Transnational Comparison Research - Appendixes

Consumer Attitudes on the Intention to Purchase Local Food Products in Sweden, Belgium, Germany, Denmark, and the Netherlands

Research commissioned by REFRAME and carried out by:

Jesper Kwant

22-1-2021

Table of Contents

Appendixes

Appendix 1: Definitions of Local Food

So, what can be understood by local food? According to Feldmann et al. (2015), there is not a universal definition for local food and enforcement through standardized labels is challenging to put into practice. Thus, identifying local food products is complex, and the labels representing local might not meet the expectations/criteria set by a person as meaning local. Nevertheless, several factors can be considered in the assessment of local such as "social embeddedness, distance, geographical boundaries, and even perceived product attributes" (Cranfield, Henson, & Blandon, 2012) and political boundaries (cities, provinces, and countries) (Zepeda & Leviten-Reid, 2004).

The most common factor in assessing local is the distance, which is sometimes also expressed in driving hours (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). The distance that a person is willing to commute for local food is influenced by the context, such as "place of residence, time of residence in a place, type of product, and respective season" (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015, Cranfield, Henson, & Blandon, 2012). Contemplating the factor distance into a quantifiable number attached to the concept of local food is found in the term locavores. The word locavores describes those people that identify themselves as pure local consumers, and the earliest definition included a boundary of 100 miles (160.93km) as local (Thilmany, Bond, & Bond, 2008). In the context of this research among the five different European countries varying in size, this definition would cover a region too large to be considered local. A definition more suited for this area assessment of local is that proposed by the Joint Research Centre Scientific, and Policy Reports referred to by the European Parliament (2016) stating "a food system in which foods are produced, processed and retailed within a defined geographical area (depending on the sources, within a 20 to 100 km radius approximately)". This definition is based on geographic area and consists of a suitable radius in the five countries to identify local. Hence, the most convenient and accurate boundary would be that of a political boundary. So, 'local food' in the context of this research refers to the food produced and sold in the respective regions/countries, as mentioned in the introduction. This established definition is further altered and translated for the various regions in this study. Appendix 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5 shows the adaptation by the various regions of this definition and additional clarification if applicable.

Appendix 1.1 Definition of Local Food in Västra Götaland, Sweden

The following definition is that for local food in Västra Götaland is the following: "Termen lokal mat som avses i enkäten är mat som producerats och sålts i Västra Götaland.". For a map of the specified region see figure 4, in the method section. Also, to see how the definition is used in the questionnaire, please refer to appendix 4.2.

Appendix 1.2 Definition of Local Food in West-Flanders, Belgium

The definition for local food in West-Flanders in Belgium is the following: “De term “lokaal voedsel” in de context van deze vragenlijst verwijst naar het voedsel geproduceerd en verkocht in West-Vlaanderen.” The allocated region in question can be seen outlined in figure 5, in the method section. Moreover, see appendix 4.3 to observe how the definition is incorporated into the questionnaire for West-Flanders.

Appendix 1.3 Definition of Local Food in Wesermarsch District, Germany

The definition for local food in Wesermarsch District in Germany is the following: “Der Begriff “Lokale” im Kontext dieses Fragebogens bezieht sich auf die in der Wesermarsch hergestellten und verkauften Lebensmittel.” The chosen region can be seen outlined in figure 6, in the method section. Furthermore, see appendix 4.4 to observe how the definition is woven into the questionnaire for Wesermarsch District.

Appendix 1.4 Definition of Local Food in Denmark

The definition of local food identified through the literature has been altered based on contact with the Reframe partner, Laurids Christensen, in Denmark. The definition still adheres to the 20 to 100 km radius as found in the literature as the new definition is the “Begrebet “lokale fødevarer” i dette spørgeskema referer til danske fødevarer købt inden for en radius af 50 km” (See appendix 4.5, for the definition in the questionnaire). The whole country has been chosen for this study as the term ‘local’ in Denmark often refers to terroir qualities more than the distance to production (For a map of Denmark refer to figure 7). Moreover, the population density in Denmark is very much focused around the national capital city Copenhagen. So the definition local as was utilized in the research into the Northern Netherlands is not Applicable in Denmark. Additionally, the retail supermarket chains in Denmark, on the other hand, define ‘local’ as ‘produced in Denmark’.

Appendix 1.5 Definition of Local Food in Northern Netherlands

The definition for local food in the Northern Netherlands is the following: “De term “lokaal voedsel” in de context van deze vragenlijst verwijst naar het voedsel geproduceerd en verkocht in Noord-Nederland, dat wil zeggen: de provincies Groningen, Friesland en Drenthe” The allocated region in question can be seen outlined in figure 8, in the method section. Moreover, see appendix 4.6 to observe how the definition is incorporated into the questionnaire for the Northern Netherlands.

Appendix 2: Literature Review Elaborated

This Appendix provides additional reasoning and justification to the variables and theories included in the literature review.

Appendix 2.1 Health Consciousness

The literature shows that health is one of the most mentioned factors which influences someone's attitude towards local food. Consumers regard local food systems to be directly benefiting one's health and that of the surrounding community as consumers tend to link local food products with healthy eating (European Parliament, 2016). Additionally, the concept of local food systems is often perceived as healthier compared to global food systems (Cranfield, Henson, & Blandon, 2012). These perceptions are fueled by the fact that the global food system is built upon industrialization and trade, which are reportedly the cause of negative implications on consumers' diet and health (Cranfield, Henson, & Blandon, 2012). Sustain (2002) further observed that food nowadays travels effortlessly across the globe, but is dependent on fossil fuels resulting in pollution. Also, the requirement for packaging, preservation, and farming practices has adverse effects on the produce (freshness and nutritional value), environment, and health (Sustain, 2002).

This so-called 'health consciousness' has also been referred to several times in other studies investigating attitudes towards local food (Kumar & Smith, 2018, Garbacz, 2018). People are health conscious when they are "aware and concerned about their state of well-being and are motivated to improve and/or maintain their health and quality of life, as well as preventing ill health by engaging in healthy behaviours and being self-conscious regarding health" (Michaelidou & Hassan, 2008). Previously conducted research has shown and validated health consciousness as a significant predictor of attitude towards local food (Kumar & Smith, 2018, Garbacz, 2018). Kumar et al. (2018), also showed that respondents would be willing to pay more for locally farmed products because of the health benefits.

On the basis of this knowledge the next hypothesis can be introduced: 'There is a positive relationship between health consciousness and attitude towards local food'. For the measurement of this variable four statements have been taken from the literature such as "I reflect on my health a lot" and "I am aware of changes in my health" (Kumar & Smith, 2018, Michaelidou & Hassan, 2008). All statements with explanations can be seen in Appendix 3.2, table 12.

Appendix 2.2 Concern for the Environment

The environment is another predictor of attitude towards local food. The consumer recognizes that the current food system is responsible for destruction of the environment, such as pollution and deforestation. At the same time, the consumer associates local food products with more environmentally-friendly production processes that emit a lower

carbon footprint and reduction of the distance (food kilometers) the food needs to travel (European Parliament, 2016, Cranfield, Henson, & Blandon, 2012, Feldmann & Hamm, 2015, Zepeda & Deal, 2009)

Research done by Kumar et al. (2018) and Garbacz (2018) also shows the concern for the environment as a factor that shapes the consumer attitude towards local food, giving input for the following hypothesis in this study: 'There is a positive relationship between concern for the environment and attitude towards local food'. The measurement of this variable is done according to three statements. An example statement for measuring this variable is "The current approach to the environment is destroying it" (Kumar & Smith, 2018, Garbacz (2018). Please refer to Appendix 3.3, table 13 for all the statements and further justification.

Appendix 2.3 Concern for the Local Economy

The concept of local food is shaped by food being produced, handled, and sold in an area where physical and economic activities take place and provide economic benefits to the region (Sustain, 2002). The predictor 'concern for the local economy' is therefore of relevance as the consumer shares this concept of local food. Moreover, research has shown that consumers link purchasing local food products with directly benefiting the local economy, such as farmers and communities (Zepeda & Leviten-Reid, 2004, Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). Besides, supporting farmers has been mentioned as one of the main reasons consumers purchase local food products (Cranfield, Henson, & Blandon, 2012). The research done by Kumar et al. (2018) also shows that concern for the local economy is a significant predictor of attitude towards local food.

The concern for the local economy is incorporated into this study in the form of the following hypothesis: 'There is a positive relationship between concern for the local economy and attitude towards local food'. The hypothesis testing will be done through two statements found in the literature. One of such statements has been tested to be successful as that of Kumar et al. (2018) "the purchase of local food products supports local companies". The additional statements and their reasoning can be found in Appendix 3.4, table 14.

Apart from the above mentioned predictors, the study by Kumar et al. (2018) mentions other potential predictors of consumer attitudes to local food that are still a gap in the literature on this topic. The potential predictors included perceived quality and food safety. These were explored in the Northern-Netherlands and showed exciting results, warranting the addition to this transnational research.

Appendix 2.4 Perceived Quality

Perceived quality can be defined and interpreted in two manners. First, the degree to which the item or service delivers on key customer requirements and how reliably these are provided (Yee & San, 2011). Secondly, the perceived quality is not referring to the product or such but more to the consumer's judgement of the overall

excellence or superiority of the entity or service (Yee & San, 2011). The perceived quality plays an essential role in the consumer decision making of purchasing a product.

Consumers will compare the quality of a product with others, in relation to the price of the product category (Yee & San, 2011). The relation between price and perceived quality is a complex one, often referred to as value for money (Cranfield, Henson, & Blandon, 2012). So, in general, for a given price, a product that someone considers of higher perceived quality is judged as superior. The judgement of a product's quality often happens on both intrinsic attributes such as product performance and extrinsic features like country of origin (Yee & San, 2011). Therefore, the perceived quality could affect the attitude towards local food. The following hypothesis has been designed to test this possible relationship: 'There is a positive relationship between perceived quality and attitude towards local food'. The statements for measuring this variable embody the various aspects of perceived quality mentioned above. For instance, one statement utilized is "Local food is of higher quality than conventional food products" (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). Please refer to Appendix 3.5, table 15, for all statements.

Appendix 2.5 Food Safety

Last of the potential predictors from the study by Kumar et al. (2018) is food safety. The literature shows that many studies have revealed that consumers consider/view local foods to be safer than non-local food products (Cranfield, Henson, & Blandon, 2012, Thilmany, Bond, & Bond, 2008, Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). People with higher food safety concerns were more likely to purchase local food products (Kumar & Smith, 2018). Moreover, consumers felt that buying local food allowed them to be more knowledgeable and reassured the safety and quality of the food.

These findings justify the following hypothesis for testing: 'There is a positive relationship between food safety and attitude towards local food'. The measurement is done through two statements derived and constructed through the literature. These statements include "locally produced food is safer to consume compared to conventional food products" and "knowing the origins of a food product makes it feel safer to consume". Please refer to appendix 3.6, table 16, for an explanation on the chosen statements.

Appendix 2.6 Theory of Planned Behaviour

This appendix provides additional information and background to the Theory Of planned Behaviour and utilization within this research. The use of the Theory of Planned Behaviour in general food purchase behaviour by Ajzen (2015) and the local context by Kumar et al. (2018) and Garbacz (2018) has proven effective, with the utilization of hypotheses conducting quantitative research. Also, the research carried out by Garbacz (2018) on attitudes and behaviour with regards to local food suggests investigations applying the Theory of Planned Behaviour should be done on a regional instead of a national level. Therefore, including the proposed definition of local food, section 2.2,

and sample area is a seamlessly perfect fit between the theory and to be studied areas. Figure 14, below gives additional context to the different variables introduced in figure 1.



Figure 14: Theory of Planned Behaviour including behavioural beliefs, normative beliefs, control beliefs, and actual behavioural control (Ajzen, 2015).

From figure 14, it can be seen that "attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control are functions of salient beliefs that are behavioural, normative, and control beliefs, respectively (Shin, Hancer, & Song, 2016)".

Appendix 2.6.1 Attitude toward the Behaviour

First, attitude toward the behaviour refers to the degree in which a person has a favourable or unfavourable evaluation of the behaviour being under consideration (Ajzen, 1991). The attitudes are based on the individual's behavioural beliefs, in essence, the perceived positive or negative outcomes of carrying out such behaviour and the importance of evaluations of the outcomes (Shin, Hancer, & Song, 2016). The consumer attitude has been discussed in section 2.3 and has resulted in this study's first hypothesis.

In this study, a thorough understanding of the consumer attitudes in the respective regions towards local food and the intention to purchase local food allows for insights into a potential relationship. This phenomenon can be morphed into a hypothesis for testing: 'Positive attitudes toward local food will have a positive impact on the intention to purchase local food'.

For the measurement of the variable consumer attitudes, several statements have been identified, and adapted for this study. The statements among others include "Local food tastes ..." and "Local food gives me a … feeling". These

were chosen as they have often been utilized in research to assess someone's attitude towards food (Skallerud & Wien, 2019, Kumar & Smith, 2018). The statements are further elaborated on in appendix 3.1, table 11.

Appendix 2.6.2 Subjective Norm

Secondly, the subjective norm is a person's perception of a particular behaviour affected by referent people. These are people in one's immediate surroundings, such as parents and friends. These norms are founded in the person's normative beliefs, that is the perceived social pressure from others to carry out such behaviour (Ajzen, 1991, Shin, Hancer, & Song, 2016). Shin et al. (2016) research utilizing the Theory of Planned Behaviour attempted to show the relationship between the theory's varying components. Although the theory was proven statistically suitable in explaining sustainable food consumption behaviour, the hypothesis regarding the subjective norm on the intention to purchase sustainable food was not. However, it also mentioned that other researchers had discovered a relationship, and for that reason, it cannot be ignored. The inclusion of the subjective norm as a predictor variable is further supported by the research to consumer attitudes and intention to purchase local food products in the Northern Netherlands. In which the relationship between subjective norm and intention to purchase local food was strongly established (Kwant, 2020).

Thus, the next hypothesis formulated states: 'Subjective norm has a positive influence on the intention to purchase local food'. This variable is measured by utilizing two statements found in the literature. These statements include "most people I value would buy local food if available instead of conventional food" and "most people that are important to me think I should buy local food" (Kumar & Smith, 2008, Garbacz, 2018). The statements can also be seen in appendix 3.7, table 17, with a more in depth explanation of the chosen variables. Besides the relationship between subjective norm on intention, figure 1 or 19 also reveals that the subjective norm influences attitude. For that reason, the following hypothesis is constructed: 'There is a positive relationship between subjective norm and attitude' - providing insight into the role of subjective norm in the formation of attitudes towards local food in the five REFRAME regions of study.

Appendix 2.6.3 Perceived Behavioural Control

Next, the component of perceived behavioural control is the person's perceived ease or difficulty of carrying out a behaviour. The perceived control is dictated through control beliefs. These are the person's perceived beliefs about the existence of opportunities or hindrances for supporting or hampering the behaviour (Ajzen, 1991, Shin, Hancer, & Song, 2016). Some perceived hindrances with regards to purchasing local food include lack of variety and availability, high prices, inconvenience, and unclear origin of local food (Shin, Hancer, & Song, 2016). As can be seen from figure 14, perceived behavioural control directly influences intention and indirectly behaviour, through actual behavioural control.

Therefore, the potential relationship between perceived behavioural control and intention can be tested via the following hypothesis: 'perceived behavioural control will have a positive influence on the intention to purchase local food'. Similarly to the subjective norm the perceived behavioural control, see figure 1 or 14, has a (potential) underlying influence on the attitude towards local food. This sparks another hypothesis: 'There is a positive relationship between perceived behavioural control and attitude'. This variable is measured through the use of four statements that encompasses controllability and self-efficacy, derived from the literature (Shin, Hancer, & Song, 2016). An example statement is "I find buying local food easy" that measures the perceived ease or difficulty of performing the behaviour, in this case purchasing local food. For an overview of all the statements please refer to appendix 3.8, table 18.

Appendix 2.6.4 Intention

The intention in the Theory of Planned Behaviour is the willingness of a person to carry out a particular behaviour, and is presumably the best predictor of behaviour (Shin, Hancer, & Song, 2016). Therefore, the predecessor of the Theory of Planned Behaviour, namely the Theory of Reasoned Action was not viable as it does not consider "behaviors over which people have incomplete volitional control (Ajzen, 1991)". The variable intention will be measured with the use of three statements, such as the statement "I expect to purchase local food in the next month" adapted from the literature and altered on the basis of the questionnaire feedback of the research on consumer attitudes in the Northern-Netherlands. For the other statements with corresponding justifications, please see appendix 3.9, table 19.

Appendix 2.7 Alphabet Theory

The Alphabet Theory functions only when a commonly agreed definition of the term local food has been identified. This further confirms the literature as elaborated upon in section 2.2 which explores the integral importance of a definition for local food to understand the research. The definition of local food will be taken into consideration when collecting data.

The 'Attitudes' in the Alphabet theory combines three components with a causal link to one another: values, beliefs, and norms that form the VBN Theory. The VBN Theory was developed by Stern et al. (1999) and "includes altruistic considerations as measures of predicting pro-environmental behavior" (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015).

It achieves this through the theory being constructed out of three other theories, namely value theory, the new ecological paradigm, and norm activation theory. First, the value theory encompasses, in essence, the values that underlie one's actions. This relates to this research as the underlying values to the consumer attitudes towards local food are explored through the predictor variables mentioned previously. These variables and their accompanying statements for measurement manifest these values. Second, is the new ecological paradigm that consists of a 12

point scale of environmental questions that measures the degree to which someone agrees the need to limit growth and be in balance with nature. The concept of the new ecological paradigm provides additional information on how attitudes are formulated. These are further incorporated in the statements of the predictor variables that are tested in how they influence the shaping of consumer attitudes. Lastly, the norm-activation theory, when looking at environmentalism, implies that moral norms are activated when a person becomes aware of the loss to themselves and others and accepts that their actions can negate these consequences.

So the VBN theory essentially predicates that values directly determine beliefs, which then affect norms, and in turn, intention and behaviour. The VBN theory is, therefore, a framework to predict the formation of attitudes. The ABC theory is based on the principle that the consumer acts in line with the gain they can expect from performing the given behaviour. This theory is mainly included in the Alphabet Theory because of the factor 'context', further explained in Appendix 2.7.4. Combining these two theories allows for the exploration of the attitude towards local food by utilizing the Alphabet Theory, which can be observed in figure 2. The hypothesis that takes this into consideration, the attitudes toward local food, has been previously formulated in section 2.7.

Appendix 2.7.1 Demographics

Among the Alphabet theory's various aspects in figure 2 is the factor 'demographics' on the attitude formation towards local food. This factor has been presented in previous research to have varying influences on the attitudes towards local food and behaviour. As described by Feldmann et al. (2015), this was used to show how personal characteristics could influence attitudes and behaviour. Furthermore, as stated by Ajzen et al. (2015) about demographic variables, they "are considered background factors in the theory of planned behaviour; they are expected to influence intentions and behaviour only indirectly by their effects on behavioural, normative, and control belief". Therefore, this factor will be taken into consideration in the research but will not be construed into a hypothesis. The demographic variables to be employed in this research include gender, age, household size, location, employment status, and income. These variables have been decided on through literature and the reasoning for choosing these can be observed in Appendix 3.13.

Appendix 2.7.2 Consumer's Knowledge

Also, the predictor variables 'Knowledge' and 'Information seeking' have shown a significant influence on the formation of attitudes (Zepeda & Deal, 2009). The first variable, knowledge, infers the comprehension of the subject, local food, in question. This would fortify the existing values of a person, which affect the beliefs and norms, resulting in an attitude towards local food purchase behaviour that is favourable or not. This facet of the Alphabet Theory is of importance and will, therefore, be studied in this research through the following hypothesis: 'There is a positive relationship between consumer's knowledge and attitude towards local food.' The testing of the hypothesis is done according to four statements extracted from the literature. Statements such as "I know where the

food I consume originates from" are used in the measurement. The other statements as well as further explanation and justification regarding the choice of statements can be found in appendix 3.10, table 20.

Appendix 2.7.3 Information Seeking

Next to consumer's knowledge is the predictor variable information seeking. Information seeking is that of how consumers collect information in this case on alternative food production methods. A consumer who investigates more into food production methods and general information around the behaviour will strengthen their knowledge and attitudes, which influences the subsequent purchase behaviour (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). The following hypothesis that will contribute to the picture of the consumer attitudes formation is: 'There is a positive relationship between information seeking and attitude towards local food.' The measurement of information seeking required statements that embody actively searching for information. This can be seen in the statement, "I actively try to find out the origin of the food I am consuming". This statement is one of the three for measuring the variable information seeking, and the others can be found in appendix 3.11, table 21.

Appendix 2.7.4 Context

Lastly, the predictor variable 'context' relates to the formation of attitudes and the behaviour in question (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). The ABC-theory is responsible for incorporating context and is essentially the constraints or incentives to purchase local food. The contextual factors that come up most frequently are "availability, convenience, price, seasonal variety, and the influence of specific product types associated with local food" (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). These influences can have a positive or negative effect on the relationship between attitude and behaviour. These have to be taken into consideration when analyzing consumer attitudes on the intention to purchase local food. The diving into the consumer attitudes should occur on a broad level, as stated by Cranfield et al. (2012) "to begin to understand the appeal of local foods and how these attitudes must be changed if the consumption of such products is to be promoted". This reiterates the importance of exploring consumer attitudes on a broad level if local food products' consumption is to be encouraged. Moreover, looking at context, this results in the last hypothesis related to the influence on the construct attitude: 'There is a positive relationship between context and attitude towards local food'. The measurement of the variable context is according to four statements obtained from the literature. Please refer to appendix 3.12, table 22 for the statements with justification.

