

Action-related information trumps system information: influencing consumers' intention to reduce food waste

Article

Accepted Version

Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0

Neubig, C. M., Vranken, L., Roosen, J., Grasso, S., Hieke, S., Knoepfle, S., Macready, A. L. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0368-9336> and Masento, N. A. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2881-1887> (2020) Action-related information trumps system information: influencing consumers' intention to reduce food waste. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 261. 121126. ISSN 0959-6526 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121126> Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/89601/>

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/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121126>

Publisher: Elsevier

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

Journal Pre-proof



Action-related information trumps system information: Influencing consumers' intention to reduce food waste

Christina M. Neubig, Liesbet Vranken, Jutta Roosen, Simona Grasso, Sophie Hieke, Sandra Knoepfle, Anna L. Macready, Natalie A. Masento

PII: S0959-6526(20)31173-2

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121126>

Reference: JCLP 121126

To appear in: *Journal of Cleaner Production*

Received Date: 19 December 2019

Revised Date: 12 March 2020

Accepted Date: 14 March 2020

Please cite this article as: Neubig CM, Vranken L, Roosen J, Grasso S, Hieke S, Knoepfle S, Macready AL, Masento NA, Action-related information trumps system information: Influencing consumers' intention to reduce food waste, *Journal of Cleaner Production* (2020), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121126>.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2020 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

Author Contributions

Neubig developed hypotheses, analyzed data and wrote the original draft. Knoepfle participated in preliminary data analysis. Macready, Roosen and Vranken helped to review and edit the paper. All helped to develop the questionnaire. Hieke, Macready, Roosen and Vranken were responsible in conceptualizing the study.

Journal Pre-proof

Action-related information trumps system information: Influencing consumers' intention to reduce food waste

Christina M. Neubig^{a*}, Liesbet Vranken^b, Jutta Roosen^a, Simona Grasso^c, Sophie Hieke^d, Sandra Knoepfle^a, Anna L. Macready^c, Natalie A. Masento^e

^a Technical University of Munich, TUM School of Management, Chair of Marketing and Consumer Research, Alte Akademie 16, 85354 Freising, Germany

^b KU Leuven, Division of Bioeconomics, Celestijnenlaan 200e – box 2411, 3001 Leuven, Belgium

^c School of Agriculture, Policy and Development, University of Reading, Reading RG6 6AR, UK

^d European Food Information Council, Rue des Deux Eglises 14, 1000 Brussels, Belgium

^e Department of Food and Nutritional Sciences, University of Reading, Reading RG6 6AP, UK

*Corresponding author: christina.neubig@tum.de (C.M. Neubig)

Author Contributions

Neubig developed hypotheses, analyzed data and wrote the original draft. Knoepfle participated in preliminary data analysis. Macready, Roosen and Vranken helped to review and edit the paper. All helped to develop the questionnaire. Hieke, Macready, Roosen and Vranken were responsible in conceptualizing the study.

Acknowledgements

Funding: This work was supported by the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT) through KIC Food [Project 18066 “Don’t Be a Food Waster”, 2018].

The authors would like to thank all other members of the EIT “Don’t be a food waster” project for their inspirational counsel and support during the project: Camila Massri, Esereosa Omoarukhe, Margot Van Cauter and Tjitske Anna Zwart. Moreover, the authors would like to thank Kirstyn Byrne from EUFIC for the appealing graphical design of the information that was provided to the treatment groups.

1 **Action-related information trumps system information: Influencing** 2 **consumers' intention to reduce food waste**

5 **Abstract**

6 In order to substantially reduce food waste at the household level, it is essential to change
7 consumer behavior. Informing consumers about the food waste issue is a promising means of
8 bringing about behavior change: research confirms that information can increase food waste
9 reduction behavior. However, it has yet to be determined what kind of information is most
10 effective and exactly how that information affects consumer food waste behavior. This study
11 compares the effects of system vs. action-related information (i.e., knowing *what* impacts
12 specific actions entail vs. knowing *how* specific actions can help to accomplish a goal) on
13 behavioral intention towards food waste. That is, the study focuses on the effect of
14 information on *the role* of food waste in the food system versus information of *actions* that
15 can be taken to avoid it. Moreover, an adapted model of the Theory of Planned Behavior is
16 used to assess how these information effects are mediated by consumers' attitude, norms, and
17 perceived behavioral control. Results from an online experiment with a between-subjects
18 design (N = 2,248) show that action-related information significantly increases respondents'
19 intention to reduce food waste while system information has no significant effect. The change
20 in behavioral intention in the action-related information group is ascribed to greater personal
21 norm activation, more favorable attitudes towards food waste reduction, and higher perceived
22 behavioral control of food waste behaviors. Even though system information does not
23 significantly increase intention to reduce food waste, it results in more favorable attitudes
24 towards food waste reduction. The findings provide insights for policy makers and NGOs on
25 what type of information to consider when designing effective food waste reduction
26 campaigns targeted at consumers, with action-related information supporting the opportunity
27 for consumer behavior change.

30 **Keywords:** Food Waste; Theory of Planned Behavior; Consumer Behavior; System
31 Knowledge; Action-related Knowledge; Information Experiment

34 **Word count:** 9,351 (excluding Appendix) → before revision: 10,659

35 **Introduction**

36 The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations estimates that a third of all
37 food produced globally for human consumption is wasted (FAO, 2011). Food waste is defined
38 as "...food appropriate for human consumption being discarded, whether or not after it is kept
39 beyond its expiry date or left to spoil. Often this is because food has spoiled but it can be for
40 other reasons such as oversupply due to markets, or individual consumer shopping/eating
41 habits." (FAO, 2013: 9).¹ In industrialized countries, the lion's share of food waste is
42 attributed to the consumption stage of the supply chain: Private households are responsible for
43 more than half of total food waste in Europe (Stenmarck et al., 2016). To reduce food waste
44 one should avoid the generation of surpluses that get thrown away or give surpluses to those
45 who are in need. While information and communication technologies based sharing economy
46 platforms enable the rise of collaborative consumption, an attitude behavior gap might loom
47 in the sharing economy (Hamari et al., 2016). Therefore, a primary way to reduce food waste
48 remains avoiding the generation of food surpluses.

49 Consumer food waste generation and prevention has gained increasing scientific attention in
50 recent years and many determinants of consumer food waste behavior have been discussed
51 (e.g., Diaz-Ruiz et al., 2018). However, when it comes to understanding how knowledge may
52 influence consumer food waste behavior, research is still limited and findings lack consensus.
53 While some studies confirm the importance of knowledge in food waste behavior (e.g.,
54 Graham-Rowe et al., 2014), others find no effect (e.g., Visschers et al., 2016). In addition to
55 exploring how existing knowledge affects consumer food waste behavior, research has started
56 to investigate the effect of newly acquired knowledge, for instance through education or
57 provision of information (e.g., Liz Martins et al., 2016). Remarkably, most studies (e.g.,
58 Schmidt, 2016) focus on what Frick et al. (2004) termed action-related knowledge (i.e.,
59 knowledge about practices that help to reduce food waste at home). The effect of system
60 knowledge (i.e., knowledge related to the impact of food waste) on the other hand is rarely
61 studied. The lack of focus on system knowledge in this research area is surprising, especially
62 in view of current food waste reduction measures such as food waste information campaigns
63 that often stress the environmental and financial impacts of food waste in addition to
64 providing practical tips and information. Therefore, exploring how consumers perceive this
65 kind of information and whether it can promote changes in their behavior is highly relevant.

¹ Even though there are several methods to recycle discarded food (e.g., Maroušek et al., 2013) and it is advised to turn waste into compost if one does end up wasting some food (Monier et al., 2010), it is important to note that according to this definition, recycled or composted food would still be regarded as food waste.

66 Furthermore, for the design of effective food waste reduction campaigns in the future, it is
67 essential to understand which is more effective – food waste system knowledge vs. food
68 waste action-related knowledge.

69

70 *1.1 The Theory of Planned Behavior in Food Waste Research*

71 The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) (Ajzen, 1991) postulates that behavior is directly
72 predicted by behavioral intention. Behavioral intention, in turn, is determined by attitude,
73 subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control (PBC). An attitude towards a specific
74 behavior reflects a person's positive or negative evaluations of that behavior. The subjective
75 norm entails the social pressure to (dis)engage in a certain behavior (i.e., the feeling that
76 important people, such as friends and family, would approve or disapprove of a certain
77 behavior). Finally, PBC describes the degree to which a person feels capable of performing a
78 specific behavior. In addition to influencing behavioral intention, PBC may also directly
79 influence the behavior itself.

80 Applied in the context of food waste behavior, this means that intention to reduce food waste
81 should be higher if a person has a positive attitude towards reducing food waste, thinks that
82 his/her peers would approve of him/her reducing food waste, and feels that reducing food
83 waste is within his/her capabilities. A higher intention to reduce food waste is in turn
84 associated with a greater likelihood of performing food waste reduction behavior. Several
85 studies have supported these assumptions with a significant influence of all three constructs
86 (attitude, subjective norm, PBC) on intention (Graham-Rowe et al., 2015), while other studies
87 report no association between either subjective norm (Visschers et al., 2016), PBC (Stancu et
88 al., 2016) or attitude (Russell et al., 2017) and consumers' behavioral intention.

