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ABSTRACT

This study examines a current phenomenon and behavioural shift amongst consumers’, namely the accelerating growth of organic food sales in Sweden. By combining the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA), with the logic of value co-creation, an appropriate research tool has been developed stemmed from two related sub-studies. Based on TRA’s argument that additional factors, referred to as external, only can influence behavioural intention indirectly, combined with the proposed impact of value co-creation on consumers’ purchase behaviour, these theoretical perspectives have been consolidated. This has been done with the purpose to validate whether external factors directly influence consumers’ behavioural intention. The findings suggest that (1) external factors directly influence behavioural intention to purchase organic food products as statistical significance is found for value, (2) as value is confirmed, one can validate that external factors directly influence consumers’ behavioural intention to purchase organic food products and (3) that no statistical significance is found for co and creation, even though a small and slight negative influence on behavioural intention is suggested. This study contributes with an understanding whether external factors directly influence consumers’ behavioural intention to purchase, having implication on both theory and practice.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

A current phenomenon that has drawn great attention in Sweden is the rapid increase of organic sales in the food industry. In 2014, the organic market grew with 38%, equivalent to 4.1 billion SEK (Biofach 2015; Ekoweb 2015). This accelerating growth was evident across all Swedish food categories (ICA 2015a; Krav 2015a; U & we 2015a) with dairy products reported as one of the largest commodity groups (Slu 2015). Along with this, the global organic market showed a common increase of 10% in 2014, in which Sweden outperformed other markets by showing the highest growth rate ever recorded (Biofach 2015; Ekoweb 2015). This sharp increase in sales in Sweden shows that consumers recently have developed a stronger interest in purchasing organic food (Ekoweb 2015). An understanding of why organic sales have accelerated and what has triggered this consumer purchase behaviour is however, as yet, needed among practitioners and scholars.

In academia, scholarly attention to the context of organic food has proven both the normative effect for purchasing organic products (Smith & Paladina 2010) and the attitudinal effect on behaviour linked to health and environment (Grunert & Juhl 1995; Padel & Foster 2005; Shepherd et al. 2005). A positive attitude toward organic food products has also been recognized among consumers (Menghi 1997; Arvola et al. 2000; Ekelund 2003), although other research has implied that a positive attitude toward a product not automatically results in an actual purchase (Warshaw & Davis 1984; Sheppard et al. 1998; Slu 2000). This is attributable on the Swedish organic market, where research and sales figures have not been equivalent in recent years. While research has identified a positive attitude toward the market, with results reporting 50-70% of respondents having positive attitudes to organic food (Scb 2004; Krav 2012), organic sales have instead displayed contradicting figures. As sales rather started to incline in 2014, consumers seem to have adopted the organic trend now when purchasing organic food products in preference to conventional options (Scb 2004; 2015; Krav 2012; Ekoweb 2015). Given that this positive attitude has been facilitated for years but not visible in purchase until recently (Ekoweb 2015), one may question what has caused the behavioural shift and why consumers are more willing to adopt the organic food trend today.

Besides the upsurge in organic sales, the increased interest in organic food in Sweden has also been evident through a more visible corporate sustainability focus (Naturskyddsföringen
2014; Arla 2015a; Krav 2015b). Various market actors are jointly promoting the benefits of organic food to increase production and sales (Krav 2014). Hence, a distinct collaborative interest between market actors has recently been recognized. This is for instance visible through the newly established network Organic Sweden consisting of 35 Swedish firms and organizations throughout the organic food chain (Krav 2014). These kind of sustainable collaborations with a common goal are suggested to be essential for future growth (Regeringskansliet 2003; Nordiska Rådet 2010), but what effect these joint efforts have on consumer purchase is however not yet well understood. While further understanding of factors influencing consumer behaviour in terms of purchasing organic food has been of interest of both academics (Lockie et. al 2004; Chen 2007; Paul & Rana 2012) and practitioners (Arla 2015a; Slu 2015), focus has rather been on understanding attitude and subjective norm in the organic food context (Grunert & Juhl 1995; Padel & Foster 2005). What impact market actors jointly can have on consumers’ purchase behaviour hence needs to be further examined.

In research it has commonly been theorised that behaviour is understood by analysing behavioural intentions (Doran 1991). One of the most prominent frameworks within this theoretical field is the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980). TRA has for long provided an established academic framework (Ryan & Bonfield 1980; Madden et al. 1992; Sheppard et al. 1998) aiming to explicate behavioural intention that mediates a specific behaviour. TRA theorises that the variables attitude and subjective norm have a direct effect on behavioural intention, hence determining it. All variables except these two are further referred to as external factors, and are characterised by only having an indirect effect through attitude and subjective norm (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980; 2005). As attitude and subjective norm hence are the only variables affecting behavioral intention directly, and these have been argued to be too consumer orientated, the framework has further been criticized as being too individualistic biased (Kippax & Crawford 1993, p.253). Following this line of reasoning, the omission of a business perspective in TRA could be questioned as it gives rise to a separation between the consumer and the firm.

An interesting academic addition to this discussion is that newer theoretical approaches instead have argued that a separation between the consumer and the firm is no longer valid (Vargo & Lusch 2004; Grönnroos & Ravald 2011; Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013) along with the
proposed impact that market actor collaboration has on consumers’ purchase behaviour (Grönroos & Ravald 2011). This is also consistent with the distinct collaborative interest that has been observed recently at the organic food market in Sweden. Shifting contemporary marketing thought, where Service-Dominant logic (S-D logic) has been given extensive scientific recognition, argues that the consumer should be included in a firm’s processes and in the development of both products and services (Vargo & Lusch 2004). Here, value and value co-creation are essential aspects, as the consumer is a co-creator, rather than excluded from the process (Vargo & Lusch 2004). The value is evaluated by the user’s fit in the actual value process (Grönroos & Voima 2011), as well as the social system and the context (Chandler & Vargo 2011; Edvardsson et al. 2011). The broadened S-D logic view embraces complexity where several market actors influence each other in the value creation. With this, a service ecosystem perspective is presented where value-creation takes place between multiple actors in an ever evolving and dynamic environment (Edvardsson et. al 2011; Lusch & Vargo 2014). In the general discussion of value co-creation this is argued to impact on consumers’ purchase behaviour, which is further recommended for future research (Grönroos & Ravald 2011). How market actors jointly influence and interact with the consumer might also impact the purchase behaviour, which in turn suggests that this could have an influence.

Building on these argumentations, and linking this to the context of TRA, previous scholars have argued that there are additional variables that also affect consumers’ behavioural intention (Bagozzi et al. 2000; Marandu et al. 2010). This strongly indicates that other variables should be included in future studies using TRA. It has further been argued that external variables are important for TRA, as they may in fact affect behavioural intention directly (Shim et al. 1989; Crosby & Muehling 1983; Bagozzi et al. 1992), which thereby challenges the argument that external factors only can affect behavioural intention directly (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980). Referring back to the discussion of value co-creation and its argued impact on purchase behaviour (Grönroos & Ravald 2011), it seems appropriate, based on the above reasoning, to include these as external variables and add it to the original TRA framework. Linking the current organic market phenomenon, and its observed market actor collaboration, together with this theoretical discussion, leads up to the research question:

Do external factors directly influence consumers’ behavioural intention to purchase organic food products?
1.1 Research purpose

The main contribution of this study is to validate whether external factors’ directly influence consumers’ behavioural intention to purchase. To address this aim, Ajzen & Fishbein’s (1980) model of human behaviour, the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA), has been applied together with the external variables comprising of value co-creation. These theoretical perspectives have been consolidated to test variables directly affecting consumers’ behaviour intention to purchase organic food products. This study marks the first known attempt to combine the original construct of TRA with the theoretical concept of value co-creation from a service ecosystem view. Researchers have advocated benefits of joining similar theoretical approaches (Warshaw 1980; Sheppard et al. 1988; Grönroos & Ravald 2011). Thereby, this study contributes with an extended understanding of external factors’ effect on consumers’ behavioural intention, with findings intending to be transferable to future research as well as influencing practitioners.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 The theory of reasoned action

The theoretical framework Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA), proposed by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980), will in this study serve as the central tool for investigating whether external factors directly influence consumers’ behavioural intention to purchase organic food products. The primary function of TRA is to explicate behaviour that is straightforward and under consumers volitional control (Sheppard et al. 1988; Armitage & Conner 2001). In addition, the framework is based on the assumption that people are rational thinkers and make use of information available to them (Ajzen & Fishbein 1975; 1980). The extended TRA, Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) (Ajzen 1991), on the other hand, does include perceived behavioural control but is otherwise identical (Madden et al. 1992). Inclusion of the added variable in TPB, contributes mainly to understanding behaviour in which circumstances have limitations on action. For this study, as purchasing organic food is here argued to be volitional as little may constrain the consumer’s purchase behaviour, using TRA is therefore appropriate as it adequately can be used to understand behaviour. The usability of TRA is further confirmed by its great merit in its simplicity (Sheppard et. al 1988; Trafimow & Lench 2015). Given that several scholars have applied TRA, also incorporating added variables to test its impact on the behaviour in question (Shimp & Kavas 1984; Petrovici et al. 2004; Fitzmaurice 2005; Finck et al. 2008), it is argued to be reasonable for this study to use the same approach when validating whether external factors have a direct impact on consumers behavioural intention.

TRA posits that it is one’s behavioural intention (BI) that is the strongest predicting variable for a specific behaviour (B). BI does, in turn, consist of the two conceptually independent determinants of intention: Attitude toward the behaviour (Aact) and Subjective Norm (SN). When these are evaluated as positive, the individual in question has a more positive intention to purchase and is thus more likely to perform the specific behaviour. In other words, the individual is more likely to perform a behaviour that is evaluated favourably by him/herself and among others. Aact and SN have been proved to impact BI directly by the developers to TRA. Although they have also tested other variables, none of these have proved to have a direct effect on behavioural intention, but instead only indirectly mediated by Aact and SN. The proven and hence established TRA variables are going to be explained further and
discussed in the following theoretical sections. The central equation explaining the relationship between the variables can be expressed as follows (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980):

\[ B \sim BI = Aact (\omega_1) + SN (\omega_2) \]

Where:

- \( B \) = A specific behaviour
- \( BI \) = A person’s intention to engage in this specific behaviour
- \( Aact \) = A person’s individual attitude toward engaging in this specific behaviour
- \( SN \) = Subjective norm concerning whether other want the person to engage in this specific behaviour
- \( \omega_1 \) and \( \omega_2 \) = Weights reflecting the relative influence of the \( Aact \) and \( SN \) factors on \( BI \)

2.1.1 (B) - a specific behaviour

A specific behaviour (B) is defined as “[...] observable acts that are studied in their own right” (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975 p. 335), which is a definition that also has been applied in other, more recent, published theoretical approaches (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980; Petrovici et al. 2004; Finck et al. 2008). Consistency in the definition confirms its validity, as it is argued as vital to clearly define the specific behaviour when utilising TRA. A specific behaviour is further explained to be a specific purchase or use situation, for instance purchasing a new pair of jeans or deciding to go to the cinema. These types of behaviours are always occurring in situational contexts and at a specific time (Ajzen & Fishbein 1969; 1980; Ajzen 1991; 2006).

2.1.2 (BI) - intention to perform a specific behaviour

A high correlation is advocated between a person’s behavioural intentions (BI) and to actually perform the specific behaviour (B). BI serves as an intervening variable between B and its two predicting variables (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980), which is a relative weighting of (1) a consumer’s attitude toward a specific behaviour (Aact) and (2) its subjective norm (SN). A positive BI, based on the two variables Aact and SN, are therefore argued to be strong indicators of actual behaviour B. BI is defined as “[...] a person’s location on a subjective probability dimension involving a relation between himself and some action. A behavioural intention, therefore, refers to a person’s subjective probability that he will perform some behaviour” (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975 p.288). This definition has been commonly used in later studies, which corroborates its appropriateness (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980). While some scholars have argued that BI and B are not always closely related to each other (Wicker 1969; Mittal & Kamakura 2001), other researchers have agreed with Ajzen and Fishbein’s (1980) in
viewing BI as the key variable to B (Sheppard et al. 1988; Arvola et al. 2008) validating this relationship.

