

## Supplementary materials

### Survey design

In the first survey, the interviews have been conducted in the two main supermarkets located outside the historic center of the city of Perugia, along the main roads in two different areas very close to the southeast and west of the city. Perugia is the capital city of Umbria region, in the center of Italy. The urban area conforms to a discontinuous and jagged urban area, interspersed with the countryside. Geographically, the land space of Umbria, being a little extended, allows us to consider the region as local, because the farthest distance traveled between farms and the city of Perugia is 90 km, therefore falling within the maximum distance generally agreed to define food as local. We made sure that both supermarkets sold LOF, given that a dedicated sale department is present in both supermarkets.

The first survey has been conducted in September 2018, and the second one has been conducted from April to May 2020.

Operatively, before the first survey, the respondents were asked some preliminary questions to check if they were aware of LOF and then the interviewer has read a brief informative text on LOF. In detail: i) all interviewers have been first educated about LOF; ii) each interviewer has read in 2 minutes a brief note describing LOF. These two procedures allow both to fill the questionnaire in an objective and unbiased manner, and to provide the same and unbiased information in order to respond to the interview. The respondents were then asked if they understood the statement or if they needed more clarification. Furthermore, among consumers there is confusion about LOF definitions, considering LOF as food produced within the municipal, regional, national borders or their metropolitan area. Thus, in our interviews, we have clearly defined LOF as food produced within the region. However, the questionnaires were distributed to only those respondents who were initially aware of LOF.

In the second survey, we have used different online platforms, such as Microsoft Teams, Zoom, Meet, Skype and Webex Meet in accordance with the availability of the interviewees

### Contingent Valuation Methods

To determine price vectors, the tool was a pre-tested interviewer-administered structured questionnaire. Pilot testing of the questionnaire was done with 30 couples, and a scenario with different prices for a kilogram of LO apples was presented to the respondents. According to Cooper and Loomis (1992) we have investigated the effect of varying both interval range and bids number on the estimates, trying to use the maximum amount of prior information on the WTP distribution. Finally, we have set eight bids and, according to Boman and Bostedt (1995), the highest price is always accepted by less the 10% of respondents. The only exception (Table 2) is represented by the Husband joint data whose value is the closest to 10% among the possible higher probabilities.

According to Lavrakas (2008), the WTP questions have been presented randomly, so that the order in which questions are proposed does not influence results.

### Households' behavior

We highlight the importance, in modelling household behavior, to distinct between individual preferences and household preferences. Households consist of different individuals with their own preferences. We do not consider the bargaining process, which could take place among household members, since our focus is about the detection of preference heterogeneity between single partner's preferences and household's preferences, to explore the bias due to interviews relying on the representative member of the family, instead of both partners.

In order to assess whether respondents change their opinion in the case of separate and joint interviews (columns 1 and 2), we have estimated two more models (available

upon request), and columns 3 and 4 (Tables S1 and S2) report the tests on the equivalence of the obtained coefficients. Focusing on columns 1 and 2 (Table S1), we can reject the equivalence of the coefficients, mainly in the case of single interviews, with reference to resy, age, and edu.

**Table S1.** Tests for equivalence of coefficients according to the type of interview -1<sup>st</sup> survey-.

<b>Columns</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>
Variables	HS vs. WS	HJ vs. WJ	HS vs. HJ	WS vs. WJ
bidLo_1	0.45 (0.503)	1.22 (0.269)	5.30** (0.021)	7.78*** (0.005)
Income_1	0.55 (0.459)	0.15 (0.702)	2.38 (0.123)	1.08 (0.299)
mun10_1	2.05 (0.152)	0.41 (0.522)	1.00 (0.317)	0.23 (0.632)
fam_1	0.62 (0.429)	1.10 (0.294)	7.29*** (0.007)	0.11 (0.737)
resy_[z]	3.69* (0.055)	0.04 (0.845)	0.75 (0.389)	0.01 (0.919)
age_[z]	4.18** (0.041)	0.42 (0.516)	1.97 (0.161)	0.00 (0.953)
edu_1_[z]	4.94** (0.027)	0.01 (0.938)	0.17 (0.684)	2.90* (0.088)
lab_1_[z]	0.13 (0.719)	0.72 (0.395)	1.66 (0.198)	0.50 (0.482)
famrkt_1_[z]	0.60 (0.439)	0.99 (0.319)	3.32* (0.069)	0.09 (0.760)
socac_1_[z]	1.83 (0.177)	0.19 (0.662)	0.90 (0.343)	1.51 (0.219)
orlochea_1_[z,x]	8.85*** (0.003)	3.30* (0.069)	0.22 (0.639)	0.07 (0.796)
orloccli_1_[z,x]	3.36* (0.067)	6.39** (0.011)	2.25 (0.133)	0.35 (0.553)
orheacli_1_[z,x]	25.19*** (0.000)	16.49*** (0.000)	0.00 (0.981)	2.10 (0.147)
purcfv_1	0.55 (0.459)	1.61 (0.204)	0.08 (0.778)	4.13** (0.042)

