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Abstract - English

Online behavior of consumers’ choice of attributes in healthy food is a rather uninvestigated field and in need for more examination. Few articles have been published using behavioral measurements as comparing attributes in groceries with conjoint analysis studies. However using Behavioral Perspective Model (BPM) to predict for consumers’ choice on healthy products lacks sources. The experiment was conducted in collaboration with Gló, one of the most progressive companies in healthy food in Iceland. Consumers’ choice of attributes were analyzed in two studies using a conjoint analyze and qualitative research method. The data from the qualitative research was analyzed with approach of the grounded theory. Application of an open coding was constructed from the data of how often each attribute was mentioned. Thematic analyze was performed and a new theme in form of unexplored attribute discovered. Findings from the conjoint analysis study showed that utilitarian stimuli of price, picture and distribution were the most important attribute of the consequence of purchasing. The findings of qualitative research in study 2 indicate that importance of attributes varies between groups of consumers. Future studies should aim on important attributes found in the present study to access each target group with efficiency.
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Consumers’ Choice of Attributes on Healthy Food in a Behavioral Perspective using Conjoint Analysis and Qualitative Research

There has been increasing interest of understanding the effects of shopping environments through mediated computer and online retails (Hoffman & Novak, 1996). Online advertising and online retailing has changed intensely in marketing of products (Werner, 2013). Online marketing relies mostly on consumers’ visual stimuli although consumers can be conditioned by other factors such as taste or smell (Skinner, 1965). Research has shown that sensed-attributes, such as scent, are not the most significant factors in online advertising (Degeratu, Rangaswamy, & Wu, 2000). Most consumers in our modern days use the Internet or other online social media to purchase products (Vinerean, Cetina, Dumitrescu, & Tichindelean, 2013). Therefore the online audience is the biggest market for marketers and managers as Alhadeff (1982) indicates in his research that marketers and marketing analyzers should always make a good and predictable model, which measures the consumer behavior accurately.

The behavioral perspective model (BPM) has been used in marketing and retails (Foxall, 1992; Sigurdsson, Menon, Sigurdarson, Kristjansson & Foxall, 2013). Although there are not many studies of using BPM in online marketing there is a great knowledge on what effect the model has and what it stands for, particularly in offline marketing (Foxall, 2004). The aim of the behavioral perspective model is to find out and predict consumer behavior and patterns of purchasing a product or service to certify the nature of what it provides in praxis (Foxall, 2004; Foxall, 1993). The consumer situation utilizes a direct influence on the shaping and allegation of consumer behavior in specific surroundings. A consumer behavior setting comprises the stimuli that form the social and physical environment. These initially neutral
stimuli are transformed into the discriminative stimuli that signal the probable outcomes of approach and avoidance responses in the setting by their intersection with the consumers’ pertinent history of reinforcement and punishment. It is this learning history that adds meaning to the otherwise neutral setting stimuli by investing them with the consequences of previous approach - avoidance behaviors in similar circumstances. The intersection of an individual’s learning history and his or her behavior setting define the consumer situation, which locates consumer behavior in space and time (Foxall, 2004; Foxall, 1993). The reinforcements as the outcomes of the consumer behavior are of two kinds, utilitarian and informational, which refer to symbolic reinforcers as social and personal evaluations (Soriano, Foxall, & Pearson, 2002). The utilitarian reinforcements are the consequences of using a product or service and are in nature a practical benefit for the consumer (Foxall, 2004). The informational reinforcements take place when individuals gain higher social standards and benefits of other peoples’ opinion of using the product or service. The utilitarian and informational punishments in consumer psychology are described as individuals experiencing aversive effects depending on their responses and therefore the consequences of the individual doing the particular behavior are decreased (Foxall, 2004).

The settings are behavioral and affect different context when the consumers’ action occur whether it is physical, temporal or social. The settings are therefore events in environment of consumption and analyze the consequences for consumer responses, which are different between individuals (Foxall, 2004; Foxall, Castro, James, Yani-de-Soriano, & Sigurdsson, 2006).
In a research by Wells, Chang, Oliveira-Castro, & Pallister (2010), the usefulness of the BPM variables, utilitarian and informational reinforcement, was investigated as a base for consumer segmentation. Consumers were measured in relations of their choice of brand, their demographic characteristics such as age and social class and different levels of utilitarian and informational reinforcement in biscuits. The findings revealed that consumers were sensitive for price changing and the consumers were more sensitive for increased price of a product when benefits of utilitarian and informational were on higher level. Lower age groups were the most sensitive for changes in utilitarian reinforcement.

Conjoint analysis is an accomplished model to analyze data and provide a prediction for a consumers’ choice (Green & Srinivasan, 1990). Conjoint analysis is an instrument to identify the consumers’ choice of the most valuable attributes in a product. Overall, studies indicate that conjoint analysis has been used frequently in marketing and other fields where there is a need for segmentations in attributes (Dick Wittink, Marco Vriens, & Wim Burhenne, 1992). For centuries, conjoint analysis methodology has been applied increasingly with food and beverages and other
physical products (Green & Srinivasan, 1990). Conjoint analysis can produce and find detailed intrinsic sensory attributes in healthy products (Endrizzi et al., 2015). It measures the relationship between consumers’ utility and product attributes with efficiency (Menon & Sigurdsson, 2015).

