

**Customer Support for a Local Food System and a Selection of Food Produced from
Ecologically and Socially Conscious Producers**

Kristy Chu, Emily Hicks, John Spencer Bailey, Elsie-Dawn Freeda Parsons, Linda Tanaya,

Sherry Yeh

University of British Columbia

AGSC 450

April 12, 2006

Disclaimer: "UBC SEEDS provides students with the opportunity to share the findings of their studies, as well as their opinions, conclusions and recommendations with the UBC community. The reader should bear in mind that this is a student project/report and is not an official document of UBC. Furthermore readers should bear in mind that these reports may not reflect the current status of activities at UBC. We urge you to contact the research persons mentioned in a report or the SEEDS Coordinator about the current status of the subject matter of a project/report".

Scenario #3

**Customer Support for a Local Food System and a Selection of
Food Produced from Ecologically and Socially Conscious
Producers**

By Group #4

Kristy Chu
Emily Hicks
John Spencer Bailey
Elsie-Dawn Freeda Parsons
Linda Tanaya
Sherry Yeh

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	p. 3
Discussion of Paradigms.....	p. 5
Sampling Methodology.....	p. 5
Proposed Survey.....	p. 8
Development of Our Survey.....	p. 8
Proposed Forum.....	p. 10
Implementation.....	p. 11
Data Analysis.....	p. 13
Timeline.....	p. 13
Overall Budget	p. 17
Proposal.....	p. 17
Costs.....	p.17
Conclusion.....	p.17
References.....	p.19
Appendix 1.....	p. 20
2.....	p. 27
3.....	p. 27
4.....	p. 28

ABSTRACT

INTRODUCTION

Since the onset of the industrial revolution, humanity has witnessed drastic changes to our agricultural systems alongside an unprecedented fusion of economies, cultures and politics. The world is becoming increasingly interconnected, yet the connections between people and places are dissolving, along with the sense of community that once imbued local food production chains from field to plate.

Our research for the UBCFSP is a quest for consumer motives, which requires that we truly understand the role of individual consumers in shaping the global food system. After all, the environmental crisis is merely a symptom of our priorities as consumers: the global economy extracts resources largely to uphold the lifestyles in affluent nations. Consumers expect year round access to inexpensive foods from across the globe, while the real costs of industrial production, transportation and storage are externalized onto the environment. Economic systems are not so much sterile, driving forces behind human activity as they are expressions of the nature of our interactions: “economic systems are effects, not causes of human values” (Lockwood, 1999:). What is valued in a food culture will be transposed onto the systems that provide for it. The dominant food culture in western societies prioritizes cost, efficiency and variety, with wide-ranging economic, environmental and social consequences: neo-liberal free trade policies have distorted food markets across the globe through tariff rate manipulation and exploitation of cheap labor; industrial agriculture is waging war on biodiversity, polluting ecosystems and exploiting natural resources, especially soil, at highly unsustainable rates; and rural farming communities are eroding under the corporate weight of plantation

agriculture. Food production today is less an act of stewardship, guided by the capacities of the land and knowledge of the grower, but increasingly a profit-driven commodity responding to the predatory actions of international retailers and marketing firms.

The UBCFSP has operated under seven guiding principles that understand the disharmony in global food production. These principles seek to stimulate the ideas, build the unity and supply the models to allow a more equitable, ecologically minded, nutritious and sustainable food system to collectively emerge (Rojas, Richer & Wagner, 2005). Our group is continuing the efforts to assess the motives of UBC consumers by gauging their willingness and capacity to purchase local and/or organic food products. The underlying rationale is to generate a representation of consumer values by interpreting the nature of their current consumption patterns. In part, values are a function of education and awareness, which are central to creating a sustainable, local food system. As consumer consciousness expands and grasps the urgency of our seven guiding principles, societal values will begin to realign with the natural world and condemn the dominant food production model. The role of individuals in shaping a food system tells us that consumer values are one of the necessary catalysts for systemic change; therefore, to effectively proceed in redesigning a food system, we must first fully understand our target populations.

Our goal was to summarize the collective research of past AGSC 450 groups in order to create the most effective questionnaire as well as provide concise guidelines for next year's students who will conduct the survey and interpret the statistical results. This paper will discuss the rationale behind the survey design by examining the individual questions and the informative piece that accompanies them. It will also describe the

research methodology used to guide our plan of action and provide the necessary tools for effectively gauging the desirability among UBC consumers to re-localize the food system that supports our growing campus community. In addition to the survey, we have proposed the use of a forum to further engage with campus consumers and have included a tentative plan for further development and discussion during the summer session.