2.1.3 (Aact) - attitude toward a specific behaviour

The attitude toward a specific behaviour (Aact) is defined as “[...] a person’s general feeling of favourableness or unfavourableness toward some stimulus object” (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975; p.216). Aact is a function of three components: (1) one’s belief (b_i) that the performing a behaviour (B) will lead to a desired outcome, (2) the evaluation of this outcome (e_i) as well as (3) the number of beliefs (n) one is holding about the performance of the specific behaviour (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980). The theory implies that Aact influences a person’s level of favourability of one’s intention to perform B. It should be added that attitude toward a specific behaviour is not consistent with an attitude toward an object. These should be separated from each other in this context (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980). Aact can be expressed as following:

\[
A_{act} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{iei}
\]

2.1.4 (SN) - subjective norm

The subjective norm (SN) is the second variable weighted for BI. This is defined as “[...] a person's perception that most people who are important to him or her think he should or should not perform the behaviour in question” (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975; p. 302). SN consists of three functions: (1) perceived expectations from other people (NB_j), (2) the actual motivation to go for these expectations and perform the behaviour (MC_j) and (3) the number of reference group beliefs (m), influencing the weight of the function in the equation (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975 p. 302). SN can be expressed as following:

\[
SN = \sum_{j=1}^{m} NB_jMC_j
\]

2.2 External factors

As elaborated, Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) propose that all variables, except Aact and SN, only have an indirect effect likely mediated by these variables. By this reasoning, other variables that affect BI indirectly should be considered as what they refer to as external variables. Although the theoretical framework’s effectiveness and strong overall utility has been proven
(Sheppard et. al 1988), criticism has been voiced, arguing that the variables $A_{act}$ and $SN$ do not provide a complete picture to understand $B$ (Aleassa et al. 2011). Kippax and Crawford (1993, p. 253) further points out the weaknesses of TRA in understanding consumer behaviour as the impact of external factors has been neglected. Other scholars have also criticized the exclusion of additional factors from TRA and suggested that external factors can have a direct impact on BI (Crosby & Muehling 1983; Shim et al. 1989; Bagozzi et al. 1992), and should therefore be included in combination with original constructs in studies using TRA (Warshaw 1980; Sheppard et al. 1988). By ignoring external factors, TRA has further been criticized as being individualistic biased and considered to have theoretical shortcomings (Kippax & Crawford 1993 p. 253-258).

The TRA research has consistently focused on the individual perspective when exploring adoption of usage and purchase behaviour. Yet, if one takes a broader view, the consumers’ usage or purchase of a product or service is often set within a system where they can interact with one another and with other market actors. A prominent argument is that TRA also has ignored broader social structures operating in the society (Kippax & Crawford 1993 p. 253; Werner 2004). Social structures are argued to be important for consumers in their purchasing behaviour. It is therefore keen to recognize and add the perspective of the dynamic interplay between individuals as well as the social process with market actors as this is necessary to create a holistic picture for the TRA framework. The actual behaviour is therefore argued to be more than just an individual process, and the framework has therefore been criticized as being too consumer oriented (Kippax & Crawford 1993 p. 253). In short, this entails that other variables could provide a better understanding of the specific behaviour in question; supporting that external factors should be explored further together with TRA.

Furthermore, with the increasing digitalization, consumers and other market actors are enabled to interact and also affect each other. New forms of interaction are therefore replacing the traditional view of exchange (Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013), which also may have an impact on consumer behaviour and behavioural intention (Grönroos & Ravald 2011). When focusing on consumers’ specific purchase behaviours, existing marketing literature formerly had its attention on transaction of physical goods, also ignoring the relational and interactional aspects influencing behaviour, similar to the criticism of TRA. This has in more contemporary research shifted toward a viewpoint where value is seen as important, jointly
created through interactions (Vargo & Lusch 2008; Gummesson & Mele 2010; Grönroos & Voima 2013). This value co-creation discussion has mainly been intensified due to research on service-dominant logic (Vargo & Lusch 2004; 2008) and has rather highlighted the intangible resources and the relationships (Vargo & Lusch 2004) as actors together exchange resources instead of the purchase being purely a transaction (Michel et al. 2008).

From viewing consumers’ purchase behaviour as the exchange of physical goods, the focus has instead shifted to actual value. By doing so, the core offering can be improved by complementing or even replacing it with a better solution based on understanding of consumer needs (Sawhney 2006). This can however only be achieved by interacting with consumers and involving them in the value creation process (Vargo & Lusch 2004; Grönroos & Voima 2011). Encouraging participation has been the key in this theoretical field as it can lead to competitive effectiveness for the firm by interacting with the consumer (Vargo & Lusch 2004). This extended approach can be viewed as complementary to the original mindset, since this more nuanced approach can provide an enriching understanding of how several markets actors influence each other, which further could provide opportunities for multiple actors as well (Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013). It is however still unclear what precise implication participation have on attitudinal and behavioural outcomes from the service relationships (Ennew & Binks 1999). Past research indicates that implications from value co-creation do not only influence consumers’ value creation, but may also impact their future purchase behaviour (Grönroos & Ravald 2011). By co-creating value, a firm is argued to have a direct impact on consumers’ value fulfilment, their preferences and lastly their future purchasing behaviour where a positive effect is the desired outcome. On the contrary, if the firm uses the direct interaction with the consumer in the wrong way, it could instead take a negative turn leading to value destruction (Grönroos & Voima 2011). By these arguments, further exploring the direct implications and effect of value co-creation on consumer behaviour is recommended (Grönroos & Ravald 2011).

Contemporary research has provided a bundle of approaches to value co-creation, which has led to a wide variety of contributions. But due to the complexity of the concept of value co-creation, it has been argued as the key to clarify the scope and nature of value co-creation as well as comprehend the roles of different actors involved in the process. This should be done to understand implications for marketing and practice (Grönroos & Ravald 2011; Grönroos &
Voima 2013). On the basis of this discussion, Saarijärvi and Kannan (2013) have, to reduce complexity, scrutinized multiple approaches to value co-creation from leading scholars and dismantled the concept of value co-creation into its constituent parts Value, Co and Creation. By doing so, it is argued that both scholars and practitioners can more easily identify and understand what kind of value that is created, by what resources and through what mechanisms, and by so assess opportunities presented by value co-creation (Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013). These constituent parts will be presented and discussed below, providing a basis for the chapters to come.

2.2.1 Value - clarifying what value for whom

According to S-D logic, value relates to the benefit for some actors where value is co-created through the establishment of new resources derived from multiple sources (Vargo & Lusch 2008; 2012 p.2). Here, co-creation of value can only occur when interacting with the proposed beneficiary, which separated the term of value creation and value co-creation. Clearly, helping the consumer to create value is not a one-way process. It is further argued that an actor can only propose value to another, and this proposed value can only be assessed by the beneficial actor (Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004; Vargo & Lusch 2004; 2012 p.3). The traditional way of value exchange, where value is created and delivered by the firm, is by this logic no longer valid, as it seems natural to think that the consumer may interfere with the value creation activities of the firm. The consumer is therefore seen as an active participator, and firms with this mindset actively involve, interact and learn from the consumer to adapt to their specific needs (Vargo & Lusch 2004). An additional remark when elaborating on the value creation process is that it does not end with the sale and distribution of the offering to the actor as beneficiary. The beneficiary continues the process of “producing” by using, learning, adapting and applying other firm-provided resources to their unique needs, usage situations and behaviours (Vargo & Lusch 2012 p. 4).

When clarifying what value and for whom, current literature has been argued to have failed when distinguishing if value propositions primarily is proposed for the consumers, firms, or even both (Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013). This criticism derives from the discussion about the multidimensionality of value, as value can extend to a full spectrum, as collaboration and interaction can take place with multiple actors (Edvardsson et al. 2011, Vargo & Lusch 2011). With this broadened perspective, co-creation can result in optimal value that is greater than the sum of value created between two (Sheth & Uslay 2007). Benefits deriving from co-
creation throughout the supply chain are pointed out to not only target one actor, but sometimes also several actors (Lambert & García 2006). As proposed by Bititci et al. (2004), collaborative value propositions can differ from individual value propositions. These collective and relational value propositions are argued as a complementary way in viewing value creation (Epp & Price 2011). Due to the complexity of value, it is essential to clarify to whom value should be created for, in order to understand derived value and utilise value co-creation (Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013).

2.2.2 Co - clarifying by what kind of resources

As elaborated by Saarijärvi and Kannan (2013), the Co in value co-creation refers to actors involved in the value co-creation process, or as the authors more specifically defines it, the resources involved, which is in line with the reasoning by Vargo and Lusch (2012 p. 6-8). More recent studies have moved beyond the dyadic relationship between the firm and the consumer, emphasizing the participation and perspectives of multiple actors, including firms, consumers, and other stakeholders in the value co-creation process (Gummesson 2007; Akaka & Chandler 2011). This has led to a more holistic view on the value co-creation process, arguing that all social and economic actors engaged in exchange are service providers and value co-creators (Edvardsson et al. 2011; Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013).

By incorporating this service centered mindset and several theoretical approaches; the concept of service ecosystem has been introduced. As elaborated, value is created, not only between the firm and the consumer (Vargo & Lusch 2004), but also in a larger service setting between multiple actors similar to a service ecosystem argued by Vargo and Lusch (2011; 2014). This concept seeks to understand the process of value co-creation that is taking place both within and between various service systems and is defined as “[...] a spontaneously sensing and responding spatial and temporal structure of largely loosely coupled, value-proposing social and economic actors interacting through institutions, technology, and language to 1) co-produce service offerings, 2) engage in mutual service provision, and 3) co-create value” (Vargo & Lusch 2011). The service ecosystem is also seen as heterogeneous entities that interact with each other toward a common goal (Wieland et al. 2012). Emphasis on the statement of the common goal narrows down the number of actors involved in the value co-creation process. This approach underlines the multitude of resources (knowledge, expertise, time, money and so forth), which are integrated in the value co-creation process (B2B, B2C,
C2B, C2C), as well as knowing who is involved in the joint creation and resources utilised is helpful to identify new ways of interacting (Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013).

2.2.3 Creation - clarifying by what kind of mechanism

According to Saarijärvi and Kannan (2013), creation is defined as “the process of integrating different resources from different actors in order to actualise their value potential”. Mechanisms are here referred to as additional resources provided by the firm, consumer, or others that are offered for use by other actors that stretch beyond monetary exchange and the exchange of goods. In other words, creation can be translated to the actual activities enabling value co-creation, while co, as elaborated, refers to the actors involved in the process. Along with advanced technology and a changed managerial mind-set, new forms of interaction and collaboration have emerged on the market (Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013). Thereby, additional mechanisms have been introduced where co-production, co-development, co-designing, co-promotion, and co-pricing (Sheth & Uslay 2007; Saarijärvi 2012) are examples, which are facilitated through different channels such as social networks, direct interaction, and new innovative ways of connecting. Further argued, mechanisms can also be designed and provided to support the consumers, which might include setting up call-centers to help and also capture their feedback. Consequently, mechanisms are argued to challenge the traditional view of exchange and the role of the consumer as market actors can harness resources in new innovative ways (Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013).

