The Journal of Animal & Plant Sciences, 28(5): 2018, Page: 1523-1531
ISSN: 1018-7081

FACTORS AFFECTING CONSUMERS' PREFERENCES FOR PURCHASE PLACE OF LOCAL FOOD PRODUCTS

E. Kadanalı[1*] and N. Demir[2]

[1]Agri Ibrahim Cecen University,Faculty of Economics &Administrative Sciences, 04100 Agri, Turkey
[2]Ataturk University, Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Agricultural Economics, 25240 Erzurum, Turkey
[*]corresponding author's e-mail: ekadanali@agri.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate the factors affecting consumers' preferences for purchase place of local food products and comparative importance of these factors. For this purpose, a face-to-face survey of consumers was conducted in Erzurum province in Turkey. In order to analyze the data obtained, a multinomial logit model was employed. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that income level and purchase frequency were statistically significant factors in determining the preference of Y_1 (Producer or farmer/ village market) among the alternative purchase places of local food products. For Y_2 (special shops where local products are sold, as purchase place), occupation and purchase frequency were found to be significant. The significant factors for Y_3 (supermarkets as purchase places) were place of birth, income level, purchase frequency and whether the meaning of geographic indication is known or not. In conclusion, it is possible to evaluate the purchase place as an important factor in consumers' preferences for local food products. Therefore, it could be stated that, considering factors influencing place of purchase, providing producer incentives and informational activities towards this sector could prove important.

Key words: Local product, consumer, multinomial logit, purchase place, Turkey.

INTRODUCTION

Most important factor affecting the consumer behavior is culture. All psychological and social factors which have an affect over consumer behavior are under influence of culture (Odabası and Barıs, 2007). Culture of a country affects the way its products are consumed as much as it determines the products to be produced in that country (Odabası and Barıs, 2007). The existence of cultural richness in the country is very influential over the traditional food products produced country-wide (Kusat, 2012). In recent years, local products sector has been shown as one of the most dynamic sectors in terms of global food consumption (Tekelioglu and Demirer, 2008). This situation can be explained by the increase in localization trends which is the result of an increased consumer consciousness about health and natural living (Tasdan *et al*., 2014). In European Union (EU) Legislation, and in Turkish Food Codex Regulation of Law no 5996, traditional product is defined as a product which is produced by using traditional raw materials, or which have a distinctive feature due to traditional ingredients or, which is passed through processes reflecting a traditional production style even though it is not based on a such traditional production type (Vasilopoulou *et al.,* 2005; LIS, 2014). In accordance with this definition, it is possible to evaluate local food products within the group of traditional products. It could be stated that local products, in their essence, reflect culture, history and life-style. In addition to that, these are products which have a traditional feature due to traditional methods and raw materials used in their production and which differentiate from similar products produced in other regions due to such characteristics (Kusat, 2012). There is a strong connection between local products, which are an important part of local culture, and the region where these products are produced (Tekelioglu and Demirer, 2008). Necessary legislative arrangements have been made in numerous countries to protect these products from imitations and unfair competition (Tekelioglu and Demirer, 2008). The concept of "locality" has taken its place in international platforms within the framework of the protection of geographical indications and designation of origin in international conventions (Tekelioglu and Demirer, 2008). Local products market is a place where consumers look for authenticity; a market where quality is sought for along with cultural dimension of the product (Meral, 2013). In relation to this subject, the system of geographical indications and its documentation has come to the fore as a legal way of protecting this cultural and local richness. Geographical indications are the marks showing that a product is associated with a region, area, location or country, where it has origin in terms of a certain feature, reputation or other characteristics (The Turkish Patent Institute, 2016).

Marketing forms and places have special importance because of the production methods and ingredients of local food products. In this respect, research on consumers' behaviors, attitudes and decisions has gained prominence. As part of consumer attitudes and

behaviors, investigation of the choice for purchase place could have implications for marketing decisions; as the place where consumers buy local food products varies depending considerably on the changes in socio-economic factors. Although traditional purchase places have lost their significance due to development in retail sector, this situation could be different in terms of local food products.

