

# *Consumer attitudes to injurious pecking in free range egg production*

Article

Accepted Version

Bennett, R. M., Jones, P. J., Nicol, C. J., Tranter, R. B. and Weeks, C. A. (2016) Consumer attitudes to injurious pecking in free range egg production. *Animal Welfare*, 25 (1). pp. 91-100. ISSN 0962-7286 doi:  
<https://doi.org/10.7120/09627286.25.1.091> Available at  
<http://centaur.reading.ac.uk/41574/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7120/09627286.25.1.091>

Publisher: UFAW

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

[www.reading.ac.uk/centaur](http://www.reading.ac.uk/centaur)

**CentAUR**

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

# 1 **Consumer attitudes to injurious pecking in free range egg production**

2

## 3 **Introduction**

4 Injurious pecking (IP) is a behaviour found in a majority of egg-laying flocks in the United  
5 Kingdom (UK) and beyond. Rodenburg et al (2013) and Nicol et al (2013) provide extensive  
6 reviews of both the extent of IP and its prevention and control in commercial systems. IP  
7 encompasses severe feather pecking and cannibalistic (often vent) pecking, frequently  
8 resulting in pain, skin damage, plumage loss and significant economic losses to the industry.  
9 It is particularly prevalent in non-cage systems, where a pecking bird has access to a far  
10 greater number of victims than it would in a cage system (Keeling and Jensen 1995). In  
11 addition, the problem is harder to manage in non-cage systems, since perpetrators cannot  
12 easily be identified (e.g. Gunnarsson et al 1999; Green et al 2000; Sherwin et al 2010). IP can  
13 start during the rearing period, though plumage damage is not usually recognised, as birds  
14 moult several times before lay. The problem increases when birds are brought into lay,  
15 possibly due to changes in hormone levels (Hughes 1973; Norgaard-Nielsen et al 1993).  
16 Careful management is essential during rearing to ensure a smooth transition from rear to lay  
17 (McKeegan & Savory 1999; Nicol et al 1999; Pöttsch et al 2001).

18

19 The estimated prevalence of IP depends on the method used to measure it in poultry  
20 populations. One method focuses on the proportion of flocks affected, regardless of severity.  
21 Using this measure, farmer reports have estimated the proportion of flocks experiencing IP at  
22 62% in Sweden (Gunnarsson et al 1999), 37.5% in Switzerland (Huber-Eicher 1999) and 47%  
23 in the UK (Green et al 2000). Lambton et al (2010) when observing 111 UK farms found  
24 severe feather pecking on 85.6% of farms at 40 weeks. However, these estimates take no  
25 account of the proportion of birds within a flock that might be affected, or the degree of

26 severity of pecking. Both phenomena are reviewed by Nicol et al (2013). Rates of severe  
27 feather pecking have been recorded at 1.15 pecks/bird/h (Nicol et al 1999) or 1.22  
28 bouts/bird/h (Lambton et al 2010). In all cases, these mean figures mask considerable inter-  
29 farm variation.

30

31 The economic consequences of IP can be substantial but calculating them is complex as many  
32 factors contribute to losses (Nicol et al 2013). Reduced plumage cover is linked with reduced  
33 feed conversion efficiency (Tauson & Svensson 1980; Peguri & Coon 1993). Severely  
34 feather pecked (bald) chickens need up to 40% more feed to maintain body temperature  
35 (Blokhuys et al 2007) and the birds are less efficient at converting food into egg mass.

36 Outbreaks of feather pecking and cannibalism also reduce overall egg production because of  
37 the associated rise in mortality (Hughes & Duncan 1972; Green et al 2000; El-Lethey et al  
38 2000; Huber-Eicher & Sebo 2001). Farmers tend to attribute a low rate of mortality to IP  
39 (Green et al 2000; Pötzsch et al 2001), much lower than the real proportion. IP is, in fact, a  
40 principal cause of mortality in non-cage systems (Rodenburg et al 2008; Fossum et al 2009;  
41 Sherwin et al 2010), which in many surveys is at significantly higher levels than in cage  
42 systems and may exceed 20% (Blokhuys 2005; Blokhuys et al 2007; Rodenburg et al 2013;  
43 Weeks et al 2012).

44

45 Worldwide, beak trimming conducted by either the infra-red (IR) or hot blade (HB) technique  
46 is the primary method used by the industry to limit the damage caused by IP (Dennis et al  
47 2009). In adult birds, HB beak-trimming has been shown to reduce cannibalism-related  
48 mortality in floor pens (Damme 1999) and reduce plumage damage (Staack et al 2007). Beak  
49 trimmed birds also tend to eat 'more efficiently', performing less exploratory pecking and  
50 improving their food conversion ratio. However, it is difficult to distinguish whether the

51 commonly-observed behavioural changes observed to occur after trimming (reduced pecking  
52 behaviour and activity (Gentle et al 1990; Craig & Lee 1990)) indicate pain or changes in  
53 beak sensitivity (Hughes & Gentle 1995).

54

55 A number of countries have or are considering implementing a ban on beak trimming. The  
56 UK Government has set a review date of 2015 with a view to banning beak trimming in 2016  
57 (Defra, 2010).

58

59 A ban on beak-trimming requires that the hens' propensity to peck other hens can be  
60 controlled or reduced by changes to housing, management, or other practices that maintain or  
61 improve bird welfare. The study reported here was part of a larger study which examined the  
62 effectiveness of evidence-based management strategies in reducing IP in practice. One  
63 hundred flocks on 63 farms were recruited for the study, of which 53 trialled suggested  
64 changes in management to control IP. Both treatment and control flocks were already  
65 employing a variety of the 46 possible management strategies, but farms enrolled as treatment  
66 farms added additional management strategies to their flock management at an early stage in  
67 the study. The uptake of new management strategies was encouraged by modest financial or  
68 practical assistance in obtaining some of the materials required (e.g. pecking blocks, starter  
69 packs of compressed wood pellets etc). The average cost of implementing the management  
70 strategies on the treatment farms was approximately 5 pence per bird (0.016p egg assuming a  
71 mean of 25 dozen eggs/bird/year). Some of the costs were one-off improvements that would  
72 remain in place for many subsequent flocks such as provision of artificial shelters or planting  
73 trees, whereas others such as maintaining friable litter require ongoing labour and substrate  
74 provision (for details see: [www.featherwel.org](http://www.featherwel.org)). Lambton et al (2013) describe in more detail  
75 this project and its findings.