The main objective of the current study is to explore motivational attributes and utility for consumers when they purchase healthy food online. Also, to utilize the behavioral perspective model as a guiding light to predict the most important attributes in online sale of healthy food products. Study 1 will analyze seven different attributes as price, portions, distribution and pictures and will be demonstrated as utilitarian stimuli. Reviews, ingredients and chicken will be construed as informational stimuli. Study 2 analyses the consumer behavior with qualitative research and based on the findings in study 1, the most important motivational attributes for purchase will be compared between three groups of consumers

Studies have shown that price is the most significant attribute and also the most sensitive factor for consumers (Wells et al., 2010). They have also shown that utilitarian stimuli have more impact than informational stimuli as a consequence in consumer consumption in e-mail marketing (Sigurdsson et al., 2013). People preferred to purchase a book and get another for free (utilitarian) rather than to buy a copy and give another to charity (informational). A conjoint analysis study indicated similar results (Fagerstrøm & Ghinea, 2011). Price had more impact than costumer reviews on online purchase amongst light shoppers, medium shoppers and heavy shoppers. When the price increased the likelihood of purchasing the product decreased. The present study examined the most valuable attributes in consumers’ choice of a daily ration from Gló, a healthy food company in Iceland.

Based on abovementioned literature, the following was hypothesized:
CONSUMERS’ CHOICE OF ATTRIBUTES ON HEALTHY FOOD

Study 1: The utilitarian attribute of price is the most influential in consumers’ choice of purchasing healthy food.

Study 2: The three highest influential attributes found in study 1, will be the same for non-, regular- and super-consumers on healthy food.

Method

Study 1

Participants.

The participants were consumers at the healthy food restaurant Gló in Reykjavík, Iceland. With convenience sampling, individuals were invited to participate in the study at a Gló restaurant in Reykjavík. The total number of participants was 82 (64 females, 18 males). The age range of the participants was from 18 to 60 years. Most participants were aged 26 to 35 years. There were four missing items. The missing items all had dismissed significant factor in the survey and were disqualified from the research.

Measures.

Online Survey Questionnaire.

Survey Monkey, an online survey software hosted the study questionnaire. The questionnaire included 28 questions were eighteen questions and included images of a daily ratio food bag that participants rated how likely they were of purchasing the product (see appendix A). The healthy food bag that was used in the questions was a product that Gló company sold on their website. The rating scale was a 5-item Likert scale, from 1 very likely to 5 very unlikely.

Background Measurement.

Age, gender, amount of physical exercise per week and online behavior were gathered with background measurement (see appendix B). The questionnaire
The research consisted of nine questions approaching online behavior considered average Internet usage per day in hours, current online consumption of groceries.

Research design.

The images in the survey contained seven attributes. The images were a daily ration of a food bag. By interviewing the executives of Gló the attributes of their food were found out. A pretest was also conducted on eight consumers to decrease the attributes from originally twelve to seven. The selected attributes were price, portions, distributions, pictures, reviews, ingredients and meat. Each attribute had three different levels based on utilitarian or/and informational stimuli as it is shown in Table 1. Levels of price were kr. 3590, kr. 5490, kr. 7490. The sizes of the portions were presented in calories (Kcal). In the images there were 1500 Kcal, 2000 Kcal or not mentioned. Pictures were low profile (e.g., not visually attractive picture of the food bag), high profile (e.g., a visually attractive picture of a roasted chicken breasts) or no picture at all. Reviews had celebrity comments (e.g., quotes from well known Icelandic athletes), anonymous comments (e.g., anonymous quotes from unknown Icelandic people) or no reviews. The meat in the images had the levels of happy chicken (e.g., Litla gula hænan, an agricultural company, which specializes in non-genetically modified chicken). Through the manufacture’s process, the chicken are allowed more space, playtime in the sun and so forth before slaughtered (Gunnarsdóttir, Barkardóttir, & Kristinsdóttir, 2014). The meat took also the level of non-plumbed chicken (e.g., not injected any genetically modified substance). The third level of the attribute of meat, the chicken was plumbed with genetically modified substance. The first level of distribution represented a free home delivery. The second level was a home delivery for 900 kr. The third level was when the food bag had to be picked up by a consumer at adjacent Gló restaurant. The seventh
attribute was the ingredients, which was either represented in the images as organic or non-organic.

Table 1

*Attributes and Levels in Food Bag*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Informational/utilitarian stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low profile</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High profile</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No picture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1500 Kcal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000 Kcal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kr. 3590</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kr. 5490</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kr. 7490</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celebrity comment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous comment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Happy Chicken</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Plumbed chicken</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plumbed chicken</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home delivery</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home delivery for 900 kr.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picked up</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingredients</td>
<td></td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Organic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The full profile model was employed in the study to collect data. With the full profile approach, each stimulus can be allocated in any level on a continuous attribute (Green & Srinivasan, 1978). The advantage of the full profile method is the amplitude to measure overall preference of participants’ judgment directly with behavioral impressions such as the consumers’ purpose to purchase (Green & Srinivasan, 1990). Participants evaluated experimental stimuli of attributes where factorial design generates the stimuli (see table 2) (see appendix A). According to the study by Green and Srinivasan (1978) the full-profile approach gives more realistic description of each stimulus by accustomed the levels of the attributes a definition and take into account probable environmental correlation between the attributes.

