

Consumer willingness to pay for low acrylamide content

Article

Accepted Version

Harkness, C. and Areal, F. (2018) Consumer willingness to pay for low acrylamide content. *British Food Journal*, 120 (8). pp. 1888-1900. ISSN 0007-070X doi: 10.1108/BFJ-01-2018-0043 Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/76872/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-01-2018-0043>

Publisher: Emerald

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading
Reading's research outputs online



Consumer willingness to pay for low acrylamide content

Journal:	<i>British Food Journal</i>
Manuscript ID:	BFJ-01-2018-0043.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Acrylamide, Willingness to pay, Choice experiment, Mixed logit model

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Consumer willingness to pay for low acrylamide content**Abstract**

Purpose: Evidence of acrylamide causing tumours in rodents has led to the chemical being classified as 'probably carcinogenic to humans' by the International Agency for Research on Cancer. The purpose of this paper is to examine consumers' willingness to pay (WTP) for a reduction in the acrylamide content of baby food and therefore a reduction in the risk of cancer.

Design/methodology/approach: A discrete choice experiment (DCE) is conducted on UK consumers incorporating different levels of seven attributes: packaging, production method (organic, GM and conventional), acrylamide level, sugar, salt, one of five portions of fruit and vegetable per day and price. Consumer WTP for low acrylamide content is estimated using a mixed logit (MXL) model.

Findings: The empirical results indicate consumers assign a high value to safer baby food, with low acrylamide content. The WTP premium for baby food with low acrylamide (105%) is the highest of all attributes assessed. Consumers also have a preference for organic baby food, in contrast to an aversion towards GM. The study results indicate that reducing the acrylamide content in baby food is desirable for consumers.

Originality/value: This is the first study to estimate consumers' WTP for reducing the acrylamide content of baby food in the UK. Existing research has been limited to examining the exposure of young children, in addition to the potential health risks.

1. Introduction

In recent years, food safety has become an increasingly pertinent issue for the UK food industry. Health concerns are often considered a motivation in consumers paying a premium for organic or pesticide-free produce (Popp et al. 2013), with chemical residues perceived as a significant health risk by many consumers (Eom, 1994; Bernard and Bernard, 2010). Parents of young children are

1
2 often found to demand more organic food, regarded as a safer and healthier alternative (Pearson et
3 al., 2010; Krystallis and Chryssohoidis, 2005). Studies examining WTP for organic baby food in the
4 U.S. have found large price premiums over conventional products. Smith et al.'s (2009) study
5 suggests the premium for organic baby food increased between 2004 and 2006, from 12-49 percent,
6 up to 30-52 percent. In addition, Peterson and Li (2011) found consumers were willing to pay a
7 premium for organic baby food, as well as products which restricted the use of pesticides and GMOs.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 Organic baby food has attained success in the UK market, holding a majority share at almost 60% in
17
18 2015, the largest of any organic food product (Soil Association, 2016). This achievement is often
19
20 considered a result of a parent's desire to provide safe food for their children alongside reducing any
21
22 risk of chemical contamination (Maguire et al. 2004; Pearson et al. 2010).
23
24

25 1.1 Acrylamide exposure

26
27

28 Following animal studies, acrylamide has been found to cause several health problems, including
29
30 developmental toxicity and carcinogenicity (Erkekoğlu and Baydar 2010; Mojska et al. 2012; EFSA,
31
32 2015). Acrylamide has been classified as 'probably carcinogenic to humans (group 2A)' by the
33
34 International Agency for Research on Cancer, albeit there is inadequate evidence from human
35
36 studies for the carcinogenicity of acrylamide (IARC, 1994). In 2015, both the Food Standards Agency
37
38 (FSA, 2015) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA, 2015) published an opinion on
39
40 acrylamide, highlighting the possible harmful effects from dietary exposure based on animal studies.
41
42

43 Acrylamide is produced naturally when cooking food high in starch at high temperatures (FSA, 2015)
44
45 and the FSA advises 'regularly eating foods containing high levels of acrylamide can increase the risk
46
47 of cancer' (FSA 2015, p.8). Particular concern has arisen regarding the levels found in baby food and
48
49 starchy food consumed by young children, who are the most exposed aged group, due to their high
50
51 consumption of carbohydrate-rich foods and low body weight (Mojska et al. 2012; FSA, 2015; EFSA,
52
53 2015). There are no maximum limits for acrylamide in food, however 'indicative values' are set out
54
55 by the European Commission (EC). Baby foods, not containing prunes, have an indicative value of 50
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ (EC, 2013). On 9th June 2017, the EC published draft regulation for consultation with the food
3 industry, requiring Food Business Operators to engage in measures reducing acrylamide in baby food
4 below a benchmark level of 40 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ (EC, 2017).

5
6
7 This paper estimates consumers' WTP for a reduction in the acrylamide content of baby food and
8 therefore a reduction in the risk of cancer using a discrete choice experiment (DCE). This is the first
9 study to estimate consumers' WTP for reducing the acrylamide content of baby food in the UK.

10
11 Existing research has been limited to examining the exposure of young children and the potential
12 health risks (Erkekoğlu and Baydar, 2010; Mojska et al., 2012).

13
14 The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 describes the materials and methods. Section 3 presents
15 the results of the econometric analysis and the WTP estimations. Section 4 provides a discussion of
16 these results and section 5 conclusions.