89 Even though the TPB has been accepted as an adequate model to predict food waste behavior,
90 it still does not capture some important food waste drivers such as self-identity or anticipated
91 regret (Graham-Rowe et al., 2015). Therefore, previous research (e.g., Stancu et al., 2016) has
92 attempted to extend and adapt the TPB to account for previously overlooked drivers of food
93 waste behaviors. One construct frequently added by researchers to the TPB model is personal
94 norm – a term interchangeably used in literature and replaced by terms such as moral attitudes
95 (Stefan et al., 2013) or moral norm (Stancu et al., 2016). Personal norm refers to the “moral
96 obligation felt by the individual to follow the line of behavior in question” (Schwartz, 1973:
97 353). Compared to subjective norms, where behavior is externally motivated by expected

98 approval or disapproval by others, people comply with personal norms for internal reasons
99 such as expectations about self-administered rewards and punishment and anticipated
100 emotions such as guilt and pride (Schwartz, 1973). Studies that included a personal norm
101 construct in their models find that it significantly influences behavioral intention (e.g., van der
102 Werf et al., 2019; Visschers et al., 2016) with some even reporting personal norms to have the
103 greatest impact on intention (Lorenz et al., 2017a; Pakpour et al., 2014)². Yet, in other studies,
104 personal norms have no significant influence on behavioral intention (Stancu et al., 2016) or
105 the construct is not included in the final model (Graham-Rowe et al., 2015)³.

106 In addition to personal norms, researchers have included a number of other additional
107 constructs in their TPB models such as taste perception (Lorenz et al., 2017a), perceived
108 portion size (Lorenz et al., 2017b), the “concept of wanting to be a good provider” (Visschers
109 et al., 2016: 69), self-identity and anticipated regret (Graham-Rowe et al., 2015), routines
110 (Stancu et al., 2016), as well as habits and emotions (Russell et al., 2017). Those extended
111 TPB models have been able to explain between 29% and 74% of the variance in food waste
112 intention, and between 16% and 46% of the variance in food waste behavior.

113

114 *1.2 Information, Knowledge and Food Waste*

115 This paper focuses on consumers’ objective knowledge, which is defined as what an
116 individual actually knows, meaning information that is stored in memory (Brucks, 1985).
117 Frick et al. (2004) divided objective environmental knowledge into three dimensions, namely
118 *system knowledge* (knowing what), *action-related knowledge* (knowing how) and
119 *effectiveness knowledge* (knowing when and why). System knowledge includes basic
120 scientific knowledge such as knowledge about the functioning of ecosystems and the
121 processes within them (Schahn and Holzer, 1990) as well as knowledge about corresponding
122 environmental problems and their consequences (Hines et al., 1987). Action-related and
123 effectiveness knowledge are closely linked: Action-related knowledge comprises possible
124 courses of action and solutions for environmental issues (Ernst, 1994) while effectiveness
125 knowledge additionally addresses the effectiveness associated with a particular behavior (e.g.,
126 the ecological benefit of various behavioral alternatives). In order to achieve the greatest

² Pakpour et al. (2014) do not use the term personal norm, but their construct “moral obligation” is comparable to the operationalization of personal norm in other studies.

³ In the study of Graham-Rowe et al. (2015), moral norm was not included in the final model due to high correlations with self-identity and anticipated guilt. The authors assume that there might be an empirical overlap between those three constructs.

127 environmental benefit (effectiveness knowledge), it is essential to be aware of environmental
128 problems and understand the basic characteristics of an environmental system (system
129 knowledge) as well as to know how to take action (action-related knowledge) (Frick et al.,
130 2004; Kaiser and Fuhrer, 2003).

131 Only a few studies have looked into consumers' objective knowledge about food waste, and
132 those who did so found it to be rather limited. For instance, when thinking about food waste,
133 consumers do not usually think of food parts such as vegetable peelings as contributing to
134 waste (Exodus Market Research, 2007). Consequently, consumers tend to think that they are
135 merely discarding inedible parts of their food and that most of their food waste is unavoidable
136 (Richter, 2017). Generally, consumers are unaware of the fact that they are the main
137 generators of food waste within the food system and the common perception is that
138 agriculture and retailers are mainly responsible for food waste (Díaz-Ruiz et al., 2015).

139 Moreover, Brook Lyndhurst et al. (2007) found that consumers predominantly consider food
140 waste as an economic problem rather than a social or environmental one. This is confirmed by
141 Watson and Meah (2012), whose participants barely saw the link between food waste and
142 environmental issues such as greenhouse gas emissions in a qualitative study. The lack of
143 knowledge with regard to environmental consequences of food waste was further highlighted
144 by studies showing that consumers felt that food waste has no negative impact on the
145 environment as it is biodegradable and rots down (e.g., Graham-Rowe et al., 2014).
146 Furthermore, research shows that consumers are not concerned about food waste when it is
147 composted (Neff et al., 2015) and that they perceive discarded packaging as being a bigger
148 environmental problem than food waste (Brook Lyndhurst et al., 2007).

149 While several studies confirm a lack of food waste knowledge, previous research has also
150 shown that consumers who do have such knowledge might actually waste less. For instance,
151 in an exploratory study using food waste diaries, Williams et al. (2012) found that households
152 who had previously participated in an environmental education program waste less food
153 compared to households who had not participated in such a program. In a qualitative study,
154 Graham-Rowe et al. (2014) confirmed that consumers, who feel knowledgeable in relation to
155 food management, report that their skills and knowledge help them to minimize food waste in
156 their homes. Moreover, based on findings from a mixed-method study (interviews and
157 participant observations) by Farr-Wharton et al. (2014), knowledge on how to creatively use
158 food when cooking meals directly influences food waste behavior. In addition, supply
159 knowledge (knowing what food consumers have available) and location knowledge (knowing

160 where to locate food items) were identified as being directly related to food waste. Therefore,
161 increasing consumers' food waste knowledge by providing additional information seems a
162 promising measure for reducing household food waste. Governments as well as non-
163 governmental organizations (NGOs) have already adopted this approach by initiating
164 information-based campaigns (e.g., "Love Food, Hate Waste" in the UK; "Zu gut für die
165 Tonne" [Too good for the bin] in Germany).

166

167 *1.3 Objectives and Theoretical Model*

168 Several studies confirm that education/information campaigns can be effective in reducing
169 household food waste (Reynolds et al., 2019). The present study extends this line of research
170 by investigating how different types of knowledge (i.e., system vs. action-related knowledge)
171 affect consumer food waste behavioral intention and which type is more effective in reducing
172 it. Knowledge, however, is a behavior-distal factor: rather than influencing behavior directly,
173 the effect of knowledge on behavior has been found to be mediated and conveyed by
174 behavior-proximal factors such as attitude, personal norms, and intention (Kaiser and Fuhrer,
175 2003). Therefore, this study intends to connect knowledge to the constructs of the TPB. An
176 adaption of the TPB was used to assess consumers' attitude, norms, and PBC, and to relate
177 those constructs to behavioral intention towards food waste reduction. This study aims at
178 answering the following three research questions:

179 (1) What do consumers think and know about food waste? More precisely, this study aims at
180 measuring consumers' attitudes, norms, PBC, and intentions regarding food waste reduction
181 as well as their general, system, and action-related food waste knowledge.

182 (2) What is the effect of additional information on consumers' intention to reduce food waste,
183 as well as their attitude, norms, and PBC? More precisely, this study aims at investigating if
184 there is a general information effect and, if so, which kind of information (system vs. action-
185 related) is more effective in increasing intention to reduce food waste. To this end, additional
186 food waste information was developed using a novel gamification approach (i.e., a food waste
187 quiz). By this means, information was provided using active learning methods as opposed to
188 passive learning methods that require respondents to simply read the provided information.

189 (3) Is an adaption of the TPB a suitable theoretical model to reflect consumer food waste
190 behavior and do the TPB constructs (attitudes, norms, PBC) mediate the hypothesized
191 information effect on intention to reduce food waste?

192 *Figure 1 around here*

193 Following the TPB, it was hypothesized that intention to reduce food waste is predicted by
194 attitude towards reducing food waste, subjective norm and PBC. As suggested by previous
195 research (e.g., Visschers et al., 2016), the model was extended to include the personal norm
196 construct. Figure 1 shows the model that was specified for the present study. Knowledge per
197 se was not included in the theoretical model, however multiple participant groups received
198 different types of information in order to compare information effects. In line with previous
199 findings (e.g., Williams et al., 2012), it was expected that more informed respondents have a
200 higher intention to reduce food waste.

201 While it was assumed that both system and action-related information result in a higher
202 intention to reduce food waste, the process is likely to be different for each type of
203 information. System information was presumed to make respondents aware of the severe
204 consequences of their food waste (environmental, social, and financial). A change in their
205 behavioral intention was therefore expected to trace back to an increased personal norm
206 activation and more favorable attitudes towards food waste reduction. On the other hand,
207 action-related information was presumed to strengthen consumers' beliefs about their
208 capability or control over reducing food waste at home. A change in their behavioral intention
209 was therefore expected to be associated with an increase in respondents' PBC. In addition,
210 increased control belief strength may lead to more favorable attitudes towards food waste
211 reduction. Therefore, action-related information may additionally increase behavioral
212 intention via respondents' attitude.

213 This study contributes to the growing body of food waste literature and provides information
214 on how to tackle the serious issue of consumer food waste. First, it extends previous research
215 concerning consumers' attitudes, norms, PBC and intention towards food waste reduction.
216 Moreover, new insights into consumers' (lack of) food waste knowledge are provided which
217 are important when considering how to tackle consumer food waste. Second, the study
218 contributes important findings on how increased knowledge can affect consumers'
219 willingness to reduce food waste at home. This study provides insights into what kind of
220 information is more effective in changing consumers' intention to reduce food waste and how
221 this effect is mediated by attitude, norms, and PBC. These findings can inform public policy
222 and help NGOs and policy-makers to design more effective information campaigns targeting
223 consumer food waste reduction. Third, this study adds to the current debate around the
224 suitability of the TBP and extended TBP models in food waste research as it provides

225 evidence that the TBP (and its extended version) can offer a meaningful framework in
226 studying and understanding drivers for consumer food waste behavior.

