RIESISE | Revista Iberoamericana de Economía Solidaria e Innovación Socioecológica
Vol. 3 (2020), pp. 169-187 • ISSN: 2659-5311
http://dx.doi.org/10.33776/riesise.v3i1.4543

QUALITY. LOCAL. SOCIAL. WHAT ELSE? – WHICH FACTORS MOTIVATE CONSUMERS TO PARTICIPATE IN ALTERNATIVE FOOD NETWORKS IN HUNGARY?*

CALIDAD. LOCAL. SOCIAL. ¿QUÉ MÁS? - ¿QUÉ FACTORES MOTIVAN A LOS CONSUMIDORES A PARTICIPAR EN REDES ALIMENTARIAS ALTERNATIVAS EN HUNGRÍA?

Anna Torok**
Universidad Corvinus de Budapest
anna.torok@uni-corvinus.hu

Ágnes Neulinger
Head of Department, Associate professor, Corvinus University of Budapest
agnes.neulinger@uni-corvinus.hu

György Pataki
Senior Researcher, Environmental Social Science Research Group (ESSRG)
pataki.gyorgy@essrg.hu

Fanni Bársony
PhD student, Corvinus University of Budapest
fanni.barsony@uni-corvinus.hu

Orsolya Lazányi
PhD student, Corvinus University of Budapest
orsolya.lazanyi@uni-corvinus.hu

Resumen

Los casos de redes de comida alternativa surgen en muchos países del mundo. También están creciendo en Hungría, aunque estos movimientos aún se encuentran en una etapa temprana de desarrollo (Benedek & Balázs, 2014a). El presente estudio tiene como objetivo profundizar nuestra comprensión de la experiencia personal de los participantes en las redes en Hungría al revelar su motivación para participar. Este artículo presenta la investigación empírica realizada entre miembros de diferentes redes ubicadas en Hungría. A partir del análisis de entrevistas cualitativas, los principa-

Abstract

Alternative food network (AFN) cases are now reported in many countries worldwide. They are growing in Hungary as well, though the alternative food movement is still at an early stage of development (Benedek & Balázs, 2014a). The current study aims to deepen our understanding of the personal experience of participants in AFNs in Hungary by revealing their motivation for participation. This paper presents empirical research carried out among members of different AFNs located in Hungary. Based on the analysis of qualitative interviews, the main motivational factors

les factores motivacionales son identificados por los diferentes tipos de redes. Se pueden clasificar dos tipos de factores motivacionales: factores individuales y comunitarios. Los factores individuales van desde factores basados en la seguridad hasta factores relacionados con la autorrealización, en línea con el modelo clásico de la teoría de las necesidades de Maslow (1943). Los factores de motivación basados en la comunidad van desde motivaciones directamente relacionadas con la comunidad en torno a la comida hasta ideas abstractas relacionadas con el sistema alimentario.

Palabras clave

Redes alimentarias alternativas; elección de comida; motivación del consumidor; Teoría de las Necesidades de Maslow.

are identified by the different types of AFNs. Two types of motivational factors can be classified: individual and community-based factors. The individual factors range from security-based factors to self-realization-related factors, in line with the classical model of Maslow's theory of needs (1943). The community-based motivational factors range from motivations directly related to the community around food to abstract ideas related to the food system.

Keywords

Alternative food networks; food choice; consumer motivation; Maslow's theory of needs.

Códigos JEL: Q00.

Fecha de recepción: 12/2/2019

Fecha de aceptación: 20/7/2020

*This research was supported by project No. EFOP-3.6.2-16-2017-00007, titled Aspects on the development of intelligent, sustainable and inclusive society: social, technological, innovation networks in employment and digital economy. The project has been supported by the European Union, co-financed by the European Social Fund and the budget of Hungary.

**We are grateful to the members of the Corvinus University of Budapest research team on social innovation for their continuous intellectual support. In particular, we would like to thank Andrea Toarniczky for her review.

1. INTRODUCTION

The different types of alternative food networks (AFNs) challenge and provide an alternative to the conventional industrial model of the food supply by enabling redefined linkages between actors and by relocalizing food production in ecologically sustainable ways (Renting et al., 2003). Alternative or "place-based" food networks are "newly emerging networks of producers, consumers, and other actors that embody alternatives to the more standardized industrial mode of food supply" (Renting et al. 2003, p. 394). AFNs and their activities translate into actual social and ecological benefits in the local place of food production.

