Chapter 2

Models of Purchase Intention

2.1 Introduction

Marketers spend a lot of attention to understand and influence the consumers’ attitudes, intentions and hence behaviours towards their products. Understanding of consumers’ needs and wants is important for marketers to create, communicate and exchange value (Kotler, 2010). Therefore, it is imperative to study consumer-buying behaviour. Consumer buying behaviour includes a series of events (or processes) to select, secure, use and dispose of products or services to satisfy their needs (Kuester, Feurer, & Schuhmacher, 2012).

Consumers’ positive attitude (directly or indirectly) and purchase intention bear a significant relationship with the actual purchase of the products or services. Marketers exert great effort to influence the attitude and purchase intention of consumers (Schuutte & Ciarlante, 1998). There are numbers of factors, which may influence attitude, and purchase intention. These factors can be broadly categorised into two big groups 1) products side factors 2) consumer side factors or consumer characteristics. Consumer side factors include but not limited to awareness, attitude, gender, cultural difference, religion, literacy and subjective-knowledge etc. On the other hand, product side factors can further be categorised as products attributes, marketing attributes and company characteristics. Product side factors can include labelling information, brand image, green image, genetically modified, halal, Store attribute, advertising, third-party endorsement, third-party certification etc.

2.2 The Consumer’s Decision Process

Rational theories of consumer behaviour maintain that individuals are rational and exhibit reasoned or planned behaviour (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975, Ajzen, 1985, 1991, and Engel, Blackwell & Miniard, 1995). According to one of such theories by Engel, Blackwell and Miniard (1995), consumers undergo a series of thinking processes (events or stages) while making a decision to buy goods or services. They gave one of the most accepted models of consumer buying behaviour. This model assumes the consumers rational (Engel, Blackwell and Miniard, 1995).
We can also say that rational thinkers have led to the birth this model of consumers’ buying decision. The model explains the level of consumers’ involvement at each stage and has manifold implications for marketers and researchers. According to the *model of buying behaviour*, a consumer goes through five distinct phases. These are phases are (1) problem recognition phase, (2) information search phase, (3) evaluation of alternative, (4) making a purchase decision, and (5) post-purchase. Similarly, Mowen and Minor (2001) also agreed that consumer decision making involves a sequence of information processing from 1) recognizing the problems, 2) looking for solutions, 3) evaluating the options, and 4) making a decision. In subsequent paragraphs, the author discusses the most relevant models applied in food purchase behaviour and specifically in the context of halal food purchase intention (Hussain, Rahman, Zaheer, & Saleem, 2016).

The current thesis builds upon two basic models of behavioural intention, the theory of reasoned action and the theory of planned behaviour, which have been extensively used in a variety of food-related studies. Theory of planned behaviour is an extension of the theory of reasoned action. Both models are referred as attitude cognition models. Theory of reasoned action (TRA) which predicts behaviour as a function of intention and intention as a function of attitude and subjective norms, assumes that the behaviour is under volitional control while Theory of planned behaviour has removed this assumption by adding another variable of perceived behavioural control along with attitude and subjective norm. Apart from that, Ajzen also suggested the addition of contextual variables could increase the predictive validity of Theory of Planned Behaviour in specific situations.

### 2.3 Theory of Planned Behaviour

Earlier studies, which focussed solely on attitude as a precursor of overt behaviour, were soon heavily criticised (Ajzen, 1985, 1988, 2002, LaPierre, 1934, cited in Shakona, 2013, Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). The criticism on attitude-behaviour relationship based mainly on two grounding one was the conceptualisation of attitude, which is until the date a debatable topic, and another criticism was attitude and overt behaviour relationship (Ajzen, 1988, Dulany, 1967, Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). Today most of the researchers in social sciences agree that it is the *behavioural intention*, not the attitude that predicts overt behaviour (Ajzen, 2002). Attitude,
however, is an important construct that influences behaviour but through a mediating variable: behavioural intention (Dulany, 1967, Yadav and Pathak, 2016, 2017). Theory of planned behavioural (TPB) and theory of reasoned action (TRA) are amongst most influential theories in the field of social psychology (Ajzen 2011, 2015; Sutton 2002, 1998; Zinsser, 2015). Theory of planned behaviour, first introduced in 1985 by Ajzen and then re-introduced in 1991 (Ajzen 1985, 1991), has been used in several Intention- behaviour paradigms (Khan and Azam, 2016). The application of theory of planned behaviour is wide and, it has been successfully applied in many areas of management, social sciences and allied fields¹. In management specifically in the area of Consumer Behaviour and more specifically food purchase behaviour, there are a number of studies, which have adopted the theory of planned behaviour as a reinforcing model by inculcating some other contextual variables (Ajzen, 2010). Very often theory of planned behaviour has been amalgamated with other theories and empirically tested to help to solve various marketing problems (Singh & Kathuria, 2016).