27 2. Methods

28 2.1 Survey

29
30 A web-based survey was designed and distributed using the software 'Qualtrics' [1]. A convenience
31 sample of UK residents over the age of 18 with children aged 5 and under was used [2]. The final
32 sample was 169 respondents, resulting in 1352 choices (169×8) and 5408 observations (1352×4).
33
34 Choice modelling literature indicates a minimum of 500 choices is generally adequate for valid
35 estimation of the MXL model (Enneking et al., 2007; Profeta et al., 2008).

36
37 In the DCE participants choose between 3 baby food products: option 1 (status quo), 2 and 3 along
38 with a fourth option not to buy any (opt-out). An opt-out choice is often included in food preference
39 studies (Balcombe et al., 2010; Van Loo et al., 2011) to make choices realistic (Lusk and Schroeder,
40 2004; Lancsar and Louviere, 2008). However, may lead respondents to avoid making demanding
41 choices (Dhar, 1997; Beattie and Barlas, 2001). In this set up, a full factorial design would result in
42 1080 possible alternatives ($3^3 \times 2^3 \times 5$). To reduce this to a feasible number of choice sets, a D-

1
2
3 optimal design is implemented to produce 48 choice sets. The respondents are presented with 8
4
5 choice sets randomly selected from the 48 designed. An example choice set is shown in Figure 1. The
6
7 attributes and levels included in the DCE are reported in Table I.
8
9

10 [Insert Figure 1]
11
12 [Insert Table I]
13
14

15 2.2 Acrylamide levels 16

17
18 For acrylamide level & lifetime cancer risk, since a published consensus is not available, estimated
19 cancer risks are based on risk estimates provided in the literature. Several studies observe that
20 children or infants are exposed to a mean acrylamide intake of approximately 1 μ g/kg bw/day
21 (Konings et al., 2003; EFSA, 2015). Risk models estimate this exposure poses a lifetime cancer risk of
22 13 in 10,000 people (Dybing and Sanner, 2003). Therefore, this risk is considered the status quo or
23 'typical' lifetime cancer risk for consumption of baby food and included as the medium level in the
24 choice card [3]. Acrylamide studies also report maximum exposures for children are approximately
25 3 μ g/kg bw/day, three times greater than the mean intake (Konings et al., 2003; EFSA, 2015).
26 Therefore, the high level is assigned a lifetime cancer risk of 39 in 10,000; three times the medium
27 risk. The low acrylamide level is assigned a lifetime cancer risk of 4 in 10,000, approximately one
28 third of the medium risk and acknowledging that acrylamide exposure from food cannot be
29 eliminated (FSA, 2015).
30
31

32 2.3 Econometric analysis 33

34
35 The DCE data is analysed using the MXL model which is considered highly flexible and able to
36 approximate any random utility model (McFadden and Train, 2000). Coefficients are considered
37 randomly distributed across individuals (Ghosh et al., 2013). The MXL model has been used
38 frequently in WTP studies for organic food (Van Loo et al., 2011; Janssen and Hamm, 2012) and is
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

particularly valuable, requiring less restrictive behavioural assumptions than applied in conventional logit models (Illichmann and Abdulai, 2013; Balogh et al. 2016).

The model estimation in this study uses 100 Halton draws, observed in other DCE studies (Boxall et al., 2009; Campbell et al., 2009; Illichmann and Abduhai, 2013) and found to provide more precise results than 1,000 random draws (Bhat, 2003). As illustrated by Train (2003) and Van Loo et al. (2011), where respondents make repeated choices, one for each time period t , the simplest method to account for the panel nature, is to treat the coefficients as varying over respondents, but constant over choices for each individual

$$U_{ijt} = \beta_i x_{ijt} + \varepsilon_{ijt} \quad (1)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, N$ is the number of respondents; j is the alternative and t is the choice situation; x_{ijt} is a column vector of variables related to alternative j and respondent n ; β_i is the row vector of individual parameters and ε_{ijt} is the extreme value error term, iid (independently distributed) over people, alternatives and time.

2.4 Model specification

The utility function is composed of several explanatory variables included in the DCE:

$$U_{ijt} = \alpha_{1,2,3} + \beta_1 price_{ijt} + \beta_2 jar_{ijt} + \beta_3 pot_{ijt} + \beta_4 GM_{ijt} + \beta_5 conventional_{ijt} + \beta_6 acrylow_{ijt} + \beta_7 acryhigh_{ijt} + \beta_8 nolabelsugar_{ijt} + \beta_9 lows_{ijt} + \beta_{10} oneoffive_{ijt} + \varepsilon_{ijt} \quad (2)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, N$ is the number of respondents, j is option 1, 2, 3, 4 (opt-out), t is the choice index; U_{ijt} is the utility each respondent i receives from alternative j for each choice t ; $\alpha_{1,2,3}$ is an alternative specific constant (ASC) of option 1, 2 and 3, with reference to 4; $price_{ijt}$ is the price for 100g of baby food of alternative j in choice situation t ; jar_{ijt} (glass jar), pot_{ijt} (plastic pot), GM_{ijt} , $conventional_{ijt}$, $acrylow_{ijt}$ (low acrylamide), $acryhigh_{ijt}$ (high acrylamide), $nolabelsugar_{ijt}$ (no label sugar), $lows_{ijt}$ (low salt) and $oneoffive_{ijt}$ (1 of 5-a-day) are attributes of alternative j ; and ε_{ijt} is error term. The model specification includes an ASC for J-1 alternatives, capturing the average