227

228 **2. Material and Methods**

229 *2.1 Procedure and Sample*

230 Data was collected through an online survey in Belgium (Flanders), Germany, and the UK.
231 The three countries were selected based on the amount of food waste they produce: the UK
232 and Germany are the two European countries with the highest total amount of food waste.
233 Belgium, in turn, is the third most wasteful country in Europe (after the Netherlands and
234 Cyprus) considering per capita food waste (Monier et al., 2010). Data collection took place in
235 June and July 2018. A total of 2,250 respondents older than 18 years were recruited via a
236 market research firm. Respondents were split equally across the three participating countries
237 (750 respondents per country). The average response rate was 22%. Respondents who
238 reported to have randomly clicked through the questionnaire (.09%) were excluded from the
239 analysis. This resulted in a final dataset of 2,248 respondents (748 from Belgium, 750 from
240 Germany, 750 from the UK).

241 The sample was 51% female, 49% male. The mean age was 49 years ($SD = 16.75$). Almost
242 60% of the sample held a university degree (Bachelor, Master, PhD) or vocation/technical
243 degree. Most respondents lived in a two-person household (41%), followed by single (28%),
244 three-person (16%) and four-person (10%) households. Less than 5% of the sample lived in a
245 household with five or more persons. Almost all of the respondents stated that they have at
246 least some responsibility for food shopping (99%) and preparation/cooking (94%). Details
247 about the socio-demographic characteristics of the study's sample by country and treatment
248 group are depicted in the Appendix, Table A1.

249 The sample is representative for the respective countries regarding age, gender, monthly net
250 income, employment status and household composition. There are slight deviations regarding
251 education (respondents in this study's sample reported higher education than the
252 representative numbers for the respective countries).

253

254

255

256 *2.2 Questionnaire and Experimental Design*

257 The survey was categorized into socio-demographic questions, questions informed by the
258 constructs of the TPB, and a food waste knowledge quiz⁴. The items for the TPB questions
259 were developed based on previous studies. A 3-item scale asking about respondents' intention
260 to reduce food waste was adapted from Stancu et al. (2016). Respondents were asked whether
261 they intend, whether their goal is, and whether they will try to reduce the amount of food they
262 throw away. Respondents answered on a 7-point Likert scale where 1 indicated strongly
263 disagree and 7 indicated strongly agree. To assess subjective and personal norms, items were
264 developed based on Thøgersen (2006): Two items measured subjective and two items
265 measured personal norms, the latter with a focus on the feeling of guilt. For all four norm
266 variables, respondents had to indicate their level of agreement to the given statement on a 5-
267 point Likert scale where 1 indicated strongly disagree and 5 indicated strongly agree. Attitude
268 was assessed by asking participants to respond to the statement "In my opinion, reducing food
269 waste is..." on two pairs of unipolar scales for positivity (1 indicated not at all positive and 7
270 indicated extremely positive) and importance (1 indicated not at all important and 7 indicated
271 extremely important). The attitude items were developed based on Stancu et al. (2016). The
272 wordings and scales were slightly adapted. PBC was measured on a 3-item scale adapted from
273 Russell et al. (2017). Respondents had to consider whether it is mostly up to them to reduce
274 food waste in their home, how much control they have over reducing food waste in their
275 household and how difficult it would be for them to reduce food waste at home. All PBC
276 items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 indicated strongly disagree and 5
277 indicated strongly agree. An overview of all TPB questions asked and the respective sources
278 are shown in the Appendix, Table A2.

279 The knowledge quiz included a total of 13 questions. While some of the questions were based
280 on previous food waste research findings, others were informed by the World Wildlife Fund
281 (2018) food waste quiz⁵. In the end, the quiz included three types of food waste questions: (1)
282 general food waste questions (e.g., food waste statistics), (2) system knowledge questions
283 (e.g., environmental impact of food waste), and (3) action-related knowledge questions (e.g.,

⁴ Data used for this research was collected within a broader consumer survey that measured a number of additional variables as well. However, those were not relevant for the purpose of this study and are therefore not described here. The full questionnaire is available upon request.

⁵ The quiz can be found at <https://www.worldwildlife.org/pages/take-the-food-waste-quiz>. The idea of passing food waste knowledge through a quiz was used to assess the effect of different types of knowledge, which has not been tested in literature before.

284 correct storage of food products). An overview of the quiz questions is provided in the
285 Appendix, Table A3.

286 Respondents were randomly assigned to one of four groups including two control (C1 and
287 C2) and two treatment groups (T1 and T2) with an equal distribution of age and gender
288 between the groups. In order to determine effects of food waste knowledge on behavioral
289 intention, T1, T2, and C1 respondents took the food waste quiz midway through the
290 questionnaire, i.e., before responding to the questions on norms, attitude, PBC, and intention.
291 T1 took the general and system knowledge quiz, receiving instant feedback including the
292 correct answers and further information on each question topic. T2 took the general and
293 action-related knowledge quiz, also receiving instant feedback including the correct answers
294 and further information on each question topic. C1 took the general and system knowledge
295 quiz but did not receive any feedback. To test for a mere quiz/gamification effect, C2 took the
296 whole quiz (all questions) at the end of the questionnaire and also received no feedback. To
297 ensure everyone had the same understanding of the term 'food waste', respondents were given
298 a comprehensive definition following Parfitt et al. (2010) prior to receiving the TPB
299 questions. For groups T1, T2, and C1, this definition was provided between the second and
300 third quiz question⁶. C2 was simply provided with the definition before answering the TPB
301 questions. A flow chart of the questionnaire design is presented in the Appendix, Figure A1.
302 Examples of the food waste information and definition provided to respondents is depicted in
303 the Appendix, Figures A2, A3 and A4.

304

305 *2.3 Data Analysis*

306 First, a descriptive analysis of the TPB constructs and consumers' knowledge was conducted
307 using IBM SPSS Statistics 25. As the variables attitude, personal norm, subjective norm, PBC
308 and behavioral intention were measured on multi-item scales, internal reliability of these
309 scales was analyzed via confirmatory factor analysis in SPSS Amos 25. Factor scores were
310 calculated and used for further analyses. The knowledge level of respondents was analyzed by
311 calculating the percentage of correct answers per question and the distribution of responses
312 across the knowledge categories. To test the effect of provision of food waste information on

⁶ The definition was provided only after asking the first two questions since it might have influenced respondents' answers to the initial and fairly general food waste questions. For the following questions, however, it was necessary to establish a common understanding of the term.

313 the TPB constructs, factor scores were compared between groups using t-tests and analyses of
314 variance (ANOVA).

315 Next, covariance-based structural equation modelling using SPSS Amos 25 was carried out in
316 order to estimate the hypothesized model using maximum likelihood estimation. Before
317 interpreting the relationships in the model, goodness-of-fit was assessed. Since there is no
318 consensus in the literature on which goodness-of-fit indicator best predicts model fit, several
319 indicators (χ^2 , RMSEA, χ^2/df , SRMR, NFI, TLI, and CFI) were looked at to gain a more
320 comprehensive view of the model, in line with Schermelleh-Engel et al. (2003).

321 Finally, multiple group analyses between the different treatment and control groups were
322 carried out within SPSS Amos 25. First, to compare values between groups, measurement
323 invariance was assessed (Horn and McArdle, 1992). In line with Temme and Hildebrandt
324 (2009), homogeneity of covariance matrices between the groups, configural invariance, and
325 metric invariance were tested. In order to compare multiple groups, the factor loadings across
326 those groups were held constant and the path coefficients obtained for each group were
327 compared. To determine significant differences in the path coefficients between treatment
328 groups, a pairwise comparison using a χ^2 difference test was carried out.

329

330 **3. Results**

331 Results of the confirmatory factor analysis confirmed all constructs of the TPB, but led to the
332 exclusion of the second item in the PBC scale (“How difficult would it be for you to reduce
333 food waste at home?”). After the exclusion of the respective item, all scales had acceptable to
334 high reliabilities (see Appendix, Table A4).

335

336 *3.1 Consumers’ Food Waste Perception and Knowledge*

337 **Attitude, Norms, PBC and Intention towards Food Waste Reduction.** The constructs of
338 attitude, norms, PBC and intention were analyzed first and results are reported in Table 1. The
339 findings show that respondents generally have a favorable attitude towards reducing food
340 waste. Personal norm is high amongst respondents, suggesting that most respondents have a
341 bad conscience or feel guilty when throwing away food. Respondents’ scores for subjective
342 norm (e.g. food waste expectations and beliefs of acquaintances) are relatively low in all
343 countries. When it comes to PBC, most respondents acknowledge that they possess a certain

344 degree of control over their food waste behavior. The intention to reduce food waste is
345 relatively high amongst respondents. Results for attitude, norms, PBC and intention in the
346 three different countries are reported in the Appendix, Table A5.

347 *Table 1 around here*

348 **Food Waste Knowledge.** Respondent's general knowledge about food waste (e.g., food
349 waste statistics) is rather poor with an average of around 34% correct answers (see Table 2).
350 For instance, only a third of respondents know that households are the main contributor to
351 food waste. Respondents' system knowledge regarding food waste is even lower, with an
352 average of around 30% correct answers. In particular, respondents are not aware of the
353 magnitude of CO₂ emissions that are related to household food waste or the number of people
354 that could be fed with all the food that is lost or wasted. Action-related knowledge related to
355 food waste is greater with an average of around 51% correct answers. The meaning of the
356 'best before' date, for instance, is understood by most respondents (around 80% correct
357 answers). However, respondents seem to be less familiar with the meaning of the 'use by'
358 date (around 50% correct answers). Results for knowledge in the three different countries are
359 reported in the Appendix, Table A6.