The theory of planned behaviour (TPB), which is essentially an extension of the theory of reasoned action (TRA), did away with the assumption of volition control, an inherent problem with the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen 1985, 1991). Ajzen added a construct perceived behavioural control to TRA and consequently developed the theory of planned behaviour. Many authors argued that PBC should be two dimensional (perceived self-efficacy and perceived control) rather than one. Hence, it is important to understand the basic features and history of TRA before going to have a detailed discussion on the importance of Theory of planned behaviour in the present research. Hence, first, a brief introduction of theory reasoned action is present, followed by Importance of theory of planned behaviour in 1) food purchase studies and 2) halal food purchase studies.

The present study employs the theory of planned behaviour and extends it by adding religiosity and subjective knowledge. The independent variables of the current study are Attitude, Subjective norms, perceived behavioural control, religiosity and

¹This fact is evident as Ajzen maintains a list of over 1000 articles, from diverse background, which have applied TPB in a number of behaviour-intention paradigm.
subjective knowledge of halal. The dependent variable is purchase intention of halal-certified food products.

Above mentioned variables are discussed in detail in section conceptual framework of next chapter, however, it is important to note that all variables are one-dimensional except perceived behavioural control, which is conceived as PBC(self-efficacy) and PBC (control).

2.4 The Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA)

Established and propounded by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) the TRA was a result of many contemporary developments. One of such developments was the reporting of the inconsistent link between attitude and behaviour, later referred as attitude-behaviour gap. Many researchers (e.g. Dulany, 1961, 1968, Sheth, 1971, 1974) suggested a mediating variable between attitude and behaviour. Meanwhile, Fishbein (1967) has also presented attitude theory of Fishbein. Earlier social scientist believed that overt behaviour was directly dependent on Attitude (Rokeach, 1968). In other words, they were of the opinion that attitude was the sole and explicit predictor of the actual behaviour. However, many reviews of attitude-behaviour relationship reported inconsistent nature of attitude in predicting the behaviour of individuals. There is one interesting study by LaPiere (1934, cited in Shakona, 2013) described in many kinds of literature related to this development in attitude behaviour research. La Pier (1934) investigated attitude of American hotel managers towards Chinese individuals. He reported that attitude and overt behaviour were not associated. This study has been considered as a landmark in consumer behaviour studies and has been reported by many researchers from time to time.

One other challenge for attitude researchers was the multiple definitions, conceptualisation and operationalization of the term attitude (Liska, 1974, & Bagozzi, 1990). Fishbein proposed Fishbein’s attitude theory (1967) where he reconceptualised and operationalized attitude. Further, taking insights from Dulany’s theory of propositional control (Dulany 1967) and the relevant literature available at that time Fishbein & Ajzen, (1975) proposed the theory of reasoned action, which proved to being superior and more successful than Dulany’s theory of propositional control, due to better operationalization of its antecedents: attitude and subjective norms.
The TRA model proposes that manifest behaviour is dependent on the behavioural intention of individuals and behavioural intention further depends upon attitude towards the behaviour and subjective norms. Attitude referred to the salient beliefs of individuals and the evaluation of these beliefs (Pratkanis, Breckler, & Greenwald, 2014), while subjective norms was conceptualised as perceived social pressure from significant others (like parents, friends, colleagues) who may be concerned about the performance or non-performance of the behaviour (Bentler & Speckart, 1979), and motivation to comply. Attitude towards the performance of overt behaviour is the person’s appraisal of carrying out a particular behaviour and can be both favourable and unfavourable. Accordingly, behavioural intention is the foremost precursor of an individual’s overt behaviour, in the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA). The theory postulates that people are willing to perform in agreement with their intention to participate in the given behaviour. Intentions are the incentive to participate in certain behaviour and correspond to a person’s anticipations about this behaviour in particular circumstance (Ajzen, 1985). Both TPB and TRA have two common antecedents to behaviour intention i.e. attitude and subjective norms. The only difference between TRA and TPB is of Perceived behavioural control, which was added to TRA formulating a new theory: TPB.