1
2 effect from factors not incorporated within the model, with option 4 (opt-out) normalised to zero
3
4 (Kjær, 2005). All the variables are estimated by effects coding, except for the ASCs and price. The
5
6 ASCs are dummy coded, and price is a continuous numeric variable, in GBP. A normal distribution for
7
8 the random parameters is assumed allowing the distribution of the coefficient estimate without a
9 strict sign (Ghosh et al., 2013; Yao et al., 2014), since certain attributes (e.g. GM and high
10 acrylamide) may not provide positive utility in comparison to the status quo. Price is modelled as a
11 fixed parameter ensuring WTP for each attribute has the same distribution as the coefficient (Train
12 and Croissant, 2013), providing a negative coefficient sign [4] and retaining stability within the MXL
13 model (Revelt and Train, 2000; Gao et al., 2010). The mean WTP is estimated by the following
14 equation:
15
16

$$WTP = \frac{(\beta_k - \beta_{k0})}{-\beta_{price}} \quad (3)$$

27
28 Where β_k is a coefficient of an attribute, β_{k0} is a coefficient of an effects coded reference level
29 (status quo) for β_k , and β_{price} is a coefficient of price. β_{k0} is subtracted to convert the effects coded
30 coefficients to dummy coded coefficients (Jaung et al., 2016). Coefficients for the status quo (β_{k0}),
31 are calculated as the negative sum of the other levels for the attribute (Wongprawmas and Canavari,
32 2017). The WTP calculation in equation (3) has been used frequently in DCE studies employing
33 effects coding and an ASC, providing the marginal (dis)utility change from the status quo (Jaung et
34 al., 2016; Wongprawmas and Canavari, 2017).

35
36 The MXL model is applied to analysed data using the package mlogit (Croissant, 2013), available in R
37 version 3.3.3 (R Core Team, 2017).

3. Results

3.1 Sample characteristics

38
39 The sample socio-demographic data is provided in Table II. The majority of the respondents are
40 female (84%), which may have been anticipated since women are argued to be the main decision
41
42

makers concerning food purchases in a UK household (Silayoi and Speece, 2004; Krystallis and Chryssohoidis, 2005). Most respondents are university educated, with 40% holding an undergraduate degree and 21% holding a postgraduate degree. The majority of the respondents are aged 30 to 39 (75%) and have a household income of more than £50,000.

[Insert Table II]

Nearly 40% of respondents are familiar with acrylamide ($n = 67$), however only 7% are aware it is present in certain baby foods ($n = 12$). The majority indicate they would be in favour of seeing acrylamide levels displayed on baby food, with 37% stating 'definitely yes' ($n = 62$) and 46% stating 'probably yes' ($n = 78$).

The respondents made 1352 (169×8) choices, choosing to opt-out on 209 occasions (15%). The frequencies of attribute levels chosen are reported in Table I. The status quo levels were chosen more frequently, with 'no added sugar' the most frequently chosen (903 choices; 67%). This may have arisen since the status quo levels were presented more often in the design of the DCE, however, the status quo was also chosen most frequently among the alternatives (457 choices), indicating a bias. Whilst the inclusion of a status quo is considered important to best represent real-life choices (Hoyos, 2010), this may result in a status quo bias (Boxall et al., 2009; Bonnichsen and Ladenburg, 2015). Any systematic effect of the status quo is captured through the inclusion of the ASC for option 1 (Scarpa et al., 2005).

3.2 MXL model

The results of the MXL model are presented in Table III. The ASCs are positive and significant at the 5% level, signifying consumers prefer to purchase the product, rather than opt-out and are willing to pay a price to purchase baby food. The coefficient for option 1 is a larger positive figure than for options 2 and 3, indicating that the status quo provides greater utility than other alternatives. As expected, the coefficient for price is negative and significant at the 1% level; as price increases, the

1
2 consumer's utility decreases. All coefficient means, with exception of the pot packaging, are
3 significant at the 5% level. The following status quo levels all have a positive coefficient (note to
4
5 Table III): pouch, organic, medium acrylamide and a 'no added sugar' label. In contrast to baby food
6 which did not include a label for 'low salt' or '1 of 5-a-day', which have negative coefficients.
7
8

9 The coefficients for acrylamide reveal a strong preference for low acrylamide along with a significant
10 aversion towards high acrylamide content. A strong aversion towards GM is also found, whereas
11 organic is preferred to conventional. With regards to the nutritional attribute labelling, the following
12 labels: 'no added sugar', 'low salt' and '1 of 5-a-day', are all preferred to the no label alternatives.
13
14 Consumers also exhibit a preference for the pouch packaging.

15 [Insert Table III]

16 The standard deviations of the random parameters (Table III) show there is significant heterogeneity
17 in consumers' preferences towards baby food attributes. In addition, the standard deviations of the
18 ASCs are all significant at the 5% level, demonstrating heterogeneity towards the choice of
19 alternative, as well as, a non-constant status quo bias across respondents, as observed in Meyerhoff
20 (2009).