360 *Table 2 around here*

361

362 *3.2 The Effect of Additional Information on Consumers' Intention, Attitude, Norms, and PBC*

363 **Prior Knowledge Differences** Prior knowledge differences were examined between control
364 and treatment groups (see Appendix, Table A7). There are no significant knowledge
365 differences except between C2 and the other groups. These differences can be explained by
366 the survey design. C2 answered the quiz at the very end of the survey and some previous
367 questions may have informed them about certain aspects such as the correct fridge
368 temperature.

369 **General Information Effect.** To test for a general information effect, control groups C1 and
370 C2 were combined into a single control group while treatment groups T1 and T2 were
371 combined into a single treatment group. Results from a t-test show that intention to reduce
372 food waste is significantly higher in the combined treatment group ($M_T = 5.67$, $SD_T = 1.26$) as
373 compared to the control group ($M_C = 5.50$, $SD_C = 1.37$), $t = 3.110$, $p < .01$, $d = .13$. Mean
374 scores for intention to reduce food waste are .17 (95% CI [.06, .28]) higher for the treatment

375 group. Therefore, respondents who received information have a significantly higher intention
376 to reduce food waste.

377 **Impact vs. Action-related Information Effect.** For the remaining analyses, treatment and
378 control groups were analyzed individually. Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations
379 of the TPB constructs for all groups (C1, C2, T1, and T2) and for the complete sample. F-Test
380 statistics and corresponding p-values from the ANOVA are reported. Results show that the
381 groups differ significantly regarding personal norm ($p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .009$), attitude ($p < .001$, η^2
382 $= .009$), PBC ($p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .004$), and intention ($p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .005$). There are no significant
383 differences in subjective norm between treatment and control groups.

384 *Table 3 around here*

385 No significant difference was found for personal norm between T1 and either of the control
386 groups (see Table 4). However, T2 shows significantly higher scores for personal norm than
387 C2, but not C1. Similarly, T1 and T2 respondents' attitude scores were significantly higher
388 than those of C2 respondents. There was no significant difference in attitude between T1, T2
389 and C1. For PBC, T2 respondents show significantly higher levels of PBC than C2. The
390 differences between all other groups remain non-significant. Finally, results for intention to
391 reduce food waste show that only T2 respondents demonstrate a significantly higher intention
392 to reduce food waste compared to C2 respondents. There were no significant differences
393 between any other groups.

394 *Table 4 around here*

395 **Quiz Effect.** To test for a possible quiz effect, the two control groups C1 and C2 were
396 compared. Results show no significant difference in the intention to reduce food waste
397 between the two control conditions. Therefore, a mere quiz effect on the change in intention
398 can be rejected. However, C1 and C2 differ significantly in other constructs. C1 respondents
399 report significantly higher scores for personal norm and attitude compared to C2 respondents.

400

401 *3.3 Food Waste, Knowledge and the Theory of Planned Behavior*

402 **Goodness-of-Fit of the TPB Model.** The χ^2 value ($\chi^2 = 84.835$, $df = 34$) shows an
403 acceptable model fit. The RMSEA (.026), SRMR (.0155), NFI (.995), TLI (.995), and CFI
404 (.997) suggest that the hypothesized model fits the data well. An overview of selected

405 goodness-of-fit statistics for the TPB model is presented in the Appendix, Table A8, and
406 compared to their respective requirements for good model fit.

407 *Figure 2 around here*

408 Figure 2 shows the standardized estimates of the path model. All paths theoretically
409 postulated by the TPB prove to be significant. Also the extension (personal norm) influences
410 intention significantly in a positive way. The influence of personal norm (.27), attitude (.23),
411 and subjective norm (.20) on intention clearly exceeds that of PBC (.06), with personal norm
412 being the strongest influence on intention. However, the differences in the standardized
413 estimates between personal norm, subjective norm, and attitude are rather small, suggesting
414 that all three constructs influence intention to reduce food waste in a similarly strong way. All
415 constructs are significantly positively correlated. The correlations are medium, with attitude
416 and personal norm (.57) as well as attitude and PBC (.51) showing the highest correlations.
417 The proportion of variance of intention that can be explained by the four constructs (personal
418 norm, subjective norm, attitude, and PBC) is 35%.

419 **Mediation Effect.** To test whether there are mediation effects of attitude, norms, and PBC,
420 the model was also tested individually for the four different information treatment groups C1,
421 C2, T1, and T2. Results from the corresponding validity checks are reported in the Appendix,
422 Tables A9 and A10. Pairwise comparisons of the groups' path coefficients using χ^2 difference
423 tests show that the differences in the path coefficients are not significant. The coefficients are
424 reported in the Appendix, Table A11, and the resulting p-values are reported in the Appendix,
425 Table A12. Consequently, the four groups do not differ significantly in how subjective norm,
426 personal norm, attitude, and PBC influence intention to reduce food waste.

427

428 **4. Discussion**

429 **Attitude, Norms, PBC and Intention towards Food Waste Reduction.** Generally,
430 respondents score relatively high on attitude, personal norm, PBC and intention to reduce
431 food waste. Interestingly, compared to personal norm, scores for subjective norm are low,
432 suggesting that people have a self-expectation that goes beyond what they think about what
433 others do and expect of them. Respondents in the present study feel guilty when wasting food
434 but they do not believe that their peers try to reduce food waste or want them to do so. This
435 finding contradicts previous research that reports high scores for subjective norm (e.g., Russel
436 et al., 2017) and/or similar levels for subjective and personal/moral norm (e.g., Graham-Rowe

437 et al., 2015; Visschers et al., 2016). A possible reason for the low subjective norm scores
438 (especially in comparison with personal norm) in the present study could be that food waste
439 mostly happens in the home and is consequently a private behavior that cannot be observed
440 by others. Respondents might feel guilty about food waste but since their peers do not see
441 this behavior, they do not feel obliged to reduce their food waste. Another possible
442 explanation could be that respondents in this sample feel they already waste very little food
443 compared to their peers which may lead to a low score for subjective norm. However, they
444 might still feel guilty when throwing out food (leading to a high score in personal norm) even
445 though (they think) they rarely do so.

446 **Food Waste Knowledge.** The findings show that respondents' general food waste knowledge
447 and their food waste system knowledge are rather poor. Concerning the food waste action-
448 related knowledge dimension such as the storage of certain food items, consumers'
449 knowledge is slightly better. The poor system knowledge finding is in line with previous
450 studies confirming that consumers lack awareness, especially of environmental consequences
451 of food waste (Brook Lyndhurst et al., 2007; Watson and Meah, 2012). It is perhaps
452 surprising that only one third of respondents is aware that households are the major source of
453 food waste. It seems that consumers underestimate their own responsibility in relation to the
454 food waste problem. Rather, producers or retailers are blamed. The ignorance of
455 responsibility may in fact lead to people behaving in less environmentally friendly ways
456 (Kollmuss and Agyeman, 2002) and therefore serves as a possible explanation for the high
457 level of household food waste in the respective countries (Bräutigam et al., 2014).

458 **Information Effect on Intention.** This study's results confirm an information effect on
459 intention to reduce food waste. Taken together, the treatment groups have a significantly
460 higher intention to reduce food waste than the control groups. This is in line with previous
461 findings (e.g., Liz Martins et al., 2016). Looking at the effect of the two different information
462 treatments individually, the results show that only the group receiving action-related
463 information (T2) shows a significantly higher intention to reduce food waste compared to the
464 group who did not participate in the quiz mid-survey (C2). However, there are no significant
465 differences in intention to reduce food waste between the two treatment groups or between
466 either treatment condition and the control group who received the quiz without feedback (C1).
467 Even though C1 and C2 do not differ in their intention to reduce food waste, C1 reports
468 significantly higher scores for personal norm and attitude. Therefore, while a mere quiz effect
469 in the change of intention to reduce food waste can be rejected, a quiz effect on the constructs

470 personal norm and attitude cannot be ruled out. The difference between C1 and C2 as well as
471 the non-existing difference between C1 and the treatment groups T1 and T2 may point to a
472 salience rather than an information effect. The information provided may not have increased
473 knowledge, however the mere process of taking part in the quiz could have made already
474 existing knowledge more salient and thus led to increased scores for attitude and norms, also
475 for C1 respondents.

476 **Information Effect on Attitude, Norms, and PBC.** The higher intention to reduce food
477 waste for the action-related information group (T2) can be traced back to significantly higher
478 scores in personal norm, attitude and PBC compared to C2. The higher scores in PBC and
479 attitude were expected, as the practical tips provided by the action-related information were
480 designed to make respondents feel more capable of reducing food waste in their home, and
481 therefore evaluate it more favorably as well. Interestingly, the action-related information
482 seems to have increased respondents' scores for personal norm towards food waste reduction,
483 i.e., their feeling of guilt when wasting food. One explanation could be that providing action-
484 related information demonstrated that reducing food waste is not complicated but achievable
485 by most. If realizing a desired behavior is not that complicated, not engaging with that
486 behavior may lead to increased feelings of guilt. Even though no significant intention change
487 is observed in the system information group, they score significantly higher than C2 on
488 attitude. This indicates that, in line with the authors' expectations, a confrontation with the
489 negative impacts of food waste increases respondents' attitude towards reducing it. Still, the
490 more favorable attitude does not translate into higher intention to reduce food waste.
491 Therefore, the findings partly contradict the authors' previous assumptions. A potential
492 explanation might be that the information provided was limited and possibly too intangible
493 which may have made it not relatable enough to result in an increase in behavioral intention to
494 reduce food waste. Water scarcity, for example, is currently not a big concern in the
495 investigated countries and the amount of CO₂ emissions emitted by food waste may be hard to
496 grasp. Even though unexpected, the results confirm findings from Ajzen et al. (2011) who
497 investigated the role of information accuracy in predicting energy saving and drinking
498 behavior and intentions.