Table 2

*Factorial Design used to Generate Stimuli Cards.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus cards</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Type of picture</th>
<th>Reviews</th>
<th>Portions</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Ingredients</th>
<th>Meat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Procedure.**

In collaboration with the executives of Gló restaurants, twelve attributes were chosen for a pretest. These twelve attributes were selected by quality standardization of the company and what the restaurants of Gló represents for, such as quality of the food, nutrition and fair price on their product. The study took place at a Gló restaurant in Reykjavík and was performed in six days. The researchers of the study invited consumers of Gló for a participation. Participants were informed of the purpose of the survey and signed an informed consent before participation (see appendix C). The researcher emphasized to the participant if he was in any doubt, he could ask the researcher for help if there was anything unclear such as the content or grammatically errors. Participants answered the abovementioned questionnaires on a computer, background measurement and online survey measurement. The time that took participants to finish the survey ranged from four minutes to 15 minutes.

**Data analysis.**

Conjoint analysis was used to measure the consumers’ preferences on the seven attributes from the eighteen images in the survey. IBM SPSS Statistics 21.0 was used to perform data analysis. The first eighteen questions were reversed in SPSS output in the process of the data. By reversing these questions the answers were logically more correct to describe in the statistics, therefor the higher on the 5-point scale responses were the more likely participants were of purchasing the food bag.

**Study 2**

**Participants.**

The participants were twelve in total, six males and six females and divided into three groups. In each group there were two males and two females. The age of the participants ranged from 22 – 56 years. The first group consisted of non-
consumers of Gló. In the second group there were regular – consumer and in the third group were super-consumers.

**Measures.**

Qualitative research was applied, using thematic analysis based on the grounded theory (Seale, 2004). The grounded theory approach is a method used for exposing theories as well as concepts and hypotheses directly from data but not from another framework or research, which have measured the same matter (Willig, 2013). Semi-structured interviews were performed in the study two, as the goal was to explore the topic of seven attributes in healthy food. The semi-structured interviews gave the participants more space to express their opinion in a response to the questions being asked (Esterberg, 2002). The interviews were all in Icelandic language and the questions were open ended to create a discussion about the topic and to give the participant a free speech about the questions as well (Esterberg, 2002). The questions were created from the framework of semi-structured interviews and formed to create discussions between the researcher and participant. Background questions were asked to gather consumption behavior on healthy food. Participants were asked if they were consumers of Gló and how frequently in a week and month the consumption was (appendix D). Participants were shown three different images of a food bag from Gló website, chosen from current research of study 1. These three selected images were chosen because it represented the seven attributes the best. The first image contained attributes of meat, picture, distribution and ingredients. The second image contained attributes of meat, distribution, portions, picture, reviews and ingredients. The third image contained attributes of meat, picture, distribution, reviews, price and portions (see appendix F). The levels for each attribute in current study 1 were the same for study 2 (see table 1). The interviews were recorded in Ipad
Air with an app to record sounds, Voice recorder. An open coding was conducted to search for other themes or finding unforeseeable patterns between participants (Esterberg, 2002). The interviews were handwritten on memorandums. Convenience sampling was used to approach all participants in the study. The main themes in the study were demonstrated in behavioral perspective and were utilitarian attributes of price, picture, distribution and portions. The informational attributes were reviews, meat and ingredients. When categorizing the groups of non-consumer, consumer and super-consumer it was made in collaboration with executives of Gló. The group of non-consumer was identified as individuals who had never eaten a food from Gló restaurants or a food from their website. Regular consumers were identified as individuals who at least eat at the restaurant of Gló regularly or purchase a food bag from Gló’s website. The super-consumer group was identified as individuals eating at least once in a week at a Gló restaurant or being in subscription of food from Gló. With assistance of managers of Gló restaurants the individuals of super-consumer were found and contacted.

**Procedure.**

The interviews were performed either at researchers’ home or in a closed room at Gló restaurant in Kópavogur. It was emphasized to minimize the external stimulus as much as possible in all the interviews. Participants had already accepted invitations for participation in the research through a telephone, arranged by manager of Gló or through e-mail between the researcher and the participant. An informed consent was obtained from all the participants after explaining the purpose of the study to them (see appendix E). However all of the aspects of study were informed in detail after their participation so their answers would not be biased or infected of researchers’ instructions. Participants were informed that the interview would be
recorded and the time duration would be approximately 15 minutes. It was clearly declared to every participant that they could quit participation at any time. The three images of the food were shown to a participant, separately. Participants were given one minute to consider each image and in following, questions about the images were asked. The researcher pointed on each attribute with his finger and asked questions as “does this factor influence the probability of you buying this food bag” and with probing “what about that one” and then point on next attribute “how about that one” without giving participants any leading questions which could bias the responses. The researcher listened carefully after repetitions and additional information. After each interview, the researcher listened to the record and wrote down analytic memorandums of themes to summarize the main findings. The memorandums were highlighted and how often participant mentioned the attributes and evaluated them. The groups were categorized in none-consumers, consumers and super-consumers and a summary of important attributes for each group analyzed.