2.3 Theoretical contribution

To sum up, the main arguments in paragraph 2.2 are (1) the academic suggestion that external factors can have a direct impact on behavioural intention (Crosby & Muehling 1983; Shim et al. 1989; Bagozzi et al. 1992), hence challenging the original TRA argument that Aact and SN are the only factors influencing BI directly (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980). Secondly, (2) the criticism that TRA neglects external factors’ impact on consumers’ purchase behaviour (Kippax & Crawford 1993, p.253), and should be included with original construct in TRA studies (Warshaw 1980; Sheppard et al. 1988), as well as (3) the argument that value co-creation have an impact on consumer purchase behaviour (Grönroos & Ravald 2011). On the basis of these main arguments, an extension of Ajzen and Fishbein’s (1980) TRA is therefore suggested. As these arguments imply that external factors could have a direct effect on behavioural intention, and value co-creation in particular, it seems appropriate to include the
theoretical concept as an external variable and add it to the original TRA framework. Hence, the three new variables Value, Co and Creation are added to the original equation of TRA:

\[ B_{\sim BI} = A_{act} (\omega_1) + SN (\omega_2) + Value (\omega_3) + Co (\omega_4) + Creation (\omega_5) \]

Where:

Value = clarifying what value for whom and its effect on behavioural intention
Co = clarifying by what kind of resources and its effect on behavioural intention
Creation = clarifying by what kind of mechanism and its effect on behavioural intention
\( \omega_3, \omega_4, \omega_5 \) = weight reflecting the relative influence of the variable

As researchers have advocated benefits of joining similar theoretical perspectives (Warshaw 1980; Sheppard et al. 1988; Grönroos & Ravald 2011), an opportunity to add the external variables and test them is provided. All succeeding sections in this paper are based on this extended TRA equation.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Execution of study

3.1.1 Selected situational context

In order to answer the research question, linked to the recognized Swedish organic market phenomenon, it was crucial to narrow down the scope to avoid being too wide in the data collection. Therefore, the organic dairy market was selected as the situational context for this research, still argued as representing the total Swedish organic market, since the organic dairy market represents one of the largest categories within organic food (Slu 2015). With this, results from this study are transferable to answer the research question in the larger setting of organic food products. The Swedish organic dairy market was hence chosen as the situational context because of its relevance to the research question, the purpose as well as the recognized market phenomenon currently observed in Sweden, a methodological choice advocated by Denscombe (2010). As these commodities are also familiar among consumers, the process of finding respondents purchasing these types of goods was simplified. In regards to the characteristics of this market and its consumers, purchasing organic dairy products is an overt behaviour, which also fits the criterion to utilise TRA properly (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975). One should also recognize that organic dairy products are linked to the Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) industry. Low-involvement products characterize this industry where the consumer purchases are more frequent and routine (Etgar 2008; Franke et al. 2009; Hoyer et al. 2010), argued as still applicable for TRA, as other researchers have utilised the framework in the similar FMCG industry (Grunert & Juhl 1995; Padel & Foster 2005).

3.1.2 Research design and approach of the two sub-studies

This study consisted of two related sub-studies (see Table 1) in order to develop an appropriate tool to examine factors directly influencing consumers’ behavioural intention to purchase in the selected situation context. Using this approach made it possible to capture the value co-creation aspect among market actors, taking a service ecosystem perspective, being the prerequisite for sub-study II. This in turn enabled to explore whether these factors directly affect consumers’ behavioural intention to purchase. Further, these two sub-studies consisted of two different complementary methods. Here, both sub-studies strived for contributing with results valuable for a more thorough understanding, but with focus on sub-study II, as it directly links to the purpose and question of this thesis. Both studies adopted a deductive
theoretical approach rather than an inductive approach as both sub-studies derived from separate theoretical angles. Using a deductive stance is recommended to test already existing theory (Bryman & Bell 2011 p.11-12; Zikmund et al. 2012 p. 43; Gray 2014), suitable for this particular study to quantitatively evaluate the impact of added variables Value, Co, Creation (Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013).

Table 1. Research overview where discovered topics in sub-study I was a precondition for sub-study II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-study I</th>
<th>Sub-Study II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Qualitative approach</td>
<td>• Quantitative approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Perreault &amp; Leigh 1989)</td>
<td>(Churchill 1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Central topics discovered for each variable</td>
<td>• Tested whether the variables Value, Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value, Co and Creation</td>
<td>and Creation have a direct effect on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consumers’ behavioural intention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-study I adopted a qualitative approach in form of in-depth interviews with market actors (Perreault & Leigh 1989; Bryman & Bell 2011 p. 27). This was chosen to construct a suitable research tool (Churchill 1979) derived from theory and to understand the value co-creational process in this context. By conducting the interviews, selected respondents could provide insights about the market and cooperation from an external viewpoint. Central topics (Spiggle 1994) that were discovered in sub-study I were consequently transferred into sub-study II, as illustrated in Table 1.

The research continued with sub-study II, which aimed to test whether value co-creation directly impacts consumers’ behavioural intention to purchase. Here, a quantitative approach was selected in line with the deductive and objectivist approach (Churchill 1979; Bryman & Bell 2011 p.27). Its appropriateness was based on the original way to test the TRA (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980), being of quantitative nature, necessary to identify patterns that suggest relationships between variables (Bryman & Bell 2011, Gray 2014). This was done in a similar manner as the statistical testing originally used in TRA. Therefore, a questionnaire was developed according to the approach of Churchill (1979) and recommendations from both Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) and Ajzen (2006) answered by a selection of consumers. Adding this quantitative approach, a consumer perspective was included. This enabled an elaboration
regarding external factors influence on consumers’ behavioural intention to purchase. Even though sub-study I was a precondition for sub-study II, it should be noted that both studies individually generated in results in which the first took a market actor perspective and the other a consumer perspective. This reasoning is illustrated in Table 1 as arrows. Still, by using related sub-studies supporting each other, the reliability of this research was further strengthened.

3.2 Data collection

3.2.1 Sub-study I

The starting point for sub-study I was an initial screening of the organic dairy market and its market actors. Appropriate respondents from a market actor perspective needed to be found to explore value co-creation process among them. Arla, being the largest organic dairy producer in Sweden (Arla 2015b), was chosen as the focal actor in order to be able to map the industry actors’ cooperation with the desired service ecosystem perspective. Therefore, the data collection process started with Arla as focal firm and then widening out. This allowed for a holistic approach mirroring the desired service ecosystem perspective. The screening was the basis for selecting firms and organizations to find appropriate interview subjects, followed by identifying appropriate people representing each market actor (Healey & Rawlinson 1993). The theoretical sampling (Glaser & Strauss 1967) further strived for a balance between different types of market actors. Using this approach, eight firms were purposively sampled and investigated: (1) the largest global producer of organic dairy products, (2) an organic stakeholder network, (3) an impartial expert organization with focus on the organic market and statistics, (4) the leading Swedish grocery retailer, (5) the national association for Swedish farmers, (6) an organic food fair exhibition, (7) the national grocery retailers’ organization, and (8) a consultancy agency with organic and sustainability focus. These market actors were all collaborating at the Swedish organic dairy market and chosen accordingly, as they contributed with different perspectives (see Appendix 8.1). The names of the respondents were removed as requested, but the roles were approved and kept accordingly. To counteract an under- or overrepresented part of the market, hence to ensure to cover the whole market, respondents were selected accordingly. This was done by choosing respondents from each firm after knowledge had been established, in which Arla had a central role to map the market, reflecting a non-random purposive process (Potter 1996, p.107; Bryman and Bell 2011, p.442). The utilised snowball sampling technique allowed Arla’s
respondents to recommend additional relevant market actors that in turn strengthened the validity of the participating respondents (Healey & Rawlinson 1993; Hair et al. 2014).

Data for sub-study I was gathered by using in-depth, semi-structured interviews. The interviews had its basis from an interview guide comprising of semi-structured questions (see Appendix 8.2) to ensure open-ended questions (Perreault & Leigh 1989). By conducting these types of questions, a reliable way of gathering data as well as elements such as knowledge, perception and experience was obtained. Also, open-ended questions enabled respondents to provide more objective answers along with more detailed answers (Bryman & Bell 2011). This in turn minimized the risk for receiving biased answers from the participants by ‘leading’ them with the questions (Yin 2011). One round of interviews was conducted for each of the firms, and each interview lasted for approximately 45 minutes, regardless if the interview was held over telephone or in person. The interview guide was structured to improve the succeeding analysis (Perreault & Leigh 1989), and constructed on the basis of Saarijärvi and Kannan’s (2013) way of breaking down value co-creation to its three constituent parts Value, Co and Creation. The categorizations and the translation from each component from sub-study I to the main study of sub-study II (see Table 2) with example questions available (see appendix 8.2 for full version).
Table 2: Added TRA variables and identified propositions in sub-study I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propositions for sub-study II</th>
<th>Example of questions translated from each variable</th>
<th>Explanation in accordance to authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Saarijärvi &amp; Kannan (2013))</td>
<td>“What kind of value for whom?”</td>
<td>&quot;Value infrastructure that is of whom for whom&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saarijärvi &amp; Kannan (2013))</td>
<td>“By what kind of resources?”</td>
<td>&quot;Co-development, co-design, co-produce etc.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saarijärvi &amp; Kannan (2013))</td>
<td>“With whom do you cooperate with to get consumers to choose organic alternatives before conventional?”</td>
<td>&quot;With whom do you cooperate with whom to get consumers to choose organic alternatives before conventional?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Saarijärvi &amp; Kannan (2013))</td>
<td>“How do you involve the consumer in your cooperation and value creation process?”</td>
<td>&quot;How do you involve the consumer in your cooperation and value creation process?&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposition 1: Proposed values (increased product offering and availability, decreased prices and improved clarity of product labelling) directly influence consumers' behavioural intention as a result of market actor collaboration.

Proposition 2: Consumers are involved with other market actors in joint creation processes, which directly influence their behavioural intention to purchase.

Proposition 3: Consumers are contributing through mechanisms (co-development, co-design, co-produce etc.), which directly influence their behavioural intention to purchase.
Transcripts of collected data from the interviews were later produced. Since the interview guide was clearly divided into its three parts, with questions closely related to each constituent part, it was clear which data that belonged to which section. The data could therefore be coded in an appropriate way to identify topics in line with Churchill (1979). These were identified by discussions and comparisons regarding what answers and statements that had been most prominent using the procedure recommended by Spiggle (1994). By following the proposed steps (Spiggle 1994) this study could ensure an accepted feasibility. One proposition was identified for each added variable, being (1) for value: "Proposed values (increased product offering and availability, decreased prices and improved clarity of product labelling) directly influence consumers' behavioural intention as a result of market actor collaboration", (2) for Co: “Consumers are involved with other market actors in joint creation processes, which directly influence their behavioural intention to purchase”, and (3) for Creation: “Consumers are contributing through mechanisms (co-development), which directly influence their behavioural intention to purchase”. These propositions found in sub-study I were hence brought into sub-study II and, as advocated by Churchill (1979), and formed the basis of the later research tool. For further elaborations of the underlying details of each proposition, follow the line of reasoning in the findings and discussion. In terms of the reliability of sub-study I, it should be noted that its qualitative approach was based on human behaviour which never gives identical results. Merriam (1994 p.182) argues that people tend to change their behaviour, and to receive a reliable research, its result must aim for having a meaning, being consistent as well as being dependent. Therefore, all choices in sub-study I were carefully made and accurately mirrored those in this paper so the same test procedure could be reconstructed.

3.2.2 Sub-study II

A quantitative approach directed toward capturing the consumers’ perspective was adopted in sub-study II to validate whether external factors directly influence consumers’ behavioural intention. By using a theory-derived questionnaire, responses from the consumers in question could more easily be collected and analysed accordingly. By recommendations from Ajzen (2006), further strengthened by Churchill’s (1979) argumentation to build questionnaires based on items, the following procedure was applied to structure the questionnaire for this study:
Specify the target behaviour and participants

Clearly defining the specific behaviour is argued as the key to construct an appropriate research tool and avoid poor prediction of behaviour (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975; Ajzen 1991). Further argued by Ajzen (1991; 2006), the behaviour should by this reasoning clearly be defined in terms of its Target, Action, Context and Time, or what the person in question (T) are doing (A) in what context (C) at what time (T). In this study, the target behaviour (see Table 3) was accordingly specified as purchase organic dairy products within the forthcoming 4 weeks. To narrow down the research, the selected target group was limited to Stockholm County, as it was not feasible to collect data from the entire Country of Sweden. Also, this study does not aim to generalize but to test the developed theoretical framework. A non-probability convenience sampling was therefore chosen. It was deemed suitable as both as both previous studies and consumer insights are missing (Bryman & Bell 2011, pp. 190). Even though statistical generalization was not possible, statistical significance can still be expressed to confirm any statistical relationship to the selected target group (Wilkinson 1999).