Additionally, the Alphabet Theory is relatively new, therefore is recommended by Feldmann et al. (2015) to focus future studies on "different socio-cultural background and other context-related national framework conditions influence attitudes and behavior differently". The utilizing of this study in five different countries and regions, would lessen this research gap. (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015, Kwant, 2020).

Appendix 3: Statements Measuring Variables

This appendix is an addition to the literature review and method chapter, whereby this appendix looks into how the variables identified are to be measured. To get a full picture of the predictor variables below they should be read in conjunction with the literature review's corresponding section. Furthermore, see appendix 4 for how these variables are incorporated into the questionnaire.

Appendix 3.1 Measurement Attitude Towards Local Food

The attitude towards local food will be measured utilizing four statements on a 7-point semantic differential scale. The number of statements is decided according to (Francis et al., 2004) as it specifies that four is the ideal for the measurement to attitude. The use of the semantic differential scale has been justified in Appendix 5.1. The four statements used to measure attitude towards local food can be seen in table 11.

Statements (Items)	**Semantic Differential Scale (1-7)**
Eating local food is...	Very Unwise - Very Wise
Local food gives me a … feeling	Very Unpleasant - Very Pleasant
When I eat local food I feel...	Very Unsatisfied - Very Satisfied
Local food tastes…	Very Bad - Very Good

Table 11: Measuring attitude towards local food.

The four statements in question were chosen based on the fact they are often used in research to assess someone's attitudes towards food objects or behaviour (Skallerud & Wien, 2019, Kumar & Smith, 2018). The statements evaluate attitude and the preference towards local food, which is essential in the consumption of set products.

Appendix 3.2 Measurement Health Consciousness

From the literature review, it can be seen that there is a growing awareness of health-related concern that is making customers question the origin of food and the transparency of the food chain (Skallerud & Wien, 2019). These health-related concerns can be worded as health consciousness, a potential predictor of attitude towards local food. As described in section 2.4.1, the literature further shows that health consciousness is a significant predictor of attitude towards local food. Four statements from the literature were extrapolated to measure this predictor variable, with corresponding Likert scale for measurement (See table 12). The first and second statement were adapted from Kumar et al., (2018) as they had in previous research been proven to be successful in the purpose of measuring health consciousness. The next two statements were taken from the literature as they had shown success in similar research, namely on organic food (Hong, 2009, Michaelidou & Hassan, 2008).

Statements (Items)	Likert Scale - Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7)
I reflect on my health a lot	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
I am aware of changes in my health	
I am very self-conscious about my health	
I take responsibility for the state of my health	

Table 12: Measuring health consciousness.

Appendix 3.3 Measurement Concern for the Environment

The measurement of the predictor variable concern for the environment is warranted as it has been discovered to be a significant predictor of attitude towards local food. The statements were picked and construed consulting the literature. The statements were adapted from the research conducted by Kumar et al. (2018) and Garbacz (2018). The statements combine the general concern for the environment as well a statement relating this to environmentally friendly food products, as are local food products (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). See table 13 for an overview of the statement for the measuring of concern for the environment.

Statements (Items)	Likert Scale - Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7)
The current approach to the environment is destroying it	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
Unless actions are taken, the environmental damage is permanent	
When buying food, I choose environmentally friendly products	

Table 13: Measuring concern for the environment.

Appendix 3.4 Measurement Concern for the Local Economy

The measurement of the predictor variable Concern for the Local Economy is done through the following three statements that can be seen in table 14. Research into the concern for the local economy has been conducted successfully by Kumar et al., (2018), as also pointed out in the literature review. This allowed for the adaptation of the statements for utilization in this research. The statements are in line with previous research conducting this predictor variable and encompass the strengthening of the local economy through supporting the local businesses and agriculture sector (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015).

Statements (Items)	Likert Scale - Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7)
The purchase of local food products supports local companies.	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
The purchasing of local good products supports local farming.	

Table 14: Measuring concern for the local economy.

Appendix 3.5 Measurement Perceived Quality

The next predictor variable under investigation is the perceived quality. As portrayed in the literature review discussion, the overall message perceived quality is the perception of the quality of a product compared to others. Furthermore, according to Cranfield et al. (2012), the consumer often considered local food to be of better quality than alternatives. This is encapsulated in the first statement in table 15. The two other statements, keeping in line with the comparison to other options, look at the "consumers' judgment about an entity's or a service's overall excellence or superiority" (Yee & San, 2011). The literature on local food and particularly product quality describes the taste and freshness as most frequently mentioned (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). These have been adapted into the statements below, table 15.

Statements (Items)	Likert Scale - Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7)
Local food is of higher quality than conventional food products	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
Local food is tastier than conventional food products	
Local food is fresher than conventional food products	

Table 15: Measuring perceived quality.

Appendix 3.6 Measurement Food Safety

The measurement of the predictor variable Food Safety is done through the following two statements that can be seen in table 16. The literature states that consumers consider local food safer to consume compared to alternatives (Cranfield, Henson, & Blandon, 2012). Moreover, Cranfield et al. (2012) mention that consumers find local food products safer to consume than from afar, so knowing the origins of set food is essential in the perception of safe food. Only two statements are utilized, even though the research revealed this is not internally reliable. The decision to this was with regards to the questionnaire's length. This in hindsight showed no issue in the internal reliability for

the regions under study in this transnational research. These are what formed the basis for the statements as in table 16.

Statements (Items)	Likert Scale - Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7)
Locally produced food is safer to consume compared to conventional food products	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
Knowing the origins of a food product makes it feel safer to consume	

Table 16 Measuring food safety.

Appendix 3.7 Measurement Subjective Norm

The predictor variable subjective norm is taken from the theory of planned behaviour. For the measuring of this variable, the previous research was consulted to see what statements had been used. The most commonly used statements in research for this variable can be seen in table 17, and are, therefore, those chosen to be used in this research looking at the Northern Netherlands. Moreover, these are validated through the use by Kumar et al. (2018) and Garbacz (2018) in their respective research into the same topics.

Statements (Items)	Likert Scale - Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7)
Most people I value would buy local food if available instead of conventional food	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
Most people that are important to me think I should buy local food	

Table 17: Measuring subjective norm.

Appendix 3.8 Measurement Perceived Behavioural Control

The perceived behavioural control originates from the Theory of Planned Behaviour similarly to Subjective norm. This variable has been investigated previously, which therefore brings forth some validated statements. The first two statements in table 18 have been adapted from Kumar et al. (2018) and Garbacz et al. (2018). The other two statements have been added through Shin et al. 2016.

Statements (Items)	Likert Scale - Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7)

I find buying local food easy	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
If I want to, I could purchase local food products instead of conventional products	
Whether I purchase local food is entirely up to me	
The decision to purchase local food is not beyond my control	

Table 18: Measuring perceived behavioural control.

Appendix 3.9 Measurement Intention

The measuring of the variable intention is of great importance as it is one of the two crucial variables together with attitude in answering the main research question. To measure the variable intention, the literature was consulted to observe how previous research had measured this variable. The theory of planned behaviour measurement through a questionnaire has been thoroughly researched and presents various statements (Francis et al., 2004, Garbacz, 2018). These statements can be seen in table 19 and have been adapted to suit this research. For instance, "in the next month" was initially "in the near future"; however, based on the testing of the questionnaire, these were adapted to consist of a time span.

Statements (Items)	**Likert Scale - Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7)**
I expect to purchase local food in the next month	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
I want to purchase local food in the next month	
I intend to purchase local food in the next month	

Table 19: Measuring intention.

Appendix 3.10 Measurement Consumer's Knowledge

The predictor variable consumer's knowledge is derived from Alphabet Theory. The central aspect of local food is that it originates from a particular place, as can be seen in the definition of local food in the literature review. The awareness of this by the consumer is only possible if they have the knowledge about where the food products they consume come from (Zepeda & Deal, 2009). This results in the first statement, as seen in table 20. Furthermore, the consumer should be aware of the advantages of local food and the importance of them to develop an intention to purchase (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). This is worded into the second statement.

Furthermore, the literature frequently makes a comparison between local and non-local food (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). A consumer's ability to distinguish between local and non-local food is an indication of their knowledge, which is encapsulated statement three. Moreover, the season of the year from the literature has an influence on the perception by people of local food. Furthermore, "products that were known to have been grown during the season positively mediated the interaction between attitudes and local food consumption" (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). The consumers know the seasonality of food products, essential for local food products, and adapts their consumption accordingly. Therefore, this is condensed into the last statement in table 20.

Statements (Items)	**Likert Scale - Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7)**
I know where the food I consume originates from	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
I am aware of all the advantages of local food compared to conventional food products	
I can distinguish between local and non-local food	
I adapt my food purchase choices based on seasonal food products	

Table 20: Measuring consumer's knowledge.

Appendix 3.11 Measurement Information Seeking

The predictor variable information seeking is also derived from the Alphabet Theory. Information seeking is something that in the Alphabet Theory both influences the attitude towards local food as well as the consumers' knowledge. The statements used for this variable, as seen in table 21, were derived from Garbacz (2018) and Kumar et al. (2018). The statements were worded in a manner to represent the actively seeking of information Feldmann & Hamm, 2015).

Statements (Items)	**Likert Scale - Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7)**
I actively try to find out the origin of the food I am consuming	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
I search for information on the way food was produced	
I read food labels to find out more about the food product	

Table 21: Measuring information seeking.

Appendix 3.12 Measurement Context

The last predictor variable under measurement is context. Looking at the first statement, table 22, it relates to context as the availability of local food is an essential influence on the possibility to purchase set food (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). Moreover, context encompasses things such as "availability, price, complexity, and inconvenience" (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). The second statement includes the availability, complexity, and inconvenience of purchasing local food and is therefore suited in measuring the variable context. The two subsequent statements come from "Local food is not perceived as expensive. Nevertheless, consumers are willing to pay a premium for local food" (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015).

Statements (Items)	**Likert Scale - Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7)**
Local food is available for purchasing	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
I would buy more locally grown foods if they were labelled as local	
Local food product are not too expensive	
I would pay a premium for local food products	

Table 22: Measuring context.

Appendix 3.13 Measurement Demographics

The demographic variables in this research are considered background factors. Nonetheless, this information will provide information on the study areas' consumer profile and observe similarities and differences. The most frequently mentioned demographic variables in research covering local food include age, gender, income, education, and location (Francis et al., 2004, TJH Research and Strategy, 2011, Hughes, Camden, & Yangchen, 2016, Dukeshire, Garbes, Kennedy, Boudreau, & Osborne, 2011). These are to be included as well as the variable employment status and size of the household (Garbacz, 2018).

Appendix 3.14 Measurement Main Categories of Food Consumption & Place of Purchase

From the definition of local food articulated in section 2.2, it can be seen that the 'type of product' is part of the classification of local. The main food consumption categories, according to Kumar et al. (2018), include: meat/poultry/fish, eggs/dairy, and fruits/vegetables. A combination of these with the categories utilized in the research into the Northern Netherlands results in the following food groups dairy, eggs, vegetables, fruit, bread,

meat, poultry, and fish. This list will be incorporated into the research tool and can be seen in Appendix 4, as it provides context to the consumer attitudes and subsequent intention on purchase behaviour.

Furthermore, the place of purchase gives insight into the context of what is being researched concerning the formation of the attitude on the purchase behaviour (Garbacz, 2018). The places of purchase include local bakeries, local butcher, local greengrocers, local market, supermarket, internet, and box-schemes (Geurts, van Bakel, van Rossum, C. T. M., de Boer, & Ocké, 2016, Garbacz, 2018). These have been altered per REFRAME region, based on the conversation between the researcher and the REFRAME partner. Please see the questionnaires in Appendix 4 on what places of purchase were included.

Appendix 3.15 Background to variables in study

Research has shown that local food buyers put more effort into shopping for their food products (Feldmann & Hamm, 2015). This is important as it provides information on how their attitudes are formed and if these same attitudes lead to putting in more effort to shop for local food products. For this reason, the following questions were formulated and added to the questionnaire 'Do you make an effort to buy local food?', 'Do you ever buy local food?', and 'How often are you responsible for grocery shopping?' (Ajzen, 2015, Garbacz, 2018). To see how these are incorporated into the questionnaire, see appendix 4.

Appendix 4: Questionnaire Outline

Appendix 4.1 Questionnaire Outline (English)

Questionnaire about Food ... (REFRAME Region)

Dear participant from the ... (REFRAME Region),

Thank you very much for participating in this questionnaire. My name is Jesper Kwant and this study was commissioned by the REFRAME project to find out more about consumers and their attitude towards local food in (REFRAME Region). Completing this questionnaire takes about 8-10 minutes, and your answers will be kept anonymous.

Your input is highly appreciated.

The term "local food" in the context of this questionnaire refers to the food produced and sold in ...

1. Do you ever buy local food?

- ❑ Yes
- ❑ Sometimes

❑ No (Skip question two)

2. Do you do your best to buy local food?

Never, Almost never, Occasionally, Frequently, Usually, Almost always, Always

3. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

Eating local food is...	Very Unwise - Very Wise
Local food gives me a … feeling	Very Unpleasant - Very Pleasant
When I eat local food I feel...	Very Unsatisfied - Very Satisfied
Local food tastes…	Very Bad - Very Good

4. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

I reflect on my health a lot	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
I am aware of changes in my health	
I am very self-conscious about my health	
I take responsibility for the state of my health	

5. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

The current approach to the environment is destroying it	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
Unless actions are taken, the environmental damage is permanent	
When buying food, I choose environmentally friendly products	

6. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

The purchase of local food products supports local companies.	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
The purchasing of local food products supports local farming.	

7. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

Local food is of higher quality than non-local food products	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
Local food is tastier than non-local food products	

Local food is fresher than non-local food products	

8. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

Locally produced food is safer to consume compared to non-local food products	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
Knowing the origins of a food product makes it feel safer to consume	

9. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

Most people I value would buy local food if available instead of non-local food	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
Most people that are important to me think I should buy local food	

10. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

I find buying local food easy	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
If I want to, I could purchase local food products instead of non-local products	
Whether I purchase local food is entirely up to me	
The decision to purchase local food is not beyond my control	

11. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

I expect to purchase local food in the next month	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
I want to purchase local food in the next month	
I intend to purchase local food in the next month	

12. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

I know where the food I consume originates from	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
I am aware of all the advantages of local food compared to non-local food products	
I can distinguish between local and non-local food	
I adapt my food purchase choices based on seasonal food products	

13. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

I actively try to find out the origin of the food I am consuming	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
I search for information on the way food was produced	
I read food labels to find out more about the food product	

14. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

Local food is available for purchasing	Strongly disagree - Disagree - Somewhat disagree - Neither agree nor disagree - Somewhat agree - Agree - Strongly Agree
I would buy more locally grown foods if they were labelled as local	
Local food product are not too expensive	
I would pay a premium for local food products	

15. What is your gender?

- ❑ Male
- ❑ Female
- ❑ Prefer not to say
- ❑ Other …

16. What age category are you in?

- ❑ 15 - 24
- ❑ 25 - 34
- ❑ 35 - 44
- ❑ 45 - 64
- ❑ 65 - 74
- ❑ 75+

17. How many people live in your household? (Including yourself)

- ❑ 1
- ❑ 2
- ❑ 3
- ❑ 4 or more

18. In which ... do you live?

- ❑ ...
- ❑ ...
- ❑ ...

19. How often are you responsible for grocery shopping?

Never, Almost never, Occasionally, Frequently, Usually, Almost always, Always

20. How often do you normally buy local food? (Only answer the following three questions if you are a buyer of local food)

Never, Almost never, Occasionally, Frequently, Usually, Almost always, Always

21. Where and how often do you normally buy local food products?

Local butcher, Local bakery, Local greengrocer, Local market, Supermarket, Internet, Box-scheme, Farm shops

Never, Almost never, Occasionally, Frequently, Usually, Almost always, Always

22. How often do you buy local food products from the following food groups

Dairy, Vegetables, Fruit, Bread, Meat, Eggs, Poultry, Fish

Never, Almost never, Occasionally, Frequently, Usually, Almost always, Always

23. What is your employment status?

- ❑ Full-time employed
- ❑ Part-time employed
- ❑ Self-employed
- ❑ Student (not employed)
- ❑ Retired
- ❑ Unemployed
- ❑ Other

24. What is the highest level of education you have attained?

- ❑ Primary education
- ❑ Secondary education (High school diploma)
- ❑ Vocational education and training
- ❑ University of Applied Sciences
- ❑ University

25. In what monthly household income category do you find yourself? (Net monthly income)

- ❑ Less than 2000 euro
- ❑ 2000 to 2499 euro
- ❑ 2500 to 2999 euro
- ❑ 3000 to 3999 euro
- ❑ 4000 to 4999 euro
- ❑ 5000 to 5999 euro
- ❑ 6000 to 6999 euro
- ❑ 7000 to 7999 euro
- ❑ 8000 to 8999 euro

- ❑ 9000 to 9999 euro
- ❑ 10000 euro +
- ❑ I prefer not to answer

Thank you very much for participating in the study.

Appendix 4.2 Questionnaire Outline - Västra Götaland (Swedish)

Enkät om livsmedel Västra Götaland

Till dig som bor i Västra Götaland

Vi vill undersöka hur du som konsument ser på lokal mat i Västra Götaland. Syftet är att inom ramen för EU-projektet REFRAME lära oss mer om konsumenters attityd till lokal mat i Västra Götaland. Det tar maximum 10 minuter att fylla i svar på alla frågor. Tack för att du tar dig tid att svara på denna enkät.

Din feedback är värdefull för projektet!

Termen lokal mat som avses i enkäten är mat som producerats och sålts i Västra Götaland.

1. Handlar du lokal mat?

- ❑ Ja
- ❑ Ibland
- ❑ Nej

2. Anstränger du dig för att handla lokal mat?

Aldrig, Nästan aldrig, Ibland, Frekvent, Vanligtvis, Nästan alltid, Alltid

3. I vilken utsträckning håller du med om följande påståenden:

Att äta lokal mat är….	Oklokt - Klokt
Lokal mat ger en känsla som är…	Mycket otrevlig - Mycket Trevlig
När jag äter lokal mat känner jag mig…	Mycket otillfredsställd – Mycket tillfredsställd
Lokal mat smakar…	Mycket illa – Mycket gott

4. I vilken utsträckning håller du med om följande påståenden:

Jag reflekterar ofta över min hälsa	Håller verkligen inte med – Håller inte med – Håller till viss del inte med – Håller varken med eller inte med – Håller med till viss del – Håller med - Håller verkligen med
Jag är medveten om egna hälsoförändringar	
Jag är mycket medveten om mitt hälsotillstånd	
Jag tar ansvar för mitt hälsotillstånd	

5. I vilken utsträckning håller du med om följande påståenden:

Nuvarande inställning till miljöläget är förödande	Håller verkligen inte med – Håller inte med – Håller till viss del inte med – Håller varken med eller inte med – Håller med till viss del – Håller med - Håller verkligen med
Om vi inte vidtar åtgärder kommer miljöskadorna bli permanenta	
När jag handlar mat väljer jag miljövänliga produkter	

6. I vilken utsträckning håller du med om följande påståenden:

Handel med lokal mat stöttar lokala företag	Håller verkligen inte med – Håller inte med – Håller till viss del inte med – Håller varken med eller inte med – Håller med till viss del – Håller med - Håller verkligen med
Handel med lokala bra produkter stöttar lokalt lantbruk	

7. I vilken utsträckning håller du med om följande påståenden:

Lokal mat håller högre kvalitet än andra alternativ	Håller verkligen inte med – Håller inte med – Håller till viss del inte med – Håller varken med eller inte med – Håller med till viss del – Håller med - Håller verkligen med
Lokal mat smakar bättre än andra alteranativ	
Lokal mat är mer färsk än andra alterantiv	

8. I vilken utsträckning håller du med om följande påståenden:

Lokalt producerad mat är mer livsmedelssäker jämfört med andra alternativ	Håller verkligen inte med – Håller inte med – Håller till viss del inte med – Håller varken med eller inte med – Håller med till viss del – Håller med - Håller verkligen med
Att känna till matens ursprung känns mer livsmedelssäkert	

9. I vilken utsträckning håller du med om följande påståenden:

Mina vänner skulle välja lokal mat framför andra alterantiv om det fanns tillgängligt	Håller verkligen inte med – Håller inte med – Håller till viss del inte med – Håller varken med eller inte med – Håller med till viss del – Håller med - Håller verkligen med
De flesta av mina vänner förväntar sig att jag handlar	

lokal mat	

10. I vilken utsträckning håller du med om följande påståenden:

Jag tycker det är enkelt att handla lokal mat	Håller verkligen inte med – Håller inte med – Håller till viss del inte med – Håller varken med eller inte med – Håller med till viss del – Håller med - Håller verkligen med
Om jag önskar kan jag välja lokal mat framför andra alternativ	
Det är min ensak om jag handlar lokal mat eller inte	
Beslutet att välja att handla lokal mat är inte utanför min kontroll	

11. I vilken utsträckning håller du med om följande påståenden:

Jag kommer att handla lokal mat nästa månad	Håller verkligen inte med – Håller inte med – Håller till viss del inte med – Håller varken med eller inte med – Håller med till viss del – Håller med - Håller verkligen med
Jag vill handla lokal mat nästa månad	
Jag har för avsikt att handla lokal mat nästa månad	

12. I vilken utsträckning håller du med om följande påståenden:

Jag vet varifrån maten jag äter kommer	Håller verkligen inte med – Håller inte med – Håller till viss del inte med – Håller varken med eller inte med – Håller med till viss del – Håller med - Håller verkligen med
Jag är medveten om alla fördelar med lokal mat jämfört med alternativen	
Jag kan skilja på vad som är lokal mat eller inte	
Jag anpassar min matinköp efter säsong	

