

Web Appendix

Table W1: Selected Literature Review of Research on Taste

Context: Marketing		
Source	Summary of Relevant Findings	Focus (Study Type)
Hoegg and Alba (2006)	The influence of nonevaluative cues on consumers' gustatory discrimination and preference	Taste perception (Experiments)
Raghunathan, Naylor, and Hoyer (2006)	Less healthy food option is inferred as more enjoyable and tastier	Taste inference (Experiments)
Allen, Gupta, and Monnier (2008)	Congruency between people's value and product symbol induces favorable taste evaluation	Taste perception (Experiments)
Elder and Krishna (2010)	Multisensory ad increases the taste perception through cognitive process	Taste perception (Experiments)
Cornwell and McAlister (2011)	Development of scale to measure children's taste preferences and the influence of marketing on taste development	Taste development (Survey)
Irmak, Vallen, and Robinson (2011)	Dieters' (vs. non-dieters) heuristic information processing resulted in less tastiness perception of unhealthy-named (vs. healthy-named) food item	Taste perception (Experiments)
Troye and Supphellen (2012)	Self-production engagement positively influences taste perception	Taste perception (Experiments)
Poor, Duhachek, Krishnan (2013)	Consummatory image of food (vs. food image alone) increases taste perception	Taste perception (Experiments)
Mantonakis et al. (2017)	Measurement tools for taste rating influence taste evaluation of a product	Taste perception (Experiments)
Moore, Wilkie, and Desrochers (2016)	Taste as a physiological predisposition influences childhood obesity	Taste preference (Conceptual)
Context: Nutrition		

Source	Summary of Relevant Findings	Focus (Study Type)
Bertino, Beauchamp, and Engelman (1986)	Supplementary salt in diet can increase preferred level of salt in later consumption	Taste preference (Experiments)
Drewnowski (1997)	In addition to innate sensory response, other factors such as genetic and socioeconomic status influence taste perception and food preference	Influencers of taste (Review)
Harris (2008)	Overview of prior findings showing determinants of children's taste development and food acceptance	Influencers of taste (Review)
Cornwell and McAlister (2013)	Children's vegetable consumption is influenced by the drink provided	Taste preference (Experiment, Survey)
Lee et al. (2013)	Organic label attached to food influences taste perception (i.e., less fatty)	Taste perception (Field Study)
Mennella (2014)	Children's innate preference for sweet and salty taste and sensory experience in early life stage can change taste preference	Taste development (Review)
Urbano et al. (2016)	Measurement tools for taste preference in sucrose, sodium chloride, and lipids	Taste preference (Scale development)
Nehring et al. (2015)	Investigation of the influence of early exposure to taste (i.e., in utero, early infant) on later acceptance of various taste	Development of taste (Review)
De Cosmi, Scaglioni, and Agostoni (2017)	Early exposure to various food can decrease child's food neophobia	Development of taste (Review)
Noel, Cassano, and Dando (2017)	College-aged men experience reduced perceptions of sweet and salt taste with body weight increase	Taste preference (Longitudinal study)
Vennerød et al. (2017)	Parents' attitudes and food sensitivity influence children's sweet preference	Taste preference (Field Study, Survey)

