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Abstract

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine what values influence Swedish consumers when purchasing tomatoes. Previous research shows that there are many factors and attributes that consumers choose from. These aspects included health, low price, labelling of products, knowledge of what labels stand for, trust in the information of the packaging and appearance of the product. The values that were investigated in this study were conceptualized by Geert Hofstede and Fons Trompenaars. They both have similar theories of national cultures, which they explained by making cultural dimension scales. These were based on values that can be identified in cultures. The cultural dimensions were individualism versus collectivism, masculinity versus femininity, high or low uncertainty avoidance, long or short-term orientation, how humans relate to the environment and individualism versus communitarianism. To investigate this, the following research questions were asked; (1) what factors/attributes are important to Swedish consumers when purchasing tomatoes, (2) what values are prominent in Swedish consumers and (3) what the relations between factors/attributes and values regarding Swedish tomato consumption are. In order to answer this, a survey was answered by 310 respondents. To understand why consumers value different factors/attributes, and possibly change consumption patterns, it is important to know what influences consumers. The results showed that the factors/attributes investigated proved to be more or less equally important no matter what pole of the different dimensions the respondents belonged to. Finally, some parts of the results did not correspond with previous research, the main difference was that low price was not considered as important as previous research showed.
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Abbreviations

COL - Collectivism
FEM - Femininity
HUA - High uncertainty avoidance
IND - Individualism
LTO - Long-term orientation
LUA - Low uncertainty avoidance
MAS - Masculinity
STO - Short-term orientation
UWCE - Unwillingness to control the environment
WCE - Willingness to control the environment
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1. Introduction

Unsustainable consumption is a global problem that has been discussed since the early 1990’s. Agenda 21 brought up the problem to the UN and ever since it has played a major role in the quest for achieving a sustainable world (UN, n.d.-a). During the UN top meeting in Johannesburg 2002 it was determined that sustainable consumption is required to reach a global sustainable society. However, there were no clear goals or plans adopted during this meeting (UN, 2002).

When the Sustainable Development Goals were adopted in 2015 many aspects that were not included in the previous Millennium Goals were added. Among those, is the goal about sustainable consumption and production. Along with many other aspects, this goal states that by 2030 we should have a sustainable management of all natural resources and that a 10-year plan should be created, action must be taken by all countries. However, the lead should be taken by the developed countries (UN, n.d.-b). This is reasonable since a major part of consumption takes place in the global north while much of the production sites are located in the global south. This is one of the few goals that Sweden is far from reaching (SDSN, 2018).

To reach this goal it is important to know what consumption looks like today. A lot of research has been done in the past to see what people are willing to do in order to change their consumption patterns. However, little is known about the values that affect people when grocery shopping. Values guide most people’s everyday life and revolve around us and influence us in ways that can be hard to describe for each person. Some of them, help people adapt to new things but some make individuals make subconscious decisions. This includes influencing and governing people’s consumption patterns in ways they are not aware of. It is hard to know what values influence certain consumption patterns and the choices people make in their regular shopping. This is important to know in order to reach a sustainable consumption in the future, and to promote sustainable consumption in today’s society.

Sweden has the resources and possibilities to reach SDG 12 within the set time frame. However, there is still a lot to be done. For a change to take place, the specific situation for Sweden has to be looked into which is what this study sets out to commence.

The tomato is one of the most common vegetables found in Swedish supermarkets and something that most people have bought sometime in their life. They can be bought all year round and grown naturally in Sweden during the summer months. The availability and the many different attributes of tomatoes make them a good product to investigate in Swedish consumption.

The consumption of vegetables has since 1980 to 2016 increased in Sweden. Since 1980 the consumption has doubled to 82 kilograms (Statens Jordbruksverk, 2017). This increase shows that the average Swede consumes more vegetables and thus, puts more strain on the environment.

In this study a survey was distributed to 310 Swedish consumers. The survey investigated tomato consumption, values that are prominent in the average Swede and the importance of different factors and attributes of tomatoes that Swedes take into consideration when purchasing tomatoes.
1.1 Purpose and research questions

The purpose of this study is to investigate what values influence Swedish consumers when purchasing tomatoes. This is important because there is no consensus on what values determine consumption patterns in Sweden.

Research questions:

- What factors and attributes on tomatoes are important to Swedish consumers when purchasing tomatoes?
- What values are prominent in Swedish consumers?
- What are the relations between factors/attributes and values regarding Swedish tomato consumption?

1.2 Tomato consumption in Sweden

In Swedish supermarkets, the offer of tomatoes is quite large. There are tomatoes from far away such as Spain and the Netherlands but also tomatoes that are grown locally or nationally during summer. Some are eco-labelled, some come in plastic boxes and some are simply not packaged at all. Some tomatoes, both the large ones and their smaller cousins, are still attached to their branches. However, in some cases the entire branch with its tomatoes are packaged in small plastic boxes.

A study conducted in 2013 about how the Swedish assortment of tomatoes should look like to fulfil the consumers’ demands, made an overview over the consumption in Sweden at the time. The most frequently bought was the cherry tomato from Spain followed by the red round tomato grown in Sweden. On third place came the vine tomato from the Netherlands (Karlsson, Olofsson & Ekelund, 2013).

1.3 Disposition

The first chapter in this study introduces the reader to the problem at hand and presents the purpose and research questions the study aims to answer. In chapter two a compilation of previous research follows which is structured according to what factors that proved to affect consumer choices in previous studies. Chapter two also presents the theories used in the study. After that, follows a motivation of the choice of method, how the material was conducted as well as method of analysis, and finally how the respondents were selected. The survey is also explained in detail, in chapter three. The results from the survey are presented in chapter four. In chapter five the analysis of the results are discussed followed by a short conclusion and discussion of further research in chapter six.

2. Previous research

Here, follows a presentation of previous research conducted in the field. First, relevant research on cultural behaviour is presented followed by aspects that have been found to be of great importance for consumers. Previous research shows many more aspects, but these are the ones that occurred
the most and are therefore further investigated in this study. The first aspect is cultural behaviour, followed by price, health, knowledge, product information, and trust. Thereafter theories of national culture from Geert Hofstede and Fons Trompenaars are presented.

2.1 Cultural behaviour

According to Minton, Spielmann, Kahle and Kim (2018) a culture’s pragmatism or normativism may influence the individual’s ability to adapt to sustainable consumption. A more pragmatic culture is not so “locked in” traditions and rules, these cultures are more prone to adapt to new ideas of sustainable development. Whereas a person with a normative culture would have a harder time truly embracing new ideas of sustainable development. They are often more concerned with how things “are supposed to be” and value their traditions more than pragmatic cultures. Furthermore, individuals are also influenced heavily by micro and macro groups of people. A macro group would be the group that surrounds the individual and “tells him or her what to do”. A micro group is the group that the individual is a part of, he or she is able to influence the group and is also influenced by it. The individual can sometimes be torn between these groups, making the ability to make choices harder. He or she may be expected to do certain things by the macro group that are conflicting with the micro group, or vice versa. The individual may also have a strong sense of pleasing the micro group in order to fit in better (Minton, Spielmann, Khale & Kim, 2018).

In today’s society, shopping can be a way of taking political action. An article that investigates Italian consumers’ thoughts when purchasing food discusses the phrases boycott and buycott. Boycott being when consumers choose not to buy something due to reasons such as wanting better salaries for workers, animal testing or environmental sustainability. Buycott on the other hand means the opposite; using choice of what you purchase to try and bring about a change (Sacchi, 2018).

2.2 Price and perceived value

The price of products is discussed in many articles as a factor that affects consumer choice. For example, an experiment made in Germany, that tested what was most important for consumers when purchasing tomatoes, showed that price was the most important factor for most participants, followed by locally grown tomatoes in the area, and after that grown within Germany. It also concluded that consumers put a high value to a product where the producer gets a fair pay (Meyerding, 2016).