13. I vilken utsträckning håller du med om följande påståenden:

Jag försöker aktivt ta reda på ursprung på maten jag äter	Håller verkligen inte med – Håller inte med – Håller till viss del inte med – Håller varken med eller inte med – Håller med till viss del – Håller med - Håller verkligen med
Jag söker information om hur maten är producucerad	
Jag läser livsmedelsinformation på etiketten för att lära mig mer om produkten	

14. I vilken utsträckning håller du med om följande påståenden:

Lokal mat är lättillgängligt för mig	Håller verkligen inte med – Håller inte med – Håller till viss del inte med – Håller varken med eller inte med – Håller med till viss del – Håller med - Håller verkligen med
Jag skulle köpa mer odlad lokal mat om de var märkta som lokal produkt	
Lokal mat är inte för dyr	
Jag är beredd att betala mer för lokal mat	

15. Vilket kön tillhör du?

- ❑ Man
- ❑ Kvinna
- ❑ Vill inte uppge
- ❑ Annat

16. Vilken ålderskategori tillhör du?

- ❑ 15 - 24
- ❑ 25 - 34
- ❑ 35 - 44
- ❑ 45 - 64
- ❑ 65 - 74
- ❑ 75+

17. Hur många är ni i ert hushåll? (inklusive dig själv)

- ❑ 1
- ❑ 2
- ❑ 3
- ❑ 4 eller fler

18. Vilken delregion bor du i?

- ❑ Sjuhärad
- ❑ Skaraborg
- ❑ Fyrbodal
- ❑ Göteborgsområdet med insjöriket

19. Hur ofta är det du som handlar mat i ditt hushåll?

Aldrig, Nästan aldrig, Ibland, Frekvent, Vanligtvis, Nästan alltid, Alltid

20. Hur ofta handlar du lokal mat?

Aldrig, Nästan aldrig, Ibland, Frekvent, Vanligtvis, Nästan alltid, Alltid

21. Var och hur ofta handlar du ofta lokalt när det gäller:

Köttdetaljist, Bageri, Grönsakshandel, lokal matmarknad, Supermarket, Internet, Gårdsbutiker

Aldrig, Nästan aldrig, Ibland, Frekvent, Vanligtvis, Nästan alltid, Alltid

22. Hur ofta handlar du lokala produkter inom dessa livsmedelskategorier:

Mejeri, Grönsaker, Frukt, Bröd. Kött. Ägg, Fågel, Fisk

Aldrig, Nästan aldrig, Ibland, Frekvent, Vanligtvis, Nästan alltid, Alltid

23. Vilken sysselsättningsgrad har du?
- ❑ Anställd heltid
- ❑ Anställd deltid
- ❑ Egenföretagare
- ❑ Student
- ❑ Pensionär
- ❑ Arbetslös
- ❑ Annat

24. Vilken är din utbildningsnivå?
- ❑ Grundskola
- ❑ Gymnasieexamen
- ❑ Universitetsexamen

25. Vilken är ditt hushålls nettoinkomst per månad?
- ❑ Mindre än 20 695
- ❑ 20 695 – 25 859
- ❑ 25 859 – 31 032
- ❑ 31 043 – 41 380
- ❑ 41 391 – 51 728
- ❑ 51 738 – 62 075
- ❑ 62 086 – 72 423
- ❑ 72 433 – 82 771
- ❑ 82 781 – 93 118
- ❑ 93 129 – 103 466
- ❑ 103 476 +
- ❑ Jag avböjer att svara

Appendix 4.3 Questionnaire Outline - West-Vlaanderen (Flemish)

Vragenlijst over voeding in West-Vlaanderen

Beste deelnemer uit West-Vlaanderen,

Bedankt voor uw deelname aan deze vragenlijst. Mijn naam is Jesper Kwant en deze studie wordt uitgevoerd in opdracht van het Farmer Business+ om meer te weten te komen over consumenten en hun houding ten opzichte van lokale voeding in West-Vlaanderen. Het invullen van deze vragenlijst duurt ongeveer 8-10 minuten en uw antwoorden zijn anoniem.

Uw inbreng wordt zeer op prijs gesteld.

De term “lokaal voedsel” in de context van deze vragenlijst verwijst naar het voedsel geproduceerd en verkocht in West-Vlaanderen.

1. Koopt u lokaal eten?

❏ Ja

❏ Soms

❏ Nee

2. Doet u een inspanning om lokaal eten te kopen?

Nooit - Bijna nooit - Af en toe - Vaak - Meestal - Bijna altijd - Altijd

3. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Het eten van lokaal voedsel is	Erg onverstandig - Erg verstandig
Lokaal voedsel geeft mij een … gevoel	Erg onaangenaam- Erg aangenaam
Als ik lokaal voedsel eet, voel ik me	Erg ontevreden - Erg tevreden
Lokaal voedsel smaakt	Heel slecht - Heel goed

4. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Ik denk veel na over mijn gezondheid	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Ik ben me bewust van veranderingen in mijn gezondheid	

Ik ben erg zelfbewust over mijn gezondheid	
Ik neem verantwoordelijkheid voor de toestand van mijn gezondheid	

5. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

De huidige manier waarop er wordt omgegaan met het milieu is destructief	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Tenzij er actie wordt ondernomen, is de milieuschade blijvend	
Bij het kopen van voedsel kies ik voor milieuvriendelijke producten	

6. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

De aankoop van lokale voedingsproducten ondersteunt lokale bedrijven	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
De aankoop van lokale voedselproducten ondersteunt de lokale landbouw	

7. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Lokaal voedsel is van hogere kwaliteit dan niet-lokale voedselproducten	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Lokaal voedsel is lekkerder dan niet-lokale voedselproducten	
Lokaal eten is verser dan niet-lokale voedselproducten	

8. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Lokaal geproduceerd voedsel is veiliger om te consumeren in vergelijking met niet-lokale voedselproducten	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Als u de oorsprong van een voedingsmiddel kent, voelt het veiliger om te consumeren	

9. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

De meeste mensen die ik waardeer, kopen lokaal voedsel indien beschikbaar in plaats van niet-lokale voedsel	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
De meeste mensen die belangrijk voor me zijn, vinden	

dat ik lokaal voedsel moet kopen	

10. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Ik vind het gemakkelijk om lokaal voedsel te kopen	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Als ik wil, kan ik lokale voedselproducten kopen in plaats van niet-lokale producten	
Ik beslis zelf of ik lokaal eten koop	
De beslissing om lokaal voedsel te kopen, ligt binnen mijn macht	

11. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Ik verwacht in de komende maand lokaal voedsel te kopen	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Ik wil in de komende maand lokaal voedsel kopen	
Ik ben van plan in de komende maand lokaal voedsel te kopen	

12. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Ik weet waar het voedsel dat ik consumeer vandaan komt	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Ik ben me bewust van alle voordelen van lokaal voedsel in vergelijking met niet-lokale voedselproducten	
Ik kan onderscheid maken tussen lokaal en niet-lokaal voedsel	
Ik pas mijn keuzes voor voedsel aankoop aan op basis van seizoensgebonden voedingsproducten	

13. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Ik probeer actief de oorsprong te achterhalen van het voedsel dat ik eet	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Ik zoek informatie over de manier waarop voedsel is geproduceerd	
Ik lees voedseletiketten om meer te weten te komen over het voedingsproduct	

14. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Lokaal voedsel is beschikbaar om te kopen	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Ik zou meer lokaal geteeld voedsel kopen als ze als lokaal werden bestempeld	
Lokale voedselproducten zijn niet te duur	
Ik zou extra betalen voor lokale voedselproducten	

15. Wat is uw geslacht?

- ❑ Man
- ❑ Vrouw
- ❑ Zeg ik liever niet
- ❑ Other (Ander) ...

16. In welke leeftijdscategorie valt u?

- ❑ 15 - 24
- ❑ 25 - 34
- ❑ 35 - 44
- ❑ 45 - 64
- ❑ 65 - 74
- ❑ 75+

17. Hoeveel mensen wonen er in uw huishouden?

- ❑ 1
- ❑ 2
- ❑ 3
- ❑ 4 of meer

18. Wat is uw postcode?

Invul balk

19. Woon je in een stad of op het platteland?

- ❑ Stad
- ❑ Platteland

20. Hoe vaak bent u verantwoordelijk voor boodschappen doen?

Nooit - Bijna nooit - Af en toe - Vaak - Meestal - Bijna altijd - Altijd

21. Hoe vaak koopt u normaal gesproken lokaal voedsel? (Alleen beantwoorden als u "Ja" of "Soms" op de eerste vraag van de vragenlijst hebt geantwoord)

Nooit - Bijna nooit - Af en toe - Vaak - Meestal - Bijna altijd - Altijd

22. Waar en hoe vaak koopt u normaalgesproken uw lokale voedselproducten (Alleen beantwoorden als u "Ja" of "Soms" op de eerste vraag van de vragenlijst hebt geantwoord)

Hoeveproduct, Streekproducent, Lokaal Afdeling Supermarkt, Internet, Boederijmarkten

Nooit - Bijna nooit - Af en toe - Vaak - Meestal - Bijna altijd - Altijd

23. Hoe vaak koop je lokale voedselproducten van de volgende voedselgroepen? (Alleen beantwoorden als u "Ja" of "Soms" op de eerste vraag van de vragenlijst hebt geantwoord)

Zuivel, Groenten, Fruit, Brood, Vlees, Eieren, Gevogelte, Vis

Nooit - Bijna nooit - Af en toe - Vaak - Meestal - Bijna altijd - Altijd

24. Wat is uw arbeidsstatus?

- ❑ Fulltime werkzaam
- ❑ Parttime werkzaam
- ❑ Zelfstandig
- ❑ Student (niet in dienst)
- ❑ Gepensioneerd
- ❑ Werkloos
- ❑ Other (Ander)

25. Wat is het hoogste opleidingsniveau dat u heeft behaald?

- ❑ Basisonderwijs
- ❑ Secundair onderwijs
- ❑ Professioneel Bachelor
- ❑ Master

26. In welke maandelijkse categorie van het gezinsinkomen bevindt u zich? (Netto maandinkomen)

- ❑ Minder dan 2000 euro
- ❑ 2000 tot 2499 euro
- ❑ 2500 tot 2999 euro
- ❑ 3000 tot 3999 euro
- ❑ 4000 tot 4999 euro
- ❑ 5000 tot 5999 euro
- ❑ 6000 tot 6999 euro
- ❑ 7000 tot 7999 euro
- ❑ 8000 tot 8999 euro
- ❑ 9000 tot 9999 euro
- ❑ 10000 euro +

❑ Zeg ik liever niet

Heel erg bedankt voor uw deelname aan het onderzoek!

Appendix 4.4 Questionnaire Outline - Wesermarsch District (German)

Fragebogen zum Thema Lebensmittel in der Wesermarsch

Sehr geehrte Teilnehmerinnen und Teilnehmer,

vielen Dank für Ihre Teilnahme an dieser Umfrage. Mein Name ist Jesper Kwant und diese Untersuchung wurde vom EU-Interreg Projekt REFRAME in Auftrag gegeben, um mehr über Verbraucher und deren Einstellungen zu regionalen Lebensmitteln herauszufinden. Das Ausfüllen dieses Fragebogens dauert ca. 8-10 Minuten und Ihre Antworten bleiben anonym. Mit Ihrer Teilnahme leisten Sie einen wertvollen Beitrag zum REFRAME-Projekt.

Der Begriff "Lokale" im Kontext dieses Fragebogens bezieht sich auf die in der Wesermarsch hergestellten und verkauften Lebensmittel.

1. Kaufen Sie lokale Lebensmittel?

❑ Ja

❑ Manchmal

❑ Nein

2. Geben Sie sich Mühe, um Ihre lokalen Lebensmittel zu kaufen?

Niemals, fast nie, gelegentlich, oft, normalerweise, fast immer, immer

3. Bitte geben Sie an, inwieweit Sie den folgenden Aussagen zustimmen:

Lokale Lebensmittel zu verzehren ist	Sehr unvernünftig - Sehr vernünftig
Lokale Lebensmittel geben mir ein ... Gefühl	Sehr unangenehmes - Sehr angenehmes
Wenn ich lokale Lebensmittel esse, fühle ich mich	Sehr unzufrieden - Sehr zufrieden
Lokale Lebensmittel schmecken	Sehr schlecht - Sehr gut

4. Bitte geben Sie an, inwieweit Sie den folgenden Aussagen zustimmen:

Ich denke viel über meine Gesundheit nach	Stimme gar nicht zu - Stimme nicht zu - Stimme eher nicht zu - Weder noch - Stimme eher zu - Stimme zu - Stimme stark zu
Ich bin mir über Veränderungen meiner Gesundheit bewusst	

Ich bin sehr reflektiert in Bezug auf meine Gesundheit	
Ich übernehme die Verantwortung für meine Gesundheit	

5. Bitte geben Sie an, inwieweit Sie den folgenden Aussagen zustimmen:

Der derzeitige Umgang mit der Natur führt zu ihrer Zerstörung	Stimme gar nicht zu - Stimme nicht zu - Stimme eher nicht zu - Weder noch - Stimme eher zu - Stimme zu - Stimme stark zu
Wenn keine Maßnahmen ergriffen werden, ist der Umweltschaden dauerhaft	
Beim Kauf von Lebensmitteln wähle ich umweltfreundliche Produkte	

6. Bitte geben Sie an, inwieweit Sie den folgenden Aussagen zustimmen:

Der Kauf lokaler Lebensmittel unterstützt lokale Unternehmen	Stimme gar nicht zu - Stimme nicht zu - Stimme eher nicht zu - Weder noch - Stimme eher zu - Stimme zu - Stimme stark zu
Der Kauf hochwertiger lokaler Lebensmittel unterstützt die lokale Landwirtschaft	

7. Bitte geben Sie an, inwieweit Sie den folgenden Aussagen zustimmen:

Lokale Lebensmittel sind von höherer Qualität als nicht lokale Lebensmittel	Stimme gar nicht zu - Stimme nicht zu - Stimme eher nicht zu - Weder noch - Stimme eher zu - Stimme zu - Stimme stark zu
Lokale Lebensmittel sind schmackhafter als nicht lokale Lebensmittel	
Lokale Lebensmittel sind frischer als nicht lokale Lebensmittel	

8. Bitte geben Sie an, inwieweit Sie den folgenden Aussagen zustimmen:

Lokal produzierte Lebensmittel sind sicherer zu konsumieren als nicht lokale Lebensmittel	Stimme gar nicht zu - Stimme nicht zu - Stimme eher nicht zu - Weder noch - Stimme eher zu - Stimme zu - Stimme stark zu
Das Wissen über die Produktherkunft erhöht das Sicherheitsgefühl für den Verzehr	

9. Bitte geben Sie an, inwieweit Sie den folgenden Aussagen zustimmen:

Ich schätze, dass die meisten Menschen lokale statt überregionale Lebensmittel kaufen würden, wenn sie verfügbar wären	Stimme gar nicht zu - Stimme nicht zu - Stimme eher nicht zu - Weder noch - Stimme eher zu - Stimme zu - Stimme stark zu
Die meisten mir nahestehenden Leute denken, dass ich	

lokale Lebensmittel kaufen sollte	

10. Bitte geben Sie an, inwieweit Sie den folgenden Aussagen zustimmen:

Ich finde es einfach, lokale Lebensmittel zu kaufen	Stimme gar nicht zu - Stimme nicht zu - Stimme eher nicht zu - Weder noch - Stimme eher zu - Stimme zu - Stimme stark zu
Wenn ich möchte, könnte ich lokale Lebensmittel anstelle von überregionalen Produkten kaufen	
Ob ich lokale Lebensmittel kaufe, liegt ganz bei mir	
Die Entscheidung, lokale Lebensmittel zu kaufen, liegt nicht außerhalb meiner Kontrolle	

11. Bitte geben Sie an, inwieweit Sie den folgenden Aussagen zustimmen:

Ich werde im nächsten Monat auf jeden Fall lokale Lebensmittel kaufen	Stimme gar nicht zu - Stimme nicht zu - Stimme eher nicht zu - Weder noch - Stimme eher zu - Stimme zu - Stimme stark zu
Ich will im nächsten Monat lokale Lebensmittel kaufen	
Ich versuche im nächsten Monat lokale Lebensmittel zu kaufen.	

12. Bitte geben Sie an, inwieweit Sie den folgenden Aussagen zustimmen:

Ich weiß, woher meine Lebensmittel stammen	Stimme gar nicht zu - Stimme nicht zu - Stimme eher nicht zu - Weder noch - Stimme eher zu - Stimme zu - Stimme stark zu
Ich bin mir aller Vorteile lokaler Lebensmittel gegenüber nicht lokalen Lebensmitteln bewusst	
Ich kann zwischen lokalem und nicht lokalem Essen unterscheiden	
Ich passe meine Kaufentscheidungen für Lebensmittel auf saisonalen Verfügbarkeiten an	

13. Bitte geben Sie an, inwieweit Sie den folgenden Aussagen zustimmen:

Ich versuche aktiv, die Herkunft der Lebensmittel zu ermitteln, die ich verbrauche	Stimme gar nicht zu - Stimme nicht zu - Stimme eher nicht zu - Weder noch - Stimme eher zu - Stimme zu - Stimme stark zu
Ich suche nach Informationen, wie die Lebensmittel hergestellt wurden.	
Ich lese Artikelbeschreibungen, um mehr über das Lebensmittel zu erfahren	

14. Bitte geben Sie an, inwieweit Sie den folgenden Aussagen zustimmen:

Lokale Lebensmittel sind im Handel verfügbar	Stimme gar nicht zu - Stimme nicht zu - Stimme eher nicht zu - Weder noch - Stimme eher zu - Stimme zu - Stimme stark zu
Ich würde mehr lokal angebaute Lebensmittel kaufen, wenn sie als lokal gekennzeichnet wären	
Lokale Lebensmittel sind nicht zu teuer	
Ich würde einen höheren Preis für lokale Lebensmittel bezahlen	

15. Was ist Ihr Geschlecht?

- ❑ Mann
- ❑ Frau
- ❑ Keine Angabe
- ❑ Other …

16. In welcher Alterskategorie sind Sie?

- ❑ 15 - 24
- ❑ 25 - 34
- ❑ 35 - 44
- ❑ 45 - 64
- ❑ 65 - 74
- ❑ 75+

17. Wie viele Menschen leben in Ihrem Haushalt? (Dich eingeschlossen)

- ❑ 1
- ❑ 2
- ❑ 3
- ❑ 4 oder mehr

18. In welcher Stadt oder Gemeinde leben Sie?

- ❑ Berne
- ❑ Butjadingen
- ❑ Jade
- ❑ Lemwerder
- ❑ Ovelgönne
- ❑ Stadland
- ❑ Brake
- ❑ Elsfleth
- ❑ Nordenham

19. Wie oft sind Sie für den Einkauf von Lebensmitteln verantwortlich?

Niemals, Fast nie, Gelegentlich, Häufig, Normalerweise, Fast immer, Immer

20. Wie oft kaufen Sie normalerweise lokale Lebensmittel? (Beantworten Sie die folgenden drei Fragen nur, wenn Sie einheimische Lebensmittel kaufen)

Niemals, fast nie, gelegentlich, häufig, normalerweise, fast immer, immer

21. Wo und wie oft kaufen Sie normalerweise lokale Lebensmittel?

Lokaler Metzger, lokale Bäckerei, lokaler Gemüsehändler, lokaler Markt, Supermarkt, Internet, Box-Schema, Hofläden

Niemals, Fast nie, Gelegentlich, Häufig, Normalerweise, Fast immer, Immer

22. Wie oft kaufen Sie lokale Lebensmittel aus den folgenden Lebensmittelgruppen?

Milchprodukte, Gemüse, Obst, Brot, Fleisch, Eier, Fisch

Niemals, Fast nie, Gelegentlich, Häufig, Normalerweise, Fast immer, Immer

23. Was ist Ihr Beschäftigungsstatus?

- ❑ Vollzeitbeschäftigt
- ❑ Teilzeitbeschäftigt
- ❑ Selbstständiger
- ❑ Student (nicht angestellt)
- ❑ Im Ruhestand
- ❑ Arbeitslos
- ❑ Other

24. Was ist das höchste Bildungsniveau, das Sie erreicht haben?

- ❑ Grundschulbildung
- ❑ Sekundarstufe (Abitur)
- ❑ Berufsbildung
- ❑ Fachhochschule
- ❑ Universität

25. In welcher monatlichen Haushaltseinkommens kategorie befinden Sie sich? (Netto Monatseinkommen)

- ❑ Weniger als 2000 euro
- ❑ 2000 bis 2499 euro
- ❑ 2500 bis 2999 euro
- ❑ 3000 bis 3999 euro
- ❑ 4000 bis 4999 euro
- ❑ 5000 bis 5999 euro
- ❑ 6000 bis 6999 euro
- ❑ 7000 bis 7999 euro
- ❑ 8000 bis 8999 euro

- ❑ 9000 bis 9999 euro
- ❑ 10000 euro +
- ❑ Ich antworte lieber nicht

Vielen Dank für Ihre Teilnahme an der Studie.

Appendix 4.5 Questionnaire Outline - Denmark (Danish)

Spørgeskema om fødevarer i Danmark

Kære deltager i Danmark,

Mange tak fordi du deltager i dette spørgeskema. Mit navn er Jesper Kwant, og dette studium er en aktivitet i REFRAME projektet, som skal undersøge forbrugere og forbrugeres holdning til lokale fødevarer i Danmark. At udfylde dette spørgeskema tager 8-10 minutter, og dit svar vil forblive anonymt.

