

**Key Findings**  
**The 2007 Adelaide Showground Farmers Market Consumer Study**

**A report prepared by:**

**Wendy J. Umberger, Randy Stringer and Emily M. Scott<sup>1</sup>**

**School of Agriculture, Food and Wine  
Waite Campus  
University of Adelaide**

**November 2007**

---

<sup>1</sup> The authors are Lecturer, Professor and Masters of Science student, School of Agriculture, Food and Wine, University of Adelaide, Australia. Please contact Dr. Wendy Umberger ([wendy.umberger@adelaide.edu.au](mailto:wendy.umberger@adelaide.edu.au)) with any questions regarding this report. The authors express sincere appreciation and acknowledge the assistance of post-graduate students Vu Thanh “Binh” Dang, Sam Price, Mariangela Pacheco, Milind Thakkar who assisted in surveying respondents.

## Summary

The data presented in this study were gathered through surveys conducted at the Adelaide Showground Farmers Market (ASFM) on May 6<sup>th</sup> and May 13<sup>th</sup>, 2007 during market hours: 9:00 a.m. until approximate closing at 1:00 p.m. On May 6<sup>th</sup> market customers were randomly selected for the survey. Individuals throughout the market were approached including those in line prior to the market opening, those waiting for food or eating a meal, participants in the market cooking classes, as well as individuals shopping for food products.

Interviewers were trained students from the University of Adelaide, School of Agriculture, Food and Wine. Each interviewer was given specific information to present to each survey respondent regarding the intended use of data collected from the survey. In order to reduce bias, four versions of the survey were used to randomize the order that attributes consumers were asked to rate or rank.

- The majority of survey respondents are:
  - the person in their household responsible for purchasing most of the food-type groceries (91%),
  - not directly involved in production agriculture (86%)
  - members of the ASFM (58%).
- The sample is comparable to the 2006 Australian Census (Australian Bureau of Statistics) in terms of ethnic background, income, current employment status, number of children per household and household size.
  - The sample includes fewer minorities, and participants are slightly older than the mean age reported by the Australian Census.
- Respondents tend to enjoy cooking (88%).
- Consumers' food purchase location appears to be highly influenced (average rating greater than very influential) by the ability to purchase superior products (in terms of taste and quality), and the ability to support local producers and the community
  - Thus, the average ASFM consumer appears to be more quality-driven than convenience and price driven.
- Respondents attend the ASFM and other farmers markets frequently (weekly or fortnightly), arrive early and stay a considerable amount of time.
- Over one-half (52%) of the respondents also had previously attended other local farmers markets;
  - 78% and 18% of respondents indicated they previously had attended the Willunga or Barossa farmers markets, respectively (Table 7).
- Many of the ASFM consumers travel considerable distances to attend the ASFM, with 26% travelling greater than 10 kilometres and 32% travelling between 5 and 10 kilometres.

- The ASFM appears to be a very important source of food for Adelaide-area consumers.
  - Approximately 91% of consumers said they attended the ASFM with the primary purpose of shopping for food.
  - Family outings, socializing and eating a meal/snack were also listed as reasons by 31%, 27% and 16.1% of consumers, respectively.
- ASFM Consumers appear to spend a large amount of their household food-type grocery expenditures at the farmers market.
- Roughly, 40% of respondents' food-type groceries are purchased at the ASFM.
- Fresh vegetables, fresh fruit and bread were frequently purchased items by a large majority of consumers: 86%, 77% and 59%, respectively.
- Farmers markets are an important purchase location for several food products: fruits, vegetables, cheese, bread and dairy. Roughly 70% of consumers purchased the majority of their fruits and vegetables at farmers markets.
- Over 50% of consumers indicated they “strongly agreed” with statements that they shop at the ASFM to support local farmers, to support the rural economy, to support independent farmers versus corporate agriculture, and because they believe the products are fresher.
- The largest share (42%) of respondents perceived the quality of the products sold at the ASFM to be of better or much better quality than other markets.
- Product information and attributes such as Country-of-Origin, No Growth Hormones Used, Free Range and Animals Treated Humanely and Environmentally-friendly were the five most important attributes (out of 16) to consumers.
- Consumers indicated they would be willing to pay the most for commodities labelled as Free Range, Organic, No Growth Hormones Used, Animals Treated Humanely and Pesticide-free.
- A majority of respondents (67%) said they prefer a mandatory labelling policy, almost 29% preferred a voluntary policy and less than 7% did not care or were indifferent.
- The majority of people (almost 36%) preferred that a third-party (non-government) organization oversee a mandatory labelling policy. Respondents were more split between the Australian government (28%) and farmers/producers (almost 26%).
- Respondents are not aware of the legal requirements related to the food attributes they deemed to be important.
- The overwhelming majority of (81%) supported subsidizing the costs of mandatory food labelling programs.
- A majority of people (89%) said that they would support subsidizing the development of farmers markets.