AFNs include a wide variety of practices. The most widespread forms are short food supply chains, local branding, farmers' markets, hobby farming and box schemes (Kamiyama et al., 2016; Plieninger et al., 2018). Venn et al. (2006) classify four main categories of AFNs based on the nature of *producer-consumer relationships and involvement*. The first category consists of "special retailers". *Online groceries and specialist wholesalers* belong to this category and sell high value-added or special foods to certain customer groups. Venn et al. (2006) identify the second category as "direct sell initiatives", where farmers and producers sell directly to consumers either offline or online. Typical examples are *farmers' markets, box schemes*, and producer cooperatives. The other subgroup of "producer-consumer partnerships" includes *community-supported agriculture* (CSA), where producers and consumers form partnerships to share the risks and rewards of farming. The third category, where producers are also consumers, describes cases where food is produced and consumed by the same group of people, as in the case of *community gardens*: gardeners grow vegetables themselves for their own consumption, spending time and energy on production. These kinds of producers can be considered "prosumers" (Ritzer & Jurgenson, 2010). In the current study, four main types of AFNs are investigated (see *Table 1*): (1) farmers' markets (traditional and online) and zero waste stores (offering natural, sustainably sourced, eco-friendly, plastic-free alternatives), (2) box schemes (flexible and fixed), (3) CSAs and (4) community gardens.

Table 1: Alternative food network types investigated in this article

Traditional and online farmers' markets and zero waste stores	Flexible and fixed box schemes	Community-supported agriculture	Community gardens

AFNs are intensively studied in all parts of the world (Renting et al., 2003) from different perspectives, including the motivation to join. McClintock & Simpson (2018) combine qualitative and quantitative methods to identify the motivational frames in the setting of urban agriculture organizations and businesses in the United States and Canada. They emphasize the importance of conducting more qualitative research to explore the differences between intentions and outcomes to obtain geographically specific insights by investigating other cities and regions in the Global North, Europe or Oceania.

In the case of Hungary, the first pioneering projects of AFNs, namely, CSA, emerged in the early 2000s (Balázs et al., 2016), and the first community gardens appeared in 2012. Although the alternative food network system is still at an early stage of development in the country (Benedek & Balázs, 2014a), it is important to mention that in general, home-based family agriculture and food self-provisioning are still strong in Hungary (Balázs et al., 2016). In the period of the Common Agricultural Policy 2015-2020, the EU prioritized strengthening the relationship between producers and consumers, and for this purpose, it created a thematic subprogram for the short supply chain as an area. The program also plays an important role among Hungarian rural development programs, and for this opportunity, to foster implementation, Hungary was provided financial support (Kujáni, 2014). Therefore, as a part of the short supply chain, AFNs are a relevant topic to analyze in the Hungarian context.

Previous studies conducted in Hungary examined the current situation and classification of AFN types (Kujáni, 2014; Benedek & Balázs, 2014b), and primary research related to one type of AFN, such as farmers' markets (Benedek & Fertő, 2015; Kerényi & Török, 2019; Szabó & Juhász, 2015), CSAs (Birtalan et al., 2019) and community gardens (Bende & Nagy, 2016), has been performed. However, in Hungary, no articles to date have paid special attention to comparing the motivational factors related to consumer participation by the different types of AFNs. Nonetheless, regarding farmers' markets, Benedek & Fertő (2015) investigated farmers' motivation for participation. Moreover, Kerényi & Török (2019) and Szabó & Juhász (2015) conducted research on consumer motivations related to farmers' markets, but they did not investigate the other types of AFNs.

Therefore, the current study aims to uncover the motivations and values that customers hold around the ideas of food related to the different types

of AFNs. The personal experience and motivation of AFN participants can be related to food choice, the consumption and purchase of food and participation in this type of short supply chain. The central question of this paper is as follows: "Which factors motivate consumers to participate in AFNs in Hungary?"

This article makes novel contributions in three ways. First, this article is the first in Hungary to investigate all the main types of AFNs in relation to motivation. Second, the article joins the literature on the differentiation between individual and community-based motivations. Third, the results of the interviews related to individual motivators are analyzed under the framework of Maslow's theory of needs (Maslow, 1943), using this classical categorization in a new context for AFNs. The application of the model is in line with recent literature regarding the measurement and categorization of food consumption motivations in general (e.g., Van Lenthe et al. 2015; Satter, 2007; Blades & Tikkanen, 2009; Perianova, 2013).