Vi værdsætter dit bidrag.

Begrebet "lokale fødevarer" i dette spørgeskema referer til danske fødevarer købt inden for en radius af 50 km.

1. Køber du lokale fødevarer?

- ❑ Ja
- ❑ En gang imellem
- ❑ Nej

2. Gør du meget for at købe lokale fødevarer?

Aldrig, Næsten aldrig, En gang imellem, Ofte, Regelmæssigt, Næsten altid, Altid

3. Angiv i hvilket omfang, du er enig i følgende udsagn:

At spise lokale fødevarer er...	Meget uhensigtsmæssigt – Meget hensigtsmæssigt
Lokale fødevarer giver mig en følelse af …	Ubehag - velvære
Når jeg spiser lokale fødevarer føler jeg mig ...	Meget utilfreds – Meget tilfreds
Lokale fødevarer smager …	Meget dårligt – Meget godt

4. Angiv i hvilket omfang, du er enig i følgende udsagn:

Jeg interesserer mig meget for mit helbred	Meget uenig - Uenig - I nogen grad uenig - Hverken enig eller uenig - I nogen grad enig - Enig - Meget enig
Jeg er opmærksom på ændringer i mit helbred	

Jeg er meget bevidst om mit helbred	
Jeg tager ansvar for mit helbred	

5. Angiv i hvilket omfang, du er enig i følgende udsagn:

Den nuværende holdning til miljøet ødelægger det	Meget uenig - Uenig - I nogen grad uenig - Hverken enig eller uenig - I nogen grad enig - Enig - Meget enig
Med mindre, der bliver handlet, vil miljøødelæggelserne være permanente	
Når jeg køber fødevarer, vælger jeg miljøvenlige fødevarer	

6. Angiv i hvilket omfang, du er enig i følgende udsagn:

Køb af lokale fødevarer støtter lokale virksomheder.	Meget uenig - Uenig - I nogen grad uenig - Hverken enig eller uenig - I nogen grad enig - Enig - Meget enig
Køb af lokale fødevarer støtter lokale landbrug.	

7. Angiv i hvilket omfang, du er enig i følgende udsagn:

Lokale fødevarer har højere kvalitet end ikke-lokale fødevarer	Meget uenig - Uenig - I nogen grad uenig - Hverken enig eller uenig - I nogen grad enig - Enig - Meget enig
Lokale fødevarer smager bedre end ikke-lokale fødevarer	
Lokale fødevarer er mere friske end ikke-lokale fødevarer	

8. Angiv i hvilket omfang, du er enig i følgende udsagn:

Lokalt producerede fødevarer er mere sikre at spise end ikke-lokalt producerede fødevarer	Meget uenig - Uenig - I nogen grad uenig - Hverken enig eller uenig - I nogen grad enig - Enig - Meget enig
At kende en fødevares oprindelse betyder, at det føles mere sikkert at spise	

9. Angiv i hvilket omfang, du er enig i følgende udsagn:

De fleste mennesker i min omgangskreds ville købe lokale fødevarer, hvis de er tilgængelige, fremfor ikke-lokale fødevarer	Meget uenig - Uenig - I nogen grad uenig - Hverken enig eller uenig - I nogen grad enig - Enig - Meget enig
De fleste mennesker, som betyder noget for mig, synes, jeg skulle købe lokale fødevarer	

10. Angiv i hvilket omfang, du er enig i følgende udsagn:

Jeg finder det nemt at købe lokale fødevarer	Meget uenig - Uenig - I nogen grad uenig - Hverken enig eller uenig - I nogen grad enig - Enig - Meget enig
Hvis jeg ønskede det, kunne jeg købe lokale fødevarer frem for ikke-lokale fødevarer	
Om jeg køber lokale fødevarer er helt min beslutning	
Jeg har ingen indflydelse på beslutning om køb af lokale fødevarer	

11. Angiv i hvilket omfang, du er enig i følgende udsagn:

Jeg forventer at købe lokale fødevarer inden for den næste måned	Meget uenig - Uenig - I nogen grad uenig - Hverken enig eller uenig - I nogen grad enig - Enig - Meget enig
Jeg ønsker at købe lokale fødevarer inden for den næste måned	
Jeg har til hensigt at købe lokale fødevarer inden for den næste måned	

12. Angiv i hvilket omfang, du er enig i følgende udsagn:

Jeg ved, hvor mine fødevarer kommer fra	Meget uenig - Uenig - I nogen grad uenig - Hverken enig eller uenig - I nogen grad enig - Enig - Meget enig
Jeg er klar over alle fordelene ved lokale fødevarer sammenlignet med ikke-lokale fødevarer	
Jeg kan skelne imellem lokale og ikke-lokale fødevarer	
Jeg tilpasser mine indkøb af fødevarer efter årstidernes fødevarer	

13. Angiv i hvilket omfang, du er enig i følgende udsagn:

Jeg prøver aktivt at finde ud af fødevarernes oprindelse	Meget uenig - Uenig - I nogen grad uenig - Hverken enig eller uenig - I nogen grad enig - Enig - Meget enig
Jeg søger information om måden, hvorpå fødevaren er fremstillet	
Jeg læser etiketten for at vide mere om fødevaren	

14. Angiv i hvilket omfang, du er enig i følgende udsagn:

Lokale fødevarer er let tilgængelige for mig	Meget uenig - Uenig - I nogen grad uenig - Hverken enig eller uenig - I nogen grad enig - Enig - Meget enig
Jeg ville købe flere lokale fødevarer, hvis de blev mærket lokale	
Lokale fødevarer er ikke for dyre	

Jeg er villig til at betale ekstra for lokale fødevarer	

15. Hvilket køn er du?

- ❑ Mand
- ❑ Kvinde
- ❑ Ønsker ikke at oplyse
- ❑ Andet …

16. Din alder?

- ❑ 15 - 24
- ❑ 25 - 34
- ❑ 35 - 44
- ❑ 45 - 64
- ❑ 65 - 74
- ❑ 75+

17. Hvor mange er der i din husholdning? (Inklusive dig selv)

- ❑ 1
- ❑ 2
- ❑ 3
- ❑ 4 eller flere

18. I hvilken region bor du?

- ❑ Hovedstaden (When this answer is pressed go to question "Bor du i København?")
- ❑ Sjælland
- ❑ Syddanmark
- ❑ Midtjylland
- ❑ Nordjylland

19. Bor du i København?

- ❑ Ja
- ❑ Nej

20. Hvor ofte er du ansvarlig for indkøb af dagligvarer?

Aldrig, Næsten aldrig, En gang imellem, Ofte, Regelmæssigt, Næsten altid, Altid

21. Hvor ofte køber du normalt lokale fødevarer? (Svar kun på de følgende tre spørgsmål, hvis du køber lokal mad)

Aldrig, Næsten aldrig, En gang imellem, Ofte, Regelmæssigt, Næsten altid, Altid

22. Hvor og hvor ofte køber du normalt lokale fødevarer? (Et valg per række)

Lokale slagter, Lokale bager, Lokale grønthandler, Lokale marked, Supermarked, Internet, Abonnementskasser, Gårdbutikker

Aldrig, Næsten aldrig, En gang imellem, Ofte, Regelmæssigt, Næsten altid, Altid

23. Hvor ofte køber du lokale fødevarer fra følgende kategorier? (Et valg per række)

Mejerivarer, Grøntsager, Frugt, Brød, Kød, Æg, Fjerkræ, Fisk

Aldrig, Næsten aldrig, En gang imellem, Ofte, Regelmæssigt, Næsten altid, Altid

24. Hvad er din jobsituation?
- ❑ Fuldtidsansat
- ❑ Deltidsansat
- ❑ Selvstændig
- ❑ Student (ikke ansat)
- ❑ Pensionist
- ❑ Arbejdsløs
- ❑ Andet

25. Hvad er din højeste uddannelsesgrad?
- ❑ Folkeskole
- ❑ Videregående uddannelse (Eksamen fra højskole el. lign.)
- ❑ Erhvervsuddannelse og praktik
- ❑ Professionsbachelor (sygeplejerske, lærer, laborant, osv.)
- ❑ Universitet

26. Indkomstniveau? (Netto månedlig indkomst før skat)
- ❑ Mindre end 15.000 kr
- ❑ 15.000 til 18.500 kr
- ❑ 18.500 til 22.500 kr
- ❑ 22.500 til 30.000 kr
- ❑ 30.000 til 37.500 kr
- ❑ 37.500 til 45.000 kr
- ❑ 45.000 til 52.500 kr
- ❑ 52.500 til 60.000 kr
- ❑ 60.000 til 67.500 kr
- ❑ 67.500 til 75.000 kr
- ❑ 75.000 kr +
- ❑ Jeg ønsker ikke at svare

Tak fordi du deltog i dette studium.

Appendix 4.6 Questionnaire Outline - Northern Netherlands

(Some statements utilized in the Northern Netherlands might differ from the other regions. The research in the Northern Netherlands was carried out prior to this research. The insights obtained from the research in the Northern Netherlands was utilized in the optimization of the statements for this research.)

Vragenlijst over voeding in Noord-Nederland

Beste deelnemer uit Noord-Nederland,

Hartstikke bedankt voor uw deelname aan deze vragenlijst. Mijn naam is Jesper Kwant en ik doe momenteel de master Interdisciplinaire Business Professional aan de Hanzehogeschool Groningen. Dit onderzoek is uitgevoerd in opdracht van het bedrijf Snackbar van de Toekomst (An organization in the network of REFRAME) en deze vragenlijst is bedoeld om meer te weten te komen over de consumenten en hun houding ten opzichte van lokale voeding in Noord-Nederland.. Het invullen van deze vragenlijst duurt ongeveer 8-10 minuten en uw antwoorden zijn anoniem.

Uw inbreng wordt zeer op prijs gesteld.

De term “lokaal voedsel” in de context van deze vragenlijst verwijst naar het voedsel geproduceerd en verkocht in Noord-Nederland, dat wil zeggen: de provincies Groningen, Friesland en Drenthe.

1. Koopt u weleens lokaal eten?

- ❑ Ja
- ❑ Soms
- ❑ Nee

2. Doet u uw best om lokaal voedsel te kopen?

Nooit - Bijna nooit - Af en toe - Vaak - Meestal - Bijna altijd - Altijd

3. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Het eten van lokaal voedsel is	Erg onverstandig - Erg verstandig
Lokaal voedsel geeft mij een … gevoel	Erg onaangenaam- Erg aangenaam
Als ik lokaal voedsel eet, voel ik me	Erg ontevreden - Erg tevreden
Lokaal voedsel smaakt	Heel slecht - Heel goed

4. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Ik denk veel na over mijn gezondheid	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Ik ben me bewust van veranderingen in mijn gezondheid	
Gezond voedsel kopen is voor mij van groot belang	

5. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Het huidige manier waarop er wordt omgegaan met het milieu is destructief	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Tenzij er actie wordt ondernomen, is de milieuschade blijvend	
Bij het kopen van voedsel kies ik voor milieuvriendelijke producten	

6. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

De aankoop van lokale voedingsproducten ondersteunt lokale bedrijven	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
De aankoop van lokale voedselproducten ondersteunt de lokale landbouw	

7. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Lokaal voedsel is van hogere kwaliteit dan conventionele voedselproducten	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Lokaal voedsel is lekkerder dan conventionele voedselproducten	
Lokaal eten is verser dan conventionele voedselproducten	

8. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Lokaal geproduceerd voedsel is veiliger om te consumeren in vergelijking met conventionele voedselproducten	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Als u de oorsprong van een voedingsmiddel kent, voelt het veiliger om te consumeren	

9. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

De meeste mensen die ik waardeer, kopen lokaal voedsel indien beschikbaar in plaats van conventioneel	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens

voedsel	- Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
De meeste mensen die belangrijk voor me zijn, vinden dat ik lokaal voedsel moet kopen	

10. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Ik vind het gemakkelijk om lokaal voedsel te kopen	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Als ik wil, kan ik lokale voedselproducten kopen in plaats van conventionele producten	

11. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Ik verwacht in de komende maand lokaal voedsel te kopen	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Ik wil in de komende maand lokaal voedsel kopen	
Ik ben van plan in de komende maand lokaal voedsel te kopen	

12. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Ik weet waar het voedsel dat ik consumeer vandaan komt	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Ik ben me bewust van alle voordelen van lokaal voedsel in vergelijking met conventionele voedselproducten	
Ik kan onderscheid maken tussen lokaal en niet-lokaal voedsel	
Ik pas mijn keuzes voor voedsel aankoop aan op basis van seizoensgebonden voedingsproducten	

13. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Ik ken liever de oorsprong van het voedsel dat ik consumeer	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Ik ben geïnteresseerd in de manier waarop het voedsel is geproduceerd	
Ik wil graag meer informatie over de voordelen van lokaal eten	

14. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:

Lokaal voedsel is voor mij gemakkelijk toegankelijk	Helemaal mee oneens - Oneens - Enigszins mee oneens - Niet eens, niet oneens - Enigszins mee eens - Eens - Helemaal mee eens
Ik zou meer lokaal geteeld voedsel kopen als ze als lokaal werden bestempeld	
Lokale voedselproducten zijn niet te duur	
Ik zou een premie betalen voor lokale voedselproducten	

15. Wat is uw geslacht?

- ❑ Man
- ❑ Vrouw
- ❑ Zeg ik liever niet
- ❑ Other (Ander) ...

16. In welke leeftijdscategorie valt u?

- ❑ 15 - 24
- ❑ 25 - 34
- ❑ 35 - 44
- ❑ 45 - 64
- ❑ 65 - 74
- ❑ 75+

17. Hoeveel mensen wonen er in uw huishouden?

- ❑ 1
- ❑ 2
- ❑ 3
- ❑ 4 of meer

18. In welke provincie woont u?

- ❑ Groningen
- ❑ Friesland
- ❑ Drenthe

19. Doet u uw eigen boodschappen?

- ❑ Ja
- ❑ Nee

20. Hoe vaak koopt u normaal gesproken lokaal voedsel?

Nooit - Bijna nooit - Af en toe - Vaak - Meestal - Bijna altijd - Altijd

21. Waar en hoe vaak koopt u normaal gesproken uw lokale voedselproducten? (Één keuze per rij)

Lokale slager, Lokale bakkerij, Lokale groenteboer, Lokale markt, Supermarkt, Internet, Box-regeling

Nooit - Bijna nooit - Af en toe - Vaak - Meestal - Bijna altijd - Altijd

22. Hoe vaak koop je lokale voedselproducten van de volgende voedselgroepen? (Één keuze per rij)

Zuivel, Groenten, Fruit, Brood, Vlees, Eieren, Gevogelte, Vis

Nooit - Bijna nooit - Af en toe - Vaak - Meestal - Bijna altijd - Altijd

23. Wat is uw arbeidsstatus?
- ❏ Fulltime werkzaam
- ❏ Parttime werkzaam
- ❏ Zelfstandig
- ❏ Student (niet in dienst)
- ❏ Gepensioneerd
- ❏ Werkloos
- ❏ Other (Ander)

24. Wat is het hoogste opleidingsniveau dat u heeft behaald?
- ❏ Basisonderwijs
- ❏ Voortgezet onderwijs
- ❏ Mbo
- ❏ HBO
- ❏ Universiteit

25. In welke maandelijkse categorie van het gezinsinkomen bevindt u zich? (Netto maandinkomen)
- ❏ Minder dan 2000 euro
- ❏ 2000 tot 2499 euro
- ❏ 2500 tot 2999 euro
- ❏ 3000 tot 3999 euro
- ❏ 4000 tot 4999 euro
- ❏ 5000 tot 5999 euro
- ❏ 6000 tot 6999 euro
- ❏ 7000 tot 7999 euro
- ❏ 8000 tot 8999 euro
- ❏ 9000 tot 9999 euro
- ❏ 10000 euro +
- ❏ Zeg ik liever niet

Heel erg bedankt voor uw deelname aan het onderzoek!

Appendix 5: Collection and Analysis of Data Elaborated

5.1 The Survey Elaborated

The survey was created through the program Google Forms as it contained the necessary features. The survey for the research in the Northern Netherlands was created through the program Microsoft Forms. The survey had been divided up into three sections containing particular question types.

First of all, the variable consumer attitude was measured through the utilization of statements from the literature. The respondents were asked to identify their attitude through a semantic differential scale (Ajzen, 1991). This scale was opted for instead of the Likert scale as the participant should respond based on their feelings and attitude towards local food. Thereby not be influenced by outside factors such as the researcher. For instance, the statement 'local food tastes very good' already has an opinion attached of how local food should taste. So, then asking if the respondent agrees or disagrees would provide a biased answer. The semantic differential scale provides polar opposite as can be observed in appendix 3. This allows the participant to assign a value between two opposites to the statement and in due course the variable under exploration and give an unbiased answer.

Next, the section that is geared towards the predictor variables of attitude towards local food and intention to purchase local food. These were measured through a 7-point Liker scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The various statements measuring these variables, shown in appendix 3, had been randomized around in the questionnaire and computer-administered so that careful responding was encouraged (Garbacz, 2018, Ajzen, 1991). Moreover, the statements that make up a variable were chosen for a variety of reasons. Firstly, previous research exploring similar topics had proven these statements to be internally reliable. Secondly, when conducting multiple regression analysis multicollinearity needs addressing. Therefore, having more than two statements allowed for some leeway in the sense that one could be deleted if proven problematic. Finally, as the number of variables incorporated in this research is considerable, the number of statements would affect the length of the questionnaire. The third and final section of the questionnaire included demographic and background factor questions. The purpose of these questions is to obtain a clearer image of the consumer in relation to the topic being researched in the REFRAME regions of study.

5.2 Cronbach's Alpha

The reliability test was conducted through Cronbach's Alpha. This test is the most common test to measure an instrument's internal consistency and carried out in previous research of similar nature. Cronbach's Alpha value's value would have to be 0.6 or more for the variables to be considered internally reliable (Yang, Al-Shaaban, & Nguyen, 2014, Garbacz, 2018, Gliem & Gliem, 2003). The results were individually judged on the internal reliability and would have consequences on whether the variables were included in subsequent analysis.

5.3 Correlation Matrix

Following the reliability test, a correlation matrix was conducted to assure that no multicollinearity exists and thereby test the discriminant validity of the different variables in the conceptual framework (Garbacz, 2018, Kumar & Smith, 2018). Because if multicollinearity were to exist, it would mean that it skews the multiple regression analysis results, so two predictor variables would be highly correlated and undermine the predictor's variable significance.

5.4 Test for Normality

The main analysis of the data to check the hypotheses was conducted through various multiple regression analysis (Ajzen, 2015). However, before the multiple regression analysis results could be interpreted, the test of normality was performed. The dependent variables' residual data, attitude towards local food, and intention to purchase local food were subjected to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to check for normality (Yee & San, 2011). The data would be considered normally distributed if the P-value of the Kolmogorov- Smirnov test was greater than 0.05 (Yee & San, 2011). The normality of the data will assure valid hypothesis testing and in answering the main research question.

5.5 Multiple Regression Analysis

For the analysis of the conceptual framework and hypothesis, two multiple regression analyses were performed in PSPP/SPSS per area of study, 10 regressions in total (Ajzen, 2015). The method utilized to perform the multiple regression analysis is known as the “Enter” method. This method of inputting the variables was decided based on Collis et al. (2014). Because when variables have been chosen based on theoretical reasons, the default “Enter” method should be utilized. The predictor variables were then removed from the model individually, starting from the highest p-value. The purpose of this was to see if these insignificant variables were clashing with other predictor variables. The multiple regression analyses were carried out accordingly.

The first multiple regression analysis was whereby the variable attitude was regressed on the remaining predictor variables after the Cronbach Alpha and correlation matrix were performed. The second multiple regression took the variable intention to purchase local food and was regressed against the variables attitude towards local food, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control. The multiple regression analysis could only be performed if the tests such as correlation matrix, Cronbach’s Alpha, and test of normality do not cause problems. Initially two multiple regression analyses were to be performed per region of study, making the total 10. This was altered to nine multiple regression analyses due to an encountered issue. This was the case for Västra Götaland whereby the dependent variable (attitude towards local food), essential for the carrying out of multiple regression analysis, was not normally distributed. In this case, the literature was consulted, and the following solution was found. An multiple regression analysis whereby the intention is regressed on all predictor variables (Garbacz, 2018). Thereby

still observing which variables eventually influence the intention and allowing for similarities and differences between the regions to be discussed.

5.6 Reliability, Validity, and Generalizability

5.6.1 Reliability

The reliability was already touched upon previously in the analysis data section, and this section will further depict why the Cronbach Alpha was chosen. First of all, the reliability of research refers "to the consistency of the measure" (Heale & Twycross, 2015), that contains three elements, namely homogeneity, stability, and equivalence, respectively. Out of these three, one the most suitable as the others are time-consuming and challenging to carry out. The element in question was homogeneity, also known as the internal consistency and is measured using the Cronbach Alpha, the most well-known test. The Cronbach Alpha is often utilized when a question has more than two answers, and as the semantic differential and Likert scale are used, this was the most optimum tool. As mentioned previously, the reliability was ensured when the Cronbach Value was above 0.6. (Kwant, 2020)

5.6.2 Validity

The validity of a study is the extent to which the concept in question is measured accurately. Validity consists of three parts; in other words, content validity, construct validity, and criterion validity. The content validity refers to the instrument, in this case, the questionnaire, and if it is designed and contains the correct content to measure the variables (those in the conceptual framework figure 3). This was secured through the use of reputable literature sources and previous research as the basis for the formation of the questionnaire. The construct validity and criterion validity is regarding the instrument, questionnaire, in measuring the variables of the conceptual framework. This was handled by asking the participant more than one question derived from the discovered literature to measure a single variable. Although the questionnaire was translated from English to the countries' respective language in this study, translation errors and misinterpretations might have occurred. This was to be avoided at all costs by conducting pilot-testing, yet it can't be excluded completely. (Kwant, 2020)

Furthermore, pilot testing took place to see if the variables were correctly measured. The intention was to have pilot testing in all regions whereby five pilot tests would take place. This was not feasible for all regions. Nevertheless feedback on the questionnaire was retrieved and adapted as well as the survey optimized. This warranted some questions to be worded differently. The questionnaire was constructed by examining previous tools found in the literature that were proven successful in investigating the local food purchase behaviour (Heale & Twycross, 2015).