- Respondents believe environmental issues (drought, arable soil, salinity) pose the greatest threat to Australian *producers*, followed by market concentration (too much power held by too few resulting in low prices for farmers).
- Respondents were concerned that market concentration (too much power held by too few resulting in higher prices for consumers) and environmental issues (overuse of pesticides, hormones etc) were the most serious threats faced by *consumers*. Issues such as product information (too much information, information is too confusing, not enough information), food standards (inconsistency, lack of regulation and oversight) and safety of food system (diseases, pathogens, bacteria etc) were seen as less threatening.

# **Key Findings of the 2007 Adelaide Showground Farmers Market Consumer Study**

## **Introduction**

Throughout Australia, Europe and the United States, farmers' markets have seen a resurgence in popularity. Whereas at one time direct selling from farmer to consumer was standard, post-war industrialization has led to the alienation of consumers from the food production system. Automobiles, mass transportation and the spread of suburbia have all given way to the rise of supermarkets where people can get their weekly groceries at a single stop (Pritchard 2000).

However, some argue that consumers increasingly want to know the individuals who produce their food (Coster 2004; Guthrie et al. 2006). Indeed, increased disposable income in developed nations allows consumers to express their opinions through their food purchases (Banks and Marsden 2001). This is particularly true in more affluent nations where people are financially able to purchase the high quality, value-added products. Lately, consumers in many of these high-income areas have found themselves in what Guthrie et al. (2006) refers to as a "real food revolution" (560); where there has been a shift in away from artificial and processed foods. Others have specifically noted this movement which refocuses attention to foods with perceived quality, unusual or artisan attributes (Fernandez-Armesto 2001).

The increasing popularity of farmers' markets encourages this belief. Over the past twenty years, over 3,500 Farmers Markets have emerged in the U.S. and nearly 500 in the United Kingdom; Australia lags behind with there being only about 80 recognized markets (Coster 2004). Notably, in 2004 more than half of these were less than two years old (Coster 2004), indicative of real interest and growth on the part of both the producer and consumer.

### *Consumer Benefits of Farmers Markets*

Literature analysing farmers' markets found that consumers attend these markets for a variety of reasons. While some consumer were looking to purchase what they felt were better, high quality foods others were interested in the societal and environmental attributes of their food purchases (Gale 1997; Andreatta and Wickliffe 2002; Guthrie et al. 2006). Specifically noted was an expressed interest in food production practices and safety issues, and environmental impacts (Gale 1997; Aldrich 1999; Kremen, Green and Hanson 2001; Coster, 2004).

At direct selling venues such as farmers' markets, customers usually have the ability to communicate personally with the growers and investigate their production practices. These interactions provide the consumer with improved knowledge and appreciation of the agricultural processes used to grow their foods resulting in increased confidence, awareness in the food production systems, and more efficient purchases (Guthrie et al. 2006).

