clarities or misconceptions could be sorted out and explained by us directly. We would accept an answering ratio of 60 – 70\%, which is an acceptable ratio according to methodology literature, although our aim was to reach a higher share of responses, preferably over 85\% which is a ration considered to be excellent.\textsuperscript{105} When compiling the survey, a fall-off of 14, i.e. 8\% of total gathered surveys, was discovered. This result clearly being excellent according to methodology literature.

When constructing our survey we used the “Likert scale”\textsuperscript{106}, as it is intended to capture attitudes. This facilitates for both the authors and the respondents. For us as authors it is easy to prepare questions and interpret answers constructed according to the Likert scale, and for the respondents answering is facilitated. A pilot testing of the survey was carried out amongst students on campus in order to avoid misconceptions. Un-clarities were adjusted, although the risk of misconceptions is unavoidable.

In order to give us an in-depth perspective, qualitative interviews with a small number of students was carried out. We believed that by executing individual qualitative interviews with open questions we could get more developed answers and a possibility to follow the thoughts and interpret the answers of the respondent. Since, as already mentioned, our field of study is by some regarded as sensitive, other types of interviews such as focus group discussions might be less successful since some group members might influence and affect the rest of the group into giving modified answers or no answers at all.\textsuperscript{107} To avoid this, individual, semi-structured interviews was used.
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An interview-guide was made in order to give the interviewers, we the authors, structure, but it was not intended to be followed strictly in order to leave the discussion open. Focus was on the interviewees own point of view and opinions, since the role of the interviewer is mainly listening, interpreting and guiding the interview forward. We followed the criterions set up by Kvale (1996) to make the interviews as successful as possible. According to Kvale, interviews should be executed in a clear, structured and flexible way, showing respect to the interviewee, interpreting what is said and questioning any inconsistency from the interviewee’s side. The questions in the guide are of open character in order to reduce the influence from the interviewers and they are all related to the subject.

We attempted to choose interviewees that we believed would represent students well, but we cannot guarantee a statistically representative selection. The selected interviewees will, in the presentation of results, be anonymous in order to fulfil the demand set about confidentiality.

4.2.1 Survey

The survey was handed out to 200 people at LiU. As we wanted to get a selection of respondents as representative as possible we targeted everybody sitting in the houses of the two campuses in Linköping, with the exception of people eating or having breaks from lectures. In order to get a spread over the different faculties and fields of studies at the university we distributed the survey in the houses A, B, C, D and Key at Campus Valla and in Örat and Cellskapet at Campus US. We chose to carry out the investigation on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday morning during the same week, when we thought we would reach as many as possible. Distributing the surveys during three days gave us the possibility to reach many people, but at the same time the risk of reaching the same respondent twice was heightened. To avoid our personal judgements about the respondents we approached everybody, and with just a few people refusing everybody asked took part.

The survey was constructed of a total of 10 questions in three parts; background of the respondent (gender, income and size of hometown), testing of the knowledge of KRAV and
attitude and behaviour towards organic milk (see Appendix 1). When constructing the
questions for the survey, the theories already found was used as a framework in order to
ensure that the result would be usable. All the questions in the survey were carefully
formulated to collect empirical data that could be connected to one or more of the theories.

The background factors were gender, age, size of hometown, occupation, income and amount
of milk consumed per month. Gender was asked about in order to see if there would be a
difference in attitude and behaviour between men and women. To eliminate non-students we
asked about occupation, and the non-students were later removed from the study as fall-offs.
The other background factors were asked in order to investigate whether they could be
explanatory factors and whether a difference in attitude or behaviour could be seen in
connection with these.

When testing the respondent’s knowledge about KRAV we decided to use “true-false” -
questions. We formulated 7 statements about KRAV and asked the respondent to mark
whether they thought the statements were true or false. We had three true statements and four
false; the false were mainly constructed to see whether the respondent were mistakenly
confusing KRAV with labels such as locally produced or low-fat. We consider those with two
or fewer incorrect answers to have a good knowledge about the KRAV labelling.

In the third part of the survey, we decided to formulate six statements and ask the respondent
to rate the degree to which he agreed with the statement, the level of agreement running from
1 (“do not agree at all”) to 5 (“fully agree”). The statements concerned opinions about organic
consumption, organic milk, influences from friends and family, the possibility of buying
organic milk and credibility of the KRAV certification.