DISCUSSION OF PARADIGMS

We felt it was imperative that we identify our group's underlying paradigms and the philosophical perspectives that guided our approach to this study and the development of our survey methodology. The ecocentric ideals that characterize our group dynamic were the basis to our understanding of the importance of a local food system. We feel that sustainable and organic food production practices are essential to maintain human and environmental health across the globe. Our work has focused on using qualitative data concerning consumer behaviors in order to interpret and explain the social phenomena of value systems as they interact with and co-create a local food system. Since underlying social epistemologies influence all quantitative and qualitative research, identifying them strengthens the validity and quality of the research project (Myers, 1997). Although we realize that all research is naturally and unavoidably biased to some extent, awareness of our influencing paradigms helped to achieve a higher degree of objectivity and prevented the manipulation of our survey respondents.

SAMPLING METHODOLOGY

When dealing with qualitative information, such as the motives and values that drive consumption behavior in a community like UBC, just one method of surveying may be inappropriate (Hoepfl, 1997; Pandit, 1996). The five possible approaches for

collecting this type of data are: the key informant approach; the public forum approach; nominal group process approach; the Delphi technique; and the survey approach (Carter and Beaulieu, 1992). Last year's group eight thoroughly discussed the methodology behind every question they chose for the surveying approach, as well as its strengths, weaknesses and overall purpose. Although we outline the survey method later in the paper, we thought it was crucial to consider other options that might improve our analysis of the complex issues surrounding food security at UBC.

The key informant approach involves creating a list of important keystone community members that represent a larger number of community members (Carter and Beaulieu, 1992). Implementing this method would involve interviews and questionnaires handed out to informants such as our UBC Food System Project (UBCFSP) partners. The overall goal is to assess their values in regards to food security on campus. This was pursued to some extent last year when representatives from "UBC Food and Beverage Services" (UBCFBS) reviewed the format of the survey and made suggestions for its development. This certainly lends credit to the survey, but assessing where their own values lie on these issues is important as well.

We feel that the knowledge and influence of all key informants would be most appropriately harnessed by involving them in a public forum (Carter and Beaulieu, 1992). A public forum can take many forms. An ideal format would involve a panel of key informants briefly explaining their position on open-ended questions (refer to appendix 5 for example) with time allotted for dialogue with other participants. By uniting these leaders in industry and community groups and engaging them in active dialogue, we can gather a lot more qualitative information on social values. Furthermore, we are raising

awareness directly through the initial experience and indirectly through the extension of knowledge that would pass between other community members.

The purpose of the ‘nominal group process approach’ is to address distinct societal issues, prioritize them, and come up with definite solutions in a brainstorming session with all the participants. While this purpose appears very useful, we felt that implementation would be unfeasible due to the lack of willing participants (Carter and Beaulieu, 1992). We hope that the majority of the benefits of this approach will be obtained through the forum approach. The ‘Delphi Technique’ has also proven to be very successful at addressing a particular problem, such as increased population pressure on campus. It would involve distributing a questionnaire to a group of respondents, asking them to identify problems, causes, solutions, and actions in relation to a specific issue. Once the respondents’ ideas are summarized, they are resubmitted in a ‘feedback’ report to the same group, who would then have the chance to prioritize or rank the input from the first round (Carter and Beaulieu, 1992). In our case, we decided this technique was not feasible because of the high degree of participation required by the focus group. The trial runs of last year’s survey found that open-ended questions were often left blank, indicating either a lack of knowledge or general disinterest. This suggests that the ‘Delphi Technique’ might be too intensive, requiring an unrealistic amount of commitment from participants.

Our group felt that while the survey proposed by last year’s group was well articulated and adequately served its purpose of evaluating the willingness to support and/or enjoy local foods offered on campus, the issues at hand were not explored to their highest potential. A more complete comprehension of the ‘complex and dynamic

qualities of the social world' in a community like UBC, a more interactive approach has a higher demand (Hoepfl, 1997). Hoepfl (1997), argues that incorporating group-based forums is crucial when dealing with these systems, especially if issues need to be raised that haven't been identified yet. Our group proposes that by coupling this group-based form of qualitative data collection, the synergy proposed by Pandit (1996) resulting from multiple collection techniques, would be evident to better understand the issues surrounding food security on campus. After all, it is the intentions driving community members that help co-create the food system.

PROPOSED SURVEY

Development of Survey

In order to further develop the survey, we incorporated group eight's recommendations from their pilot study in 2005 as well as the recommendations from our partners from UBCFS and AMSFBD. In terms of specific survey content, a specific recommendation made by group eight was to change the format of question 15, previously numbered question 11, since it was confusing to those respondents in the pilot study.