76 In the October quarter of 2011, 44.1 per cent of UK egg packers' throughput was from free  
77 range units, which make up the overwhelming majority of UK non-cage systems (Defra  
78 2014). Almost all of this free range production is to Freedom Food Standards which specify  
79 stocking rates and limit colony size to 4,000 birds (maximum flock size of 16,000). The  
80 principal finding of the study was that the more of the 46 management strategies that were  
81 employed, plumage damage, incidence of feather pecking behaviour and likelihood of vent  
82 pecking were all significantly reduced alongside a reduction in levels of mortality at 40 weeks  
83 of age (Lambton et al 2013). Thus, the premise that IP can be reduced by altered practices,  
84 some of which have a cost, was substantiated.

85

86 A report by IGD (2011) found that nearly half of UK consumers surveyed stated that animal  
87 welfare was either very important, or extremely important, to them. There are a number of  
88 studies in the literature that report that consumers are concerned about hen welfare in  
89 particular, although not about IP specifically. For example, at the EU level, the  
90 Eurobarometer (2007) survey reported that 58% of citizens across 25 member states thought  
91 that hen welfare in their countries was either 'very' or 'fairly' bad. In Great Britain, Mayfield  
92 et al (2007) found that 64% of consumers thought the treatment of hens was very important  
93 (only 9% thought it not important) although 56% thought that welfare conditions for hens  
94 were poor.

95

96 In the sections that follow, we present the results of the above project's consumer survey  
97 where consumer attitudes to free range egg production are detailed together with the  
98 calculation of the price premium consumers said they would be prepared to pay to help reduce  
99 IP in free range systems. After discussion of the results, some conclusions are drawn and the  
100 implications for animal welfare policy are considered.

101

102 **Methodology**

103 A focus group of eight consumers was carried out to help inform the design of the consumer  
104 postal survey. The focus group was stratified to ensure participants came from a mix of  
105 socio-economic backgrounds. The following issues were explored with focus group  
106 participants: consumer beliefs concerning the welfare of hens in free range laying systems;  
107 current knowledge of IP; attitudes to IP and the welfare of hens after a full briefing about IP;  
108 and attitudes to the potentially higher costs of eggs resulting from the introduction of on-farm  
109 measures leading to reduced levels of IP. Beak trimming was not mentioned as it was  
110 regarded as a separate welfare issue.

111

112 Findings from the consumer focus group were used to help inform design of a questionnaire  
113 which was then trialled in a pilot exercise with 10 egg consumers. Following this exercise,  
114 the A4-size, two-page questionnaire was revised (see Appendix 1). It consisted of four  
115 sections designed to collect information, in order, on:

- 116 • the demographics of the respondent and their household;
- 117 • food, egg, and specifically, free range egg purchasing behaviour;
- 118 • attitudes to hen welfare (including IP); and
- 119 • willingness to pay (wtp) to help poultry farmers ensure that hens do not suffer from IP.

120

121 The amended questionnaire was sent to a sample of 1776 consumers stratified by  
122 geographical location and socio-economic characteristics such as age, sex, income and type  
123 of accommodation. This was undertaken to try to ensure the sample was representative of all  
124 GB consumers with particular emphasis on those socio-economic characteristics that were  
125 thought, a priori, to affect egg purchasing behaviour. The sample was purchased from the

126 Yell.com telephone database for GB and the questionnaires, together with a covering letter,  
127 were sent out on Wednesday 20 July 2011 with a reply-paid envelope for their return. A  
128 reminder letter with a further copy of the questionnaire was sent out on Wednesday 17  
129 August 2011 and a second reminder letter was sent out on Wednesday 14 September 2011; a  
130 response rate of nearly 15% was obtained with 257 questionnaires returned. Response rates to  
131 surveys can vary greatly depending on a host of factors. Kaplowitz et al (2004) report an  
132 average response rate of 13% for mail surveys suggesting that 15% is not unreasonable.  
133 Alternative survey administration methods, such as in person, by telephone and on the  
134 internet were considered (see Marsden and Wright, 2010 for a comprehensive description).  
135 The first was thought to be far too costly, the second was costlier than using mail and also it  
136 was felt that respondents needed the wtp part of the questionnaire in front of them to be able  
137 to answer the questions (although a mixed approach using post and telephone would have  
138 been possible). The third method, using the internet, was thought likely to achieve a low  
139 response rate for a survey of this kind.

140

141 To check the representativeness of the respondents, comparisons were made with the  
142 National Population Census (ONS, 2013). This revealed that they were representative in  
143 terms of age, education and employment status, but there was a significant difference in  
144 gender balance, with 24% more women responding to the survey than would be expected.  
145 This is likely to be because the main food purchaser in households would be the one who  
146 tended to complete the questionnaire. Probably, for the same reason, there was a slight  
147 under-representation amongst respondents of the very youngest consumers.

148

149 The contingent valuation (CV) technique was used to elicit consumers' wtp to help poultry  
150 farmers ensure that hens do not suffer from IP. The CV approach (see Mitchell and Carson,



151 1989) was used because, in the context of this study, it was considered more appropriate and  
152 easier (i.e. less cognitively difficult) for respondents to understand and respond to in a mail  
153 survey compared to stated choice approaches (see Louviere et al 2000). Prior to the bid  
154 questions, some briefing information was offered. First, the phenomenon of IP was described  
155 and details given of management approaches that might be adopted to control it (see  
156 Appendix 1). It was also pointed out that these control measures would result in increased  
157 costs of production for the farmer. Second, respondents were reminded of the prevailing  
158 price context for free-range egg purchases in an attempt to ‘ground’ their wtp responses in  
159 reality (wtp studies often remind respondents of their limited budget or provide a ‘cheap talk’  
160 script to ground their responses but given the small percentage of their budget that people  
161 spend on eggs a price context was thought to be more appropriate and more compatible with  
162 how consumers compare prices when food shopping).