Lastly we wanted to investigate the behaviour towards organic milk with the help of two
questions. In the first the respondent was asked to estimate how often they buy organic milk,
this in order to give us an idea of the general buying behaviour. In the second we asked a
question about the reasons for not buying organic milk. The respondent could choose from
twelve statements and had the possibility of multiple answers. We also had room for the
respondent’s own comments about the reasons not to buy organic milk.
4.2.2 Interviews

The four interviewees were chosen by convenience\textsuperscript{112}; they are all acquaintances of ours, the reason for this being that it is difficult to get random people to take part in longer interviews. We felt that when conducting the interviews it was not of importance to get a representative selection of interviewees when it came to being members of different faculties since it would not have an impact on the outcome of the interviews. We interviewed two women and two men, ages ranging from 23 to 30, all of them students at the University of Linköping. The interviews each took about twenty minutes to carry out.

The interviews followed an interview guide (see Appendix 3), in order to make sure we received all answers needed, but the guide was not followed in a strict way. The questions were, following Kvale’s definitions, mainly indirect and follow-ups to earlier asked questions\textsuperscript{113}, but sometimes we the authors used interpreting questions in order to clarify the answers given by the interviewee. The interviewees were allowed to speak freely about the subject, and the questions asked were open and designed to entice the interviewees to speak their mind. This was done by making sure that no questions could be answered simply with “yes” or “no”, they all needed some sort of comment or explanation. We were flexible and let the interviewee speak, even if he/she drifted from the questions asked, we interpreted and sometimes clarified the answers, without forcing our own thoughts on the interviewee.\textsuperscript{114} Even though we strive not to influence the interviewee we are aware of the fact that we in our way of asking and interpreting questions will in some way influence the answers given.
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5. Results

We present the results of the survey and the interviews carried out in order to collect empirical data to help us form answers to our questions. The result will be divided into four parts; background factors, KRAV related, attitude and behaviour and reasons for not consuming.

5.1 Background factors

The respondents of the survey are distributed evenly between men and women, men constituting 49% of the respondents and women 51% of the respondents, this corresponding well to the actual distribution between the sexes at the University of Linköping (47% respectively 53%). A predominant part of the respondents (80%) were between the ages of 21 and 25 years old. Of the respondents 42% were from a small town with less than 50 thousand inhabitants, 19% from a city with more than 200 thousand citizens, and the rest from a small to medium sized city with 50–200 thousand inhabitants.

45% of the respondents in our survey states that, when asked about income, that the only income they have is CSN. 46% states that they have CSN and an additional contribution from work or family as income. This can be compared to the national average where six out of ten students work outside of their studies. 8% of the respondents stated otherwise, some stating that they only take CSN allowance or only getting salary from full-time job as an income, others stating that they do not have an income at all, or that they live on saved money.

The amount of milk bought per month varies but it is clear that the majority consume milk, only approximately 4% do not consume milk at all. On asking how often they buy organic milk, only 8% stated that they always do and 21% stated that they often do. 69% of the respondents stated that they never or seldom buy organic milk, leaving 2% with no opinion or not knowing. The mean amongst women was slightly higher, in the aspect that they buy organic milk slightly more often.
We can also see in the survey that it is students coming from bigger hometowns (100-200 thousand inhabitants) that consume organic milk the most, whilst students from smaller hometowns (up to 100 thousand inhabitants) consume the least.

5.2 Related to KRAV

In order to investigate if the attitude-behaviour gap can be explained by the level of knowledge about the KRAV certification we examined the knowledge of the respondents with regards to the KRAV-labelling. 11% of the respondents answered correctly on the 7 statements. None of the respondents had less than 2 correct answers and the mean value for all respondents was 4.9 correct answers i.e. approximately 2 incorrect answers. There was a slight dissonance between men and women with regards to knowledge with women having a slightly higher knowledge with a mean of 5.04 correct answers and men having a mean of 4.75 correct answers.

The statements most widely answered incorrectly were statements regarding whether the transportation needs to be environmentally friendly and whether the producer needs to be socially responsible in the production (see diagram 1). The statement that *transportation needs to be environmentally friendly* is false, 60% of the respondents answered incorrectly. The statement that *the producer needs to be socially responsible* is true, 62% answered incorrectly. On the statement that *the products need to be locally produced*, a bit over 30% of the respondents answered incorrectly, stating that this is a criterion that needs to be fulfilled. The statement that *there is a maximum allowed share of saturated fats in KRAV-labelled products* is false, 18% answered incorrectly.

