



**AgEcon** SEARCH  
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

*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.*

Analysing Consumers' Behaviour towards Genetically  
Modified Food by a Variance-Based Structural Equation  
Modelling Method

Melania Salazar-Ordóñez<sup>1</sup> and Macario Rodríguez-Entrena<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Applied Economics  
Universidad Loyola Andalucía, Córdoba (Spain)  
E-mail: msalazar@etea.com

<sup>2</sup>Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Studies  
Institute of Agricultural Research and Training (IFAPA), Córdoba (Spain)  
E-mail: macario.rodriguez@juntadeandalucia.es

*Selected Poster prepared for presentation at the International Association of Agricultural Economists (IAAE) Triennial Conference, Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil, 18-24 August, 2012.*

*Copyright 2012 by [authors]. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.*

# Analysing Consumer' Behaviour towards Genetically Modified Food by a Variance-based Structural Equation Modeling Method



Melania Salazar-Ordóñez<sup>†</sup>, Macario Rodríguez-Entrena<sup>‡</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Dpt. Applied Economics  
Universidad Loyola Andalucía, Cordoba (Spain)  
E-mail: msalazar@etea.com  
<sup>‡</sup> Dpt. Agricultural Economics and Rural Studies  
Institute of Agricultural Research (IFAPA), Cordoba (Spain)  
E-mail: macario.rodriguez@juntadeandalucia.es

## Introduction

Knowledge is one of the most unsteady variables influencing in consumers' GM food acceptance. It shows positive (Moerbeek and Casimir, 2005), negative (Grunert et al., 2001) and no relations (Priest, 2000) on GM food acceptance. Priest (2000) states the role played by people literacy and the relevance of studying "science literacy" effects.

But, which is the potential role of people literacy in determining consumers' acceptance towards GM foods?


The research is performed in Southern Spain by 169 face-to-face surveys –from January to April 2008.

## Method

Structural Equation Modelling is a multivariate technique. Relations are: among theoretical constructs –unobserved variables (structural model), and theoretical constructs with indicators –observed variables (measurement model). We apply Partial Least Squares (PLS), variance method. Multi-group comparison –scientific-technical (S1) and social-humanistic fields (S2)– follows Chin (2000) parametric method.

## Theoretical Framework and Model Development

Based on multi-attribute approach developed originally by Fishbein (1963), cognition and attitudinal features are relevant variables to explain GM food purchase intention (Bredahl, 2001; Verdurme and Viane, 2003).



## Results: Measurement Model

Loadings over 0.5 (Duxbury and Higgins, 1991)  
Composite reliability ( $\rho_c$ )  $\geq 0.7$  (Nunnally, 1978)  
Average variance extracted (AVE)  $\geq 0.5$  (Fornell and Larcker, 1981)

X: Loadings; C: $\rho_c$ and AVE					
	S1	S2		S1	S2
C1	0.80   0.57	0.80   0.58	C2	0.87   0.69	0.86   0.69
X1	0.81***	0.70***	X4	0.71***	0.79*
X2	0.75***	0.78***	X5	0.86***	0.80*
X3	0.70*	0.80***	X6	0.90***	0.88*
C3	0.89   0.81	0.90   0.82	C4	0.79   0.56	0.86   0.67
X7	0.89***	0.85***	X9	0.81***	0.86***
X8	0.91***	0.96***	X10	0.74***	0.85***
			X11	0.69***	0.75***
C5	0.82   0.61	0.86   0.67	C6	0.95   0.83	0.96   0.87
X12	0.79***	0.76***	X15	0.91***	0.92***
X13	0.67***	0.69***	X16	0.94***	0.95***
X14	0.87***	0.77***	X17	0.91***	0.93***
			X18	0.88***	0.92***