**Data analysis.**

The approach of the grounded theory was used. The data was collected and coded as well as there were some questions that needed to be answered in the beginning. The data was read few times and attributes participants mentioned more often in the interview or talked highly about were coded. From the coding of the data, thematic analyze was made.

**Results**

**Study 1**

Table 3 displays the seven attributes and utility estimates as well as the most important values were ranked with a conjoint analysis.
Table 3

*Conjoint Impact Estimate and Relative Importance of Attributes.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes and levels</th>
<th>Utility Estimate</th>
<th>Importance Score</th>
<th>Importance Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low profile</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High profile</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None picture</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 Kcal</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Kcal</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kr. 3590</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>39.31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kr. 5490</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kr. 7490</td>
<td>-.759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity comment</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous comment</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Chicken</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Plumbed chicken</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbed chicken</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home delivery</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home delivery for 900 Kr.</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picked up</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingredients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Organic</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first column the attributes and levels are shown. The utility estimate scores are shown in the second column. The most significant attributes are displayed in the third column and given a rank from (1) to (7) in the fourth column as the most important value is ranked with (1) and the least important attribute is given a rank of
The contrary relationship between the utility estimate and the price was the most significant, when the price increased, the correspondence of utility decreased. This contrary relationship between the utility and the other attributes of picture, portions, reviews, meat, distribution and ingredients held true.

In figure 2 the average importance scores are analyzed for the seven attributes. From 1 to 7, the attributes and their levels were examined and an average importance score of the likelihood of purchasing a food bag measured. The highest importance score was the utilitarian stimuli price as the most influential attribute on overall preference with an importance score of 39.31. The second most influential attribute on overall preference with average importance score of 13.28 was picture, also a utilitarian attribute. The third highest attribute, also a utilitarian attribute was distribution with an importance score of 11.77. Other attributes were lower ranked as in meat with 11.37, reviews 9.61, portions 8.49 and ingredients as the least influential attribute on overall preference with an importance score of 6.17.

As table 3 shows there are three internal levels among each attribute excluding the attribute of ingredients, which have two. The levels of the attribute of portions were 1500 Kcal, 2000 Kcal and not mentioned.
Surprisingly when portion level was 2000 Kcal it slightly had negative effect on the consumers’ likelihood of purchasing the food bag with the motivation score of -0.027. When the portion was smaller, 1500 Kcal had almost none effect on the likelihood of purchasing (-0.001). With calories not mentioned the motivation score of buying the food bag was positive influenced (0.028). Having a celebrity comment in the image of the food bag had the highest motivational score of the attribute of reviews (0.024). No comment mentioned had a negative effect on the likelihood of purchasing the food bag (-0.025). Anonymous comment had almost no motivational impact (0.001).

In figure 3 the summary utility score of the attribute price is analyzed. The level that had the lowest price (3590 kr.) had the highest motivational score on consumer likelihood of purchasing of all attributes and levels observed in the study (0.745). The highest price on the food bag (7490 kr.) had the most negative effect on the likelihood of purchasing of all attributes and levels observed in the study (-0.759).
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Figure 3. The utility score of the utilitarian attribute of price.

The attribute of meat took three levels of stimuli. Non-plumbed chicken had the highest motivational score of the consumers’ likelihood of buying the food bag (0.060). Interestingly the happy chicken had reasonably positive effect on consumer likeliness with motivation score of 0.048. Plumbed chicken had negative effect on the likelihood of purchase with a motivation score of –0.108. The attribute of ingredients took two levels, organic or non-organic. Both of the levels had minor effect on the motivation of purchase with slightly more positive effect in organic ingredients (0.008) and negative effect in non-organic (-0.008).

In figure 4 the summary utility score of the attribute distribution is explained. The attribute of distribution had the second highest importance score on the consumers’ likelihood of purchasing the food bag. Free home delivery had the most positive motivation score (0.048). When consumers were appointed to pick up the food bag at the adjacent restaurant of Gló, it had negative effect on the motivation score of the likelihood of purchase (-0.062). Home delivery for standard 900 kr. had marginally positive effect on the likelihood of purchasing the food bag (0.014).
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Figure 4. The utility score of the utilitarian attribute of distribution.

The levels of the attribute of picture were low profile, high profile and no picture as figure 5 displays. The level of low profile had the most positive motivational score for the consumer in purchasing the food bag of all attributes (0.138) although the difference was not significant comparing to no picture which had slightly negative impact on purchasing the food bag. High profile had almost no influence on the consumer on the likelihood to purchase (0.012).

Figure 5. The utility score of the utilitarian attribute of picture.
Study 2

A summary of participants’ reviews was made for groups of non-consumers, regular consumers and super-consumers. Table 4 displays a compilation of responses for the groups, how they ranked the attributes and how often each group mentioned them on average.