On the statements *chemical pesticides are allowed* (false) and *additives are regulated* (true) the knowledge was high with just a few incorrect answers. On the statement *animals need to be treated well* (true) only 10% answered incorrectly.
When asking our interviewees what they associate with KRAV, statements such as: “fair”, “a good cause”, “better for the environment”, “organic” and “happier cows” was mentioned. This can be connected to the answers in the survey since the respondents and the interviewees seem to have similar perceptions of KRAV.

One of our interviewees, brought up on a dairy farm certified by KRAV, and therefore having a lot of knowledge, stated that she “always buys organic milk and other dairy products”. She also stated that, based on own experience, she has confidence in the KRAV certification but that she also knows that the regulatory framework is not always followed and that farmers sometimes bend the rules.

To investigate the credibility amongst the respondents regarding the KRAV certification we made the statement “I believe KRAV is a believable labelling”. To this statement 60% of the respondents answered that they agree fully or to an extent. Only 10% of the respondents did not agree at all or did not agree to an extent, leaving 28% with no opinion or not knowing. The distribution between the sexes leaves the women agreeing stronger with the statement then men, with 29% female respondents that they agree fully and only 11% of males stating the same.
When investigating the relation between knowledge and trust for the KRAV label we found that of respondents with good knowledge (having 2 or less incorrect answers) 66% trusted the label, while of the respondents with a lack of knowledge 68% trusted the label, the difference here being minimal.

5.3 Attitudes and behaviour

When investigating what the attitude is towards organic milk we asked the respondents to rate the level of agreement to the statement “I think it is important that there are organic alternatives in the supermarkets” 53% fully agreed and almost 30% agreed to an extent. We interpret the ratings “fully agree” and “agree to an extent” as being positive towards having organic options. Only 5% did not agree at all or did not agree to an extent to this statement, and 11% stated that they did not know or did not have an opinion. On average, women agreed stronger to the statement than men do. None of the female respondents answered that they did not agree at all or did not agree to an extent to the statement, this meaning that 90% of the women are positive towards organic options. Answers given by male respondents are more spread with respondents being represented in all different categories, although a predominant part agreeing fully or to an extent. When investigating the relation between knowledge and attitude we found that respondents with good knowledge are slightly more positive towards organic options than the respondents with less knowledge. Also, in the conducted interviews the general opinion about KRAV and organic consumption was positive. Only one of our interviewees did not have any opinions about KRAV, she also gave other answers indicating that she was neutral towards the subject stating that “it is good that KRAV exists for the people who do want to buy organic, but I don’t”.

In order to identify the intention of buying organic milk we used the statement “when I buy milk it is important that it is organic”. Only 9% of the respondents agreed fully to this whilst 15% agreed to an extent. The predominant part of the respondents answered that they did not agree at all (30%) or did not agree to an extent (24%). The female respondents are better represented in the answers fully agree and agree to an extent than men, although this being a small proportion of the total female answers.
We found that of those claiming to be positive towards organic options (83%), only 28% had the intention to buy organic. Of the respondents with an intention to buy organic milk, 81% stated that they buy it often or always.

In attempt to see if the determinant self-identification can be an explanatory factor to the gap we asked the respondents to rate the level of agreement to the statement “I see myself as a green consumer”. Only 3% fully agreed and 17% agreed to an extent. A predominant part of the respondents, 60% answered that they do not agree with this statement at all or do not agree to an extent. Men are stronger represented then women in not agreeing at all or not agreeing to an extent in the statement concerning whether or not they see themselves as green consumers and women being consequently stronger represented then men in agreeing fully or agreeing to an extent, although this part being little in respect to total distribution.

Our interviewees generally saw themselves as “partly green consumers”, buying organic milk and other dairy products, but not much else. One of the interviewees stated that she is “not an environmental caring person, I do not separate household waste and I take my car everywhere”, leaving us to interpret this as her not seeing herself as a green consumer.

On investigating the subjective norm, we asked the respondents whether or not the surroundings (i.e. family, friends etc) affect them as consumers. Approximately 40% agreed fully or to an extent to the statement “My surroundings affect me as a consumer”. 36% did not agree at all or to an extent, leaving 23% with no opinion or not knowing. On the contrary, in the conducted interviews we found that the interviewees considered themselves influenced by their surroundings. They stated, for example, that “my family has always bought organic milk”, and that “advertisements, TV and media plays an important role” in their consumption behaviour, and also that “it is politically correct to consume organic and a much debated subject at the moment”. The fact that the surroundings has an impact on consumer behaviour was also true for the one interviewee who stated that she does not buy organic milk, which according to her is partly because of her family not consuming organic.