Old version of question:

11) Place in order of importance to you the following features of a food item

(Indicate by numbering from 1-3 in order where 1 is the most important)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Organic
<input type="checkbox"/>	Price
<input type="checkbox"/>	Convenience
<input type="checkbox"/>	BC Grown
<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair Trade
<input type="checkbox"/>	Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	In Season

In order to solve this problem, we reduced the number of choices offered to rank from seven to five. We felt that these five categories: price, organic, locally produced, convenience/location and appearance/quality, were adequate to reflect the purchasing preferences of consumers, but not too many to overwhelm or confuse people.

New version of question:

15) What are the top three factors that influence your food purchasing choices?

(Please rank them in order, 1 being the top influence)

- _____ Price
- _____ Organic
- _____ Convenience/Location
- _____ Locally Produced
- _____ Appearance/Quality

It was also mentioned that many of the open-ended questions were left blank; however, the answers that were received provided very useful and insightful information. In order to address this concern, we removed the following open-ended question:

14) How would you define locally produced foods?

Since we define ‘locally produced foods’ in the list of definitions at the beginning of the survey this question was no longer necessary. In addition, these definitions also made it easier to answer the two remaining open-ended questions. None of the new questions added to the survey were in open-ended format.

The newly developed questions were created in response to the recommendations made by our UBCFSP partners in order to assess the desirability of consumers to purchase local, organic, free range and fair trade foods, as well as questions to assess current purchasing behaviors (Beck et al., 2005). The rationale behind these new questions (#4,5,6,7,8 and 16) and the questions retained from last year’s survey can be found in **Appendix 1**.

Additionally, it was suggested that we develop an informative ‘prose’ piece about the benefits of local foods to appear at the beginning of our questionnaire. We decided against this suggestion since we felt that it would influence peoples’ answers and impede our goal of generating a true reflection of current food knowledge and beliefs among the target populations. Instead, we provided a short list of simple definitions at the beginning of the survey and an unbiased, informative table mid-way through the survey, which includes 5 benefits of both local and global food production systems. We did this because we realize that not everyone is aware of the local versus global concept and wanted to provide some insight before asking the open-ended questions. In addition, we recognized the potential for this survey to be an educational tool for developing awareness about food and its ecological and social implications. By providing five broad benefits of both local and global food, we feel that the answers will be a truer reflection of what people value more in accordance with their current interpretations and awareness of food production systems. Finally, questions #2, 14 and 15 in our survey were reworded and reformatted from the original #2, 20 and 21 to enhance their clarity (See **Appendix 1**).

PROPOSED FORUM

The public forum is the only extra method of qualitative analysis we are proposing due to time, labor and money constraints. We felt that a public forum is quintessential in assessing and advertising the food security issues that are currently challenging the UBC community. The goal of this forum should be to engage in open dialogue with UBCFSP partners and community members and collect qualitative data pertaining to their motives and values surrounding food. The fact that open-ended

questions were the most valuable yet least answered of last year's pilot study points to the limitations of multiple choice questionnaires and the need for a deeper probing into consumer behaviors. Through the help of a facilitator, this approach will generate the desired discussion of broader issues related to food security that can't be addressed in simple surveys. It should be well advertised in order to promote community participation. Incentives such as specialty foods (organic and/or local to keep with the theme), musical performances (UBC music school, campus-based bands), or inspirational guest speakers could serve the multiple purposes of fund raising, raising awareness, creating solutions to problems and making the issues more visible on campus. Food and social components such as these should occur after the forum to ensure that people with busy schedules can attend just for the forum. Our group felt that involving First Nations representatives from campus and perhaps conducting the forum in the longhouse would be a great way to reflect on our roots and ancestors while building community cohesion.

IMPLEMENTATION

In terms of changes made to the surveying technique, we decided that a web-based survey is most feasible, as group eight had recommended. The reasons for this choice are that it is cost effective, there is a higher and faster response to online surveys compared to other methods and it reaches two large groups of our proposed stratum: AMS customers and UBC Food Services consumers (Websurveyor Corporation, 2006). We also favored this surveying technique as it would reduce the use of paper and therefore be more environmentally sustainable. Another reason for choosing the web-based survey is that it is ideal for our chosen stratified sampling technique. Our three

target strata include students and faculty that live on campus, students and faculty that live off campus and non-student/faculty residents of UBC (refer to **Appendix 1** question #1). The web-based survey will reach most of our targeted population: students and faculty living both on and off campus. The manager of AMS UBC Food and Beverage Services, Nancy Toogood, was contacted in regards to using student body websites for the use of our survey; unfortunately contact was not established at the time of writing this paper. The General Manager of UBC Food Services, Dorothy Yip, responded to our question regarding the possible use of contact lists for our online survey administration. Since the UBC Food Services does not have these desired lists, she suggested that Nancy Toogood might be able to provide this resource in the form of student body websites. Our sample also includes those people that may just be residents of the UBC campus with no other affiliations. In order to reach this group, we have proposed that 75 surveys be distributed in the UBC village to those people who appear to be residents. We can ensure success by politely asking people if they are residents of UBC and what their affiliations are, and refrain from handing over a survey unless they meet the criteria.