2.5 Protection Motivation Theory

The Protection Motivation Theory was given by Rogers (1975, 1983). The theory postulates about appreciation of human behaviour and works on the concept of threat identification and its reaction. The theory has two main elements or appraisal processes. One element which deals with the process of knowing the possible threats is known as “threat appraisal process” and another element which deals with how people react to threat stimuli is known as “coping appraisal processed. In a study, Scarpa and Thiene (2011), focused on organic food purchase behaviour, founds two important threats: 1) Pesticide presented in the non-organic food products 2) The bad effect of non-organic food products on the environment. Therefore, the consumer will like to buy organic food products. Thus, the main two main postulates of protection motivation theory are fulfilled. First, individuals have the cognitive ability to detect threats in the environment and secondly, we put effort to avoid the possible threats. It also evident, that protection motivation theory builds upon fear appeal and its consequences as discussed in the previous example of Scarpa and Thiene (2011).
Figure 2.1 Theory of reasoned action (Fishbein and Ajzen 1975)

Figure 2.2 Theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1985, 1991)
2.6 Attitude Behaviour Context Theory (ABC)

Attitude Behaviour Context theory (Stern, 1999) is a model of individual’s perception of the environment. This model considers the surrounding elements of individuals to understand the attitude and the behaviour of the individuals. The ABC theory is founded on the concept of original means-end theory, which suggests that individuals behave based on their evaluations of utilitarian and emotive gains from a given activity or the behaviour in a given context. As the context changes other variables also changes. Thus, ABC theory contemplates the interplay of various factors within broad categories of attitude behaviour and the context. With regard to food products, especially, halal food products, the ABC theory can help in providing important insights. One external factor in the context of halal food products is the easy availability of the halal-certified products.

![Figure 2.3: Protection Motivation Theory (Rogers, 1975)](image1)

![Figure 2.4: Attitude Behaviour Context Model (Stern, 1999)](image2)

2.7 Health Belief Model (HBM)
Originally, the Health belief model, proposed by Rosen stock (1966, 1974) and again revised by him (Rosenstock, 1974), has two main viewpoints on behaviours related to health. One such viewpoint or perspective is the perception and the appraisal of threats and the other such perspective is related to the behavioural evaluation or the understanding of the perceived threat. These two broad perspectives are further categorised into other subcategories. The perception of threat has two main subcomponents: 1) how vulnerable or prone is the threat condition and 2) what is the expectation about the outcome of a threat condition. Further, there are two subcomponents of behavioural evaluation. The first subcomponent is the expectation of the benefit in indulging in a given health-related behaviour. Second, a component of behavioural evolution regarding the challenges and barriers related to performing the behaviour. Apart from these factors, many other factors such as demographic characteristics can have an indirect influence on health-related behaviour (Clark and Becker, 1998). The major advantage of the health belief (HBM) model is that it has high face validity mainly attributed to the fact that the researchers working in the area of health-related behaviour developed it. In fact, health belief model has been successfully applied to a number of health-related contexts (Conner and Norman, 2005). In spite of being a good model, there are some shortcomings as well. The most important limitation of health belief model is that it does not account for the role of societal pressure in relation with the behaviour (Conner & Norman, 2005, and Rosenstock, 1966, 1974).

**Figure 2.5:** Health Belief Model (Rosenstock, 1966, 1974)
2.8 Value Belief Norm (VBN) Theory

Unlike the theory of planned behaviour, the Value Belief Norm theory (Stern, Dietz, Abel, Guagnano, & Kalof, 1999) accommodates altruistic attitude to understand the behaviour better. This theory was specifically proposed to study the factors related to environmental behaviour. The purpose of the theory was to develop and study a framework to study the conservation behaviour of individuals. The value belief norms (VBN) theory connects three concepts 1) Value theory, 2) Norm activation theory and 3) New ecological paradigm.

These concepts were merged resulting into a sequence of five variables: personal values, personal norms for pro-environmental actions, awareness of adverse consequences, and ascription of responsibility to self and new ecological paradigm (NEP). Among these variables awareness of adverse consequences (AC), the ascription of responsibility to self and new ecological paradigm (NEP), are the beliefs of individuals related to the external environment. Personal values vary among individuals and are an important constituent of the theory to obtain pertinent information.