Frostling-Henningsson, Hedbom and Wilandh (2014) conducted a study with the aim to investigate why Swedes do not buy organic or eco-friendly food even though they explain that they have intentions to do so. They focused the study on ethical and environmental concerns and strategies to cope with them. The study found some different ways so justify not buying organic or eco. The most common one, especially among households that were new to buying eco or organic, was that the price was too high, followed by confusion of too many and too complicated labels which resulted in consumers not caring at all. Next, comes distrust in labels. Some participants raised concerns of organic food not being as fresh as conventionally grown or that it might have bugs. This study also discussed the difference between eco-friendly and organic and the difficulties for consumers to choose between them. In many cases, organic products are eco-friendly, but the
participants raise a concern about transportation and packaging since they many times are not as eco-friendly as some conventionally grown products. They also discuss that organic farming is less efficient than conventional farming. The result also shows that parents are often affected by their children wanting them to buy organic.

There are also reasons for why customers in general are willing to pay a higher price for eco or organic labelled food and products. Organic food has been proved to be more appreciated if there are health benefits to gain or clear environmental advantages to it. (Linder et al., 2010).

2.3 Organic food and its health benefits

Health has been discussed to be one of the possible main motivators of “going green”, the other being concern for the environment. Many organic consumers go under the impression that organic products are healthier due to the avoided risks of pesticide residues in the products. Earlier reviews of published research have revealed that health reasons were the dominant drivers for choosing organic food and produce. Still, this is not an absolute truth. First of all, different cultures can perceive the benefits of organic food differently, second, how the questions and methods have been carried out in previous research affect the outcome of the results (Röös & Tjärnemo, 2011).

Bryła (2016) found that one of the main reasons for shopping organic products was that they were perceived to be healthier than conventional products, in the eyes of consumers in Poland. Health was found to be the second most important motive to Polish consumers for choosing organic products. However, price was the most important motivator for purchasing or not purchasing organic products. This largely coincides with a similar study conducted in Germany where the authors found that health was considered to be the third most important motive for purchasing organic food (Gotshalk & Leistner, 2012). Interestingly, researchers in Ireland found that another reason for shopping healthier, such as whole wheat bread, more vegetables and fruit and so on, was of concern for other family members, for example children and partners (O’Brien et al, 2013).

Goetzke, Nitzko and Spiller (2014) conducted a study that looks into if organic and functional consumption comes as a result of wanting to live healthy. ‘Functional food’, is the phrase they use for foods that can positively affect health, for example omega 3 enriched products or vitamin drinks. Health was identified as a very broad term and was therefore separated into two categories. Cognitive-emotional, meaning the perception of one’s own health in aspects of psychological, social, emotional and physical health, and health behaviour which means actions, habits and behaviour to sustain or achieve health, for example medical care. The study concludes that the cognitive-emotional category affects consumers to buy functional food more than it affects purchasing of organic food. It says that decreased cognitive health increases consumption of functional food, eating then becomes a strategy for people to feel better. When discussing consumption from the behaviour aspect, social commitment is said to be more crucial for organic consumption. Common reasons for consuming organic is stated to be environmental benefits, charity and altruism.

2.4 Lack of, or overload of, knowledge

Lack of knowledge seems to be one of the main reasons as to why consumers choose not to buy labelled food and produce. Consumers may have insufficient knowledge about climate change or
eco-labelled food. However, this does not necessarily mean that it is a lack of knowledge that makes consumers not choose the labelled wares. Sometimes it can be an information overload that is inhibiting the consumer in making sound and rational choices for the environment (Röös & Tjärnemo, 2011). If this happens, it was proven that most customers would choose according to which brand they preferred, instead of sustainability labels or other factors that otherwise would have affected their choice (Mancini, Marchini & Simeone, 2017).

An article written by Mancini, Marchini and Simeone (2017) examines the differences in thoughts about and awareness of sustainability in relation to food purchasing between a group of people with high level of education and a group with lower level of education. It showed, through focus group discussions, that the high education group was more sensitive and aware of environmental issues. Neither of the groups had any significant knowledge of trademarks or labels but they reacted differently to them when they were explained. The lower education group showed little interest in environmental problems while an interest arose in the higher education group. This shows a difference in knowledge that occurs as a result of socio-economic background, but lack of knowledge is also a problem amongst people with the same background.

Pieniak, Aertsens and Verbeke (2010) identified that subjective knowledge about organic vegetable consumption was shown to be very important. It was significantly, relatively strongly and directly associated with organic vegetable consumption, whereas objective knowledge was indirectly associated. This shows that the perceived reality (the subjective knowledge of the reality), and certainty and uncertainty, of organic vegetables is more important than the actual reality (the objective knowledge of reality). As such, more subjective knowledge about organic vegetables, and perhaps food in general, can raise the consumption of these products. The authors suggest that subjective knowledge about organic vegetables both directly increases the consumption of them, as well as indirectly through general attitudes towards these products (Pieniak, Aertsens & Verbeke, 2010).

One way for the government to spread knowledge about how to make good sustainable decisions as a consumer is through the school curriculum. An article by Gissievik, Wernersson, Åberg and Larsson (2016) investigates the development of and changes in the Swedish curriculum for Home and Consumer Studies. It starts with the curriculum from 1962 and finishes with the one from 2011. From the 60’s until the early 21’s century there was little focus on environmental sustainability. However, some things that we today would classify as environmentally friendly were taught, for example how to preserve food, but it was done from a different perspective. The economical aspect was taken into account much more frequently. In 2011, the phrase sustainable development was incorporated into the curriculum for the first time, it was however not properly defined. Overall, the authors see a steady improvement since the early 60’s but they also identify problems with the 2011 curriculum where further improvement needs to be made.

A study very similar to the earlier mentioned German study of consumers choice of tomatoes was conducted, also, in Germany about purchasing patterns, important attributes and knowledge before purchasing asparagus. In this study participants got to research different types of asparagus in a pre-designed program. The study investigated what attributes were customers looked for the most and how quick decisions were made. It was found that origin, not the price as in the case with tomatoes, proved to be most important, then followed by price and production. Sustainability
information, however, had much lower importance. According to this study, it takes longer for parents with children younger than 18 years old to make their decision which was discussed to be a result of wanting to provide the best possible option in all aspects to children (Lambert, Menrad, Emberger-Klein, 2017).

2.5 Improving product information and labels

Another thing that comes up in previous research is the discussion of labels. Labels in the sense of environmental friendly, ecological, fair trade. However, carbon labelling appears most frequently. Questions are raised about if it is an efficient label, if it helps people in their decision-making or not and how it can be improved. Many (e.g. Röös & Tjärnemo, 2011; Vanclay, et.al, 2011) articles indicate that carbon labels often are too complicated and need to be improved and simplified in order to help the consumer. Eco-labels also occur often. One article discussed whether eco-labels add to the perceived quality of the product or not. The overall answer is that the label affects perceived quality. However, it depends on the brand of the product. Brands that already have a good reputation gain less from eco-labelling than those with bad reputation. The study shows that consumers perceive the quality of a product with an eco-label from a bad reputation brand as much better than a product from the same brand without label. This is contrary to if a brand with good reputation uses the label since it proved to barely make any difference at all for the quality. The same pattern was seen in the expected taste; greater improvement for bad reputation brands. The article also states factors that affect eco-labelling negatively; increased price compared to non-labelled products, visual appearance, trust to the label and what it stands for and perceived value of the label (Larceneux, Benoit-Moreau & Renaudin, 2012).

Another experiment was conducted in 2016 to see how much consumers were willing to pay for a not yet introduced (at the time of the study) label called Product Ecological Footprint (PEF). The PEF is a way for ecological labelling at the production level and addresses some of the criticism previous eco labels had, such as not accounting for production waste and unsustainable production activities. In doing so, it moves away from the more traditional “carbon emission” approach from previous labels. The researchers examined the Willingness to Pay (WTP) of organic purchasers and non-organic purchasers of products with the PEF label. The study concluded that there is an interaction between organic purchasers and the PEF. However, they put no value on the label since they already are shopping organic foods and produce. Non-organic purchasers preferred no PEF label and they have a WTP for lower PEF (Limnios et. al., 2016).