Various studies made on the consumers' behaviors towards local food products showed that there was an increase in consumers' interest in local food products as they were considered healthier, less processed and of higher quality (Jekanowski *et al*.,2000; Brown 2003; Demirbas *et al*.,2006; Carpio and Massa, 2008; Brown, *et al*.,2009; Pieniak *et al*., 2009; Coksoyler, 2011; Kusat, 2012; Delice *et al*.,2013; Altuntas and Gulcubuk, 2014; Tasdan *et al.,* 2014; Aprile *et al*., 2015; Kadanali and Dagdemir, 2016). Besides, in some studies it was stated that the demand for local food products would have positive effects on local development and improvement of farmers'/producers' income level. However, it has not been possible to find any study investigating the factors influencing consumers' choice for purchase place of local food products, which indicates the unique value of this present study. With this study, it is aimed to determine the factors influencing the determination of purchase place of local food products.

Local Product: As new production and marketing techniques emerge because of developing technology, which swiftly meet the growing demand of increasing population (Coksoyler, 2009), natural quality of agricultural and animal products was deteriorated thus the trend for locally produced foods has risen significantly. Increase in the number of companies competing in this sector and utilization of production methods based on technology, with a view to meeting the increase in demand, caused changes in the natural quality and content of the products. In addition to that, the existence of an inclination for debasement and imitation of products has brought about consumer concerns related with quality, hygiene and health (Kadanali and Dagdemir, 2016). Hence, increasing awareness of the consumers about healthy and quality products provided in accordance with hygiene rules has also become a factor affecting the purchase place of the products.

Turkey is a very rich country in terms of its climate and geographical properties, diversity of its production in agriculture and livestock raising, traditional production methods peculiar to different regions and product diversity. It is possible to state that the existence of local food products associated with each region is an issue that should be dealt with separately, as it could reveal cultural and traditional richness of the country and its meaning for production and marketing of such goods (Tekelioglu and Demirer, 2008).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The questionnaires conducted with consumers living in the central district of Erzurum constitute the main material of the study. The secondary sources are comprised of previous studies carried out on this subject.

Sampling Method: Data obtained from Civil Registry of Erzurum Province in Turkey was used as sampling frame in determining the number of questionnaires. In this respect, a Proportional Sampling Method was utilized. It is often very difficult to know the standard deviations and variances in the population, so they should be estimated. It is much easier to make an estimate via the ratios (Kurtulus, 1989). Proportional sampling is a method of sampling in which the investigator divides a finite population into sub-populations and then applies random sampling techniques to each sub-population. So, sample size was calculated in accordance with Formula 1 considering ratio of the known and predicted elements which have a specific quality to the finite population (Newbold, 1995). It was assumed that proportion of individuals who consume local food is 75% and of individuals who do not consume is 25% by authors' discretion. In this way, the sample size was determined as 288. However, several back-up questionnaires, 5% of the sample size, were also included in the study. Similarly, Aprile *et al*. (2015), in their study, found that 70.3% of respondents would prefer local food.

$$n = \frac{N * P * (1-p)}{(N-1) * \sigma_p^2 + p * (1-p)} \quad (1)$$

In this formula;
n: sample size,
N: number of households in the population,
$\sigma^2_{p:}$ variance of the ratio,
r: mean deviation (%5)
$Z_{\alpha/2}$: z table value (1.96)
p: Ratio of the number of consumers to the population.