When investigating if the perceived behavioural control can explain the attitude-behaviour gap, we asked the respondent to rate the level of agreement to the statement “I think I have
the possibility to buy organic milk”. The predominant part (81%) stated that they fully agree or agree to an extent.

5.4 Reasons for not consuming

In order to reach a conclusion to our purpose we wanted to investigate the possible reasons as to why people do not consume organic milk. We found that almost 60% stated that it was because of the higher price of organic milk (see diagram 2), the price difference between organic and conventional milk in different stores ranges from 0.30 to 1.90 SEK per litre.$^\text{117}$ The high percentage made us want to investigate this issue further. When examining if the income is related to the consumption of organic milk we found that 27% of students with CSN as only income consume organic milk always or often, whilst 29% of students with an income per month of CSN and an additional 1000 SEK or more claim to do the same. Approximately the same percentage of respondents with CSN as only income as those with CSN and an additional income of 1000 SEK or more claimed that they do not consume organic milk because of the price. The difference in income shows little difference in consumption.

![Diagram 2: Showing the reasons for not consuming organic milk.](image)

$^\text{117}$ Own calculation from Ica Skolgatan and Hemköp Lucullus
Of all the respondents, 45% answered that they do not buy organic milk because they buy conventional milk out of habit. Contrary to the habit not to buy organic milk, one of our interviewees stated that she buys organic milk out of habit and that “I have made a decision once to buy organic milk – why re-evaluate that? I don’t have the energy to gather information and reassess my decision every time I buy milk”. Almost 23% of the respondents stated that they do not buy organic milk because of a lack of dedication to the issue. Price, habit and lack of dedication are, as seen earlier, the most cited reasons for not buying organic, but other factors such as poor availability, expiry date, and not believing that green consumption makes a difference for the environment/farmers/cows are also cited.

We investigated further if the subjective norm could be connected to the reason “lack of dedication”. We found that almost 90% of the respondents stating lack of dedication as a reason not to buy organic, also stated that they “do not agree at all” or “do not agree to an extent” to the statement “I see myself as a green consumer”.

Our interviewees stated that they thought that people in general do not buy organic milk because of higher price, not believing that organic consumption makes a difference and habit. This is corresponding to the results from the survey. When asking our interviewees why they buy organic milk they stated that they do it for the animals or that they do it for the environment. One male answered that he was afraid of the environmental development/evolution and that this was his way to make a difference.

A few men commented in the survey that conventional milk tastes better or has better quality than organic, while one of our male interviewees stated that “milk that has been organically or ethically produced tastes better, at least for the conscience”. Other comments made in the survey was that the respondents buy the locally produced Östgötamjölk instead of organic milk for various reasons such as that they believe it is better to buy locally produced than buying organic, or that they wanted to support the local producers. One respondent stated that he believed that organic milk is transported longer than conventional milk. Another respondent stated that he did not have the energy to check whether he buys organic or conventional milk, others stated that the buy e.g. milk low in lactose which does not exist as organic. One comment made by many respondents was that they will buy organic milk when they earn more money, or that they did buy organic before but realized that the total cost
difference between buying organic and buying conventional was too high. One of our interviewees stated that she does “not buy organic milk, but do not know why. There’s no reason in particular, I’m not making a strong statement; I just don’t care”.

We also wanted to investigate what the interviewees thought about the future, and the answers were in accordance. All interviewees believed that the trend of organic consumption is permanent and that it will develop, and that all products today seen as organic will be seen as conventional.

After compiling the result from survey and the interviews, we can conclude that an attitude-behaviour gap regarding organic milk do exist amongst the students of LiU, as 83% are positive towards it but merely 30% buy it often or always. We can also conclude that the main reasons for not buying organic milk are price, habit and lack of dedication to the issue.
6. Analysis

We present the analysis where the empirical findings are linked to the theoretical framework presented earlier. First we present the revised analytical model and then we analyse the impact of each determinant on the attitude-behaviour gap.

6.1 Consumption

As members of an academic society we are constantly encouraged to question all that we see and hear. In the process of writing this thesis we have put our focus towards an apparent theoretical flaw; the problem of the attitude-behaviour gap in consumer behaviour. How is it that a person’s attitude can be very positive but that the person’s behaviour does not act in line with the attitude, when theory states that it should?

By conducting our survey, we found that the students of LiU are overall very positive towards organic options but that when it comes to actually buying organic they act against their beliefs. This result corresponds well with previous research done in the area. According to theory, the stronger the attitude and the intention is, the more precise is the prediction to buy. With this in mind, it should be possible to predict that students at LiU would buy organic milk, and this prediction should be rather precise since the attitude is strongly positive.