Table 3. TACT principle applied to the behaviour “purchasing organic dairy products within the forthcoming 4 weeks”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Consumers living in Stockholm county</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Organic dairy products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Within the forthcoming 4 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of method to measure intention

To evaluate possible relations between variables, linked to TRA, a statistical analysis was hence an appropriate method (Zikmund 2000, p. 51-52; Wilson 2010, p. 46-49). As a data collection instrument, the theoretically derived questionnaire was based on TRA (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975; 1980), with original variables behavioural intention toward purchasing organic dairy products (BI), and their attitude toward this specific behaviour (Aact), the subjective norm (SN), as well as extended with Value, Co and Creation. A quantitative measurement was also necessary to utilise the way that BI was measured according to the original TRA. To conduct the data analysis, IBM’s Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, version 21 2012) was utilised. This software was chosen due to its fit with this quantitative research method as well being a widely used statistical instrument.

Indirect measurement

Eliciting accessible beliefs and opinions is recommended by Ajzen (2006), to later construct the direct measurement in the form of a questionnaire. Accordingly, in this study, a small
sample of six individuals was selected from the target group, to answer questions for each of the three fixed variables in TRA: BI, Aact and SN (see examples in Appendix 8.3). Open-ended questions were structured to determine intention, the most perceived advantages or disadvantages of performing the behaviour, as well as determine the most important people or groups who would approve or disapprove the behaviour. The elicitation was done individually, to avoid influence from a group and answers were later compared to identify to most common answers. Value, Co and Creation was identified differently as the findings from Sub-study I generated in three propositions, which laid the foundation for the questions to each of the three added variables to TRA (see Table 2 under section 3.2.1). Selected individuals did not participate in the survey to avoid biased answers.

Direct measurement

The six different variables, BI, SN, Aact, Value, Co, and Creation were translated into fixed, closed-ended questions. The questions for the added TRA variables (Value, Co and Creation) were based on each variables identified proposition from sub-study I, whereas the existing TRA variables (BI, Aact and SN) were based on the original authors' definition (See Table 4 for examples of questions, and see Appendix 8.4 for the full questionnaire). By using closed questions, data was gathered in a standardized way, where answers more easily could be coded and analysed (Bryman & Bell 2011 p.150). As recommended by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975; 1980), a bipolar adjective seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) was applied in the survey. This allowed the target group to rank the questions according to their individual opinion that corresponds to the way the TRA function is originally measured. Even though a five-point scale is commonly used and recommended (Bryman & Bell 2011 p.262), a seven-point scale is equally sufficient to use and prevent consumers from being too neutral in their responses (Dawes 2008). It was not an option for participants to answer with a simple yes or no, meaning that they could not solely state whether or not they purchase organic milk. Therefore, participants negative toward this behaviour still could answer the questionnaire. Here, it was instead an option for those negative toward the specific behaviour to express this via ‘strongly disagree’ under purchase intention. By doing so, this study was not angled toward any positive or negative direction by only choosing participants for or against.
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing TRA Variables</th>
<th>Proposed by Authors</th>
<th>Example of questions translated from each variable</th>
<th>Explanation of variables in accordance to authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Intention</td>
<td></td>
<td>I have the intention to purchase organic dairy products within the next four weeks</td>
<td>Fishbein &amp; Ajzen (1975; p.288) &quot;Behavioral intention refers to a person’s subjective probability that he will perform some behavior.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td>For me to purchase organic dairy products instead of conventional alternatives feels good</td>
<td>Fishbein &amp; Ajzen (1975; p.216) &quot;An attitude represents a person’s general feeling of favourableness or unfavourableness toward some stimulus object.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norm</td>
<td></td>
<td>My friends think I should purchase organic dairy products</td>
<td>Fishbein &amp; Ajzen (1975; p.302) &quot;The person’s perception that most people who are important to him or her think he should or should not perform the behavior in question.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I think that there are many forums where I can express my opinion</td>
<td>Saarijärvi &amp; Kannan (2013) &quot;Proposition 3: Consumers are contributing through mechanisms (co-development), which directly influence consumers’ central feeling of involvement in such consumer relationships, which directly influence consumers’ central feeling of involvement in such consumer relationships.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I think that there are many forums where I can express my opinion</td>
<td>Saarijärvi &amp; Kannan (2013) &quot;Proposition 3: Consumers are contributing through mechanisms (co-development), which directly influence consumers’ central feeling of involvement in such consumer relationships, which directly influence consumers’ central feeling of involvement in such consumer relationships.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table above provides a summary of questions translated from each variable, along with explanations of the variables based on the authors' propositions.
Participants

Before sending out the final questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted to test the questionnaire, and this according to recommendations by Ajzen (2006). A pilot study was important to conduct to ensure that the questionnaire operated well and captured what it was supposed to measure, hence to validate the survey questions (Bryman & Bell 2011 p. 262; Gujarati & Porter 2009). Here, 10 participants were selected to answer the online questionnaire where a convenience sampling was utilised (Bryman & Bell 2011 pp.190). Choosing known participants for this stage in the process contributed to a complete response rate with no missing answers. They were excluded from participating in the final questionnaire to avoid biased answers. For the larger sampling connected to the final questionnaire, a total of N: 224 respondents living in participated in answering the electronic questionnaire via social networks. Using social networks did limit the spread of age as most users as well as the authors’ social network are around similar age. To ensure a demographical spread among our respondents, some were more specifically asked to participate in this study to avoid too homogeneous sampling. A smaller non-probability sampling of participants was chosen, but still, above 150 cases argued as sufficient for factor analysis and other statistical methods (Pallant 2011; Hair et al. 2014). By answering the questionnaire, the respondents agreed to participate in this study. Only fully completed questionnaires without missing responses were reported, therefore the end result was a total of N: 200 responses. An overview of the respondents (see Appendix 8.5) shows the demographic distribution. Most respondents were between the ages of 25-34 (65.5 %) and working (61.9 %). In terms of gender, it was quite evenly distributed between Females (53.2 %) and Males (46.8 %).

3.3 Data transformation

Scoring responses

To analyse the collected data in accordance to original recommendations by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975; 1980), responses had to be re-coded. Due to the seven point Likert-scale, the raw data was ranging from 1 to 7, and this for both assertion responses and weighting responses, except for BI that only consisted of the assertion responses. In order to intensify negative or positive responses, each variables assertion response was therefore re-coded in SPSS ranging from -3 to +3. Responses thereby got translated to strongly disagree (-3) or strongly agree (+3). Importance and motivation to comply, the weighting of each assertion,
was however left with original scoring ranging from 1 to 7 following recommendations (Fishbein and Ajzen 1975; 1980).

**Data transformation**

In order to further prepare the data for the analysis, data transformation was necessary. The process of transforming the data involved pairing two questions together, one being the assertion (e.g. what my friends think of my purchase is important to me) and the second being the weighting (my friends think I should buy organic dairy products). These were computed into a single item in SPSS by multiplying the values. As discussed above, the assertion responses had been re-coded giving a scale from -3 to +3. As the weighting of each assertion was kept ranging from 1 to 7 gave new total scores ranging from -21 to +21. To provide an example, the items used to measure the variable Value were consolidated into one single variable by adding the sum of each and divide the total by the number of items, producing a mean score. This was done for the independent variables, however not for the dependent variable BI. As elaborated above, BI was only consisting of the assertion responses, hence its scale was thereby kept being -3 to +3, a methodological choice reflecting the original TRA framework (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975; 1980).

### 3.4 Concluding research methodology

To summarize, by conducting two complementary sub-studies, both generating results, as well as followed methods stressed by others scholars including Wallendorf and Belk (1989), way of triangulation across different sources and methods, credibility, general validity as well as reliability was strengthened. For the following chapters, the important take-away is, as previously elaborated, that sub-study I is the prerequisite for sub-study II. Findings are on the other hand equally important for the understanding of this study though findings from sub-study II are directly linked to the purpose of this research. To follow the logical sequence of this research, the findings from sub-study I will be presented followed by the findings from sub-study II in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

4.1 Sub-study I

4.1.1 Value - clarifying what value for whom

All respondents were asked to describe and elaborate on what kind of value that is created when collaborating with other actors at the market, for whom this value is created, as well as to describe the overall objectives with the collaborations. All questions asked were linked to organic dairy products, even though many of the respondents had an overall objective to increase organic food in more general terms and create value also in a broader context.

In terms of the objective for promoting organic dairy products, the larger proportion of the respondents commonly shared that this was to increase the organic dairy growth, also including organic food, and raise awareness about the benefits of these types of goods via various channels. Svensk Dagligvaruhandel was more neutral in their response stating that they take an active and joint responsibility for competition-neutral issues, where organic is one of these topics. Although financial benefits were raised as a partial objective, the main purpose shared by most of the market actors was to increase sustainability in the way of doing business and also increase the sustainability for society as a whole. The concept of sustainability in society was mentioned to be in a premature stage, but has become more prominent amongst the market actors.

“[...] the interesting thing is that companies and organizations that collaborate together do not only see organic as a way of making money, but see organic as something very powerful in a larger sense and as a platform connecting market actors together. The purpose is not only to increase the financial benefits, but to promote the benefits for the society as a whole and to make all involved actors satisfied.” - Nordic Manager, Nordic Organic Food Fair, 2015

Amongst the market actors, collaboration with each other was said to enable each of them to contribute with their own business perspective as well as gaining valuable input of best practice. It was said that the sharing of the different views often generate a more complete understanding of the entire industry that in turn leads to more thought through strategies. Further elaborated by the Project Manager at EkoMatCentrum, the knowledge bank and the
power to influence is increasing amongst all actors involved. It was also said that more communication channels toward the consumer become available when collaborating. Working together creates additional value as actors can benefit from one another.

“Arla is Krav’s largest customer and I would say that we work closely. The value created by this collaboration is that it is knowledge rewarding for both parties as we can benefit from each other’s strengths. By collaboration, both parties are getting a valuable and important exchange of knowledge as well as access, which is developing for both of us.” - Marketing & Brand Manager, Arla, 2015

For the consumer, value was reported by the market actor respondents as created directly and indirectly together with a variety of market actors. Also as the market actors collaborate together, the consumers’ feedback is turned into actions rapidly. By exchanging consumer information and providing access to each other’s business, the market actors argued that value is created for their own business, their customers’ and the consumer.

“By listening to the consumer and working together, there are today many options of organic food and the availability of these goods has increased extensively. What is also visible is that organic food has become more attractive in terms of packaging and price, targeting different consumer groups on the market.” - CEO, U&We, 2015

As stated by the store manager at ICA, the collaboration they have with the producers today enables the retailer to increase the organic product offer in-store as well as its availability. And in terms of pricing, both the CEO of EkoWeb and the Store Manager at ICA stated that the price of organic food and organic dairy products has dropped due to initiatives from the market actors, as they have understood that the consumers want lower prices. This is something that consumers have responded well to. Further elaborated, these lowered prices have increased the incentive for the consumers to choose organic before conventional in combination with these products added benefits.

