

Errata:

Master's thesis by Junrui Li

Title of Thesis: Food Identity Conveyed: Improving Consumers' Food Value Recognition in Cross-Cultural Dining Scenarios.

Programme: Master's Programme in Creative Sustainability, Aalto University

Department: Department of Design

Page 4. Paragraph 3.

Error: The author mixed up production identity and preparation identity when writing the abstract.

Corrected text should be:

The results show that, in terms of customers' perception, the attributes of food identity can be divided into four aspects: sensory identity, production identity, cultural identity, and preparation identity. As for the relationship between these aspects and food value recognition, the results reveal that the sensory identity and the cultural identity have a significant impact on both customers' recognition of the food and further purchase intentions. While the production identity is only influencing on recognition of the food but failed to further promote repurchase intentions. Lastly, the preparation identity is discovered with no significant impact on both food recognition and repurchase intentions. Consequently, these results suggest that restaurant operators can enhance diners' food value recognition by elaborating on the sensory and cultural identities of the dishes they serve. In addition, improving the customers' consideration of production and preparation identities of food can be a worthwhile direction for future research.

Page 34. Paragraph 1&2.

Error: The text interpreting the finding of Table. 7 is inconsistent with the result in the table. This was due to the fact that incomplete data had been used to test the analysis methods in the middle of the study, and versioning errors occurred due to improper calibration when the paper was finally integrated.

Corrected text should be:

As shown in the parameter estimates of the two regression analyses (Table 7), in terms of consumers' recognition of the food, which is asked in the questionnaire as consumers'

appreciation of Chinese cuisine, the regression is valid in explaining influences of consumers' recognition as "strongly disagree" compared to the others, and also in their recognition as "strongly disagree", "disagree", and "neutral" compared to the others. However, it does not explain why consumers choose "strongly agree" over "agree". The result shows that the sensory identity, production identity, and cultural identity have a statistically significant impact on consumers' recognition of the food. The estimates of the three aspects are positive, indicating that both have a positive effect on consumers' appreciation of the cuisine. Preparation identity, on the other hand, had no significant effect on the results.

In terms of consumers' further purchase intentions, the regression is valid in explaining all the different choices. The result shows that only sensory identity and cultural identity have a statistically significant impact on consumers' further purchase intentions. The estimate shows the impact is positive, meaning a better satisfaction in terms of the sensory and cultural identity attributes results in higher repurchase intentions. However, the other two aspects of food identity have no impact on the result.

Page 36. Paragraph 3.

Error: The author mixed up production identity and preparation identity when writing the discussion. This leads to a contradiction between the significant influence of production identity stated earlier in the paragraph and the ineffectiveness of production identity stated later. The latter production identity is in fact the preparation identity.

Corrected text should be:

The results of the logistic regression analysis show that in addition to sensory attributes, the cultural considerations and production processes also have a significant positive impact on consumers' recognition of the food value, which is not explored that much in most previous studies. However, it is also worth pointing out that the results of this study show that food production identity does not have a significant effect on consumers' repurchase intentions, though it affects positively on their recognition of the food, which is in line with the findings of a previous study on consumers' attitudes towards sustainability aspects of food production by Krystallis et al. (2012). Moreover, the preparation identity is found not significant in neither consumers' recognition of the food nor their repurchase intentions. Considering the current trend that there are more restaurants choosing to build open kitchens along with the dining areas, it can be interesting to further discuss how to improve consumers' perception of food preparation identity and trigger their food value recognition in this form (see chapter 6.3).

Page 39. Paragraph 3.

Error: The author mixed up production identity and preparation identity when writing the discussion.

Corrected text should be:

Telling customers about the information in the production of the ingredients of a dish helps them recognise the food value. This information can include the traceability of ingredients, the nutritional value, and efforts inputted to achieve sustainability. However, the communication of this message requires a reasonable choice for the specific dining situation.

The model of this thesis assumes that consumers' food value recognition can be improved due to their perception of the efforts put into the preparation of a dish, which can include the cultural, technical and safety considerations of the restaurants. However, the regression results show that the preparation identity has no significant impact on neither their recognition of the food nor their further purchase intentions. While in the meantime, as stated in previous text, the application of open kitchens is becoming popular among restaurants: they replace the walls of the kitchen with glass or simply place the kitchen in the middle of the dining area, allowing customers to see what is going on in the kitchen. This is certainly an innovation that makes some food identity information, especially in terms of preparation, more transparent. Specifically, this open kitchen provides customers a visual access to the person who cooks the food, the cooking method, the tools used and the cooking environment. However, the preparation processes before the food are cooked and the disposal of leftovers are usually avoided in the open kitchen design, which is understandable because not all processes are aesthetically pleasing for diners.

Page 42. Paragraph 2.

Error: The author mixed up production identity and preparation identity when writing the conclusion.

Corrected text should be:

Regarding future research directions, this paper firstly suggests an exploration on the joint influence of food identity and other external factors on users' consumption behaviour in a more complex consumption environment. Secondly, given the complexity of food identity information, future research could explore how to effectively communicate food identity information in different dining scenarios. Finally, the results of the analysis show that

consumers' perception of the production and preparation identity of food presents no significant effect on consumers' repurchase intentions in restaurant dining settings. While these two processes are very important parts of the food value chain, this result deserves more in-depth verification in subsequent studies. At the same time, it is also worthwhile to discuss how to enhance consumers' attention to production identity in today's consumer environment.