This article is structured as follows: The first section is concerned with the analysis of food consumption motivations, including the main types of AFNs and the well-known theory and model of motivation by Maslow (1943). Next, the research methodology and findings are discussed. Finally, in the conclusion, we summarize both the theoretical and empirical contributions of the article.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.2. THE MOTIVATIONS OF FOOD CHOICE AND PARTICIPATION

The motivations of AFN participants can be related to food choice, the consumption and purchase of food, and participation in this type of short supply chain. Food choice is more relevant for farmers' markets and box schemes, as the commitment to producers or distributors is only occasional or weekly. In contrast, participation refers more to CSAs and community gardens, as the commitment is for a year and contains some formal agreements.

Food choice refers to everyday human behavior, but it can be influenced by many complex factors. Köster (2009) argues that instead of psychological constructs such as attitudes and intentions, actual food choices can be better predicted by habits, past behavior, and hedonic appreciation. Different forms of learning, including imprinting and conditioning (pre- and perinatal), praise, reward and punishment (early childhood: parents or others), imitation (childhood and puberty: parents, peers, idols), cognitive learning (adulthood: advice, labeling, risk perception) and sensory learning (lifelong: complexity, boredom, exposure), are involved in food habit formation. Food product choice is also determined by the complexity of sensory and nonsensory factors

(Eertmans et al., 2001). The latter incorporate, for instance, food-related health claims, expectations and attitudes, as well as mood, price and ethical concerns. Moreover, social, cultural and economic factors can influence dietary patterns. Intraindividual determinants should also be mentioned, including knowledge, physiological and psychological factors and acquired preferences, which can be differentiated by interpersonal or social factors, such as family and group influences (Prescott et al., 2002).

In marketing-related research, food safety or food security seems to play the most important role in food choice. The concept of food security, which refers to measurable supply and demand and increases in production, can be found in many discourses. Hwang's study (2016) concerns the most important motivational factors related to the organic food purchase intention of older consumers. Among meaningful motives, self-presentation and food safety concerns are the most important. Michaelidou & Hassan's (2008) research is about attitude and purchase intention within the context of organic produce. They also find that food safety is the most important predictor of attitude. In contrast, health consciousness turns out to be the least important motive. Furthermore, ethical self-identity has been proven to affect both attitude and intention to purchase organic produce. Fotopoulos et al. (2009) include 1000 Greek households in their research. Based on their findings, the ''natural content'' of foods is the highest among all motives for Greek consumers. In addition, Greek consumers tend to attach a high level of importance to almost the same motivational dimensions (for instance, ''price'', ''convenience'', ''health'' and ''sensory appeal''). Additionally, AFN consumers and urban agriculture practitioners often mention the reduction in the distance that food needs to travel, also known as food miles (Weber & Matthews, 2008), from producer to consumer as an important benefit (McClintock & Simpson, 2018).

It is necessary to mention that there are certain barriers to buying from and participating in alternative food supply chains. The main barrier may be related to the perceived higher price and expensiveness of local organic food, which cause such food to be considered inaccessible to lower-income groups and to be the preserve of the elite (Seyfang, 2008). The results of Ares et al. (2017) show a strong influence of income level on the motives underlying food choice and the barriers to the adoption of healthy eating. Moreover, there can be other disadvantages related to AFNs, such as inconvenience related to seasonality, problems with payment (only cash), relatively small choices and poor quality (Benedek & Balázs, 2014b; Neulinger et al., 2020; Ostrom, 2007).

AFN participants can be distinguished by their motivation for food choice and participation. Zoll et al. (2018) define three different types of AFN participants based on qualitative research conducted in Germany. Their first

category of consumers consists of *lifestyle-oriented pragmatists*, who focus on their own well-being, the quality of food and health-related outcomes. Second, *community-oriented conscious consumers* are identified; such consumers tend to emphasize shared risks and solidarity with farmers. The third category is composed of *convinced practitioners*, who have a high degree of awareness of social-environmental problems and are committed to a sustainable lifestyle.