$$\sigma_p^2 = \frac{r}{Z_{\alpha/2}}$$

$$\sigma_p{}^2 = \frac{0.05}{1{,}645}$$

=0,0304

$$n = \frac{180780 * 0.75 * 0.25}{(180780 * 0{,}0304^2) + (0.75 * 0.25)} = 288$$

Data Analysis Method

Multinomial Logit: Multinomial logistic regression analysis is a method which is used to determine the relationship between the response variable and explanatory variables (independent variables) in cases where the response variable has three or more categories. In multinomial logistic regression analysis, any one of the categories of response variable is taken as reference category and other categories are analyzed in accordance with this reference category (Elasan and Keskin, 2015). Utility maximization is a good starting point to understand the structure of non-sequential categorical models. When a choice is made among j-number of alternatives (j= 1, 2,.., J), the utility obtained by many individuals, i. (i=1, 2, N) is shown as Uij (Borooah, 2002 p. 45). Utility is expressed as following (Karli *et al*., 2008):

$$U_j = V_j + \varepsilon_j \qquad j = 1,2,3$$

Alternative places for purchase of local products by households are shown as (Karli *et al.*, 2008):

$$U_j(V_j + \varepsilon_j) > U_k(V_k + \varepsilon_k) \quad for\ all\ other\ k \neq j$$

The probability of j as the purchase place chosen by consumers:

$$\vartheta_j = P_r(V_j - V_k > \theta_{jk}, \forall_{kj})$$

Here, $\theta_{jk} = \varepsilon_k - \varepsilon_j$

V_j is not directly observable; instead, we can observe which purchase place consumers are inclined.

If, $\delta_j = 1$, for a defined variable like δ_j, consumer chooses of one of the alternatives of j and o. Then, $\delta_j = 1$, if

$V_J + \varepsilon_J > V_k + \varepsilon_k \ \forall k \neq j$ and;

$$\theta_j = P_r(V_j - V_k > \theta_{jk} \forall_{k \neq j})$$

$$= P_r(\delta_j = 1)$$

The factors effecting the consumers' decisions for purchase place were tried to be determined with the help of Multinomial Logit (MNL) regression in which socio demographic factors were used as descriptive variables. The model set up in the study is shown below:

$$\gamma = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_8 X_8 + \beta_9 X_9 + \beta_{10} X_{10} + \beta_{11} X_{11} + \varepsilon$$

Where Y is preferences for purchase place of local food products, X_1 stands for person's gender; X_2 for age, X_3 for education, X_4 for profession, X_5 for social security, X_6 for place of birth, X_7 for marital status, X_8 for total number of individuals in the household, X_9 for average monthly income of the household, X_{10} for the frequency of decisions made for purchase of local products $X_{11}$for whether definition of geographic indications is known or not and ϵ for error term.

Multinomial logit could be denoted as following (Greene, 2003):

$$\Pr(\delta = 1) = \frac{e^{Vj}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{2} e^{Vk}} \quad \text{for j= 2, 3}$$

$$\Pr(\delta = 1) = \frac{e^{Vj}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{2} e^{Vk}} \quad \text{for j= 1}$$

In the model, Marginal effects;

$$\gamma j = \frac{\partial \Pr_j}{\partial x} \quad j = 1, 2,3 \qquad = \Pr_j \left(j^{-} \right)$$

here, $^{-} = \sum_{k=0}^{2} \Pr_{jj}$

Here "j" s, constitute the set of parameters corresponding to alternatives.

Table 1. Description of variables.

Variable	Descriptions
Y_0	District market
Y_1	Producer or farmer/village market
Y_2	Special shops where local products are sold
Y_3	Supermarket
Gender	Gender
Age	Age
Education	Education
Profession	Job
SSecurity	Social Security
Place of birth	Place of birth
Marital status	Marital status
Hsize	Population of household
Income	Income
CLocal food	The frequency of decision to buy local food
GI	Whether definition of geographical indications is known or not

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-demographical characteristics of consumers participating in the research are shown in Table 2. 49% of the consumers are male while 51% of the participants are female. In terms of groupings made in accordance with the number of household members, the families with 1-5 members have the highest share with 78.9%. When distribution of age groups is considered, it was found that 37.7% of the consumers were between 20-30 ages while 42.0% was between 31-41 ages 20.3% was above 42 years old. The consumers between 31-41 ages constituted the highest portion of the sample. When education level was considered, it was observed that the largest share (44.6%) belonged to the group composed of university graduates and post-graduate degree holders. 51.7% of the consumers were married while 48.3% were single. In terms of income distribution, the consumer group with an income level between 2001- 4000 TL (Turkish Liras) had the highest share with 46.9%. When professions of consumers were considered it was seen that 24.3% of the participants were civil servants, while workers, self-employed persons and housewives constituted 15.6%, 15.0% and 15.3% of the participants respectively.

