

Developing a Sustainable UBC Food System Scenario 3: Customer Support for a Local Food System and Food Produced from Ecologically and Socially Conscious Producers

Jennifer Blades, Cindy Chow, Manpreet Dhaliwal, Sienna Huang, Victoria Lo, Oscar

Pottinger, Annie Tsang

University of British Columbia

AGSC 450

April 14, 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".

Developing a Sustainable UBC Food System

Scenario 3:

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

AGSC 450
April 14, 2006

Group 9:

Jennifer Blades
Cindy Chow
Manpreet Dhaliwal
Sienna Huang
Victoria Lo
Oscar Pottinger
Annie Tsang

Abstract:

The ultimate goal of the UBC Food Systems Project is to increase the sustainability of the university food system. One step towards achieving this goal involves re-localization of our foodstuffs. Consequently, our task in 2006 was to develop a survey to assess the desirability and feasibility of re-localization on campus along with current purchasing behaviors, and to further determine willingness to purchase foods produced by socially and ecologically conscious producers. This survey has been built upon a foundation provided by our colleagues over the past several years and finalized through integration of information provided through a pilot test made up of both a class and a field survey. Further, funding, incentives and survey implementation have been organized to ensure success. Collectively, the resulting survey can be implemented in the fall of 2006, through either student distribution or a web based survey, to provide statistically relevant results to our partners in food services on campus to move towards a more sustainable food system here at UBC.

Background and Introduction

Residents of Vancouver, as in most developed countries, have come to expect year round availability of a wide array of food items from all over the world.⁹ To meet consumer demands, four important developments have taken place on a global level: 1) the building and maintenance of a transportation infrastructure with low direct cost; 2) intensification of agricultural technology; 3) widespread commitment to global free trade policy; and 4) vertical and horizontal consolidation and centralization of the corporate food system.⁴ Food items that arrive on UBC campus, for the most part, will travel between 2500-4000 km before it reaches our plates.² While the globalization of our food system seems economically efficient, the foods are artificially cheap. The physical distancing of food from producers to consumers has caused many negative externalities that consumers do not pay for directly.² Consequently, our food system is deemed socially, environmentally and economically unsustainable.

The environmental and ecological costs include the release of carbon emissions, which contribute to global warming, depletion of wildlife habitat, loss of genetic diversity and soil quality, and increased ground and water pollution. Social costs include the distancing of consumers from producers and a disparity in the distribution of wealth. Economic costs include

declining profit margins for farmers, along with increased costs of extenuating environmental impacts, and global food transport.⁷

One of the main issues faced on UBC campus is feeding its growing population in a sustainable fashion. According to the University of British Columbia Food System Project (UBCFSP) guiding principles, re-localization will help improve the sustainability of the food system here at UBC.⁹ One step towards doing so is determining if it is feasible for food outlets to use locally produced food. We need to ensure that there is consumer willingness to buy locally produced food, which will essentially offer security to those providing food. The purpose of last year's questionnaire was to determine the willingness of UBC residents to buy and pay more for local foods; this year we have added two new objectives to the survey: 1) to assess the level of desirability among UBC consumers to purchase a selection of food produced from ecologically and socially conscious producers and 2) to assess current purchasing behaviours, rather than just attitudes, towards these products.

The final results from this survey can be presented to UBC food outlets to encourage incorporation of both local foods and foods produced by ecologically and socially conscious producers. As a group, we understand that the underlying motivation for most businesses is profits, however, we also realize that change is possible provided that the economic situation is not negatively affected. We believe that food outlets will be more likely to change the food they provide if results determine there is a demand for them on campus.

Value Assumption

We, as a group, acknowledge that being brought up in an economically centered world causes people to be anthropocentric. Since human beings drive food production and food security is of great concern worldwide, we look at situations through this anthropocentric view. However, being educated in the Faculty of Land and Food Systems, our group holds a weaker

anthropocentric paradigm and takes into consideration a biocentric viewpoint, as it is important to promote the conservation of our natural environment and its resources.

Vision Statement:

The seven principles for a sustainable food system at UBC have been created through 3 years of UBCFSP to guide sustainability of the UBC food system. These principles act as a framework to achieve sustainability and must be able to provoke people to analyze and potentially change the way they perceive their food system and environment. Through our pilot studies, we realized that the vast majority of people do not fully understand the meaning of local, organic, fair trade, and free-range foods. Therefore, although we agree with the basis of the principles, we believe an emphasis should be placed on promoting education, awareness, and understanding of what a sustainable food system is and its impacts on the rest of the community.

Group 8 of AGSCI 450 suggested adding an 8th principle: “to address the issue of looking at the UBC food system in a global context and being aware of the reciprocal impacts the UBC food system and those systems around it have on one another”. We would like to expand on this 8th principle, by suggesting a global use for the UBCFSP. If our vision is met, we will have a sustainable UBC food system, and it should act as a working model for other communities, cities and eventually countries. Thus, the global community can move closer to the ultimate goal of food security.

With this vision in mind, the goal of this paper is to provide guidelines to conduct a survey determining consumer attitudes and behaviors in the fall of 2006. After reviewing previous AGSCI 450 questionnaires, our group created a preliminary version that was administered to other AGSCI 450 students, modified as per suggestions, and re-tested in a field study using UBC campus consumers. We will review the responses and provide a discussion of these results. Our paper will also describe a plan of action to have the survey administered in the

fall of 2006. Finally, we will provide recommendations to next year's group and the AGSCI 450 teaching team regarding analysis and the back-up online survey.

Sampling Technique

The purpose of using questionnaires and surveys is to determine the attributes and dynamics of a certain population.¹⁴ In our case, in order to assess the desirability of consuming sustainable foods and the current purchasing behaviors among UBC consumers, a target population must be established. Upon reviewing previous years' research on this topic we decided that our population should be customers at food outlets on the UBC campus. By accurately sampling the target population of all UBC food consumers, we should be able to derive the population characteristics needed for the UBCFSP. Group 8 of AGSCI 450 2005, encountered a problem when defining the scope of the target population and assessing the boundaries of the UBC food system. Our group, similar to previous ASGCI 450 groups, decided to limit the survey to areas where people can purchase food on campus, this includes private residences, the food outlets in the University Village, and all other campus food outlets.