References

- Allen, Michael W, Richa Gupta, and Arnaud Monnier (2008), “The Interactive Effect of Cultural Symbols and Human Values on Taste Evaluation,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35 (2), 294–309.
- Bertino, Mary, Gary K Beauchamp, and Karl Engleman (1986), “Increasing Dietary Salt Alters Salt Taste Preference,” *Physiology & Behavior*, 38 (2), 203–13.
- Cornwell, T Bettina, and Anna R Mcalister (2011), “Alternative Thinking About Starting Points of Obesity. Development of Child Taste Preferences,” *Appetite*, 56 (2), 428–39.
- Cornwell, T Bettina, and Anna R McAlister (2013) “Contingent Choice. Exploring the Relationship Between Sweetened Beverages and Vegetable Consumption,” *Appetite* 62 (March), 203-08.
- De Cosmi, Valentina, Silvia Scaglioni, and Carlo Agostoni (2017), “Early Taste Experiences and Later Food Choices,” *Nutrients*, 9 (2), 107.
- Drewnowski, Adam (1997), “Taste Preferences and Food Intake,” *Annual Review of Nutrition*, 17 (1), 237–53.
- Elder, Ryan S., and Aradhna Krishna (2010), “The Effects of Advertising Copy on Sensory Thoughts and Perceived Taste,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36 (5), 748–56.
- Harris, Gillian (2008), “Development of Taste and Food Preferences in Children,” *Current Opinion in Clinical Nutrition and Metabolic Care*, 11 (3), 315–19.
- Hoegg, Joandrea, and Joseph W Alba (2007), “Taste Perception: More than Meets the Tongue,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33 (4), 490–98.
- Irmak, Caglar, Beth Vallen, and Stefanie Rosen Robinson (2011), “The Impact of Product Name on Dieters’ and Nondieters’ Food Evaluations and Consumption,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 38 (2), 390–405.
- Lee, Wan-chen Jenny, Mitsuru Shimizu, Kevin M Kniffin, and Brian Wansink (2013), “You Taste What You See: Do Organic Labels Bias Taste Perceptions?,” *Food Quality and Preference*, 29 (1), 33–39.
- Mantonakis, Antonia, Norbert Schwarz, Amanda Wudarszewski, and Carolyn Yoon (2017), “Malleability of Taste Perception: Biasing Effects of Rating Scale Format on Taste Recognition, Product Evaluation, and Willingness to Pay,” *Marketing Letters*, 28 (2), 293–303.
- Mennella, Julie A (2014), “Ontogeny of Taste Preferences: Basic Biology and Implications for Health,” *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 99 (3), 704S-711S.

Moore, Elizabeth S, William L Wilkie, and Debra M Desrochers (2017), “All in the Family? Parental Roles in the Epidemic of Childhood Obesity,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 43 (5), 824–59.

Nehring, Ina, Tanja Kostka, Rüdiger von Kries, and Eva A Rehfuss (2015), “Impacts of In Utero and Early Infant Taste Experiences on Later Taste Acceptance: A Systematic Review,” *The Journal of Nutrition*, 145 (6), 1271–79.

Noel, Corinna A, Patricia A Cassano, and Robin Dando (2017), “College-Aged Males Experience Attenuated Sweet and Salty Taste with Modest Weight Gain,” *The Journal of Nutrition*, 147 (10), 1885–91.

Poor, Morgan, Adam Duhachek, and H Shanker Krishnan (2013), “How Images of Other Consumers Influence Subsequent Taste Perceptions,” *Journal of Marketing*, 77 (6), 124–39.

Raghunathan, Rajagopal, Rebecca Walker Naylor, and Wayne D Hoyer (2006), “The Unhealthy = Tasty Intuition and Its Effects on Taste Inferences, Enjoyment, and Choice of Food,” *Journal of Marketing*, 70 (4), 170–84.

Troye, Sigurd Villads, and Magne Supphellen (2012), “Consumer Participation in Coproduction: ‘I Made It Myself’ Effects on Consumers’ Sensory Perceptions and Evaluations of Outcome and Input Product,” *Journal of Marketing*, 76 (2), 33–46.

Urbano, Christine, et al. (2016), “Development of a Sensory Tool to Assess Overall Liking for the Fatty, Salty and Sweet Sensations,” *Food Quality and Preference*, 48 (March), 23–32.

Vennerød, Frida Felicia Fry, Valérie Lengard Almli, Ingunn Berget, and Nanna Lien (2017), “Do Parents Form Their Children’s Sweet Preference? The Role of Parents and Taste Sensitivity on Preferences for Sweetness in Pre-Schoolers,” *Food Quality and Preference*, 62, 172–82.