21 The estimated mean WTP (£) and 95% confidence intervals are presented in Table IV.

22 [Insert Table IV]

23 *3.3 WTP for acrylamide level & lifetime cancer risk*

24 Each acrylamide level is described by an associated lifetime cancer risk for that exposure. Table V
25 illustrates the change in risk following exposure to high or low acrylamide content, in comparison to
26 medium (status quo or base risk level).
27
28

29 [Insert Table V]

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A high acrylamide content results in an increased lifetime cancer risk of 26/10,000 (200%), whereas low acrylamide reduces the risk by 9/10,000 (69%). This illustrates the change in risk between a medium and high level is greater than the change between a medium and low level.

However, the equivalent change in WTP for acrylamide shows an insignificant variation in comparison to the change in risk. Consumers are willing to pay £1.31 less for high acrylamide content associated with an increased cancer risk of 200% from the status quo. Conversely, consumers are willing to pay £1.05 more for low acrylamide content, corresponding to a premium of 105% above the typical price of baby food employed in this experiment (£1.00) and largely exceeding the associated cancer risk reduction (69%).

4. Discussion

The results of this study show UK consumers have a relatively high WTP for baby food with low acrylamide content. The results indicate a significant aversion towards a high level of acrylamide, with consumers willing to pay £1.31 less than the same product with medium acrylamide content (£1.00). This result suggests consumers would not be willing to purchase baby food reported to contain a high level of acrylamide, in a real-life situation. An alternative approach to the MXL model design could involve censoring the normal distribution of the random parameters at zero, resulting in the marginal utility for high acrylamide being equal to zero and implying the respondent is indifferent to the attribute (Balcombe et al., 2010). However, given the nature of acrylamide and the risk it poses to human health, it is considered important to allow negative WTP estimates to measure negative preferences associated with disutility, as seen in Illichmann and Abdulai (2013). WTP for a reduction in acrylamide is non-proportional to the change in cancer risk. We found consumers are willing to pay a higher price for a low acrylamide content (105% premium), in return for a smaller reduction in risk (69%). Therefore, the proportionality assumption of standard economic theory (Jones-Lee, 1974; Weinstein et al., 1980) does not hold which is a common finding in the literature (Hammitt and Haninger, 2010). Under this assumption it is expected that WTP to reduce the small probability of an adverse health effect (e.g. cancer) should be nearly proportional

1
2 to the change in risk. WTP to reduce the cancer risk from acrylamide exposure appears insensitive to
3 the magnitude of the change in risk, also referred to as scale-bias (Andersson and Svensson, 2008).
4 As observed in Eom (1994), this may represent consumers' desire to acquire safer food, rather than
5 reflecting the risk itself; with consumers regarding the acrylamide content as levels of 'food safety'
6 per se and demonstrating less consideration of the associated probabilities [5].
7
8

9 This study reveals consumers are willing to pay more for organic baby food, which parents are often
10 considered to regard as a healthier and safer alternative for their children (Pearson et al., 2010;
11 Krystallis and Chryssohoidis, 2005), in comparison to conventional or GM products. This result is also
12 consistent with previous WTP studies, which found organic baby food attracts a price premium in
13 the U.S. (Maguire et al., 2004; Smith et al., 2009). The results also indicate a significant aversion
14 towards GM baby food. Consumers are willing to pay £1.00 less for GM than organic, representing a
15 large reduction from the typical price of baby food employed in this experiment (£1.00). As observed
16 for high acrylamide, this may indicate consumers would not be willing to purchase GM baby food, in
17 a real-life situation. Previous studies examining attitudes towards GM food have also found
18 consumers are opposed to these products (Shaw, 2002; Saher et al., 2006). Reported health risks
19 from GM food may have increased the number of consumers choosing organic food for their
20 children, with a view to reducing this risk (Saher et al., 2006). With regards to packaging, consumers
21 are willing to pay more for a pouch than a jar. The pouch is often the preferred packaging since it is
22 more convenient for feeding (Hansen and Kristensen, 2013). Given the importance of nutritious and
23 safe food for a child's health in their early years (Erkekoğlu and Baydar, 2010), the estimate that
24 consumers are willing to pay more for baby food labelled with 'low salt', '1 of 5-a-day' or 'no added
25 sugar', than for an unlabelled alternative is not surprising.
26
27

28 5. Conclusion 29 30

31 UK consumers may have a high WTP for baby food with low acrylamide content. Acrylamide content
32 is therefore considered an important aspect of UK consumers' preferences for baby food. WTP for
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 low acrylamide also appears insensitive to the magnitude of the change in risk. This scale-bias may
3
4 be indicative of consumers' desire to acquire safer food, regarding the acrylamide content as
5 descriptive indicators of food safety, without significant consideration for the associated probability
6
7 of risk.
8
9

10
11 The results of this study indicate to policy advisors that regulation to reduce the acrylamide content
12 in baby food is highly desirable for consumers. Albeit, if reducing the acrylamide in all baby food
13 products to a low level is not achievable, a product labelling policy would assist consumers in making
14 informed choices, enhancing the market. Producers who reduce the acrylamide content in baby food
15 could attract premium prices, which may also seek to cover any additional costs of producing safer
16 baby food. In addition, advertising baby food which highlights a low acrylamide content could aid in
17 differentiating products from their competitors and increasing demand.
18
19

20 Consumers' preference for organic baby food suggests the market potential for GM baby food in the
21 UK may be limited. Consumers are also willing to pay a premium of 41% for a 'low salt' label and 50%
22 more for a '1 of 5-a-day' label on baby food packaging, as well as 52% less for an unlabelled product,
23 in comparison to a 'no added sugar' label. These results suggest producers may have the opportunity
24 to increase demand for baby food products which include nutritional content labels and sell these at
25 a premium price.
26
27