### *Producers' Benefits from Farmers Markets*

On the supply side, Gale (1997) claims there are many reasons for this renewed interest in direct farm marketing, specifically, dissatisfaction with low farm-gate prices. As mentioned, over the past several years retail food prices have remained stable (if not decreased) while farm-gate prices have dropped. Often, direct-selling prices (such as those at farmers markets)

are higher than average wholesale prices, yet lower than supermarket shelf prices – essentially satisfying both parties (Gale 1997).

Generally, farmers who participate in farmers' markets can manage a 40-80 percent return on their product (Myers 1991; Coster 2004). Without the middleman, farmers can recover costs that would otherwise be lost to transport, handling, distributing, labelling, brokering etc. (Myers 1991; Andreatta and Wickliffe 2002). Producers at farmers' markets also benefit from the lack of labelling and packaging that would otherwise be required of them by the large supermarket outlets.

For many producers, selling at the farmers markets becomes a significant source of their operations' revenue. This is with regard to both large and small producers. For small producers, this may be particularly true as they face difficulties entering the conventional market place due to their limited production (Andreatta and Wickliffe 2002). For established producers who are attempting to introduce a new idea or product, the markets may serve as a springboard to research the market before risking more substantial investment (Guthrie et al. 2006).

In addition to the financial benefits of direct selling, producers have the opportunity to interact with both customers as well as other producers fostering an environment for learning, innovation, and entrepreneurship (Aldrich 1999; Coster 2004; Hinrichs, Gillespie and Feenstra 2004).

### *Community Benefits*

With the benefit small producers receive from selling at local farmers' market the associated communities profit as well. Several studies analysing the financial impact of farmers' markets in local communities have estimated that for every dollar spent at local farmers' markets \$2-3 is returned to the community through a multiplier effect (Bullock 2002; Coster 2004; Guthrie et al. 2006). Using a multiplier of 2.0, Coster (2004) estimated that sales from farmers' markets in Australia provide around \$80 million for their communities. However, given that products are all grown, transported, sold, and purchased locally, such estimates could be higher (Guthrie et al., 2006).

Also worth mentioning, community pride is bolstered as local residents and urban tourists visit the market. At present, tourism is a significant revenue source for rural Australia, yet there is immense room for improvements to generate even more. Notably, improving rural Australia for tourism will help to ensure that money spent stays in Australia and not overseas.

While some argue that farmers' markets negatively impact other local businesses as they draw customers away, studies have found this to actually be the opposite as farmers' markets draw people to the general area where many go on to shop at other local venues (Guthrie et al., 2006).

Additionally, people benefit from the farmers' markets as environmental impacts of shopping at a local farmers' market may be less than shopping at a large retail outlet. For example, there tends to be much more waste resulting from multiple labels and packaging materials at supermarkets. As many farmers' markets have regulations stating that only "local" producers may participate (with the definition of local varying from market to market) food sold generally does not have to be transported far and there may be less pollution through reduced

CO2 emissions (Coster 2004). This is aside from the environmental benefits touted by organic, natural, bio-dynamic producers etc (who typically make up a significant percentage of those producers in attendance).

### *Government's Role in Farmers Markets?*

In general, government's role with regard to food production is thought to be one of regulation and control, ensuring product health and safety, and providing factual information to the public (Hadden 1986; Kriflik and Yeatman 2005). Does the government have an obligation to support the farmers' markets as a means to encourage rural development and sustain small producers?

Several options exist for the Government regarding the support of farmers' markets. A complete take-over of the farmers' markets by the administration may not be effective in the current "hands-off" environment established by the government. Nor would such be appreciated by the consumers, producers, or managers of the farmers' markets. Instead, government assistance may be provided through subsidies which would help reduce the cost for vendor participation, advertising, licensing, rent etc.

One potential, less drastic, solution would be for the government to subsidize farmers' markets perhaps specifically those in rural areas. Funds could be used for advertising, administration, staff or to reduce the cost or participation for vendors.