5.6.3 Generalizability

The generalizability of the data has to do with a sample size that is representative of the population. Previously it was mentioned that a sample of 151 was needed. This is correct when a margin of error of 8% is considered instead of the usual 5% whereby a sample of 385 is required. The final number of usable observations acquired were 159 for Västra Götaland (Sweden), 172 for West-Flanders (Belgium), 87 for Wesermarsch District (Germany), 78 for Denmark, and 152 for the Northern Netherlands. The minimum amount of respondents for three of the five regions was achieved. The findings' generalizability was a limitation of this research as the margin of error to accompany Wesermarsch district (11%) and Denmark (12%). Therefore, the eventual conclusion was not generalizable for the two regions to the entire population of the study areas. Consequently, the results at best give an indication of the predictor variables important on the attitude towards local food and subsequent intention to purchase local food products. Furthermore, another limitation of this study was the method of sampling as it might not be representative of the entire population. Convenience sampling might cause bias, and therefore, the sample might not be representative of the whole population under study. This was to be avoided by asking the respondents to pass the survey along to create a snowball effect and distribute the questionnaire on as many online platforms (Kwant, 2020).

5.7 Consideration of Ethical Issues

The questionnaire's aim and nature were made clear to the participant so that informed consent is assured when taking part in the survey. Moreover, the questionnaire was conducted in Swedish, Danish, German, Flemisch, and Dutch. The researcher is from the Netherlands, and this will be taken into account when reporting the results from these various countries/regions. (Kwant, 2020)

Appendix 6: Demographics Information (Data Visually Presented)

Appendix 6.1 Demographics Information Västra Götaland (Sweden)

Gender					
Value	Missing	Kvinna	Man	Vill inte uppge	Total
Frequency	1	98	59	1	159

Table 23: Gender of respondents Västra Götaland.

Age								
Value	15 - 24	25 - 34	35 - 44	45 - 54	55 - 64	65 - 74	75+	Total
Frequency	5	12	40	49	34	18	1	159

Table 24: Age of respondents Västra Götaland.

Household size

Value	1	2	3	4 eller fler	Total
Frequency	11	63	35	50	159

Table 25: Household size of respondents Västra Götaland.

Region						
Value	Missing	Fyrbodal	Göteborgsområdet med insjöriket	Sjuhärad	Skaraborg	Total
Frequency	2	12	28	14	103	159

Table 26: Region of respondents Västra Götaland.

Employment Status										
Value	Missing	Anställd deltid	Anställd heltid	Arbetslös	Egenföretagare	Egenföretagare och deltidsanställd	Pensionär	Sjukskriven	Student	Total
Frequency	1	4	87	2	45	1	12	1	6	159

Table 27: Employment status of respondents Västra Götaland.

Education Level Achieved					
Value	Missing	Grundskola	Gymnasieexamen	Universitetsexamen	Total
Frequency	1	4	65	89	159

Table 28: Education level achieved of respondents Västra Götaland.

Income														
Value	Jag avböjer att svara	Mindre än 20 695	20 695 – 25 859	25 859 – 31 032	31 043 – 41 380	41 391 – 51 728	51 738 – 62 075	62 086 – 72 423	72 433 – 82 771	82 781 – 93 118	93 129 – 103 466	103 476 +	Missing	Total
Frequency	17	9	9	6	19	27	27	15	10	7	3	8	2	159

Table 29: Income of respondents Västra Götaland.

Appendix 6.2 Demographics Information West-Flanders (Belgium)

Gender					
Value	Missing	Man	Vrouw	Zeg ik liever niet	Total
Frequency	3	67	101	1	172

Table 30: Gender of respondents West-Flanders.

Age								
Value	15 - 24	25 - 34	35 - 44	45 - 54	55 - 64	65 - 74	75+	Total
Frequency	10	32	63	28	21	16	2	172

Table 31: Age of respondents West-Flanders.

Household Size					
Value	1	2	3	4 of meer	Total
Frequency	13	51	25	83	172

Table 32: Household Size of respondents West-Flanders.

Postcode					
Value	Frequency	Value	Frequency	Value	Frequency
3000	1	8560	3	8870	3
8000	4	8580	1	8880	2
8200	22	8587	1	8900	13
8211	1	8600	3	8902	2
8300	1	8610	1	8904	1
8310	6	8630	1	8906	3
8380	1	8670	1	8908	3
8400	13	8690	1	8920	2
8420	1	8700	3	8940	3
8450	2	8720	1	8950	1
8470	2	8730	1	8951	1
8480	2	8750	1	8954	2
8490	1	8770	1	8956	1
8500	4	8790	5	8970	16
8501	3	8792	2	8979	1
8520	1	8800	11	8980	2

8540	1	8840	1	9031	1
8550	5	8850	3	Missing	3
				Total	172

Table 33: Postcode of respondents West-Flanders.

City or country side			
Value	Platteland	Stad	Total
Frequency	69	103	172

Table 34: City or countryside of respondents West-Flanders.

Employment Status										
Value	Fulltime werkzaam	Gepensioneerd	Huismoeder	Parttime werkzaam	Parttime werkzaam + student	Student (niet in dienst)	Werkloos	Zelfstandig	other	Total
Frequency	112	26	1	11	1	4	1	15	1	172

Table 35: Employment status of respondents West-Flanders.

Education									
Value	Missing	Arts	Basisonderwijs	Hbo5	Master	Professioneel bachelor	Secundair onderwijs	Doctoraat	Total
Frequency	1	1	2	1	74	62	30	1	172

Table 36: Education level of respondents West-Flanders.

Income										
Value	Zeg ik liever niet	Minder dan 2000 euro	2000 tot 2499 euro	2500 tot 2999 euro	3000 tot 3999 euro	4000 tot 4999 euro	5000 tot 5999 euro	6000 tot 6999 euro	7000 tot 7999 euro	Total
Frequency	15	17	29	21	32	34	20	2	2	172

Table 37: Income of respondents West-Flanders.

Appendix 6.3 Demographics Information Wesermarsch District (Germany)

Gender

Value	Keine Angabe	Frau	Mann	Total
Frequency	2	65	20	87

Table 38: Gender of respondents Wesermarsch District.

Age							
Value	15 - 24	25 - 34	35 - 44	45 - 54	55 - 64	65 - 74	Total
Frequency	12	23	14	20	17	1	87

Table 39: Age of respondents Wesermarsch District.

Household Size						
Value	1	2	3	4	Missing	Total
Frequency	13	39	17	17	1	87

Table 40: Household size of respondents Wesermarsch District.

Place of Residence											
Value	Missing	Berne	Brake	Butjadingen	Elsfleth	Jade	Lemwerder	Nordenham	Ovelgönne	Stadland	Total
Frequency	1	7	24	7	8	3	3	12	14	8	87

Table 41: Place of residence of respondents Wesermarsch District.

Employment Status												
Value	Missing	Arbeitslos	Auszubildende	Elternzeit	Hausfrau	Im Ruhestand	In Elternzeit	Selbstständiger	Student (nicht angestellt	Teilzeitbeschäftigt	Vollzeitbeschäftigt	Total
Frequency	2	5	1	1	2	2	1	4	4	14	51	87

Table 42: Employment status of respondents Wesermarsch District.

Education							
Value	(Fach-)Abitur	Berufsbildung	Fachhochschule	Hauptschulabschluss	Mittlere Reife	Universität	Total
Frequency	8	25	20	2	21	11	87

Table 43: Education of respondents Wesermarsch District.

Income								
Value	Keine Angabe	Weniger als 2000 Euro	2000 bis 2499 Euro	2500 bis 2999 Euro	3000 bis 3999 Euro	4000 bis 4999 Euro	5000 bis 5999 Euro	Total
Frequency	10	17	18	14	10	13	5	87

Table 44: Income of respondents Wesermarsch District.

Appendix 6.4 Demographics Information Denmark

Gender			
Value	Kvinde	Mand	Total
Frequency	59	19	78

Table 45: Gender of respondents Denmark.

Age								
Value	15 - 24	25 - 34	35 - 44	45 - 54	55 - 64	65 -74	75+	Total
Frequency	55	23	13	5	23	7	2	78

Table 46: Age of respondents Denmark.

Household Size					
Value	1	2	3	4	Total
Frequency	12	39	15	12	78

Table 47: Household Size of respondents Denmark.

Region						
Value	Hovedstaden	Midtjylland	Nordjylland	Sjælland	Syddanmark	Total
Frequency	19	29	18	8	4	78

Table 48: Region of respondents Denmark.

Employment Status												
Value	Arbejdsløs	Barsel	Deltidsansat	Efterskoleelev.	Fleksjob	Fuldtidsansat	Pensionist	Selvstændig	Student (ikke ansa	Sygemeldt	Rentier	Total
Frequency	2	1	8	1	1	36	7	12	8	1	1	78

Table 49: Employment Status of respondents Denmark.

Education

Value	"Professionsbachelor (sygeplejerske	Erhvervsuddannelse og praktik	Folkeskole	Universitet	Videregående uddannelse (Eksamen fra højskole el. lign.)	Total
Frequency	21	8	3	37	9	78

Table 50: Education of respondents Denmark.

Income											
Value	Jeg ønsker ikke at svare	Mindre end 15.000 kr	15.000 til 18.500 kr	18.500 til 22.500 kr	22.500 til 30.000 kr	30.000 til 37.500 kr	37.500 til 45.000 kr	45.000 til 52.500 kr	52.500 til 60.000 kr	75.000 kr +	Total
Frequency	11	13	3	5	9	15	9	4	7	2	78

Table 51: Income of respondents Denmark.

Copenhagen				
Value	Missing	Ja	Nej	Total
Frequency	57	14	7	78

Table 52: Copenhagen of respondents Denmark.

Appendix 6.5 Demographics Information Northern Netherlands

Gender					
Value	Missing	Man	Vrouw	Zeg ik liever niet	Total
Frequency	0	64	88	0	152

Table 53: Gender of respondents Northern Netherlands.

Age								
Value	15 - 24	25 - 34	35 - 44	45 - 54	55 - 64	65 - 74	75+	Total
Frequency	77	49	4	17	0	1	4	152

Table 54: Age of respondents Northern Netherlands.

Household Size					
Value	1	2	3	4 of meer	Total
Frequency	38	51	20	43	152

Table 55: Household Size of respondents Northern Netherlands.

In which province do you live?				
Value	Drenthe	Friesland	Groningen	Total
Frequency	14	23	115	152

Table 56: Household Size of respondents Northern Netherlands.

Employment Status									
Value	Fulltime werkzaam	Niet werkzaam	Part-time werkzaam	Gepensioneerd	Zelfstandig	Student (niet in dienst)	Student (Part-time werkzaam)	other	Total
Frequency	23	3	21	7	7	84	3	4	152

Table 57: Employment status of respondents Northern Netherlands.

Education						
Value	Basisonderwijs	Voortgezet onderwijs	Mbo	HBO	Universiteit	Total
Frequency	2	16	8	76	50	152

Table 58: Education level of respondents Northern Netherlands.

Income										
Value	Zeg ik liever niet	Minder dan 2000 euro	2000 tot 2499 euro	2500 tot 2999 euro	3000 tot 3999 euro	4000 tot 4999 euro	5000 tot 5999 euro	6000 tot 6999 euro	7000 tot 7999 euro	Total
Frequency	18	88	17	10	9	5	3	1	1	152

Table 59: Income of respondents Northern Netherlands.

Appendix 7: Additional Information on Local Food Consumption

Appendix 7.1 Additional Information on Local Food Consumption in Västra Götaland (Sweden)

	Place and frequency of purchasing local						
	Köttdetaljist (Local Butcher)	Bageri (Local Bakery)	Grönsakshandel (Local Greengrocer)	Lokal matmarknad (Local Market)	Supermarket	Internet	Gårdsbutiker(Farm shops)
Number of responses (out of 159)	145	143	141	142	147	136	148
Mean out of 7	4.01	4.06	4.09	3.49	4.47	1.88	3.34

Table 60: Var och hur ofta handlar du ofta lokalt när det gäller? (Where and how often do you normally buy local food products?)

	Frequency of purchasing local food from following food categories							
	Mejeri (Dairy)	Grönsaker(Vegetables)	Frukt (Fruit)	Bröd (Bread)	Kött (Meat)	Ägg (Eggs)	Fågel (Poultry)	Fisk (Fish)
Number of responses (out of 159)	152	152	153	151	150	151	149	148
Mean out of 7	4.49	4.42	3.46	3.99	4.84	5.40	3.63	3.05

Table 61: Hur ofta handlar du lokala produkter inom dessa livsmedelskategorier? (How often do you buy local food products from the following food groups?)

Responsible for grocery shopping (Frequency out of 159)						
Aldrig (Never)	Nästan aldrig (Almost never)	Ibland (Occasionally)	Frekvent (Frequently)	Vanligtvis (Usually)	Nästan alltid (Almost always)	Alltid (Always)
0	2	14	36	37	48	22

Table 62: Hur ofta är det du som handlar mat i ditt hushåll? (How often are you responsible for grocery shopping?)

Frequency of purchasing local food (Frequency out of 155)						
Aldrig (Never)	Nästan aldrig (Almost never)	Ibland (Occasionally)	Frekvent (Frequently)	Vanligtvis (Usually)	Nästan alltid (Almost always)	Alltid (Always)
0	3	30	44	37	37	4

Table 63: Hur ofta handlar du lokal mat? (How often do you normally buy local food?)

Effort to purchase local food (Frequency out of 158)						
Aldrig (Never)	Nästan aldrig (Almost never)	Ibland (Occasionally)	Frekvent (Frequently)	Vanligtvis (Usually)	Nästan alltid (Almost always)	Alltid (Always)
1	9	47	29	29	32	11

Table 64: Anstränger du dig för att handla lokal mat? (Do you do your best to buy local food?)

Appendix 7.2 Additional Information on Local Food Consumption in West-Flanders (Belgium)

	Place and frequency of purchasing local				
	Hoeveproducent (Farm producer)	Streekproducent (Regional producer)	Lokaal afdeling supermarkt (Local supermarket department)	Internet	Boederijmarkten (Farm shops)
Number of responses (out of 172)	162	156	152	148	154
Mean out of 7	3.99	3.47	3.48	1.57	2.65

Table 65: Waar en hoe vaak koopt u normaalgesproken uw lokale voedselproducten? (Where and how often do you normally buy local food products?)

	Frequency of purchasing local food from following categories							
	Zuivel (Dairy)	Groenten (Vegetables)	Fruit	Brood (Bread)	Vlees (Meat)	Eieren (Eggs)	Gevogelte (Poultry)	Vis (Fish)
Number of	167	168	168	163	167	163	163	164

responses (out of 172)								
Mean out of 7	3.56	4.73	4.32	4.61	3.90	4.01	3.28	2.96

Table 66: Hoe vaak koop je lokale voedselproducten van de volgende voedselgroepen? (How often do you buy local food products from the following food groups?)

Responsible for grocery shopping (Frequency out of 172)						
Nooit (Never)	Bijna nooit (Almost never)	Af en toe (Occasionally)	Vaak (Frequently)	Meestal (Usually)	Bijna altijd (Almost always)	Altijd (Always)
0	9	15	35	23	49	41

Table 67: Hoe vaak bent u verantwoordelijk voor boodschappen doen? (How often are you responsible for grocery shopping?)

Frequency of purchasing local food (Frequency out of 167)						
Nooit (Never)	Bijna nooit (Almost never)	Af en toe (Occasionally)	Vaak (Frequently)	Meestal (Usually)	Bijna altijd (Almost always)	Altijd (Always)
0	7	47	64	32	15	2

Table 68: Hoe vaak koopt u normaal gesproken lokaal voedsel? (How often do you normally buy local food?)

Effort to purchase local food (Frequency out of 170)						
Nooit (Never)	Bijna nooit (Almost never)	Af en toe (Occasionally)	Vaak (Frequently)	Meestal (Usually)	Bijna altijd (Almost always)	Altijd (Always)
1	10	49	55	28	20	7

Table 69: Doet u een inspanning om lokaal eten te kopen? (Do you do your best to buy local food?)

Als u het niet gemakkelijk vindt om lokaal voedsel te kopen, waarom niet?
Niet makkelijk beschikbaar. Tijdsgebrek om meerdere plaatsen te doen.
Mocht er een systeem bestaan in de dichte omgeving (ongeveer 10km) van waar ik woon, waarbij je zoals bij Collect & Go al het lokaal lekkers uit de buurt online en op 1 website kan bestellen (zoals bij KoKet) en op een gekozen moment kan afhalen dan zou ik dit sterk overwegen.

Onvoldoende aanbod in de supermarkten, en vaak geen tijd om speciaal naar de markt/hoevewinkel te gaan
Het ontbreekt me aan tijd
Boerderij winkels zijn niet altijd makkelijk bereikbaar + het is een drempel omdat bepaalde hoevewinkels niet overzichtelijk zijn
Wanneer je in de winkel (bv. Colruyt, Delhaize...) wandelt, is het heel moeilijk om de lokale producten te onderscheiden.
Oorsprong onduidelijk
Ik weet niet waar ik allemaal lokaal voedsel kan vinden. Het is gemakkelijk in een supermarkt.
vaak een 'nichemarkt'
Grote supermarkt biedt alles aan met veel keuzemogelijkheden. Lokaal kopen is vaak meerdere stops doen wat met drie kinderen niet altijd ideaal is
Niet alles is te verkrijgen op fietsafstand dus niet zo lokaal
Niet alles op fietsafstand te verkrijgen.
tijdskader, indien geen automaat moeilijk
Niet alles in 1 winkel te vinden. (1x week alle of toch zoveel mogelijk boodschappen samen)
In lokale winkels verkopen ze meestal heel specifieke voeding. In supermarkten wordt alles te koop aangeboden.
Bereikbaarheid
Ik laat me verleiden door goedkope prijzen van andere producten en doe mijn boodschappen meestal in een supermarkt waar weinig aanbod is.
Openingsuren hoevewinkel beperkter, dus moeilijkere combinatie met werk
Veel verschillende winkels
Tijdsgebrek, snel alles kopen in supermarkt
niet altijd beschikbaar, extra verplaatsing, verder dan supermarkt
Is niet zo vlakbij als de supermarkt.
Wisselende beschikbaarheid en je kan vaak niet al je boodschappen ineens kopen.
stedelijke context
ik koop oa appelen lokaal en moet daar speciaal om rijden
afstand, bewust met opzet naar de hoevewinkel gaan is soms een belemmering
Vlees bestellen op voorhand, weinig keuze ter plaatse. Groenten wel makkelijk
aanbod beperkt. Vaak niet geweten waar men terecht kan.
beschikbaarheid, kennis van beschikbaarheid
Wegens tijdsgesprek raak ik niet op verschillende plaatsen voor de aankoop van lokale voeding.
Prijs en niet altijd in het aanbod in supermarkt
Je moet er extra moeite voor doen, want in de doorsnee supermarkt (wat comfortabel winkelen is, alles op 1 plaats) komt alles meestal van ver.