28 **Appendix A. Information given prior to DCE**
29
30

31 **Acrylamide**
32
33

34 Since you may not be familiar with acrylamide, in comparison to other attributes of baby food,
35 information is given below:
36
37

38 Acrylamide is a chemical naturally produced from cooking certain starchy foods (grains, potatoes
39 and fruits) at a high temperature. It is not deliberately added to foods, but is a natural by-product of
40 the cooking process.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 Acrylamide has been found to cause cancer, as well as a number of other health problems in animals
3
4 is classified as 'probably carcinogenic to humans' by the International Agency for Research on
5
6 Cancer. The Food Standards Agency (FSA) advises: "Regularly eating foods containing high levels of
7
8 Acrylamide can increase the risk of cancer".
9
10

11 **Notes:**
12
13

- 14 1. A pilot survey was conducted to test the functionality and comprehension of the survey,
15 focusing on the choice card information.
16
17 2. 327 individuals visited the survey, 169 individuals had a child aged 5 and under and provided
18 full responses. We use snowball sampling reflecting the exploratory nature of the research.
19
20 We contacted UK residents over the age of 18, with children aged 5 and under, via email and
21 Facebook, to voluntarily take part in the study. Although the distribution of respondents by
22 age is similar to the Office for National Statistics (ONS, 2011), female is overrepresented. We
23 acknowledge there may be low precision and some bias present due to the relatively small
24 sample. Future research should ensure the use of representative sampling in order to
25 generalise our findings.
26
27 3. The cancer risk is a result of regular consumption over a lifetime. Respondents are provided
28 with an outline of acrylamide and the cancer risk from regular consumption prior to the DCE
29 (appendix A), which is subsequently described as acrylamide level & lifetime cancer risk. We
30 acknowledge the possibility of bias derived from giving respondents health information only
31 related to acrylamide.
32
33 4. A normal distribution for the price coefficient would not ensure a negative coefficient,
34 whereas a lognormal distribution may result in values close to zero and unrealistically large
35 WTP values (Revelt and Train, 2000).
36
37 5. It is well established that people have difficulty understanding low risk levels tending to
38 overestimate small probabilities (Hammitt and Graham, 1999).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Andersson, H. and Svensson, M. (2008), "Cognitive ability and scale bias in the contingent valuation method: An analysis of willingness to pay to reduce mortality risk", *Environmental and Resource Economics*, Vol. 39 No. 4, pp. 481–495.
- Balcombe, K., Fraser, I. and Falco, S. Di. (2010), "Traffic lights and food choice: A choice experiment examining the relationship between nutritional food labels and price", *Food Policy*, Vol. 35 No. 3, pp. 211–220.
- Balogh, P., Békési, D., Gorton, M., Popp, J. and Lengyel, P. (2016), "Consumer willingness to pay for traditional food products", *Food Policy*, Vol. 61, pp. 176–184.
- Beattie, J. and Barlas, S. (2001), "Predicting perceived differences in tradeoff difficulty", in: E. U. Weber, J. Baron and G. Loomes (Ed.), *Conflict and tradeoffs in decision making*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 25-64.
- Bernard, J.C. and Bernard, D.J. (2010), "Comparing parts with the whole: Willingness to pay for pesticide-free, non-GM, and organic potatoes and sweet corn", *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, Vol. 35 No. 3, pp. 457–475.
- Bhat, C.R. (2003), "Simulation estimation of mixed discrete choice models using randomized and scrambled Halton sequences", *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, Vol. 37 No. 9, pp. 837–855.
- Bonnichsen, O. and Ladenburg, J. (2015), "Reducing status quo bias in choice experiments", *Nordic Journal of Health Economics*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 47-67.

- 1
2
3 Boxall, P., Adamowicz, W.L. and Moon, A. (2009), "Complexity in choice experiments: Choice of the
4 status quo alternative and implications for welfare measurement", *Australian Journal of*
5
6 *Agricultural and Resource Economics*, Vol. 53 No. 4, pp. 503–519.
7
8
9 Campbell, D., Hutchinson, W.G. and Scarpa, R. (2009), "Using choice experiments to explore the
10 spatial distribution of willingness to pay for rural landscape improvements", *Environment and*
11
12 *Planning A*, Vol. 41 No. 1, pp. 97-111.
13
14
15
16 Croissant, Y. (2013), "mlogit: multinomial logit model", R package version 0.2-4, available at:
17
18 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mlogit>
19
20
21 Dhar, R. (1997), "Consumer preference for a no-choice option", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.
22
23 24 No. 2, pp. 215-231.
24
25
26 Dybing, E. and Sanner, T. (2003), "Risk assessment of acrylamide in foods", *Toxicological Sciences*,
27
28 Vol. 75 No. 1, pp. 7–15.
29
30
31 Enneking, U., Neumann, C. and Henneberg, S. (2007), "How important intrinsic and extrinsic product
32 attributes affect purchase decision", *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 133–138.
33
34
35 Eom, Y.S. (1994), "Pesticide Residue Risk and Food Safety Valuation: A Random Utility Approach",
36
37 *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 76 No. 4, pp. 760–771.
38
39
40 Erkekoğlu, P. and Baydar, T. (2010), "Toxicity of acrylamide and evaluation of its exposure in baby
41 foods", *Nutrition research reviews*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 323–33.
42
43
44
45 European Commission (EC) (2013), "Commission Recommendation of 8 November 2013 on
46 investigations into the levels of acrylamide in food", available at:
47
48 <http://eurlex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32013H0647> (accessed 10 August
49
50 2017).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 European Commission (EC) (2017), "Draft regulation Commission Reg. (EU) on the application of
3 control and mitigation measures to reduce the presence of acrylamide in food", available at:
4
5 https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/initiatives/ares-2017-2895100_en (accessed
6
7 20 June 2017).
8
9