Table 4
Summary of Results from the Interviews with Consumers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean ranking</th>
<th>Attributes mentioned</th>
<th>Comments summary for different groups of consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-consumer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Felt high profile picture most attractive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portions</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Portions of 2000 Kcal and low price was the most profitable for participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>Price was the most important factor to purchase or not to purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Influenced one participant of increased likelihood to purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Having the word “plumbed” mentioned had a negative affect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All participants felt that free home delivery was an important factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingredients</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Organic or non-organic had no affection at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular-consumer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>Picture of low profile was best describing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portions</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>Portions size was important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>All participants admitted that price was a superior factor of purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>Celebrity review would be better than no review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Less information of origin had the most positive affect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Was not one of the key factors for purchasing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingredients</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Did not care if it was organic or not but did not want foreign ingredients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super-consumer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Low profile picture better describing then high profile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portions</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Portions size did not matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Price was not a key factor for purchase if the food was of high quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Had no influence on participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>Non-plumbed had significant affection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Distribution was not important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingredients</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Icelandic pure vegetables would have a huge impact of the likelihood of purchasing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The evaluation of the most important attributes was based on what the participants expressed in the interviews, how often they mentioned each attribute and by the ranking they gave the attributes from 1 as the most important factor for purchase of the food bag to 7 as the least important factor.

**Picture.**

From the interviews it was construed from non-consumer participants that the attribute of picture were the second most important factor of buying the food bag. Regarding the level of high profile picture, the non-consumer group overall felt it had a positive effect on them. In the group of regular consumer, the level of low profile had the most positive effect on the likeliness to purchase because it described the contents of the food bag the best. For the group of super-consumers the attribute of picture was not a crucial factor for purchasing. However all the participants felt it was better to have picture than none at all and the low profile picture was more effective than the high profile picture.

**Portions.**

For the non-consumer group, portions were ranked the third most important attribute of purchasing the food bag. Non-consumers valuated portions sizes as the most important attribute when it increased from 1500 Kcal to 2000 Kcal. The regular consumer had a similar opinion, as portions were the third most important attribute. For super-consumers the attribute of portions was not a factor they considered of potential purchase.

**Price.**

The groups of non-consumers and regular consumers declared that attribute of price were the most important factor for purchasing. For super-consumers it was the fourth most important factor for purchase. The groups of regular- and non-consumers
were highly sensitive for the highest price of the food bag and all the participants declared negatively to purchase. Super-consumer group was not sensitive for higher price if the vegetables in the food were of high quality and “pure” with high nutrition as one participant of the group defined “purity”.

**Reviews.**

Anonymous reviews had smallest influence on participants in the groups of non-consumer and regular consumer. For super-consumer it had none effect at all. Celebrity reviews were always better than no review or anonymous review for group of regular consumers.

**Meat.**

A non-plumbed chicken was not an important factor for all of the groups. Participants felt they were negatively affected of reading, “plumbed”, although it was written “non-plumbed” on the images being shown. The level of happy chicken, participants claimed that it did not affect them. However for a super consumer, if the manufacture process was clean and the chicken was given “good food” (e.g., food with a quality nutrient), then the factor of importance was the second most important. Participants overall felt more positive when the meat was but too detailed information about the origin of the meat could have negative affection.

**Distribution.**

The free home delivery was high in importance for the group of non-consumers. Participants overall declared that they would much rather have it home delivered than picked up. For super consumers it was not an important factor at all.

**Ingredients.**

Ingredients of organic or non-organic had minimum influence on participants to purchase for groups of non- and regular consumers. Mean ranking for super
consumers on ingredients was the most important attribute for the participants to purchase the food if the ingredients were of Icelandic origin.

**Discussion**

The present study illustrated a quantitative and qualitative research using conjoint analysis and thematic analysis. In collaboration with the healthy food product company Gló, the attributes of a daily ration healthy food bag were examined in a behavioral perspective. Considering results from the two studies the motivational attributes were supported by previous studies on price.

Results from the conjoint analysis indicated that price was the most important factor to influence the consumers’ likelihood to purchase. Based on the rankings of utility there were picture as the second most important attribute, distribution as the third important, meat, reviews, portions and ingredients as the least important factor. Using conjoint analysis there was a contrary relationship between price and utility, as well for other attributes in the present study as indicated by recent conjoint analyze study in market segmentation (Menon & Sigurdsson, 2015). The utility score increased the likelihood of purchase of the food bag when the price decreased. Surprisingly the “real” price on the food bag from Gló, of 5490 kr., had marginally small influence on participants. These findings do support the hypothesis of price as the most influencing attribute for the consumers’ consequence of purchase and previous research on consumers’ price sensitivity (Wells et al., 2010).

With current study of qualitative research a categorization of consumers was performed. The groups of non-consumers and regular consumers mentioned price most often as the most important factor to increase the likelihood of purchase with price of 3590 kr. This inverse relationship of price and utility had also the most negative affect with the lowest utility of highest price of 7490 kr. Interestingly for the
super-consumer group, the lowest price could be an avoiding factor as participants claimed it could affect the quality of the food and was considered unrealistically low. These findings are also consistent with previous conjoint analysis research on attributes comparison in online consumer consumption where price had significantly more impact on the likelihood of purchase than customer reviews (Fagerstrøm & Ghinea, 2011). The findings of the current qualitative research improve the previous findings, as the super-consumer group was the least affective of celebrity- and anonymous comments. As conjoint analysis utility estimate indicates, containing an advertisement with either comments from celebrity or anonymous have more positive effect on consumers than having no comment at all. The findings from the conjoint analysis it was reckoned a non-plumbed chicken had positive effect on consumers as well as having the origin of the manufacture process of the chicken stated. However, when groups of regular consumers and non-consumers were required responses of the attribute of meat in the qualitative interviews, negative responses were common and individuals expressed that they would rather have no knowledge of the chicken’s origin. As well, observing the word “plumbed” had negative effect on the two groups. The group of super-consumers had the opposite opinion and felt it was necessary to have the details of the meat’s origin and ranked the attribute as the second most important factor.