499 **The TPB Model.** Results regarding the extended TPB model suggest that all paths
500 theoretically postulated by the TPB as well as the newly included construct of personal norm
501 significantly influence intention to reduce food waste. However, the influence of personal
502 norm, attitude, and subjective norm on intention clearly exceeds that of PBC. The small effect

503 of PBC is in line with previous findings from Stancu et al. (2016) who did not find significant
504 effects of PBC on intention at all. However, the present study's finding contradicts other
505 research that has found PBC to be one of the important predictors of intention (Graham-Rowe
506 et al., 2015; Russell et al., 2017; Visschers et al., 2016). Given the significant influence of
507 personal norm which has also been observed in previous studies (Lorenz et al., 2017a;
508 Visschers et al., 2016), the incorporation of this construct into the model of the TPB when
509 investigating food waste or related behaviors is supported. When testing the path model
510 within each treatment/control group, results show that the differences in coefficients are not
511 significant across groups for either construct. Therefore, the results do not confirm significant
512 differences of how system and action-related information influence intention within the TPB
513 model.

514

515 *4.1 Implications*

516 This study shows that the level of knowledge concerning food waste and how to avoid it
517 among consumers in Belgium, Germany, and the UK is rather low and therefore needs to be
518 improved. Based on the results obtained in this study, it is recommended that policy makers
519 and NGOs launch more consumer education campaigns using action-related information;
520 educating consumers about how to store food products to keep them fresh the longest, at what
521 temperature to set their fridge, the importance of planning meals and writing a shopping list,
522 to name just a few.

523 The importance of personal norms in predicting behavioral intention indicates that campaigns
524 should further focus on communicating the moral obligation to reduce food waste. In that
525 context, it is important to note that previous findings show that simply blaming the consumer
526 and eliciting feelings of guilt may not be effective in reducing waste (Birau and Faure, 2018).
527 Therefore, further research on how campaigns can increase consumers' personal norm
528 without unwanted side effects is required. For instance, effort could be directed towards
529 alerting consumers about the magnitude of household food waste since the ascription of
530 responsibility is considered a prerequisite for the emergence of negative emotions, and this
531 may in turn strengthen personal norms.

532 Moreover, the way the information was presented to respondents might have played an
533 important role. Previous research on environmental behavior (e.g., Cialdini, 2003) suggests
534 that information campaigns with different message framing can differ significantly in their

535 effectiveness. This line of research should be extended to the food waste field. Since the
536 increase in intention caused by the action-related information was rather small, additional
537 ways to influence consumers' intention and eventually their behavior regarding food waste
538 should be explored. In the end, the model accounted for only 35% of the variance in
539 behavioral intention, suggesting that other constructs influence food waste intention and
540 behavior. Therefore, future research should include additional constructs in their models
541 explaining household food waste behavior. Next to investigating how to prevent food waste, it
542 is also important to further investigate methods of food waste recovery, either in the
543 household (e.g. motivate consumers to participate in food sharing initiatives) (e.g., Lazell,
544 2016) or in industry (e.g. via the method of biochar farming) (Maroušek et al., 2019).

545

546 *4.2 Limitations*

547 There were methodological limitations to this study which could partially affect the
548 generalizability of the results. First, the findings depend on self-reported consumer data which
549 is prone to bias, particularly when it comes to emotionally charged topics, causing responses
550 to be biased towards appropriate social norms. Food waste can be such an emotional topic
551 since it is often associated with feelings of shame and guilt (Quested et al., 2013). This is
552 confirmed by respondents' feedback to the questionnaire which included a number of
553 comments and justifications of people claiming never to waste food. Furthermore, this study
554 was not able to measure actual food waste behavior. Instead, behavioral intention was the
555 final dependent variable in this study. Measuring real life food waste behavior is difficult.
556 Although there are several methods such as food waste diaries and self-report questionnaires,
557 those are expensive and/or usually biased (Jörissen et al., 2015). Even though low response
558 rates are common in online surveys, it has to be addressed that the response rate of the present
559 survey was at 22%. A possible reason might be the length of the questionnaire which took
560 respondents on average about 28 minutes to complete. However, representativeness of the
561 sample to the respective countries' population was still ensured using quotas, thus reducing
562 the risk of non-response bias.

563 It should also be stated that the effectiveness of educating people – especially in the long-term
564 – is debatable. Some researchers argue that education campaigns alone may not be enough to
565 change the underlying norms and habits that lead to food waste behavior (Gjerris and Gaiani,
566 2013; Hebrok and Boks, 2017; Quested et al., 2013). Liz Martins et al. (2016), for instance,
567 who implemented different education campaigns in three schools in Portugal, show that

568 education measures designed for children reduced plate waste at first. However, this effect
569 decreased after a period of three months. A campaign targeted at teachers was more effective.
570 Even though the present study confirms the effect of information, it has to be pointed out that
571 effect sizes were rather small. Moreover, while this study focused on objective knowledge,
572 previous research has shown that subjective knowledge might be even more important in
573 environmentally sustainable consumption choices (Peschel et al., 2016).

574 Moreover, this study only investigated consumers from Belgium, Germany and the UK. The
575 sample was representative for the respective countries which means that the results can be
576 generalized onto the overall population of those countries. Since there were little differences
577 between the three countries, it can be assumed that the results of this study can also be
578 generalized onto similar countries, i.e., other industrialized ones. On a global level, though,
579 results may vary. Countries differ in the stage of the supply chain at which most food waste is
580 created. In developing countries, the majority of food waste does not happen at the
581 consumption stage but in earlier supply chain stages. As a consequence, rather than
582 investigating whether the results of this study could be adapted to those countries, further
583 research needs to address how to avoid food waste in earlier supply chain stages. Lastly, a
584 sole focus on individual food waste prevention is not sufficient. In order to substantially
585 decrease food waste, a holistic approach including consumers, policy makers, and
586 stakeholders along the supply chain is indispensable (Schanes et al., 2018).

587

588 **5. Conclusion**

589 The findings of this study show that action-related information significantly increases
590 consumers' behavioral intention to reduce food waste while system information has no direct
591 effect on intention although it results in more favorable attitudes towards food waste
592 reduction. To the best of the authors' knowledge, this is the first study to compare how those
593 different types of information influence consumers' intention towards reducing food waste.

594 These findings are important for both practitioners and researchers and they are especially
595 relevant in sight of the Sustainable Development Goal 12.3 to halve global per capita food
596 waste as proposed by the United Nations. The study's findings stress the importance of
597 action-related information in changing consumer behavior and they represent an important
598 foundation for the development of future campaigns and educational material aimed at
599 influencing cognitive drivers of food waste generation to change consumer behavior. Since

600 consumers (and especially those in Western countries) are a major contributor to the food
601 waste problem, changing their behavior is an important step towards reducing global food
602 waste and thus fighting climate change.

603 Lastly, the results contribute to the ongoing scientific debate about factors influencing food
604 waste intention and behavior. The central role of attitudes, norms and PBC has been
605 confirmed and insights into causal mechanisms involved in the intention formation process
606 are provided.

Journal Pre-proof

607 **References**

- 608 Ajzen, I., 1991. The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human*
609 *Decision Processes* 50, 179–211.
- 610 Ajzen, I., Joyce, N., Sheikh, S., Cote, N.G., 2011. Knowledge and the Prediction of Behavior:
611 The Role of Information Accuracy in the Theory of Planned Behavior. *Basic and Applied*
612 *Social Psychology* 33, 101–117.
- 613 Birau, M.M., Faure, C., 2018. It is easy to do the right thing: Avoiding the backfiring effects
614 of advertisements that blame consumers for waste. *Journal of Business Research* 87, 102–
615 117.
- 616 Bräutigam, K.-R., Jörissen, J., Priefer, C., 2014. The extent of food waste generation across
617 EU-27: different calculation methods and the reliability of their results. *Waste*
618 *Management & Research* 32, 683–694.
- 619 Brook Lyndhurst Ltd, Cox, J., Downing, P., 2007. Food behaviour consumer research:
620 quantitative phase. WRAP, UK.
621 [http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/Food%20behaviour%20consumer%20research%20](http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/Food%20behaviour%20consumer%20research%20quantitative%20jun%202007.pdf)
622 [0quantitative%20jun%202007.pdf](http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/Food%20behaviour%20consumer%20research%20quantitative%20jun%202007.pdf). Accessed October 10, 2019.
- 623 Brucks, M., 1985. The Effects of Product Class Knowledge on Information Search Behavior.
624 *Journal of Consumer Research* 12, 1–16.
- 625 Cialdini, R.B., 2003. Crafting Normative Messages to Protect the Environment. *Current*
626 *Directions in Psychological Science* 12, 105–109.
- 627 Díaz-Ruiz, R., Costa-Font, M., Gil, J.M., 2015. A social perspective on food waste: to what
628 extent consumers are aware of their own food waste, in: Escajedo San-Epifanio, L., De
629 Renobales Scheifler, M. (Eds.), *Envisioning a future without food waste and food poverty.*
630 *Societal challenges.* Wageningen Academic Publishers, Wageningen, 157–164.
- 631 Díaz-Ruiz, R., Costa-Font, M., Gil, J.M., 2018. Moving ahead from food-related behaviours:
632 an alternative approach to understand household food waste generation. *Journal of Cleaner*
633 *Production* 172, 1140–1151.
- 634 Ernst, A.M., 1994. *Soziales Wissen als Grundlage des Handelns in Konfliktsituationen.* P.
635 Lang, Frankfurt am Main, New York.
- 636 Exodus Market Research, 2007. *We Don't Waste Food! A Householder Survey.* Retail
637 *Programme - Food Waste: Final Report.* WRAP, UK.
638 [http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/We_don_t_waste_food_-](http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/We_don_t_waste_food_-_A_household_survey_mar_07.db6802f9.6397.pdf)
639 [_A_household_survey_mar_07.db6802f9.6397.pdf](http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/We_don_t_waste_food_-_A_household_survey_mar_07.db6802f9.6397.pdf). Accessed October 10, 2019.
- 640 FAO, 2011. *Global food losses and food waste. Extent, causes and prevention,* Study
641 *conducted for the International Congress SAVE FOOD! at Interpack2011, Düsseldorf,*
642 *Germany.* <http://www.fao.org/docrep/014/mb060e/mb060e.pdf>. Accessed October 22,
643 2019.
- 644 FAO, 2013. *Food wastage footprint: impacts on natural resources.*
645 <http://www.fao.org/docrep/018/i3347e/i3347e.pdf>. Accessed January 23 2020.