According to theories of consumer behaviour, consumers are rational and intend to maximize their utility with the budget restraints set upon them. As seen earlier, this theoretical approach has been altered and modern theory also put emphasis on the added value given by both sensory and non-sensory characteristics of the products. The way of consuming in the 21\textsuperscript{th} century is characterized by emotional criterions rather than rational. The consumers today put more focus on aspects such as brand, design etc., and by consuming emotionally consumers get more than just a good; they can get group affiliation, acceptance or admiration from consuming in a certain way. As consumers, buying organic milk gives us something else than just the product “milk”; a social acceptance, a belief that we make a difference for the environment, that it is better or healthier for us etc. It could be seen as in consuming organic milk instead of conventional the consumer fulfils other requirements of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. Since we are rational beings we would not behave in a manner that does not favour us. If consuming organic milk instead of conventional milk would not give consumers a higher utility they would not consume it.
6.2 The revised analytical model

From the results of our survey, we can verify the existence of the attitude-behaviour gap discussed above; with more than 80% of all respondents being positive towards organic options but only 28% of the positive ones stating that they have an intention of consuming. More than 80% of the respondents with an intention to consume did in fact buy organic milk. From this we can establish that the actual attitude-behaviour gap in this case, arise where the five determinants form the actual intention (see figure 2). Our respondents do not even have an intention of buying organic milk, and simultaneously will not consume it.

![Figure 2: Revised analytical model](image)

We see a strongly positive attitude, but an intention in the same direction is never formed. This must be because of other determinants also being strong but opposing the attitude. When examining if and how the background factors affect the gap, we discovered that they do not have a direct impact. The background factors can help explain each determinant and therefore indirectly have an impact on the attitude-behaviour gap.

6.3 Impact of each determinant

According to our theory, subjective norm is one of the factors that determine intention – and therefore behaviour. Since organic consumption is a sensitive and debated subject, we thought that the opinions and actions of others would have an important impact on a person’s behaviour. In the results from our survey, however, only 40% answered that they felt this impact. On the other hand, amongst our interviewees we found that all of them felt that family has an important impact on their consumer behaviour, as it makes an important contribution to their habits. Those whose family bought organic milk bought it themselves out of habit, and
the interviewee who did not buy organic milk came from a family where the environment and organic food were not important issues, and therefore she did not have a habit of consuming it.

A large part of consumer behaviour regarding milk seems to be related to habit, seeing as in the survey this was also one of the main reasons as to why people do not buy organic milk. This can also be connected to the theory that milk is a non-durable product, i.e. quickly consumed and bought without much effort, characteristics that are connected to habitual decision-making. From this it can be concluded that milk is often bought out of habit without much consideration. This is also reflected in our empirical data, as one of our interviewees stated that she did not have the energy to re-evaluate the decision every time she buys milk.

Quite a large part of the respondents to the survey (23%) answered that they did not know or did not have an opinion about the influences from their surroundings, something that the theory says is important, both when it comes to utility and forming intentions. The answers can be interpreted as them not knowing whether they behave in a certain way because of influences from others. We believe that it can be difficult to know the reasons behind a behaviour, especially if it is something you have been doing for a long time. This is where influence from family and upbringing can have an indirect effect, a person may not be aware that he has been affected into doing something that he considers to be “just a habit”. Since consumers are assumed to be conventional when it comes to buying food, and it also seems that milk is bought without much consideration or collecting of information, it may be difficult to change a consumer’s habit into buying organic milk.

We believe that the subjective norm has a big influence on our habits and since a large part of the respondents’ state that they do not buy organic because of a habit we can conclude that the impact of the subjective norm is strong. The social influence can be seen as a barrier not to consume organic and an explanation for the attitude-behaviour gap.

The perceived behavioural control, in this case, is strong since 81% of the respondents stated that they have the possibility to buy organic milk. The fact that it does not seem to be a high level of difficulty in acquiring organic milk should, according to the theory of planned behaviour, lead to people consuming it, and therefore perceived behavioural control should
bridge the gap. It is interesting to discuss this matter in connection with the relatively high number of all respondents (58%) saying that one of the reasons for not buying organic milk is the price, i.e. they blame external factors outside their own control. If they consider themselves having the possibility to buy organic milk, they should be able to afford it and therefore price should not be a barrier. It seems that the respondents are contradicting themselves in this matter, an action that can be explained by the use of the neutralization theory. In connecting this theory to the answers, we interpret that blaming the price is in fact denial of responsibility. By blaming somebody or something outside of their own control, the respondents can justify them not buying organic milk although they have a positive attitude and the possibility to buy it. We consider the ability to justify a certain behaviour contradicting one’s principles as an important factor when it comes to explaining the attitude-behaviour gap. The conclusion here being that perceived behavioural control is a strong determinant but does not have a big impact because of the possibility to use neutralization.

