Examining consumer response to broad-based promotion programs for fruits and vegetables
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Growers of agricultural commodities contribute to promotion programs through mandatory assessments, and these programs are designed to improve producer incomes by increasing demand. Generic promotion and advertising activities are generally “commodity-specific” meaning they are aimed at increasing the demand only for the individual commodity using funds collected from the producers of that commodity. Recently, there has been interest in expanding the “5-a-day” or “broad-based” promotion efforts for fruits and vegetables in Canada and the United States, following in the path of a successful program in Australia (Go for 2&5® campaign). Although there has been much support for this idea among health officials and retailers of fresh produce, uncertainties about the benefits and costs of such a program make this a highly controversial issue among those in the horticultural sector. To examine the possible economic implications of expanding broad-based promotional efforts, we collect data in an experiment that introduces participants to various advertisements for fruits and vegetables. Our results indicate that commodity-specific promotional efforts may be less effective at increasing demand for fruits and vegetables than earlier studies have suggested, yet broad-based advertisements appear to have a significant effect on the demand for fruits and vegetables. After controlling for various demographic differences between treatments, our results show that demand for fruits and vegetables was 21% higher among subjects in the broad-based group compared to the control group.