Table 2. Socio-demographical characteristics of the sample

DemographicalVariables	%	Demographical Variables	%
Gender		**Education**	
Male	49	Primary School	16.7
Female	51	Secondary School	11.4
Population		High School	27.3
1-5	78.9	University Graduate+	44.6
6- 8	15.7	**Marital status**	
9+	5.4	Married	51.7
Age		Single	48.3
20- 30	37.7	**Profession**	
31- 41	42.0	Civil servant	24.3
42+	20.3	Housewife	15.3
Income Level (Turkish Liras)		Worker	15.6
650- 2000	26.6	Self-employed	15.0
2001- 4000	46.9	Profession requiring expertise	11.0
4001-10.000	25.8	Retired	6.5
10.001+	0.7	Unemployed	6.0
		Unemployed and income	1.0
		Student	5.3

In addition to that, evaluations related to questions, which were used in the research, about the purchase of local food products, consumers' preferences and knowledge level are provided in Table 3. It is seen that 76.7% of the consumers made some effort to buy local products. This result can be explained by the consumers' taste and consciousness for healthy diet. On the other hand, the share of consumers, who said to have often, sometimes and seldom bought local products are 42.7%, 41.3% and 16.0% respectively. Consistent with the findings of Aprile *et al*. (2015), who stated that 45% of consumers bought local foods often, 43% of sometimes, and 7% of rarely.

30.0% of the consumers stated that they bought local products in special shops where similar products are sold while 15.0% of consumers told they bought local products in local markets, 39.0% from the producer-farmers' markets and 16.0% from supermarkets. In their study Aprile *et al.* (2015) found out that 32.6% of consumers made purchase directly from the producer; 25.6% from supermarkets, 18.8 from the market and 10.4% from special shops and 7.6% from farmers' markets.

It was determined that 58.0% of consumers participating in the study were not informed about the geographical indications system. When the distribution related to the perception of the local products was reviewed, it was seen that 61.3% of the consumers described local products as produced in Erzurum province and nearby districts and villages. The share of consumers describing these products as grown and produced in Turkey is 16.9%.

Table 3. Preference for purchase place of local food products, and level of knowledge

Do you make effort to find and purchase local food products?	%
Yes	76.7
No	23.3
Total	100.0
How often do you purchase local food products?	%
Often	42.7
Sometimes	41.3
Seldom	16.0
Total	100
Where do you purchase local products?	%
Farmer/Village market	39.0
Special shops for local food products	30.0
District Market	15.0
Supermarket	16.0
Total	100.0
Do you know about the geographic indication?	%
Yes	42.0
No	58.0
Total	100.0
How do you define local food products?	%
Products grown and produced in Turkey	16.9
Products grown and produced in Erzurum and nearby villages/districts	61.3
Products with Geographical Indications	8.9
Products purchased from the producer	12.9
Total	100.0
Which documents better prove security and quality of local products?	%
Geographic Indications Certificate	11.4
Organic Product Label	12.4
ISO Certificate	18.4
TSE	38.7
Geographic Indications and TSE	14.4
Other (Different combinations of documents mentioned above)	4.7
Total	100.0

In a study carried by Aprile *et al*. (2015), it was found that the share of persons who defined local food products as “products grown/produced in my own region” was 53.2%. Brown (2003) asked what `locally grown' meant household food buyers and found that %14 of buyers responded restricted `to locally grown 'to within their county, and 14 % of them would expand that definition to include their county and an adjoining county.

In the study, it was determined that 38.7% of consumers mentioned TSE (Turkish Standard Institute) documents when asked about documents preferred for security and quality of the local product.