Another determinant that affects the attitude-behaviour gap is self-identification, since 83% of our respondents were positive towards organic milk, but almost 60% of the respondents disagreed to the statement “I see myself as a green consumer”. We interpret this as a contributing factor as to why people do not consume organic milk, since the theory shows that if a person identifies with the issue, she will act in line with it. We also want to connect the factor self-identification to the lack of dedication as an answer to why the respondents do not buy organic milk. The results from the survey shows that almost 23% answered that they do not buy organic because of a lack of dedication to the issue and of these, 90% stated that they do not see themselves as green consumers. Therefore we can conclude that a green consumer is dedicated to the issue, but it seems that the case here is that people do not see themselves as organic consumers, and therefore do not buy organically.

The lack of dedication also points to a lack of ethical obligation, which is another determinant that can explain the gap. We believe that a person who has strong opinions about organic consumption also has a dedication to the issue, and therefore feels an ethical obligation. In the survey it was clear that there is a lack of dedication to the issue, since this was the third biggest reason for not buying organic. It can be concluded that a big part of the respondents do not feel that they have an ethical obligation to consume organic and therefore this component might partly explain the gap between the attitude and the behaviour. One of our
interviewees answered that the reason for not buying organic is that she just does not care, whilst another one answered that he buys organic because he feels that it is a way for him to make a difference. This gives us an indication that the determinant ethical obligation is important; it can affect the attitude-behaviour gap in both ways. For the person who feels an ethical obligation, it can contribute to the actual consumption, but for the person lacking it, it contributes to the gap. This is supported by previous research showing that the main motive for buying organically is concerns about the environment.

Another example of not having an ethical obligation is where some respondents answered that they did not consume organic because they did not feel that their consumption makes a difference for the environment, farmers or cows. We draw the conclusion that by saying that there is no difference they are saying that nobody is worse off with them not consuming, nobody gets injured. We believe that these respondents are in fact using neutralization through denial of injury or denial of victim to justify their behaviour, meaning that they can behave in this way because they do not think that they are injuring anybody. In our case this can be interpreted as that they do not see why they should pay extra for organic milk, when it does not favour or disfavour anybody. An example of having an ethical obligation but still not buying organic milk is the respondents buying Östgötamjölk. They have an ethical obligation, but by using neutralization through appealing to higher loyalties they justify not buying organic milk since they follow their beliefs that the consumption of locally produced milk is better.

When it comes to credibility in a certification and its connection to the buying behaviour according to our theory, KRAV should have high credibility since it is the only certification organ in Sweden and very well-known. High credibility should give a high expected quality of the product. Since “organic” is a quality that cannot be asserted by the consumer herself, she has to trust information about the product given by others. In our survey we found that 60% of our respondents agreed that KRAV is a certification one can trust, this saying that the expected quality would be high for those 60%. When compiling the survey, it was clear that the general knowledge about the KRAV criterions was good, which also should give high expected quality. We also saw that many of the respondents thought that the KRAV certification captures more environmental issues then it actually does. The respondents seem to confuse KRAV with other certifications, and this must be regarded as positive for KRAV.
since the consumers value the certification higher. The credibility together with the high knowledge and the positive associations to KRAV, should lead to a higher expected quality, and therefore a higher consumption. The positive attitude towards KRAV-labelled organic options can indicate a higher expected or experienced quality of the product, which also should predict a higher consumption, i.e. bridge the attitude-behaviour gap.
7. Conclusion

The actual existence of an attitude-behaviour gap regarding the consumption of organic milk has been established in this thesis, and also that the gap arises before an intention has been made. When connecting this to the theory of planned behaviour and the underlying determinants we have found that some determinants play a bigger role than others in explaining the gap.

The subjective norm in this case is strong, but towards the consumption of conventional milk, and therefore this determinant is one of the contributing factors to the existing gap. The perceived behavioural control is strong, but it is neutralized, and the impact on the gap seems to be minimal. The ethical obligation has a big impact on the gap, in this case explaining the existence of it. The self-identification is also an important determinant when explaining the gap. Background factors such as gender, knowledge, hometown etc. do have an effect on the gap, but this effect is indirect through the determinants.