2.6 Consumer trust and product credibility

Distrust in labels also heavily influence the consumer in decision making when purchasing food. Distrust can be linked with lack of knowledge in some cases, as little knowledge of a specific label may result into thinking that it is not trustworthy. However, distrust can also be due to a product of a badly marketed label and a label that has had some backlash. It may also be as simple that the consumer does not believe in one, or all labels (Feucht & Zander, 2018). One thing many articles came back to is the knowledge of what different labels entail. This is also closely related to if consumers trust the labelling or not.
Larceneux, Benoit-Moreau and Renaudin (2012) discusses greenwash in connection to eco-labels. Many brands use phrases such as “100% natural”, “more sustainable” and “sustainable choice” which leads people to believe a product is good while a certified eco-labelled product would be much better. This phenomenon has become more and more common and consumers have become aware of it, but the result is many times that they get suspicious about the certified label as well.

A study conducted in Australia discusses different ways labelling affects consumers’ trust in actors of food production and selling, such as the government, marketing departments and food system as a whole. It states that labels can be used both to create trust in the labeller as well as that trust in the labeller can lead to trust in the label. All participants expressed that labels are a way for the food industry to communicate with the consumers. Concerns were however raised about if the producers actually cared for the consumer or if what their labels said were designed to give the greatest economic benefit or guard the company for scandals. The last mentioned referred to labels including a “may contain…” part. The study concludes that labels can be used to build trust but then the label itself have to seem trustworthy or the opposite will happen. One of the interviewed persons in this study gave an example of when this was the case, a product was labelled with 99% fat free which only made the consumer think more about what that 1% actually is (Tonkin, Webb, Coveney, Meyer & Wilson, 2016).

Trust in labels is central to the purchasing of sustainable products and environmentally friendly alternatives. It has been shown that consumer trust has a powerful impact on attitudes on the marketplace. Consumers are much less likely to adopt a positive attitude when there are suspicions of deceitful messages, or “greenwashing”. Something that is important to note is that it is not only consumer trust that is highly important but also message credibility about labels. Both these claims fall under the same category of credence claims. Many product claims, such as eco-labelling and sustainability, can be verified through information searches and personal experience. Message credibility, on the other hand, must be accepted as truthful when consumers hear or read about them (Atkinson & Rosenthal, 2014).

2.7 Dimensions of national culture

This section of the study presents theories about culture, and how values affect them, from professors Geert Hofstede and Fons Trompenaars. These theories were chosen because they are well known and prominent in their field and can be applied in the Swedish context. The cultural theories are presented in relation to the aspects identified in the previous research and sustainable consumption behind consumer choices.

2.7.1 Hofstede’s dimensions of national culture

Professor Geert Hofstede has in collaboration with Gert Jan Hofstede and Michael Minkov developed six dimensions of culture in order to define national cultures. These dimensions include common values in cultures. Hofstede et. al gathered data from more than 70 countries between the years 1967 and 1973. They then created a tool, in the form of scales, for comparison between different nations. There was one scale for each dimension, where the end pole of each scale represented extremes of each dimension (Hofstede Insights, n.d.). In this study only four of the six dimensions were used: Individualism versus collectivism, masculinity versus femininity, uncertainty
avoidance and long versus short term orientation. These were chosen because they were seen as relevant and applicable to the studying of lifestyle choices regarding sustainability.

**Individualism versus collectivism**

This dimension investigates how a person makes his or her decisions, according to what will benefit the individual the most or what will benefit the group. In a collectivist culture a person’s identity is closely connected with the group’s identity. This can be described through the ties that connect people. In an individualistic society ties are loose and few, whilst in a collectivist society ties are strong and many. A person living in a collectivist society is dependent on the group he or she is a part of. This group has its starting point in the family the child grows up with, which in such a culture often include more distant relatives than in individualistic societies. Children in a collectivist society will learn to think of themselves as a “we-group”, also called in-group, and people who are not a member of that group will automatically be classified as they, the outgroup. In an individualistic society on the other hand, children will learn early to think of themselves as an “I” in a way that is separate from anyone else. To establish this “I” it is important to be able to create your own opinions at an early stage in life or children will be considered to have weak character, whilst in a collectivist culture, being different from the group, can be seen as wrong (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).

Living in close connection with many people, as in collectivistic societies, will result in not only affecting more people with your own choices but being affected by others. Meaning that lifestyle choices one person wants to make, can be hindered by the group as a whole not wanting to do so. However, it also affects the other way around (Ibid). If most people in the group want to live healthy and environmentally friendly so will the rest.

**Masculinity versus femininity**

Masculinity versus femininity should not to confused with the ideology feminism. This dimension focuses on characteristics of cultures regarding masculine and feminine characteristics and values. In a masculine culture status is very important as well as your earnings, the recognition you get for what you perform, having a challenging work, and the ability to advance in your carrier. Femininity on the other hand, values healthy relationships, cooperation, secure employment and a good living situation for themselves and their family (Ibid).

When it comes to shopping there are also some clear differences which are strongly connected with the relationship between the man and the woman in a household and the importance of status. In a feminine society men and women share the responsibility of food purchasing and more products for the home are bought than in a masculine society where status is much more important. The woman is often the one responsible for food and the man for items that will add to his or the family’s status, such as cars (Ibid).

Being restrained when shopping and only buying what you need and what is practical for the individual or the family, are characteristics of feminine cultures. These are also, in some cases, evidence of sustainable consumption. Sustainable consumption can be prominent in masculine cultures, but it largely depends on what is considered to have more status. Sustainable consumption can have a
high status in these societies and would in this case play a big role. However, masculine cultures usually have unsustainable consumption patterns and there is a tendency to spend money in order to show status, which can lead to over-consuming (Ibid.).

**Uncertainty avoidance index**

Uncertainty avoidance deals with a culture’s way of handling the fact that we cannot predict the future and to what extent people try to control the future. In strong uncertainty avoidance countries people will make lifestyle choices that attempts to control the future while uncertainty accepting countries will not have the need to do so to the same extent (Ibid). Making choices that ensures a stable future would involve following science and current recommendations from experts.

When it comes to shopping, high avoidance countries tend to value basic products, purity and cleanliness while uncertainty accepting countries look for convenience. Purity can be connected with often choosing to buy organic whenever possible. Since organic products are often connected with not having any unnecessary substances that may or may not affect the consumer or the environment in the future, and it is also linked to better health than conventionally grown produce. Contrary to this the uncertainty accepting countries might care more about the convenience of price and access (Ibid).

**Long versus short-term orientation**

This dimension brings forward how different cultures take action in accordance to time. Long-term oriented cultures focus on the future and short-term oriented cultures care more about the past and present. Long term cultures tend to focus more on achieving slow results that will have good outcome further ahead, compared to the short term that wants to see quick results. Short-term oriented cultures also strive more to preserve traditions from the past and values personal stability while long term oriented are more concerned about economic stability, savings and the possibility to adapt oneself to coming situations. It is more common in short term cultures that there is a greater social pressure towards spending (Ibid).

Long term cultures usually plan for the future and adapt to crises before they arise. Sustainable consumption and development come more naturally to these cultures as it is more natural for them to adapt to new things and see the risks in the future. They also have less tight connections with their traditions which further increases their ability to adapt into lifestyles that might be necessary in the future. Short-term oriented cultures might struggle here since they have to preserve their traditions and lifestyles from previous generations (Ibid).

**Sweden according to Hofstede**

The score of 71/100 on the dimension of individualism makes Sweden an individualistic society meaning that being independent is important and you are only responsible of taking care of yourself and your closest family. The low score of 5/100 makes Sweden the lowest scoring country on the masculinity dimension, making it a feminine society. Sweden is on the lower part of uncertainty avoidance, 29/100, which implies a more relaxed society and what is done means more than principles about it. Innovation is seen as something positive. Sweden, scores in the middle, 53/100, of
the scale of long term orientation which means that no direct conclusion can be drawn (Hofstede Insights, n.d.).