Additionally, in order to provide incentive to take part in the survey, we have suggested that those completing the survey have their name entered into a draw for a prize. A local Point Grey restaurant, called *Enigma*, has agreed to be a survey sponsor and will provide a \$25 gift certificate for the winner (See Appendix 4 for contact info and further information). Other good sponsor might include ‘Sprouts’ in the SUB or the ‘UBC Bookstore’ so they should be contacted early on to discuss the possibility of donating a gift certificate in exchange for their logo appearing at the beginning of the survey.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The statistical analysis of the information collected is crucial to the objectives of this proposal. Kathy Baylis from Food and Resource Economics (FRE) was contacted for her opinion and possible participation in the analysis of information collected from the survey and the forum. She agreed to help with the statistical analysis of results if needed and to contact her when these results were obtained. Our group felt that having a directed studies student work extensively with the data set would be the more effective way to handle this aspect of the proposal. This student would be integral to the project: the information must be compiled into a usable and meaningful format, allowing it to be shared among community members and provide a basis for action. Concise analysis and meaningful interpretation are paramount. Professors Rick Barichello and Sumeet Gulati were contacted for potential participation as supervisors for this directed studies student. Both emphasized how a directed studies student was a great idea to address analysis of this form, but felt they were not qualified to deal with this level of statistics. Dr. Barichello was very pleased to have been contacted and expressed interest in acting as a contact person in this project for help given where he could. He also recommended we contact Kathy Baylis for the technicalities of data analysis. This was done but a response is still pending. With her recent interest expressed on related aspects of our proposal we suspect she will be a beneficial contact.

TIMELINE (see Appendix 2)

The set timeline for students implementing the survey is laid out over ten weeks of a semester system, much like that of Agsci 450. This project is essentially initiated in the summer months when there is a workshop held with UBCFS partners to discuss this

year's conclusions. During this workshop it is crucial that Liska Richer proposes the forum and asks the key informants to pencil a date in on their calendar for the following spring. Hopefully, this will ensure their participation. Week four of the semester will be week one of the project where groups will choose and be assigned their scenarios. The tasks of the groups assigned our scenario will be to read over four papers: our paper, group 4 2006; 2005's group 8, 2004 Sauder School of Business available on the course website and "Choosing Qualitative Research: A Primer for Technology Education Researchers" available at <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JTE/v9n1/hoepfl.html#strauss>. These readings are recommended so the group has background knowledge of the UBCFSP and the prior work and effort involved. The readings should be completed within a week so that the group will be ready to implement the research thereafter.

Week two should begin with assigning a group member to be "social coordinator": to contact all outside partners. This member should contact our UBCFSP partner Nancy Toogood at AMS to send out our developed survey online to all of her student email contacts. Ideally, this survey will be conducted in January so those first year students in residents have a semester to gather knowledge and experience of food availability on campus to offer an adequate opinion. These surveys will be sent out to a large population of students.

Also during week two the group can discuss qualitative research approaches, outline focus group and forum research, and what the main goal of the research will be.

During the time when the group is waiting for responses, they can photocopy around 75 paper questionnaires (see **Appendix 1**) to hand out at the UBC village. These

written questionnaires will be handed out during weeks three and four of the UBCFSP. The student's budget will come from the proposal of our paper to redeem a dollar from photocopy fees collected from Agsci 450 students each year. This may cause a dollar increase in the photocopy fees, but it would allow the group an estimated two hundred dollars to allot to research and forum development.

Week three will start with group members setting up a table in the village and requesting residents to fill out the survey. We estimated from last year's formula, $N = N/1 + N(e)^2$, that the number of total surveys needed to be returned to get significant results would be 400. From our online surveys, we expect a larger number; therefore we estimated that fifty to seventy five responses in the village would be adequate. Some group members maybe able to allocate some work time in the class to collect surveys, as street surveying is notorious for taking time to collect data.

The social coordinator should also contact the Agriculture Undergraduate Society about the funding available to rent out a room in the SUB or the longhouse for the forum. Using Agora after a Wednesday night BBQ is also an option.

Week four would consist of finishing up data collection from both online surveys and handout surveys, finalizing a list of open-ended discussion questions to be brought up at the forum, and encouraging all stakeholders to participate in open dialogue. The group should also meet with someone in the faculty such as the AGUS president, a TA or professor who has conducted a similar event in order to receive feedback about questions and the running of the event.