There are three core values or concerns in the VBN model: Biospheric, altruistic and egoistic. Biospheric is related to the values of the earth. Altruistic values are the concern for other individuals. Moreover, egoistic values are about self-interest or concern for oneself. New ecological paradigm (NEP) deals with how consumers view the world from an ecological perspective. So if somebody believes that trees should be saved to protect the environment he would also be ready to reduce the consumption of goods related to the destruction of trees.

Awareness of adverse consequences (AC) deals with the acknowledgement of the fact that the behaviour affects the things, which have meanings to the individuals. On the other hand, AR is the perception of the person’s competence to decrease the recognized risk caused by the given behaviour. For individuals, the personal norms are related to the consciousness of own responsibility to embark on behaviour which is environmentally friendly.
2.9 Self-Efficacy Theory

Bandura (1977) developed the idea of self-efficacy in his social cognitive theory. Self-efficacy represents individuals’ judgment of his own capabilities and the control that he may exert on a particular behaviour. The idea of self-efficacy suggests that individuals can evaluate their own ease or difficulty in participating in behaviour. The perception of ease or difficulty in performing a given behaviour may arise out of the interaction between self and the environment.

Another related concept is the outcome expectation, which stands for estimating the unforeseen events or actions, which may impede the behaviour. Building upon the concept of ‘self-efficacy’ and the ‘outcome expectations’, Bandura (1977) developed the self-efficacy theory. The judgment about ones self-efficacy arises from four main types of sources: 1) Past experiences 2) vicarious experiences i.e. experiences from others 3) Verbal persuasion and 4) Emotional arousal. Previous researchers have investigated the robustness of self-efficacy theory in food-related studies (Chang et al. 2003). Ounpuu, Woolcott& Rossi (1999) tested the new self-efficacy scale known as situation self-efficacy scale.

The self-efficacy theory has also been used in behaviour related to low intake of fats in food products. In the above studies, the self-efficacy instrument of 12 items has shown a high level of reliability and validity. Thompson et al (2007) used self-efficacy scale along with social norms related to consumption of fruits and vegetables among school going children.

The study tested the three types of scales: fruits self-efficacy, vegetable self-efficacy, and fruits and vegetable related social norms. They reported that there was a positive correlation between self-efficacy constructs and the social norms constructs. The study concluded that both self-efficacy and the social norms are related to fruits and vegetable consumption.
Figure 2.6: Value belief Norm Theory (Stern, Dietz, Abel, Guagnano, & Kalof, 1999)
2.10 Behavioural Reasoning Theory (BRT)

Behavioural Reasoning Theory (BRT) was developed in order to identify new linkages underlying intentions and behaviour (Westaby, 2005). The theory proposes that reasons serve as important linkages between beliefs, global motives, intentions and behaviour. The BRT theory was created upon the framework of the Theory of Planned Behaviour, as the creator identified a gap in the model construct. As such, the BRT theory would be a reasonable concept to include when trying to improve the TPB. When it comes to the VBN theory, the concept of reason is not directly included in the model, and it is, therefore, a candidate for implementation and possible improvement of the original model.

2.11 Khan’s Model

Making food choices is a complex process. Since food carries with itself a symbolic meaning and aims to satisfy their subconscious minds, nutritive value takes a backseat. It thus becomes essential to understand how a person makes choices regarding food and the values he associates with it while making the decision. Food is an area about which customers have the expertise and enjoy, irrespective of how negative that can be from the dietary point of view. This makes human beings incredibly essential of food and leads one's biases and beliefs. This is further inspired
by the surroundings in which human beings stay. On the different hand, a mixture of sustenance not just offers different selections, but also circuitously ensures nutritional functionality (Khan, 1981). Khan (1981) categorized some elements that affect meal preference indicating that they're not simply complexes but are also notably variable.