### 2.7.2 Trompenaars’ dimensions of national culture

Fons Trompenaars developed similar culture dimensions as Hofstede but with some minor differences. Trompenaars’ model focuses at helping business meetings across cultures, and to prepare people of the differences they may face when communicating with different cultures. In his model, five dimensions explain different characteristics of cultures. Trompenaars also gives explanations of how different cultures perceive time and handles the environment around them (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Only two of Trompenaars dimensions were used to complement the four used from Hofstede, *how humans relate to the environment and individualism versus communitarianism.*

**How humans relate to the environment**

The environment is viewed in different ways by different societies and cultures. Some cultures see the environment as an obstacle or something to be conquered. Controlling the environment can be done by imposing your own will and needs over it. Other cultures view the environment as something that we should adapt to. Humanity is a part of the environment and must follow her laws and forces in order to prosper (Ibid.).

Trompenaars (1997) identified two different orientations that cultures take when dealing with nature and the environment. The first is called inner-directed, these cultures tend to identify with mechanisms. In other words, the organisation is viewed as a machine and will obey its operators. The second is called outer-directed and instead views an organisation as a product of nature itself. The organisation owes its nutrients and development to the environment.

Opting for control or no control over the environment is central in the path to sustainable development. Societies that opt for control would try and impose their own will upon the environment (Ibid). With the research questions in mind, sustainable consumption in these societies would most likely reflect the same thing, solving problems for a short period of time as they come up. People would have little interest in purchasing products that are sustainable and cutting back on their consumption. Societies that opt for less, or no control, would find it more natural to make investments for the environment. In helping and preserving the environment they would instead get something back in the long run (Ibid). People in societies like these would most likely be keener to buying sustainable products and organic food.

**Individualism versus communitarianism**

Societies and cultures deal with the individual and the community in different ways. In some, there is a larger focus on individual development and self-interests and in others there is a focus on the community and the needs of others. Perhaps the most noteworthy difference between these two is the fact that in individual cultures, people generally focus on improving their own lives by improving themselves. Whereas in communitarian cultures, improving the community, and your fellow mans’ lives, will eventually improve your personal life (Ibid.).
Individualism has many times been regarded as a characteristic of a modernising society. Sustainability is a characteristic of a modernized society, new innovations and the economic possibilities to invest more in green products. Communitarianism on the other hand has been associated with more ‘traditional’ societies and the fall of many communist regimes. Communitarian societies are more inclined in making lifestyle choices that benefit all, possibly sustainable choices. The reason as to why individualism has been considered as the rise of modernisation can be the fact that “I” is capitalized in the English language. This, of course, has to be considered a cultural belief and not a fact. Great Britain has in the past influenced, or indeed controlled, most of the world, so the spread of the capital letter “I” and the emergence of the individual has gone on for a long time. The individual and the society has changed considerably since the Renaissance, at least in the West (Ibid.).

What differs Trompenaars’ dimension on individualism and communitarianism from Hofstede’s (individualism and collectivism) is mainly that Trompenaars has included some economic factors. Trompenaars focuses on how businesses can communicate across cultures, thus there is a focus on managers and their employees in their corporations. It can be difficult to apply these “business cultures” on national cultures, but this dimension offers some insight that Hofstede’s does not (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997; Hofstede Insights, n.d.).

**Sweden according to Trompenaars**

Sweden is a somewhat individualistic country where “alone time” is valued and there is a focus on one’s personal life rather than that of others. However, in many cases Sweden is also communitarian, such things as incentives for raising money for others is not uncommon for Swedish people to take part in (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997). Finally, very few people in Sweden believe they can control nature and the environment and believe instead that the things that happen to them is their own doing (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997).

**2.8 Summary of previous research and definitions**

What has been discussed in the previous part have been factors/attributes that may be important for consumers. The ones that were seen as the most important were selected to be used in the survey in order to answer the first research question, what factors/attributes are important to Swedish consumers when purchasing tomatoes. These factors/attributes were; health, low price, labelling, knowledge of what labels are and what they stand for and trust in the information on the packaging. The six cultural dimensions that were presented were used to answer the second research question, which values are prominent in Swedish consumers.

In order to clarify the factors/attributes, these definitions were used:

*Culture* is a framework for how to make decisions and act in life shared by a group of people. It consists of values, norms, religion, roles in the family, worldviews, traditions, shared experiences, geographic region and many other aspects of life (Liu, Volcic & Gallois, 2015).
Values are a part of societies, groups, cultures or organisations. They are learned, general, lasting, goal-oriented tendencies that help actors to choose between different actions. Values both state what is important and how it is important (Stier, 2015).

Health in this study will be used following the definition from the World Health Organization (WHO). It states that health is not only a question of illness and absence of disease but to have good health there has to be a state of social, physical and mental well-being (WHO, 2006).

Sustainable consumption as defined in the Oslo Symposium 1994 regards the use of services and related products that respond to the basic needs of human lives and bring about a better quality of life. At the same time minimizing the use of natural resources and toxic materials, emissions of waste and pollutants over the entire life cycle of a product and not jeopardizing the needs of future generations (UN, n.d-c).

Labels in this study refer to different product labels that are put on tomatoes to help the consumer in making environmental friendly choices, such as eco-labels. Social labels like the Fairtrade mark has been mentioned in previous research, however, this is not relevant in this study as the Fairtrade label is non-existent on tomatoes in Sweden.

3. Method

In this chapter, choice of method is described as well as the selection of respondents, distribution of the survey, delimitations, and method of analysis of the collected data material.

3.1 Choice of method

This is a quantitative study where the data material was gathered through an online survey consisting of 19 questions. The advantages of a quantitative method are the fact that it is easier to generalize from such studies, and the numbers provide measurable results. Quantitative studies also offer an insight as to why things are the way they are which is important in this study (Bryman, 2014).

The survey was divided in four parts; background questions about the respondents, general questions about the respondents’ tomato consumptions, and finally respondents rated the importance of different factors/attributes on tomatoes for their choices of consumption. Such factors/attributes regard aspects of health, price, (lack of or overload of) knowledge of labels, labelling of tomatoes, trust in the information on the packaging and appearance of the tomatoes (see appendix). The survey way distributed via Google’s survey platform Google Surveys. This platform allows authors to reach many respondents in a short time, without having to pay for the service. Google Surveys was chosen as this is an easy way to get an adequate survey platform and because it is very easy to use and access.

The first two questions of the first part treated if you live in Sweden, and for how long, to make sure that the respondents fit the target group. This was followed by questions about age, sex and education in order to see if there are any significant differences between respondents. The second part consisted of questions designed to investigate which of the poles in each of the cultural dimensions, as defined by Hofstede and Trompenaars, the respondents belong to. Each of the questions included four statements, where two of the statements represented one pole of the dimension.
The first question was about individualism and collectivism. The two individualistic statements were: To control my own life choices is the most important to me and The most important to me is that I have achieved something of value. The collectivistic were: How others are affected by my choices is the most important to me and my family and friends are the most important to me. The second question regarded masculinity and femininity. Masculine statements were: I prioritise income before leisure time and I buy the trendiest things. The feminine statements were: I prioritise leisure time before income and I buy the most convenient things. Uncertainty avoidance was investigated in the third question. High uncertainty avoidance was represented in these statements: Rules are important and I worry about the future. The low uncertainty avoidance statements were: Rules are obstacles and I do not worry about the future. The forth question was about long and short-term orientation. The long-term oriented answers were: I live in the present and plan for the future and I prefer slow results that may favour me or others in the future. The short-term answers were: I want quick result where I immediately see a difference and It was better in the past. The final question answered if the respondents were willing to control the environment or not. The respondents who were willing to do so answered: I think that humans should control natural phenomenon’s like weather and natural disasters or The nature has its own cycle and will not be affected by humans. The persons not willing to control the environment answered: I see humanity as part of the natural environment or What I do affects the environment. When the statistics were calculated, the statements for each pole of the dimension were put together in order to show one combined number for each pole.