The high expected quality of organic milk and KRAV labelled products should predict consumption, i.e. bridge the gap. The characteristics of milk, the habitual buying behaviour linked to it and the fact that consumers are conventional restrains the consumers from taking in new information and re-evaluating the decision made; to buy conventional milk.

What we can conclude is that the determinants subjective norm, ethical obligation and self-identity together with the factors of the decision-making process, are strong enough to neutralize the influence of the attitude. This is done before an intention of consuming organic is formed and therefore neither an intention nor a behaviour of consuming organic milk takes place.
8. Closing thoughts

We present our suggestions to minimize the attitude-behaviour gap towards organic milk and give some suggestions for further research.

8.1 Suggestions for minimizing the gap

In order to bridge the attitude-behaviour gap we believe that the main action needed in order to change this is to actually get the consumers to form an intention of buying organic. This can be accomplished by increasing the added value of the organic milk so that the utility of consuming organically will exceed the utility of consuming conventionally. According to the results from our thesis this can be done by changing the consumer habits, changing the way the consumer sees herself, and by making the consumer feel a responsibility towards animals and the environment. Another way of increasing the consumption is by increasing the supply of organic dairy products so that the consumption will not be restrained by a lack of availability. Increasing the sales can also be done by targeting new consumer groups. This can be accomplished by increasing the assortment of organic milk, e.g. lactose-free. We believe that these actions can be carried out by both providers, such as Arla, grocery stores and the KRAV organization.

8.2 Further research

During the process of writing this thesis we found many interesting ideas for further research, but because of time restraints we could not investigate this on our own.

In the conclusion of this thesis we have made some suggestions as to how the gap can be minimized. Our suggestions are scarce and an investigation and a feasible plan of action of how to achieve this would be of great interest.

One aspect that became very clear to us was the difference between the genders when it comes to consuming organically, this is also the results from other investigations. An investigating of why there is such a difference and how it could be eliminated would be interesting.
When concluding this thesis we started wondering whether our way of reasoning and interpreting would be possible to apply to other fields of studies in order to examine the attitude-behaviour gap towards similar subjects. It would be of interest to apply our discussion to issues such as public transport, separation of household waste and the buying of green cars.
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Appendix 1

1) Kön: Man ☐ Kvinna ☐

2) Ålder: under 20 ☐ 21 - 25 ☐ 26 - 30 ☐ 30 eller äldre ☐

3) Hur stor är din hemstad?
(Den stad du har växt upp i)
Antal invånare fler än 200 000 ☐ Antal invånare 100 000 - 200 000 ☐
Antal invånare 50 000 - 100 000 ☐ Antal invånare färre än 50 000 ☐

4) Sysselsättning: Student ☐
Anntat ☐ …………………………………………..

5) Inkomst/månad: CSN ☐ CSN + extrajobb/bidrag mindre än 1000 kr ☐
CSN + extrajobb/bidrag över 1000 kr ☐ Annat………………………………………..

6) Hur mycket mjölk handlar du varje månad?
Ingen ☐ mindre än 4 liter ☐ 4 - 8 liter ☐ mer än 8 liter ☐

7) För att en vara skall få KRAV-märkas måste vissa kriterier uppfyllas.
Vilka av följande påståenden är sanna respektive falska vad gäller dessa kriterier?

Kemiska bekämpningsmedel får användas ☐ ☐
Produkterna skall vara närproducerade ☐ ☐
Djuren ska behandlas väl ☐ ☐
Transporten måste vara miljövänlig ☐ ☐
Livsmedelstillsatser regleras ☐ ☐
Producenten skall ta socialt ansvar ☐ ☐
Produkterna får endast innehålla en viss andel mättat fett ☐ ☐

8) Hur väl håller du med om följande påståenden?
Markera Din åsikt genom att ringa in siffran som stämmer bäst överens med Din uppfattning.