It is unrealistic to poll all UBC consumers individually, so our group, like group 1 and 8 of the 2004 and 2005 AGSCI 450 class respectively, decided on a proportional stratified random sample of the target population. This form of sampling divides the entire population into strata, which are then sampled relative to the entire population.⁸ While this allows for a more detailed analysis of the entire population, as previous groups pointed out, it is hard to get a completely random sample of each stratum. Since we plan to administer the survey face-to-face, the data will be type of convenience sampling called quota sampling. Quota sampling is similar to stratified sampling in that the target populations is divided into strata, but the strata are sampled either by convenience or judgment.⁹ Because individuals chosen for the survey are not selected randomly, judging the accuracy of the results cannot be done with standard error and confidence.

Therefore the survey will be used as an exploratory investigation and can be analyzed to extrapolate pertinent information. This must be taken into account when analyzing the final results of the survey.

To determine the strata, our group looked into the revenue of various areas around campus. Through revenue analysis, we were able to derive the amount of consumer activity in certain areas (Appendix 1). Thus, we divided the campus into 7 locations for questionnaire distribution: The S.U.B., UBC Village, Totem Park Dining Room, Vanier Dining Room, Gage Towers, Trek Express area, and Sage Bistro. These areas represent 2/3 of our target population, which makes it more representative of the total UBC consumer population.²

Sample Size

An accurate sample size will allow the analyzers of the information to suggest different characteristics among the UBC consumers.⁹ Similar to previous years' groups, we used the formula outlined in the Research Methods resource pages.¹⁵

Where N is the total population,
$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$
 n is the sample size and e is the desired error. The two previous groups used a plus/minus of 5% for their error, but this would result in a sample size of less than 1% of the population, so we decided to use an error of plus/minus 3%. This result is a sample size of 1090 participants. This number takes into account non-responses, therefore we decided to bring the number down to an even 1000. Each of the 7 areas will be surveyed according to their relative use (Appendix 1).

Applying the Survey

The goal of our project is to have a survey completed so that the AGSCI 450 class of 2007 can analyze our data and provide results to our partners at AMS Food and Beverages (AMSFB) and UBC Food Services (UBCFS). In order to do so, we have arranged for the AGSCI 100 class of 2006 to carry out surveying responsibilities. Next year, AGSCI 100 will become

AGSCI 150 and will be worth an extra credit. Dr. Andrew Riseman, the teacher of AGSCI 150, has notified us that the students are required to complete 2-4 hours of community service and consequently can use this time to hand out questionnaires. In order to do so, he has suggested that the class be presented a background on the UBCFSP, as well as a short lesson on how to conduct a survey. The AGSCI 450 teaching team will present this, using resources and information from our project. Further, our group has created a document of instructions on handing out surveys (Appendix 4) and proposed a time line for the survey implementation (Appendix 5). By introducing the project to AGSCI 150 students, they will become aware of food systems and be better prepared for their careers in the faculty of Land and Food Systems. They will also learn the basics of surveying and statistics, while completing their community service hours. We have also decided to use an online survey as a back-up plan, a timeline can be found for this survey in Appendix 6. Although a strong response rate is not guaranteed, the survey will be easier to administer and will not require an instruction lesson for students. Furthermore, since the online survey would be implemented through WebCT, courses would determine the strata, rather than food outlets on campus.

Budget

The main expenses of this project would be photocopying fees. There are 6 pages per survey package; the survey is 4 pages, and the informative piece and coupons are 1 page each. Using CopyRight, the projected cost is \$0.40 per package or \$400 for 1000 surveys (for a breakdown of costs, see appendix 2).

The teaching team suggested contacting our UBC Food System Project partners such as UBCFS for funding, however they were unresponsive. While increasing course fees to cover the cost of the UBCFSP is an option suggested by Alejandro Rojas, there are contradictory opinions regarding usage of course funds as the survey itself is not part of course materials. Consequently,

the most feasible option might be partial funding provided by Agora in combination with other fund raising initiatives. Lauchlan Jankola, chief financial officer of Agora Eats Café for 2005-2007 committed Agora to sponsorship in 2006 (contact information in Appendix 3). The Agora committee has approved the request and will commit up to \$150 in funding towards the AGSCI 450 UBCFSP for winter of 2006. This donation may be in the form of food, money or gift certificates, depending on our needs. Initially, a small advertisement for Agora was proposed in exchange, however, this was not implemented due to their advertising restrictions and should be re-examined in the fall.

Incentives

An important issue involved in the administration of surveys is encouraging individuals to participate. Following recommendations from group 8 of AGSCI 2005, we have decided to provide incentives for respondents. Coupons will be provided with the survey to encourage students to try local food products for themselves. Erin Nichols, the promotions supervisor at Small Potatoes Urban Delivery (SPUD), has agreed to provide discounts for SPUD products to all 1000 participants in exchange for promoting their company in the informative handout (contact information in Appendix 3). They provided a promotional code, which can be typed in at the SPUD website (www.spud.ca) and will offer a total of \$25 off their first 4 deliveries. This code is located on a coupon attached to the take-home handout.

UBC Farm's program coordinator, Mark Bomford, has agreed to provide the first 100 respondents with coupons for 10% off farm market produce of purchases over \$10 (contact information in Appendix 3). The UBC Farm discount is in its preliminary stages of development; consequently, this partnership must be re-visited in the fall of 2006 to re-establish support. The coupon for SPUD has been approved and the draft for UBC Farm has been sent to Mark Bomford. Any future changes must be re-approved by both organizations prior to distribution.

Research Methodology

Based on the purposes of this questionnaire, outlined within our introduction, our research team formulated a survey with 17 questions and the resulting draft questionnaire was submitted to our 'scenario room' for feedback. Their feedback was then incorporated into a final questionnaire distributed to UBC food consumers.

The survey was introduced in a one-page summary to define, in a specific and concise manner, the terminology that would be used throughout the questionnaire. This was done to ensure that respondents understood the meaning of each term within the context of the survey, enabling them to answer the questions to the best of their ability. Our introduction was modified from its original format in response to suggestions from students in our 'scenario room'. The resulting introduction (please refer to appendix 7) was shortened accordingly to make a more reader-friendly version for the UBC population. The survey was then concluded with an informative piece on the benefits of purchasing local foods along with foods produced from socially and ecologically conscious producers. This was done to help increase present knowledge of these foods in an attempt to change future behavior.