The different types of motivations can also be investigated by AFN types. In the case of *farmers' markets,* Feagan & Morris (2009) identify the following main food-related concerns in Canada: health (43% of respondents), community (41%), and the environment (41%). Kerényi & Török (2019) examine farmers' markets in Hungary, and their results are almost entirely in line with international trends. Consumers identify supporting local economies as the most important motivation: Although shopping is not cheaper, they say that the price premium is in good hands and raises the income level of local producers. They also emphasize the reliability and quality of products and the fact that they think that products purchased locally are more environmentally friendly. In another study carried out in Hungary, consumers mention the freshness, reliable origin, appropriate price of produces and a wide range of goods as the most important factors for purchase (Szabó & Juhász, 2015). Seyfang (2008) examines consumer purchasing motivations related to a local producer cooperative based in East Anglia called Eostre. It consists of nine local organic growers who sell their produces through *farmers' markets and box schemes*. The most important issues for consumers are the environment (94%) and the reduction in packaging waste (85%) and food miles (84%), but they also mention aspects related to localism, such as the importance of supporting local farmers (84%) and cooperative businesses (70%), keeping money in the local economy (65%) and preserving local heritage and traditions (36%). In addition, it is important for consumers to know where their food comes from and how it was produced (76%); 77% claim that organic food is safer, and face-to-face contact with growers (25%) is also highlighted. Finally, 80% of consumers claim that organic food tastes better and is more nutritious than products from a supermarket. Ostrom's (2007) research shows the following top motivations for joining a *CSA*: obtaining fresh, nutritious produce; buying local produce; supporting small-scale farmers; obtaining a source of organic produce; and caring for the environment. Lang (2010) identifies that the most important factors underlying people's membership in CSAs are obtaining locally grown (86%) and organic (84%) produce, supporting local farmers (78%) and environmental reasons (73%). In their qualitative research in Hungary, Birtalan et al. (2019) identify five different factors for joining CSAs: (1) active

action for themselves (an internal driving force to control health, focus on socioecological principles and the presence of factors that facilitate connection); (2) the influence of specific life and household management; (3) active leisure time (learning and source of joy); (4) self-reflection-projection (identity) and (5) spiritual factors (spirituality, including mental and physical health, connection to nature). *Community garden* participants claim to have several different motivations: consuming fresh foods, community building, culture exchange, improving health among members, making or saving money by consuming from the community garden or selling the food produced, enjoying nature, environmental sustainability and enhancing spiritual practice (Guitart et al., 2012; Venn et al., 2006). Spilková's (2017) research shows a slightly different pattern, as the main motivational factor turns out to be community, followed by self-realization and healthy and quality food, which have the same weights. Bende & Nagy (2016) find that in Hungary, community gardeners aim to live a rural-like life in cities and to belong to a community.

2.3. THE MEASUREMENT AND ANALYSIS OF MOTIVATIONS RELATED TO FOOD CHOICE

On the one hand, studies applying a *quantitative* approach (e.g., Fotopoulos et al., 2009) favor the use of scales, for example, the Food Choice Questionnaire originally developed by Steptoe et al. (1995). Nine motivational dimensions are distinguished that address general food selection determinants: 1. ''health'', 2. ''mood'', 3. ''convenience'', 4. ''sensory appeal'', 5. ''natural content'', 6. ''price'', 7. ''weight control'', 8.''familiarity'', and 9. ''ethical concern''.

On the other hand, in *qualitative* research approaches to food consumption motivations, one popular theoretical perspective is Maslow's (1943) theory of needs (e.g., Van Lenthe et al. 2015; Satter, 2007; Blades & Tikkanen, 2009; Perianova, 2013). It seems useful to apply Maslow's concept to food selection and acquisition (Satter, 2007), as it is a tool for determining essential human motivations and needs. Moreover, Maslow's motivators may be matched to food choice motivators (Perianova, 2013).

Maslow's original model states that people are motivated by unmet needs, which are in a hierarchical order. Unless all lower-level needs have been met, people cannot be motivated based on the next need area. This statement was later altered by Maslow (1987, p. 68), who concluded that the order in the hierarchy "is not nearly as rigid" as he suggested before. Maslow's theory of needs introduces five major areas: *physiological needs* (air, water, food, shelter, sleep, clothing, reproduction), *safety needs* (personal security, employment, resources, health, property), *love and belonging* (friendship, intimacy, sense of connection), *esteem* (respect, self-

esteem, status, recognition, strength, freedom), and *self-actualization* (the desire to become the most that one can be) (Maslow, 1943). According to Van Lenthe et al. (2015), if individuals have higher levels of education or income, they already satisfy more basic needs; thus, they end up higher in the hierarchy. Moreover, at higher levels, people tend to have a higher interest in making healthy food choices instead of only satisfying the need to consume sufficient energy. However, such choices become prioritized only when other needs are already satisfied. The same holds for people who are surrounded by an abundance of unhealthy food alternatives. In this case, making healthy food choices can be seen as a need to reach self-fulfillment.