Table W2: Summary Predictions Included in the Hypotheses

Hypothesis (direction of effect)	Independent variable	Mediator	Dependent variable	Moderator
H1: partial mediation (+) Supported	Parent SFS	Child exposure to junk food (Child EJJ)	Child SFS	---
H2a: direct effect (-) Supported	Parental lay theories of limited self- control (unlimited/limited)	---	Child EJJ	---
H2b: moderation (+) Supported	Parent SFS	---	Child EJJ	Parental lay theories of limited self-control (unlimited/limited)
H2c: moderation of indirect effect (+) Supported	Parent SFS	Child EJJ	Child SFS	Parental lay theories of limited self-control (unlimited/limited)
H3a: direct effect (+) Supported	Parental lay theories of fixed self-control (malleable/fixed)	---	Child EJJ	---
H3b: moderation (-) Supported	Parent SFS	---	Child EJJ	Parental lay theories of fixed self-control (malleable/fixed)
H3c: moderation of indirect effect (-) Supported	Parent SFS	Child EJJ	Child SFS	Parental lay theories of fixed self-control (malleable/fixed)
H4: partial mediation (-) Not Supported*	Parent SFS	Child EJJ	Vegetables eaten by the child	
H5: moderation of indirect effect (-) Supported	Parent SFS	Child EJJ	Vegetables eaten by the child	Parental lay theories of limited self-control (unlimited/limited)
H6: moderation of indirect effect (+) Supported	Parent SFS	Child EJJ	Vegetables eaten by the child	Parental lay theories of fixed self-control (malleable/fixed)

Notes: *finding was support for full mediation not partial

Table W3: Summary of Results

Hypothesis (Direction of effect)	Finding	Supported/ Not Supported
H1: partial mediation (+)	Parent SFS is positively related to Child SFS directly as well as indirectly through Child exposure to junkfood (CEJF).	Supported
H2a: direct effect (-)	Parental lay theories of Limited self-control (unlimited/limited) are related to Child SFS directly such that Limited self-control leads to lower Child EJJ than Unlimited self-control.	Supported
H2b: moderation (+)	Parental lay theories of Limited self-control (unlimited/limited) moderate the relationship between 'Parent SFS and Child EJJ' such that the effect is stronger with more Limited self-control than Unlimited self-control.	Supported
H2c: moderation of indirect effect (+)	Parental lay theories of Limited self-control (unlimited/limited) moderate the indirect effect of 'Parent SFS on Child SFS through Child EJJ', such that the effect is stronger with more Limited self-control than Unlimited self-control.	Supported
H3a: direct effect (+)	Parental lay theories of Fixed self-control (malleable/fixed) are related to Child SFS directly such that Fixed self-control leads to greater Child EJJ than Malleable self-control.	Supported
H3b: moderation (-)	Parental lay theories of Fixed self-control (malleable/fixed) moderate the relationship between 'Parent SFS and Child EJJ' such that the effect is stronger with more Malleable self-control than Fixed self-control.	Supported
H3c: moderation of indirect effect (-)	Parental lay theories of Fixed self-control (malleable/fixed) moderate the indirect effect of 'Parent SFS on Child SFS through Child EJJ', such that the effect is stronger with more Malleable self-control than Fixed self-control.	Supported
H4: partial mediation (-)	Parent SFS is negatively related to Vegetables eaten by the child (VEGETN) directly as well as indirectly through Child EJJ.	Partially Supported*
H5: moderation of indirect effect (-)	Parental lay theories of Limited self-control (unlimited/limited) moderate the indirect effect of 'Parent SFS on VEGETN through Child EJJ', such that the effect is stronger with more Limited self-control than Unlimited self-control	Supported
H6: moderation of indirect effect (+)	Parental lay theories of Fixed self-control (malleable/fixed) moderate the indirect effect of 'Parent SFS on VEGETN through Child EJJ', such that the effect is stronger with more Malleable self-control than Fixed self-control.	Supported

*Full mediation was observed