1) Are you a:	Faculty: _____
___ UBC Undergraduate Student	
___ UBC Faculty Member	Gender: M / F
___ UBC Staff	
___ UBC Graduate Student	Age (Please circle one):
___ Other: _____	18 & under 19-30 31-55 56 & over

The first question in our survey was very similar to our colleagues' from AGSCI 450 group 8, 2005. Our group agrees that it is relevant to determine the demographic distribution of the population for future analysis to determine which students would like to (or are) currently purchasing the foods of interest.⁹ Andrew Parr, of UBC Food Services, has also determined that certain 'niche markets' exist on campus and are often related to areas of study. As a result, it would be most beneficial to determine both who is and is not interested in these products to

Richer, who suggested that might people may think they know which foods are locally produced but actually do not. This type of question is important to ensure the validity of the survey.

Further, by asking those who do not buy locally produced foods their reason for not doing so, appropriate solutions can be created accordingly.

- 6) What do you think is more important?
___ The distance the food has travelled
___ The country in which the food is produced
___ No opinion

This question was taken from group 8 of AGSCI 450 in 2005 and modified only

slightly. We believe this question helps to identify what consumers believe to be most important when selecting foods that they perceived to be 'local'. These beliefs may ultimately influence their purchasing behaviour and would be beneficial information for food service providers to be aware of when marketing their products. Furthermore, we added a 'no opinion' to this question to prevent biased answers.

- 7) a) What are the major benefits of purchasing locally produced food?
b) What are the major disadvantages of purchasing locally produced food?

Question seven was a very important two part question to help determine exactly what people think the costs/ benefits of local food consumption are. It has also been found that open-ended questions are useful in gaining valuable information that may not have been previously considered.⁸ From the information provided, appropriate marketing/ promotion strategies can be developed based on consumer opinion.

- 8) 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?
a) Yes b) No c) Don't Know
- 9) If it were to cost more to offer locally produced foods at UBC food outlets, how much more would you be willing to pay?
a) Wouldn't be willing d) 40-60% more
b) 0-20% more e) 60-80% more
c) 20-40% more f) 80-100% more

Question eight was proposed by group 8 of AGSCI 450 2005 and seeks to identify consumer preferences for locally produced foods, while question nine determines if UBC

consumers would be willing to pay more for locally produced foods and how much more. This would be very important to people within UBCFS and AMSFB as it shows consumers' willingness to pay more, thereby determining demand for local foods. Our scale has been set in 20% increments to facilitate comprehension of actual increased costs and the addition of a 'wouldn't be willing' option prevents bias. We thought that it was unlikely that a consumer would be willing to pay more than double (100% more) for locally produced food so increments end at this amount.

10) Are you interested in buying fair trade products?
 a) Yes b) Maybe c) No d) Don't know

This question was added to assess desirability of purchasing from socially conscious producers, which would include fair trade products, as we believe there is a growing interest in these products on campus. AMS Food and Beverage retailers, such as Blue Chip, and other campus retailers also sell fair trade coffee; suggesting greater service of fair trade products could be feasible on campus.

11) Do you buy fair trade products to use at home?
 • If yes, how many items per **month**? 0 1-3 4-6 7-9 10+
 • If no, why not? _____

12) Do you request fair trade beverages when purchasing them pre-made at a coffee shop?
 a) Always b) Sometimes c) Rarely d) Never

Question eleven and twelve were added to our survey to determine actual purchasing behaviors of consumers on campus. Question eleven seeks to determine how frequently consumers purchase fair trade items, if at all, without limiting the choice only to coffee. Respondents who do not purchase fair trade items are given the option of an open-ended reply to provide us with information that we may not have considered.⁹ Question twelve then identifies whether consumers are consciously purchasing fair trade beverages, in an effort to indicate the level of desire for fair trade products.

- 13) Are you willing to buy organic foods even if they are more expensive?
a) Yes b) Maybe c) No d) Don't know

- If so, what foods would you most be interested in buying on campus? _____

This question was developed by our group to determine the level of interest in purchasing organic products as they have become increasingly “trendy” in today’s society. Respondents are also asked which organic foods they would be interested in purchasing on campus; useful information regarding product demand for our retail partners. In our original question, we also asked consumers how much more they would be willing to pay, but Liska Richer recommended deleting this portion of the question because we have yet to determine attitudes towards organics. Further, we also limited this section purposefully as we recognize that organic foods are not always produced in an environmentally sustainable manner.

- 14) Are you willing to buy free-range eggs on campus, for example in a breakfast, even if they are more expensive?
a) Yes b) Maybe c) No d) Don't know

If yes, how much more would you be willing to pay?

- a) \$0.00- \$0.50 more
- b) \$0.50-\$1.00 more
- c) \$1.00-\$1.50 more
- d) Other: Please specify _____

- 15) Do you currently buy free-range eggs?
a) Always b) Sometimes c) Never

- If no, why not? _____

Question fourteen and fifteen were added to determine the level of interest in purchasing and consuming free-range eggs. The example of free-range eggs ‘in a breakfast’ was added to our question, as this would most likely be the manner in which free-range eggs would be sold on campus. Our original survey contained choices of increased costs in the form of percentages, however, we modified the question to make the additional cost in dollar increments, to give consumers a clearer idea of how much more they would be willing to pay. Free-range poultry was deleted from our original question, as recommended by Liska Richer, as its high cost limit the marketability on campus.

16) **Rank in order of importance** the following features you consider when purchasing a food item: With 1 being the most important and 7 being the least important.

- Price
- Organic/ Fair Trade
- Quality
- Free Range/ Free Run
- Produced within B.C.
- Convenience
- Other: (please specify) _____

This question is used to determine where the priority for local production lies in comparison to other features that consumers consider when purchasing food. AGSCI 450 Group 8 (2005) had a version of this question that asked consumers to rank their top three features. However, due to the frequency of respondents that only checked the top three choices rather than ranking them, they suggested modifying it to emphasize the instructions of ranking the items by using bold face type and underlining. Choices such as ‘Organic/ Fair Trade’ and ‘Free Range/ Free Run’ were added to determine their importance to consumers.

17) Would you like to see more locally produced, organic and/or fair trade products available on the UBC campus?
a) Yes b) No c) Don't know

One purpose of this survey was to determine whether a market currently exists on the UBC campus for locally produced foods, organic, and fair trade products. Therefore, question seventeen seeks to further determine the level of consumer interest for these products on campus. Without consumer demand for such products, implementing them into the UBC food system would be futile and a waste of resources. Overall, this question strives to extract consumers' overall attitude towards these products.

