Cross-cultural consumer perception of new fish products
What we know...

Aquaculture supply approximately 50% of global food fish production compared with just 9% in 1980s

Aquaculture is still far from its full potential development since European aquaculture production represent about 20% of the total fish production

European consumers perceive farmed fish as being of lower general quality than wild fish

Efforts should be more oriented towards an improvement of the image of farmed fish than towards an enhancement of the sensory properties
Beliefs

- B1. Farmed fish is safer than wild fish
- B2. Wild fish is more affected by marine pollution (spillages) than farmed fish
- B3. Wild fish contains more heavy metals than farmed fish
- B4. Wild fish contains more antibiotics than farmed fish
- B5. Wild fish is more affected by parasites (anisakis) than farmed fish
- B6. Farmed fish has a healthier diet than wild fish
- B7. Farmed fish is healthier than wild fish
- B8. Farmed fish is of better quality than wild fish
- B9. Farmed fish is fresher than wild fish
- B10. Farmed fish is more nutritious than wild fish
- B11. Wild fish is more fatty than farmed fish
- B12. Farmed fish tastes better than wild fish
- B13. Farmed fish is firmer than wild fish
- B14. Farmed fish is more controlled than wild fish
- B15. Farmed fish is more handled than wild fish
- B16. Wild fish is more artificial than farmed fish
- B17. Farmed fish provides more guarantees than wild fish
- B18. Farmed fish is easier to find than wild fish
- B19. Farmed fish is cheaper than wild fish
What we know...

Beliefs

Cluster 1 “Neutral”:
< 40 years

Cluster 2 “Pro-farmed fish”

Cluster 3 “Pro-wild fish”
> 50 years
What we know...

Wild or farmed taste??

Overall liking of wild and farmed fish in the blind and informed conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall liking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wild fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed condition</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind condition</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSE</td>
<td>2.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p Value</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we know...

The relative low market share of aquaculture can also be a direct consequence of the poor variety of aquaculture products in the market, and in particular because of the lack of processed aquaculture foodstuffs.

Variety has been identified as a relevant factor in order to stimulate consumers’ purchase, thus avoiding boredom and satisfying individual curiosity.

Diversification: new species and new products: DIVERSIFY.

Objective: to assess consumer perception of new products from new farmed species in the five countries investigated (i.e., Germany, France, United Kingdom, Italy and Spain).
# Methodology

- Selection of the new products to test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAGRE</th>
<th>Idea 1*: Frozen fish fillets with different recipes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idea 6: Fish burgers shaped as fish (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idea 4: Ready to eat meal: salad with fish (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIKEPERCH</td>
<td>Idea 21: Fresh fish fillet with different “healthy” seasoning and marinades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idea 30: Ready-made fish tartar with additional soy sauce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idea 9: Fish spreads/pate (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREY MULLET</td>
<td>Idea 2: Thin smoked fillets (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idea 33: Ready-made fish fillets in olive oil (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idea 21: Fresh fish fillet with different “healthy” seasoning and marinades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREATER AMBERJACK</td>
<td>Idea 13: Frozen fish fillet that is seasoned or marinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idea 30: Ready-made fish tartar with additional soy sauce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idea 34: Fresh fish steak for grilling in the pan (L)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L: low processing; M: mid processing; H: high processing.
Methodology

Recruitment of participants

100 consumers

- 50% of the individuals per country "Involved innovators" and "Involved traditional"

- Balanced fish consumption (farmed and wild), age, gender, income and marital status, trying to fit the average frequencies in their respective segments per country
Methodology

Preparation of the samples
Methodology

Test design and execution

- Ten tasting sessions (1-1.5h) in each location in two consecutive days (10-12 participants)

- Each tasting session was divided in four main parts:
  1) Participants were informed about the aim of the test and how to use the computers for inserting their answers
  2) Overall liking expectation for each of the 10 different ideas
  3) Blind tasting: liking and Check-all-that-apply or CATA (28 sensory descriptors) of the six selected products
  4) Overall expectation in informed condition: overall acceptability, purchase intention and personal perception of each product by means of a semantic differential scale (made up of 11 adjectives)
Methodology

Please, try to imagine how much you think you would like the following fish product:

Frozen fish fillets with different recipes

Please answer by ticking in the relevant box on the left hand side.