Khan (1981) talks about people picking meals in preference to nutrients for his or her food plan, which is interrelated to their persona and intellect. The personal factors, according to Khan (1981), consist of familiarity, appetite, mood, feelings, and meanings attached to food. Socio-economic factors such as a person’s income, cost of food, meaning and status attached to food, etc. decide various aspects of the lifestyle an individual sustains. A study, which investigated socio-economic status and fruit and vegetable consumption, revealed that a less nutritional diet pattern is observed in people at lower socio-economic strata (De Irala-Esteves et al., 2000). The third element Khan brings in is an Educational factor. When people show their unwillingness to change their beliefs about food, one can assume they have a bad nutritional knowledge, they do not identify with the benefits associated with the foods, they do not read labels and thus, cannot differentiate when a huge choice is put forward them. That’s why knowledge becomes important to make people realize that diet can affect their health. Herne (1995) states that with better education, people get better employment opportunities and a chance to move ahead to higher socio-economic strata. This in turn also helps them make a better choice for nutrient intake. Probart et al. (1989) suggest that people with better knowledge themselves seek information about food and improve their intake choices.

Khan’s (1981) study includes biological, physiological and psychological factors, including gender and age that affect choices. The study between the male and female if very complicated, yet definite patterns have emerged. The study of Pollard et al. (2001) which investigated lifestyle factors affecting fruit and vegetable consumption. The study shows married women consume more fruits and vegetable. Another study on marital status and its association with fruit and vegetable consumption by Donkin et al. (1998), conducted on men, show that married men consume more fruit and vegetable than single men do. The fifth factor is cultural, religious and regional influences. Culture plays the biggest role among all with it being the deciding factor as to how the food is consumed, what foods are allowed for consumption, the basic
etiquette for their consumption when the food should be consumed etc? Religious belief connected to food refuse to change even when migration from one place to another takes place. Studies by authors like Mennell et al. (1992), and Askegaard & Madsen (1998) pointed towards geographical difference and religious influences respectively. Factors, which are extrinsic such as environment and situation, time and seasonal variation, also affect food choices in Khan’s (1981) model. On environment and situation, limited literature is available but it suggests that quality expected out of food is a function of the place it is being consumed at. Foods habits can be changed and advertisement can play an important role in conveying consumers a lot of information.

Vickers (1993) suggests that brand influences consumer-buying decision. Cheng et al (1990) through conjoint analysis with restructured beefsteaks, was able to show that product preferences, packaging, and brand identification are interlinked and affect consumer decision. Intrinsic factors are those directly associated with the food itself such as the odour, texture, temperature, quality, and quantity of food. All these factors are significant and influence individual’s choice. Moskowitz (1994) shows in a product concept test with fat reduced cheese, how other information modifies consumer preference. Khan (1981) concluded food preferences being an important indicator of food consumption. They depended upon the likes and dislikes towards a food item and more the food was altered, the less appealing it became to the consumers.

![Figure 2.8 Behavioural Reasoning Theory (Westaby, 2005)](image-url)
Figure 2.9: Khans’ food choice model (1981)
Consumer’s stated purchase intent could be increased by incorporating a health concern. Vickers (1993) examined some considerations arising from incorporating tasting into a conjoint analysis procedure studying the effects of taste, brand, price and health claim on the buying intent for strawberry yoghurt. Respondents considered the sensory qualities important for purchasing strawberry yoghurt. Khan (1981) concluded that food preferences could be an important indicator of food consumption. People decide on the spot as and when choices are presented to them and these are directly connected with their choice making behaviour (Gregory et al., 1993).

2.12 Radder and Roux’s Model

Radder and Roux (2005) proposed a model that would help understand factors affecting consumer choices for food. The factors were grouped under two interrelated dimension, the first being consumer-related forces and the other being market-related forces. Consumer-related factors include variables such as health, social interactions, habits, psychographics, and demographics. Health is considered as an important variable (Pollard et al., 2002). Thus, for Radder and Roux health is an important factor while making food choices. Sensory channels also play a significant role in the perception of food and consumers’ eating choices, which help transform behavioural intentions into actual eating behaviour (Stroebele and De Castro, 2004).

In Radder and Roux’s model, social interaction influences social behaviour and influences food choices. An individual’s social status and group association are often reflected in the type of food he prefers (Pollard et al., 2002). Lindeman and Stark (1999) suggest the impact of sociological factors such as ethics, culture, and politics on food choices. Leek et al., (2000) include the impact of family and friends in food preferences. When people are exposed more to a particular food, it increases their acceptability towards that it. Pliner and Hobden (1992) defined it as behaviour where people are reluctant to try novel foods because of their unfamiliarity with it. Food is now not just a means to satisfy hunger, but has become a symbol of who you are. It is rather a question of an ideology of how life ought to be lived (Lindeman and Sirelius, 2001). At last, demographics such as age, gender, education and occupational status are included as variables in consumer-related factors. According to Roininen et al
(1999), demographics affect food choice, such as seen in the Younger generation, which is less concerned about health than the older generation. Marketing activities are undertaken with a view to generating profit and thus consumer choices include market-related factors as well. Garber et al. (2003) claimed similar opinions as of Radder and Roux.