Results & Discussion of Pilot Tests

Both a class and field survey was administered on UBC campus in our pilot test to analyze the effectiveness of our survey questions along with the questionnaire design. To accomplish this task we used quota sampling because actual results were not used for statistical analysis and there was limited time available. Although the information was not used to calculate

any sort of standard error, we were able to notice trends in responses to indicate poorly understood questions.¹

Within the class survey, 22 students completed the survey. In the field survey, 44 surveys were completed with 15 handed out at the SUB, 15 handed out in the 99 chairs area, and 14 handed out at the UBC village. We chose these locations as they make-up a major percentage of food sales on campus. The results from both surveys are summarized in Appendix 8. The following paragraphs discuss the results of both surveys, compare and contrast the two test groups polled, and outline some problems with the questions in our survey. Results from the pilot tests have ultimately led to changes in both format and content of the final questionnaire to be distributed.

When comparing the survey of AGSCI 450 students to the poll of UBC consumers at the food outlets, the disparity in ‘food knowledge’ was very apparent. Nearly every question showed that as a result of the course content in the Land, Food and Community series, student responses were commonly more educated. In general, students with knowledge about local, organic, free trade and free-range foods have stronger opinions and understand the impacts of purchasing these foods. A common theme when comparing the results from our surveys is that our peers in ASGCI 450 generally were willing and/or already purchasing sustainable foods. The results, for the most part indicate that more information and increased marketing of these products (and the benefits of them) need to be made available to the public in order for a change to occur in the UBC food system.

Demographics of the survey can be found in Appendix 8, tables 1 and 2. The relative differences in gender between the two tests were also evident as the class survey was filled out primarily by female students (90%), yet the field survey was approximately even. However, this

may be due to the distribution of sexes within the faculty of Land and Food Systems that has predominantly more females (75%) than males (25%).¹⁰ From our survey, Appendix 8 table 2, it is evident that the majority of respondents do not live on campus or rely on cafeteria meals. Only one student from the field survey and zero from the class survey lived in a residence that provided meals. However, since we did not poll consumers at the residence cafeterias, this is an unrepresentative sample as students with UBC meal plans make-up a large consumer base of UBC food services.⁹ Results from the demographic breakdown emphasize the importance of proper sampling techniques for students next year in order to receive statistically accurate results.

From the data collected in question 3, summarized in Appendix 8 table 3, we found that the large majority of students from both tests purchase foods on campus. Of these students, 77% from the field survey and 88% from the class survey, purchase food between 1-6 times per week on campus. This shows that most students are buying food regularly and consequently have significant purchasing power on campus. We also found that 63% of students from the field survey are most often buying their foods from the SUB and only 14% from 'other' sources. This can be compared to only 32% of those in the class survey stating that they purchase foods most often from the SUB with another 32% from 'other' sources. This is likely due to the physical distance between the Macmillan building and the SUB. Nevertheless, information provided by this question is useful to determine the locations where strategies should be put in place first to affect the largest consumer base.

Question 4, summarized in Appendix 8 table 4, attempts to determine knowledge regarding local foods. From the class survey, 36% of students are familiar with foods that grow locally compared to only 11% within the field survey. Question 5, summarized in table 5, then seeks to determine actual purchasing behavior of these foods. It was found that most people

'sometimes' purchase local foods, however, in the field study 30% were 'unsure' if they did or not compared to 14% from the class survey. When asked which foods people most commonly purchase, many individuals from the field survey were unsure of what foods were local, for example stating that oranges are local to BC. Several also answered with non-specific statements such as 'many Canadian products' or 'fruit'.

Question 6, summarized in Appendix 8 table 6, shows key characteristic differences between the two surveys. We found that most people from the class survey have a distinct opinion on which is more important to purchasing in regards to local foods as a total of 91% have an opinion one way or the other. However, a distinct opinion is not seen in the majority of respondents within the field study as only 61% feel strongly one way or the other and the greatest percentage of people, 39%, having 'no opinion' on this subject. Again, this lack of opinion is important as it shows many may lack knowledge regarding aspects of local foods thereby supporting the need for increased awareness through promotional activities.

Question 7 a and b, found in Appendix 8 tables 7 and 8, regard the perceived benefits and drawbacks of purchasing local foods. As this question is open-ended, the number of votes exceeds the total number of people surveyed as many provided more than one answer. From responses provided, the most commonly cited benefits for purchasing locally produced foods in both tests was support for the local economy and fresher/ better tasting foods. However, 21% of students from the class survey also reported that local foods help protect the environment through decreased transportation compared to only 3% from the field study who mentioned this as a major benefit. It also is important to note that from the field survey 9/ 44, or 20%, of individuals left this question blank or responded 'not sure', compared to 1/ 22, or 5%, in the class survey. The large number of non-responses from the field survey could be due to lack of

knowledge regarding local foods or due to increased respondent burden for filling out open-ended questions.⁹

The second part of this question seeks to identify possible disadvantages for choosing locally produced foods and the results are summarized in Appendix 8 table 8. From replies, the greatest drawbacks included a lack of variety and greater expenses of food produced locally. Although we do agree that locally produced foods offer less variety to the consumer, we are unsure whether they would necessarily cost more especially when local foods are in season. We believe that respondents, in both tests, may be confusing ‘local’ foods with ‘organic’ foods, a common mistake, which would cause respondents to believe that local foods are indeed more expensive. This further suggests a lack of understanding of ‘local foods.’

From question 8 and 9, summarized in Appendix 8 tables 9 and 10, the desirability of local foods was examined based primarily on the issue of price. The majority of individuals in both surveys would be more open to purchase local foods if prices compared to non-local foods. Though, the number of people willing to buy local foods was far greater in the class survey, at 91%, than the field study of only 66%. The next question then attempted to determine if (and by what amount) people would be willing to pay for local food. Interestingly, although most people in the previous question support the idea of purchasing local foods the majority of those in the field study, 52%, would not be willing to pay more for it compared to only 5% from the class survey. These results are very useful as they concur with last year's results and emphasize the importance of price when making food selections.⁹

The results from question 10, summarized in Appendix 8 table 11, indicate strong consumer interest in fair trade products. In the field survey, the majority of respondents (48%) chose ‘maybe’ when asked if they were interested in buying fair trade products, followed closely

by 34% that chose 'yes'. Results from the class survey indicated that an overwhelming majority of respondents, 86%, are interested in buying fair trade products compared to only 34% of respondents from the field survey. This question helped us to determine that despite the current lack of consumer knowledge surrounding fair trade products, with promotion and education campaigns; there may be a strong market demand for additional fair trade items on the UBC campus.