163

164 Consumers were asked whether they would be willing to pay a specified amount of money as  
165 an extra payment on top of what they currently pay per half dozen for free range eggs to help  
166 poultry farmers ensure that hens do not suffer from injurious pecking. One of eight different  
167 initial bid levels (ranging from 2 pence to 16 pence) for six free range medium-sized eggs  
168 were randomly allocated to those sampled. If they were prepared to accept the initial bid  
169 (they were given the option of saying ‘yes’, ‘no’ or ‘no opinion’), the next given bid level  
170 provided was 50% higher. If the first bid was rejected, respondents were then offered a bid at  
171 a level of half the initial bid level. This technique is known as the double-bounded  
172 dichotomous choice wtp elicitation method and has been recommended for use in CV studies  
173 (Hanemann et al, 1991). Immediately after the bid questions, respondents were then asked to  
174 describe briefly the reasoning behind their answers to the bid questions; this practice is often  
175 called ‘debriefing’.

176

177 Several methods could have been used to estimate wtp using the data. The approach used in  
178 this case was an Interval Maximum Likelihood Logistic Regression (SAS, PROC  
179 LOGISTIC) which predicted consumer response to BID (the highest accepted bid value)  
180 based on a number of determining variables, including various socio-economic characteristics  
181 of the respondent, attitudinal responses to questions about egg production and the opening bid  
182 level. The total usable sample size was 250, after deleting non-responses to the wtp question.  
183 However, a relatively large number (190) of the observations had randomly occurring  
184 missing values, usually just one, or a small number, particularly in the attitudinal questions,  
185 resulting in the exclusion of these observations from the Logistic Regression. Thus it was  
186 decided that remedial action was necessary to recover and use some of the ‘lost’  
187 observations.

188

189 For this purpose, a principled multiple imputation (MI) method was used to replace missing  
190 values (SAS, PROC MI) from the attitudinal questions. Several MI approaches are available  
191 (see Rubin 1987) but, in this case, the approach adopted was the Markov Chain Monte Carlo  
192 (MCMC) method, as this is regarded as the most appropriate method for datasets with  
193 arbitrary missing data patterns compared to any other method (Schafer 1997). MCMC draws  
194 a random sample of values to replace missing values from the available distribution for each  
195 variable. This process allows for the generation of valid statistical inferences that properly  
196 reflect the uncertainty due to missing values - for example, confidence intervals with the  
197 correct probability coverage. This also allows standard statistical procedures for complete  
198 data analysis to be used with the filled-in data set. As a result of this exercise, a useable  
199 sample of 193 respondents was obtained.

200

201 Various techniques could have been employed to estimate wtp but the method employed in  
202 this case was Maximum Likelihood Estimation, after Cameron (1988) and extended by  
203 Hanemann et al (1991) and employed by Bennett and Blaney (2003) to estimate consumers'  
204 wtp to improve hen welfare via legislation to ban battery cages.

205

206 By this approach, individual  $i$  has an implicit (unobserved) wtp, for a pack of 6 eggs  
207 produced to higher welfare standards, given by:

208

$$209 \quad (1) \quad wtp_i = \underline{x}_i' \underline{b} + s u_i,$$

210

211 where:

212  $wtp_i$  is the individual's true, but incompletely observed, willingness to pay

213  $\underline{x}_i'$  is a vector of explanatory factors which can be observed,

214  $u_i$  is a symmetric random error with zero mean and unit variance that arises from the  
215 unobserved factors about  $i$ 's wtp, and

216  $\underline{b}$  is a vector and  $s$  a scalar to be estimated.

217

218 Each respondent was asked whether they were willing to pay a randomly assigned amount ( $B$   
219  $_i$ ). The probability of observing a positive response to this wtp question is:

220

$$221 \quad (2) \quad \Pr ( \text{Yes} ) = \Pr ( u_i < -B_i / s + \underline{x}_i' \underline{b} / s ).$$

222

223 Alternatively, this probability can be written as:

224

$$225 \quad (3) \quad \Pr ( \text{Yes} ) = F ( c B_i + \underline{d}' \underline{x}_i ),$$

226

227 where:  $c = -1 / s$  and  $\underline{d} = \underline{b} / s$ .  $F(\ )$  is the cumulative distribution function of  $u_i$  and its  
228 assumed distribution determines the type of binary choice model used. The use of a varying  
229 bid level enables the identification of the scale of the wtp relationship and so the bid ( $B_i$ ) is  
230 included amongst the set of explanatory variables ( $\underline{x}_i$ ) in the binary choice model. The  
231 coefficients obtained from the binary choice model are then used to identify the parameters in  
232 Equation (1). The estimated parameters in the binary choice model are  $c$  and  $\underline{d}'$  and thus the  
233 estimates of  $\underline{b}'$  and  $s$  (Bennett and Larson, 1996).

234 will be:

235

236 (4)  $\underline{b}' = -\underline{d}' / c$

237

238 (5)  $s = -1 / c$

239

240 Once the coefficients of the explanatory variables were obtained from the model, it was then  
241 possible to estimate wtp. In this case, maximum likelihood estimation procedures were used,  
242 specifying a logit model (assuming a standard logistic distribution function) and using  
243 standard procedures available in the software package of the SAS Institute Inc. of Cary,  
244 California.

245

246 A complete list of all variables used in the Logistic Regression analysis is provided in  
247 Appendix 2. The socio-economic variables were selected on the basis that, in past studies,  
248 they had proved to be good indicators of wtp for a variety of food attributes (e.g. Tranter et al  
249 2009; Yiridoe et al 2005; Shaw & Shiu 2002).

250

251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275

**Results**

The consumer focus group findings can be summarised as: all participants bought free range eggs for perceived welfare benefits; participants had no idea that IP went on and were shocked to discover the fact, as they thought that free range production was the ‘gold standard’ for hen welfare; there was a general feeling of betrayal, with some indicating that they might stop buying free range eggs; and most participants said they would happily pay extra to compensate poultry farmers for the costs of removing or lessening the IP problem. In the main survey, only 3% of respondents reported that they did not buy eggs at all, most of whom kept their own chickens. The majority (67%) of consumers reported that they bought eggs for their household and, also, did so weekly. The mean number of eggs bought monthly was 23. Some 66% of the respondents reported that they always bought free range eggs, with a further 28% stating that they bought them sometimes; only 6% reported that they never bought free range eggs.

Respondents were asked why they bought free range eggs. They were given five possible reasons and asked to score each on a 6 point (0-5) Likert scale, with 5 being ‘very important’ and 0 being ‘not important at all’. The most commonly given reason was: ‘Hen welfare is better’ which also had the highest mean importance score of 4.60 (S.D. 0.86). The next most commonly cited reason was: ‘Free range hens are happy’ with a mean importance score of 4.31 (S.D. 1.03). The next most commonly cited reason was: ‘They taste better than other eggs’ with a mean importance score of 3.67 (S.D. 1.51), followed by ‘They are healthier than other eggs’ (3.53; S.D. 1.52) and ‘They are fresher than other eggs’ (3.30; S.D. 1.68).