### **Study Objectives**

This study complements earlier ones by examining consumers' motivations behind their grocery purchases (including where they purchase the majority of their food products) and their perceptions of agriculture and food systems. While literature regarding the benefits of farmers' markets is increasing, there are no studies (to our knowledge) that directly investigate Farmers Markets as a mechanism to correct any market failures that may exist in the retail industry as a result of increased concentration or as a means by which to help the rural areas and small producers in light of insufficient government intervention.

This paper has two specific objectives: (1) to determine if farmers' markets are a mechanism to alleviate market concentration (imperfect information) and (2) the willingness of Australian consumers to support Australian rural areas and small producers.

### **Data Collection**

Data were gathered through surveys conducted at the Adelaide Showground Farmers Market (ASFM) on May 6<sup>th</sup> and May 13<sup>th</sup>, 2007 during market hours: 9:00 a.m. until approximate closing at 1:00 p.m. On May 6<sup>th</sup> market customers were randomly selected for the survey. Individuals throughout the market were approached including those in line prior to the market opening, those waiting for food or eating a meal, participants in the market cooking classes, as well as individuals shopping for food products. As an incentive for participation, each individual was offered a coupon valid for up to \$3 off a coffee product of their choice at the coffee and baked goods trailer supported by the ASFM. On the second day of surveying, May 13<sup>th</sup>, two hand-drawn signs were displayed advertising, "Free Coffee for One Survey,

University of Adelaide,” to facilitate survey participation and convey the survey’s association with a local respected academic institution.

Interviewers were trained students from the University of Adelaide, School of Agriculture, Food and Wine. Each interviewer was given specific information to present to each survey respondent regarding the intended use of data collected from the survey. In order to reduce bias, four versions of the survey were used in order to randomize the order that attributes consumers were asked to rate or rank.

Additionally, electronic surveys were distributed to members of the ASFM via email link with data collected May 11<sup>th</sup>- June 10<sup>th</sup>, 2007 through the use of the online survey company, Survey Monkey. Questions in the online survey were presented in exactly the same numerical order and were formatted to resemble the physical survey as closely as possible. Similar to the other surveys, the order of attributes in questions that required rating or ranking was set to vary to reduce order bias. Online surveys included an electronic coupon to print out for coffee at the ASFM.

Prior to conducting the actual survey, a pilot survey was conducted on approximately 25 individuals, including students at the University of Adelaide School of Agriculture, Food, and Wine as well as at the ASFM on April 29<sup>th</sup>. As a result of comments from these focus groups, the final survey was adjusted and clarified.

In the survey, respondents were asked general questions regarding their purchasing behaviour with regard to food products at the ASFM and other retail outlets as well as attitude and knowledge regarding various agricultural practices. In order to achieve the goals of the study we asked consumers their concerns related to Australian agriculture and food systems (including market concentration), their interest in helping local producers, and their belief whether or not the government should provide assistance to farmers’ market to encourage their growth and sustainability. Socio-demographic characteristics of survey respondents were also collected.

As with all surveys, the ultimate goal is to recreate a sample representative of the total population. An understood disadvantage of the utilized forms of surveying methods include unintentional self-selection biases where results may not be as representative as samples collected via stratified sampling and may have favoured those individuals whose mere association with the ASFM may be indicative of their amplified concern with current food trends and production methods.

## **Survey Respondents**

In total, 416 usable surveys were collected: 208 collected via personal interviews and 208 collected through the online survey database, Survey Monkey. This is a response rate of about 30% for the online portion of the survey. Information was not collected regarding the number of individuals who declined to participate in the personnel surveying at the Adelaide Showground Farmers’ Market. However, it should be noted that individuals were keen to participate to show support for the University of Adelaide as well were eager to receive the advertised free cup of coffee. As mentioned, a request to participate in the online survey was distributed to all members of the ASFM. Immediately prior to the email requesting survey participation, the ASFM celebrated its 1000<sup>th</sup> member, however, not all members were in the e-mail database. No members were specifically excluded from the e-mail invitation.