Further, to make it even easier for the consumers to choose organic food products and organic dairy products, all interviewees reported information and labelling as necessary. As elaborated by the Environment & Sustainable Manager and also the Marketing & Brand
Manager at Arla, close collaboration with Krav was important as associations with Krav and their label is a quality symbol for the consumers. Clearly marked products are important for the consumers in order to differentiate the products. Krav was also stated to be a neutral forum where the consumer can get more information, and is also stated to be a link between the consumer and the legislators. Additionally, as more consumers are interested in organic food, more forums are mentioned by the interviewees to be available where the consumers can ask questions and provide feedback. Informing the consumers, but also to be informed about what they ask for, was stated by several respondents to be the key for further adding value and increase sales in the organic food industry.

On the basis of the findings for Value, the following proposition was created:

**Proposition 1:** Proposed values (increased product offering and availability, decreased prices and improved clarity of product labelling) directly influence consumers’ behavioural intention as a result of market actor collaboration

### 4.1.2 Co - clarifying by what kind of resources

Further, all interviewees were asked to describe the collaboration from their perspectives, highlighting the collaborative approach and engagement among market actors and consumers. This enabled an understanding of which actors that are involved, hence clarifying by what kind of resources value is created from.

Even with varying purposes for wanting to promote organic dairy products, market actors throughout the value chain in Sweden was described as integrated directly or indirectly with one another. The CEO of Svensk Dagligvaruhandel and the CEO of U&We highlighted the fact that collaboration among market actors within this industry was not something new, but as expressed by ICA and other actors, collaboration has been intensified and has expanded to a wider network, also being more targeted and complementing now than before. All interviewees further expressed that collaboration was necessary in order to meet consumers’ needs and also spread information about the benefits of organic dairy products. The
Marketing Manager for Arla Brand stated that several actors throughout the value chain are integrated in the process of product development.

“[…] we are collaborating for the interest of our farmers as well as our consumers by actively work closely with our farmers, retailers, U&We, Krav, Naturskyddsförerningen, commercial agencies in order to increase the value, also incorporating the consumer opinions. Arla is also a member of the newly established network Organic Sweden, with 35 different market actors, initiated by KRAV.” - Marketing Manager, Arla Brand, 2015

Further elaborated by the CEO of U&We and Nordic Manager of Nordic Organic Food Fair collaboration is a necessary mean to ensure market growth.

“[…] collaboration is required by all market actors in order to deliver needed goods to the consumer. We are stronger together than we are alone.” - Nordic Manager, Nordic Organic Food Fair, 2015

The growing interest for organic food and organic dairy products in particular was expressed to be especially evident in recent years. “The industry has grown extensively in the last four years, making it easier to collaborate as the economic benefits in doing so are evident.” (Nordic Manager for Nordic Organic Food Fair 2015). This statement was confirmed by several of the other respondents, highlighting that willingness to collaborate toward the broader objective has grown. As stated by the store manager at ICA, there is much more collaboration around organic food today than before. Retailers have always collaborated with our suppliers, but the focus has suddenly shifted toward promoting organic goods. As also elaborated by the CEO of Svensk Dagligvaruhandel, the organic dairy industry and the sustainability question are met with greater respect than ever before. Arla further highlighted the collaborative benefits.

“The interest for organic food has been increasing and more and more people are actually contacting us to establish future collaborations and product development. The collaborative scape looks a lot more different now and organic goods are easier to sell-in as the threshold is lower among the retailers’. Also, it would not have been possible a couple years ago to be
invited to customize the dairy shelf at the retailers’ as we are able to do now. Organic farming and dairy cows are a trendy topic today.” - Marketing Manager, Arla Brand, 2015

Though direct, more long-term relations were defined, a holistic collaborative network with a wide variety of ties was identified among all actors. Depending on the organization or firm and their specific purposes, different collaborations are used among the market actors. Most evident for Arla and ICA was to collaborate with the entire value chain, but the consumers, media, PR, commercial agencies, organizations, scientist, restaurants, the public sector, among others, were also mentioned. Strategic collaborations beyond close ties with the retailers, mentioned by Arla, were also to have close contact with municipalities, restaurants and chefs. Incorporating restaurants to promote organic food and sustainability was seen as a strategic step as well for the CEO of U&We “[...] we run various of projects to increase sustainability at restaurants among others.”

From another perspective, participating in different councils and forums was expressed to be of importance by several of the interviewees in order to be updated as well as participating in lobbying activities. Many of the interviewees stated that they are members of different councils.

The market analysis- and statistical expert at LRF expressed this thought “[...] we collaborate with Krav among others in order to ensure the best possible outcomes in regulations for the farmer.” This was further confirmed by the CEO of Svensk Dagligvaruhandel, who stated that lobbying activities are important to ensure that retailers’ opinions are heard and that regulations are fairly developed. Governmental and political support is argued to be vital for the continued growth of organic food and seen as both a positive and a negative force.

“There is an on-going conflict regarding the level of sustainable requirements. Reinforced regulations do not only lead to improvements but could also have negative effects by making requirement too difficult to follow. Regulations therefore need to be handled by all actors.” - Sustainability Manager, Arla, 2015

The CEO of U&We elaborated on the growing interest from the consumers point of view to actively involve themselves and purchase organic dairy products: “The demand from the
consumers do most likely originate from the climate crisis debate as well as recent food scandals. The consumers feel that they have been cheated by the food industry, which has led to an increasing demand for healthier food."

The role of the consumer in creating value is seen as active, which is an opinion shared among the respondents. Further, they also state that the market actor collaboration is important for what the consumers receive as it is a process that is necessary to meet consumer needs.

On the basis of the findings for Co, the following proposition was created:

**Proposition 2:** Consumers are involved with other market actors in joint creation processes, which directly influence their behavioural intention to purchase

### 4.1.3 Creation - clarifying by what kind of mechanism

All interviewees were asked to share information about what type of mechanisms that are being used to actualise value. This could be referred to as additional resources or activities such as co-developer, co-designer, co-producer etc. Additionally, they were also asked to elaborate through what type of channels they use to involve the consumers. While some respondents gave few examples, others had a variety of ways to interact with market actors and consumers, depending on their specific role on the market and closeness to the consumer.

Depending on the purpose for collaboration, it appeared that the mechanisms used in the collaborations varied, as the respondents mentioned several examples. Arla, ICA and other respondents described relationships with other actors to have a co-producing or co-developing role as they interact with each other to develop and increase the number of offered products. The Sustainable Manager at Arla exemplified this by stating that TetraPak have a co-designing type of role in terms of further evolving sustainable packaging.

When asked about ways of interacting with one another, direct meetings and insights to each other’s businesses were mentioned as some of the ways to enable value creation to take place.
“A continuous dialog and insight into each other’s everyday work is important for a collaboration to be effective”. (Market analysis- & statistical expert, LRF, 2015) The Project Manager of EkoMatCentrum further confirmed this by saying that personal meetings are the key for creating long-lasting relationships. Further, active participation in councils, seminars, debates, board meetings, sales meetings and informal meetings are common practice among all interviewees asked. As stated by the Marketing Manager for Arla Brand “Board meetings and similar forums create an important platform for negotiation and further development.” It was stated by several of the interviewees that they were members of different boards and councils, as mentioned by the Marketing Manager of Arla Brand, highlighting the example of Organic Sweden.

It appeared that new ways to engage with one another among the market actors have emerged in the last couple of years. These include, for example, larger events, seminars, galas and organic food fairs. One of the larger events mentioned was Ekogalan, hosted by Ekoweb that is an independent monitor and expert on the organic market and organic statistics.

“This was the fourth time that we hosted the gala, which is a platform for market actors to meet and also a forum to celebrate the success of promoting organic food. Being present where the market actors interact is important, and attending events like this is a great way to meet multiple market actors at once.” - CEO, Ekoweb, 2015

Mechanisms in relations to the consumer were mentioned to be of the co-developing character. However, actual purchase was mentioned by most of the respondents as being the most influential way for consumers to express what they want. Beyond the act of purchasing, the consumers are involved in the process also in other ways when in stores, such as sharing their opinions directly to store personnel according to the Store Manager at ICA. Many consumers are said to actively share their opinions and demands in the stores, which are captured and forwarded by the staff to decision makers across the organization and beyond.

“The end-consumer has today all possibilities to have an active role in the development of organic food. On one hand they can purchase the products, but they can also share their opinions and express what they are missing.” - Project Manager, EkoMatCentrum, 2015
The consumers are seen as active, but as further stated by the CEO of U&We, market actors must push information to the consumers to show the available offers as well as to educate the consumer. The adaption of products to create organic dairy alternatives are, according to the Sustainable Manager at Arla, a mix between listening to the consumers and their demands. But there are also elements of forced conversion by removing options for the consumers, to promote organic alternatives as well as pushing ‘new’ benefits out to the market. But the Sustainability Manager at Arla ends with that if the benefits are not visible and understandable for the consumers, and the demand is not present, the consumers will not purchase those alternatives.

As stated by both respondents from Arla and also by ICA, opinions from the consumers change their offerings and how they communicate with them. In order to interact with the consumer and to capture their opinions, both direct by face-to-face interaction, as well as indirect through social media platforms were mentioned by all respondents to be of importance to get input from the consumers, so that action can be taken.

Further personal interaction with the consumers was stated to be as equally important by many of the respondents. Active direct interaction with the consumer was confirmed by Arla.

“[...] we at Arla are very active in-store as well as active with our farmers, and we always try to be where the consumer is trying to encourage for a platform where the consumers’ opinions get heard. In 2015, around 860 000 personal contacts are being made through different events such as Kosläppet and Vasaloppet. These are also forums where the consumers can ask questions and speak their minds.” - Marketing Manager, Arla, 2015

Also mentioned by several respondents to be important way to involve the consumer and extracting their opinions was consumer surveys. As the Market analysis- and statistical expert at LRF expressed it “Surveys are an important channel for the consumers to influence the offer on the market.” Surveys were further mentioned to be regularly conducted by Ekoweb, Nordic Organic Fair, Arla and ICA in order to gain information about consumer needs. But as further elaborated by ICA:
“Consumers do on many occasions speak directly to the staff by the dairy section in the store, which is an effective way as these opinions are being forwarded to our suppliers.” - Store Manager, ICA, 2015

On the basis of the findings for Creation, the following proposition was created:

**Proposition 3:** Consumers are contributing through mechanisms (co-development), which directly influence their behavioural intention to purchase”.

### 4.1.4 Concluding sub-study I

Firstly, as clearly stated by all respondents, listening to the consumer and collaborating with other market actors is important to co-create value that benefits the market actors themselves but mostly the consumer. By doing so, proposed values were stated to increase the incitement among the consumers to purchase organic dairy products, translated into proposition 1. Secondly, by collaborating with multiple actors including the consumer it was argued that they could benefit from other actors perspectives and also capture the consumers’ perspective. By involving the consumer in the value co-creation process, it was therefore reasoned that this affect their purchase behaviour linked to proposition 2. Lastly, market actors, including the consumers, contribute with additional resources to actualise value through different channels. As consumers take on activities beyond monetary exchange, such as being co-developers, it was therefore argued that they could in a greater extent get products that fit their needs and by this increase the incitement for purchase is increased linked to proposition 3. These discovered topics were transferred into sub-study II where proposition 1 formed the component Value, proposition 2 the component Co, and proposition 3 formed the component Creation. By statistically test these from a consumer perspective, in line with the original TRA framework, their direct impact on the consumers’ behavioural intention to purchase could be discovered.
4.2 Sub-study II

4.2.1 Data analysis

The statistical testing in sub-study II had its basis in this study’s extended TRA equation\(^1\) and the questionnaire (see appendix 8.4). 18 items were used to assess Behavioural Intention (BI). These items were distributed as follows: 3 items each for the original independent TRA variables Attitude (Aact) and Subjective Norm (SN), as well as 4 items for Value and 2 items each for Co and Creation, being the three added independent variables. These items were all subjected to factor analysis by conducting a principal component analysis with varimax rotation. This was carried out to verify all variables and to check that each item measured its correct variable, hence that all questions were confirmed for the data analysis (Churchill 1979). Interestingly, the factor analysis reported that the items for Co and Creation appeared to load on the same component, instead of loading on separately as expected from the theoretical reasoning (see Table 5). Consequently, this led to the two variables being merged together to the component Co-Creation. This in turn resulted in five components being analysed instead of six, however still including all desired aspects.