Question 11 and 12, summarized in Appendix 8 table 12 and 13, attempted to determine current purchasing behaviors of fair trade products by consumers on the UBC campus. However, 7 out of 44 of respondents in the field survey left this question blank indicating that changes may be necessary to the question content and design. One potential problem we determined is that respondents were asked whether they purchased fair trade products to use at home but there was no distinct 'yes' or 'no' option available first leading respondent into the next part question. In both the tests, the main reason stated for not purchasing fair trade products was because most were not sure which products are/are not fair trade. In question 12, summarized in table 13 of Appendix 8, respondents were asked how often they requested fair trade beverages at a coffee shop. The majority from the field and class survey, 45% and 41% respectively answered 'never'. This question suggests that either the majority of consumers are not interested in fair trade or lack the awareness or education necessary to make decisions accordingly.

Results from question 13, Appendix 8 table 14, indicate that the majority of respondents from both surveys might be interested in purchasing organic food even at higher costs. From the field survey 68% said either 'yes' or 'maybe' to paying more compared to a combined total of 91% within the class survey. Organic fruits and vegetables were the most popular choice respondents in the field survey would be interested in buying on campus. However, information

from this question indicates that although there is interest in organic foods there may not currently be a large market demand on campus if they were to cost more.

Questions 14 and 15, seek to determine interest and current purchasing behaviors of free-range eggs, results are located within Appendix 8 tables 15 and 16. When respondents were asked if they would be willing to pay more for free range eggs, the results from the field survey were inconclusive as the percentages of people that answered 'yes', 'maybe', and 'no' were roughly equal. Further, for those willing to pay more, the majority would only be willing to pay up to \$0.50 more, indicating low demand for these products. However, class survey results indicated that majority, 63%, would be willing to pay more for free range eggs and 73% said they would be willing to pay up to 40% more. Question 15, results in Appendix 8 table 16, was similar for both the field and class survey. In both surveys, the majority purchased free-range eggs 'sometimes'. Common reasons not buying these eggs included expense and lack of knowledge of the difference between free-range and regular eggs.

Question 16 attempted to determine what factors were most important to consumers when purchasing foods. The results, found in Appendix 8 table 17, indicate that 'price' and 'quality' were most important in both the field and class survey. Though in the class survey, 'quality' was more important than 'price' whereas respondents in the field survey ranked them roughly equal. This concurs with our colleagues from Group 8 AGSCI 2005 that determined that price is a large determining factor when purchasing foods. Foods that were 'produced within British Columbia' were found to be least important in the field survey while class respondents rank this 4th (of 7), indicating again that the general consumer population on the UBC campus may not know the benefits associated with purchasing locally produced foods and therefore do not prioritize local foods when making decisions.

Question 17 asked respondents whether they would like to see more locally produced, organic, and fair trade products available on the UBC campus. The results, summarized in Appendix 8 table 18, showed that 50% of respondents from the field study would like to see more of these products on campus yet 41% answered with 'don't know'. In contrast, 91% of the class survey respondents indicated they would like to see more of these products available on campus and the remaining 9% had left the question blank. These results suggest that although consumers may not have all the information they need to change their current purchasing behaviours, there is an interest in buying from ecologically and socially conscious producers that can be enhanced through appropriate education and promotion.

Conclusion

A key concept of the UBCFSP is to increase the sustainability of the UBC food system through re-localization. Consequently, our task was to revise surveys proposed by colleagues over the past years and develop new questions that go beyond consumers' willingness to purchase local foods to determine current purchasing behaviours of these products. Further, we developed questions to determine interest in foods produced by socially and ecologically conscious producers. Two surveys were used in our pilot test to determine the effectiveness of our questions along with survey design. The resulting questionnaire, with appropriate modifications, can be used in fall of 2006 for statistically relevant results to be presented to our partners at UBCFS and AMSFB. This information can then be used to make real changes on campus to help increase the sustainability of the UBC food system.

Recommendations:

After administering the pilot test of our survey and interpreting the results, we have developed a series of recommendations for completion of this survey.

To receive statistically accurate results the survey must have a representative sample of the target population. Consequently, we propose using a stratified random sampling method that is proportional to the various market segmentations outlined in Appendix 1. To determine a representative sample size, it is important to determine the size of the target population. We recommend using a sample size of 1000 as this would give more accurate results. Further, this sample size is feasible given the number of students available in AGSCI 150 to distribute the survey. However, funding to cover the costs of this project is still inconclusive. If no fundraising efforts have been accomplished prior to fall 2006 we have two suggestions to implement this survey: 1) contact Kalev Hunt (Appendix 3) for information regarding implementation of the survey on WebCT or 2) distribute only 400 surveys, as proposed by Group 8, AGSCI 450 2005. The cost of 400 surveys would be \$160, which could be covered by the Agora committee.

As stated in our discussion, we also think that it would be valuable to determine the cost differences between local and non-local foods throughout the seasons to determine if local foods are indeed more expensive. This information could be included in the informative piece located at the end of the survey. As also stated in our discussion question 3 and 11 need to be reformatted. In question 3, it would be useful to emphasize that we wanted students to specify which 'other' places they most often purchased foods from as most people only checked the box rather than provided a location. Therefore we suggest changing the question to:

3) How many times a week do you purchase food on campus? (including UBC Village)				
0	1-3	4-6	7-9	10+
Please specify where you eat most often:				
__ Residence cafeteria		__ S.U.B.		__ Village
__ Other: (please specify): _____				

Further, question 11 was also poorly worded and therefore should be changed to:

- 11) Do you buy fair trade products to use at home?
- a) Always b) Sometimes d) Never
- If never, please specify why?

After implementation of the survey the AGSCI 450 class of 2007 should then analyze the results and summarize the information to provide to our partners at UBCFS and AMSFB.