On average, respondents' age was about 50 years, and their annual income was approximately \$45,000AUD (pre-tax). The majority had no dependent children<sup>2</sup> living in their household (58.8%), were female (74%), had completed at least some University education (52.9%), and identified themselves as having an ethnic background of Australian/Northern and Western European and/or British (79.5%). Fifty-three percent of respondents were employed full-time and 17% of the respondents were students. Interestingly, nearly 20% of the respondents had immigrated to Australia at some stage of their life. Demographic summary statistics are presented in Table 1.

The sample is comparable to the 2006 Australian Census (Australian Bureau of Statistics) in terms of income, current employment status, number of children per household and household size. However, this sample includes fewer minorities, and participants are slightly older than the mean age reported by the Australian Census. Notably, this sample included significantly more females and married individuals; also, survey participants were typically more educated. As with all surveys, there could be some degree of sample selection bias in which the respondents who were more interested in those particular foods and production methods advertised at the farmers' markets or were more interested in helping support the University of Adelaide were more likely to participate.

### **Respondents' Involvement in Shopping and Participation in Farmers Markets**

In addition to demographics, several other lifestyle-related questions were asked to assess consumers' involvement in food-related activities such as shopping, cooking, farmers markets and production agriculture (Tables 2 and 3). The majority of respondents are the person in their household responsible for purchasing most of the food-type groceries (91.3%), are not directly involved in production agriculture (85.9%), and are members of the ASFM (58.4%). Respondents tend to enjoy cooking (87.7%).

As shown in Table 4, consumers' food purchase location appears to be highly influenced (average rating greater than very influential) by the ability to purchase superior products (in terms of taste and quality), and the ability to support local producers and the community. Thus, the average ASFM consumer appears to be more quality-driven than convenience and price driven. In fact, these reasons also received higher mean ratings than cleanliness of the store/market, variety/availability, reputation and speed/efficiency of market.

Respondents attend the ASFM and other farmers markets frequently, arrive early and stay a considerable amount of time. Approximately 42% of respondents indicated they had attended the ASFM 3-5 times (weekly) in the past month and 44.1% indicating they had attended 1-2 times (fortnightly) in the past month (Table 5). Over one-third had attended the ASFM 10 or more times in the past six months (Table 6). Over one-half (51.7%) of the respondents also had previously attended other local farmers markets; for example, 77.7% and 18.1% of respondents indicated they previously had attended the Willunga or Barossa farmers markets, respectively (Table 7). Most (83.3%) ASFM attendees arrive at the market before 10:30 a.m. and stay either 30 minutes to an hour (44.4%) or longer than one hour (50%) (Tables 9 and 10).

---

<sup>2</sup>On the survey instrument, dependent children were defined using the Australian Bureau of Statistics definition: "Dependent children are children aged 0 to 14 years and children aged 15-24 years who are full-time students."

Many of the ASFM consumers travel considerable distances to attend the ASFM, with 25.9% travelling greater than 10 kilometres and 32.5% travelling between 5 and 10 kilometres. Not surprisingly, due to the distance they need to travel, 70% of respondents drive to the ASFM and 17% ride their bike (Tables 10 and 11).

The ASFM appears to be a very important source of food for Adelaide-area consumers. Approximately 91% of consumers said they attended the ASFM with the primary purpose of shopping for food (Table 12). Family outings, socializing and eating a meal/snack were also listed as reasons by 30.6%, 26.5% and 16.1% of consumers, respectively.

ASFM Consumers appear to spend a large amount of their household food-type grocery expenditures at the farmers market. The average amount consumers spent on food-type groceries was \$100 to \$150 per week (Table 13), and the average amount consumers spent on food purchases at the farmers market was \$40 to \$60 per visit (Table 14). Therefore, roughly, 40% of respondents' food-type groceries are purchased at the ASFM.