- 646 Farr-Wharton, G., Foth, M., Choi, J.H.-J., 2014. Identifying factors that promote consumer
647 behaviours causing expired domestic food waste. *Journal of Consumer Behavior* 13, 393–
648 402.
- 649 Frick, J., Kaiser, F.G., Wilson, M., 2004. Environmental knowledge and conservation
650 behavior: exploring prevalence and structure in a representative sample. *Personality and*
651 *Individual Differences* 37, 1597–1613.
- 652 Gjerris, M., Gaiani, S., 2013. Household food waste in Nordic countries: Estimations and
653 ethical implications. *Etikk Praksis - Nordic Journal of Applied Ethics* 7, 6-23.
- 654 Graham-Rowe, E., Jessop, D.C., Sparks, P., 2014. Identifying motivations and barriers to
655 minimising household food waste. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 84, 15–23.
- 656 Graham-Rowe, E., Jessop, D.C., Sparks, P., 2015. Predicting household food waste reduction
657 using an extended theory of planned behaviour. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*
658 101, 194–202.
- 659 Hamari, J., Sjöklint, M., Ukkonen, A., 2016. The sharing economy: Why people participate in
660 collaborative consumption. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and*
661 *Technology* 67, 2047–2059.
- 662 Hebrok, M., Boks, C., 2017. Household food waste: Drivers and potential intervention points
663 for design – An extensive review. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 151, 380–392.
- 664 Horn, J.L., McArdle, J.J., 1992. A practical and theoretical guide to measurement invariance
665 in aging research. *Experimental Aging Research* 18, 117–144.
- 666 Jörissen, J., Priefer, C., Bräutigam, K.-R., 2015. Food Waste Generation at Household Level:
667 Results of a Survey among Employees of Two European Research Centers in Italy and
668 Germany. *Sustainability* 7, 2695–2715.
- 669 Kaiser, F.G., Fuhrer, U., 2003. Ecological Behavior's Dependency on Different Forms of
670 Knowledge. *Applied Psychology* 52, 598–613.
- 671 Kim, J.-O., Ferree, G.D., 1981. Standardization in Causal Analysis. *Sociological Methods &*
672 *Research* 10, 187–210.
- 673 Kollmuss, A., Agyeman, J., 2002. Mind the Gap: Why do people act environmentally and
674 what are the barriers to pro-environmental behavior? *Environmental Education Research*
675 8, 239–260.
- 676 Lazell, J., 2016. Consumer food waste behaviour in universities: Sharing as a means of
677 prevention. *Journal of Consumer Behavior* 15, 430–439.
- 678 Liz Martins, M., Rodrigues, S.S., Cunha, L.M., Rocha, A., 2016. Strategies to reduce plate
679 waste in primary schools - experimental evaluation. *Public Health Nutrition* 19, 1517–
680 1525.
- 681 Lorenz, B.A., Hartmann, M., Hirsch, S., Kanz, O., Langen, N., 2017a. Determinants of Plate
682 Leftovers in One German Catering Company. *Sustainability* 9, 807.

- 683 Lorenz, B.A., Hartmann, M., Langen, N., 2017b. What makes people leave their food? The
684 interaction of personal and situational factors leading to plate leftovers in canteens.
685 *Appetite* 116, 45–56.
- 686 Maroušek, J., Kondo, Y., Ueno, M., Kawamitsu, Y., 2013. Commercial-scale utilization of
687 greenhouse residues. *Biotechnology and Applied Biochemistry* 60, 253–258.
- 688 Maroušek, J., Strunecký, O., Stehel, V., 2019. Biochar farming: defining economically
689 perspective applications. *Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy* 21, 1389–1395.
- 690 Monier, V., Mudgal, S., Escalon, V., O'Connor, C., Gibon, T., Anderson, G., Montoux, H.,
691 Reisinger, H., Dolley, P., Ogievie, S., & Morton, G., 2010. Preparatory study on food waste
692 across EU 27. Technical Report - 2010 - 054, European Commission.
693 http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eussd/pdf/bio_foodwaste_report.pdf. Accessed October
694 22, 2019.
- 695 Neff, R.A., Spiker, M.L., Truant, P.L., 2015. Wasted Food: U.S. Consumers' Reported
696 Awareness, Attitudes, and Behaviors. *PLOS ONE* 10, e0127881.
- 697 Pakpour, A.H., Zeidi, I.M., Emamjomeh, M.M., Asefzadeh, S., Pearson, H., 2014. Household
698 waste behaviours among a community sample in Iran: An application of the theory of
699 planned behaviour. *Waste Management* 34, 980–986.
- 700 Parfitt, J., Barthel, M., Macnaughton, S., 2010. Food waste within food supply chains:
701 quantification and potential for change to 2050. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal
702 Society B, Biological Sciences* 365, 3065–3081.
- 703 Peschel, A.O., Grebitus, C., Steiner, B., Veeman, M., 2016. How does consumer knowledge
704 affect environmentally sustainable choices? Evidence from a cross-country latent class
705 analysis of food labels. *Appetite* 106, 78–91.
- 706 Quested, T.E., Marsh, E., Stunell, D., Parry, A.D., 2013. Spaghetti soup: The complex world
707 of food waste behaviours. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 79, 43–51.
- 708 Reynolds, C., Goucher, L., Quested, T., Bromley, S., Gillick, S., Wells, V.K., Evans, D., Koh,
709 L., Carlsson Kanyama, A., Katzeff, C., Svenfelt, Å., Jackson, P., 2019. Review:
710 Consumption-stage food waste reduction interventions – What works and how to design
711 better interventions. *Food Policy* 83, 7–27.
- 712 Richter, B., 2017. Knowledge and perception of food waste among German consumers.
713 *Journal of Cleaner Production* 166, 641–648.
- 714 Russell, S.V., Young, C.W., Unsworth, K.L., Robinson, C., 2017. Bringing habits and
715 emotions into food waste behaviour. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 125, 107–
716 114.
- 717 Schahn, J., Holzer, E., 1990. Studies of Individual Environmental Concern: The role of
718 knowledge, gender, and background variables. *Environment and Behavior* 22, 767–786.
- 719 Schanes, K., Dobernig, K., Gözet, B., 2018. Food waste matters - A systematic review of
720 household food waste practices and their policy implications. *Journal of Cleaner
721 Production* 182, 978–991.

- 722 Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., Müller, H.H., 2003. Evaluating the fit of structural
723 equation models: tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods*
724 *of Psychological Research Online* 8, 23–74.
- 725 Schmidt, K., 2016. Explaining and promoting household food waste-prevention by an
726 environmental psychological based intervention study. *Resources, Conservation and*
727 *Recycling* 111, 53–66.
- 728 Schwartz, S.H., 1973. Normative explanations of helping behavior: A critique, proposal, and
729 empirical test. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 9, 349–364.
- 730 Stancu, V., Haugaard, P., Lähteenmäki, L., 2016. Determinants of consumer food waste
731 behaviour: Two routes to food waste. *Appetite* 96, 7–17.
- 732 Stefan, V., van Herpen, E., Tudoran, A.A., Lähteenmäki, L., 2013. Avoiding food waste by
733 Romanian consumers: The importance of planning and shopping routines. *Food Quality*
734 *and Preference* 28, 375–381.
- 735 Stenmarck, A., Jensen, C., Quested, T., Moates, G., 2016. Estimates of European food waste
736 levels, IVL Swedish Environmental Research Institute, Stockholm. [https://www.eu-](https://www.eu-fusions.org/phocadownload/Publications/Estimates%20of%20European%20food%20waste%20levels.pdf)
737 [fusions.org/phocadownload/Publications/Estimates%20of%20European%20food%20wast](https://www.eu-fusions.org/phocadownload/Publications/Estimates%20of%20European%20food%20waste%20levels.pdf)
738 [e%20levels.pdf](https://www.eu-fusions.org/phocadownload/Publications/Estimates%20of%20European%20food%20waste%20levels.pdf). Accessed December 12, 2019.
- 739 Temme, D., Hildebrandt, L., 2009. Gruppenvergleiche bei hypothetischen Konstrukten — Die
740 Prüfung der Übereinstimmung von Messmodellen mit der Strukturgleichungsmethodik.
741 *Schmalenbachs Zeitschrift für betriebswirtschaftliche Forschung* 61, 138–185.
- 742 Thøgersen, J., 2006. Norms for environmentally responsible behaviour: An extended
743 taxonomy. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 26, 247–261.
- 744 van der Werf, P., Seabrook, J.A., Gilliland, J.A., 2019. Food for naught: Using the theory of
745 planned behaviour to better understand household food wasting behaviour. *The Canadian*
746 *Geographer / Le Géographe canadien* 63, 478–493.
- 747 Visschers, V.H.M., Wickli, N., Siegrist, M., 2016. Sorting out food waste behaviour: A
748 survey on the motivators and barriers of self-reported amounts of food waste in
749 households. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 45, 66–78.
- 750 Watson, M., Meah, A., 2012. Food, Waste and Safety: Negotiating Conflicting Social
751 Anxieties into the Practices of Domestic Provisioning. *The Sociological Review* 60, 102–
752 120.
- 753 Williams, H., Wikström, F., Otterbring, T., Löfgren, M., Gustafsson, A., 2012. Reasons for
754 household food waste with special attention to packaging. *Journal of Cleaner Production*
755 24, 141–148.