The third part regarded tomato consumption. Respondents were asked how often they buy tomatoes followed by a question of how often they eat tomatoes. These two questions were relevant to see if the person actually buys and eats tomatoes on a regular basis. Since there was a possibility that people buy tomatoes but not eat them themselves, a third question was added to see for whom they buy tomatoes.

In the fourth and last part of the survey, respondents had to determine the importance of different aspects when purchasing tomatoes. They had to rate aspects on a five-grade scale where one was not important at all and five was very important. The aspects used in the survey were chosen for their relevance in previous research: health, labels, low price, knowledge of what labels stand for and trust in information on packaging. In addition to these, appearance was added as it had been suggested by the respondents in a pilot survey as a relevant factor.

3.2 Selection of respondents

This study focuses on Swedish consumers. Therefore, a question about how long the respondents have lived in Sweden was included. However, Swedish does not refer to being an ethnical Swede, instead, it refers to individuals having lived long enough in Sweden to be influenced by the culture. Since the 1970’s, when Hofstede conducted his study, Sweden has received many immigrants (Statistiska centralbyrån, n.d-a) who brought their culture with them into the Swedish context (Immigranternas riksförbund, 2013). The limit was set to four years of residing in Sweden since that is the amount of years refugees and stateless immigrants have to live in Sweden before they can apply for a Swedish citizenship (Migrationsverket, 2017).

The survey was first distributed via internet and social media and then through personal contacts of the authors. It is advantageous to use social media to reach out to as many people as possible all
over the country. To make sure that the population was evenly represented the survey was supplied to a wide variety of people, from different age groups and with different interests (Bryman, 2014). Internet surveys were considered a valid method that would reach the desired population since most Swedes have access to internet in one way or another.

The survey was filled in by 310 respondents. The number of respondents of the survey was not large enough to generalize across the total population of Sweden. 18 respondents were disqualified due to not living in Sweden or not purchasing tomatoes.

![Diagram 1](image.png)

When these 18 respondents were deleted from the statistics the demographics of the participators were analysed. The group consisted of more women than men, 70.6% women and 29% men (only one person preferred not to specify gender). There was a good spread of ages (diagram 1). The range 16-24 years was slightly overrepresented. The low number of respondents younger than 15 was not considered a problem since young people rarely are responsible for food purchasing.
The level of education had a more uneven spread than the age (diagram 2). Most people had high school as their highest level of education, 48%, followed by an almost equally high number of university degrees. Both elementary school and vocational university had few responses, 5% each, as well as the option “other” with only 2%. Compared with figures presenting the Swedish level of education from Statistics Sweden from 2017 theses numbers differs somewhat. According to Statistics Sweden (Statistiska centralbyrån, n.d.-b) 12% of the Swedes had finished elementary school, 23% high school, 15% had a degree from a vocational university or an equivalent degree and 27% had at least a three-year university degree. The figures differ somewhat, this might be due to the fact that Statistics Sweden did not include the option “other”.

3.3 Method of analysis

For the analysis of the results, the method univariate analysis (UA) has been used. UA is an easy way of presenting data where only one variable at a time is analysed. (Hjerm, Lindgren & Nilsson, 2014). This method was used in order to answer the two first research questions, what factors/attributes that are important to Swedish consumers and which values are prominent in Swedish consumers.

In order to answer the third research question, the results were put into the program Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Here, the results from the questions regarding culture and the different values within a culture, and the factors and attributes rating scales were compared via crosstabs. These crosstabs showed the relationship between the values within a culture and what people in the different dimensions considered to be of importance. An overview over what each group found to be more or less important can be seen in the appendix.

At the same time as the crosstabs were made they were also put through a Chi square test to test the level of significance. It was decided that numbers below 0,1 would be considered to have good significance and the numbers between 0,1-0,2 would be looked at with restraint, these results can contribute to the investigated area, but no clear conclusions were drawn from these.
3.4 Validity and reliability

Validity is perhaps the most important thing to have in mind when conducting research. The term regards how well researchers measure what they set out to do (Hjerm, Lindgren & Nilsson, 2014). How well a term or question mirrors what it says it will is central to the validity. For example, if researcher want to investigate consumption patterns, each question must ask how often respondents buy an item, not how often they use it (Bryman, 2011).

When categorizing the respondents in the five cultural dimensions, it was easy to maintain a high reliability since the dimensions were well explained by the original authors (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005; Trompenaars, 1997). The statements that respondents had to choose from, all mirrored each dimension, making the categorizing process much easier, as well as giving reliable results.

Reliability regards whether the research can be conducted once more and if the result will be similar. Reliability is particularly important when conducting quantitative research since it is important that researchers measure what they set out to do. It is closely related to validity. If the aim is to investigate consumption patterns via a survey it is vital that the survey asks the right questions, so that the same respondent can give the same answer two times. Other researchers in the future should also be able to conduct the exact same study once more and receive the same results (Bryman, 2011; Hjerm, Lindgren & Nilsson, 2014).

In this study, the research questions were based on aspects found in previous research that were important to consumers. As such, no completely new aspects were needed to be found and defined. This strengthens the reliability of the study considerably since these attributes/factors had been researched extensively and were easy to formulate and understand for respondents.

Surveys may be less valid or reliable since some respondents are uninterested in answering truthfully or answer jokingly on each question (Bryman, 2011). However, the survey in this study was very straightforward and quite short, eliminating many unserious answers.

In order to strengthen the validity and reliability of the study even further, a pilot survey was distributed to eight people who could all suggest things to add, improve or remove parts of the survey.

4. Result

This chapter presents the results of the survey. First, the results of the first research question, about what attributes are important of the tomato for the consumer are presented along with an analysis of previous research. Next, the results of the question regarding what culture values govern Swedish consumers, together with an analysis of the value theories presented earlier. Finally, a comparison between the cultural dimensions and the attributes and factors of tomatoes are presented to answer the last research question, the relationship between attributes and factors and Swedish values.

4.1 Attributes of tomatoes

This part answers the first research question, what factors/attributes are important to Swedish consumers. Diagrams are presented before their corresponding paragraph.
The aspect of tomatoes that received the highest response rate on “very important” was the appearance of the tomatoes (diagram 3). This proves that Swedish consumers take this aspect into account when purchasing tomatoes. The appearance also received many responses on the “important” option.

Diagram 3

Trust in information on the packaging of the tomatoes had the same response rate on the “very important” option as appearance had. Trust also received many responses on the “important” option (diagram 4). Trust in labels has been discussed in previous research as one of the main motivators for purchasing organic food and eco-friendly products. In some cases, lack of trust can be linked with lack of knowledge of what labels stand for (Feucht & Zander, 2018). Greenwashing also influence trust in many ways as branding products as “100% natural” and “more sustainable”,

Diagram 4
generally does not give a trustworthy image of a label (Larceneux, Benoit-Moreau & Renaudin, 2012).

**Diagram 5**

Healthiness of tomatoes received most responses on the “important” option but very few picked the “very important” option (diagram 5). It did, however, rank high on the “neither” option. Röös and Tjärnemo (2011) found that organic products are perceived as healthier than non-organic products. Avoiding taking in harmful pesticides was perceived as healthier for consumers. Health was also found to be one of the main drivers for choosing organic products for polish consumers (Bryła, 2016). The same can be said about German consumers who also found the health aspects of organic foods to be of great importance (Gotshalk & Leistner, 2012).