Based on BPM, the three highest attributes of importance were all utilitarian reinforcements as the lowest price was the highest motivational factor, low profile picture the second highest and the third was a free home delivery. It is presumed by the present study and supported by previous findings that utilitarian reinforcement provides higher impact of utility to consumers than informational reinforcements as consumers experience an immediate economic benefits (Sigurdsson et al., 2013). As
paying less for a food bag and get food delivered for free, which saves individual’s time and finance. The application of the qualitative study 2 was to compare the three most motivational factors from conjoint analysis in study 1. The hypothesis of the present qualitative study was not supported, as there were different attributes that influenced variable groups to purchase healthy food. The group of non-consumers ranked price as the most motivational attribute for purchasing, following pictures and portions as second and third most motivational attributes. Regular consumers considered picture as the most motivational factor and price as the second most important. For super-consumers, price was ranked as the fourth most motivational factor, however it was mentioned most often out of all attributes in average. When enquiring participants for the importance in attributes of ingredients (organic or non-organic), interestingly all the four participants in super-consumer group expressed that those levels of ingredients were not important. However ingredients as Icelandic vegetables was a big factor of purchasing healthy food and foreign vegetables defined as an avoiding factor. This was discovered after the first interview of a participant in super-consumer group. Participants declared Icelandic vegetables were more “tasty”, “bigger” and “purer” and “more colorful”.

The new theme of “Icelandic vegetables” was found by interviewing participants in different groups of consumers and must be considered as an important factor, as either informational or utilitarian reinforcement. For super-consumers it was the most significant influential attribute of the consequence of purchase. The second most important attribute for super-consumers was informational attribute of meat were chicken was non-plumbed, plumbed or happy through the manufacture process. It is identified from the findings that the super-consumer group is much different from groups of regular consumers regarding emphasis on attributes.
The full profile approach operation in conjoint analysis has some limitations, as participant is overburden of tempting information forcing the respondent to simplify the task, execute it rapidly and discard the less important factors (Green & Srinivasan, 1978). Therefore, in certain circumstances it gives wrong image on the real life conditions whereas individuals have more time to prudent the product more carefully as well being motivated by other factors. The present qualitative study was limited with quite a few participants of twelve. Although researcher applied the interviews in modest way to avoid biased questions, it is difficult to be certain of that matter. When gathering data on information about price, participants in super-consumer group expressed that they were not sensitive for higher prices, however frequently mentioning price and often expressed themselves in contradiction. This seems to be an evidence of researchers’ presence during data gathering that responses were affected.

In reference to the present qualitative research, future studies should aim on categorizing groups of consumers using BPM to receive accurate information about aspects of informational and utilitarian attributes. “One size fits all” phrase is not applicable. For marketers and companies to generate online advertisements there are informational factors that increase more value as findings of the present study indicates. Future studies based on the current study should explore the super-consumer group more accurately with qualitative research method, with richer emphasis on valuation of domestic ingredients, foreign ingredients and price with a larger sample to generalize the population of super-consumers better.
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Appendix A

Stimuli cards and example from the online survey questionnaire
Appendix B

Questionnaire for Conjoint Analysis

1. Hver er aldur þínn?
   18 – 25 ára
   26 – 35 ára
   36 – 44 ára
   45 – 54 ára
   55 – 65 ára
   66 ára eða eldri

2. Hvert er kyn þitt?
   Kk.
   Kvk.

3. Hversu oft í viku stundar þú líkamsrækt eða aðra hreyfingu?
   Aldrei
   Einu sinni til tvisvar sinnum í viku
   Þrívar til fjórnum sinnum í viku
   Fimm til sex sinnum í viku
   Daglega

4. Hversu mikil er meðal notkun þín á internetinu á dag í klukkustundum (klst) á?
   0 – 2 klst. á dag.
   3 – 5 klst. á dag
   6 – 10 klst. á dag
   12 - 14 klst. á dag
   15 klst. eða oftar
5. Hversu líkleg/ur ertu að kaupa matarbakka frá Gló í gegnum heimasíðu þeirra www.glo.is?

Mjög líkleg/ur
Frekar líkleg/ur
Ekki viss
Frekar ólíkleg/ur
Mjög ólíkleg/ur

6. Hversu oft kaupir þú matarbakka frá Gló á internetinu á viku?

Aldrei
Einu sinni til tvisvar sinnum í viku
Þrisvar til fjórum sinnum í viku
Fimm til sex sinnum í viku
Daglega

7. Hversu líklegt eða ólíklegt er að þú kaupir matvöru í gegnum internetið á næstu sex mánuðum?

Mjög ólíklegt
Frekar ólíklegt
Veit ekki
Frekar líklegt
Mjög líklegt

8. Hversu oft kaupir þú skyndibita í hverri viku?

Aldrei
Einu sinni til tvisvar sinnum í viku
Þrisvar til fjórum sinnum í viku
Fimm til sex sinnum í viku
Daglega
9. Hversu mikilvæg er neysla hráfæðis í þínnum augum?