After the adjustment of eliminating three of the items\(^2\), a satisfactory five-factor solution was found (see Table 5). As it lacked apparent cross-loadings, the sampling showed to be adequate as well as appropriate for the solution (Pallant 2011; Hair et al. 2014). This five-factor solution presented four variables with eigenvalues over the cut-off value 1 that respectively explained 39.1%, 13.6%, 8.0% and 7.3% of the variance. The component Aact however had an eigenvalue meeting .901, hence slightly below the cut-off value. Since Aact is an original TRA variable and accordingly confirmed by several researchers, combined with the eigenvalues closeness to cut-off value 1, this was chosen to be included in the data analysis as it also explained 5.4% of the variance. The five-factor analysis presented a KMO of .849 and a Bartlett’s test of sphericity of \(p<.001\). As presented in Table 5, all items loaded above .560, hence significant, which indicates high discriminant validity as well as high convergent validity (Hair et al. 2014).

\(^1\) The extended TRA equation: \( B \sim BI = Aact (\omega_1) + SN (\omega_2) + Value (\omega_3) + Co (\omega_4) + Creation (\omega_5) \)

\(^2\) Removed items to reach the five-factor solution: (1) the item concerning receiving good feelings when purchasing organic dairy products (Aact); (2) the item concerning information (Value), and (3) the item focusing on the sharing aspect (Co-creation). See appendix 8.4 for the exact questions that this affected.
Accordingly, the items were summarized for every component. A final check of reliability of the items for each of the components was also performed, by conducting reliability statistics. All variables loaded above .7 on Cronbach’s Alpha and therefore within the internal consistency acceptable range. Therefore, all five constructs were used in the analysis.

Testing multicollinearity

Before being able to understand whether or not multicollinearity had to be mitigated, the data required to be transformed from the individual items into being the five variables discovered in the factor analysis (see Table 5). As reported, the items loaded on respectively component and these were in turn computed into its variable. After computing the variables, respectively was proven significant. Outliers was found on the variables SN and Co-creation but kept accordingly, as excluding them could give misleading results due to having 7 point Likert scale (Hair et al. 2014). All variables were further shown to be normal apart from SN showing abnormal tendencies, but still within the range of what a regression can handle, and the regression were therefore robust (Pallant 2011).

In order to avoid multicollinearity, the data was subsequently examined through Pearson Correlation Matrix, with its coefficients presented in Table 6. This showed that
multicollinearity had no significant influence, as the inter-correlations between the variables were low, ranging between .206 and .613. This confirmed that perfect multicollinearity did not exist, enabling a multiple regression analysis (Hair et al. 2014). The variance inflation factor (VIF), presented in Table 6, further controlled for multicollinearity. As all values in this study were below 1.6, further confirmed that multicollinearity was not an issue (Gujarati & Porter 2009).

The multiple regression analysis that followed, which included all independent variables, explained 44.1% of the variance for BI ($R^2=.441$, $F_{(4,199)}=38.41$, $p=.000$), hence the equation fitted the data quite well (see Table 7). All variables showed an influence on BI. Aact was most prominent of the independent variables with its positive impact on BI with a beta coefficient of .445 ($p<.001$). Hence, a 1-point increase in Aact would mean a .445 unit increase in BI. SN also showed to have a positive impact on BI with its slightly smaller beta value of .117, significant at the level of $\alpha=1$.

### Table 6. Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Behavioural Intention</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Subjective Norm</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Co-creation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Intention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>.613***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norm</td>
<td>.419***</td>
<td>481***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.506***</td>
<td>488***</td>
<td>.451***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-creation</td>
<td>.206***</td>
<td>255***</td>
<td>471***</td>
<td>.396***</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIF-value</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td>1.614</td>
<td>1.510</td>
<td>1.362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† $p<.1$, *$p<.05$, **$p<.01$, ***$p<.001$. Two-tailed.
N=200

### Table 7. Results from the regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Behavioural Intention (BI)</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>s.e.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (A-act)</td>
<td>.445***</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norm (SN)</td>
<td>.117†</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.262***</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Creation</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diagnostics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R-squared</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-statistics</td>
<td>38.411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† $p<.1$, *$p<.05$, **$p<.01$, ***$p<.001$. Two-tailed tests.
Of the external factors proposed to TRA, the findings indicated that Value and Co-creation influence BI. Value was showed to have a positive impact with a beta value of .262 and was statistically significant (p<.001). Co-creation, on the other hand, showed a slight negative impact with a beta value of -.066. This means that a 1-point increase in Co-creation would mean a .066 unit decrease in BI, which is equal to a different slope, compared the other independent factors. No statistical significance could be found in the regression for Co-creation, which will be further assessed below in the following post-hoc analysis.

As elaborated in previous sections, the original TRA model has been controlled for omitted variable bias prior to this study. Hence the theoretical field of TRA have controlled and discussed other variables. By this, they have concluded that the two variables that affect BI directly are Aact and SN, and that these are good hence enough to understand BI. The original TRA have specified ‘demographics’ as indirectly affecting BI, which includes gender, age and occupation (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980). In order to further specify the model, we tested for omitted variables by including the chosen control variables age, occupation and gender in the regression. This showed that none of these had an effect due to beta coefficients < .001 and p=n.s.

In order to further assess eventual differences in these, an ANOVA tests was conducted. Through this, no significant effect on consumers behavioural intention to purchase organic food products could be reported: gender (F(1,195)=4.38, p=n.s.), occupation (F(2,197)=1.59, p=n.s) and age (F(4,199)=1.53, p=n.s). Hence, no significant effect was found on BI by demographics.

Post-hoc analysis
As can be noted in the regression presented in Table 7, there were two variables that required to be further analysed in this study. These variables were the original TRA variable SN that only showed p<.1 and the added external variable Co-creation as no statistical significance could be found in the regression. Based on this, these two variables were therefore taken into a further data analysis by conducting a hierarchical regression analysis. To check the variables influence in the TRA model and hence their individual contribution to the explanation of the variance in BI, this stepwise regression started by including only Co-creation as independent
variable. As can be seen in Table 8, where these analysing steps are presented, Co-creation and SN seems to have an effect on BI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Behavioural Intention</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>s.e.</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Co-creation</td>
<td>.206***</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.012†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 Subjective Norm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.413***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3 Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To conclude, an investigation of what these findings mean is still needed. Therefore, these findings will be investigated further with the theoretical framework in the following analysis.

4.2.2 Concluding sub-study II

On the basis of sub-study I and sub-study II, the following discussion chapter will utilise the external variables Value, Co and Creation paired with the original TRA variables Aact and SN and follow the same structure. Even though Co and Creation were consolidated into one variable in the data analysis, they are kept separated in the following section consistent with the other parts of this study.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

5.1 External factors

The results of this study challenge the argument that external factors only indirectly influence behavioural intention, hence seem to contradict what TRA scholars previously have proposed (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980). The conducted statistical analysis suggests that the three added external factors, being value, co and creation, have an impact on behavioural intention to purchase organic dairy products. This could be linked to the argument proposed by Grönroos & Ravald (2011) that value co-creation can affect consumers’ purchase behaviour, hence supporting it. Of the external factors, value is the only one with a clear significant impact, hence the only external factor that clearly have a direct impact on behavioural intention. This is in line with other scholars’ argument that external factors should be taken into account in TRA (Warshaw 1980; Sheppard et al. 1988; Aleassa et al. 2011) as well as that there are additional variables that affect consumers’ behavioural intention (Bagozzi et al. 2000; Marandu et al. 2010). By ignoring the impact of external factors, one seems to neglect aspects that may be important to explain consumers’ behavioural intention to purchase organic dairy food products, as these show to have an impact. This further strengthens the argument that has been raised by Kippax and Crawford (1993, p.253). Even though no statistical significance is found for the identified impact of co and creation, findings from sub-study I show that there are underlying processes of creating value currently taking place among market actors on the organic dairy market in Sweden. Co and creation are hence of importance, even if these are not comprehended by the consumers. Each of the external factors will be discussed further along with the original TRA variables attitude and subjective norm.

5.1.1 Value - clarifying what value for whom

As recognized from sub-study I, mirroring the market actors’ responses, the proposition for value is formulated as following:

Proposition 1: Proposed values (increased product offering and availability, decreased prices and improved clarity of product labelling) directly influence consumers’ behavioural intention as a result of market actor collaboration.
A significant result for value is observed through the statistical testing in sub-study II. This means that consumers understand that value is created for them, hence increasing their behavioural intention to purchase organic dairy products. Support for proposition 1 is therefore confirmed at the Swedish organic dairy market. The evidence that value is created among the several market actors, as well as that consumers understand this, create strong arguments to believe that external factors can have a direct effect on behavioural intention.

By taking a service-centred approach, and through inviting the consumer in the development of dairy products, it is understood that firms can adjust their offerings to the consumer to better fit their needs (Sawhney 2006; Grönroos & Voima 2011; Vargo & Lusch 2012 p. 8). Involving the consumer in the firm’s process can therefore create value compelling to the consumer (Vargo & Lusch 2012). There exists a consensus among the market actor respondents in sub-study I that collaborations between them, as well as between the consumers at the organic market, improves their consumer offering, which becomes value propositions in different forms, such as increased product offering and improved product availability. Alongside, the market actors argue that collaborations with other market actors give rise to an important value for them, which in turn enable them to improve the product and service offering.

As value shows the second largest influence on behavioural intention of all independent variables, it is further clear that value has been created between market actors and with the consumer has had a positive impact on the consumer, and should therefore be seen as created for the consumer. Results from this study hereby challenge the argument that external factors only can influence behavioural intention indirectly (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980), as value’s individual contribution is both significant and evident. Therefore, it can be argued, with additional involvement of the consumer, that value propositions can become even more compelling in accordance to Vargo and Lusch (2012) or even further stretch beyond only making propositions by getting closer to the consumers (Grönroos & Voima 2011). In a practical sense, it is encouraged that market actors should further listen and collaborate with the consumers and other market actors to create additional value propositions for all parties. Here, it is also beneficial for market actors to clearly communicate the value propositions at
the market. This, as it is evident from this study, that consumers appreciate as well as comprehend the value already established at the organic dairy market.

Clarifying what value and for whom, current literature has failed to distinguish if value propositions are primarily proposed for the consumers, firms, or even both (Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013). Previous S-D literature state that value co-creation can only be created by interacting with the consumer to create value propositions for them (Vargo & Lusch 2004). However, this study shows that market actors do not only create value for the interest of the consumer, but also amongst themselves as well as for a greater cause with the health and environment in mind. Discussion about the multidimensionality of value is a present topic (Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013), as value can extend to a full spectrum, as collaboration and interaction can take place with multiple actors. Findings further confirm that market actors through their supply chain interact and collaborate, evident when Arla has a close contact with farmers, scientists, producers, retailers, and so forth. Benefits deriving from co-creation throughout the supply chain are pointed out further by Lambert and García (2006). With this broadened perspective, co-creation can result in optimal value that is greater than the sum of value created between two (Sheth & Uslay 2007).

Findings further show that value propositions are created by joint efforts between the market actors by integration and sharing of resources, including knowledge sharing, this in accordance with several scholars (Michel et al. 2008; Vargo & Lusch 2008; Grönroos & Voima 2012). As elaborated it is also evident that value is created, not only between the firm and the consumer (Vargo & Lusch 2004), but also in a larger service setting between multiple actors similar to a service ecosystem argued by Vargo and Lusch (2011). By doing so, this research suggests that market actors can create value more effectively and propose better offerings for the consumer than they would have been able to do separately. The incentive for collaborating with one another comes from the collective purpose of increasing the organic market as well as for the benefitting purpose for the society related to environment and health. One can therefore argue that market actors create value propositions amongst each other as well as collective propositions serving a greater good. Interaction toward a common goal (Wieland et al. 2012), therefore seem to be the glue that hold the collaboration together. As theorized by Bitici et al. (2004), collaborative value propositions can differ from individual value propositions, which is also evident in this study, as value propositions take on different
forms and target different actors and consumers. These collective and relational value propositions are argued as a complementary way in viewing value creation (Epp & Price 2011).