References

1. Addison, Angela, Olivia Lee, and Sundip Purewal. Scenario # 1a: Desirability of Relocalization UBC's Food System. The Sustainability of the UBC Food System Collaborative Project III a. AGSC 450. The University of British Columbia. 21 April, 2005.
2. Halweil, Brian. "Home Grown: The Case for Local Food in a Global Market". WorldWatch Institute: 2002
3. Henry, Robert. "Organic Poultry Eggs". Maritime Certified Organic Growers. (2002). 5 Mar, 2006. <http://www.acornorganic.org/pdf/poultryeggsprofile.pdf>
4. Kloppenburg, Jonathan, James Henderickson, and Gavin Stevenson. "Coming Into the Foodshed". Rooted in the Land: Essays on Community and Place. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996
5. McCauley, Marika Alena. "Buying Local Food: The Smart Alternative". 5 Mar, 2006. http://www.oxfamamerica.org/whatwedo/whae_we_work/united_states/news_publications/food_farm/art2564.html
6. Organic Trade Association. "Health of the Planet and its Inhabitants." 15 Mar. 2006. <http://www.ota.com/organic/benefits/health.html?PHPSESSID=5f2ef5421d5687588b18dff39699ccd0>
7. Richer, Liska. "Paths Towards a Just Sustainable and Food Secure UBC Food System: 2005 UBC Food System Project (UBCFSP) Report". Campus Sustainability Office. University of British Columbia. 15 Sept, 2005
8. Statistics. "Stratified Sampling". 21 Mar, 2006
<http://www.statistics.com/content/glossary/s/stratasamp.php>
9. Steele, Karen, et al. Scenario 1: Desirability of Re-localization UBC Food System. The Sustainability of the UBC Food System Collaborative Project III a. AGSC 450. The

University of British Columbia. 2005. 23 Mar, 2006. <http://www.planning.ubc.ca/living/index.html>

10. Transfair Canada. “About Fair Trade”. 15 Mar.2006. <http://www.transfair.ca/en/fairtrade/>
11. UBC Campus and Community Planning. “Living at UBC”. 23 Mar, 2006. <http://www.planning.ubc.ca/living/index.html>
12. UBC Demographics. “Planning and Institutional Research UBC”. 6 Apr, 2006. <http://www.pair.ubc.ca/student/demographics.htm>
13. UBC School of Library, Archival and Informational Studies (SLAIS). “Determining Sample Size”. 2005. 13 Mar, 2006. http://www.slais.ubc.ca/resources/research_methods/
14. UBC School of Library, Archival and Informational Studies (SLAIS). “Questionnaires”. 2005. 12 Mar, 2006. http://www.slais.ubc.ca/resources/research_methods/
15. UBC. “Media Release”. 2005. 8 Mar, 2006. <http://web.ubc.ca/okanagan/about/news/mr-05-008.html>
16. Wikipedia. “Local Food”. 5 Mar, 2006. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Local_food

Appendix 1: Distribution of Consumers

Most of the stores in the UBC Villiage open 7 days a week; however, the business is about 1/2 on weekends. Therefore, the estimated revenue of the Village of a year is:

$$\$17900 \times [6 \text{ (days/week)} \times 52 \text{ (weeks/year)} - 20 \text{ days holiday}] = \sim 5 \text{ million/ year}$$

Small Operations	~\$350/day x 3 stores = \$1050/day
Medium Operations (e.g. stores in the basement)	~\$950/day x 13 stores = \$12350/day
Big Operations (e.g. one more sushi, starbucks)	~\$1500/day x 3 stores = \$4500/day
Total = \$17900/day	

The revenue of UBC Village is a rough estimation because most of the food outlets were not willing to disclose their revenues. Some store managers provided us with the approximated average revenue of their store forming the bases of our estimation. We organize 19 food outlets in the Village into three groups according to their estimated revenue

The following chart specifies the estimated revenue, the proportion, and the quantity of questionnaires to be distributed of each sampling location.

Locations	Estimated Revenue¹ (million)	Proportion (location revenue/ total revenue)	Questionnaire Quantity (1000 x proportion) (rounded number)
S.U.B	7.5	32.8%	325
UBC Villiage	5	21.9%	220
Totem Park	2	8.8%	85
Place Vanier	2	8.8%	90
Gage	2	8.8%	90
Trek Express	3	13.1%	130
Sage Bistro	1.34	5.8%	60
Total	22.84	100%	1000

¹ Approximated from revenue amounts received from Andrew Parr and Nancy Toogood

Appendix 5: Face-to-face survey: Time-line and Tasks

Tasks	Time required	Date
1. Questionnaire administrator recruitment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduce the survey to AGSC150 students - Recruit 100 AGSC150 students as questionnaire administrators; each administrator will be responsible to distribute 10 questionnaires - assign each administrator a location for the distributing questionnaires 	1~2 classes	September 7, September 14
2. Training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A written instruction of questionnaire administration is given to the students. 	1 class	September 21
3. Questionnaire administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - distributing questionnaires during lunch time on regular school days - Each questionnaire will take ~10 minutes to complete. 	1~2 weeks	October 2~6 October 9~13
4. Data Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gather completed questionnaires - Process and analyse results 	1 month	October 19~ November 20

Appendix 6: Web-based Survey

Tanya Stack, the Technical Assistant from TREK Program Centre, generously shared the following information. She had recently completed a U-Pass survey to all UBC Okanagan staff, students and faculty in February, 2006. Although the population size of UBC Vancouver is about ten times greater than that of UBC Okanagan, the process for conducting web-based surveys should be similar. Historically, the survey received a statistically significant response rate (more than 10% of total population) for a period of 2-3 weeks. Therefore, the web-based survey can be a viable option for launching the UBCFS survey.

To successfully launch a web-based survey, sufficient advertisement, confidentiality and ample survey access time are important. Advertisement can be done through broadcast email that provides information on survey purpose objectives as well as the incentives and privacy information for completing the survey. Booths can be set up to advertise and hand out hard-copy surveys for people who do not have access to internet. The survey access time should be open for 2 weeks minimum. Longer surveying time may be needed; however, most people participate as soon as they receive the email. The tasks and timeline is summarized below.

Tasks	Time Required	Date
1. Design and test web-based UBCFS survey	1 week	September 5-9, 2006
2. Booths advertising the survey	2~3 days	September 11-12
3. Survey Open <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Broadcast email - hand out hard-copy at the booths 	~2 weeks	September 13-30
4. Data analysis	2 weeks	October 1-14

Appendix 7: Consumer Preferences and Purchasing Behaviors Questionnaire

The following questionnaire addresses your own preferences and purchasing behaviors regarding 'locally produced food' as well as your interests in purchasing food from ecologically and socially conscious producers. For clarification purposes, listed below are some definitions of terminology that will be used for the purpose of this survey.

Local food is a flexible definition and can describe food:

- in terms of the geographical distance they have traveled (e.g. within 50 km)
- in terms of political boundaries (e.g. only within Canada, B.C., etc.)
- should NOT to be confused with 'organic' food which describes a method of farming

For the purposes of this questionnaire, the term '**local food**' will only refer to food produced within the province of British Columbia.

