



*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

*No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.*

# **Consumer Attitudes to Genetically Modified Organisms in Food in the UK**

Michael Burton<sup>φ</sup>, Dan Rigby<sup>ψ</sup>, Trevor Young<sup>ψ</sup> and Sallie James<sup>φ</sup>

## **Abstract**

This paper reports the results of a study of UK consumer attitudes to food safety as they relate to Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) and the extent to which they translate into a relatively high willingness to pay to avoid these products. The results indicate the relative importance of different aspects of the food system in forming preferences, and that GM food is only one of a number of concerns, albeit a significant one. The results also indicate that attitudes towards organic food may be taken as a useful indicator of attitudes towards GM technology, as the preference structure which underlies the former also appears to inform the latter. Significant differences are found between attitudes to GM food in which plants are modified by the introduction of genes from other plants and those in which they are modified by the introduction of genes from animals and plants.

Keywords: choice modelling; GMOs; food safety; stated preference

**This paper is published in full in**

**European Review of Agricultural Economics Vol 28(4) (2001) pp.479-498**

<http://erae.oupjournals.org/content/vol28/issue4/>

---

<sup>φ</sup> Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of Western Australia

<sup>ψ</sup> School of Economic Studies, University of Manchester.

We gratefully acknowledge the support provided by an Australian Research Council research grant.