While 18.4% preferred ISO documents, 11.4% stated their preference for Geographical Indication Certificate. It is possible to explain the higher preference for TSE and ISO documents with the fact that there was perception of state guarantee and control.

Table 4. Multinomial Logit Results

	Variable	Coeff.	St. Error	Marginal effects
Farmer/Village Market= Y1	Constant	-0.12423	1.84278	-
	Gender	-0.54016	0.46759	-0.06862*
	Age	-0.00542	0.02258	0.39547D-04
	Education	-0.06230	0.05924	-0.00618
	Profession	-0.15824	0.10720	0.00582
	Security	0.12487	0.20966	0.01477
	Place of birth	-0.35108	0.72531	-0.04596

Special Shops for local products =Y2	Marital Status	0.09114	0.33106	0.00207
	Hsize	0.05280	0.12412	0.00921
	Income	-0.00036**	0.00015	-0.39175D-04***
	CLocal food	0.79373**	0.32969	-0.08246***
	GI	0.76494	0.48359	0.00522
	Constant	-2.97783*	1.67856	-
Supermarket =Y3	Gender	0.07669	0.41698	0.02924
	Age	0.00413	0.02141	0.00313
	Education	0.00953	0.05377	0.00779
	Profession	-0.23375**	0.09164	-0.00985
	Security	-0.06820	0.19797	-0.02544
	Place of birth	-0.35150	0.62649	-0.11168
	Marital Status	-0.07462	0.30286	-0.04759
	Hsize	-0.01388	0.11874	0.00118
	Income	-0.55475D-04	0.00011	0.11663D-05
	CLocal food	1.91482***	0.31533	0.15564***
	GI	0.54981	0.42131	-0.05559
	Constant	-2.76676*	1.59657	-
	Gender	0.07069	0.39911	0.03760
	Age	-0.01448	0.02057	-0.00382
	Education	-0.02265	0.05122	-0.00334
	Profession	-0.24707***	0.08769	-0.01936
	Security	0.03956	0.18442	0.01205
	Place of Birth	0.36164	0.62221	0.15769*
	Marital status	0.19954	0.28426	0.05422
	Hsize	-0.04607	0.11153	-0.01242
	Income	0.12286D-04	0.9886D-04	0.31185D-04*
	CLocal food	1.63310***	0.29364	0.09112**
	GI	1.03194**	0.40666	0.13400**

***, **, * ==> Significance at 1%. 5%. 10% level. District markets are taken as reference.

Multinomial logit model was used in the study of the factors influencing the consumers' preferences for purchase places of local food products and the degree of relative importance of these factors. The purchase places were examined in four different groups as following: producer or farmer/ village markets; special shops where local food products are sold; district markets and supermarkets. Similarly, Kizilaslan *et al.* (2008), in their study, applied multinomial logit model to measure the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable in which, they examined the socio-economic factors affecting meat sales outlets, as preferred by the consumers of the city of Tokat, Turkey. Another study by (Kizilaslan *et al.* 2014), attempted to manifest the factors influencing the consumers' preference for purchase place of sunflower oil with the help of multinomial logit analysis. To analyze the multinomial logit model, it is necessary normalize one of these categories. For normalization, parameters of the related category are equalized to 0 (Greene, 2003). In this study, the group of district markets was normalized. Therefore, parameter estimation fort his group was not made. The results of Multinomial model and marginal effects of the independent variables over the likelihood of preference for purchase place are shown in Table 4. The results of parameter estimation for the analysis are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. The results of parameter estimation for the analysis.