Omdat het niet altijd duidelijk is op de verpakking in de supermarkt
Labeling waar voedsel vandaan komt soms echt heel moeilijk
Omdat ik zin heb in bv. exotisch fruit :)
Ik koop vaak alles in de supermarkt. Daar probeert ik zo veel mogelijk belgisch te kopen. Maar niet alle producten komen uit west vlaanderen.
Aanbod bestaat veelal uit geimporteerd voedsel (groente, fruit in supermarkt)
Niet van toepassing
Duur
Ik vind dit makkelijk
Niet altijd duidelijk hoe en waar te vinden
te duur
Het is vaak lang zoeken op internet tot je kleine boeren en hun lokale producten kan vinden. Online bestellen (zo zijn er een aantal mogelijkheden in WVL) vind ik persoonlijk maar niets. Ik heb graag het echte contact (coronaproof ;)). De boerin waar ik nu ga vertelt me graag over de soorten appels, welke groenten je nu moet eten, ...
Aanbod niet altijd dichtbij te vinden
Te weinig lokale shops
Je moet er moeite voor doen en ik heb nu eenmaal te weinig tijd
Weinig Aanbod in warenhuizen, je moet er voor naar lokale markten. Dit moeilijker te organiseren
Te weinig aanbod, graag slechts één winkel om boodschappen te doen
Niet weten waar te kopen
Openingsuren te beperkt (bv. van boerderijwinkel), niet alles is lokaal te vinden (bv sinaasappel)
winkelen wordt wegens timemanagement liever beperkt tot één winkel/warenhuis. Aanbod is er meestal niet zo groot of minder vindbaar.
Niet georganiseerd --> boeren verkopen apart wat ze hebben. Pooling op een markt zou handig zijn
/
In plaats van 1 winkel te bezoeken, moet je naar de slager, bakker, groenten- en fruitwinkel... Het neemt dus meer tijd in beslag.
Het is te makkelijk om alles van het grootwarenhuis mee te brengen in 1 keer
Tijdstippen qua ophalen zijn niet evident. Levering aan huis zou ideaal zijn.
Weinig aanbod, onduidelijke of ontbrekende etikettering
Teveel tijdverlies om op verschillende plaatsen te winkelen. Concept van boerenmarkt of afhaalboxen meestal beperkt in tijd. Soms zijn producten ook duur. Ik wil wel een eerlijke prijs betalen maar ook niet teveel ... Wij werken fulltime en hebben drie kinderen dus Tijd is erg belangrijk
Niet altijd duidelijk wat de oorsprong van het voedsel is (op markt of in lokale groentenwinkel)
Niet genoeg initiatieven en/of publiciteit erover. Niet gebruiksvriendelijk genoeg (bestellen op voorhand etc)

Verplaatsen, aanbod
Er mag nog meer ingezet worden op transparantie, dus duidelijke vermelding van waar een product exact komt.
moeilijk beschikbaar
Soms verspreid over verschillende locaties: tijd nodig om er te geraken.
aanbod
In de supermarkt moet je zelf etiketten uitpluizen
Ik hou van bananen, Zuid-Afrikaanse wijn, chocolade,...
Ik koop het liefst bio zonder dierlijke meststoffen. Dat is niet makkelijk te vinden.
niet dichtbij, openingsuren
tijdsgebrek
Partner kiest veelal voor het goedkoopste product en het aanbod lokaal voedsel is nog beperkt tenzij je op verschillende plaatsen gaat winkelen.
Als je iets lokaal nodig hebt, rij je te veel rond om al je inkopen te moeten doen
Ik moet daarvoor heel wat extra km's en tijd investeren

Table 70: Als u het niet gemakkelijk vindt om lokaal voedsel te kopen, waarom niet?

Appendix 7.3 Additional Information on Local Food Consumption in Wesermarsch District (Germany)

	Place and frequency of purchasing local							
	Lokaler Metzger (Local Butcher)	Lokale Bäckerei (Local Bakery)	Lokaler Gemüsehändler (Local Greengrocer)	Wochenmarkt (Local Market)	Supermarket	Internet	Abobox (Subscription-box)	Hofläden (Farmshops)
Number of responses (out of 87)	77	80	78	82	80	77	77	80
Mean out of 7	3.69	5.10	3.72	3.54	4.82	1.54	1.60	3.05

Table 71: Wo und wie oft kaufen Sie normalerweise lokale Lebensmittel? (Where and how often do you normally buy local food products?)

	Frequency of purchasing local food from following categories

	Milchprodukte (Dairy)	Gemüse (Vegetables)	Obst (Fruit)	Brot (Bread)	Fleisch (Meat)	Eier (Eggs)	Fisch (Fish)
Number of responses (out of 87)	82	81	82	82	82	82	80
Mean out of 7	4.19	4.60	4.41	4.98	4.28	5.18	3.59

Table 72: Wie oft kaufen Sie lokale Lebensmittel aus den folgenden Lebensmittelgruppen? (How often do you buy local food products from the following food groups?)

Responsible for grocery shopping (Frequency out of 87)						
Niemals (Never)	Fast nie (Almost never)	Gelegentlich (Occasionally)	Oft (Frequently)	Normalerweise (Usually)	Fast immer (Almost always)	Immer (Always)
0	1	6	9	10	24	34

Table 73: Wie oft sind Sie für den Einkauf von Lebensmitteln verantwortlich? (How often are you responsible for grocery shopping?)

Frequency of purchasing local food (Frequency out of 83)						
Niemals (Never)	Fast nie (Almost never)	Gelegentlich (Occasionally)	Oft (Frequently)	Normalerweise (Usually)	Fast immer (Almost always)	Immer (Always)
1	9	29	23	12	7	2

Table 74: Wie oft kaufen Sie normalerweise lokale Lebensmittel? (How often do you normally buy local food?)

Effort to purchase local food (Frequency out of 81)						
Niemals (Never)	Fast nie (Almost never)	Gelegentlich (Occasionally)	Oft (Frequently)	Normalerweise (Usually)	Fast immer (Almost always)	Immer (Always)
0	9	28	12	14	18	0

Table 75: Geben Sie sich Mühe, um Ihre lokalen Lebensmittel zu kaufen? (Do you do your best to buy local food?)

Appendix 7.4 Additional Information on Local Food Consumption in Denmark

	Place and frequency of purchasing local							
	Lokale slagter (Butcher)	Lokale bager (Bakery)	Lokale grønthandler (Greengrocer)	Lokale marked (Local Market)	Supermarked (Supermarket)	Internet	Abonnementskasser (Subscription box)	Gårdbutikker (Farm shops)
Number of responses (out of 79)	65	64	65	62	69	60	63	67
Mean out of 7	3.03	3.62	3.15	2.87	4.33	2.14	1.95	3.15

Table 76: Hvor og hvor ofte køber du normalt lokale fødevarer? (Where and how often do you normally buy local food products?)

	Frequency of purchasing local food from following categories (Mean out of 7)							
	Mejerivarer (Dairy)	Grøntsager (Vegetables)	Frugt (Fruit)	Brød (Bread)	Kød (Meat)	Æg (Eggs)	Fjerkræ (Poultry)	Fisk (Fish)
Number of responses (out of 79)	66	68	65	67	65	66	65	67
Mean out of 7	3.11	3.95	3.76	3.63	3.57	3.92	3.21	3.28

Table 77: Hvor ofte køber du lokale fødevarer fra følgende kategorier? (How often do you buy local food products from the following food groups?)

Responsible for grocery shopping (Frequency out of 76)						
Aldrig (Never)	Næsten aldrig (Almost never)	En gang imellem (Occasionally)	Ofte (Frequently)	Regelmæssigt (Usually)	Næsten altid (Almost always)	Altid (Always)
0	0	8	10	15	22	21

Table 78: Hvor ofte er du ansvarlig for indkøb af dagligvarer? (How often are you responsible for grocery shopping?)

Frequency of purchasing local food (Frequency out of 71)						
Aldrig (Never)	Næsten aldrig (Almost never)	En gang imellem (Occasionally)	Ofte (Frequently)	Regelmæssigt (Usually)	Næsten altid (Almost always)	Altid (Always)
1	7	28	10	20	15	0

Table 79: Hvor ofte køber du normalt lokale fødevarer? (How often do you normally buy local food?)

Effort to purchase local food (Frequency out of 71)						
Aldrig (Never)	Næsten aldrig (Almost never)	En gang imellem (Occasionally)	Ofte (Frequently)	Regelmæssigt (Usually)	Næsten altid (Almost always)	Altid (Always)
3	9	33	15	6	5	0

Table 80: Gør du meget for at købe lokale fødevarer? (Do you do your best to buy local food?)

Appendix 7.5 Additional Information on Local Food Consumption in Northern Netherlands

	Place and frequency of purchasing local						
	Lokale Slager (Local Butcher)	Lokale Bakkerij (Local Bakery)	Lokale Groenteboer (Local Greengrocer)	Lokale Markt (Local Market)	Supermarkt	Internet	Box-Regeling (Subscription-box)
Number of responses (out of 152)	148	148	149	149	149	149	150
Mean out of 7	2.61	3.60	3.19	3.90	4.89	1.96	1.35

Table 81: Waar en hoe vaak koopt u normaal gesproken uw lokale voedselproducten? (Where and how often do you normally buy local food products?)

	Frequency of purchasing local food from following categories							
	Zuivel (Dairy)	Groenten (Vegetables	Fruit (Fruit)	Brood (Bread)	Vlees (Meat)	Eieren (Eggs)	Gevogelte	Vis (Fish)

		)					(Poultry)	
Number of responses (out of 152)	151	151	149	150	149	148	148	149
Mean out of 7	2.96	4.38	4.31	4.22	3.26	3.36	2.62	2.76

Table 82: Hoe vaak koop je lokale voedselproducten van de volgende voedselgroepen? (How often do you buy local food products from the following food groups?)

Own Grocery Shopping (Frequency out of 151)	
Ja (Yes)	Nee (No)
140	11

Table 83: Doet u uw eigen boodschappen? (Do you do your own grocery shopping)

Frequency of purchasing local food (Frequency out of 152)						
Nooit (Never)	Bijna nooit (Almost never)	Af en toe (Occasionally)	Vaak (Frequently)	Meestal (Usually)	Bijna altijd (Almost always)	Altijd (Always)
5	32	40	33	28	10	4

Table 84: Hoe vaak koopt u normaal gesproken lokaal voedsel? (How often do you normally buy local food?)

Effort to purchase local food (Frequency out of 121)						
Nooit (Never)	Bijna nooit (Almost never)	Af en toe (Occasionally)	Vaak (Frequently)	Meestal (Usually)	Bijna altijd (Almost always)	Altijd (Always)
5	18	30	26	24	17	1

Table 85: Doet u uw best om lokaal voedsel te kopen? (Do you do your best to buy local food?

Appendix 8: Cronbach's Alpha - Internal Reliability

To measure the internal reliability of the variables each was separated individually, and Cronbach's Alpha calculated. As previously stated in Appendix 5.1, for the variables to be reliable, a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.6 or higher is acceptable.

Appendix 8.1 Cronbach's Alpha - Internal Reliability in Västra Götaland (Sweden)

Variable	Numbers of Items Used in Questionnaire	Cronbach's Alpha Value
Intention	3	.87
Attitude	4	.89
Health Consciousness	4	.85
Subjective Norm	2	.23
Perceived Behavioural Control	3 (One Item Deleted)	.62
Concern for the Environment	3	.67
Concern for the Local Economy	2	.69
Perceived Quality	3	.84
Food Safety	2	.76
Consumer's Knowledge	4	.70
Information Seeking	3	.81
Context	3 (One Item Deleted)	.61

Table 86 Cronbach's alpha value of variables Västra Götaland.

As can be seen from table 86, one of the predictor variables, subjective norm, does not conform to the criteria of having a Cronbach's Alpha value above 0.6. Therefore, it can't be included in the multiple regression analysis. This can be avoided in future research by adding additional items to measure the construct subjective norm. Furthermore, the variable perceived behavioural control and context did not adhere to the criteria, and for that reason, one item was deleted so that the criteria set forth was met.

Appendix 8.2 Cronbach's Alpha - Internal Reliability in West-Flanders (Belgium)

Variable	Numbers of Items Used in Questionnaire	Cronbach's Alpha Value
Intention	3	.88

Attitude	4	.82
Health Consciousness	4	.77
Subjective Norm	2	.78
Perceived Behavioural Control	4	.75
Concern for the Environment	3	.72
Concern for the Local Economy	2	.77
Perceived Quality	3	.72
Food Safety	2	.80
Consumer's Knowledge	4	.75
Information Seeking	3	.83
Context	4	.53

Table 87: Cronbach's alpha value of variables West-Flanders.

From table 87, it can be seen that all variables excluding the variable context adhere to the criteria of a Cronbach's Alpha above 0.6. There was no opportunity to make the context variable reliable by deleting one of the items measuring this construct.

Appendix 8.3 Cronbach's Alpha - Internal Reliability in Wesermarsch District (Germany)

Variable	**Numbers of Items Used in Questionnaire**	**Cronbach's Alpha Value**
Intention	3	.92
Attitude	4	.82
Health Consciousness	4	80
Subjective Norm	2	.26
Perceived Behavioural Control	4	.75
Concern for the Environment	3	.56
Concern for the Local Economy	2	.70
Perceived Quality	3	.61

Food Safety	2	.80
Consumer's Knowledge	4	.68
Information Seeking	3	.88
Context	4	.60

Table 88: Cronbach's alpha value of variables Wesermarsch District.

As can be observed from table 88, several predictor variables do not meet the criteria of having a Cronbach's Alpha Value above 0.6. These include subjective norm and concern for the environment and could not be altered to become reliable.

Appendix 8.4 Cronbach's Alpha - Internal Reliability in Denmark

Variable	**Numbers of Items Used in Questionnaire**	**Cronbach's Alpha Value**
Intention	3	.93
Attitude	4	.78
Health Consciousness	4	.84
Subjective Norm	2	.49
Perceived Behavioural Control	3 (One Item Deleted)	.63
Concern for the Environment	3	.45
Concern for the Local Economy	2	.73
Perceived Quality	3	.81
Food Safety	2	.66
Consumer's Knowledge	4	.83
Information Seeking	3	.87
Context	4	.49

Table 89: Cronbach's Alpha Value of Variables.

As can be observed from table 89, several predictor variables do not meet the criteria of having a Cronbach's Alpha Value above 0.6. These include subjective norm, perceived behavioural control, concern for the environment, and

context. The perceived behavioural control could be made internally reliable by deleting one of the items. The other variables could not be made internally reliable.

Appendix 8.5 Cronbach's Alpha - Internal Reliability in the Northern Netherlands

Variable	Numbers of Items Used in Questionnaire	Cronbach's Alpha Value
Intention	3	.94
Attitude	4	.90
Health Consciousness	3	.63
Subjective Norm	2	.68
Perceived Behavioural Control	2	.55
Concern for the Environment	3	.68
Concern for the Local Economy	2	.70
Perceived Quality	3	.73
Food Safety	2	.57
Consumer's Knowledge	4 (One Item Added)	.58 became .61
Information Seeking	3	.71
Context	4 (One Item Added)	.50 became .61

Table 90: Cronbach's Alpha Value of Variables

As can be observed from table 90, several predictor variables do not meet the criteria of having a Cronbach's Alpha Value above 0.6. These include perceived behavioural control, perceived value, food safety, consumer's knowledge, and context. To see if this could be resolved somehow, the items were investigated to see if they also measure other variables. Two of the variables, consumer's knowledge and context, could be salvaged to be internally reliable and to be utilized further.

Appendix 9: Correlation Matrix

The correlation matrix shows the correlation coefficients between all variables to check for multicollinearity. Multicollinearity is to be avoided as it means a high correlation between two or more variables, and the separate

effects of them can't be identified. According to Collis et al. (2014) and Garbacz (2018), the cut-off point is when the correlation coefficient is 0.7 or higher.

Appendix 9.1 Correlation Matrix Västra Götaland (Sweden)

	Food Safety	Attitude	Intention	Health Consciousness	Subjective Norm	Concern for the Environment	Concern for the Local Economy	Perceived Quality	Consumer's Knowledge	Information Seeking	Context	Perceived Behavioural Control
Food Safety	1.00	.18	.24	.64	.10	.21	.18	.41	.32	.26	.27	.25
Attitude	.18	1.00	.28	.11	.20	.19	.29	.40	.22	.23	.41	.17
Intention	.24	.28	1.00	.24	.49	.33	.49	.33	.44	.55	.54	.52
Health Consciousness	.64	.11	.24	1.00	.10	.27	.21	.21	.31	.21	.21	.28
Subjective Norm	.10	.20	.49	.10	1.00	.21	.23	.19	.39	.32	.39	.30
Concern for the Environment	.21	.19	.33	.27	.21	1.00	.20	.30	.44	.41	.34	.22
Concern for the Local Economy	.18	.29	.49	.21	.23	.20	1.00	.27	.34	.26	.32	.41
Perceived Quality	.41	.40	.33	.21	.29	.30	.27	1.00	.38	.40	.48	.28
Consumer's Knowledge	.32	.22	.44	.31	.39	.44	.34	.38	1.00	.71	.48	.41
Information Seeking	.26	.23	.55	.21	.32	.41	.26	.40	.71	1.00	.53	.34
Context	.27	.41	.54	.21	.39	.34	.32	.48	.48	.53	1.00	.34
Perceived Behaviour	.25	.17	.52	.28	.30	.22	.41	.28	.41	.34	.34	1.00

al Control												

Table 91: Correlation Matrix to Test for Multicollinearity Västra Götaland (Sweden).

Appendix 9.2 Correlation Matrix West-Flanders (Belgium)

	Food Safety	Attitude	Intention	Health Consciousness	Subjective Norm	Concern for the Environment	Concern for the Local Economy	Perceived Quality	Consumer's Knowledge	Information Seeking	Context	Perceived Behavioural Control
Food Safety	1.00	.22	.33	.26	.42	.12	.22	.60	.35	.35	.42	.45
Attitude	.22	1.00	.44	.19	.22	.32	.50	.36	.28	.14	.40	.28
Intention	.33	.44	1.00	.29	.40	.23	.42	.31	.40	.29	.53	.54
Health Consciousness	.26	.19	.29	1.00	.40	.35	.12	.20	.36	.47	.31	.29
Subjective Norm	.42	.22	.40	.40	1.00	.22	.12	.41	.41	.41	.50	.38
Concern for the Environment	.12	.32	.23	.35	.22	1.00	.14	.08	.25	.45	.25	.06
Concern for the Local Economy	.22	.50	.42	.12	.12	.14	1.00	.26	.20	.03	.32	.28
Perceived Quality	.60	.36	.31	.20	.41	.08	.26	1.00	.49	.23	.44	.28
Consumer's Knowledge	.35	.28	.40	.36	.41	.25	.20	.49	1.00	.62	.56	.51
Information Seeking	.35	.14	.29	.47	.41	.45	.03	.23	.62	1.00	.45	.35
Context	.42	.40	.53	.31	.50	.25	.32	.44	.56	.45	1.00	.66

Perceived Behavioural Control	.45	.28	.54	.29	.38	.06	.28	.28	.51	.35	.66	1.00

Table 92: Correlation Matrix to Test for Multicollinearity West-Flanders (Belgium).

Appendix 9.3 Correlation Matrix Wesermarsch District (Germany)

	Food Safety	Attitude	Intention	Health Consciousness	Subjective Norm	Concern for the Environment	Concern for the Local Economy	Perceived Quality	Consumer's Knowledge	Information Seeking	Context	Perceived Behavioural Control
Food Safety	1	0.27	0.52	0.4	0.19	0.49	0.29	0.7	0.57	0.48	0.32	0.37
Attitude	0.27	1	0.56	0.37	0.27	0.25	0.54	0.37	0.34	0.37	0.42	0.22
Intention	0.52	0.56	1	0.21	0.35	0.48	0.49	0.45	0.55	0.6	0.47	0.28
Health Consciousness	0.4	0.37	0.21	1	0.23	0.32	0.29	0.35	0.32	0.3	0. 34	0.42
Subjective Norm	0.19	0.27	0.35	0.23	1	0.31	0.14	0.25	0.31	0.33	0.38	0.23
Concern for the Environment	0.49	0.25	0.48	0.32	0.31	1	0.32	0.42	0.53	0.62	0.46	0.08
Concern for the Local Economy	0.29	0.54	0.49	0.29	0.14	0.32	1	0.27	0.24	0.29	0.33	0.2
Perceived Quality	0.7	0.37	0.45	0.35	0.25	0.42	0.27	1	0.44	0.41	0.39	0.23
Consumer's Knowledge	0.57	0.34	0.55	0.32	0.31	0.53	0.24	0.44	1	0.71	0.51	0.26
Informatio	0.48	0.37	0.6	0.3	0.33	0.62	0.29	0.41	0.71	1	0.43	0.1

n Seeking												
Context	0.32	0.42	0.47	0.34	0.38	0.46	0.33	0.39	0.51	0.43	1	0.39
Perceived Behavioural Control	0.37	0.22	0.28	0.42	0.23	0.08	0.2	0.23	0.26	0.1	0.39	1

Table 93: Correlation Matrix to Test for Multicollinearity Wesermarsch District (Germany).

Appendix 9.4 Correlation Matrix Denmark

	Food Safety	Attitude	Intention	Health Consciousness	Subjective Norm	Concern for the Environment	Concern for the Local Economy	Perceived Quality	Consumer's Knowledge	Information Seeking	Context	Perceived Behavioural Control
Food Safety	1	0.12	0.23	0.41	0.03	0.16	0.22	0.09	0.14	0.35	0.18	-0.02
Attitude	0.12	1	0.37	0.09	0.35	0.43	0.4	0.55	0.6	0.32	0.51	0.16
Intention	0.23	0.37	1	0.22	0.32	0.43	0.87	0.27	0.56	0.63	0.56	0.44
Health Consciousness	0.41	0.09	0.22	1	-0.12	0.19	0.15	-0.19	-0.11	0.14	0.21	0.24
Subjective Norm	0.03	0.35	0.32	-0.12	1	0.52	0.32	0.55	0.58	0.6	0.41	0.26
Concern for the Environment	0.16	0.43	0.43	0.19	0.52	1	0.42	0.43	0.52	0.63	0.43	0.22
Concern for the Local Economy	0.22	0.4	0.87	0 .15	0.32	0.42	1	0.24	0.59	0.62	0.53	0.34
Perceived Quality	0.09	0.55	0.27	-0.19	0.55	0.43	0.24	1	0.53	0.35	0.36	0.29
Consumer's	0.14	0.6	0.56	-0.11	0.58	0.52	0.59	0.53	1	0.71	0.56	0.33

Knowledge												
Information Seeking	0.35	0.32	0.63	0.14	0.6	0.63	0.62	0.35	0.71	1	0.62	0.34
Context	0.18	0.51	0.56	0.21	0.41	0.43	0.53	0.36	0.56	0.62	1	0.32
Perceived Behavioural Control	-0.02	0.16	0.44	0.24	0.26	0.22	0.34	0.29	0.33	0.34	0.32	1

Table 94: Correlation Matrix to Test for Multicollinearity Denmark.