Fresh vegetables, fresh fruit and bread were frequently purchased items by a large majority of consumers: 86.3%, 76.8% and 59.3%, respectively (Table 15). Eggs, flowers and cheese were also frequently purchased products, with 40% to 50% of respondents indicating they had purchased these items. Cakes, milk, herbs, fresh meat (beef, pork or lamb), sausages, seeds/plants and honey also appear to be commonly purchased items, with 20% to 40% of respondents indicating they purchased these items. Yoghurt, ice cream, fresh poultry, fresh seafood, wine, confectionary items and cereals (e.g. granola) were purchased by less than 20% of consumers.

When asked to indicate where the *majority* of several categories of food products were purchased, respondents indicated farmers markets are an important purchase location for several food products: fruits, vegetables, cheese, bread and dairy (Table 16). Roughly 70% of consumers purchased the majority of their fruits and vegetables at farmers markets.

When asked whether they agreed or disagreed with 15 statements regarding why they attend the ASFM, over 50% of consumers indicated they "strongly agreed" with statements that they shop at the ASFM to support local farmers, to support the rural economy, to support independent farmers versus corporate agriculture, and because they believe the products are fresher. Other reasons including beliefs that ASFM products taste better, are of higher quality and more confidence in the source of food received a large percent of agreement, with mean ratings above "agree". Interestingly, over one-third (37.6%) of consumers were unsure (neither agreed nor disagreed) with the statement that ASFM products are safer (Table 17).

Recommendations by family member or friends and newspapers were the most common ways that consumers initially heard or learned of the ASFM (Table 18). It is vital that the ASFM board of directors and producer-members meet consumers' changing demands, exceed their expectations in terms of quality and continue to adapt the market to meet their needs. Although the largest share (42%) of respondents perceived the quality of the products sold at the ASFM to be of better or much better quality than other markets, and 66.2% were happy with the ASFM "as is", there is still room for improvement (Tables 19 and 20). This is particularly true given the importance of word-of-mouth advertising for promoting the ASFM. Over 90% of consumers indicated they would like to see more product information

at the ASFM, 86.3% would like to see more variety and other commodities, 85% would like more cooking classes, 84% want more children's activities and entertainment. Longer trading hours and more ready-to-eat food were also requested by over 70% of respondents.

### **Consumers Preferences and Willingness-to-Pay for Food Attributes**

In order to analyse the significance of information of food labels, survey respondents were asked to specify the importance of 16 attributes that may appear of food product labels using a five-point Likert scale. Consumers feel that information such as Country-of-Origin, No Growth Hormones Used, Free Range and Animals Treated Humanely and Environmentally-friendly were the 5 most important (Table 21). Information on food product labels which consumers felt were the least important included Bio-Dynamic, Food Miles and Carbon Labelled. It could be that consumers were unfamiliar with these terms and did not know what they meant.

Additionally, consumers were asked to estimate their willingness to pay (WTP) for these same labelling attributes listed in Table 21. Consumers were willing to pay the most for commodities labelled as Free Range (Table 22). Consumers were also willing to pay more for commodities labelled as Animals Treated Humanely, No Growth Hormones Used, Organic and Pesticide-free. These results are interesting because Organic was a food characteristic that was rated lower than other attributes in a previous question.

### **Consumers Knowledge and Preferences for Food and Agricultural Policy Alternatives**

Survey respondents were asked to indicate their preference for mandatory vs. voluntary labelling policies with regard to food and agricultural products including those purchased at the ASFM. A majority of respondents (67%) said they prefer a mandatory labelling policy, almost 29% preferred a voluntary policy and less than 7% did not care or were indifferent (Table 23).

Respondents were then asked which entity they felt was best suited to initiate and oversee a *mandatory* labelling policy. The majority of people (almost 36%) preferred that a third-party (non-government) organization oversee a mandatory labelling policy. Respondents were more split between the Australian government (28%) and farmers/producers (almost 26%) with the rest of respondents indicating no opinion or other (Table 24).