Variable	Y1		Y2		Y3	
	Estimate	z- value	Estimate	z- value	Estimate	z- value
Constant	-0.12423	0.9463	-2.97783*	0.0761	-2.76676*	0.0831
Gender	-0.54016	0.2480	0.07669	0.8541	0.07069	0.8594
Age	-0.00542	0.8104	0.00413	0.8470	-0.01448	0.4815
Education	-0.06230	0.2929	0.00953	0.8593	-0.02265	0.6584

Emplogy	-0.15824	0.1399	-0.23375**	0.0187	-0.24707***	0.0048
Security	0.12487	0.5514	-0.06820	0.7305	0.03956	0.8302
Place of birth	-0.35108	0.6284	-0.35150	0.5748	0.36164	0.5611
Marital status	0.09114	0.7831	-0.07462	0.8054	0.19954	0.4827
Hsize	0.05280	0.6706	-0.01388	0.9069	-0.04607	0.6796
Income level	-0.00036**	0.0193	-0.55475D-04	0.6071	0.12286D-04	0.9011
CLocal food	0.79373**	0.0161	1.91482***	0.0000	1.63310***	0.0000
GI	0.76494	0.01137	0.54981	0.1919	1.03194**	0.0112
Log-likelihood			-344.04833			
Restricted Log likelihood			-393.93651			
Chi Squared with 33 df			99.77635			

In the Table 5, log likelihood is used to test the level of importance for factors among alternative choices. In the model, it was assumed that alternative options making up the dependent variable were independent from each other (Greene, 2003). One of the assumptions of Multinomial logit model is the Independence of Irrelevant Alternatives (IIA). The independence of alternatives is defined as the independence, of the probability ratio of choosing two alternatives, from the third alternative. Multinomial logit model assumes that deviations are independent.

In Table 4, the results of Multinomial logit analysis are presented. In the model, district market, which is expressed as Y_0, was taken as reference. Because of the analysis, it was determined that income level and frequency of the purchase were statistically significant in preference of Y_1 (producer or farmer/village market) as purchase place for local food products. In Table 5, it is shown that the statistically significant relationship is positive with frequency of purchase and negative with income level. This situation could be effective over preference of consumers maintaining connection with the village for producer or farmer/village markets. Frequency of purchase can be explained by the effect of familiarity and mutual trust. In Table 4, the marginal effects of the variables are also presented. Accordingly, when the marginal effect of significant variables was examined, it was seen that income level and purchase frequency decreased the preference for producer or farmer/ village market by 39% and by 8% respectively. Profession and purchase frequency were calculated as significant for special shops where local products are sold as purchase place. It was found that, among significant variables, professions, in accordance with the order of professions as shown in Table 2, decreased preference for special shops as purchase of location by 0,09% while frequency of purchase increased its preference by 15%. The variables found as significant for supermarket as purchase place were place of birth, income level, frequency of purchase, and awareness of geographical indications. It was determined that these variables increased the dependent variable in the following rates: place of birth by 15%, income level by 31%, purchase frequency by 9% and awareness of geographic indications by 13%. Martı´nez *et al*. (2006), in their study, examined the effect of purchase place and consumption frequency on consumers preferences towards quality wine. As a result of the study, they pointed out that the consumption frequency and purchasing place is efficient on consumer preferences. The place of birth or province where consumers live affects their food consumption habits and preferences. Cantarero *et al*. (2013) confirmed the relationship between food preferences and age, gender, birthplace, education level, employment situation, professional category, average income, etc.

A consumer survey by Kizilaslan *et al.* (2008) found that age, household size, place of residence, status of the mother, income, price difference, quality difference, hygiene, freshness and the seller's image are deemed to be the variables affecting the consumers' meat outlet preferences. In some other studies about different product groups, it is observed that especially income is an important variable (Wolf, 1997; Kezis *et al.,* 1998; Carpio and Massa, 2008; Mutlu, 2007; Kizilaslan *et al.,* 2008; Aprile *et al.,* 2015). Another study conducted by, Kizilaslan *et al*., (2014) about to determine the factors influencing the preferences for purchase place of sunflower oil showed, age of the consumer and frequency of purchase as significant factors for markets and supermarkets as purchase places.

In this study, also it was determined that the factor related to the focus level to quality certifications with specific reference to GI, TSE and ISO labels also plays an important role on decision consumers' purchase place for local foods. According to a study conducted by Aprile *et al*. (2015), consumers believe that quality and safety aspects of local products are guaranteed by the presence of Geographical Indications label and European Organic Farming label.