**Diagram 6**

How important is it that you have knowledge of the label?
Knowledge of what the labels stand for received many responses in the important options, as seen in Diagram 6. Lack of knowledge can be due to an overload of knowledge, consumers usually find it hard to sort the knowledge they are given and end up being confused and unable to make rational choices (Röös & Tjärnemo, 2011). In these circumstances consumers usually choose the brand that they are familiar with (Mancini, Marchini & Simeone, 2017). The subjective knowledge of reality, in this case about organic products, has been proven to be more important than the objective knowledge of organic products. An increase of subjective knowledge can raise the consumption of sustainable products (Pieniak, Aertsens & Verbeke, 2010).

Diagram 7

Low price on tomatoes proved to be neither important nor unimportant for Swedish consumers, the “neither” option received. As can be seen in diagram 7, the diagram has a Gaussian distribution, which means that no clear conclusions can be drawn. Researchers in Germany found that price was very important to consumers when purchasing food (Meyerding, 2016). Many times, organic and sustainable food is more expensive than conventional food and this sometimes deters consumers from choosing these options (Limnios et. al., 2016).
Labelling on tomatoes was also ranked high on the importance scale. Diagram 8 shows that the most picked option for this aspect was the “important” option followed by the “neither” option. However, there was also a considerable amount of responses in the “very important” option. Labels have been described in previous studies as complicated and need to be simplified for consumers in order to help them (Vanclay, et.al, 2011). Labelling on different brands have different impacts on the choice the consumer makes. Brands that have a bad reputation can gain a lot from an eco or social label, whereas brand with good reputation generally do not gain as much. They are already perceived as a good quality brand (Larceneux, Benoit-Moreau & Renaudin, 2012).

**4.2 Cultural dimensions**

Here follow the results that answer the second research question, what values are prominent in Swedish consumers.

The results show that the statistics gathered from the question designed according to Hofstede’s dimension on masculinity versus femininity is the one that correlates the best with what Hofstede concluded about the Swedish culture. 82% picked the options in the survey that were feminine in nature, 18% choose one of the two masculine alternatives. Sweden scores 5/100 on masculinity according to Hofstede which is a slightly lower number than in this study, but that material is conducted in a larger group.

In the question about how humans relate to environment it showed, much like what Trompenaars found, that Swedes put a high value on the environment and find it important to protect it while 21% wanted to control it. 93% of the respondents in this study picked the options that said that humanity affects the environment and should not try to control it.

In this study it showed that Swedes are somewhat individualistic, however not as much as Trompenaars and Hofstede see. 57% correlates well with Trompenaars 60% and 66% but differs more to Hofstede’s 71%. Long-term orientation also correlated bad with Hofstede’s results. 70%
of the respondents were found to be long-term oriented through the survey conducted in this study whereas in Hofstede’s results there was no clear answer to if the Swedes are long termed or short termed since they score in the middle of his scale.

The dimension that correlated the least was uncertainty avoidance where the results in this study showed that 70% had a high uncertainty avoidance while Hofstede’s results showed only 29% to be uncertainty avoiding which would make Sweden a fairly uncertainty accepting country.

4.3 Values correlating with consumption

This section shows the crosstab results between values and factors/attributes. This was done in order to answer the third research question, what are the relations between factors/attributes and values regarding Swedish tomato consumption. Tables 1 – 5 show a compilation of the gathered data material. The numbers at the top of the table indicate the importance. 1 = “not important at all”, 2 = “less important”, 3 = “neither”, 4 = “important”, 5 = “very important”.

Some of the crosstabs showed a higher Chi square number than what is considered to be acceptable. This high Chi square might be due to the fact that the number of respondents were too low to see any true relations between values and the factors/attributes. An acceptable Chi square is 0.05 – 0.1 which 1/3 of the crosstabs in this study achieved. For the results, only the crosstabs that achieved an acceptable Chi square will be presented, the ones that did not will be presented but they will not be analysed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors/attributes</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labels</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of labels</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low price</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information trust</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Correlation between individualism vs. collectivism and factors/attributes

The relationship of health and individualism versus collectivism showed that there were some differences between collectivistic and individualistic people. The main difference was that collectivists had less “not important” answers than the individualists (Table 1). Combining the “less important” and “not important at all” options, collectivists had 16% and the individualists 26%, indicating that the health aspect was of less importance to them than the collectivists. Individualists were more spread out over the scale; however, the majority of the respondents picked the “neither” and the “important” option. In general, collectivist seemed to regard the health aspect on tomatoes as
slightly more important than the individualists. The “important” option received 34% for the collectivists and 33% for the individualists, making it no clear difference. However, the “very important” option received 15% for the collectivists and 12% for the individualists, making the total of respondents that considered the health aspect to be of importance 49% and 45%, respectively.

More than half of the collectivists considered labels to be of importance, 55% of the answers were located on the two important options. 47% of individualist answers were located here as well, indicating that it is of some importance to them too. Individualists had a higher tendency towards the “neither” option and only a small proportion picked the “very important” option. A much larger proportion of the collectivists picked the “very important” option and the “neither” option received less responses than the individualists. On the options that indicated low importance, both dimensions’ combined score was low, individualists had 25% and the collectivists had 23%.

Both dimensions are quite unanimous on the importance of knowing what labels stand for. The main differences can be found on the “very important” option and the “less important” option. On the “very important” option, individualists had 22% of answers, whereas collectivists had 31%. On the less important option the individualists had 15% and the collectivists 7%. Most individualist answers were located on the “important” option followed by the “neither” option. Collectivists had very similar figures, the “important” option was their second most picked option and the “neither” option was the same size as the individualists. This shows that knowledge of what labels stand for is more important to collectivists than individualists. The Chi square test for this dimension showed a slightly higher number than what can be interpreted as reliable, 0,116. However, this number is still low.

On the importance of low price there was a large spread of ratings. Most of the responses were situated in the middle of the scale for the collectivists. Individualists on the other hand had most responses on the “important” option. The individualists had almost an equal spread over the “less important”, “neither” and “important” options. Collectivists were more “neither” on this aspect than the individualists who more spread out over the scale. The importance of low price gave a higher Chi square number than knowledge of what labels stand for, 0,175. Therefore, no conclusions can be drawn from these results, but they can still contribute to a possible picture of the reality, that has to be further researched.

According to the statistics from the survey trust of the information on the packaging was of high importance to both dimensions, however, the Chi square test gave a too high number to be able to use these numbers for any conclusions, as can be seen in table 1. Therefore, the results are presented but not further analysed. The importance of the appearance of the tomato also got a high Chi square number and will not be analysed.

### Masculinity versus femininity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors/attributes</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labels</td>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When it comes to the dimension of masculinity and femininity health proved to be one of the crosstabs where no conclusions can be drawn due to the Chi square test (Table 2), the same goes for the importance of labels on tomatoes.

Knowledge of labels and what they stand for were more important to the respondents from the feminine pole. Their highest response rate was situated at the “important” option of the scale, with 33,6% or the feminine answers. Whereas the masculine respondents’ highest rating was the “neither” option, 25,5%. Overall both the feminine and the masculine respondents were spread out over the scale but they both had a clear tendency towards the options on the “important” side of the scale. However, the feminine pole had a slightly larger share that chose the option “not important”.

Low price was of slightly higher importance for the masculine respondents than the feminine. The feminine respondents had their highest response number on the middle option with 30% of the answers, compared to the masculine pole where “important” was the most frequent answer with a slightly larger share of responses. On the feminine pole the answers were more spread with the lowest frequency at both ends of the scale and more responses closer to the middle, a Gaussian distribution can be seen. With a Chi square number of 0,163, no clear generalisation can be made but the numbers can contribute to a picture that should be further investigated.

As can be seen in table 2 the results generated by the question of how important trust in what manufacturers put on the packaging gave a too high number in the Chi square test and cannot contribute to the final conclusion.

The appearance of the tomatoes was important to both of the dimensions. The highest response rate was situated at the “very important” option for both of the poles. However, the feminine side had a larger share of respondents that picked the two lowest answers than the masculine had.