*HS = husband single; WS = wife single; HJ = husband joint; WJ = wife joint  
orlochea = Local development vs. Healty food; orloccli = Local development vs. Climate change;  
orheacli = Healty food vs. Climate change  
\*, \*\*, and \*\*\* represent significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively; n.r. not relevant.*

**Table S2.** Tests for equivalence of coefficients according to the type of interview -2<sup>nd</sup> survey-.

<b>Columns</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>
Variables	HS vs. WS	HJ vs. WJ	HS vs. HJ	WS vs. WJ
bidLo_2	1.90 (0.168)	0.32 (0.573)	3.17* (0.075)	3.70* (0.055)
income_2	2.23 (0.135)	0.12 (0.724)	1.30 (0.254)	2.10 (0.147)
incomf_var	0.00 (0.976)	4.48** (0.034)	0.97 (0.326)	2.60 (0.107)
mun10_2	0.23 (0.633)	0.98 (0.321)	0.19 (0.670)	1.02 (0.312)
fam_2	4.50** (0.034)	0.09 (0.770)	5.26** (0.022)	0.57 (0.451)
resy_[z]	0.46 (0.499)	0.42 (0.516)	1.30 (0.254)	2.34 (0.126)
age_[z]	1.75	0.24	2.88*	0.05

	(0.186)	(0.624)	(0.090)	(0.818)
edu_2_[z]	0.61	0.27	0.01	0.01
	(0.435)	(0.605)	(0.915)	(0.904)
lab_2_[z]	0.50	1.10	2.59	0.02
	(0.478)	(0.295)	(0.108)	(0.888)
famrkt_2_[z]	3.14*	0.05	0.11	2.68
	(0.076)	(0.825)	(0.743)	(0.102)
socac_2_[z]	2.29	0.57	1.09	1.22
	(0.130)	(0.449)	(0.296)	(0.269)
orlochea_2_[z,x]	0.10	0.06	0.39	2.06
	(0.748)	(0.806)	(0.533)	(0.151)
orloccli_2_[z,x]	4.22**	1.02	0.21	0.30
	(0.040)	(0.312)	(0.648)	(0.582)
orheacli_2_[z,x]	0.79	0.05	0.75	0.12
	(0.373)	(0.821)	(0.387)	(0.728)
purcfv_2	0.00	2.87*	0.37	5.11**
	(0.980)	(0.091)	(0.544)	(0.024)
incomred_[z]	1.13	1.30	2.58	0.03
	(0.287)	(0.255)	(0.108)	(0.866)
cvd19_[z]	0.88	1.40	2.44	0.13
	(0.348)	(0.236)	(0.119)	(0.716)
hmfd_[z]	2.51	9.94***	0.00	7.08***
	(0.113)	(0.002)	(0.954)	(0.008)

---

*HS = husband single; WS = wife single; HJ = husband joint; WJ = wife joint*  
*orlochea = Local development vs. Healty food; orloccli = Local development vs. Climate change;*  
*orheacli = Healty food vs. Climate change*  
*\*, \*\*, and \*\*\* represent significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively; n.r. not relevant.*

---

## References

- Boman, M., Bostedt, G., 1995. Valuing the wolf in Sweden: Are benefits contingent on the supply?, in: Boman, M., Brännlund, R., Kriström, B. (Eds.), Topics in Environmental Economics, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Berlin, pp. 157-174
- Cooper, J., Loomis, J., 1992. Sensitivity of willingness-to-pay estimates to bid design in dichotomous choice contingent valuation models. Land Econ. 68, 211-224
- Lavrakas, P.J., 2008. Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, USA