9  □  I think I would like it extremely
8  □  I think I would like it very much
7  □  I think I would like it moderately
6  □  I think I would like it slightly
5  □  I do not think I would like it nor dislike it
4  □  I think I would dislike it slightly
3  □  I think I would dislike it moderately
2  □  I think I would dislike it very much
1  □  I think I would dislike it extremely
# Methodology

**Product: 246**

Frozen fish fillets with different recipes

In your opinion, this product...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Moderately disagree</th>
<th>4 Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>5 Moderately agree</th>
<th>6 Agree</th>
<th>7 Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is nutritious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is healthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes people feel good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is convenient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is easily available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tastes good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains no additives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good value for money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is expensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is hard to digest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is familiar/known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a traditional product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is produced in an environmental friendly way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is authentic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a high quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps local producers/economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is unsafe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology

Please, taste the product provided and answer the following questions by ticking in the appropriate box (please, keep some sample for the next questions):

- How much do you like this fish product (overall liking)?

  - I dislike it extremely
  - I dislike it very much
  - I dislike it moderately
  - I dislike it slightly
  - I do not like it nor dislike it
  - I like it slightly
  - I like it moderately
  - I like it very much
  - I like it extremely

- How much do you like the ODOUR of this fish product?

  - I dislike it extremely
  - I dislike it very much
  - I dislike it moderately
  - I dislike it slightly
  - I do not like it nor dislike it
  - I like it slightly
  - I like it moderately
  - I like it very much
  - I like it extremely

- How much do you like the FLAVOUR of this fish product?

  - I dislike it extremely
  - I dislike it very much
  - I dislike it moderately
  - I dislike it slightly
  - I do not like it nor dislike it
  - I like it slightly
  - I like it moderately
  - I like it very much
  - I like it extremely

- How much do you like the TEXTURE of this fish product?

  - I dislike it extremely
  - I dislike it very much
  - I dislike it moderately
  - I dislike it slightly
  - I do not like it nor dislike it
  - I like it slightly
  - I like it moderately
  - I like it very much
  - I like it extremely
Methodology

Please, taste the sample again and tick in the following list all the sensory descriptors that you can perceive in this sample:

- Acid
- Aromatic herbs
- Bitter
- Butter
- Earthy
- Fish
- Garlic
- Intense
- Lemon
- Metallic
- Milky
- Oil
- Pungent
- Salty
- Sardine
- Shellfish
- Smoked
- Sweet
- Vegetables
- Vinegar
- Adhesive
- Crumbly
- Fibrous
- Gummy
- Hard
- Juicy
- Oily
- Pasty
Product: **Fresh thin smoked fillets** from grey mullet, which can be used as a starter or incorporated within a sandwich/salad. The product is sustainably produced. It is labelled as a premium product and the country of origin is EU. The packaging is a plastic tray where the fillets are laid covered with a transparent plastic, which allows visibility of the fillets and vacuum or modified atmosphere packaging is used for shelf life prolongation. Ideas concerning the different uses of the fillets are included on the product’s sleeve.

- How much do you like this fish product (overall liking)?

- Would you buy this product?
Product: Fresh thin smoked fillets from grey mullet, which can be used as a starter or incorporated within a sandwich/salad. The product is sustainably produced. It is labelled as a premium product and the country of origin is EU. The packaging is a plastic tray where the fillets are laid covered with a transparent plastic, which allows visibility of the fillets and vacuum or modified atmosphere packaging is used for shelf life prolongation. Ideas concerning the different uses of the fillets are included on the product’s sleeve.

In your opinion this product is or have:

- Known
- Unique
- Safe
- Unhealthy
- Expensive
- Bad taste
- Low quality
- Boring
- Artificial
- Environment loading
- Traditional

- Unknown
- Standard
- Unsafe
- Healthy
- Cheap
- Good taste
- High quality
- Stimulating
- Natural
- Environment friendly
- Contemporary
## Results

### Liking expectations

Average expected degree of liking of selected product ideas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Mean value</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grilled fillet (Idea 34)</td>
<td>7.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh fillet (Idea 21)</td>
<td>7.1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoked fillet (Idea 2)</td>
<td>6.8&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frozen fillet (Idea 1)</td>
<td>6.7&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salad (Idea 4)</td>
<td>6.7&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish olive oil (Idea 33)</td>
<td>6.6&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frozen marinated fillet (Idea 13)</td>
<td>6.6&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburger (Idea 6)</td>
<td>6.2&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tartar (Idea 30)</td>
<td>5.8&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pate (Idea 9)</td>
<td>5.8&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a-e</sup>: Mean values with different superscripts differ significantly (p<0.05).