**High or low uncertainty avoidance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors/attributes</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 % of total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>HUA</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labels</td>
<td>HUA</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of labels</td>
<td>HUA</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Correlation between masculinity vs. femininity and factors/attributes
High uncertainty avoidance (HUA) respondents tended to find the health aspects of tomatoes to be more important than the low uncertainty avoidance (LUA) respondents. However, the Chi square test gave the high number of 0.591 (Table 3) for this crosstab therefore no generalisations are made and the material are not further analysed.

Labels were of greater importance for the HUA respondents than the LUA. The highest frequency of responses was at the “very important” for the HUA. The LUA respondents also found labels to be important with a slight tendency towards the “neither” option, 34% of the answers on this pole. What can also be seen in the statistics is that the HUA had an equal rise of answers between the steps in the scale. The level of significance was almost good enough to draw conclusions from, meaning that these numbers will be included but looked at with restriction.

The Chi square test for how different levels of uncertainty avoidance affects the importance of knowing what labels stand for gave one of the worst results, these results will not be used in order to draw any conclusions.

Low price was of less importance for the LUA respondents than the HUA respondents. Both poles had their highest rates on the middle score of the scale, but the HUA had more responses to the higher answers, 37%, than on the lower options, but the LUA had it the other way around; more answers to the low answers, 38%, than the high ones. 0.171 was the number generated by the Chi square test, which is higher than what is needed to draw conclusions.

Both trust in information on packaging and the importance of appearance generated high numbers in the significance test when put into crosstabs with the dimension of high and low uncertainty avoidance and can therefore not be used to generalise any results.

### Table 3: Correlation between uncertainty avoidance and factors/attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors/attributes</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LTO</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STO</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LTO</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STO</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of labels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LTO</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STO</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LTO</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STO</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LTO</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STO</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0,08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Chi square number 0.272 is to high to draw any conclusions from the relationship between the long and short-term respondents and health (Table 4). However, the numbers are presented to give a view over what the results in this study showed.

With the high Chi square number of 0.507 no conclusion can be drawn from the results from the crosstab that compared the importance of labels on tomatoes with the dimension of long and short-term orientation.

Knowledge of what labels stand for generated a lower number in the significance test but not good enough to draw clear conclusions from. It was of high importance for the LTO respondents who had most responses in the “important” option with 34%, second highest was the “very important” option with 27%. However, there was also a high number of respondents that picked the “neither” option. 28% of STO respondents mostly picked the “neither” option, with a very small tendency towards the “important” option. STO respondents also had a relatively high number of respondents that picked the “less important” option.

The aspect of how important low price is got a too high number in the Chi square test which is why the result concerning this question is only presented in the table above but analysed or discussed further.

Both dimensions put more or less equal weight on the importance of trust in the information on the packaging. There are no significant differences to be found and both dimensions had most responses in the “very important” option, 40% for the LTO and 36% for the STO. The rest of the options followed in decreasing order from “very important” to “not important at all”.

The appearance of tomatoes proved to be of very high importance for the STO respondents. 48% of responses were located on the “very important” option followed by “important”. LTO respondents also found this aspect to be important but not to the same degree as STO. LTO had the highest response rate in the “important” option with 36% and equally high on the “very important”.

### How humans relate to environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors/attributes</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 % of total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCE</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWCE</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCE</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWCE</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge of la-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beleds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCE</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWCE</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low price</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCE</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWCE</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCE</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Correlation between long- vs. short-term orientation and factors/attributes
Respondents who picked the options in the survey that represented having an unwillingness to control the environment (UWCE) generally found that the health aspect of tomatoes were of importance (Table 5). However, these number are just presented but not represented in the final conclusion since the result from Chi square test was not good enough.

Labels were regarded as important by UWCE respondents where their highest response rate was located. They also had a high response rate in both the “neither” and “very important” option. WCE respondents found that labels on tomatoes were very little importance. Their highest responses were in the “neither” option and the two options that indicated less or no importance. 0.193 was the number generated in the Chi square test which is not quite good enough to contribute to conclusions if no further investigations are made.

UWCE respondents found that knowledge of what labels stand for was of importance, but no conclusions will be drawn from these results due to the high Chi square number.

Low price of tomatoes was spread out for the UWCE respondents. The “neither” option received most of the responses, followed by both the “important” and the “less important” option. WCE respondents had the most responses in the “important” option followed by the “neither” option, indicating that low price has some importance to them. The option “not important at all” received an equal amount of responses as the “neither” option. The significance number of 0.117 is close to what can be considered low enough to draw conclusions but will be looked at with restraint.

Trust in the information on the packaging was proven to be very important to both dimensions. Both UWCE and WCE respondents picked the “very important” option for the most part. The second most picked option for both the dimensions was the “important option”.

Appearance of tomatoes was important to both dimensions where the WCE respondents had a majority in the “very important” option. The UWCE respondents had high responses in both the “very important” and the “important” option, the latter being the majority.

5. Discussion

This part discusses the results in a more overarching perspective than was done in chapter four, the results. The third research question, what are the relations between factors/attributes and values regarding Swedish tomato consumption, is discussed in detail here.

The survey was answered by a majority of females which might affect the result of the study. However, gender differences were not something that was closely studied, and therefore it does not have a direct effect on the result, but rather an indirect. Age groups were divided unequally where the largest group was people aged between 16-24 years. This might be due to the fact that the survey was mainly distributed via Facebook. Even though the age groups were of different sizes,
each of the groups were considered big enough to represent that group. The age group 15 years and lower was under-represented. However, assuming that this age group is not generally responsible for food purchasing, this was overlooked. The respondents that opted for a willingness to control the environment (WCE) had a low number of representatives, therefore, no clear generalization can be made.

Some attributes that were investigated in this study, contradicts previous research. Low price has been described as a very important factor when shopping (e.g. Limnios et. al., 2016; Frostling-Henningsson, Hedbom & Wilandh, 2014). However, in this study low price is not considered as important. In general, Swedish consumers find that low price is neither important nor unimportant, price is not vital when shopping for tomatoes.

The two most important aspects to Swedish consumers are trust in the information on the packaging and the appearance of the tomatoes. Appearance was believed to be of importance, since this came up as a recommendation to add during the pilot survey. However, trust, was shown to be of greater importance than anticipated according to the cultural dimensions.

Labels were believed to be of greater importance than the results showed. Labels can be interlinked with trust and since this was important, labels should have had a higher importance rating (Feucht & Zander, 2018). Since the price of labelled tomatoes is not significantly higher in Sweden, people should be more inclined to buy labelled tomatoes. However, many eco-labelled tomatoes in Sweden are packaged in plastic packaging, thus the added bonus of an eco-label may be looked over, as discussed in previous research (e.g. Frostling-Henningsson, Hedbom & Wilandh, 2014), since plastic is in general bad for the environment. Organic products are also perceived as healthy, and this was proven to be of importance to Swedish consumers. Not only because some tomatoes are organic, but also because vegetables in general are perceived as healthy.

Knowledge of what labels stand for was of high importance, which shows that there is a will to be enlightened about labels. Thus, there should be more information given to the public about what labels stand for, without the need to actively search for it, in order to achieve a sustainable consumption on individual level. Both Sweden and the UN need to inform the public about labels. The UN can also assist the global society in achieving SDG 12. Knowledge of what labels stand for was proven in previous research to be important (e.g. Röös & Tjärnemo, 2011; Pieniak, Aertsens and Verbeke (2010). The results from this study correspond well with previous research.

The high number of respondents that opted for less or no control of the environment and saw humanity as part of the natural environment correlates well with what Trompenaars found. Since Trompenaars conducted his study in 1997, when the environmental problems were not so high on the agenda, the high number of respondents in this study would indicate that people have become more aware of the problems at hand. Even though sustainable consumption was discussed in the UN, first during Agenda 21 and later during the top meeting in Johannesburg (e.g. UN, n.d-a; UN, 2002). The concept of sustainable consumption was still quite new at this point. Awareness has increased since then, perhaps because the issue is discussed more frequently today.
Hofstede found that Swedes were very individualistic in 1970’s and Trompenaars found that Swedes were less individualistic in the 1990’s. This study shows that Swedes are less individualistic today, indicating that the people are going from a very individualistic society to a mixed one, where people are both individualistic and collectivistic depending on the situation. Furthermore, over the years Sweden has seen an increased immigration from countries that are in general collectivistic (e.g. Syria, Afghanistan and former Yugoslavia) which also influences the culture and society (Immigranternas riksförbund, 2013).