276 Consumers were asked a series of questions designed to elicit their attitudes towards egg  
277 laying hens and free range egg production. Their answers to the eight statements given,  
278 showing their levels of agreement or disagreement, are shown in Table 1 below. Some 43%  
279 of respondents either agreed, or strongly agreed, with the statement that they were well-  
280 informed about how laying hens were treated, with 78% expressing concern over the nature  
281 of the treatment they received; 86% of respondents believed that free range production  
282 offered ‘higher levels of welfare than cage production’, with 89% affirming that hens should  
283 be able to display normal behaviour. In terms of the impact of production system on the  
284 quality of eggs, 68% thought that ‘eggs from birds with a high welfare are healthier and  
285 better tasting’. Furthermore, 41% of our respondents agreed with the statement that ‘eggs  
286 from hens with high welfare are safer to eat’, in spite of a lack of scientific evidence to  
287 support this view. Probably reflecting the highly positive views that respondents have of the  
288 benefits of free range egg production, 76% said they were ‘happy to pay more for free range  
289 eggs’.

290

291 Table 1 around here

292

293 After the wtp questions, the respondents were asked whether, before reading the  
294 questionnaire, they knew that IP was a common problem in all flocks of laying hens,  
295 including free range. A minority (36%) said that they were aware, while 64% said they were  
296 not. They were then asked whether knowing about IP changed their attitude towards free  
297 range eggs: 40% said it did and 60% said that it did not.

298

299 The respondents were asked to rate, on a 100 point scale, how they perceived the welfare  
300 level of free range hens compared to caged laying hens. Three base levels of welfare for

301 caged hens were provided, at one of 40, 50 or 60 points, with respondents being asked to rate  
302 the welfare of free range hens relative to these three base levels. Half of the respondents  
303 were asked this question before IP was explained to them and the other half after it had been  
304 explained. When respondents were asked to rate the welfare of free range hens after the  
305 phenomenon of IP had been explained to them, they gave a slightly lower mean welfare score  
306 (78.22) than those who had not yet had IP explained (78.76). In both cases, the respondents  
307 rated the welfare of free range production as significantly higher than cage production,  
308 although the difference between the two groups was non-significant (Table 2). However,  
309 there were some differences in respondents' mean welfare scores according to whether the  
310 baseline score they had on their questionnaires was 40, 50 or 60. Higher 'mark-ups' for free  
311 range welfare were given for baselines of 40 and 50 compared to 60. From these responses,  
312 it can be taken that knowledge of pecking problems and the level of assumed welfare  
313 attributable to caged systems does not unduly impact consumer perceptions of the welfare  
314 premium that free range egg production provides over cage production.

315

316 Table 2 around here

317

318 To estimate wtp, Logistic Regression was carried out using backward stepwise regression,  
319 where variables were included in the regression model sequentially if their statistical  
320 significance was 0.1 or better and variables were retained in the model if their significance  
321 was 0.05 or better. Table 3 contains the two variables retained in the final model. From Table  
322 3, it can be seen that the respondents' socio-economic characteristics were not found to be  
323 significant determinants of wtp to reduce IP.

324

325 Table 3 around here

326

327 To estimate wtp, the coefficients from Table 3 above were multiplied by the values of the  
328 relevant explanatory variables, for each respondent, as shown in Equation 1 above.

329

330 This gives a mean wtp estimate of 5.6 pence, i.e. the average respondent would be willing to  
331 pay a premium of 5.6 pence over the prevailing price of 6 medium-sized free range eggs to  
332 help poultry farmers ensure that hens do not suffer from IP. At the time of survey, the  
333 average current price of free range eggs was £1.65, so the estimated IP premium was 3.4%  
334 more.

335

336 It can be seen from Table 3 that only two of the variables tested were significant determinants  
337 of wtp: the bid level accepted and the attitudinal variable connected with the statement that  
338 respondents were happy to pay more for free range eggs. It is important to the credibility of  
339 such economic models that are used to estimate wtp that the bid level is a significant  
340 explanatory variable and that it has the expected sign (i.e. the higher the bid the less likely  
341 respondents are to say 'yes' to it). The positive sign on the attitudinal variable, indicates that  
342 the more strongly respondents agreed with the statement, the higher the bid level they were  
343 likely to accept in the wtp question.

344

345 It is common practice to identify and remove 'protest' bids from wtp estimation (these bids  
346 are often very high or very low, e.g. zero, depending on the context of the wtp questions; see  
347 Diamond et al, 1993). It is argued that these bids do not reflect the real value that  
348 respondents place on a good, but are posited in order to register an objection to having to pay  
349 by a particular payment vehicle, or for something originally available for free 'Debriefing'  
350 questions are used to identify such protest bids which may then be removed from the



351 analyses. However, various researchers have questioned the often arbitrary nature of  
352 excluding protest bids from analyses (e.g. Jorensen et al, 1999) and the potential introduction  
353 of significant bias by doing so (see Halstead et al, 1992). In this study, there was no clear  
354 indication of protest bids from analysing responses to the debriefing question, so no  
355 observations were excluded from the estimation of wtp for that reason.

356

357 Table 4 presents responses to the debriefing questions. It will be seen that the most common  
358 reason given by respondents for their choices was a desire to pay more if it improves hen  
359 welfare (25.6%), followed by a feeling that free range production is important for animal  
360 welfare (16.8%). Some 15% of respondents felt that free range eggs were too expensive  
361 already, or that they could not afford to pay any more for their eggs.