Certified organic ~ foods produced under strictly defined standards without the use of synthetically produced inputs such as pesticides, fertilizers, growth stimulates, or specific feed additives.

Fair trade ~ an international method of conducting business usually involving producers in developing countries

- seeks to provide fair payment for products, adequate wages for workers, sustainable environmental standards, improved social practices, and increased investment in local business
- common items include coffee, tea, rice, bananas, mangos, cocoa and sugar

Conventional egg production ~ animals are placed in high density within wire cages, are not given access to the outdoors, and are feed a diet containing chemical substances, such as hormones or antibiotics.

Free run eggs ~ chickens do not live in cages; instead they are allowed to run freely on barn floor, they are densely packed within the enclosed area and are usually given the same type of feed as in conventionally farmed poultry

Free range ~ chickens have greater space allocated per animal than either conventional or free run, have access to the outdoor environment for the majority of the year, feed does not contain any chemicals used for increased production.

Questionnaire:

1) Are you a: Faculty: _____
____ UBC Undergraduate Student
____ UBC Faculty Member Gender: M / F
____ UBC Staff
____ UBC Graduate Student Age (Please circle one):
____ Other: _____ 18 & under 19-30 31-55 56 & over

2) Do you live on campus? Yes No
If yes, which residence do you live in:
__ Place Vanier __ Totem Park __ Gage __ Fairview
__ Ritsumeikan-UBC House

3) How many times a week do you purchase food on campus? (including UBC Village)
0 1-3 4-6 7-9 10+
Please specify where you eat most often:
__ Residence cafeteria __ S.U.B. __ Village __ Other: (**please specify**):

4) Are you familiar with what fruits and vegetables are produced locally in B.C?
a) Yes b) Somewhat c) No d) Not sure

5) Do you purchase locally produced food?
a) Yes b) Sometimes c) No d) Not sure
• If yes which items do you most commonly buy _____

• If no, why not? _____

6) What do you think is more important?
____ The distance the food has travelled
____ The country in which the food is produced
____ No opinion

7) a) What are the major benefits of purchasing locally produced food?

b) What are the major disadvantages of purchasing locally produced food?

8) 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?
a) Yes b) No c) Don't Know

- 9) If it were to cost more to offer locally produced foods at UBC food outlets, how much more would you be willing to pay?
- a) Wouldn't be willing d) 40-60% more
 b) 0-20% more e) 60-80% more
 c) 20-40% more f) 80-100% more

- 10) Are you interested in buying fair trade products?
- a) Yes b) Maybe c) No d) Don't know

- 11) Do you buy fair trade products to use at home?
- a) Always b) Sometimes d) Never
- If never, please specify why? _____

- 12) Do you request fair trade beverages when purchasing them pre-made at a coffee shop?
- a) Always b) Sometimes c) Rarely d) Never

- 13) Are you willing to buy organic foods even if they are more expensive?
- a) Yes b) Maybe c) No d) Don't know
- If so, what foods would you most be interested in buying on campus? _____
-

- 14) Are you willing to buy free range eggs on campus, for example in a breakfast, even if they are more expensive?
- a) Yes b) Maybe c) No d) Don't know

- If yes, how much more would you be willing to pay?
- a) \$0.00- \$0.50 more c) \$1.00-\$1.50 more
 b) \$0.50-\$1.00 more d) Other: Please specify _____

- 15) Do you currently buy free range eggs?
- a) Always b) Sometimes c) Never
- If no, why not? _____
-

16) **Rank in order of importance** the following features you consider when purchasing a food item: With 1 being the most important and 7 being the least important.

- __ Price
- __ Organic/ Fair Trade
- __ Quality
- __ Free Range/ Free Run
- __ Produced within B.C.
- __ Convenience
- Other: (please specify) _____

- 17) Would you like to see more locally produced, organic and/or fair trade products available on the UBC campus?
- a) Yes b) No c) Don't Know

~Thank You For Completing This Survey~

Why Choose Local Foods?

To buy 'locally produced foods' means purchasing products that are grown within British Columbia and have traveled a limited distance to reach the consumer. Doing so supports not only our province but also the individual communities in which we live. Buying locally grown and organic foods, as well as foods produced with animal and human welfare in mind positively contributes to environmental and social sustainability with additional economic and health benefits.

Purchasing locally grown foods benefits the environment and encourages a sustainable food system. Buying foods that have traveled only a short distance leads to lower fossil fuel emissions due to decreased transportation. In addition, locally produced foods require less packaging, which reduces the amount of waste created. Local foods also enhance food security in the community providing a link between consumers and producers. Furthermore, freshly picked produce ripen to perfection, providing superior taste over those that were picked green and traveled for thousands of miles in storage before reaching the consumer's table.

A typical farmer receives only 10% of the profit returns on non-locally purchased foods while the remaining 90% of the profits goes towards transportation, packaging, and marketing. Conversely, farmers can earn up to 37% more from sales at local farmers markets than from wholesalers due to the elimination of transportation, packaging and marketing costs which in turn, decreases prices for consumers. For every dollar spent on locally grown foods, three dollars are put back into the local economy. Moreover, putting money back into the community supports the growth of small businesses, increases the number of local jobs, and raises property values.

Buying organic foods helps to support the growth of small-scale farms that often have diverse crops that are rotated regularly to maintain soil health, and use limited chemicals inputs. Organic agriculture protects the health of the planet by reducing the overall exposure to toxic chemicals from synthetic pesticides that can end up in the ground, air, water and food supply thus simultaneously protecting human health.

Fair trade is an international method of business that provides better trading conditions to producers and workers in developing countries. The choice to purchase products such as fair trade coffee or tea guarantees farmers and workers in developing countries fair compensation for their products and labor, sustainable environmental practices, improved social services, and investment in local economic infrastructure.

Buying foods from ecologically conscious producers and producers that protect animal and worker welfare provides nutritional, economic, and health benefits to consumers while encouraging environmental and social sustainability.

For more information on sustainable organizations, visit www.spud.ca and <http://www.landfood.ubc.ca/ubcfarm> and enjoy the coupons provided!



Small Potatoes Urban Delivery (**SPUD**) is the leading organic home delivery service in Canada. We believe that buying local and organic is an important choice for the health of consumers, their communities and the environment. Starting with just five organic farms in 1998, we now buy from over 70 BC organic growers. We also have 1,500 grocery items made by local and socially responsible businesses. SPUD: changing the world one grocery delivery at a time.

Sign up at www.spud.ca and use *Promo Code **HEALTH6** to receive \$25 off over your first 4 deliveries, \$10 off the 1st and \$5 off the 2nd, 3rd and 4th.