10
11 European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) (2015), "Scientific Opinion on Acrylamide in Food", *EFSA
12 Journal*, Vol. 13 No. 6.
13
14

15
16 Food Standards Agency (FSA) (2015), "Chief Scientific Advisor's Science Report: Issue Two (Seeking
17 and acting on independent expert advice on food chemicals)", available at:
18
19 <https://www.food.gov.uk/news-updates/news/2015/14655/chief-scientific-advisor-s-reportacrylamide> (accessed 21 August 2017).
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Gao, Z., Schroeder, T. and Yu, X. (2010), "Consumer Willingness-to-Pay for Cue Attribute: the Value
27 beyond its Own", *Journal of International Food and Agribusiness Marketing*, Vol. 22 No. 1–2,
28 pp. 108–124.
29
30
31

32 García, A.L., Raza, S., Parrett, A. and Wright, C.M. (2013), "Nutritional content of infant commercial
33 weaning foods in the UK", *Archives of disease in childhood*, Vol. 98 No. 10, pp. 793–7.
34
35

36 Ghosh, S., Maitra, B. and Das, S.S. (2013), "Effect of Distributional Assumption of Random
37 Parameters of Mixed Logit Model on Willingness-to-Pay Values", *Procedia - Social and
38 Behavioural Sciences*, Vol. 104, pp. 601–610.
39
40
41
42

43 Hansen, M. W., and Kristensen, N. H. (2013), "The institutional foodscapes as a sensemaking
44 approach towards school food", in L. Hansson, U. Holmberg, and H. Brembeck, (Ed). *Making
45 Sense of Consumption: Selections from the 2nd Nordic Conference on Consumer Research
46 2012*, University of Gothenburg, Sweden, pp. 299-312.
47
48
49
50
51

52 Hammitt, J.K. and Haninger, K. (2010), "Valuing fatal risks to children and adults: Effects of disease,
53 latency, and risk aversion", *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 57–83.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 Hoyos, D. (2010), "The state of the art of environmental valuation with discrete choice experiments".
3
4 *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 69 No. 8, pp. 1595–1603.
5
6

7 International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) (1994), "Acrylamide (Group 2A)", available at:
8
9 <http://www.inchem.org/documents/arc/vol60/m60-11.html> (accessed 21 April 2017).
10
11

12 Illichmann, R. and Abdulai, A. (2013), "Analysis of Consumer Preferences and Willingness-To-Pay for
13 Organic Food Products in Germany", available at:
14
15 <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/record/156100> (accessed 03 August 2017).
16
17

18 Janssen, M. and Hamm, U. (2012), "Product labelling in the market for organic food: Consumer
19 preferences and willingness-to-pay for different organic certification logos", *Food Quality and*
20
21 *Preference*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 9–22.
22
23

24 Jaung, W., Putzel, L., Bull, G.Q., Guariguata, M.R. and Sumaila, U.R. (2016), "Estimating demand for
25 certification of forest ecosystem services: A choice experiment with Forest Stewardship
26 Council certificate holders", *Ecosystem Services*, Vol. 22 No. November, pp. 193–201.
27
28

29 Jones-Lee, M.W. (1974), "The Value of Changes in the Probability of Death or Injury", *Journal of*
30
31 *Political Economy*, Vol. 82 No. 4, pp. 835–849.
32
33

34 Kjær, T. (2005), "A review of the discrete choice experiment - with emphasis on its application in
35 health care", *Health Economics Papers*, pp. 1–139.
36
37

38 Konings, E.J.M., Baars, A.J., Van Klaveren, J.D., Spanjer, M.C., Rensen, P.M., Hiemstra, M., Van Kooij,
39
40 J.A. and Peters, P.W.J. (2003), "Acrylamide exposure from foods of the Dutch population and
41 an assessment of the consequent risks", *Food and Chemical Toxicology*, Vol. 41 No. 11, pp.
42
43 1569–1579.
44
45

46 Krystallis, A. and Chryssohoidis, G. (2005), "Consumers' willingness to pay for organic food", *British*
47
48 *Food Journal*, Vol. 107 No. 5, pp. 320–343.
49
50
51