362

363 Table 4 around here

364

## 365 **Discussion**

366 IP is found in a majority of egg-laying flocks in GB and is particularly prevalent in free range  
367 and non-cage systems. IP can have substantial welfare issues for hens and financial  
368 implications for producers. The results of this survey show that consumers are largely  
369 unaware of the welfare problems associated with IP in free range laying hens and are  
370 somewhat concerned when informed about such issues. Nonetheless, consumers seem to  
371 largely maintain their belief that free range production is superior on welfare and other  
372 grounds (such as food safety, health and taste) compared to other production systems.  
373 Respondents to the survey expressed a wtp price premium of 3.4% (5.6 pence) on the  
374 current retail price of eggs to help address IP in free range systems. This amount may be  
375 thought relatively small, perhaps because a number of respondents considered free range eggs

376 to already be relatively expensive compared to cage eggs (and thus were not prepared to pay  
377 much more) and some were not convinced that paying more would help solve the problem (it  
378 could be argued that some in this latter category could be classed as protest bids). Indeed, a  
379 more rigorous identification of possible protest bids by the use of appropriate follow-up  
380 questions for this purpose could have resulted in some zero bids being removed from the  
381 sample with a subsequent increase in mean wtp. Moreover, it could also be argued that the  
382 framing of the wtp question in the context of the current egg prices at the time of survey and  
383 increased costs to farmers may have had a downward bias on respondents' wtp. Conversely  
384 though, one could maintain that this context merely served to ground the responses in reality.  
385 ~~Over three per cent also~~ However, the wtp estimate appears credible when compared to the  
386 results of the Eurobarometer (2005) survey in the UK which found that most people would  
387 not pay more than 10% as an additional price premium to source eggs from an animal welfare  
388 friendly production system. ~~However, it~~ should also be noted that 5.6 pence is equivalent to  
389 around £1.40 per bird per year (assuming a mean yield of 25 dozen eggs per bird per year).  
390 This is a relatively substantial amount to producers given than an average gross margin per  
391 bird of around £7 might have been expected from free range egg enterprises at that time (Nix,  
392 2013).

393

394 The finding that consumers have a positive wtp to improve animal welfare is consistent with  
395 other wtp consumer/citizen studies using various valuation methods. For example, Bennett et  
396 al (2012) (using choice experiment and CV methods) found that consumers in GB have a  
397 substantial wtp per annum to improve the welfare of various farmed species, whilst Bennett  
398 (1997) reported a consumer wtp of £0.32 per week to ban cage egg production in the UK  
399 (using the CV method) with the EC (2007) finding that 57% of EU consumers across 25  
400 Member States were willing to pay a price premium for hens' eggs sourced from animal

401 welfare friendly production systems. In Northern Ireland, Burgess and Hutchinson (2005)  
402 reported substantial mean wtp to improve the welfare of dairy cows, pigs, broilers and laying  
403 hens through legislation (also using the CV method) whilst Norwood and Lusk (2008) found  
404 that US consumers had a wtp for higher welfare in egg production (using an experimental  
405 auction-based approach) as did Carlsson et al (2005) in relation to consumers in Sweden  
406 (using a choice experiment method).

407 |  
408 The CV method used for this study was considered appropriate by the authors. Alternative  
409 stated preference valuation methods include choice experiments and experimental auctions  
410 but these were not considered to be appropriate in this context. The choice experiment  
411 method is used to elicit the values that people have for a range of attributes and for different  
412 attribute levels associated with a good (see Louviere et al, 2000 for a comprehensive  
413 description). In this study, we wanted to elicit only one value in terms of consumers' wtp to  
414 help poultry farmers ensure that hens do not suffer from IP. Experimental auction approaches  
415 have the advantage that they use real goods, and real money, in an (experimental) market  
416 context as opposed to the hypothetical context used in CV (see Lusk and Shogren, 2007 for a  
417 comprehensive guide to experimental auctions). However, the cost of experimental auctions  
418 can be relatively quite high when a substantial number of consumers is involved. The price of  
419 eggs in food stores was also considered an appropriate payment vehicle for the study.  
420 Consumers are well used to a variety of shell eggs in food stores differentiated by size, breed,  
421 production system, price etc. It is difficult to be sure that there is not some hypothetical, or  
422 other bias, in our study which could have influenced the wtp estimates. We have tried to  
423 minimize these by sensible design of the survey instrument and by appropriate choice of  
424 analytical method. Moreover, as discussed above, the wtp results appear very credible and  
425 broadly consistent with people's stated attitudes and opinions.

426

427 **Conclusions and implications for animal welfare**

428 The study reported here found that consumers are largely unaware of the problem of injurious  
429 pecking in free range laying hens. Despite the finding that consumers have a belief that free  
430 range means better welfare, there is a danger that this belief may be undermined if consumers  
431 learn of significant welfare problems on free range units, such as those caused by IP on the  
432 majority of free range egg production systems. Consumers were concerned when learning of  
433 IP on free range units, with 40% stating that it changed their attitude towards free range eggs.  
434 Producers need to address such welfare problems as a matter of urgency to ensure that  
435 consumers continue to value free range egg production and that it can continue to command  
436 its current price premium in the market. Indeed, the study findings suggest that there may be  
437 an additional price premium that producers could command, and that consumers would be  
438 willing to pay, for demonstrating the high welfare provenance of their eggs (e.g. birds with  
439 intact beaks and no, or limited, IP amongst other welfare attributes).

440

441 The findings of our study have relevance across livestock production systems (free range or  
442 otherwise) which consumers currently perceive as being high welfare. Consumers may feel  
443 equally concerned if they learn of other production practices or welfare issues of which they  
444 are unaware which could affect the demand for, and future sales of, free range eggs and other  
445 products in stores. Such practices and issues might include various animal mutilations such  
446 as beak trimming for chickens, castration and tail docking in pigs, lameness in dairy cows  
447 and in sheep, and leg health problems in broilers. Food retailers are keen to guard against  
448 such eventualities and have already put in place a number of initiatives to be able to  
449 demonstrate that they are addressing the issues. The livestock industries, and farm assurance  
450 schemes, need also to take action to address such welfare issues to ensure that they are not

451 vulnerable to large shifts in consumer demand as a result of changes in perceptions regarding  
452 the welfare of animals used to produce our food.

453

454 There is also a wider issue concerning welfare provenance of livestock products and the  
455 transparency of farm assurance. The FAWC (2006) recommended the development of a  
456 single, accredited, mandatory EU-wide welfare-labelling scheme, backed by welfare  
457 assessment based primarily on welfare outcomes, that would provide a transparent measure  
458 of the welfare status of animals involved in producing livestock products. To date, such a  
459 scheme has not been initiated, but it could greatly assist in assuring consumers about the  
460 welfare provenance of the food they eat, provide a vehicle on which to base price premia for  
461 differentiated livestock products, and so provide a stronger market incentive to producers to  
462 improve farm animal welfare.