Week five would consist of finalizing forum details such as the food, the room, the delegates and the questions discussed. Ideally, the forum would be set around four or

five o'clock in the afternoon so that all participants could attend the Wednesday night BBQ afterwards. A group member could approach the AGUS about sponsoring the dinner, or not charging the special guests. Afterwards it would be up to the group to provide refreshments (tea, coffee, etc.). In this way, the implementation of the forum will not be too costly.

Week six, create posters to advertise the forum. Posters should be distributed across the campus to different faculties as well as to the SUB, the farm, the Village, and residences such as Totem Park, Vanier, and Gage. As well, advertisements should be posted as announcements on webCT and through AGUS email. Ask people to RSVP at certain email address to get an idea of how many participants are interested.

Week seven will simply be the implementation of the forum. We suggest that two group members lead the forum with questions followed by discussion. The rest of the group members can act a recorder, recording the responses to the questions.

In week eight the data from the forum, online surveys and handout surveys should be analyzed. Then the next step will be to review the results and establish any new ideas, interesting patterns and recommendations that can be made to the UBCFSP.

Week nine will consist of publishing the results and recommendations. A discussion with our partners, the TA's and the professors concerning the findings of the surveys and forum should be held in order to get feedback on the implementation of recommendations.

In week ten the group will present the findings as a powerpoint presentation to the class, the partners and any other participants of the forum that want to attend.

Overall budget proposal: (see Appendix 3)

A dollar increase in AgSci 450 course fees: based on an estimation of class members in 2005, the group would receive \$192 to implement their research.

Costs:

Survey double sided four cents a pages times three pages is eighteen dollars. One hundred dollars could be spent on two fifty dollars gift certificates given as prizes to randomly chosen participants. The remaining seventy-four dollars could be spent on purchasing five dollars dinner for up to twelve key participants in the forum, which would be sixty dollars each. Fourteen dollars could be spent making posters (photocopying and poster paper) as well as buying tea and coffee for the forum.

CONCLUSION

In the midst of drastic structural changes to local and global food production, which threatens human, animal and environmental health, there exists an intricate network of consumer value. Consumers are co-creators of the food systems that provide for them, shaping the nature of food procurement through their purchasing behaviors. Since the UBC Food System is a microcosm of its global counterpart, understanding the motives and roles of consumers in our campus community will afford us a more comprehensive understanding of collective consumer influence on a larger scale (Rojas, Richer & Wagner, 2005). With this knowledge, we are developing strategies to address local issues that are applicable to comparable issues in the wider arena of global food production. Our methodological approach is also relevant to other small-scale, community initiatives that seek to explore human motivations and values related to food, as

a stepping stone towards a more secure and sustainable food production system. Our group proposes that the surveying method be the cornerstone in the qualitative analysis of consumer values and purchasing behaviors within the UBC community. The purpose, approach and method of implementation have been thoroughly discussed throughout this paper. As a complement to the questionnaire, we also included tentative plans for an interactive forum, which can provide a more comprehensive understanding of consumer behaviors while expanding the data set available for interpretation. Furthermore, we feel the forum approach will help create a stronger foundation for positive change by encouraging community involvement in food security initiatives and raising awareness of important food system issues (Carter and Beaulieu, 1992). Throughout this project, our group has remained grounded to the greater vision of creating a more secure, locally defined and sustainable food production system. In such, we have helped develop a surveying method tailored to the needs of other AGSC 450 groups and proposed the use of a participatory forum to generate local knowledge and enhance the capacity for local action.

REFERENCES

- Beck, M., Chu, Luke., Ho, A., Lee, G., Nimmo, J., Steele, K., and Yeh, T. (2005). Desirability of Re-localization. Retrieved February 20th 2006 from http://www.webct.ubc.ca/SCRIPT/agsc_450/scripts/student/serve_bulletin
- Carter, K.A. and Beaulieu, L. J. (1992). Conducting a Community Needs Assessment: Primary Data Collection Techniques. *The Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences*.
- Hoepfl, M. (1997). Choosing Qualitative Research: A Primer for Technology Education Researchers. *Journal of Technology Education*. 9 (1). Retrieved March 20th 2006 from <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JTE/v9n1/strauss#strauss>
- Lockwood, Jeffrey. (1999). Agriculture and Biodiversity: Finding Our Place in this World. *Agriculture and Human Values*. 16: 365-379.
- Myers, M. D. "Qualitative Research in Information Systems," *MIS Quarterly* (21:2), June 1997, pp. 241-242. MISQ Discovery, archival version, June 1997, http://www.misq.org/discovery/MISQD_isworld/. MISQ Discovery, updated version, last modified: www.qual.auckland.ac.nz
- Pandit. (1996). The Creation of Theory: A Recent Application of the Grounded Theory Method. *The Qualitative Report*. 2 (4). Retrieved March 20th 2006 from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR2-4/pandit.html>
- Rojas, A., Richer, L. & Wagner, J. (2005). The Dreaming and the Making of a Sustainable University Food System: The University of British Columbia Food System Project (UBCFSP). Retrieved on February 5th from <http://www.landfood.ubc.ca/courses/agsc/450/project/files/pressandpublications.htm>
- Websurveyor corporation (2006). Comparison of Traditional vs. Online Survey Methods. Retrieved April 4th 2006 from <http://www.websurveyor.com/pdf/WebvsMail.pdf#search='Comparison%20of%20Traditional%20vs.%20Online%20Survey%20Methods.%20WebSurveyor%20Corporation.'>