*Promo Code expires on December 31, 2006

001

[DRAFT]



ubcfarm
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

UBC Farm is a 24 hectare teaching, research, and community farm located on UBC campus. The ultimate goal of the farm is to retain and re-create existing farm and forest lands at the University of British Columbia into an internationally significant centre for sustainable agriculture, forestry, and food systems.

To learn more, go to: <http://www.landfood.ubc.ca/ubcfarm>

With this coupon, you can get **10%** off farm market produce for purchases **over \$10**, redeemable one time only.

Appendix 8: Results from the Pilot Test

Table 1: Question 1, results from the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey		Field Survey	Class Survey
UBC Undergraduates	37	21	Under 18 yr old	4	0
Faculty member	0	0	19-30 yr old	38	21
UBC Staff	3	0	31-55 yr old	0	0
UBC Graduates	1	1	Above 55 yr old	0	0
Others	3	0	Didn't Answer	2	1
Male	24	2			
Female	19	20			
Didn't Answer	1	0			

Table 2: Question 2, results from in the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey		Field Survey	Class Survey
On Campus:	6	3	Fairview	1	0
Place Vanier	1	0	Ritsumeikan-UBC House	1	0
Totem Park	0	0	Not specified/Others	1	2
Gage	2	1	Not on Campus	38	19

Table 3: Question 3, results from in the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey		Field Survey	Class Survey
Purchase food on campus (times/week)			Most often:		
0	6	3	Residence Cafeteria	2	0
1 to 3	21	15	S.U.B.	28	7
4 to 6	13	3	Village	5	6
7 to 9	3	0	S.U.B. + Village	1	0
>10	1	0	Others	6	7
Blank	0	1	Not Specified	2	2

Table 4: Question 4, results from in the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey		Field Survey	Class Survey
Yes	5	8	No	11	2
Somewhat	21	10	Not Sure	7	2

Table 5: Question 5, results from in the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey		Field Survey	Class Survey
Yes	4	6	No	3	3
Sometimes	24	10	Not Sure	13	3

Table 6: Question 6, results from in the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey
The distance the food has traveled	11	11
The country in which the food is produced	16	9
No opinion	17	2

Table 7: Question 7a, results from in the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey		Field Survey	Class Survey
Knowledge of where the food is produced	3/61 votes	0 votes	Less transportation/protect environment	2/61 votes	9/44 votes
Fresher/good tastes	17/61 votes	11/44 votes	Others	3/61 votes	4/44 votes
Supporting the local economy/community	26/61 votes	17/44 votes	Doesn't care/blank/not sure	4/61 votes	1/44 votes
Cheaper	6/61 votes	2/44 votes			

Table 8: Question 7b, results from the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey		Field Survey	Class Survey
Lack of variety	15/53 votes	10/30 votes	Less quantity (supply)	2/53 votes	0 votes
More expensive than imported food	12/53 votes	10/30 votes	Seasonality limits	4/53 votes	4/30 votes
Less convenient/ hard to find	2/53 votes	1/30 votes	Others	4/53 votes	3/30 votes
Lower quality	5/53 votes	1/30 votes	Blank/not sure	9/53 votes	1/30 votes

Table 9: Question 8, results from the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey		Field Survey	Class Survey
Yes	29	20	Don't know	7	0
No	8	1	Blank	0	1

Table 10: Question 9, results from the field and class survey

	Field survey	Class Survey		Field survey	Class Survey
Would not be willing	23	1	60-80%	0	0
0-20%	21	17	80-100%	0	0
20-40%	0	2	Blank	0	2
40-60%	0	0			

Table 11: Question 10, results from the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey		Field Survey	Class Survey
Yes	15	19	Do not know	6	1
Maybe	21	1	Blank	0	1
No	2	0			

Table 12: Question 11, results from in the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey		Field Survey	Class Survey
Yes:	26	17	No:	11	4
0	21	4	Expensive	3	0
1-3	3	11	Not sure what products are fair-trade	7	3
4-6	1	0	Prefer brand names	1	0
7-9	1	1	Others	0	1
10+	0	1	Blank	7	1

Table 13: Question 12, results from in the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey		Field Survey	Class Survey
Always	0	4	Never	20	9
Sometimes	8	6	Blank	1	2
Rarely	15	1			

Table 14: Question 13, results from in the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey		Field Survey	Class Survey
Yes	7	7	0-20% more	N/A	12/19 votes
Maybe	23	13	20-40% more	N/A	6/19 votes
No	13	0	40-60% more	N/A	1/19 votes
Don't know	1	1	60-80% more	N/A	0 votes
Blank	0	1	80-100% more	N/A	0 votes

Table 15: Question 14, results from in the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey		Field Survey	Class Survey
Yes	12	14	\$0.00-\$0.50 more	17/30 votes	N/A
Maybe	15	6	\$0.50-\$1.00 more	10/30 votes	N/A
No	14	1	\$1.00-\$1.50 more	3/30 votes	N/A
Don't know	3	0	Others	0/30 votes	N/A
Blank	0	1			
			0-20% more	N/A	9/20 votes
			20-40% more	N/A	8/20 votes
			40-60% more	N/A	3/20 votes
			60-80% more	N/A	0 votes
			80-100%	N/A	0 votes

Table 16: Question 15, results from in the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey		Field Survey	Class Survey
Always	4	2	Never	17	5
Sometimes	22	14	Blank	1	1

Table 17: Question 16, results from in the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey		Field Survey	Class Survey
Most important:			Least important:		
Quality/Nutritional content	18/43 votes	11/19 votes	Price	1/41 votes	0 votes
Price	21/43 votes	3/19 votes	Organic/Fair Trade	7/41 votes	1/19 votes
Free Range/Free Run	1/43 votes	0 votes	Free Range/Free Run	9/41 votes	2/19 votes
Produced within B.C.	1/43 votes	2/19 votes	Produced within B.C.	18/41 votes	4/19 votes
Convenience	1/43 votes	2/19 votes	Convenience	6/41 votes	11/19 votes
Other: taste	1/43 votes	0 votes	Nutritional Content	N/A	1/19 votes
Organic/Fair Trade	0 votes	1/19 votes			

Table 18: Question 17, results from in the field and class survey

	Field Survey	Class Survey		Field Survey	Class Survey
Yes	22	20	Don't know	18	0
No	4	0	Blank	0	2