463

#### 464 **Acknowledgements**

465 This article arises from a project (Reducing injurious pecking amongst layer hens by  
466 implementing existing knowledge, 2007-12), supported by the Tubney Charitable Trust. We  
467 are grateful for this support, but the opinions given here are ours and not necessarily those of  
468 the Trust.

469

470 **Appendix 1. Specimen Questionnaire**471 **Appendix 2. List of potential determining variables evaluated in the WTP analysis**

472

Variable name	Format	Description
Employ	Categorical variable (5 categories)	Employment status
Income	Ordinal variable (4 point scale)	Household income category, values given as central value in 4 categories
Eggfreq	Integer (interval scale)	Frequency of egg purchases, where 1=daily or weekly; 0=less than weekly
Rank_ch	Integer (ordinal scale 0-100)	Difference between respondent welfare rating and stated current average welfare rating
A1	Binary variable (M or F)	Gender
A2	Integer (interval scale)	Respondent age
A3	Integer (interval scale)	Age left full-time education
A8	Integer (interval scale)	Number of eggs bought each month
A10a	Ordinal variable (5 point scale)	Attitudinal variable. Ranking of agreement with statement: 'They are fresher than other eggs'
A10b	Ordinal variable (5 point scale)	Attitudinal variable. Ranking of agreement with statement: 'Free range hens are happy'
A10c	Ordinal variable (5 point scale)	Attitudinal variable. Ranking of agreement with statement: 'They taste better than other eggs'
A10d	Ordinal variable (5 point scale)	Attitudinal variable. Ranking of agreement with statement: 'They are healthier than other eggs'
A10e	Ordinal variable (5 point scale)	Attitudinal variable. Ranking of agreement with statement: 'Hen welfare is better'
B1	Binary variable (1=agreement; 0=neutral or disagreement)	Attitudinal variable. Ranking of agreement with statement: 'I feel well informed about how laying hens are treated'
B2	Binary variable (1=agreement; 0=neutral or disagreement)	Attitudinal variable. Ranking of agreement with statement: 'I am concerned about the way laying hens are treated in the process of producing eggs'
B3	Binary variable (1=agreement; 0=neutral or disagreement)	Attitudinal variable. Ranking of agreement with statement: 'Eggs from birds with high welfare are healthier and better tasting'
B4	Binary variable (1=agreement; 0=neutral or disagreement)	Attitudinal variable. Ranking of agreement with statement: 'It's wrong to eat eggs from hens that have not had a good life'

B5	Binary variable (1=agreement; 0= neutral or disagreement)	Attitudinal variable. Ranking of agreement with statement: 'Free range production provides higher levels of welfare than cage production'
B6	Binary variable (1=agreement; 0= neutral or disagreement)	Attitudinal variable. Ranking of agreement with statement: 'Eggs from high welfare are safer to eat'
B7	Binary variable (1=agreement; 0= neutral or disagreement)	Attitudinal variable. Ranking of agreement with statement: 'I am happy to pay more for free range eggs'
B8	Binary variable (1=agreement; 0= neutral or disagreement)	Attitudinal variable. Ranking of agreement with statement: 'It is important that hens can display normal behaviour'
C1	Integer (interval scale)	Bid level accepted
C3	Binary variable (yes / no)	Prior knowledge of feather pecking as a problem
C5a	Binary variable (yes / no)	Knowledge of feather pecking changes attitudes to free range eggs

473

474

475 **References**

476

477 **Bennett RM** 1997 Farm animal welfare and food policy. *Food Policy* 22: 281-288

478

479 **Bennett RM and Blaney RJP** 2003 Estimating the benefits of farm animal welfare  
480 legislation using the contingent valuation method. *Agricultural Economics* 29: 85-98

481

482 **Bennett RM and Larson D** 1996 Contingent valuation of the perceived benefits of farm  
483 animal welfare legislation: an exploratory survey. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 47:  
484 224-235

485

486 **Bennett R, Kehlbacher A and Balcombe K** 2012 A method for the economic valuation of  
487 animal welfare benefits using a single welfare score. *Animal Welfare* 21: 125-130

488

489 **Blokhuis H, Cepero R, Colin P, Elson A, Fiks Van Niekerk T, Keeling L, Michel V,**  
490 **Nicol CJ, Oester H and Tauson R** 2005 Welfare aspects of various systems of keeping  
491 laying hens. *EFSA Journal* 197: 1-23

492

493 **Blokhuis HJ, van Niekerk TF, Bessei W, Elson A, Guemene D, Kjaer JB, Levrino GAM,**  
494 **Nicol CJ, Tauson R, Weeks CA and De Weerd HAV** 2007 The LayWel project: welfare  
495 implications of changes in production systems for laying hens. *World's Poultry Science*  
496 *Journal* 63: 101-114

497

498 **Burgess D and Hutchinson WG** 2005 Do people value the welfare of farm animals?

499 *EuroChoices* 4: 36-43



500

501 **Cameron TA** 1988 A new paradigm for valuing non-market goods using referendum data:

502 maximum likelihood estimation by censored logistic regression. *Journal of Environmental*

503 *Economics and Management* 15: 355-379

504

505 **Carlsson F, Frykblom P and Lagerkvist CJ** 2005 Consumer preferences for food product

506 quality attributes from Swedish agriculture. *Ambio* 34: 366-370

507

508 **Craig JV and Lee HY** 1990 Beak trimming and genetic stock effects on behaviour and

509 mortality from cannibalism in white leghorn-type pullets. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*

510 25: 107-123

511

512 **Damme K** 1999 Effect of beak-trimming and strain on performance, feather loss and nesting

513 behaviour of different commercial white layer hybrids in floor pens. *Archiv Fur*

514 *Geflugelkunde* 63: 93-99

515

516 **Defra** 2014 United Kingdom Egg Statistics - Quarter 4, 2013. 6 February 2014. Defra:

517 London, UK

518

519 **Dennis RL, Fahey AG and Cheng, HW** 2009 Infrared beak treatment method compared

520 with conventional hot-blade trimming in laying hens. *Poultry Science* 88: 38-43

521

522 **EC** 2007 Attitudes of consumers towards the welfare of farmed animals. Wave 2. Special