5.1.2 Co - clarifying by what kind of resources

As recognized from sub-study I, mirroring the market actors’ responses, the proposition for co is formulated as following:

**Proposition 2:** Consumers are involved with other market actors in joint creation processes, which directly influence their behavioural intention to purchase.

No statistical significance is found for co in itself. Therefore, no support for proposition 2 is found. What can be found is however a slight negative impact of co on behavioural intention. Findings from sub-study I still show that underlying processes of creating value is currently taking place among market actors at the organic dairy market in Sweden. Interestingly, the consumers do not comprehend this even though the market actors state that they are inviting and involving the consumers in their processes.

It clearly appears from the investigation with the market actor respondents that inclusion of other actors is currently taking place throughout the value chain on the organic food market. Following the argumentation by Gummesson (2007) as well as Akaka and Chandler (2011), the inclusion of multiple actors, including firms, customers, and other organisations at the market is the key. There exists a consensus that the different actors in several ways are involved in each other’s processes and that the consumers are also involved, reflecting a service ecosystem (Vargo & Lusch 2011; Wieland et al. 2012). This mirrors the theoretical argument that market actors that are involved in each other’s processes, as both service providers, as well as value co-creators (Edvardsson et al. 2011; Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013).

The co in value co-creation has in theory been referred to as defining the involved market actors in a value co-creation process (Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013), hence the resources involved (Vargo & Lusch 2012 p. 6-8). Several forms of relationships are found in this context, in accordance to the holistic service ecosystem perspective (Vargo & Lusch 2011;
2014), for example the network Organic Sweden among others. These relationships are here argued to be vital among the market actor respondents for sharing of resources. By collaboration, market actors exchanging resources is seen as being complementary for the involved actors. As none of the market actors possess all resources alone in-house, collaborations are further argued as necessary. This since actors can draw benefits from each other’s resources such as expertise and knowledge, which in turn mirrors the arguments by Vargo and Lusch (2004) as well as Michel et al. (2008).

Interestingly, this study however shows that the market actors and the consumers do not equally perceive the processes currently taking place on the organic dairy market. As the statistical results indicate, customers are not highly involved with the market actors, as the effect of co is both slightly negative as well as small, one may question the market actors’ view regarding how the consumers are actually involved in their value development. This line of reasoning could be seen as slightly contradicting to the argument by Vargo and Lusch (2004) as they propose that the consumers should be highly involved in order to create value and therefore seen as important in the value co-creation process. Following other scholars’ argumentation, the FMCG industry could affect consumers’ participation, as it is characterised as low-involvement products where consumer might not appreciate the co-creational aspect (Etgar 2008; Franke et al. 2009; Hoyer et al. 2010). This however needs to be further examined.

5.1.3 Creation - clarifying by what kind of mechanism

As recognized from sub-study I, mirroring the market actors’ responses, the proposition for creation is formulated as following:

**Proposition 3:** Consumers are contributing through mechanisms (co-development), which directly influence their behavioural intention to purchase.

No statistical significance for creation in itself can be found from the regression analysis. Therefore, no support for proposition 3 is found. What can be identified is however a slight negative impact on behavioural intention, which is equivalent to co. Findings from sub-study I also show that market actors contribute with additional resources to actualise value through
different channels on the organic dairy market in Sweden. What should be noted is that consumers on the other hand do not comprehend this, as the identified effect of creation on behavioural intention is small.

From the results it is clear that the mechanisms, also referred to as the activities, play a significant role in the process of actually integrating resources from different actors in order to actualise value potential (Saarijärvi 2012; Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013). These mechanisms can come in various forms, ranging from co-producer, co-developer, co-designer (Sheth & Uslay 2007) among others, which are supporting the firm in their value creation where actors can contribute with their different roles. The variation of forms are linked to the purpose of the different actors in how they can complement each other toward the common goal, as well as to their own specific goals. It is clear from sub-study I that variations of mechanisms are apparent between the market actors as well as between the consumers, which are facilitated through various ways of connecting. Arla state that TetraPak is having a co-designing role in developing the packaging of the dairy product, whereas most of the respondents mention co-producing or co-developing roles in terms of activities offered by other actors, in line with the argumentation of Sheth and Uslay (2007) as well as Saarijärvi (2012).

It appears that mechanisms are facilitated through multiple channels on the organic dairy market, mirroring the argument by Saarijärvi and Kannan (2013). Mechanisms are, in alignment with Vargo and Lusch (2011) as well as Saarijärvi (2012), contributing with complementary resources that derive through these mechanisms facilitated by interaction. Between the market actors, it is evident that board meetings, fairs and galas are the key platforms, in which the market actors are exchanging information and resources. Changing perspective to the consumers, the key available channels are mentioned to be forums, social media, in-store interaction and surveys, following the line of argumentation of Saarijärvi and Kannan (2013), who argue that mechanisms can be developed to capture consumer feedback. Through these channels, the consumer is seen as a co-developer, as their opinions are transformed into actions evolving different aspects of the product, as well as its availability. By defining the different types of mechanisms, the consumer is not only a co-creator of value (Vargo & Lusch 2004), but more specifically have other more defined roles, which can impact the way one should integrate and interact with the consumer. The market actors argue
that a multitude of interactions with the consumer is taking place, also including new more advanced technological ways in line with the argumentation of Saarijärvi and Kannan (2013).

As the statistical testing however indicates, both a small and a slight negative effect for creation on behavioural intention, it could be questioned how involved the consumers actually are in the value creation process, in its role of being a co-developer. As previously elaborated, the FMCG industry is related to low-involvement, which could be elaborated as one of the reasons to this result. But what should be brought up in this discussion is rather what the market actors mentioned, namely that they see the actual purchase by consumers as the most influential way for them to express what they want. Linking this to the discussion of value co-creation and S-D logic in general (Vargo & Lusch 2004), the actual purchase could be related to the traditional good-centered paradigm that S-D logic criticise. The purchase does not meet the requirements for being a mechanism according to Saarijärvi (2012), as well as Saarijärvi and Kannan (2013), descending from the S-D logic view.

5.2 Existing TRA variables attitude and subjective norm

It is statistically discovered that attitude and subjective norm, the original variables of TRA, seems to be proposed and proven as determinants of behavioural intention in the context of organic dairy products. As predicted originally in TRA (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980), both attitude and subjective norm have an impact on behavioural intention even in this context. Attitude normally performs better than subjective norm (Fishbein and Ajzen 1975; 1980), and as attitude also in this study was found to have the most influence on purchase behaviour, this argument is supported. Within attitude, health- and environmental aspects were included in the questionnaire as they were found in the pre-study as well as argued for in other studies revolving organic food (Grunert & Juhl 1995; Padel & Foster 2005; Shepherd et al. 2005). Their importance for influencing the purchase of organic food was reflected in the overall performance of attitude.

In the context of organic food, subjective norm has been proven to be of significant importance (Smith & Paladina 2010), which has also been argued for in literature (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975; 1980). The findings in this study indicate that Subjective Norm has a positive impact. Interestingly, subjective norm did not show the second largest impact on behavioural intention, which value did instead. From these findings, it is possible to conclude that
respondents are under attitudinal control rather than under a normative control when evaluating purchase of organic dairy products even if factors may indirectly influence the attitude toward the behaviour.

5.3 Concluding discussion

As elaborated, the findings from this study suggest that external factors have a direct impact on behavioural intention, along with attitude and subjective norm. This is evident, as value shows a clear significant impact, hence supporting external factors, direct effect on behavioural intention. Thereby, proposition 1 is confirmed. Proposition 2 and 3 that reflect co and creation are however not proven. This because no significant support is found for these through sub-study II. As one of the three propositions is confirmed, one can validate that external factors do have a direct effect on consumers’ intention to purchase organic dairy products.

It should however be highlighted that co and creation seems to have a small and slight negative effect on behavioural intention that indicates a different form of impact on behaviour than was theorized prior to the findings, hence seems to be inconsistent with expected outcome. As value co-creation is said to have a positive effect on behavioural intention when efficiently applied (Grönroos & Ravald 2011; Grönroos & Voima 2011) it seemed reasonable to expect that value, co and creation were likely to impact consumers’ behavioural intention to purchase positively. Thus, it is interesting that this study indicates that value is the only factor that shows a positive effect on behavioural intention. One could also question if the small impact that co and creation show, could be an indication that the two variables indirectly are mediated through value. This since value derives from the co-creation of process. What implications and reasons the indicated negative effect of co and creation has, as well as the direct or indirect effect, do however go beyond the scope of this research.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUDING REMARKS

6.1 General conclusions

The purpose of this research was to validate whether external factors directly influence consumers’ behavioural intention to purchase. To achieve this, TRA was chosen as a central tool in combination with the emerging academic logic constituting of value co-creation to evaluate its strategic nature and its implication on consumers’ behavioural intention. To our knowledge, this study is the first known academic attempt to connect these two theoretical concepts.

This study has further been conducted with a narrowed focus on the organic dairy industry, but results are hereby argued to be transferable toward the larger setting of organic food products. This because it is one of the largest organic commodities in Sweden, as well as many of the actors involved in this research are also connected to other categories within the larger setting of organic food. Reflecting upon the context, an understanding of why organic food sales in Sweden have recently accelerated and what has triggered consumers toward this purchase behaviour is lacking. Findings from this research shed light on what might impact the consumers’ behavioural intention in a direct manner, which contributes to understanding the role of external factors in the organic food industry and how they influence the consumers. The findings in this study suggest that:

1. Out of the external factors value, co and creation; value is confirmed as it shows a clear significant impact on behavioural intention to purchase organic dairy products, a result argued to be transferable to the larger setting of organic food products.

2. As value is confirmed, one can validate that external factors directly influence consumers’ behavioural intention to purchase organic food products.

3. No statistical significance is found for co and creation, even though a small and slight negative influence on behavioural intention is suggested.

Further elaborating on external factors, this research demonstrates the impact market actors jointly can have on consumer purchase behaviour when also inviting the consumer in the co-
creation process of value. As highlighted, statistical support is found for value but not for co and creation. Value is theorised as deriving from the co-creation process (Vargo & Lusch 2004) and therefore, one could question whether co-creation is indirectly mediated through value.

The statistical testing also confirms that the original TRA variables attitude and subjective norm have a direct impact on behavioural intention. This supports the utilisation of TRA as a theoretical tool in examining purchase intention of a consumer product as well as the pairing it with the external variables including value co-creation. With this, external factors seem to provide an additional understanding of the behavioural intention to purchase organic food than the original TRA variables. This contradicts that attitude and subjective norm are the only variables directly affecting behavioural intention (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980; 1975) in the context of organic food products.

Linking back to the theoretical contribution of this study, expressed as a joint mathematical function, the findings suggest that value, co and creation can take different forms. This line of reasoning is consistent with Grönroos and Voima (2011), proposing that value co-creation can take a form of positive or negative effect. Therefore, the following mathematical operator prior to each external factor is applied:

\[ B \sim BI = A_{act} (\omega1) \pm SN (\omega2) \pm Value (\omega3) \pm Co (\omega4) \pm Creation (\omega5) \]

### 6.2 Academic and managerial implications

The study contributes to the academia in two ways. Firstly, as value co-creation primarily has taken a theoretical approach focusing on firms’ facilitation of value, this study instead angles the value co-creational aspect toward its impact on the consumer based on the findings from a service ecosystem perspective. Hereby the attention is drawn toward not only discussing value co-creation in a theoretical manner but also include a more hands-on approach by measuring the perspective and its effect on the consumer in a statistical manner. By taking this approach, findings indicate that value co-creation has an impact on the consumers’ behavioural intention, where value has been created among several market actors and with the consumer in accordance with the original statements (Vargo & Lusch 2004). This further
confirms the arguments made by Grönroos and Ravald (2011) that value co-creation have an implication for the consumer, which further confirms the practicality of value co-creation in a practical manner. Also, by taking a more holistic approach with a service ecosystem perspective (Vargo & Lusch 2011), findings further confirms the systems approach toward how value can be created between several actors through various mechanisms (Saarijärvi 2012). These findings increase the current understanding of value co-creation and its effect on the consumer when they are included in the process.