Appendix 1 - Survey (with question rationale included)

Please take a moment to fill out this important survey on consumer preferences and knowledge towards food.

Some helpful Definitions:

Organic Farming:

A method of agricultural production that is free of pesticides, fertilizers and other synthetic chemical inputs. It operates in harmony with the surrounding ecosystem and seeks to maintain biodiversity.

Free Range Eggs:

Eggs produced by chickens that are free from hunger, thirst, pain and distress. Instead of being caged, these chickens are able to roam freely in an outdoor environment and fully express their natural behavioural patterns.

Fair Trade:

Items that are purchased at above-average prices to reflect actual production costs and ensure fair returns to producers. Especially important in developing countries where export markets are distorted by international trade agreements.

Local Food:

Food produced close to home. Although no precise universal definition exists, for the purpose of this survey, we have decided to use 'food grown within BC'.

Food mile:

A measure of the distance food must travel from the farm to your plate.



~Survey Start~

<p>1) Are you a:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> UBC Undergraduate Student</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> UBC Faculty Member</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> UBC Staff</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> UBC Graduate Student</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>	<p>Department: _____</p> <p>Gender: M / F</p> <p>Age (Please circle one):</p> <p>18 & under 19-30 31-55 56 & over</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Questions 1 to 3 are retained from the original survey because they allow us to sort the respondents into the proposed strata. The first question is to identify different demographic groups of UBC consumers. The information is useful for the UBC Food System Project to determine which groups of people show particular interests to local food on campus and it provides a starting point for action.

<p>2) Where do you live?</p> <p>On Campus: <input type="checkbox"/> Totem/Vanier <input type="checkbox"/> Off Campus _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) _____</p>

It is important to distinguish between people who live on campus, and are regular UBC Food Service customers, and those who live off campus, who are less frequent or potential customers. Distinguishing between residence and non-residence populations is also important since the former probably consume most of their meals at residence cafeterias, while the latter is more likely to purchase meals from UBC Food Service outlets.

<p>3) How many times a week do you purchase food on campus, including The Village? (Groceries and/or prepared foods or meals)</p> <p>0 1-3 4-6 7-9 10+</p>

This question is an extension of question 2 in that it attempts to discover more specifically consumer purchasing behaviors. People who frequently purchase food on campus are of special interest to all UBC Food Service outlets as they provide an opinionated foundation for improvement. Furthermore, we can compare answers with the previous demographics to uncover why an off campus resident rarely purchases food on campus for example.

4)

a. Are you aware of the availability of these selections of food in your local grocery store?

	Yes	No
Fair Trade	_____	_____
Free Range	_____	_____
Organic	_____	_____

b. If yes, do you prefer them to regular food selections?

_____Yes _____No

c. Would you like to see Fair Trade, Free Range and/or Organic products in UBC food outlets?

_____Yes _____No

d. If you had a choice, disregarding price, would you purchase Fair Trade, Free Range and Organic foods:

Always (every time you shop)	_____	
Never		_____
Depends (specify)	_____	

Consumer behaviours help shape the food system since retail supply responds to consumer demand, with ramifications throughout the production supply chain; therefore, individual awareness is a crucial consideration for our study. We decided to use the terms 'Fair Trade' and 'Free Range' in isolation of specific products since people might associate them with a unique item, unaware that they apply to a wide range of food items. Answers to questions 4b, c and d will reflect values in purchasing behaviours and allow us to assess the willingness of people to buy these items. It shows whether or not people who are aware of these items are willing to pay for them. This information is important because it helps us determine whether increasing awareness will lend itself to more local purchasing patterns

5)

a. How often do you purchase groceries from large supermarkets such as Safeway, Save-On-Foods, the Canadian Superstore, or IGA?

Always_____ Over half the time_____ Under half the time_____ Never_____

b. Why do you purchase your groceries at these places?