Conclusions and Recommendations: Preferences for purchase places and factors influencing these preferences could be important in terms of investigations studying consumer behaviors.

The factors influencing the consumers' preferences for purchase place of local food products were analyzed with the results of multinomial logit model. It was determined that income level and purchase frequency were statistically significant factors for consumers preferring producer or farmer/ village markets. As income level rises, the preference for producer or farmer/ village markets decreases. This result could be explained by the fact that consumers prefer well-known products. On the other hand, it was seen that as the purchase frequency increased, preference for producer or farmer/ village markets increased as well. For preference of special shops where local products are sold, profession and purchase frequency were determined as significant factors while significant factors for preference of supermarkets were profession, purchase frequency, and being aware of the meaning (definition) of geographical indications. As in other sectors, technological changes in food sector had important implications over the changes in behaviors and attitudes of the consumers. EU commission made important evaluations supporting this view in its report prepared for 16 Western European countries. The report stated that 76% of the consumers consumed traditional products and 56% of them evaluated the localization as an important aspect of quality. The fact that local products were subject to less technology made them preferable.

When the place of purchase is considered as an important issue for consumers along with preferences made for these products, it is possible to argue that marketing of local food products is as much important as their production. Given the increase in consumer conscience, the purchase place of a product is evaluated, together with content, production method and packaging of the product as well as with local and international documents and certificates approving the product. Despite the developments in the retail sector, consumers prefer to purchase local food products from producer or farmer/village markets and make their evaluations about quality, hygiene etc. depending upon the documents and certificates of these products. The fact that not only the consumption of these products itself but also the purchase place is a factor influencing the consumers' preferences, could contribute to the improvement for the competitiveness of the products. It could be stated that in market mix decisions, consumers' expectations and preferences for purchase places should also be considered.

REFERENCES

Altuntas, A. and B. Gulcubuk (2014). Traditional foods as a spreading instrument in local development and disseminationof traditional food legislation. J. Agricultural Faculty of Gazi Osman Pasa University, 31: 73-81.

Aprile, M.C., V. Caputo, and R. M. Jr. Nayga (2015). Consumers' preferences and attitudes toward local food products. J. Food Products Marketing, 0:1–26.

Borooah, V.K. (2002). Logit and Probit, Ordered and Multinomial Models, series/number 07-138, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

Brown, E., S. Dury, and M. Holdsworth (2009). Motivations of consumers that use local, organic fruit and vegetable box schemes in central England and Southern France. Appetite 53: 11-18.

Brown, C (2003). Consumers' preferences for locally produced food: a study in Southeast Missouri. American J. Alternative Agriculture, 18 (4): 213- 224.

Cantarero, L., E. Espeitx, M. G. Lacruz and P. Martín (2013). Human food preferences and cultural identity: The case of Aragon (Spain). International J. Psychology, 48(5): 881- 890.

Carpio, C.E. and O. I. Massa (2008). Consumer willingness to pay for locally grown products: the case of South Carolina. Southern Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meeting, Dallas, TX, February 2-6.

Coksoyler, N. (2009). Foreword. II. Traditional Foods Symposium, 27-29 May, Van.

Coksoyler, N. (2011). What do we mean by traditional food? What is the traditional food perception of the people? www.gidalab.tarim.gov.tr /izmir /Belgeler/ (Access date: 08.09.2014).

Delice N.Y., O. Guneser, and Y.K. Yuceer (2013). Consumer expectation and preference of ezine cheese. J. Tekirdag Agri. Faculty,10 (2): 92-103.

Demirbas, N., D. Oktay, and D.Tosun (2006). From the perspective of food safety, production and marketing of traditional foods in Turkey, as a country in the process of EU membership, J. Agricultural Faculty of Harran University, 10 (3):47-55.

Elasan, S. and S. Keskin (2015). An application with multinomial logistic regression analysis, International J. Human Sciences, 12(1), 443-455.