Secondly, this study indicates that external variables in the form of value co-creation have a direct impact on behavioural intention when integrated with the original constructs of TRA. As previously stated, this contradicts the notion by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980; 1975) that all external variables have an indirect impact on behavioural intention. Other theoretical discussions and contributions toward the understanding of what it is that impact the consumers’ behavioural intention have been conducted also disputing that attitude and subjective norm are the only factors affecting behavioural intention (Aleassa et al. 2011). External factors have also been added to study their effect on behavioural intention (Crosby & Muehling 1983; Shim et al. 1989; Bagozzi et al. 1992). This study does however take another approach, by including the value co-creational aspect, incorporating the impact of several market actors and thereby moving away from TRA’s individualistic biased perspective that it has been criticized for (Kippax & Crawford 1993 p. 253-258). Reflecting on this approach is different to other existing studies, and can thereby contribute with an additional understanding of what factors that have an impact on behavioural intention from a value co-creational aspect.

For practitioners, findings from this study provide further understanding of the creational process of consumer value and how it is co-created with the consumers in collaboration with other market actors. Thereby, this research has a managerial approach as well. It is important to understand value co-creation and its constituents, in order to utilise this approach in a practical sense. This because it can generate in opportunities that stretches beyond the traditional role of the provider. Also an important result from the findings is that value is co-created with and for the consumer has been comprehended and positively received. This further supports that value co-creation can provide opportunities for the firm as well as offer value propositions for the consumers that is adjusted to their specific needs and wants, hence
increasing their behavioural intention to purchase organic food products. Further, it is encouraged that market actors should continue to collaborate with other market actors as well as consumers, including capturing exchanged resources. By doing that, additional value propositions could be created for involved parties.

6.3 Limitations and suggestions for future research

Limitations of this study could firstly be related to the selection of respondents in sub-study 1 and that their answers are objective and could be biased. Although this might limit the credibility of their responses, some of the largest market actors within the industry were carefully selected with respondents having leading positions. Therefore, it could be argued that their answers reflect the organic food market. Secondly, the methodological choice for sub-study II of using a non-random sample technique, in the narrowed down selected target group of Stockholm County, can affect this study since it may not reflect a true representation of the selected target group in this particular context of organic food in Sweden. Although this might limit generalizability, obtained results can still show statistical significance confirming the statistical relationship to the selected target group (Wilkinson 1999). Thereby, this study and results shed light on the direct influence external factors might have on consumers’ behavioural intention to purchase organic food products. Further, it is acknowledged that the context of this study may limit the transferability of these findings to other contexts outside the chosen scope. The chosen situational context may be similar to others where consumers’ general involvement is low affecting the interest from the consumers to participate in the value co-creation process. However, there is no reason as to why these findings could not be applied to a context where involvement of the consumer is higher and the offering is narrower than in the FMCG industry.

This study is providing groundwork for future research. More compelling evidence to validate this research would be provided by studies testing value co-creation as an added concept to TRA in other contexts, and further also test if value co-creation in a generalizing way have an effect on consumers’ behavioural intention. Therefore it is suggested to further investigate value co-creation in a similar manner, dividing the concept into its constituent parts as Saarijärvi and Kannan (2013), to firstly identify and understand value co-creation in the chosen context to further understand its implication on the consumer as researchers have argued for (Grönroos & Ravald 2011). To also combine it with the TRA, future studies are
able to in a constructive manner measure behavioural intention, as the efficiency of this framework has been proven not only in this study but also others. Researchers could also construct own tools to test what effect value co-creation has on the consumer, also adding additional variables, as other concepts and frameworks could moderate consumers’ behavioural intention. This study further explored a particular phenomenon in a particular time. Therefore, future research could also benefit from a longitudinal study as consumers, other market actors, relationships, as well as the context are in constant change along with technological advancement, which could affect consumers’ behavioural intention.
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## CHAPTER 8: APPENDIX

### 8.1 Sub-study I: respondent profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Contributing business perspective</th>
<th>Respondent position</th>
<th>Interview information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arla</td>
<td>Cooperative owned by its farmers who also are the producers. Is the largest global producer of organic dairy products having a huge focus on the environment</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Brand Manager</td>
<td>2015-03-23 14:00-14:45 Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environment &amp; Sustainability Expert</td>
<td>2015-03-27 12:30-13:15 Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekomatcentrum</td>
<td>Organic market network for stakeholders, which includes the farmers, wholesalers, restaurants, processing companies, consumers, etc. Working to influence policy decisions as well as spread knowledge at the market</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>2015-03-25 10:00-10:45 Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EkoWeb</td>
<td>Impartial expert organization focusing on the organic market as well as organic statistics.</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>2015-03-18 09:00-09:45 Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICA</td>
<td>Grocery store that have brought in organic alternatives, and that strives to offer its consumers organic products as an alternative to conventional products in all of its product groups</td>
<td>Store Manager for Ica Kvantum Kungens Kurva</td>
<td>2015-04-01 17:00-17:45 Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRF</td>
<td>National Association for Swedish independent farmers and farmers in cooperative and have for example initiated a deep market collaboration with ICA</td>
<td>Dairy Market analysis- &amp; statistical expert</td>
<td>2015-04-01 10:00-10:45 Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic Organic Food Fair</td>
<td>Organic food fair exhibitions organiser that welcomes more than 300 exhibitors and thousands of visitors and is the only business related event that is dedicated to organic certified food</td>
<td>Nordic Manager</td>
<td>2015-03-27 10:00-10:45 Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svensk Dagligvaruhandel</td>
<td>Professional organization with grocery store members as Axfood, Coop, ICA, and Lidl. Represents its members to the government and EU</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>2015-03-25 08:30-09:15 Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U&amp;We</td>
<td>Consultancy agency seen as a &quot;Catalyst for Good Business&quot;, aiming to combine profitability with environmental and social responsibility</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>2015-03-18 15:00-15:45 Personal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2 Sub-study I: interview guide

As value co-creation is seen as the central concepts, and the purpose of the qualitative section is to understand these variables from a firm/organizational perspective, the following interview guide is based on Saarijärvi and Kannan (2013) way of breaking down the concept value co-creation to its three constituent parts: value, co and creation:

![Diagram of value co-creation process]

(Saarijärvi & Kannan 2013)

**General questions**

1. Describe your role and your field of activity within the organic dairy market
2. How long have you been working in this field?

**VALUE - What kind of value is created and for whom?**

3. What is your purpose for working with organic dairy products?
4. Do you collaborate toward the same goal as the other actors you work with?
   a. Have the other market actors the same reasons to work with organic dairy products as you have?
5. If focusing on the market actors you work with in the organic field, what value would you say is created based on your cooperation?
   a. For whom is this value created?
6. If we instead focus on your end customers, what value would you say are created for them based on your cooperation?
   a. How do you see that this value is created?
   b. What is being created for the end consumer?

**CO - By what kind of resources?**

8. Have your partners any cooperation with other market actors that are important in this but that you do not have a direct contact with (indirectly)?
9. Are you involving the end-consumer in your cooperation and value creation?
   a. If yes, in what way?
10. Has the cooperation always looked like this when it comes to promoting organic dairy products?
   a. Do you collaborate more/less today?
   b. Is it easier/more difficult to collaborate today?
11. What do you think can be improved when it comes to the cooperation aspect within the organic dairy area?

**CREATION - Through what kind of mechanisms?**

12. Do you see the consumer as active or passive?
13. Through what mechanisms refers to additional resources used, or elaborated, the role that the consumer have defined by the firm to actualise value (co-developer, co-producer, co-designer etc.). With this in mind, how do you view the role of the consumer?
14. Through what channels do you involve the end-consumer? (For example: customer surveys, forums, customer service, inviting customers in the development, etc.)
15. How do would you view the role of other actors in the creation of value (co-developer, co-producer, co-designer etc.)?
16. Through what channels do you involve other market actors? (For example: meetings, exhibitions, sharing information, etc.)

Thank you for your participation!
8.3 Sub-study II: indirect measurement questionnaire guide

Eliciting Accessible Behavioural Intentions
Following questions were asked to elicit the Behavioural Intention toward the specific behaviour that are readily accessible in memory.

1. Would you say that you are likely to purchase organic dairy products within the forthcoming month?

Eliciting Accessible Attitudes
Following questions were asked to elicit the attitudes toward the specific behaviour that are readily accessible in memory.

2. What would you say is the benefits of purchasing organic dairy products? Do you find any negative aspects of purchasing organic dairy products?

Eliciting Accessible Normative Referents
Following questions were asked to elicit relevant referent individuals and groups that are readily accessible in memory.

3. Are there any individuals or groups who would approve of you purchasing organic dairy products in the forthcoming month?
4. Are there any other individuals or groups who come to mind when you think about organic food products in the forthcoming month?

Thank you for your participation!
8.4 Sub-study II: questionnaire guide

Share your opinion with us about organic dairy products

Thank you for participating in our survey!

Many questions in this survey use rating scales with seven places where you click on the one number that best describes your opinion. Some of the questions may appear similar, but they do address somewhat different issues. So please read each question carefully before you give your answer. Make sure to answer all questions.

(Estimated time: 5-8 minutes)

**What is your intention? (Behavioural Intention)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the intention to purchase organic dairy products within the next four weeks.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to purchase organic dairy products within the next four weeks.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will purchase organic dairy products within the next four weeks.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What do you think? (Attitude)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For me to purchase organic dairy products instead of conventional alternatives feels good</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To purchase organic dairy products that feels good for me is important

For me to purchase organic dairy products is good for my health

To purchase organic dairy products that is good for my health is important to me

For me to purchase organic dairy products is good for the environment

To purchase organic dairy products that is good for the environment is important to me

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do others think about your choices? (Subjective Norm)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My friends think I should purchase organic dairy products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What my friends think about my purchase is important to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family think I should purchase organic dairy products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What my family thinks about my purchase is important to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues/classmates think I should purchase organic dairy products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What my colleagues/classmates think</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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about my purchase is important to me

**What is your opinion? (Value)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think that there are many alternatives of organic dairy products to choose among</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many options to choose among makes me more inclined to purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that organic dairy products are reasonably priced in store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A reasonable price makes me more inclined to purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that organic dairy products are certified with clear labelings (e.g. KRAV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A clear labeling makes me more inclined to purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think organic dairy products are easy to find in stores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To easily find products makes me more inclined to purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that I can get information about organic dairy product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get information about organic dairy products makes me more inclined to purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**What is your opinion? (Co-Creation)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co</th>
<th>1 Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think that I can affect the offer of organic dairy products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That I can affect the offer makes me more inclined to purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that my opinion about organic dairy products is captured by companies/organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That my opinion is captured by companies/organizations makes me more inclined to purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creation</th>
<th>1 Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think that there are many forums where I can express my opinion about organic dairy products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That there are many forums where I can express my opinion makes me more inclined to purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I happily share my opinions about organic dairy products directly to companies/organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to share my opinions about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
organic dairy products makes me more inclined to purchase

Age:
- Under 18
- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-55
- Over 55

Occupation:
- Working
- Studying
- Retired
- Other

Sex:
- Man
- Female
- Do not want to specify

Thank you for your participation!
8.5 Sub-study II: respondent profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not want to specify</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Ns vary because of missing data*