52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lancsar, E. and Louviere, J. (2008), "Conducting discrete choice experiments to inform healthcare
4 decision making", *Pharmacoconomics*, Vol. 26 No. 8, pp. 661-677.
5
6 Lusk, J.L. and Schroeder, T.C. (2004), "Are choice experiments incentive compatible? A test with
7 quality differentiated beef steaks", *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 86 No. 2,
8 pp. 467- 482.
9
10 Maguire, K.B., Owens, N. and Simon, N.B. (2004), "The Price Premium for Organic Babyfood: A
11 Hedonic Analysis", *Journal of agricultural and resource economics*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 132–149.
12
13 McFadden, D. and Train, K. (2000), "Mixed MNL Models for Discrete Response", *Journal of Applied
14 Econometrics*, Vol. 15 No. 5, pp. 447–470.
15
16 Meyerhoff, J. (2009), "Status Quo Effect in Choice Experiments: Empirical Evidence on Attitudes and
17 Choice Task Complexity", *Land Economics*, Vol. 85 No. 3, pp. 515–528.
18
19 Mintel (2017), "Baby Food and Drink - UK - April 2017", available at:
20
21 <http://academic.mintel.com/display/829785/> (accessed 20 June 2017).
22
23 Mojska, H., Gielecińska, I. and Stoś, K. (2012), "Determination of acrylamide level in commercial
24 baby foods and an assessment of infant dietary exposure", *Food and Chemical Toxicology*, Vol.
25 50 No. 8, pp. 2722–2728.
26
27 Office for National Statistics (2011), *Age of youngest dependent child by household type by sex by
28 age*, available at: <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011/dc1112ewla>
29
30 Pearson, D., Henryks, J. and Jones, H. (2010), "Organic food: What we know (and do not know) about
31 consumers", *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 171–177.
32
33 Peterson, Hikaru Hanawa and Li, X. (2011), "Consumer Preferences for Product Origin and Processing
34 Scale: The Case of Organic Baby Foods", *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 93
35 No. 2, pp. 590–596.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Popp, J., Peto, K. and Nagy, J. (2013), "Pesticide productivity and food security. A review", *Agronomy
4
5 for Sustainable Development*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 243–255.
6
7 Profeta, A., Enneking, U. and Balling, R. (2008), "Interactions between brands and CO labels: The
8
9 case of bavarian beer and munich beer - Application of a conditional logit model", *Journal of
10
11 International Food and Agribusiness Marketing*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 73–89.
12
13 R Core Team (2017), "R: A language and environment for statistical computing", R Foundation for
14
15 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
16
17 Revelt, D. and Train, K. (2000), "Customer-Specific Taste Parameters and Mixed Logit: Households'
18
19 Choice of Electricity Supplier", working paper No. E00-274, Department of Economics,
20
21 University of Berkeley, Berkeley, May 2000.
22
23 Saher, M., Lindeman, M. and Hursti, U.K.K. (2006), "Attitudes towards genetically modified and
24
25 organic foods", *Appetite*, Vol. 46 No. 3, pp. 324–331.
26
27 Scarpa, R., Ferrini, S. and Willis, K. (2005), "Performance of Error Component Models for Status-Quo
28
29 Effects in Choice Experiments", in R. Scarpa and A. Alberini, (Ed.), *Applications of Simulation
30
31 Methods in Environmental and Resource Economics. The Economics of non-Market Goods and
32
33 Resources 6*, Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp. 247-273.
34
35 Shaw, A. (2002), "It just goes against the grain." Public understandings of genetically modified (GM)
36
37 food in the UK", *Public Understanding of Science*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 273-291.
38
39 Silayoi, P. and Speece, M. (2004), "Packaging and purchase decisions", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 106
40
41 No. 8, pp. 607–628.
42
43 Smith, T.A., Huang, C.L. and Lin, B.H. (2009), "How Much are Consumers Paying for Organic Baby
44
45 Food?", paper presented at the Southern Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meeting
46
47 in Atlanta, GA, USA, January 31-February 3, 2009, available at:
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
<https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:ags:saeana:46748> (accessed 21 April 2017).

- 1
2
3 Soil Association (2016), "Organic Market Report 2016", available at:
4
5 http://www.soilassociation.org/marketreport (accessed 21 April 2017).
6
7
8 Train, K.E. (2003), *Discrete Choice Methods with Simulation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9
10 Train, K. and Croissant, Y. (2013), "Kenneth Train's exercises using the mlogit package for R",
11 available at: https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mlogit (accessed 07 August 2017).
12
13
14 Van Loo, E.J., Caputo, V., Nayga, R.M., Meullenet, J.F. and Ricke, S.C. (2011), "Consumers' willingness
15 to pay for organic chicken breast: Evidence from choice experiment", *Food Quality and*
16
17 *Preference*, Vol. 22 No. 7, pp. 603–613.
18
19
20 Weinstein, Milton C. Shepard, Donald S. and Pliskin, J.S. (1980), "The Economic Value of Changing
21 Mortality Probabilities: A Decision-Theoretic Approach", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*,
22 Vol. 94 No. 2, pp. 373–396.
23
24 Wongprawmas, R. and Canavari, M. (2017), "Consumers' willingness-to-pay for food safety labels in
25 an emerging market: The case of fresh produce in Thailand", *Food Policy*, Vol. 69, pp. 25–34.
26
27
28 Yao, R.T., Scarpa, R., Turner, J.A., Barnard, T.D., Rose, J.M., Palma, J.H.N. and Harrison, D.R. (2014),
29 "Valuing biodiversity enhancement in New Zealand's planted forests: Socioeconomic and
30 spatial determinants of willingness-to-pay", *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 98, pp. 90–101.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

	Option 1 100g	Option 2 100g	Option 3 100g
Packaging			
Pouch		Plastic pot	Glass jar
Production method	Organic	Conventional	GM
Acrylamide level & lifetime cancer risk	Medium 13 in 10,000	Medium 13 in 10,000	Low 4 in 10,000
Sugar content	No added sugar	No added sugar	No added sugar
Salt content		Low salt	Low salt
5-a-day			1 of 5-a-day
Price	£1.00	£0.50	£1.25