Recent books and studies present exciting results from the perspective of Maslow's model in the domain of food choice motivation. Perianova's (2013) book uses Maslow's theory of needs to present how food may satisfy an entire range of needs. Food not only provides a solution to the physiological needs of sustenance but also can make people feel safe and secure and strengthen their social and cultural identity. Moreover, the author states that food can affect acceptance, esteem, bonding, affiliation, and self-actualization as well. It is important to mention that in line with Maslow's later modification regarding the specific attributes of the hierarchy, food might satisfy both higher- and lower-level needs, and it may be present across the whole range of motivators. As part of their study, Van Lenthe et al. (2015) investigate the priorities of healthy food choices of socioeconomic groups among older adults in the Netherlands who have different material, living, working and social circumstances by testing whether Maslow's pyramid of needs is a useful framework. They find that healthier food choices, including a higher consumption of fruits and vegetables as well as more healthy than unhealthy bread, snack and dairy consumption, are related to the higher levels of the hierarchy of Maslow's pyramid of needs, not only the physiological needs of sustenance. Satter (2007) also applies Maslow's concept of food selection and acquisition. Satter's hierarchy of food needs consists of different hierarchical levels, from the experience of food insecurity at the lowest level as *physiological needs*, named "enough food", to the highest state as *self-actualization*, called "instrumental food". In the latter category, people consider choosing food for instrumental reasons to achieve a desired physical, cognitive, or spiritual outcome. In line with the model of Maslow (1943), the motivators—needs—at each level define the food management behavior at that level.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

The current study is exploratory qualitative research that aims to understand the mechanism, features, and characteristics of AFNs in Hungary. Twenty-three in-depth interviews were conducted between July and

December 2018 in Hungary, mainly in the capital, Budapest, and surrounding towns. The interviewees were selected based on their participation in the four main types of AFNs and the level of experience of the members, meaning new members (maximum 1 year in the network) and experienced members (minimum 3 years in the network) (*see Table 2*). Eight interviews were with community garden users, 11 interviews were conducted with members of CSAs, 4 interviews were conducted with members of box schemes, and 5 respondents associated with farmers' markets and zero waste stores were interviewees having multiple experiences with another type of AFN (box schemes, CSAs or community gardens). The community gardens indicated in the current research are located in Budapest. These gardens consist of 30 to 80 individual parcels that are cultivated mainly by families. The CSAs in the current study are located in the countryside but with delivery to Budapest. There are between 13 and 50 participants in these networks. The box schemes mentioned in this study serve as hubs and have delivery points in Budapest. Farmers' markets remarked in the study are mainly located in Budapest.

Table 2: Sample – interviews based on the different types of AFNs

Type of AFN	Number of AFNs	Commitment	Experience	Number of interviews
Traditional and online farmers' markets and zero waste stores	3	Occasional	Experienced	5
Flexible and fixed box schemes	2	Weekly	New member	2
			Experienced	2
Community-supported agriculture	3	Yearly	New member	5
			Experienced	6
Community gardens	3	Yearly	New member	2
			Experienced	6

The interview guideline included an introduction section, lifestyle and shopping habits, AFN participation and the motivation for joining, passion and problems related to the AFN, and demographic questions. For the data analysis of the transcribed in-depth interviews, qualitative content analysis (QCA) was used (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009). A combination of inductive and deductive codings was applied (Berg, 2001; Patton, 2002). Initial coding followed an inductive logic, and all motivators were collected from the interviews, with the type of AFN always being marked in parentheses. In this way, categories emerged through the researchers' careful examination and continuous comparison. Second, the categories were reviewed, compared and modified based on the existing theoretical constructs (deductive phase

of coding). The analytical procedures and interpretations were based on the guidelines of Zhang & Wildemuth (2009).

4. RESULTS

4.1. THE MAIN MOTIVATIONS BY AFN TYPES

The final subcategories from the analysis were divided into individual and community-related motives by AFN types (see *Table 3*). It is important to mention that motivations can be present in different categories at the same time. However, in *Table 3,* the most important categories mentioned by the participants are indicated. In the case of farmers' markets, the most important motivational factors were easy access to quality, healthy and safe local food (individual motivation) and personal relationships with farmers and sellers (community-based motivation). Participants in box schemes and community-supported agriculture considered having quality, safety and healthy local food (individual motivation) and supporting local economies by supporting local farmers (community-based motivation) to be the most meaningful motivations. The most important motivational factors for members of community gardens were self-fulfillment (individual motivation) and sustainability (community-based motivation).