Appendix 9.5 Correlation Matrix Northern Netherlands

	Attitude	Intention	Health Consciousness	Subjective Norm	Concern for the Environment	Concern for the Local Economy	Perceived Quality	Consumer's Knowledge	Information Seeking	Context
Attitude	1	.44	.38	.25	.36	.37	.55	.45	.41	.37
Intention	.44	1	.27	.54	.34	.35	.43	.61	.46	.61
Health Consciousness	.38	.27	1	.21	.42	.49	.31	.34	.51	.30
Subjective Norm	.25	.54	.21	1	.20	.10	.40	.50	.43	.61
Concern for the Environment	.36	.34	.42	.20	1	.43	.31	.29	.50	.39
Concern for the Local Economy	.37	.35	.49	0.10	.43	1	0.25	.30	.34	.31
Perceived Quality	.55	.43	.31	.40	.31	.25	1	.51	.41	.53
Consumer's Knowledge	.46	.61	.34	.55	.30	.30	.51	1	.56	.61
Information Seeking	.41	.46	.51	.43	.50	.34	.41	.56	1	.51
Context	.36	.61	.30	.61	.39	.31	.53	.61	.51	1

Table 95: Correlation Matrix to Test for Multicollinearity Northern Netherlands.

Appendix 10: Test for Normality

The testing of normality was performed to see whether the residuals of the dependent (outcome) variables, the attitude towards local food and intention to purchase local food variables, were normally distributed. This is of importance as it will check if hypothesis testing can be carried out. To see this, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov was used. To satisfy the normality criteria, a p-value greater than 0.05 must occur for both attitude towards local food and intention to purchase local food. All the dependent variables for all regions were normally distributed except the attitude towards local food in Västra Götaland. The researcher explored multiple methods to see if normality of the residuals was possible, yet this was not. This has several implications on the analysis and is further discussed in Appendix 5.4 and 11.

Appendix 11: Multiple Regression Analysis Elaborated

11.1 Attitude - Västra Götaland (Sweden) Multiple Regression on Predictor Variables

The first multiple regression analysis would be the variable attitude on the remaining predictor variables. However, because the variable attitude was not normally distributed multiple linear regression could not be performed for Västra Götaland. Thus, an alternative was discovered whereby the variable intention is regressed on all predictor variables (Garbacz, 2018).

To further elaborate, the questionnaire shows that the people of Västra Götaland have an extremely positive attitude towards local food with a mean of 6.26. The attitude towards local food is also interestingly distributed, very negatively skewed, in figure 15. This can be resolved next time by asking different questions to measure the variable in Västra Götaland and through collecting a more representative sample. Most respondents were retrieved through convenience sampling, and that mainly consisted of the network of the REFRAME-Partners. These already have a positive association with local food, which could have contributed to the skewed variable. Even though this was to be avoided by randomizing sampling where possible.



Figure 15: Attitude towards local food distribution histogram Västra Götaland.

As it was not possible to conduct the multiple regression analysis whereby the predictor variables are regressed on attitude towards local food an alternative is proposed. Namely, multiple regression through which the intention to purchase local food is regressed on all the predictor variables. Garbacz et al. (2018) also utilized this in previous research when running into a similar problem. Furthermore, Michaelidou et al. (2008) already explored a direct relationship between antecedents and the intention to purchase local food. Therefore, the multiple regression on the intention to purchase local food is justified.

11.2 Intention - Västra Götaland (Sweden) Multiple Regression on Predictor Variables

Intention Regressed on all Predictor Variables

Since the other predictor variables first labelled as such for the attitude towards local food variables are now added towards the multiple regression for intention. This does not allow to see how the people's overall attitudes in Västra Götaland are constructed, but it will enable seeing which specific predictor variables that could make up attitudes have a positive relationship with the intention to purchase local food. The subjective norm was not included as it was not internally reliable according to Cronbach's Alpha. Moreover, the variable information seeking intertwined with the variable consumer's knowledge. Through careful examination of the items and the variables themselves,

consumer knowledge was chosen as consumer's knowledge. The reason being that consumer's knowledge comes after the other. After this the multiple regression analysis was performed and the results can be seen in table 96.

Coefficients (Testing each independent variable at alpha = .05)

Predictor Variable	Unstandardized B	Significant or Not significant	Sig.
Food Safety	.00	Not significant	(p = .987)
Health Consciousness	.01	Not significant	(p = .930)
Consumer's Knowledge	.07	Not significant	(p = .404)
Perceived Quality	-.01	Not significant	(p = .898)
Concern for the Environment	.09	Not significant	(p = .184)
Perceived Behavioural Control	.24	Significant	(p < .001)
Concern for the Local Economy	.39	Significant	(p = .001)
Context	.33	Significant	(p < .001)
Attitude Towards Local Food	.01	Not significant	(p = .884)

Table 96: Coefficients of all predictor variables on the intention to purchase local food.

Whereas the model summary and anova (See Appendix 13.1) table look at the predictor variables collectively, the coefficient table examines each individually. Table 96 shows that three predictor variables namely concern for the local economy, context, and perceived behavioural control adhere to the p-value less than 0.05 criteria. This indicates that these variables are significantly predicting/explaining the intention to purchase local food. So the significant predictor variables as $p < 0.05$ it means that they explain an amount of unique variance in the intention to purchase local food. The regression coefficient (Unstandardized B) shows the relationship between the dependent/outcome variable and each independent/predictor variable (Yee & San, 2011). The higher the unstandardized B value, the stronger the relationship is. From table 96, it can be seen that concern for the local economy made the strongest contribution to the prediction of intention to purchase local food. Therefore, explaining most of the adjusted R^2 (45% - from Appendix 13.1) and followed by context and perceived behavioural control.

11.3 Attitude - West-Flanders (Belgium) Multiple Regression on Predictor Variables

The first multiple regression analysis is that of the variable attitude on the remaining predictor variables. From PSPP, various things are of interest and will be used in the checking of the hypotheses. Before jumping into the PSPP output, it should be pointed out that the variable context has been excluded from the multiple regression analysis. The reason for exclusion is that the variable did not adhere to the Cronbach's Alpha criteria set (Please see Appendix 65.4). It should be noted that the other variables, not significant, have been taken away from the regression one by one from largest to smallest to see if they interacted with the other variables. From this process, the variable perceived behavioural control became significant. The output of PSPP after performing a multiple regression analysis is using first presenting the model summary, anova table, and coefficients table. The model summary and anova table can be seen in appendix 12.1. These are important for this research as they see if the predictor variables, when considered together, as a group, predict the dependent variable attitude towards local food. Below is the coefficients table from the PSPP output that allows for hypothesis testing.

Coefficients (Testing each independent variable at alpha = .05)

Predictor Variable	Unstandardized B	Significant or Not significant	Sig.
Food Safety	-.06	Not Significant	(p = .217)
Perceived Quality	.22	Significant	(p = .001)
Concern for the Environment	.23	Significant	(p < .001)
Information Seeking	-.06	Not significant	(p = .213)
Concern for the Local Economy	.39	Significant	(p < .001)
Perceived Behavioural Control	.14	Significant	(p = .043)
Subjective Norm	.01	Not significant	(p = .838)
Health Consciousness	.01	Not significant	(p = .844)

Table 97: Coefficients of predictor variables on attitude towards local food.

Whereas the model summary and anova table look at the independent variables collectively, the coefficient table examines each individually. Table 97 shows that four independent variables perceived quality, concern for the environment, concern for the local economy, and perceived behavioural control adhere to the p-value less than 0.05

criteria. This indicates that these variables are significantly predicting/explaining the attitude towards local food. So the significant predictor variables as $p < 0.05$ it means that they explain an amount of unique variance in the attitude towards local food. The regression coefficients (Unstandardized B) shows the relationship between the dependent/outcome variable and each independent/predictor variable (Yee & San, 2011). The higher the unstandardized B value, the stronger the relationship is. Table 97 shows that concern for the local economy made the strongest contribution to the prediction of attitude towards local food. Therefore, explaining most of the adjusted R^2 (36% - from Appendix 12.1) and followed by concern for the environment, perceived quality, and perceived behavioural control.

11.4 Intention - West-Flanders (Belgium) Multiple Regression on Predictor Variables

Intention on Predictor Variables

The second multiple regression analysis for West-Flanders looks at the intention regressed on the predictor variables attitude towards local food, perceived behavioural control, and subjective norm from the conceptual framework. After performing the multiple regression analysis, the following predictor variables in table 98 remained.

Coefficients (Testing each independent variable at alpha = .05)

Predictor Variable	Unstandardized B	Significant or Not significant	Sig.
Attitude towards local food	.31	Significant	($p < .001$)
Subjective Norm	.13	Significant	($p = .004$)
Perceived Behavioural Control	.39	Significant	($p < .001$)

Table 98: Coefficients of predictor variable attitude towards local food, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control on the intention to purchase local food.

Whereas the model summary and anova table (Appendix 13.2) look at the independent variables collectively, the coefficient table examines each individually. Table 98 shows that all independent variables, attitude towards local food, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control adhere to the p-value less than 0.05 criteria. This indicates that all independent variables are significantly predicting/explaining the intention to purchase local food. So the significant predictor variables as $p < 0.05$ it means that they explain an amount of unique variance in the intention to purchase local food. The regression coefficients (Unstandardized B) shows the relationship between the dependent/outcome variable and each independent variable (Yee & San, 2011). The higher the unstandardized B

value, the stronger the relationship is. Table 98 shows that perceived behavioural control made the strongest contribution to the prediction of intention to purchase local food. Therefore, explaining most of the adjusted R^2 (40% - from Appendix 13.2) and followed closely by attitude towards local food and subjective norm.

11.5 Attitude - Wesermarsch District (Germany) Multiple Regression on Predictor Variables

The first multiple regression analysis for Wesermarsch District is the variable attitude on the remaining predictor variables. From PSPP, various things are of interest and will be used in the checking of the hypotheses. Before jumping into the PSPP output, it should be pointed out that the variable subjective norm and concern for the environment have been excluded from the multiple regression analysis. The exclusion of these variables was because they did not adhere to the Cronbach's Alpha criteria set (Please see Appendix 5.4). Furthermore, the predictor variable information seeking was not included as it clashed with the predictor variable consumer's knowledge. It should be noted that the other variables, not significant, have been taken away from the regression one by one from largest to smallest to see if they interacted with the other variables. From this process, the variable perceived behavioural control became significant. The output of PSPP after performing a multiple regression analysis is using the enter method, among other things, first presenting the model summary, anova table, and coefficients table. The model summary and anova table can be seen in appendix 12.2. These are important for this research as they see if the predictor variables, when considered together, as a group, predict the dependent variable attitude towards local food. Below is the coefficients table from the PSPP output that allows for hypothesis testing.

Coefficients (Testing each independent variable at alpha = .05)

Predictor Variable	Unstandardized B	Significant or Not significant	Sig.
Perceived Quality	.14	Not significant	(p = .067)
Context	.19	Significant	(p = .028)
Concern for the Local Economy	.52	Significant	(p < .001)

Table 99: Coefficients of predictor variables on attitude towards local food.

Whereas the model summary and anova table look at the independent variables collectively, the coefficient table examines each individually. Table 99 shows that two independent variables namely concern for the economy and context, adhere to the p-value less than 0.05 criteria. This indicates that these variables are significantly predicting/explaining the attitude towards local food. So the significant predictor variables as $p < 0.05$ it means that

they explain an amount of unique variance in the attitude towards local food. The regression coefficients (Unstandardized B) shows the relationship between the dependent/outcome variable and each independent variable (Yee & San, 2011). The higher the unstandardized b value, the stronger the relationship is. Table 99 shows that concern for the local economy made the strongest contribution to the prediction of intention to purchase local food with the variable attitude towards local food following close behind. Therefore, explaining most of the adjusted R^2 (36% - from Appendix 12.2) and followed by context.

11.6 Intention - Wesermarsch District (Germany) Multiple Regression on Predictor Variables

Intention on Predictor Variables

The second multiple regression analysis for West-Flanders looks at the intention regressed on the predictor variables attitude towards local food, perceived behavioural control from the conceptual framework. As previously mentioned the variable subjective norm was not internally reliable and therefore not included. After performing the multiple regression analysis, the following predictor variables in table 100 remained.

Coefficients (Testing each independent variable at alpha = .05)

Predictor Variable	Unstandardized B	Significant or Not significant	Sig.
Attitude towards local food	.76	Significant	($p < .001$)
Perceived Behavioural Control	.19	Not significant	($p = .068$)

Table 100: Coefficients of predictor variable attitude towards local food and perceived behavioural control on the intention to purchase local food.

Whereas the model summary and anova table (Appendix 13.3) look at the independent variables collectively, the coefficient table examines each individually. Table 100 shows that the independent variables attitude towards local food and perceived behavioural control adhere to the p-value less than 0.05 criteria. This indicates that these independent variables are significantly predicting/explaining the intention to purchase local food. So the significant predictor variables as $p < 0.05$ it means that they explain an amount of unique variance in the intention to purchase local food. The regression coefficients (Unstandardized B) shows the relationship between the dependent/outcome variable and each independent variable (Yee & San, 2011). The higher the unstandardized B value, the stronger the relationship is. Table 100 shows that attitude towards local food made the strongest contribution to the prediction of

intention to purchase local food. Therefore, explaining most of the adjusted R^2 (33% - from Appendix 13.3) and followed by perceived behavioural control.

11.7 Attitude - Denmark Multiple Regression on Predictor Variables

The first multiple regression analysis for Denmark is that of the variable attitude on the remaining predictor variables. From PSPP, various things are of interest and will be used in the checking of the hypotheses. Before jumping into the PSPP Output, it should be pointed out that the variable context, concern for the environment, and information seeking has been excluded from the multiple regression analysis. The reason being that this variable did not adhere to the Cronbach's Alpha criteria set (Please see Appendix 6.4) or clashed in the correlation matrix. It should be noted that the other variables, not significant, have been taken away from the regression one by one from largest to smallest to see if they interacted with the other variables. The output of PSPP after performing a multiple regression analysis is using the enter method, among other things, first presenting the model summary, anova table, and coefficients table. The model summary and anova table can be seen in appendix 12.3. These are important for this research as they see if the predictor variables, when considered together, as a group, predict the dependent variable attitude towards local food. Below is the coefficients table from the PSPP output that allows for hypothesis testing.

Coefficients (Testing each independent variable at alpha = .05)

Predictor Variable	Unstandardized B	Significant or Not significant	Sig.
Health Consciousness	.16	Significant	(p = .005)
Consumers's Knowledge	.38	Significant	(p < .001)
Perceived Quality	.32	Significant	(p < .001)
Perceived Behavioural Control	-.16	Not significant	(p = .077)

Table 101: Coefficients of predictor variables on attitude towards local food.

Whereas the model summary and anova table look at the independent variables collectively, the coefficient table examines each individually. Table 101 shows that four independent variables consumer's knowledge, perceived quality, and health consciousness adhere to the p-value less than 0.05 criteria. This indicates that these variables are significantly predicting/explaining the attitude towards local food. So the significant predictor variables as $p < 0.05$ it means that they explain an amount of unique variance in the attitude towards local food. The regression coefficients (Unstandardized B) shows the relationship between the dependent/outcome variable and each independent variable (Yee & San, 2011). The higher the unstandardized B value, the stronger the relationship is.

Table 101 shows that consumer's knowledge made the strongest contribution to the prediction of intention to purchase local food. Therefore, explaining most of the adjusted R^2 (47% - from Appendix 12.3) and followed by perceived quality and health consciousness.

11.8 Intention - Denmark Multiple Regression on Predictor Variables

Intention on Predictor Variables

The second multiple regression analysis for Denmark looks at the intention regressed on the predictor variables attitude towards local food, perceived behavioural control from the conceptual framework. As previously stated the variable subjective norm was excluded due to not being internally reliable. After performing the multiple regression analysis the following predictor variables in table 102 remained, which were revealed to be significant.

Coefficients (Testing each independent variable at alpha = .05)

Predictor Variable	Unstandardized B	Significant or Not significant	Sig.
Attitude towards local food	.46	Significant	(p = .002)
Perceived Behavioural Control	.57	Significant	(p < .001)

Table 105: Coefficients of predictor variable attitude towards local food and perceived behavioural control on the intention to purchase local food.

Whereas the model summary and anova table (Appendix 13.4) look at the independent variables collectively, the coefficient table examines each individually. Table 105 shows that the independent variables, attitude towards local food and perceived behavioural control adhere to the p-value less than 0.05 criteria. This indicates that these independent variables are significantly predicting/explaining the intention to purchase local food. So the significant predictor variables as $p < 0.05$ it means that they explain an amount of unique variance in the intention to purchase local food. The regression coefficients (unstandardized B) shows the relationship between the dependent/outcome variable and each independent variable (Yee & San, 2011). The higher the unstandardized B value, the stronger the relationship is. Table 102 shows that perceived behavioural control made the strongest contribution to the prediction of intention to purchase local food with the variable attitude towards local food following close behind. Therefore, explaining most of the adjusted R^2 (27% - from Appendix 13.4) and followed closely by attitude towards local food.

11.9 Attitude - Northern Netherlands Multiple Regression on Predictor Variables

The first multiple regression analysis is that of the variable attitude on the remaining predictor variables. From SPSS (Regression from previous research), various things are of interest and will be used in the checking of the hypothesis. Before jumping into the SPSS output, it should be pointed out that the variables information seeking, health consciousness, and perceived behavioural control are excluded from the multiple regression analysis. The reason for this being that they clashed with the other variable to such extent that it affected their significance level or due not being internally reliable. The variable information seeking intertwined with the variable consumer's knowledge. Through careful examination of the items and the variables themselves, consumer knowledge was chosen as consumer's knowledge is of importance in the shaping of the attitude and information seeking in the shaping of the knowledge. Furthermore, when reading the results, it should be noted that some predictor variables measurement items were altered to be internally reliable. This was applicable for the variables consumer's knowledge and context, and the final measurement items can be seen in appendix 3.6 (Numbered list 12 and 14). The variable health consciousness clashed with concern for the local economy and as the concern for the local economy was significant, and health consciousness was not it was excluded. Furthermore, the variable perceived behavioural control did not adhere to the criteria of the Cronbach's Alpha and was therefore excluded. The output of SPSS after performing a multiple regression analysis is, among other things, first presenting the model summary, anova table, and coefficients table. The model summary and anova table can be seen in appendix 12.4. These are important for this research as they see if the predictor variables, when considered together, as a group, predict the dependent variable attitude towards local food. The SPSS output can be seen below with accompanying explanation.

Coefficients (Testing each independent variable at alpha = .05)

Predictor Variable	Unstandardized B	Significant or Not Significant	Sig.
Concern for the Environment	.13	Not significant	(p = .086)
Concern for the Local Economy	.20	Significant	(p = .022)
Perceived Quality	.42	Significant	(p < .001)
Consumer's Knowledge	.22	Significant	(p = .024)
Subjective Norm	-.03	Not Significant	(p = .662)
Context	-.06	Not Significant	(p = .552)

Table 103: Coefficients of predictor variables on attitude towards local food.

Whereas the model summary and anova table look at the predictor variables collectively, the coefficients table examines each individually. Table 103 shows that three predictor variables, concern for the local economy, perceived quality, and consumer's knowledge adhere to the p-value less than 0.05 criteria. These three are significant predictors of attitude towards local food, while the other variables are not. So the significant predictor variables as $p < 0.05$ it means that they explain an amount of unique variance in the attitude towards local food. The regression coefficients (Unstandardized B) shows the relationship between the dependent/outcome variable and each independent variable (Yee & San, 2011). The higher the unstandardized B value, the stronger the relationship is. The regression coefficients (Unstandardized B) show that the predictor variable perceived quality made the strongest contribution to the prediction of attitude. Therefore, explaining most of the Adjusted R^2 (37% - from Appendix 12.4) and followed by the predictor variable consumer knowledge and concern for the local economy.

11.10 Intention - Northern Netherlands Multiple Regression on Predictor Variables

Intention on Predictor Variable

The second multiple regression analysis is that of intention regressed on the variables attitude and subjective norm from the conceptual framework. As previously stated the variable perceived behavioural control was excluded due to not being internally reliable. The SPSS output (Regression from previous research) shows various aspects that are interesting and will be used in the checking of the hypothesis. The output of SPSS after performing a multiple regression analysis is, among other things, first presenting the model summary, anova table, and coefficients table. The model summary and anova table can be seen in appendix 13.5. These are important for this research as they see if the independent variables, attitude and subjective norm, when considered together as a group, predict the dependent variable intention to purchase local food. After performing the multiple regression analysis the following predictor variables in table 104 remained.

Coefficients (Testing each independent variable at alpha = .05)

Predictor Variable	Unstandardized B	Significant or Not significant	Sig.
Attitude towards local food	.46	Significant	($p < .001$)
Subjective Norm	.53	Significant	($p < .001$)

Table 104: Coefficients of predictor variable attitude towards local food and subjective norm on intention to purchase local food.

Whereas the model summary and anova table (Appendix 13.5) look at the independent variables collectively, the coefficient table examines each individually. Table 104 shows that the independent variables, attitude towards local food and subjective norm adhere to the p-value less than 0.05 criteria. This indicates that these independent variables are significantly predicting/explaining the intention to purchase local food. So the significant predictor variables as $p < 0.05$ it means that they explain an amount of unique variance in the intention to purchase local food. The regression coefficients (unstandardized B) shows the relationship between the dependent/outcome variable and each independent variable (Yee & San, 2011). The higher the unstandardized B value, the stronger the relationship is. Table 104 shows that subjective norm made the strongest contribution to the prediction of intention to purchase local food with the variable attitude towards local food following close behind. Therefore, explaining most of the adjusted R^2 (39% - from Appendix 13.5) and followed closely by attitude towards local food.