Mjög ómikilvægt
Frekar ómikilvægt
Hef ekki skoðun
Frekar mikilvægt
Mjög mikilvægt
Appendix C

Eyðublað fyrir upplýst samþykki

Rannsókn: Hegðun neytanda á vefmiðli

Tilgangur þessa eyðublaðs er að tryggja að þátttakandi skilji þaði tilgang rannsóknarinnar og hvert hans hlutverk er í rannsókninni. Eyðublað þetta verður að veita nýgur upplýsingar svo þátttakandi geti tekið upplýsta ákvöðun um þátttöku sina í rannsókninni. Vinsamlegast leiði til rannsakandans ef einhverjar spurningar vakna eftir leitur þessa eyðublaðs.

Boð um þátttöku:


Tilgangur:

Tilgangur þessarar rannsóknar er að skoða hegðun neytenda á hollum vörum á vefmiðlum, þannig má fá mikilvægar upplýsingar á hegðun neytenda og hvernig einstaklingar bregðast við hán og lágu vörugjaldi og skoða þannig hvort neysla eykst eða minnkar og hvort auglýsingar hafi áhrif á þá skynjun.

Verkefni:

Í rannsókninni verður þér sýndar vörur á netinu og þú sem þátttakandi átt að svara spurningum sem tengjast vörunni eftir bestu getu.

Þarf ég að taka þátt?

Þátttakandi hefur fullan ákvöðunarrétt um hvort hann tekur þátt í rannsókninni eða ekki. Ef þú ákveður að taka þátt færðu þetta eyðublað fyrir upplýst samþykki og beðin um að skrifá undir það. Þú hefur fullan rétt á að hætta þátttöku í þessari rannsókn hvener sem er.

Hversu lengi mun rannsóknin standa yfir?

Rannsóknin felur í sér 27 spurningar og áætlun að þátttökutími er 5-10 mínútur
Hver er minn ábati af því að taka þátt? Þú munt sem þátttakandi getur lært meira um þína kauphegðun með það að markmiði að spara tíma og peninga. Einnig færðu kjörid tökifæri til að læra meira um stærða markaðssetningu sem er talin ein af framtíðarleiðum í markaðsfraði og í senn vitundarvakningu.

Hverjar eru áhætturnar við að taka þátt?
Engin fyrirsjáanleg áhætta fylgir þáttöku í þessari rannsókn. Ef hins vegar þú finnur fyrir kvíða eða óþóægindum á meðan á rannsókn stendur, vinsamlegast láttu rannsakandann vita.

Hvern hef ég samband við ef mig vantaei upplýsingar?
Eftirfarandi aðili er starfandi við rannsóknina og má hafa samband við hann hvæna sem er ef þörf er á frekari upplýsingum varðandi þessa rannsókn: Brynjur Þór Hreggviðsson (brynjarh09@ru.is) og Ólafur Þór Jónsson (olafurtj12@ru.is).

Ég hef leiði ofantalda lýsingu á rannsókninni; neytendahegðun á hollustu vörum á vefmiðlum. Ég geri mér grein fyrir skilyrðum þáttöku minnar.

________________________
Dagsetning:____________________________________________
Nafn: _________________________________________________
Undirskrift rannsakanda:________________________________
Undirskrift þátttaka:___________________________________
Appendix D

Researchers’ questions for the qualitative interviews

Góðan dag, á eftir mun ég spyrja þig spurninga tengdar þremur myndum af kjúklingamatarbakka frá Gló af internetinu sem hefur mismunandi útfærslur. Fyrst vil ég fá að vita örstutt um þina kauphegðun.

1. Kaupir þú matvöru frá Gló?
2. Hversu oft í viku? En á mánuði?
3. Kaupiru skyndibita af vefsíðum
4. Kaupiru hollustuvörur (matvöru) á vefsíðum?
5. Kaupiru hollustuvörur af Gló á netinu?
6. Hvað er það í auglýsingu sem þér finnst skipta mestu máli fyrir þig þegar þú kaupir hollustufæði? Mátt nefna fleira en eitt

Hér verða þér sýnd þrjú skjáskot af kjúklingamatarbakka frá Gló. Við hverja mynd mun ég spyrja þig spurninga sem við kemur matarbakknum.