- Option 1
- Option 2
- Option 3
- Option 4 - None of these

Figure 1 Example of a choice set included in the choice experiment

Attribute	Levels	Frequency	%
Packaging	<i>Pouch</i>	723	53%
	Glass jar	207	15%
	Plastic pot	213	16%
Production method	<i>Organic</i>	717	53%
	GM	127	9%
	Conventional	299	22%
Acrylamide level & lifetime cancer risk	<i>Low: 4 in 10,000</i>	428	32%
	<i>Medium: 13 in 10,000</i>	673	50%
	<i>High: 39 in 10,000</i>	42	3%
Sugar	<i>No added sugar</i>	903	67%
	<i>No label sugar^a</i>	240	18%
Salt	<i>Low salt</i>	426	32%
	<i>No label salt^a</i>	717	53%
1 of 5-a-day ^b	<i>1 of 5-a-day</i>	442	33%
	<i>No label 1 of 5-a-day^a</i>	701	52%
Price	£0.25	198	15%
	£0.50	163	12%
	£0.75	173	13%
	£1.00	553	41%
	£1.25	56	4%

Notes: in italics are the attribute levels for the status quo alternative; ^athese attributes are shown as blank (unlabelled) in the choice card; ^bthe attribute '1 of 5-a-day' refers to one of five portions of fruit and vegetable per day; the prices shown represent the range of prices observed in UK supermarkets in April 2017; the frequency of options chosen: option 1 (status quo) = 457, option 2 = 340, option 3 = 346, option 4 (opt-out) = 209

Table I Choice frequency of attribute levels within the DCE, no. of choices = 1352

Characteristics	Frequency	%
Gender		
Male	27	16%
Female	142	84%
Education level		
No qualifications	1	1%
GCSE	13	8%
National diploma/NVQ	23	14%
A-levels	18	11%
Undergraduate degree	67	40%
Postgraduate degree	35	21%
Other	12	7%
Age		
20-29	26	15%
30-39	126	75%
40+	17	10%
Household income (£/year)		
0-10,000	4	2%
10,001-20,000	3	2%
20,001-30,000	10	6%
30,001-40,000	27	16%
40,001-50,000	29	17%
50,001+	96	57%

Table II Socio-demographic characteristics of the sample, no. of respondents = 169

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error
1:(intercept)	1.899***	0.414
2:(intercept)	1.516***	0.254
3:(intercept)	0.689*	0.272
Price	-2.267***	0.272
Jar (pouch ^a)	-0.372**	0.116
Pot (pouch ^a)	-0.049	0.141
GM (organic ^a)	-1.387***	0.156
Conventional (organic ^a)	0.516***	0.126
Acrylow (acrymed ^a)	2.570***	0.158
Acryhigh (acrymed ^a)	-2.772***	0.176
No label sugar (no added sugar ^a)	-0.586***	0.098
Lows (no label salt ^a)	0.468***	0.096
1 of 5 (no label 1 of 5 ^a)	0.563***	0.098
Standard deviation		
1:(intercept)	1.163***	0.237
2:(intercept)	2.812***	0.244
3:(intercept)	2.877***	0.247
Jar (pouch ^a)	0.983***	0.124
Pot (pouch ^a)	0.611***	0.120
GM (organic ^a)	1.067***	0.131
Conventional (organic ^a)	0.682***	0.114
Acrylow (acrymed ^a)	0.460***	0.125
Acryhigh (acrymed ^a)	1.344***	0.165
No label sugar (no added sugar ^a)	0.173	0.102
Lows (no label salt ^a)	0.214*	0.098
1 of 5 (no label 1 of 5 ^a)	0.287*	0.112
Number of observations	5408	
Log-likelihood	-1198.7	
McFadden pseudo R ²	0.344	
LR test χ^2	1256.1***	
Halton draws	100	

***significant at 0.1%; ** significant at 1%; *significant at 5%

Notes: ^aReference levels of the attributes (means): pouch = 0.420; organic = 0.871; acrymed = 0.202; no added sugar = 0.586; no label salt = -0.468; no label 1 of 5 = -0.563

Table III Estimation of MXL model results

Attribute level	WTP
Jar (pouch)	-0.350 (-0.482; -0.249)
Pot (pouch)	-0.207 (-0.331; -0.080)
GM (organic)	-0.996 (-1.215; -0.842)
Conventional (organic)	-0.156 (-0.266; -0.030)
Acrylow (acrymed)	1.045 (0.818; 1.398)
Acryhigh (acrymed)	-1.312 (-1.698; -1.060)
No label sugar (no added sugar)	-0.517 (-0.641; -0.427)
Low salt (no label salt)	0.413 (0.329; 0.519)
1 of five (no label 1 of 5)	0.497 (0.400; 0.633)

Note: reference category in brackets.

Table IV Consumer WTP and 95% confidence intervals for baby food attributes (£/100g)

Acrylamide content	WTP (£)	Base risk level	New risk level	Risk reduction	Risk reduction (%)
High	-1.312	13/10,000	39/10,000	-26/10,000	-200%
Medium	0.000	13/10,000	-	0	0%
Low	1.045	13/10,000	4/10,000	9/10,000	69%

Note: negative risk reduction figures represent an increase in risk (medium to high)

Table V Change in lifetime cancer