Quality_____ Price_____ Location_____ Other (specify)_____

Big-box food retailers and multinational supermarkets operate with price and efficiency as their bottom line and therefore source their products globally and are less likely to offer a variety of local and organic foods. Every food purchase involves a moral decision because it embodies an approval or disregard for the ethical and environmental dimensions of that item's production evolution. It is important to know why people shop at these stores because the alternatives can often be less convenience or more expensive.

6)

a. How often do you purchase groceries from small, privately owned stores?

Always_____ Over half the time_____ Under half the time_____ Never_____

b. Why do you shop at these places?

Quality_____ Price_____ Location_____ Other (specify)_____

c. How do you access these places?

Car_____ Bus_____ Bike_____ Foot_____ Other (specify)_____

These questions build on the previous inquiry into what type of establishment the respondent's dollar is supporting and the reasons for doing so. We might find that purchasing behaviours are driven entirely by convenience of location or price.

7) How often do you eat fruits and vegetables from UBC food services, including the sub and residence cafeterias?

Every day _____ Once a week _____ Once a month _____ Never _____

8) What is your most frequented and favourite food service outlet on campus?

Most frequented _____

Reason:

The type of food/service _____ Location _____ Price _____

Favourite _____

Reason:

The type of food/service _____ Location _____ Price _____

Although this question may seem redundant, a person's most frequented food service outlet is not necessarily their favorite. Someone might purchase food from Starbucks most often because of its proximity to their classrooms, but prefer an independent food outlet such as the Pendulum for its variety of food choices. We felt the distinction was important, especially considering the highly uneven distribution of food outlets across campus.

9) Are there benefits to eating/purchasing locally produced food?

10) What might be the drawbacks of eating locally produced food?

Questions eleven and twelve are taken from last year questionnaire, and they both accomplished several things. First, these questions will determine the panelists' knowledge about locally produced food, how well they know about the advantages and disadvantages of the locally produced food. Second, these questions will give us an illustration of the panelists' opinion about locally produced food. Although some people may not answer these open-ended questions, our group decided to keep these questions because many valuable ideas and interesting thoughts were given by respondents. It was important that these open-ended questions appear before the informative piece to find out the respondent's attitudes based solely on previous opinion. This also prevents the repetition of the ideas from the informative piece.

11) Which do you feel is more important?

_____ The distance that food has traveled

_____ The country in which the food is produced

This question builds on defining local food and gauges the respondent's consideration of transportation costs, emissions and the ideas of nationalism. There may be political or ethical reasons why consumers chose not to purchase from specific countries, even though these products are geographically closer and therefore less environmentally damaging than similar products sourced domestically.

Benefits of an Industrial, Global Food System:

- Year-round access to a wide variety of fresh foods
- Competition between retailers brings inexpensive prices to consumers
- Product uniformity and dependability through branding
- Highly efficient: mechanized labor on large-scale plantations
- International trade allows producers to have access to foreign markets

Benefits of a Local, Organic Food System:

- Purchases support local growers, producers and entire communities
- Less shipping: minimized transportation costs and carbon dioxide emissions
- Food is healthy and safe: no chemical dependencies and less handling
- Local labor laws ensure fair returns to growers, processors and manual workers
- Promotes Food Democracy: local control over food regulations and standards

According to *2005 UBC Food System Project Report*, questions left unanswered are due to several reasons: participants did not have sufficient English language skills to answer questions sufficiently, participants did not have sufficient knowledge, and participants disdain the questions.

As a result, this piece of information is provided for the purpose of giving the panelists some background information about the benefits of an industrial, global food system compared to benefits of a local, organic food system. By comparing both of the benefits of those food systems, panelists will be more informed and aware about global and local food systems before they answer the next several questions.

For the remaining questions, locally produced food will refer to food grown within British Columbia

This statement is added to the questionnaire because our group found that there were several different definitions of locally produced food in terms of the distance that food has to travel. Therefore, in order to get the same way of knowing of locally produced food between panelists, it is important to provide our panelists with a clear, concise, and uniform definition of locally produced food.

12) Would knowing a food item was produced locally encourage you to purchase it if it was the same price as an identical item produced outside the province?

_____Yes _____No _____Neutral

This question is also taken from last year questionnaire; it was developed to determine respondent's preferences for local and global foods. Its purpose is to evaluate panellist's desirability of consuming local food as compared to global food when price is not a concern.

13) At the cost of eating fewer imported foods (like bananas), would you be willing to eat more locally produced food (like apples)?

_____Yes _____No _____Neutral

This question was taken from last year questionnaire; it was developed to determine whether people are willing to pay more for local food.

14) If it were to cost more to offer locally produced foods at UBC food outlets, for example, local apple = \$1.25/lb vs. imported apple \$1.00/lb, would you be willing to pay the extra for the locally grown apple?