Respondents also were asked who they felt would be the best entity to initiate and oversee a *voluntary* labelling program. The majority of people (almost 39%) felt that farmers/producers were the best entity (Table 25). People felt that third-party non-government organizations were also a good entity to oversee the program (33%). Finally, individuals felt that the Australian government was least suited to initiate and oversee the program (almost 19%) with the remaining respondents indicated no opinion/don't know (almost 7%) or other (2%).

In order to gauge how well informed people were about food labelling policy in Australia, survey respondents were asked four, True / False questions about Australian food labelling laws (Table 26). Specifically, consumers were asked about the testing and certification standards for Organic food products in Australia; 36.4% of respondents answered correctly.

They were also asked about the labelling of organic products destined for export (as only those products labelled as organic and bound for export must, by law, be tested and certified as organic); 57.1% of people answered this question correctly. Next, they were asked about the requirements and guidelines for food products labelled as Certified Free-Range; almost 32% of respondents answered correctly. Finally, respondents were asked about the certification and labelling of food containing genetically modified organisms or GMOs. Almost 62% of people answered correctly. Paralleling other studies we can say that people may not be particularly aware of those food attributes which they deem to be important.

Survey participants were asked two questions regarding their opinions on policies which would involve the government providing support (subsidizing) Australian producers to help bear the burden of labelling costs associated with a mandatory labelling policy and to subsidize the development of farmers markets to encourage their growth and sustainability. The overwhelming majority of (81.5%) supported subsidizing the costs of mandatory food labelling programs. Furthermore, a majority of people (89%) said that they would support such a policy, only 6.5% said they would not and 4.7% said they did not know. ASFM consumers see value in farmers market and indicated their support for certain agricultural enterprises and labelling programs (Table 27).

### **Consumers' Perceptions of the Threats facing Agricultural Producers and Consumers**

To better understand the issues which people were most concerned with, consumers were asked to state what they felt were the most serious threats to agricultural *producers* and *consumers* in Australia. Particularly, we asked people to rank what in their opinion were the top three threats (of a possible seven) with 1 being the most serious and 3 being the third most serious) to agricultural *producers* in Australia. Respondents indicated that they felt that Environmental Issues (drought, arable soil, salinity etc) posed the greatest threat to Australian producers followed by Market Concentration (too much power held by too few resulting in low prices for farmers). Too Many Regulations (restrictions that inhibit production and innovation), Too Few Regulations (farmers are not accountable), and Market Entry Barriers (it is too costly or too competitive for farmers to survive) were overall seen as far less threatening (Table 28).

Respondents were also asked to indicate, what in their opinion, were the top three threats (of a possible seven) to *consumers* regarding the Australian food system. Again, respondents clearly indicated their concern with regard to Market Concentration (too much power held by too few resulting in higher prices for consumers) and Environmental Issues (overuse of pesticides, hormones etc). Issues such as Product Information (too much information, information is too confusing to understand), Product Information (not enough information on production methods to make educated decisions), Food Standards (inconsistency, lack of regulation and oversight) and Safety of Food System (diseases, pathogens, bacteria etc) were seen as less threatening. Clearly, consumers are concerned about the results of market concentration on both producers and consumers. On the other hand, consumers were not extensively bothered by the amount of information provided (or not provided) on product labels (Table 29).