- Higher preference for those products having the genuine sensory properties of fish, without any interference (recruitment criteria)
Results

Liking expectations
Results

Image/perception of the different products or ideas

- All the products were perceived quite positively
Results

Blind tasting (6 products)

Mean acceptability values for the different products per country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fish olive oil</td>
<td>6.3&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.7&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.2&lt;sup&gt;abc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.0&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.7&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grilled fillet</td>
<td>7.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburger</td>
<td>6.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.2&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.9&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.1&lt;sup&gt;abc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.4&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.0&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pate</td>
<td>5.8&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.2&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.4&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.6&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.3&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.3&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salad</td>
<td>6.3&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.4&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.5&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoked fillet</td>
<td>6.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.3&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.7&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.6&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.9&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error

0.088  0.200  0.192  0.166  0.186  0.228

a-c: Mean values with different superscripts differ significantly (p<0.05).

- Agreement with the previously reported expected liking
Results

Sensory perception (made by consumers and trained assessors, CATA)
## Results

**Overall liking in the full informed condition**

Mean acceptability values for the different products per country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fish olive oil</td>
<td>6.4&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.0&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.0&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.9&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.8&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grilled fillet</td>
<td>7.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburger</td>
<td>6.2&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.7&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.8&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.7&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pate</td>
<td>5.6&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.2&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.9&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.8&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salad</td>
<td>6.3&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.9&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.5&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.2&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoked fillet</td>
<td>6.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.5&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.1&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.9&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.2&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a-d: Mean values in the same column with different superscripts differ significantly (p<0.05).

- Similar to what was observed in the blind tasting
**Results**

**Confirmation/disconfirmation of expectations**

- In most cases the difference between the blind and the fully informed tasting was not significant
# Results

## Purchase probability

Purchase probability for each product and country (Juster 11-points scale, 0 to 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fish olive oil</td>
<td>5.4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.3&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.8&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.2&lt;sup&gt;abc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.9&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.6&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grilled fillet</td>
<td>6.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburger</td>
<td>5.1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.8&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.3&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.2&lt;sup&gt;abc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.8&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.7&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pate</td>
<td>4.3&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.8&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.6&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.4&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.4&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salad</td>
<td>5.3&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.2&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.2&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.0&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.3&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoked fillet</td>
<td>5.6&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.9&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.7&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.1&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.9&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a-c: Mean values with different superscripts differ significantly (p<0.05).

- Similar pattern than this observed for the acceptability in the full informed condition (r=0.81)
Results

Product image with full information

• Positive perception

• High discrepancies between countries, perception clearly different when dealing with the main intangible dimensions that might define the different products
Results

Know/Unknown
Unique/Standard
Safe/Unsafe
Unhealthy/healthy
Expensive/Cheap
Bad taste/God taste
Low quality/High quality
Boring/Stimulating
Artificial/Natural
Environment loading/Environment friendly
Traditional/Contemporary

German consumers

- Grilled fillet
- Smoked fillet
- Salad
- Fish olive oil
- Hamburger
- Pate
Take-home messages

• Sensory dimension seems to have an important contribution to the overall acceptance of the product and to its purchase probability

• The products already developed were not able to reach the initial expectations that they produced in the participants

• Products with a lower degree of processing were those who generated higher expected scores and higher acceptability in the blind test (recruitment criteria)

• The stimulating character (vs. boring) of the product also seems to play an important role as a preference driver
Take-home messages

• The environmental friendly character of the products did not affect the preference (it was included in the description of the different products)

• Low impact of the two identified segments (“Involved traditional” and “Involved innovators”) on the results obtained, novelty of the products??

• Effect of the country of origin of the participants was lower than expected

• Image/perception of the different products other than the sensory properties, differed in an important way between countries as well as their impact on the product acceptance and purchase probability
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