523 Eurobarometer.

524 [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/survey/sp\\_barometer\\_fa\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/survey/sp_barometer_fa_en.pdf) (last accessed 4 June  
525 2013)  
526  
527 **El-Lethey H, Aerni V, Jungi TW and Wechsler B** 2000 Stress and feather pecking in  
528 laying hens in relation to housing conditions. *British Poultry Science* 41: 22-28  
529  
530 **Eurobarometer** 2005 Attitudes of consumers towards the welfare of farmed animals. Special  
531 Eurobarometer 229. European Commission: Luxembourg  
532  
533 **Eurobarometer** 2007 Attitudes of EU citizens towards animal welfare. Special  
534 Eurobarometer 270. European Commission: Luxembourg  
535  
536 **FAWC** 2006 Report on Welfare Labelling. Farm Animal Welfare Council, London.  
537  
538 **Fossum O, Jansson DS, Etterlin PE and Vagsholm I** 2009 Causes of mortality in laying  
539 hens in different housing systems in 2001 to 2004. *Acta Veterinaria Scandinavica* 51: article  
540 3  
541  
542 **Gentle MJ, Waddington D, Hunter LN and Jones RB** 1990 Behavioural evidence for  
543 persistent pain following partial beak amputation in chickens. *Applied Animal Behaviour*  
544 *Science* 27: 149-157  
545  
546 **Green LE, Lewis K, Kimpton A and Nicol CJ** 2000 Cross-sectional study of the prevalence  
547 of feather pecking in laying hens in alternative systems and its associations with management  
548 and disease. *Veterinary Record* 147: 233-238

549

550 **Gunnarsson S, Keeling LJ and Svedberg J** 1999 Effect of rearing factors on the prevalence  
551 of floor eggs, cloacal cannibalism and feather pecking in commercial flocks of loose housed  
552 laying hens. *British Poultry Science* 40: 12-18

553

554 **Halstead JM, Luloff AE and Stevens TH** 1992 Protest bidders in contingent valuation.  
555 *Northeastern Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 21 (2)

556

557 **Hanemann M, Loomis J and Kanninen B** 1991 Statistical efficiency of double-bounded  
558 dichotomous choice contingent valuation. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 73:  
559 1255-1263

560

561 **Huber-Eicher B** 1999 A survey of layer-type pullet rearing in Switzerland. *World's Poultry*  
562 *Science Journal* 55: 83-91

563

564 **Huber-Eicher B and Sebo F** 2001 The prevalence of feather pecking and development in  
565 commercial flocks of laying hens. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 74: 223-231

566

567 **Hughes BO** 1973 The effect of implanted hormones on feather pecking and cannibalism in  
568 pullets. *British Poultry Science* 14: 341-348

569

570 **Hughes BO and Duncan IJ** 1972 The influence of strain and environmental factors upon  
571 feather pecking and cannibalism in fowls. *British Poultry Science* 13: 525-547

572

573 **Hughes BO and Gentle MJ** 1995 Beak trimming in poultry, its implications for welfare.  
574 *World's Poultry Science Journal* 51: 51-61  
575  
576 **IGD** 2011 Shopper attitudes to animal welfare. A report for Freedom Food by IGD  
577 [http://www.freedomfoodpublishing.co.uk/fairerlife/downloads/Shopper\\_Attitudes\\_Welfare\\_](http://www.freedomfoodpublishing.co.uk/fairerlife/downloads/Shopper_Attitudes_Welfare_Report.pdf)  
578 [Report.pdf](http://www.freedomfoodpublishing.co.uk/fairerlife/downloads/Shopper_Attitudes_Welfare_Report.pdf)  
579  
580 **Jorgensen B, Syme G, Bishop B and Nancarrow B** 1999 Protest responses in contingent  
581 valuation. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 14 (1): 131-150  
582  
583 **Kaplowitz MD, Hadlock TD and Levine R** 2004 A comparison of web and mail survey  
584 response rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 68 (1): 94-101  
585  
586 **Keeling LJ and Jensen P** 1995 Do feather pecking and cannibalistic hens have different  
587 personalities? *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 44: 265  
588  
589 **Lambton SL, Knowles TG, Yorke C and Nicol CJ** 2010 The risk factors affecting the  
590 development of gentle and severe feather pecking in loose housed laying hens. *Applied*  
591 *Animal Behaviour Science* 123: 32-42  
592  
593 **Lambton SL, Nicol CJ, Friel M, Main DCJ, McKinstry JL, Sherwin CM, Walton J and**  
594 **Weeks CA** 2013 A bespoke management package can reduce levels on injurious pecking in  
595 loose-housed laying hen flocks. *Veterinary Record* 172: 423  
596

597 **Louviere JL, Hensher DA and Swait JD** 2000 *Stated Choice Methods*. Cambridge  
598 University Press: Cambridge, UK  
599  
600 **Lusk JL and Shogren JF** 2007 *Experimental auctions. Methods and applications in*  
601 *economic and marketing research*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK  
602  
603 **Marsden PV and Wright JD** (eds) 2010 *Handbook of Survey Research*. 2nd edition.  
604 Emerald Group Publishing Ltd: Bingley, UK  
605  
606 **Mayfield LE, Bennett RM, Tranter RB and Wooldridge MJ** 2007 Consumption of  
607 welfare-friendly food products in Great Britain, Italy and Sweden, and how it may be  
608 influenced by consumer attitudes to, and behaviour towards, animal welfare attributes.  
609 *International Journal of Sociology of Food and Agriculture* 15: 59-73  
610  
611 **McKeegan DEF and Savory CJ** 1999 Behavioural and hormonal changes associated with  
612 sexual maturity in layer pullets. *British Poultry Science* 39: S6-S7  
613  
614 **Mitchell RC and Carson RT** 1989 Using Surveys to Value Public Goods. The Contingent  
615 Valuation Method. Resources for the Future. Washington DC  
616  
617 **Nicol CJ, Gregory NG, Knowles TG, Parkman ID and Wilkins LJ** 1999 Differential  
618 effects of increased stocking density, mediated by increased flock size, on feather pecking  
619 and aggression in laying hens. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 65: 137-152  
620