Uncertainty avoidance is a very hard dimension to measure since few Swedes are either HUA or LUA. Instead the middle score would indicate that Swedes are both HUA and LUA. In certain situations, Swedes are more accepting to new things, such as sustainable development as a concept and new technologies. Whereas in other circumstances, such as accepting Sweden’s role in climate change and sustainable consumption, Swedes are less accepting.

Labels was important to both individualists and collectivists. For individualists this might be because they are concerned with doing something good for others in order to feel good about themselves. They may want to do things that indirectly benefits themselves, such as cognitive benefits. Collectivists might have similar incentives but for different reasons. Instead of feeling good about themselves, they may be more concerned with how others feel about them, and also how they can help vulnerable people. However, since collectivists’ decisions may be influenced by a larger group with many opinions, such as family and friends, many things may be considered as important (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).

Appearance was also the aspect that was most important to respondents on the masculine pole of the scale. This might be due to the fact that neither of the aspects or attributes reflect any specific trendiness or status, that normally would be of importance for masculine respondents, therefore appearance was highly represented. Low price was also important to masculine respondents, which could indicate a willingness to save money or an unwillingness to spend unnecessary money, in order to buy other, more expensive, products that are trendy or are a sign of status. Hofstede (2005) considered masculine societies to be concerned with such things that reflect trendiness and high status. It is important to note that the Chi square number was quite high, but still below 0.2 which is why this is included here. Appearance, which was important to feminine respondents, is not a very practical attribute to look for when grocery shopping, since an appealing and a non-appealing tomato will most likely have the same taste and the same nutritional value (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).

Trust was also important for LTO respondents, which is not surprising since in order to make long-term decisions, trusting a product or a brand is important. LTO respondents also had a high importance score on labels. This indicates that they are more aware of their choices when choosing environmental products and the effects their choices will have in the future. STO respondents considered appearance to be of great importance, since they usually do not take into account the long-term effects of their decisions. Appearance can be seen as a short-term aspect since this does not permanent effects. It is a decision that consumers make “in the moment”.
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The UWCE respondents found trust in information on packaging to be the most important factor, however they also found labels to be important, the Chi square number was high but below 0.2 which is why it is included. The reason for trust to be of greater importance might be that labels are unnecessary if you do not trust what that label stands for. WCE on the other hand thought low price (same as before, the Chi square number was high but below 0.2) and appearance was the most important factors. Since most of the other factors strive to not control the natural environment, which is why they might make decision from an economical point of view instead.

6. Conclusion and further research

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study are that the same factors/attributes proved to be, more or less, equally important to the Swedish consumers, no matter what pole of the different dimensions they belonged to. Low price of products was proven in previous research to be important, which contradicts the results found here. Trust in the information on the packaging was also of high importance, along with knowledge of what labels stand for. Health benefits were considered a main motivator for going green, therefore it would rank higher on the importance scale. Swedes in this study opted mostly for less or no control of the environment, 93% fell into this dimension. Most respondents proved to go under the feminine dimension, which corresponds well with Hofstede’s results. However, Swedes were of higher uncertainty avoidance in this study than in Hofstede’s. Appearance was of high importance to all respondents, whereas low price was of less importance, except for the WCE respondents.

Many other aspects could have shown interesting and useful results. These could be looked at in further research to bring more knowledge of the topic and possibly lead to a more sustainable consumption. It could also be interesting to do similar studies on other products and compare differences. A similar study to the one Hofstede made in the 70’s could be very useful to conduct again to see if any major differences have arisen. More research in Swedish consumer patterns is required in order to understand why Sweden does not live up to the goal of a cleaner production and consumption. Comparing a country that fulfils SDG 12, and investigating the values of people in that nation, to Swedish values, would contribute to understanding what values inhibit sustainable consumption. Finally, making the same study again with a larger number of respondents, would render the results more representative and generalizable.
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Appendix

Hur tänker du när du handlar tomater?

Den här enkäten är en del av ett examensarbete på Jönköping University som syftar till att undersöka hur svenska konsumenter påverkas av normer och värderingar när de handlar tomater, oavsett tomatsort (plommontomat, kvisttomat mm). Dina svar är anonyma.

*Obligatorisk

Först ber vi dig besvara några frågor om din bakgrund.

1. Bor du i Sverige?
   Ja
   Nej

2. Hur länge har du bott i Sverige?
   0-3 år
   3-9 år
   10 år eller mer
   Hela livet

3. Hur gammal är du?
   15 eller yngre
   16-24
   25-34
   35-50
   50+

4. Vänligen ange ditt kön
   Kvinna
   Man
   Annat/vill inte ange

5. Vad är din högsta avslutade utbildning?
Grundskola
Gymnasium
Yrkeshögskola
Högskola/universitet
Annat

I frågorna som följer nedan ber vi dig välja det påstående som stämmer bäst överens med hur tänker om dig själv, stämmer flera alternativ ber vi dig ändå välja ett svar.

Obs. dessa frågor handlar inte om konsumtion.

6. 1.
Att få styra över mina egna livsval är det viktigaste för mig
Det viktigaste för mig är att känna att jag själv har uppnått något värdefullt Hur andra påverkas av mina val är det viktigaste för mig
Min släkt och mina vänner är det viktigaste i mitt liv

7. 2.
Jag prioriterar inkomst framför fritid
Jag handlar det som är trendigast
Jag prioriterar fritid framför inkomst
Jag handlar det som är mest praktiskt

8. 3. *
Jag tycker att regler är viktiga
Jag oroar mig mycket för framtiden
Jag tycker regler är ett hinder
Framtiden är inget som oroar mig

9. 4. *
Jag lever i nuet men planerar för framtiden
Jag föredrar långsamma resultat som kan gynna mig eller andra i framtiden
Jag vill ha snabba resultat där jag ser skillnad direkt
Det var bättre förr
10. 5. *
Jag ser mänskligheten som en del av den naturliga miljön
Vad jag gör påverkar miljön
Jag anser att mänskligheten bör kontrollera naturliga fenomen, såsom väder och naturkatastrofer
Naturen har sitt eget kretslopp och kommer inte påverkas av mänskligheten

Nedan ber vi dig svara på frågor angående din tomatkonsumtion, oavsett sort

11. Hur ofta handlar du tomater?
2-3 gånger i veckan eller oftare
1 gång i veckan
2-3 gånger i månaden
Mer sällan än 3 gånger i månader
Aldrig

12. Hur ofta äter du tomater?
2-3 gånger i veckan eller oftare
1 gång i veckan
2-3 gånger i månaden
Mer sällan än 3 gånger i månaden
Aldrig

13. Till vem handlar du tomater?
Välj alla alternativ som passar in på dig. Markera alla som gäller.
Dig själv
Din partner
Dina barn
Nedan kommer du få bedöma hur viktigt olika aspekter är för dig när du handlar tomater.

14. De bidrar till god hälsa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inte viktigt alls</td>
<td>Mycket viktigt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. De är miljömärkta (tex. KRAV, Svenskt sigill, EU-eco)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inte viktigt alls</td>
<td>Mycket viktigt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Att du vet vad märkningarna (tex. KRAV, Svenskt sigill, EU-eco) står för

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inte viktigt alls</td>
<td>Mycket viktigt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. De har lågt pris

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inte viktigt alls</td>
<td>Mycket viktigt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Att du litar på informationen på tomatens förpackning

1 2 3 4 5

Inte viktigt alls                Mycket viktigt

19. Tomatens utseende (obs, ej sort)

1 2 3 4 5

Inte viktigt alls                Mycket viktigt