Figures




Figure 1: Hypothesized Path Model




Figure 2: Standardized estimates for the complete sample
 N = 2248, *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05

Tables

Table 1: TPB Constructs – Means and Standard Deviations (SD)

Construct	Mean	SD
Personal Norm^A	3.94	.82
Subjective Norm^A	2.42	.52
Attitude^B	5.98	.96
PBC^A	3.72	.65
Intention^B	5.59	1.32

^AConstructs measured on a 5-point Likert scale

^BConstructs measured on a 7-point Likert scale

Table 2: Food Waste Knowledge – Percentage of average correct responses per knowledge dimension

Questions	Percentage of respondents that answered correctly
General Knowledge (N = 2,248)	33.64
System Knowledge (N = 1,685)	29.64
Action-related Knowledge (N = 1,124)	50.77

Table 3: Means and standard deviations for treatment and control groups, F-test statistic and corresponding P-value.

		Mean	Standard Deviation	F-Test	P-Value	N
Personal Norm	Control 1	3.99	.82			561
	Control 2	3.81	.88			561
	System Info (T1)	3.94	.77			563
	Action Info (T2)	4.01	.78			563
	Total	3.94	.82	5.962 ^a	.000	2248
Subjective Norm	Control 1	2.44	.54			561
	Control 2	2.40	.53			561
	System Info (T1)	2.40	.53			563
	Action Info (T2)	2.43	.49			563
	Total	2.42	.52	.777	.507	2248
Attitude	Control 1	6.01	.92			561
	Control 2	5.83	1.05			561
	System Info (T1)	5.99	.99			563
	Action Info (T2)	6.08	.87			563
	Total	5.98	.96	6.378 ^a	.000	2248
Perceived Behavioral Control	Control 1	3.70	.67			561
	Control 2	3.69	.65			561
	System Info (T1)	3.72	.66			563
	Action Info (T2)	3.79	.60			563
	Total	3.72	.65	3.085	.026	2248
Intention	Control 1	5.52	1.36			561
	Control 2	5.48	1.38			561
	System Info (T1)	5.63	1.24			563
	Action Info (T2)	5.71	1.28			563
	Total	5.59	1.32	3.617 ^a	.013	2248

^aWelch's F, used for data that violated the assumption of homogeneity of variance.

Table 4: Mean score separation (MS) with corresponding confidence intervals (CI) and p-values (P) for all treatment and control groups.

		Personal Norm ^a			Attitude ^a			Perceived Behavioral Control ^b			Intention ^a		
		MS	95% CI	P	MS	95% CI	P	MS	95% CI	P	MS	95% CI	P
System Info (T1)	Action Info	-.069	-.189; .050	.442	-.093	-.236; .050	.335	-.077	-.176; .022	.188	-.081	-.275; .112	.700
	Control 1	-.049	-.172; .074	.732	-.022	-.169; .124	.980	.014	-.086; .113	.985	.113	-.086; .313	.460
	Control 2	.126	-.001; .253	.053	.157	.000; .314	.049	.032	-.067; .131	.843	.150	-.051; .351	.218
Action Info (T2)	Control 1	.020	-.103; .143	.975	.071	-.067; .209	.547	.091	-.009; .190	.087	.195	-.008; .398	.065
	Control 2	.195	.068; .323	.001	.250	.101; .399	.000	.109	.010; .208	.025	.232	.027; .436	.019
Control 1	Control 2	.175	.044; .306	.003	.179	.027; .331	.013	.018	-.081; .118	.965	.037	-.173; .247	.970

^aevaluated by Games-Howell, ^bevaluated by Tukey's HSD post-hoc test

Online Appendix

Figures Online Appendix




Figure A1: Flowchart Experimental Design




Figure A2: Example of System Information Treatment




Figure A3: Example of Action-related Information Treatment



Figure A4: Food Waste Definition

Tables Online Appendix

Table A1: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Variable	Frequency (%)							
	Total	Bel- gium	Ger- many	UK	C1	C2	T1	T2
Gender (Male)	49.0	48.9	49.1	49.1	49.0	49.2	49.0	48.8
Age								
18 – 35	27.7	27.9	25.1	30.0	27.6	27.6	27.9	27.5
36 – 45	15.7	17.1	14.0	16.0	15.9	15.7	15.6	15.6
46 – 55	18.0	17.0	18.9	18.0	17.8	18.2	17.8	18.1
56 – 65	16.0	16.0	16.9	14.9	16.0	15.9	16.0	16.0
> 65	22.7	21.9	25.1	21.1	22.6	22.6	22.7	22.7
Household's Monthly Net Income^A								
Less than £/€1000	11.2	2.9	13.3	16.5	11.6	11.5	11.1	10.5
£/€1001 - £/€2000	30.4	27.0	30.1	33.9	27.7	33.1	30.6	30.2
£/€2001 - £/€3000	27.4	30.9	29.5	22.1	32.4	25.1	26.9	25.2
£/€3001 - £/€4000	16.9	24.0	14.3	13.3	14.1	16.8	17.0	19.7
£/€4001 - £/€5000	7.9	8.8	8.8	6.2	7.3	7.6	7.6	9.3
£/€5001 - £/€6000	3.7	5.0	2.5	3.8	4.3	3.3	4.3	3.0
More than £/€6000	2.4	1.4	1.5	4.3	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.2
Higher Education^B	59.6	53.2	69.1	56.4	61.7	55.7	60.8	60.1
Employment Status								
Employed (full/part time or self-employed)	53.1	51.5	53.1	54.8	52.6	52.2	53.6	54.0
Unemployed	13.0	13.4	9.1	16.7	12.1	15.2	12.1	12.8
Student	4.8	5.7	5.1	3.5	5.9	4.5	3.9	4.8
Retired	29.1	29.4	32.8	25.1	29.4	28.2	30.4	28.4
Household Size								
1	27.8	21.4	36.7	25.5	28.2	26.4	30.2	26.6
2	41.2	43.6	42.1	37.9	39.8	42.2	40.5	42.3
3	15.9	16.4	12.5	18.7	15.9	16.9	15.6	15.1
4	10.3	12.3	6.4	12.1	11.1	8.7	9.6	11.7
5	3.2	4.1	1.5	4.1	3.6	3.0	3.0	3.4
6 or more	1.6	2.1	.8	1.7	1.6	2.7	1.1	.9
N	2,248	748	750	750	561	561	563	563

^AOnly respondents that chose to communicate their income were considered. N = 2,016

^BHigher education refers to a university, vocation, or technical degree. Respondents who ticked the option 'Other' were not considered. N = 2,230

Table A2: Overview of TPB Questions, Scales and Sources

Construct	Items	Scale	Based on
Personal Norm	1. I get a bad conscience if I throw away food.	5-point Likert scale strongly disagree – strongly agree	Thøgersen, 2006 Stefan et al., 2013
	2. When I throw away food I feel guilty.		
Subjective Norm	1. I believe that most of my acquaintances (e.g. family, friends, neighbors) expect that I try to reduce the amount of food wasted in my household.	5-point Likert scale strongly disagree – strongly agree	Thøgersen, 2006
	2. I believe that most of my acquaintances try to reduce the amount of food wasted in their households.		
Attitude	1. In my opinion reducing food waste is...	7-point Likert scale 1. not at all positive – extremely positive 2. not at all important – extremely important	Stancu et al., 2016
	2. In my opinion reducing food waste is...		
PBC	1. How much control do you have over reducing food waste in your household?	5-point Likert scale 1. very little control – great deal of control 2. very difficult – very easy 3. strongly disagree – strongly agree	Russell et al., 2017
	2. How difficult would it be for you to reduce food waste at home? ^A		
	3. It is mostly up to me whether I reduce food waste in my home.		
Intention	1. I intend to reduce the amount of food I throw away.	7-point Likert scale strongly disagree – strongly agree	Stancu et al., 2016
	2. My goal is to reduce the amount of food I throw away.		
	3. I will try to reduce the amount of food I throw away.		