**Table 1. Demographic summary statistics of ASFM survey respondents.**

<b>Demographic Variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>Coding</b>	<b>% of Sample</b>	<b>N</b>
Age in years	3.55	1.31	1 = 18 - 24	4.97	382
			2 = 25-34	19.63	
			3 = 35 - 44	23.56	
			4 = 45 - 54	26.18	
			5 = 55-64	18.85	
			6 = 65 years or over	6.81	
Gender	0.742	0.438	0 = Male	25.85	383
			1 = Female	74.15	
Education (Highest Level)	5.04	1.63	1 = Primary School	0.26	380
			2 = Some Secondary School	5.53	
			3 = Completed Secondary School	16.05	
			4 = Some University	8.68	
			5 = Completed University Degree	37.89	
			6 = Some Graduate School	6.32	
			7 = Completed Graduate Degree	19.21	
			8 = Technical institution, TAFE	6.05	
Gross Annual Household Income	12.38	3.19	0 = Zero Income/year	1.64	365
			1 = \$1 - \$2,079	1.10	
			2 = \$2,080 - \$4,159	0.55	
			3 = \$4,160 - \$6,239	0.27	
			4 = \$6,240 - \$8,319	0.00	
			5 = \$8,320 - \$10,399	0.82	
			6 = \$10,400 - \$15,599	1.64	
			7 = \$15,600 - \$20,799	0.82	
			8 = \$20,800 - \$25,999	4.38	
			9 = \$26,000 - \$31,199	2.74	
			10 = \$31,200 - \$36,399	4.93	
			11 = \$36,400 - \$41,599	7.12	
			12 = \$41,600 - \$51,999	7.40	
			13 = \$52,000 - \$77,999	20.82	
			14 = \$78,000 to \$100,000	17.81	
15 = more than \$100,000	27.95				
Current Employment Status	2.69	1.01	1 = Unemployed	2.40	375
			2 = Full time	53.60	
			3 = Part time	26.13	
			4 = Retired/Pensioner	8.80	
			5 = Stay at home parent	8.53	
			6 = Disabled	0.53	
Currently a Student	0.17	0.38	0 = No, not a student	82.85	379
			1 = Yes, a student	17.15	

**Table 1, Continued. Demographic summary statistics of ASFM survey respondents.**

<b>Demographic Variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>Coding</b>	<b>% of Sample</b>	<b>N</b>
Marital Status	2.63	0.89	1 = Single, never married	15.34	378
			2 = De Facto couple	16.93	
			3 = Married couple	59.26	
			4 = Divorced or separated	6.35	
			4 = Widowed/Spouse Deceased	2.12	
Number of Dependent Children	0.74	1.00	0 = no dependent children	58.84	379
			1 = 1 dependent child	14.51	
			2 = 2 dependent child	21.37	
			3 = 3 dependent child	4.22	
			4 = 4 dependent child	1.06	
Current Household Size	2.78	1.23	1 = 1 person	11.23	374
			2 = 2 people	40.11	
			3 = 3 people	18.45	
			4 = 4 people	22.73	
			5 = 5 people	5.08	
			6 = 6 people	1.87	
			7 = 7 people	0.53	
Ethnic Background	2.09	2.83	1 = Australian/ Northern and Western European and/or British	79.53	381
			2 = Australian/Eastern European	5.25	
			3 = Australian/Greek	1.31	
			4 = Australian/Italian	2.89	
			5 = Chinese or other North-East Asian	2.36	
			6 = Indian or other Southern/Central Asian	0.79	
			7 = Middle Eastern	0.00	
			8 = Pacific Islander	0.26	
			9 = Sub-Saharan African	0.26	
			10 = South-East Asian	2.10	
			11 = Indigenous Australian, Aboriginal	0.52	
			12 = Other, please explain	4.72	
Immigrated to Australia	0.19	0.40	0 = No	80.58	381
			1 = Yes	19.42	

**Table 2. Summary statistics of consumers (Questions 1, 2, 9, 19)**

	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>Min.</b>	<b>Max.</b>	<b>N</b>
Member of Farmers Market	58.41	0.5842	0.4983	0	1	416
Person who purchases most of food-type groceries	91.33	0.9133	0.7659	0	15	415
% who attend other farmers markets	51.68	0.5168	0.5003	0	1	416
Involved in production agriculture	14.07	0.1407	0.3482	0	1	405

**Table 3. Consumers' preferences for cooking.**

<b>Preference</b>	<b>%</b>
1 = I <i>enjoy cooking</i> and do it often	60.34
2 = I <i>enjoy cooking but do not do it as often</i> as I would like	27.34
3 = I <i>neither like nor dislike</i> cooking	8.37
4 = I <i>do not enjoy cooking</i> and only do it out of necessity	2.96
5 = I <i>do not cook</i>	0.99