Farmers' markets

The dominant *individual* motivational factor among participants in farmers' markets was easy access to quality, healthy and safe local food while supporting local economies, preferably in a sustainable way (zero waste stores, short supply chains). For example, "*I go to the farmers' market on Saturday early morning when the family is still sleeping, as I can buy most of the things there*". This aspect is closely related to the quality and health factor, which was mentioned more times than easy access in other studies (Feagan & Morris, 2009; Szabó & Juhász, 2015). The most relevant *community-related* motivator was personal relationships with farmers and sellers, the formation of interpersonal ties within the producer-consumer partnerships and strengthening solidarity, trust and participation: "*When I go to the market and package-free shops, I enjoy chatting with the sellers*", and "*I love to join producers at the market, and I want to support these local producers*". However, this aspect also shows a very close relationship with supporting local economies, which tends to be a more dominant factor in the previous literature (Kerényi & Török, 2019; Feagan & Morris, 2009).

Box schemes and CSAs

Having quality, safe and healthy local food was a dominant *individual* motivational factor among most of the participants, especially those who participate in short supply chains such as box schemes and CSAs. Other

indicators that the participators mentioned were "*bio, organic, fresh, tasty food, without chemicals, the source of which is known*", giving healthy food to children, and having a diet due to diseases (for instance, autoimmune illness): "*My motivation for joining was curiosity, and I was seeking quality and bio goods*". Another participant stated that *"I am environmentally conscious. I prefer organic food and other locally produced products. Besides, I like to know where the products come from. This is my main motivation, and it is especially important for me since my child was born*". In the case of fixed box schemes and CSAs, creativity was also mentioned as an advantage: "*I need to learn to 'deal' with all sorts of vegetables and discover ways to cook them. I think it is a combination of experience doing it and enjoying doing it and knowing that it's a good thing to do*". Motivation can be harmed by negative effects and inconvenience related to orders and deliveries: "*I would be happy if there would be more options for deliveries during the week or if they would have a pick-up point closer to me. Furthermore, I don't like keeping the empty boxes at home until the next delivery when the courier finally takes them away*". Another interviewee commented, "*I don't like the rule that we need to do online ordering before Tuesday 8:00 am. It is very difficult for me due to my busy life*". The main *community-related* factor was supporting local economies by supporting local farmers and being a patron: "*I like to know where my money goes. I know the founders of the bio village called 'Biofalu', and we became friends, and I fully trust them*". Others mentioned the following: "*I am price conscious, and I prefer local products; besides, I would like to support locally grown products*", and "*I would like to support sustainable production and the community*". These findings were in line with the previous literature (Seyfang 2008; Ostrom, 2007; Lang, 2010; Birtalan et al., 2019).

Table 3: Motivators by alternative food network types

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2" rowspan="2"></th><th rowspan="2">Farmers' markets (traditional and online), zero waste stores</th><th colspan="2">Box schemes</th><th rowspan="2">Community supported agriculture</th><th rowspan="2">Community gardens</th></tr>
<tr><th>Flexible</th><th>Fixed</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Motivation for joining</td><td>Individual</td><td>Easy access to quality and local food</td><td colspan="3">Quality/safety of the food consumed</td><td>Self-fulfillment, personal balance (interaction with nature)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Community</td><td>Personal relationships with the producer</td><td colspan="3">Support local economies</td><td>Sustainability</td></tr>
</table>