## Results: Structural Model

	S1		S2		Hypothesis	Multi t
	$\beta$	t	$\beta$	t		
H1	-0.30***	-3.35	-0.42***	-6.40	Support	1.38 ns
H2	0.43***	5.21	0.44***	6.14	Support	-0.02 ns
H3	-0.43***	-3.33	-0.44***	-5.27	Support	0.04 ns
H4	0.53***	5.16	0.51***	7.21	Support	0.13 ns
H5	0.03 ns	0.25	0.30***	3.82	Part Support	-1.97*
H6	-0.19*	-1.67	-0.21**	-2.52	Support	0.17ns
H7	0.03 ns	0.23	0.16*	2.04	Part Support	-0.92 ns
H8	0.22*	1.99	-0.06 ns	-0.77	Part Support	2.11 *
H9	0.08 ns	0.69	-0.08 ns	-1.20	Not Support	--
*** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; *p < 0.05; n.s. non significative						

## Conclusions

Consumers' risk and benefit perceptions play a key role in purchase intention; though for scientific-technical people, risks loss relevance, because the self-confidence from this training may reduce risk impact in a cognitive level.

Attitude to GM technology is the main key driver in consumer's risk and benefit beliefs. Trust in institutions reduces perceived risks and vice versa, but scientific-technical literacy people is only influenced in risk perceptions.

Knowledge, for social-humanistic literacy people, does not have a significant relation with the risks; but existing with the benefits which may be easier to assimilate. In scientific-literacy group, higher knowledge means a higher risk perceptions. No direct influence from knowledge to purchase intention may be owing to the consumers' ability to absorb the hodgepodge of conflicting information.

## References

- Bredahl, L., 2001. Determinants of consumer attitudes and purchase intentions with regard to genetically modified foods –results of a cross-national survey. *Journal of Consumer Policy* 24, 23–61.
- Chin, W., 2010. How to write up and report PLS analyses. Esposito, Chin, Henseler & Wang (Eds.), *Handbook of Partial Least Squares* (pp. 655-690). Berlin: Springer.
- Duxbury, L.E., Higgins, C.A., 1991. Gender differences in work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 76, 60-74.
- Fishbein, M., 1963. An investigation of the relationship between beliefs about an object and the attitude toward that object. *Human Relations* 16, 233-239.
- Fornell, C., Larcker, D.F., 1981. Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research* 18.
- Grunert, K.G., Bredahl, L., Scholderer, J., 2003. Four questions on European consumers' attitudes toward the use of genetic modification in food production. *Innovative Food Science and Emerging Technologies* 4, 435-445.
- Moerbeek, H., Casimir, G., 2005. Gender differences in consumers' acceptance of genetically modified foods. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 29, 308-318.
- Nunnally, J.C., 1978. *Psychometric theory*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Priest, S. 2000. US public opinion divided over biotechnology? *Nature Biotechnology* 19, 939-942.

C	Indicators
C1	Applying gene tech is X1: ethically unacceptable; X2: naturally unacceptable; X3: worst than conventional-tech X4: EU monitors GM tech correct use in food sector; X5: I trust in scientist reports about GM food safety; X6: I can distinguish GM food by labels
C2	X7: Scoring in test knowledge ; X8: Self-knowledge level
C3	Applying gene tech in food production will X9: increase yields; X10: solve ecological problems; X11: improve functional issues
C4	Applying gene tech in food production X12: proves harmful to environment; X13: causes allergy in humans; X14: only serves big companies interests
C5	I would buy a precooked meal if X15: chicken was GM; X16: vegetables were GM; X17: preservatives were GM; X18: chicken fed with GMO
C6	
Indicators: 5 point-Likert scale, except C6 = 10 point-Likert scale	

H1: Consumers' purchase intention to GM food is decreased by GM food perceived risks; H2: Consumers' purchase intention to GM food is increased by GM food perceived benefits; H3: Perceived benefits from GM food is decreased by consumers' negative attitude to GM tech; H4: Perceived risks from GM food is increased by consumers' negative attitude to GM tech; H5: Perceived benefits from GM food is increased by consumers' trust in institutions; H6: Perceived risks from GM food is decreased by consumers' trust in institution; H7: Perceived benefits from GM food are influenced by knowledge; H8: Perceived risks from GM food are influenced by knowledge; H9: Consumers' GM purchase intention is influenced by knowledge.