Fyrsta mynd sýnd

i. Myndir þú vera líkleg/ur til þess að kaupa þennan matarbakka?

ii. Hvað er það sem er aðilaðandí við þessa auglýsingu sem myndi ýta undir að þú myndir kaupa bakkann? En hvað er það sem er óaðilaðandí? Hversu máli skiptir þetta þér (bent á mynd) en þetta hér en þetta hér. Þannig halda áfram þangað til allir eiginleikar eru upprunir

iii. Hversu mikilvægt finnst þér þessi eiginleiki En þessi og koll af kolli

IV. Hvernig myndiru gefa einkunn á þá þætti sem þér þykir mikilvægastur að þú myndir kaupa maturbakkann, 1 sem mikilvægastur og 7 sem skiptir hvað minnstu máli? (þátttakanda bent á eiginleika)
Önnur mynd sínd

i. Myndir þú vera líkleg/ur til þess að kaupa þennan matarbakka?

ii. Hvað er það sem er aðlaðandi við þessa auglýsingu sem myndi ýta undir að þú myndir kaupa bakkann? En hvað er það sem er óaðlaðandi? Hversu máli skiptir þetta þér (bent á mynd) en þetta hér en þetta hér. Þannig halda áfram þangað til allir eiginleikar eru upprunir

iii. Hversu mikilvægt finnst þér þessi eiginleiki En þessi og koll af kollo

IV. Hvernig myndiru gefa einkunn á þá þætti sem þér þykir mikilvæ gastur að þú myndir kaupa matarbakkann, 1 sem mikilvæ gastur og 7 sem skiptir hvað minnstu máli? (þátt takanda bent á eiginleika)

Þriðja mynd sínd

i. Myndir þú vera líkleg/ur til þess að kaupa þennan matarbakka?

ii. Hvað er það sem er aðlaðandi við þessa auglýsingu sem myndi ýta undir að þú myndir kaupa bakkann? En hvað er það sem er óaðlaðandi? Hversu máli skiptir þetta þér (bent á mynd) en þetta hér, en þetta hér. Þannig halda áfram þangað til allir eiginleikar eru upprunir

iii. Hversu mikilvægt finnst þér þessi eiginleiki En þessi og koll af kollo

IV. Hvernig myndiru gefa einkunn á þá þætti sem þér þykir mikilvæ gastur að þú myndir kaupa matarbakkann, 1 sem mikilvæ gastur og 7 sem skiptir hvað minnstu máli? (þátt takanda bent á eiginleika)
Appendix E

Informed consent for qualitative interview

Rannsókn: Hegðun neytanda á vefmiðli

Tilgangur þessa eyðublaðs er að tryggja að þátttakandi skilji bæði tilgang rannsóknarinnar og hvert hans hlutverk er í rannsókninni. Eyðublað þetta verður að veita nægur upplýsingar svo þátttakandi geti tekið upplýsta ákvörðun um þátttöku sina í rannsókninni. Vinsamlegast leitið til rannsakandans ef einhverjar spurningar vakna eftir ledur þessa eyðublaðs.


Tilgangur: Verkefni þetta er í samvinnu við fyrirtækið Gló sem rekur veitingastaði og selur hollustuvörur í búðum og á netinu. Viðtal þetta er hluti af bSc verkefni Brynjórs Hreggviðsson sálfraðinema á þriðja ári. Tilgangur þessarar rannsóknar er að skoða hegðun neytenda á hollum vörum á vefmiðlum, þannig má fá mikilvægar
upplýsingar á hegðun neytenda gagnvart eiginleikum sem finna má við hverja vöru.

**Verkefni:** Í þessu viðtali verðar þér sýndar skjáskot af tilraunar auglýsingum Gló af netinu. Að því loknu verður þú spurði/ur um þá eiginleika sem þér þótti vera mikilvægastir í ljósi þinnar kauphegðunnar. Viðtalið verður hljóðritað á Ipad Air tæknibúnað. Fyllstu nafnleyndar verður gætt og munu svör viðmælanda eingöngu notað í rannsókn þessa.

**Þarf ég að taka þátt?**

Þátttakandi hefur fullan ákvörðunarrétt um hvort hann tekur þátt í rannsókninni eða ekki. Ef þú ákvæður að taka þátt færðu þetta eyðublað fyrir upplýst samþykki og beðin um að skrifa undir það. Þú hefur fullan rétt á að hætta þátttöku í þessari rannsókn hvenær sem er.

**Hversu lengi mun viðtalið standa yfir?**


**Hver er minn ábati af því að taka þátt?**

Þú munt sem þátttakandi getur lært meira um þina kauphegðun með það að markmiði að spara tíma og peninga. Einnig færðu kjörið tækifæri til að læra meira um stafðra markaðssetningu sem er talin ein af framtíðarleiðinum í markaðsfreiði og í senn vitundarvækningu.

**Hverjar eru áhætturnar við að taka þátt?**

Engin fyrirþjáanleg áhætta fylgir þáttöku í þessari rannsókn. Ef hins vegar þú finnur fyrir kviða eða óþægindum á meðan á rannsókn stendur, vinsamlegast láttu
Hvern hef ég samband við ef mig vantar meiri upplýsingar?

Eftirfarandi aðili er starfandi við rannsóknina og má hafa samband við hann hvenær sem er ef þörf er á frekari upplýsingum varðandi þessa rannsókn: Brynjar Þór Hreggiðsson (brynjarh09@ru.is).

Ég lef lesið ofantalda lýsingu á rannsókninni; neytendahegðun á hollustu vörum á vefmiðlum. Ég geri mér grein fyrir skilyrðum þátttöku minnar.

Dagsetning:____________________________________________

Nafn: _________________________________________________

Undirskrift rannsakanda: ________________________________

 Undirskrift þátttaka: ________________________________
Appendix F

Images for the qualitative interviews
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