This question is from last year questionnaire, but we modified by adding specific examples, for the purpose of giving panelists an illustration to compare local food price and imported food price. However, we find that there is a controversy for this question; we are not sure whether or not locally produced foods at UBC food outlets are more expensive than imported foods. Our group decided to put this question in the questionnaire only to assess the panelist's desirability and willingness to buy and consume locally produced food compared to imported/global food.

**15) What are the top three factors that influence your food purchasing choices?
(Please rank them in order)**

_____Price
_____Organic
_____Convenience/location
_____Locally Grown

This question was originally from last year questionnaire, but the factors that influence people's purchasing choices are modified. Our group felt that factors were too specific and could be represented in the broader categories, which are price, organic,

convenience/location. This question was developed in order to determine where local food fits in people's priorities, compared to the others factors affecting purchasing behaviour.

16) Are you aware of locally produced items at your local grocery store?

This question was developed in order to determine panelist's awareness of the availability of local food at their grocery store. This will give us some information of whether they are interested in purchasing and consuming local food.

Appendix 2 – Table 1: Timeline of Project Implementation

Week One	Group reads assigned readings
Week Two	Assign a social coordinator Send out online surveys Photocopy surveys Discuss main goals of research
Week Three	Find room to implement forum research Hand out surveys in village
Week Four	Finish data collection Meet with TA, professor or AGUS president on advice for running a forum
Week Five	Finalize forum details (delegates, food, room etc)
Week Six	Create and post posters advertising forum
Week Seven	Implement forum
Week Eight	Collect and analyze results from forum, online and handout surveys
Week Nine	Publish results and recommendations. Discuss with project partners, TA's, classmates and professors about implementation of recommendations.
Week Ten	Present power point presentation to class on findings and recommendations to the UBCFSP.

APPENDIX 3 - Table 2: Budget Summary

Item	Cost
Photocopying	Surveys- \$18 Posters- \$ 7
Wednesday night BBQ (12 guests)	12 x \$5= \$60

Gift Certificates	Enigma Restaurant -\$ 25 (donated)
	Sage Restaurant-\$ 50
	UBC bookstore- \$ 50
Refreshments	Coffee and Tea -\$10
<u>Total Cost</u>	\$ 200 (donated and collected from course fees)

APPENDIX 4 – Contact Information

Contact List

Alejandro Rojas
AGSC 450 Instructor

████████████████████
████████████████

Nancy Toogood
AMS Food Services
<http://www.ams.ubc.ca/content.cfm?ID=291>

Andrew Parr and Dorothy Yip
UBC Food Services
<http://www.foodserv.ubc.ca/>

Brenda Sawada
UBC SEEDS
<http://www.sustain.ubc.ca/seeds.html>

Dr. Freda Pagani
UBC Office of Campus Sustainability
<http://www.sustain.ubc.ca/>

Mark Bomford
Project coordinator UBC Farm
<http://www.landfood.ubc.ca/ubcfarm/>

Incentives

Enigma Bar & Restaurant
4397 West 10th Avenue (at Trimble)

████████████████████
████████████████████
████████████████

Spencer Bailey ([REDACTED]) from this working group has already been in contact with the manager of Enigma, Hiram Buchman, regarding the contribution of a \$25 gift certificate in exchange for sponsorship of the web-based questionnaire. This would probably involve pasting the Enigma logo and contact information on the cover page of the questionnaire, which would also let respondents know of their chances to win if they complete all the questions. Contact Hiram via email and let him know who you are and discuss the arrangements. Feel free to contact Spencer if you have any questions prior to making contact at Enigma.

Sprouts

Elana Cossever (President)

Terra Kaethler, Alison Dyck (Managers)

Located on lower level of Student Union Building (SUB)

<http://www.ams.ubc.ca/clubs/nfc/?page=store>

[REDACTED]

Sage Bistro

John Flipse Manager

<http://www.sage.ubc.ca/>

Statistic Analysis

Katherine Baylis, PhD

Assistant Professor, Agroecology

Food & Resource Economics Group

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dr. Baylis has expressed her interest in working with next years group to analyze the qualitative data collected. Although she did not respond with a commitment to supervising a directed studies student, she would be a great contact to get a start on this endeavor.

Rick. Barichello, D. Phil

Associate Professor, Food Nutrition & Health

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dr. Barichello expressed interest in participating in this project but felt he was not qualified for the position of supervisor for the analysis of this type of data.

APPENDIX 5 – Forum Discussion Questions

- A) What does the term LOCAL mean to you?
- B) Do you think the people you represent or yourself would be open to an educational campaign pertaining to local and organic food choices?
- C) What are the possible benefits that you can see of adopting more locally grown foods into our food outlets?
- D) In your opinion, what types of circumstances or forces prevent the adoption of more locally grown food into your food outlets?