621 **Nicol CJ, Bestman M, Gilani A-M, de Haas EN, de Jong IC, Lambton S, Wagenaar JP,**  
622 **Weeks, CA and Rodenburg TB** 2013 The prevention and control of feather pecking:  
623 application to commercial systems. *World's Poultry Science Journal* 69: 775-788  
624  
625 **Nix J** 2013 Farm Management Pocketbook. 44th edition 2014. Agro Business Consultants  
626 Ltd: Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, UK (p 94)  
627  
628 **Norgaard-Nielsen G, Vestergaard K and Simonsen HB** 1993 Effects of rearing experience  
629 and stimulus enrichment on feather damage in laying hens. *Applied Animal Behaviour*  
630 *Science* 38: 345-352  
631  
632 **Norwood FB and Lusk JL** 2008 *A calibrated auction-conjoint valuation method: valuing*  
633 *pork and eggs produced under differing animal welfare conditions*. Working Paper.  
634 Department of Agricultural Economics, Oklahoma State University  
635  
636 **Office of National Statistics** 2013 UK Population Census 2011. TSO: London  
637  
638 **Peguri A and Coon C** 1993 Effect of feather coverage and temperature on layer  
639 performance. *Poultry Science* 72: 1318-1329  
640  
641 **Pöttsch CJ, Lewis K, Nicol CJ and Green LE** 2001 A cross-sectional study of the  
642 prevalence of vent pecking in laying hens in alternative systems and its associations with  
643 feather pecking, management and disease. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 74: 259-272  
644

645 **Rodenburg TB, Tuytens FAM, de Reu K, Herman L, Zoons J and Sonck B** 2008  
646 Welfare assessment of laying hens in furnished cages and non-cage systems: an on-farm  
647 comparison. *Animal Welfare* 17: 363-373  
648

649 **Rodenburg TB, van Krimpen MM, de Jong IC, de Haas EN, Kops MS, Riedstra BJ,**  
650 **Nordquist RE, Wagenaar JP, Bestman M and Nichol CJ** 2013 The prevention and control  
651 of feather pecking in laying hens: identifying the underlying principles. *World's Poultry*  
652 *Science Journal* 69: 361-374  
653

654 **Rubin DB** 1987 Multiple imputation for non response in surveys. J Wiley & Sons: New  
655 York, USA  
656

657 **Schafer JL** 1997 Analysis of incomplete multivariate data. Chapman & Hall: London, UK  
658

659 **Shaw D and Shiu E** 2002 An assessment of ethical obligation and self-identity in ethical  
660 consumer decision-making: a structural equation modelling approach. *International Journal*  
661 *of Consumer Studies* 26: 286-293  
662

663 **Sherwin CM, Richards GJ and Nicol CJ** 2010 Comparison of the welfare of layer hens in 4  
664 housing systems in the UK. *British Poultry Science* 51: 488-499  
665

666 **Staack M, Gruber B, Keppler C, Zaludik K, Niebuhr K and Knierim U** 2007 Importance  
667 of the rearing period for laying hens in alternative systems. *Deutsche Tierärztliche*  
668 *Wochenschrift* 114: 86-90  
669

670 **Tauson R and Svensson SA** 1980 Influence of plumage condition on the hens feed  
671 requirement. *Swedish Journal of Agricultural Research* 10: 35-39

672

673 **Tranter RB, Bennett RM, Costa L, Cowan C, Holt GC, Jones PJ, Miele M, Sottomayor**  
674 **M and Vestergaard J** 2009 Consumers' willingness-to-pay for organic conversion-grade  
675 food: evidence from five EU countries. *Food Policy* 34: 287-294

676

677 **Weeks CA, Brown SN, Richards GJ, Wilkins LJ and Knowles TG** 2012 Levels of  
678 mortality in hens by end of lay on farm and in transit to slaughter in Great Britain. *Veterinary*  
679 *Record* 170: 647

680

681 **Yiridoe EK, Bonti-Ankomah S and Martin RC** 2005 Comparison of consumer perceptions  
682 and preference toward organic versus conventionally produced foods: a review and update of  
683 the literature. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems* 20: 193-205

684



685 **Table 1. Respondents' levels of agreement/disagreement with a series of statements**  
 686 **concerned with egg production and hen welfare (% 193 of respondents).**

687

Statements on egg production and hen welfare	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree/disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I feel well-informed about how laying hens are treated in egg production	8	35	32	20	5
I am concerned about the way laying hens are treated in the process of producing eggs	35	43	20	1	1
Eggs from birds with high welfare are healthier and better tasting	22	46	27	3	2
It is wrong to eat eggs from hens that have not had a good life	33	31	26	8	2
Free range production provides higher levels of welfare than cage production	40	46	12	2	0
Eggs from hens with high welfare are safer to eat	15	26	47	11	1
I am happy to pay more for free range eggs	29	47	15	7	2
It is important that hens can display normal behaviour	46	43	10	1	0

688

689

690 **Table 2. Respondents' mean welfare scores for free range hens in comparison with**  
 691 **various arbitrary scores given for caged layers, stratified by whether they had yet been**  
 692 **informed about IP on the questionnaire.**

693

Respondents' welfare scores for free range egg laying hens			
Arbitrary cage welfare score	Question posed before IP explained (n)	Question posed after IP explained (n)	Overall (n)
40	74.32 (44)	72.7 (42)	73.53 (86)
50	78.56 (39)	79.34 (50)	79.00 (89)
60	85.32 (31)	82.63 (40)	83.80 (71)
Overall	78.76 (114)	78.22 (132)	-

694

695

696 **Table 3. Logistic Regression estimates and their statistical significance**

697

Variable name	Description	Maximum likelihood estimate	Pr>ChiSq
Intercept	-	-3.8761	0.0004
C1	Bid level accepted	0.0937	0.0002
B7	Attitudinal variable. Ranking of agreement on a 5-point scale where 1=agreement and 0=neutral or disagreement with statement: 'I am happy to pay more for free range eggs'	0.8458	0.0012

698

699 Notes:

700 -2 Log likelihood (with covariates) 239.24.

701 Chi-Square for covariates 54.7 with 27 degrees of freedom (p = <0.0003).

702 Association of predicted probabilities and observed responses = 75% concordant.

703

704

705 **Table 4. Answers to debriefing questions<sup>1</sup> as to why consumers indicated that they**  
 706 **might pay more to reduce levels of IP in free range flocks (% of 193 responses)**

Reasons	
Will pay more if it improves welfare/the hens have a better life	25.6
Insist on free range for welfare reasons/animal welfare is very important	16.8
Too expensive already/can't afford to pay any more	15.3
Miscellaneous reasons	13.7
No answer given at all	9.9
Price premium must benefit farmer only	7.3
Will the measures to reduce IP really work	6.1
All birds peck each other at times	5.3
	100.0

707 <sup>1</sup>No respondent gave what could be construed as a protest bid.

708