Greene, W. H. (2003). Econometric analysis. Prentice-Hall International, Inc., 1026s.

Jekanowski M. D., D. R. Williams II, and W. A. Schiek (2000). Consumers' willingness to purchase locally produced agricultural products: an

analysis of an Indiana survey. Agricultural and Resource Economics Review 29(8): 43-53.

Kadanali, E. and V. Dagdemir (2016). Consumers' willingness to purchase local food products. J. Agricultural Faculty of Gaziosmanpasa University, 33 (1): 9-16.

Karli, B., A. Bilgic and B. Miran (2008). Consumer' perceptions about genetically modified food labeling: Evidences from Turkey. AgEcon Search. http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/handle/6754.

Kezis, A., T. Gwebu, S. Peavey, and H.T.Cheng (1998). A study of consumers at a small farmers' market in Maine: Results from a 1995 survey. J. Food Distribution Res., 29:91-99.

Kizilaslan, H., Z. G. Goktolga and N. Kizilaslan (2008). An analysis of the factors affecting the food places where consumers purchase red meat. British Food J., 110 (6):580-594.

Kizilaslan, N., C. Hanedar, R. Kızıloğlu, T. Ünal, and H. Kızılaslan, (2014). Determining the factors affecting where people purchase sunflower oil (The Case of Tokat Province). XI. National Agricultural Economics Congress, 3- 5 September, Samsun/ Turkey.

Kurtuluş, K. (1989), Research methodology in business (Research Methods), İstanbul, Faculty of Business Administration Publication No: 210, Institute of Business Economics Publication No: 106.

Kusat, N. (2012). A study based on "the role of traditional food products on regional development" and "innovation characteristics of traditional food products": example of Afyon. J. The Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences of Celal Bayar University. 19 (2): 261–276.

Legislation Information System (LIS), (2014). Turkish Food Codex Regulation. http://mevzuat.basbakanlik. gov.tr. (Access date (: 10.06.2014).

Martı´nez, L.M.C., M. B.M, Bauza´, F. J. D. C., Gomis and A. M. Poveda (2006). Influence of purchase place and consumption frequency over quality wine preferences. Food Quality and Preference 17, 315–327.

Meral, Y. (2013). Preferences of consumers towards product with geographical indication at centre of province of Kahramanmaras: Case study of Gemlik olive. Postgraduate Thesis. (Acces date: 2016).

Mutlu, S. (2007). Consumer behaviors on food safety (a case study on red meat consumption in urban areas of Adana). Ph.D. Thesis. (Access date: 2016) http://traglor.cu.edu.tr/objects/objectFile/e7bSWTUE-492013-8.pdf

Newbold, P. (1995). Statistics for business & economics. Fourth Edition, Prentice Hall.

Pieniak, Z., W. Verbeke, F. Vanhonacker, L. Guerrero, and M. Hersleth (2009). Association between traditional food consumption and motives for food choice in six European countries. Appetite, 53(1).

Tasdan, K., M. Albayrak, B. Gurer, O. Ozer, K. Albayrak, and H.T. Guldal (2014). The perception of food safety of consumers on traditional foods: the case of Ankara. http://yucita.org/uploads/yayinlar/diger/makale/Geleneksel_Gdalarda_Tuketicilerin_Gda_Guvenlii_Algs.pdf.

Tekelioglu, Y. and R. Demirer (2008). Local products in globalization process and future of geographical indications. İgeme'den Bakış Dergisi, 36: 87-102

Turkish Patent Institute (2016). http://www.turkpatent.gov.tr

Odabası, Y. and Barıs, G. (2007). Cosumer behaviour. Mediacat

Vasilopoulou, E., V. Dilis, S. Soukara, and A. Trichopolilou (2005). The systematic investigation of traditional foods in Europe. 1. International Food and Nutrition Congress, TUBITAK, June 15, Istanbul.

Wolf, M. M. (1997). A target consumer profile and positioning for promotion of the direct marketing of fresh produce: A case study. J. Food Distribution Res., 28:11-17.