Their model shows interrelatedness of demographics and market-related variables. The price of food, place of purchase, message in the form of advertisement and availability are important factors for determining food choices. Radder and Roux’s (2005) framework is different from others because of factors it has introduced and the effect they have on the consumers’ food choices when consumer-related variables interact with market-related variables. In addition, Radder and Roux (2005) acknowledged the complexity of food selection process. It identified various categories, which affect food choice by themselves and could be associated with others as well.

![Radder and Roux's Model (2005)](image)

*Figure 2.10: Radder and Roux’s Model (2005)*
2.13 Furst et al.’s Model

Furst et al. (1996) gave a funnel-shaped model for food choice process. It represents the factors and the process involved in a single choice event. Factors involved were grouped into major components, which were 1) life course, 2) influences, and 3) personal system. The relatedness of these components to one another generated a process ending in the choice being made. The life course shapes the way an individual makes his choices as well as the way and the extent to which social and physical factors affect how people formulate and implement personal choices for food. It includes personal roles, social, cultural and physical environment.

The personal experiences and historical eras, current events, and culture, all have a bearing on the choice making process. Five major categories of influences are included in the model. They are ideals, personal factors, resources, social framework and food context. Boundaries between them were often blurred but the point of focus was clear. Ideals include standards, beliefs, and hopes, which, are mostly cultural or have originated symbolically. Personal factors include individual based choices depending upon their needs and preferences arising out of psychological and physiological features. Resources include money, equipment, space, skills, knowledge, and time. The social framework such as association with friends and family, status in society, their household situation also affects food choices. Food context includes the environmental surroundings both physical and social. It involves specific food supply factors and availability of food in the food system.

Rappoport et al. (1992) suggested that people divide their food into categories, which help them evaluate food situations including pleasure, health, tradition, and convenience. Connors et al. (2001), who examined the way people make food choices, also studied these factors. Participants categorized food for simplicity in choice, with categories being an interface between personal values and the food itself. This habit of making food choices over the life course led to people creating a personal system for food selection choices. The personal system has two major components: 1) value negotiation and 2) strategies. The model suggests their interrelatedness and the process as highly dynamic. For food selection, the recurrent values were sensory perceptions, monetary considerations, convenience, health/nutrition, managing relationships and quality.
Values were categorized as beliefs, which guide behaviour and were important in self-distinctness (Kahle and Timmer, 1983). Values were often defined as significant in food choices (Lennernas et al., 1997), and provided some standard scripts for food choice behaviours (Grunert, 1993). Rokeach (1986) suggest that a person’s value system consist of the rules for making selections and for finding a solution to a problem. It includes strategies for making food choices as well. These strategies help a person negotiate with the broader societal food system. Although each person’s strategies are different, there exists patterns and rule for making food selection choices.

Janas et al. (1996) describe personal dietary guidelines, which are personal strategies to change eating patterns to improve cardiac health. Bettman et al. (1998) also defined consumer choice making process with them using context-dependent plans. When permitting one value to dominate, it would often lead to the value dominating in the next situation of value conflict. People reported their presumptions and kept track of previous values. This self-monitoring influenced food choices both current as well as future.

Bell and Meiselman (1995) worked on similar lines. They suggested that the domain of food-choice event included not only present and future expectations but also earlier observations and habits. Decision studies show that more complex the decision is, the more people use decision heuristics (Payne and Bettman, 1992). Another research suggests that with increasing choice complexity, arranging processes into logical, rational, and coordinated system helped adapt to change (Onken et al., 1985). Furst et al. (1996) acknowledge that food choices are ever-changing, constantly developing and dynamic. They propose an understanding of the adaptive systems that people develop to assist themselves in organizing and simplifying their food choices. These are important in developing theories for food and eating behaviour.
Figure 2.11 Furst et al.’s (1996) Model