

CONSUMERS' VALUATION OF BLOCKCHAIN-BASED TRACEABILITY FOR FETA CHEESE IN GREECE: A SEGMENTATION STUDY

Presenter: Duc Tran Date: August 2-7, 2024. Location: New Delhi, India

Authors: Duc Tran^a, Hans De Steur^a, Xavier Gellynck^a, Andreas Papadakis^b, Joachim J. Schouteten^a ^a Department of Agricultural Economics, Ghent University (Belgium) ^b Synelixis SA (Greece)





Background

- Food fraud is a key concern in modern world due to complex global supply chains.
- **Food traceability** is a prominent tool to address food fraud (Aung & Chang, 2014)
- Consumers are **willing to pay a price premium for traceable foods** (Tran et al., 2024) due to:
- Concerns about food fraud and safety incidents
- Demand for sustainable production
- Applications of blockchain (as a "trust machine") may revolutionise (food) traceability systems (Yavaprabhas et al., 2023; Collart & Canales, 2021).

Case study context

Product of interest: Feta cheese in Greece

- A Protected Designation of Origin (PDO) product



- Subject to **food fraud** due to difficulties in verifying the origin of raw materials
 - Illegal raw materials: cow milk, imported sheep milk.
 - Fragmented productions: **80**% milk from small-scale & family farms.

Potentially low trust in government (in control food systems)High risk might motivate seeking product information

Conceptual framework



Research objective

Objective 1: Identify the consumer segments based on consumers' trust in government and product information-seeking behavior.

Objective 2: Profile the consumer segments with regard to sociodemographic and consumption variables.

Objective 3: Estimate the effect of consumer segment memberships on the WTP of traceable food.

Methods & materials

Qualtrics survey

N=707 Greek consumers

1) "Governmental trust" & "Product information-seeking behavior" = five-point Likert scale (4 items/construct)

2) Choice experiments = 16 choice set (CE)s / 2 blocks = 8 CEs for each

With 2 alternatives 1 opt-out option



Methods & materials

Cluster analysis

(Hierarchical clustering Then, K-means clustering)

Effects of cluster membership on WTP for traceable food attributes

Cluster profiling

Governmental trust*



Random parameter logit (RPL) models with cluster memberships as interaction terms and of each segment.

Multinomial logistic regression model using Reliant group as the reference groups

*summated means of 4 items, measured by a five-point Likert scale



*summated means of 4 items, measured by a five-point Likert scale

Results

		N = 707	N = 707	N = 707	N = 707
Effect of Cluster Membership (dummy) as an interaction term		Skeptic	Engaged	Vigilant	Reliant
	Production Designation of Origin (PDO)	-	+	ns	+
EDCIMAN	Blockchain	-	+	+	ns
Dependence mapping	Company information – QR code	-	+	ns	ns
	Product traceability information – QR code	_	+	+	ns

+, - indicated significant positive or negative effects on consumers' valuation for the examined attributes at p-value<0.05; "ns" means not significant.

Results

		N = 159	N = 128	N = 170	N = 250
	Marginal WTP (€) in each segment*	Skeptic	Engaged	Vigilant	Reliant
	Production Designation of Origin (PDO)	€ 0.52	€ 1.43	€ 0.79	€ 0.81
ELCYCHAN	Blockchain	€0.05	€ 0.39 =	€ 0.41	€ 0.26
Dispopelie cropela;	Company information – QR code	€0.36	€ 1.08	€ 0.65	€ 0.57
Γληροφορίες ιχνηλασιμότητας	Product traceability information – QR code	€0.39	€ 1.26 =	€ 1.20	€ 0.64



*Results based on a multinomial regression model using Reliant as the reference group.



*Results based on a multinomial regression model using Reliant as the reference group.



*Results based on a multinomial regression model using Reliant as the reference group.

Final remarks

Practical implications

(1) The Skeptic: Price sensitive \rightarrow Discounts/ Promotions.

(2) The Engaged: Ready to BC-traceable products.

(3) The Vigilant: Need to communication about blockchain benefits.

(4) The Reliant: Prefer PDO \rightarrow attention to and communication about the authenticity of the current certified products.

Scientific implication

Previous studies: High trust in government = High valuation of (BC) traceable food (*Liu et al, 2019; Li et al, 2023*)

→ This study challenged the findings by examining the joint impact of information-seeking behaviors (e.g., Vigilant and Reliant).

Thank you for your attention! Q&A

Contact

Duc Tran (Doctoral research) @Ghent University, Belgium

diminhduc.tran@ugent.be

in https://www.linkedin.com/in/diminhductran/

<u>0000-0003-4249-9076</u>





References

- Astill, J., Dara, R. A., Campbell, M., Farber, J. M., Fraser, E. D. G., Sharif, S., & Yada, R. Y. (2019). Transparency in food supply chains: A review of enabling technology solutions. *Trends in Food Science and Technology*, 91(July), 240–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2019.07.024
- Aung, M. M., & Chang, Y. S. (2014). Traceability in a food supply chain: Safety and quality perspectives. *Food Control*, 39(1), 172–184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2013.11.007
- Collart, A. J., & Canales, E. (2021). How might broad adoption of blockchain-based traceability impact the U.S. fresh produce supply chain? *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*, (June), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1002/aepp.13134
- Li, Y., Liao, A., Li, L., Zhang, M., Zhao, X., & Ye, F. (2023). Reinforcing or weakening? The role of blockchain technology in the link between consumer trust and organic food adoption. *Journal of Business Research*, *164*(July 2022), 113999. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.113999
- Liu, R., Gao, Z., Nayga, R., Snell, H. A., & Ma, H. (2019). Consumers' valuation for food traceability in China: Does trust matter? *Food Policy*, 88(October 2018), 101768. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2019.101768
- Lusk, J. L., Jamal, M., Kurlander, L., Roucan, M., & Taulman, L. (2005). A Meta-Analysis of Genetically Modified Food Valuation Studies, 30(1).
- Machado Nardi, V. A., Teixeira, R., Ladeira, W. J., & de Oliveira Santini, F. (2020). A meta-analytic review of food safety risk perception. *Food Control*, *112*(January), 107089. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2020.107089
- Tran, D., Schouteten, J. J., Gellynck, X., & De Steur, H. (2024). How do consumers value food traceability ? A meta-analysis. *Food Control*, *162*(March), 110453. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2024.110453
- van Rijswijk, W., Frewer, L. J., Menozzi, D., & Faioli, G. (2008). Consumer perceptions of traceability: A cross-national comparison of the associated benefits. *Food Quality and Preference*, *19*(5), 452–464. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2008.02.001
- Yavaprabhas, K., Pournader, M., & Seuring, S. (2023). Blockchain as the "trust-building machine " for supply chain management. *Annals of Operations Research*, 327(1), 49–88. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10479-022-04868-0
- Zhai, Q., Sher, A., Li, Q., & Chen, C. (2022). Consumers 'food control risk attitude for blockchain traceable information seeking: Evidence from fresh fruit buyers in China. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 6, 984493. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2022.984493