^AItem deleted for final construct and analysis

Table A3: Overview of quiz questions and correct answers

Type of knowledge	Question	Answers (correct answer in bold)
General	What percent of food is annually wasted worldwide?	a) 10% b) 30% c) 50% d) 85%
	Which group of the food supply chain causes most food waste and loss in Europe?	a) Food service (i.e. hotels, restaurants, catering, canteens, hospitals) b) Households c) Processing (i.e. manufacturers of food products and beverages) d) Production (i.e. farmer, fisher, hunter) e) Wholesale and retail
	Which types of food are wasted the most in European households?	a) Meat & offal b) Fish & seafood c) Roots & tubers (e.g. potatoes, sweet potatoes, cassava etc.) d) Fruits & vegetables e) Cereals and cereal products (e.g. bread, pastry, pasta, rice, maize, wheat etc.) f) Milk & eggs g) Oilseeds & pulses, incl. nuts (e.g. soybeans, groundnuts (shelled), sunflower seeds, olives, other oil crops)
System	The agricultural sector uses a certain percentage fresh water for the production of food that is later on wasted. How much water is used this way (compared to how much agriculture uses in total)?	a) 1% b) 5% c) 11% d) 15%
	When food is wasted, this results in CO ₂ emissions. The annual CO ₂ emissions of household food waste in Europe is as big as the annual CO ₂ emissions of...	a) approx. 1 million cars b) approx. 4 million cars c) approx. 20 million cars d) approx. 40 million cars
	What food, when wasted, represents the biggest waste of resources?	a) Tomatoes b) Beef c) Poultry d) Corn
	On average, what percentage of value (€) of households' total annual shopping basket goes to waste in the U.K./Germany/Belgium? ^A	a) 6% b) 12% c) 18% d) 24%

	More than 800 million people are currently undernourished. With all the food that is lost, discarded or wasted, we could feed...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) One fourth of all undernourished people in the world (\pm 200 million people) b) Half of all undernourished people in the world (\pm 400 million people) c) Approx. all undernourished people in the world (\pm 800 million people) d) More than double the number of undernourished people in the world (~ 2 billion people)
Action-related	What is the best place to store bananas?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) At room temperature, e.g. in a bowl b) In an air-tight plastic container c) In the fridge d) In a cool, dry place, e.g. in the basement
	What is the optimal temperature of the fridge to keep food fresh for the longest time?	(open answer)
	What does the “best before” date on food packaging mean?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) After this date the food might not be at its best but is still safe to eat if stored according to storage instructions b) After this date the food won’t be safe to eat. c) This date is just for the shop staff, I ignore it. d) The food can be eaten without hesitation if it is consumed no later than 1 week after this date.
	What does the “use by” date on food packaging mean?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) After this date the food might not be at its best but is still safe to eat if stored according to storage instructions b) After this date the food won’t be safe to eat. c) This date is just for the shop staff, I ignore it. d) The food can be eaten without hesitation if it is consumed no later than 1 week after this date.
	How can food waste at household level be reduced? ^B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) By writing a shopping list b) By planning meals c) By reusing leftovers d) By composting at home

^AThis question and the corresponding answers were adapted for each country. The numbers in the example are for Germany.

^BMultiple answers correct.

Table A4: Results of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Construct	Item	Factor loading	AVE	CR	Cronbach's Alpha
Personal Norm	When I throw away food I feel guilty.	.888			
	I get a bad conscience if I throw away food.	.895	.795	.886	.885
Subjective Norm	I believe that most of my acquaintances try to reduce the amount of food wasted in their households.	.667			
	I believe that most of my acquaintances (e.g. family, friends, neighbors) expect that I try to reduce the amount of food wasted in my household.	.738	.495	.661	.657
Attitude	In my opinion reducing food waste is... (important)	.962			
	In my opinion reducing food waste is... (positive)	.699	.707	.825	.793
PBC	How much control do you have over reducing food waste in your household?	.860			
	It is mostly up to me whether I reduce food waste in my home.	.711	.623	.766	.751
Intention	My goal is to reduce the amount of food I throw away.	.953			
	I intend to reduce the amount of food I throw away.	.958			
	I will try to reduce the amount of food I throw away.	.965	.919	.971	.971

AVE = Average Variance Extracted; CR = Composite Reliability

The first model to be tested consisted of five latent variables (personal norm, subjective norm, attitude, PBC, and behavioral intention) and 12 manifest variables (i.e., the corresponding items measuring the five constructs). Despite a rather good model fit, reliability of the second item in the PBC scale (“How difficult would it be for you to reduce food waste at home?”)

and the latent variable PBC was not satisfactory. Due to the low factor loading of the PBC item on the PBC construct (standardized factor loading: .468), an insufficient Cronbach's Alpha for the PBC construct ($\alpha = .682$), and low values for average variance extracted (AVE) and composite reliability (CR), this item was excluded from further analysis. After having eliminated the item, confirmatory factor analysis was performed again. With the revised model, the value of Cronbach's Alpha increased and all scales had acceptable to high reliabilities.

Table A5: TPB Constructs – Means and results from ANOVA and post-hoc test for country specific distributions

Construct	Mean Total	Belgium (N = 748)	Germany (N = 750)	UK (N = 750)	ANOVA (p-value)
Personal Norm ^A	3.94	3.84 ^a	4.12 ^b	3.85 ^a	.000
Subjective Norm ^A	2.42	2.39 ^a	2.45 ^b	2.41 ^{ab}	.044
Attitude ^B	5.98	5.86 ^a	6.17 ^b	5.90 ^a	.000
PBC ^A	3.72	3.56 ^a	3.87 ^b	3.75 ^c	.000
Intention ^B	5.59	5.47 ^a	5.84 ^b	5.45 ^a	.000

^{abc}Different letters in one row indicate significant differences between the respective groups. Attitude was evaluated by Games-Howell; the remaining constructs were evaluated by Tukey's HSD post-hoc test.

^AConstructs measured on a 5-point Likert scale

^BConstructs measured on a 7-point Likert scale

Table A6: Food Waste Knowledge - Percentage of average correct responses per knowledge dimension, ANOVA and post-hoc test for country specific distributions

Questions (% of respondents that answered correctly)	Total	Belgium	Germany	UK	ANOVA (p-value)
General Knowledge (N = 2,248)	33.64	31.60 ^a	36.76 ^b	32.58 ^a	.000
System Knowledge (N = 1,685)	29.64	29.16	30.57	29.18	.354
Action-related Knowledge (N = 1,124)	50.77	49.20	51.95	51.15	.235

^{ab}Different letters in one row indicate significant differences between the respective groups. Evaluated by Games-Howell post-hoc test.

Table A7: Food Waste Knowledge - Percentage of average correct responses per knowledge dimension, ANOVA/t-test and post-hoc test for treatment specific distributions

Questions (% of respondents that answered correctly)	C1	C2	T1	T2	ANOVA/t-test (p-value)
General Knowledge (N = 2,248)	33.81 ^{ab}	30.01 ^a	35.23 ^b	35.52 ^b	.001
System Knowledge (N = 1,685)	29.88 ^{ab}	31.37 ^a	27.67 ^b	n.a.	.004
Action-related Knowledge (N = 1,124)	n.a.	55.47 ^a	n.a.	46.07 ^b	.000

^{ab}Different letters in one row indicate significant differences between the respective groups. Evaluated by Tukey's HSD post-hoc test for general and system knowledge.

Table A8: Selected Goodness-of-fit Statistics

Index of Fit	Value	Requirement for Good Model Fit (based on Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003: 52)
χ^2	84.835 (df = 34)	$0 \leq \chi^2 \leq 2df$
p-value	.000	$.05 < p \leq 1.00$
RMSEA	.026	$.00 \leq RMSEA \leq .05$
p-value	1.000	$.10 < p \leq 1.00$
χ^2/df	2.495	$0 \leq \chi^2 / df \leq 2$
SRMR	.0155	$.00 \leq SRMR \leq .05$
NFI	.995	$.95 \leq NFI \leq 1.00$
TLI	.995	$.97 \leq TLI \leq 1.00$
CFI	.997	$.97 \leq CFI \leq 1.00$

Table A9: Goodness-of-fit Indices for the Individual Groups

	χ^2 (df)	p	TLI	CFI	RMSEA
C1	40.311 (34)	.211	.998	.998	.018
C2	82.289 (34)	.000	.981	.988	.050
T1	42.958 (34)	.139	.997	.998	.022
T2	75.845 (34)	.000	.984	.990	.047

Table A10: Goodness-of-fit Indices for Configural and Metric Invariance Models

	χ^2 (df)	p	TLI	CFI	RMSEA
Configural Invariance	241.404 (136)	.000	.990	.994	.019
Metric Invariance	260.181 (154)	.000	.991	.994	.018

Table A11: Standardized (unstandardized) estimates of all groups and the full sample

	Full Sample N = 2,248		C1 N = 561		C2 N = 561		T1 N = 563		T2 N = 563	
PN → IN	.27	***	.26	***	.24	***	.28	***	.32	***
	(.42)		(.41)		(.36)		(.44)		(.50)	
SN → IN	.20	***	.27	***	.19	***	.18	***	.19	***
	(.43)		(.57)		(.42)		(.35)		(.43)	
AT → IN	.23	***	.22	***	.20	***	.24	***	.24	***
	(.31)		(.33)		(.26)		(.30)		(.35)	
PBC → IN	.06	*	.00		.03		.15	**	.06	
	(.10)		(-.01)		(.05)		(.26)		(.11)	

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05; IN = Intention, PN = Personal Norm, SN = Subjective Norm, AT = Attitude, PBC = Perceived Behavioral Control

Table A12: p-values for group comparison of path coefficients

	C1 vs. C2	C1 vs. T1	C1 vs. T2	C2 vs. T1	C2 vs. T2	T1 vs. T2
PN → IN	.680	.785	.452	.490	.234	.635
SN → IN	.384	.111	.379	.641	.956	.565
AT → IN	.501	.786	.861	.654	.394	.646
PBC → IN	.668	.034	.395	.108	.668	.280

IN = Intention, PN = Personal Norm, SN = Subjective Norm, AT = Attitude, PBC = Perceived Behavioral Control; critical value of .008 (based on Bonferroni correction) was applied

Highlights

- Providing information increases consumers' intention to reduce food waste
- Informing consumers about possible actions to reduce food waste is effective
- Informing consumers about food waste impacts is not effective in changing intention

Journal Pre-proof

Declaration of interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

Funding: This work was supported by the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT) through KIC Food [Project 18066 "Don't Be a Food Waster", 2018].