11.11 Model Presenting Tested Hypothesis with Results

Now that Cronbach's Alpha (Appendix 8), correlation matrix (Appendix 9), and test for normality (Appendix 10) has been determined for the various regions, the next step is the multiple regression analysis. Two multiple regression analyses are conducted per region/country to test the literature review's hypotheses, expect Västra Götaland. In the first analyses, the attitude towards local food will be regressed on the predictor variables. In the second analysis, the intention will be regressed on attitude towards local food, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control. For Västra Götaland a multiple regression analysis is performed whereby the intention is regressed on all predictor variables.

Multiple regression analyses have been performed and the results can be seen in the figures below. From these the set out hypotheses have either been supported, not supported, or excluded. An overview of this per REFRAME region can be seen in Appendix 14. Moreover, the models below are a visual representation of the hypothesis and consequently, an updated conceptual framework for the five different REFRAME regions. The regression coefficients between the variables shows the contribution made to the prediction of the set dependent variable. For instance, when looking at figure 17, we can see that the variable perceived behavioural control causes the most change in the intention to purchase local food. Furthermore, the adjusted R^2 shows the percentage of variation explained by the predictor variables (The variables are bold when they contribute to the adjusted R^2). So, for figure 17 this would mean that these three variables explain 40% of the change in the intention to purchase local food.



Figure 16: Updated conceptual framework with the respective adjusted R^2 and unstandardized B coefficients of Västra Götaland (Sweden) - Intention on all predictor variables.



Figure 17: Updated conceptual framework with the respective adjusted R^2 and unstandardized B coefficients of West-Flanders (Belgium) - Attitude and intention regressed on predictor variables.



Figure 18: Updated conceptual framework with the respective adjusted R^2 and unstandardized B coefficients of Wesermarsch District (Germany) - Intention and attitude regressed on predictor variables.



Figure 19: Updated conceptual framework with the respective adjusted R^2 and unstandardized B coefficients of Denmark - Intention and attitude regressed on predictor variables.



Figure 20: Updated conceptual framework with the respective adjusted R^2 and unstandardized B coefficients of Northern Netherlands - Intention and attitude regressed on predictor variables.

Appendix 12: Attitude - Multiple Regression on Predictor Variables

Appendix 12.1 Attitude - Model Summary and Anova Table West-Flanders (Belgium)

R Square (R^2)	Adjusted R Square
.39	.36

Table 105: Model summary table of attitude regressed on perceived quality, concern for the environment, information seeking, concern for the local economy, subjective norm, perceived behavioural control, health consciousness, and food safety.

a. Predictors: Perceived Quality, Concern for the Environment, Information Seeking, Concern for the Local Economy, Subjective Norm, Perceived Behavioural Control, Health Consciousness, and Food Safety.

The model summary, table 105, shows different results; the important figure to look at is the Adjusted R^2. The Adjusted R^2 is .36 and means that the significant predictor's variables concern for the local economy, concern for the environment, perceived quality, and perceived behavioural control when taken together as a set account for 36% of the variance in the dependent variable attitude towards local food.

Anova - (Test Using Alpha = .05)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	43.68	8	5.46	13.10	.000
Residual	67.94	163	.42		
Total	111.62	171			

Table 106: Anova table of attitude regressed on predictor variables (West-Flanders).

The anova, table 106, continues upon the model summary table by looking at the Adjusted R^2 and seeing if it is significantly greater than zero. If the Sig. (p-value) is less than .05 than the regression is significant. As can be seen from table 106, the p-value is less than .05, so the Adjusted R^2 is significantly greater than zero. Resulting in that the predictor variables can account for a significant amount of variance in the attitude towards local food. So, the regression model is statistically significant as tested at F (8,163) = 13.10, $p < .001$, Adjusted $R^2 = .36$.

Appendix 12.2 Attitude - Model Summary and Anova Table Wesermarsch District (Germany)

R Square (R^2)	Adjusted R Square
.39	.36

Table 107: Model summary table of attitude regressed on predictor variables (Wesermarsch District).

a. Predictors: Perceived Quality, Context, and Concern for the Local Economy.

The model summary, table 107, shows different results; the important figure to look at is the Adjusted R^2. The Adjusted R^2 is .36 and means that when the significant predictor's variables context and concern for the local economy account when taken together as a set account for 36% of the variance in the dependent variable attitude towards local food.

Anova - (Test Using Alpha = .05)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	26.74	3	8.91	17.40	.000
Residual	42.52	83	.51		
Total	69.26	86			

Table 107: Anova table of attitude regressed on predictor variables (Wesermarsch District).

The anova, table 107, continues upon the model summary table by looking at the Adjusted R^2 and seeing if it is significantly greater than zero. If the Sig. (p-value) is less than .05 than the regression is significant. As can be seen from table 107, the p-value is less than .05, so the Adjusted R^2 is significantly greater than zero. Resulting in that the predictor variables can account for a significant amount of variance in the attitude towards local food. So, the regression model is statistically significant as tested at F (3,83) = 17.40, p < .001, Adjusted R^2 = .36.

Appendix 12.3 Attitude - Model Summary and Anova Table Denmark

R Square (R^2)	Adjusted R Square
.50	.47

Table 108: Model summary table of attitude regressed on predictor variables (Denmark).

a. Predictors: Health Consciousness, Consumer's Knowledge, Perceived Quality, and Perceived Behavioural Control.

The model summary, table 108, shows different results; the important figure to look at is the Adjusted R^2. The Adjusted R^2 is .47 and means that when the significant predictor's variables health consciousness, consumer's knowledge, and perceived quality account when taken together as a set account for 47% of the variance in the dependent variable attitude towards local food.

Anova - (Test Using Alpha = .05)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	37.25	4	9.31	18.16	.000
Residual	37.44	73	.51		
Total	74.69	77			

Table 109: Anova table of attitude regressed on predictor variables (Denmark).

The anova, table 109, continues upon the model summary table by looking at the Adjusted R^2 and seeing if it is significantly greater than zero. If the Sig. (p-value) is less than .05 than the regression is significant. As can be seen from table 109, the p-value is less than .05, so the Adjusted R^2 is significantly greater than zero. Resulting in that the predictor variables can account for a significant amount of variance in the attitude towards local food. So, the regression model is statistically significant as tested at F (4,73) = 18.16, p < .001, Adjusted R^2 = .47.

Appendix 12.4 Attitude - Model Summary and Anova Table Northern Netherlands

R Square (R^2)	Adjusted R Square
.40	.37

Table 110: Model summary table of attitude regressed on predictor variables (Northern Netherlands).

a. Predictors: Context, Concern for the Environment, Concern for Local Economy, Perceived Quality, Consumer's Knowledge, Subjective norm.

The model summary, table 110, shows different results; the important figure to look at is the adjusted R^2. The adjusted R^2 is .37 and means that when the predictor's variables concern for the environment, concern for the local economy, perceived quality, information seeking, subjective norm, and context account when taken together as a set account for 37% of the variance in the dependent variable attitude towards local food.

Anova - (Test Using Alpha = .05)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	66.309	6	11.051	15.946	.000b
Residual	100.492	145	.693		
Total	166.801	151			

Table 111: Anova table of attitude regressed on predictor variables.

The anova, table 111, continues upon the model summary table by looking at the Adjusted R^2 and seeing if it is significantly greater than zero. If the Sig. (p-value) is less than .05 than the regression is significant. As can be seen from table 111, the p-value is less than .05, so the Adjusted R^2 is significantly greater than zero. Resulting in that the predictor variables can account for a significant amount of variance in the attitude towards local food. So, the regression model is statistically significant as tested at $F(6,145) = 15.95$, $p < .001$, Adjusted R2 = .37.

Appendix 13: Intention - Multiple Regression on Predictor Variables

Appendix 13.1 Intention - Model Summary and Anova Table Västra Götaland (Sweden)

Intention on all predictor variables

R Square (R^2)	Adjusted R Square
.48	.45

Table 112: Model summary table of intention regressed on food safety, health consciousness, consumer's knowledge , perceived quality, concern for the environment, perceived behavioural control, concern for the local economy, context, and attitude towards local food.

a. Predictors: Food Safety, Health Consciousness, Consumer's Knowledge, Perceived Quality, Concern for the Environment, Perceived Behavioural Control, Concern for the Local Economy, Context, and Attitude Towards Local Food.

The model summary, table 112, shows different results; the important figure to look at is the Adjusted R^2. The Adjusted R^2 is .45 when rounded to two decimals and means that the variables concern for the local economy, context, and perceived behavioural control when taken together as a set account for 45% of the variance in the dependent variable intention to purchase local food.

Anova (Test using alpha = .05)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	70.91	9	7.88	15.11	.000
Residual	77.68	149	.52		
Total	148.58	158			

Table 113: Anova table of intention regressed on food safety, health consciousness, consumer's knowledge, perceived quality, concern for the environment, perceived behavioural control, concern for the local economy, context, and attitude towards local food.

The anova, table 113, continues upon the model summary table by looking at the Adjusted R^2 and seeing if it is significantly greater than zero. If the Sig (p-value) is less than .05 than the regression is significant. As can be seen

from table 113, the p-value is less than .05, so the Adjusted R^2 is significantly greater than zero. Resulting in that the independent variables can account for a significant amount of variance in the intention to purchase local food. So, the regression model is statistically significant as tested at F (9,149) = 15.11, p < .001, Adjusted R^2 = .45.

Appendix 13.2 Intention - Model Summary and Anova Table West-Flanders (Belgium)

R Square (R^2)	Adjusted R Square
.41	.40

Table 114: Model summary table of intention regressed on attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control.

a. Predictors: Attitude Towards Local Food, Subjective Norm, and Perceived Behavioural Control.

The model summary, table 114, shows different results; the important figure to look at is the Adjusted R^2. The Adjusted R^2 is .40 when rounded to two decimals and means that the significant predictor variables attitude towards local food, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control when taken together as a set account for 40% of the variance in the dependent variable intention to purchase local food.

Anova (Test using alpha = .05)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	54.82	3	18.27	39.60	.000
Residual	77.53	168	.46		
Total	132.34	171			

Table 115: Anova table of intention regressed on attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control.

The anova, table 115, continues upon the model summary table by looking at the Adjusted R^2 and seeing if it is significantly greater than zero. If the Sig (p-value) is less than .05 than the regression is significant. As can be seen from table 115, the p-value is less than .05, so the Adjusted R^2 is significantly greater than zero. Resulting in that the independent variables can account for a significant amount of variance in the intention to purchase local food. So, the regression model is statistically significant as tested at F (3,168) = 18.27, p < .001, Adjusted R^2 = .40.

Appendix 13.3 Intention - Model Summary and Anova Table Wesermarsch District (Germany)

R Square (R^2)	Adjusted R Square
.35	.33

Table 116: Model summary table of intention regressed on attitude and perceived behavioural control.

a. Predictors: Attitude Towards Local Food, Perceived Behavioural Control.

The model summary, table 116, shows different results; the important figure to look at is the Adjusted R^2. The Adjusted R^2 is .33 when rounded to two decimals and means that the significant predictor variable attitude towards local food when taken accounts for 33% of the variance in the dependent variable intention to purchase local food.

Anova (Test using alpha = .05)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	50.06	2	25.03	22.17	.000
Residual	94.83	84	1.13		
Total	144.89	86			

Table 117: Anova table of intention regressed on attitude and perceived behavioural control.

The anova, table 117, continues upon the model summary table by looking at the Adjusted R^2 and seeing if it is significantly greater than zero. If the Sig (p-value) is less than .05 than the regression is significant. As can be seen from table 117, the p-value is less than .05, so the Adjusted R^2 is significantly greater than zero. Resulting in that the independent variables can account for a significant amount of variance in the attitude towards local food. So, the regression model is statistically significant as tested at $F(2,84) = 22.17$, $p < .001$, Adjusted $R^2 = .33$.

Appendix 13.4 Intention - Model Summary and Anova Table Denmark

R Square (R^2)	Adjusted R Square
.29	.27

Table 118: Model summary table of intention regressed on attitude and perceived behavioural control.

a. Predictors: Attitude Towards Local Food and Perceived Behavioural Control.

The model summary, table 118, shows different results; the important figure to look at is the Adjusted R^2. The Adjusted R^2 is .27 when rounded to two decimals and means that the significant predictor variables attitude towards local food and perceived behavioural control when taken together as a set account for 27% of the variance in the dependent variable intention to purchase local food.

Anova (Test using alpha = .05)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	47.36	2	23.68	15.09	.000
Residual	117.68	75	1.57		
Total	165.05	77			

Table 119: Anova table of intention regressed on attitude and perceived behavioural control.

The anova, table 119, continues upon the model summary table by looking at the Adjusted R^2 and seeing if it is significantly greater than zero. If the Sig (p-value) is less than .05 than the regression is significant. As can be seen from table 119, the p-value is less than .05, so the Adjusted R^2 is significantly greater than zero. Resulting in that the independent variables can account for a significant amount of variance in the intention to purchase local food. So, the regression model is statistically significant as tested at $F(2,75) = 15.09$, $p < .001$, Adjusted $R^2 = .27$.

Appendix 13.5 Intention - Model Summary and Anova Table Northern Netherlands

R Square (R^2)	Adjusted R Square
.40	.39

Table 120: Model summary table of intention regressed on attitude and subjective norm.

a. Predictors: Attitude Towards Local Food, Subjective Norm.

The model summary, table 120, shows different results; the important figure to look at is the Adjusted R^2. The Adjusted R^2 is .39 when rounded to two decimals and means that the variables attitude towards local food and subjective norm when taken together as a set account for 39% of the variance in the dependent variable intention to purchase local food.

Anova (Test using alpha = .05)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	128.264	2	64.132	48.727	.000b
Residual	196.106	149	1.316		
Total	324.369	151			

Table 121: Anova table of intention regressed on attitude and subjective norm.

The anova, table 121, continues upon the model summary table by looking at the Adjusted R^2 and seeing if it is significantly greater than zero. If the Sig (p-value) is less than .05 than the regression is significant. As can be seen from table 121, the p-value is less than .05, so the Adjusted R^2 is significantly greater than zero. Resulting in that the independent variables can account for a significant amount of variance in the attitude towards local food. So, the regression model is statistically significant as tested at F (2,149) = 48.73, p < .001, Adjusted R Squared = .39.

Intention on all predictor variables

R Square (R^2)	Adjusted R Square
.52	.50

Table 122: Model summary table of intention regressed on concern for the environment, concern for the local economy, consumer's knowledge, subjective norm, context, attitude, health consciousness, and perceived quality.

a. Predictors: Concern for the Environment, Concern for the Local Economy, Consumer's Knowledge, Subjective Norm, Context, Attitude, Health Consciousness, and Perceived Quality.

The model summary, table 122, shows different results; the important figure to look at is the Adjusted R^2. The Adjusted R^2 is .50 when rounded to two decimals and means that the significant predictor variables concern for the local economy, consumer's knowledge, context, subjective norm, and attitude towards local food when taken together as a set account for 50% of the variance in the dependent variable intention to purchase local food.

Anova (Test using alpha = .05)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	169.31	8	21.16	19.52	.000
Residual	155.06	143	1.08		
Total	324.37	151			

Table 123: Anova table of intention regressed concern for the environment, concern for the local economy, consumer's knowledge, subjective norm, context, attitude, health consciousness, and perceived quality.

The anova, table 123, continues upon the model summary table by looking at the Adjusted R^2 and seeing if it is significantly greater than zero. If the Sig (p-value) is less than .05 than the regression is significant. As can be seen from table 123, the p-value is less than .05, so the Adjusted R^2 is significantly greater than zero. Resulting in that the independent variables can account for a significant amount of variance in the intention to purchase local food. So, the regression model is statistically significant as tested at $F(8,143) = 19.52$, $p < .001$, Adjusted $R^2 = .50$.

Appendix 14: Hypothesis Testing

Appendix 14.1 Hypothesis Testing - Västra Götaland (Sweden)

From the analyses conducted the hypothesis set out in the literature review can be tested and seen in table 124.

Hypothesis	**Supported, not supported, or excluded.**
H1: There is a positive relationship between health consciousness and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H2: There is a positive relationship between concern for the environment and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H3: There is a positive relationship between concern for the local economy and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H4: There is a positive relationship between perceived quality and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H5: There is a positive relationship between food safety and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H6: There is a positive relationship between consumer's knowledge and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H7: There is a positive relationship between information seeking and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H8: There is a positive relationship between context and attitude towards local food.	Excluded

H9: Positive attitudes toward local food will have a positive impact on the intention to purchase local food.	Not supported
H10: There is a positive relationship between subjective norm and attitude.	Excluded
H11: Subjective norm has a positive influence on the intention to purchase local food.	Excluded
H12: *There is a positive relationship between perceived behavioural control and attitude.*	Excluded
H13: *Perceived behavioural control will have a positive influence on the intention to purchase local food.*	Supported

Table 124: Hypothesis testing for Västra Götaland (Sweden).

Appendix 14.2 Hypothesis Testing - West-Flanders (Belgium)

From the analyses conducted the hypothesis set out in the literature review can be tested and seen in table 125.

Hypothesis	**Supported, not supported, or excluded.**
H1: There is a positive relationship between health consciousness and attitude towards local food.	Not supported
H2: There is a positive relationship between concern for the environment and attitude towards local food.	Supported
H3: There is a positive relationship between concern for the local economy and attitude towards local food.	Supported
H4: There is a positive relationship between perceived quality and attitude towards local food.	Supported
H5: There is a positive relationship between food safety and attitude towards local food.	Not supported
H6: There is a positive relationship between consumer's knowledge and attitude towards local food.	Excluded

H7: There is a positive relationship between information seeking and attitude towards local food.	Not supported
H8: There is a positive relationship between context and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H9: Positive attitudes toward local food will have a positive impact on the intention to purchase local food.	Supported
H10: There is a positive relationship between subjective norm and attitude.	Not supported
H11: Subjective norm has a positive influence on the intention to purchase local food.	Supported
H12: *There is a positive relationship between perceived behavioural control and attitude.*	Supported
H13: *Perceived behavioural control will have a positive influence on the intention to purchase local food.*	Supported

Table 125: Hypothesis testing for West-Flanders (Belgium).

Appendix 14.3 Hypothesis Testing - Wesermarsch District (Germany)

From the analyses conducted the hypothesis set out in the literature review can be tested and seen in table 126.

Hypothesis	**Supported, not supported, or excluded.**
H1: There is a positive relationship between health consciousness and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H2: There is a positive relationship between concern for the environment and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H3: There is a positive relationship between concern for the local economy and attitude towards local food.	Supported
H4: There is a positive relationship between perceived quality and attitude towards local food.	Not supported

H5: There is a positive relationship between food safety and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H6: There is a positive relationship between consumer's knowledge and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H7: There is a positive relationship between information seeking and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H8: There is a positive relationship between context and attitude towards local food.	Supported
H9: Positive attitudes toward local food will have a positive impact on the intention to purchase local food.	Supported
H10: There is a positive relationship between subjective norm and attitude.	Excluded
H11: Subjective norm has a positive influence on the intention to purchase local food.	Excluded
H12: *There is a positive relationship between perceived behavioural control and attitude.*	Excluded
H13: *Perceived behavioural control will have a positive influence on the intention to purchase local food.*	Supported

Table 126: Hypothesis testing for Wesermarsch District (Germany)

Appendix 14.4 Hypothesis Testing - Denmark

From the analyses conducted the hypothesis set out in the literature review can be tested and seen in table 127.

Hypothesis	**Supported, not supported, or excluded.**
H1: There is a positive relationship between health consciousness and attitude towards local food.	Supported
H2: There is a positive relationship between concern for the environment and attitude towards local food.	Excluded

H3: There is a positive relationship between concern for the local economy and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H4: There is a positive relationship between perceived quality and attitude towards local food.	Supported
H5: There is a positive relationship between food safety and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H6: There is a positive relationship between consumer's knowledge and attitude towards local food.	Supported
H7: There is a positive relationship between information seeking and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H8: There is a positive relationship between context and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H9: Positive attitudes toward local food will have a positive impact on the intention to purchase local food.	Supported
H10: There is a positive relationship between subjective norm and attitude.	Excluded
H11: Subjective norm has a positive influence on the intention to purchase local food.	Excluded
H12: *There is a positive relationship between perceived behavioural control and attitude.*	Not supported
H13: *Perceived behavioural control will have a positive influence on the intention to purchase local food.*	Supported

Table 127: Hypothesis testing for Denmark.

Appendix 14.5 Hypothesis Testing - Northern Netherlands

From the analyses conducted the hypothesis set out in the literature review can be tested and seen in table 128.

Hypothesis	**Supported, not supported, or excluded.**

H1: There is a positive relationship between health consciousness and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H2: There is a positive relationship between concern for the environment and attitude towards local food.	Not supported
H3: There is a positive relationship between concern for the local economy and attitude towards local food.	Supported
H4: There is a positive relationship between perceived quality and attitude towards local food.	Supported
H5: There is a positive relationship between food safety and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H6: There is a positive relationship between consumer's knowledge and attitude towards local food.	Supported
H7: There is a positive relationship between information seeking and attitude towards local food.	Excluded
H8: There is a positive relationship between context and attitude towards local food.	Not supported
H9: Positive attitudes toward local food will have a positive impact on the intention to purchase local food.	Supported
H10: There is a positive relationship between subjective norm and attitude.	Not supported
H11: Subjective norm has a positive influence on the intention to purchase local food.	Supported
H12: *There is a positive relationship between perceived behavioural control and attitude.*	Excluded
H13: *Perceived behavioural control will have a positive influence on the intention to purchase local food.*	Excluded

Table 128: Hypothesis testing the Northern Netherlands.