1 = Håller inte alls med
2 = Håller inte med till viss del
3 = Vet inte / har ingen åsikt
4 = Håller med till viss del
5 = Håller helt och hållet med

A) Jag tycker att det är viktigt att det finns ekologiska alternativ i livsmedelshandeln

1 2 3 4 5
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B) När jag handlar mjölk är det viktigt att den är ekologisk

1 2 3 4 5

C) Jag anser mig vara en ekologisk konsument

1 2 3 4 5

D) Min omgivning (familj, vänner etc.) påverkar mig som konsument

1 2 3 4 5

E) Jag anser mig ha möjlighet att handla ekologisk mjölk

1 2 3 4 5

F) Jag tycker att KRAV är en trovärdig märkning

1 2 3 4 5

9) Hur ofta handlar du ekologisk mjölk?
(Gäller ej Östgöta mjölk då den ej räknas som ekologisk)

Table: 

| Alternativ |选择
|---|---
| Alltid | ☐
| Ofta | ☐
| Sällan | ☐
| Aldrig | ☐
| Vet ej | ☐

10) Att/när jag inte handlar ekologisk mjölk beror det på:
(Fler alternativ får kryssas i)

Table: 

| Alternativ |选择
|---|---
| Pris | ☐
| Att jag av vana köper vanlig mjölk | ☐
| Fel sorts förpackning | ☐
| Smak | ☐
| Vet inte vad ekologiskt står för | ☐
| Dålig tillgänglighet | ☐
| Hållbarhet | ☐
| Brist på engagemang i frågan | ☐
| Handlar alltid ekologiskt | ☐

Jag tror inte att ekologisk konsumtion gör någon skillnad för miljön / korna / bönderna | ☐

Vanlig mjölk har högre kvalitet än ekologisk | ☐

Annat | ☐

………………………………………………

Denna enkät kommer att användas som underlag i vår uppsats om konsumentbeteende gentemot ekologisk mjölk.

Tack för Din medverkan!

Elin Olsson och Karin Lindgren

Sprek 4
Appendix 2

Compilation of surveys

Number of surveys: 200  Fall-offs: 14 = 8%
Total received answers 186

1) Gender
   Male       91  49%
   Female     95  51%

2) Age:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 or younger</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older than 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Hometown:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hometown</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 +</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-200</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 -</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) Income:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSN - 1000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSN + 1000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) How much milk do you buy every month?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 4 litres</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8 litres</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 8 litres</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Right answers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Right answers</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Which where the wrong answers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemical pesticides can be used in production</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products shall be locally produced</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals shall be treated well</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of transportation shall be environmentally friendly</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additives are regulated</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer shall be socially responsibel</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products can only contain certain amount of saturated fats</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8) How well do you agree with these following statements

#### A) I think it is important that there are organic alternatives in the supermarkets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree at all</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree to an extent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know/ no opinion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree to an extent</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully agree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean: 4.301

#### B) When I buy milk it is important that it is organic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree at all</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree to an extent</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know/ no opinion</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree to an extent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean 2.5

#### C) I see myself as a green consumer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree at all</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree to an extent</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know/ no opinion</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree to an extent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### D) My surroundings affect me as a consumer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree at all</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree to an extent</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know/ no opinion</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree to an extent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E) I think I have the possibility to buy organic milk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree to an extent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know/ no opinion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree to an extent</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>63,4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F) I think KRAV is a believable labelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree at all</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not agree to an extent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know/ no opinion</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree to an extent</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>39,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) How often do you buy organic milk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mean: 2,323

10) When/that I do not consume organic milk is because

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>58,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavour</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiry date</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong packaging</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor availability</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always by organic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By conventional milk of habit</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>45,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know what organic is</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of dedication</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional milk has got a higher quality</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not believ green consumption makes a difference</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8,1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other:
- Tror att ekologisk mjölk har längre transport
- Godare med vanlig mjölk
- Östgöta mjölk / närproducerad
- Skulle köpa om bättre ekonomi - dvs priset?
- Bara beroende på CSN bidragets storlek
- Finns ej i laktosfritt
- Orkar inte kolla
Appendix 3

Intervjuguide – ekologisk konsumtion

Vad är viktigt för dig när du köper mjölk?

Vad påverkar dig som konsument att handla som du gör?

Vad associerar du med märkningen KRAV?

Vad tycker du om KRAV som certifiering?

- Vad tror du om standarden/kvaliteten på KRAV märkta varor jämfört med konventionella?

- Litar du på KRAV märkningen? Varför/varför inte?

Konsumerar du ekologiskt?

- Varför eller varför inte konsumerar du ekologisk mjölk?

- Om du inte konsumerar ekologiskt, vad skulle få dig till att börja?

- Om du konsumerar ekologiskt, vad skulle få dig till att sluta?

Generellt, varför tror du att ”folk” inte konsumerar ekologisk mjölk?

Tror du att ekologisk konsumtion är en trend eller något bestående?