Community gardens

For community gardens, the main *individual* motivation was self-fulfillment. Gardening was stated to improve quality of life; it can ensure reconnection and interaction with nature and provide a better life and meaningful work. It becomes a creative hobby, where people can learn something new and take an active role in production and consumption. This activity ensures empowerment by gaining control, leading to personal growth and spiritual well-being: "*I love the experience of producing food for myself*". Gardening can provide relief from stress as well: "*Connecting to nature, it gives a regenerative feeling*", and "*I love digging the earth. I don't realize how time passes by*". Farming activity often serves as a nostalgic hobby for members since many community gardeners are originally from the countryside or their parents lived in the countryside and practiced agricultural activities. This is similar to the case of some elderly gardeners who moved to the city from the suburbs after retiring and who had previously cultivated a kitchen garden. The main *community*-based motivational factor is closely related to sustainability. Community garden participants stated that taking care of biodiversity, creating an alternative economy, and being ecological (e.g., reducing the ecological footprint, reducing waste, urban greening, reducing energy usage, having a sustainable food supply) are the main aspects of their participation. The interviewees mentioned that belonging to a community is important; nevertheless, it is usually not the primary incentive for joining but rather an experience that grows while being a member of the garden. This remark also suggests that motivations are not fixed; they might change over time; thus, temporality can have an important role. "*I became conscious of the social and the environmental impacts of the agricultural style, and I wanted to participate in creating an alternative and do something beyond just changing shopping habits*". These findings were also in line with the literature (Guitart et al., 2012; Venn et al., 2006; Spilková, 2017; Bende & Nagy, 2016).

4.2. INDIVIDUAL MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS

The individual factors tend to show an arc from security-based factors to self-realization, which is in line with the classical model of Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1943) *(see Table 4)*. However, in parallel with Maslow's later modification of the hierarchy, the lower-level needs do not necessarily need to be met, and people can be motivated based on the next need area. In addition, food might satisfy both higher- and lower-level needs, and it may be present across the whole range of motivators: "*I was looking for healthy food, especially for the children, so I joined a CSA, and I get to order from there every second week. Besides, I go shopping every Saturday at the farmers' market*".

From the same perspective, another CSA participant stated, "*I also go to the market, which I like as well, where I always search for the small farmers' section*".

First, as consumers have basic physiological needs (food) and buy in a place that they know and can easily access quality food, they tend to start shopping at *farmers' markets and zero waste stores*. If they are sensitive to the topic of AFNs and they become informed about alternative ways, then they might start ordering *box schemes*: "*I always loved shopping at farmers' markets, but 3 months ago, I joined Kiskosár community shopping in Esztergom and order boxes every second week. I would like to support the local community*". For them, the most important motivations are physiological needs (food) and security (safe, healthy local food with an identifiable place of origin). If these needs are met, they might then move to the importance of belonging somewhere and having a higher degree of commitment by making a contract with suppliers and engaging in *CSA*: "*I was a bio shopper first. I was open to these ideologies as vegetarian, vegan approaches and reform eating. Consciousness is important to me. First, I heard about CSAs, and I Googled them and joined programs as a consumer*". In this way, they connect with people and might gain status and admiration from others due to their higher commitment and support for local economies. The final stage mentioned by the interviewees consists of joining *community gardens*, which is strongly related to self-realization and personal balance. Since it is a time-consuming and place-based activity, it is not an option for everyone, and it highly depends on the available time and the lifestyle of people: "*I am now an observer of the alternative food networks by ordering boxes, but I am looking forward to being a participant when I am able to take that step*". Based on the sample, young mothers and retired people tend to participate more frequently in community gardens.

Table 4: Individual motivational factors based on commitment, parallel with Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1943)

4.3. COMMUNITY-BASED MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS

Community-based motivational factors range from motivations directly related to the community to abstract ideas. These motivational elements are learned by the participants by interacting with the environment, and they show a constant development regarding commitment and a deeper understanding of the existing types of AFNs (ranging from farmers' markets to community gardens).

First, most commonly, AFN consumers start shopping at farmers' markets and zero waste stores and then enter the stage of ordering box schemes (the same pattern as in the individual-based motivators). At this stage, the most important motivation is the personal relationship with the producer, and then, supporting local economies becomes more of a focus. Finally, related to high commitment and mainly participation in community gardens, sustainability is more important to gardeners. Thus, we can distinguish a learning phase from community-based, simple basic needs such as relationships and support to abstract ideas that influence the whole society: "*I heard about the CSA called Birs from friends, and it was just at the right time because I was looking for options for how to produce less waste*".

However, it should be emphasized again that all motivational types are present in each state but to different extents.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The current study aimed to explore the main motivational factors by the four different alternative food network types in the Hungarian market; this topic has not previously been researched in such depth and variation. A new classification was applied to the presentation of the results: individual and community-related motivators were separated. Based on the results, we can distinguish 6 different motivational factors: in farmers' markets or zero waste stores, access to quality food was the most dominant individual factor, while with regard to community-related motivations, personal relationships with farmers turned out to be the most important. Box schemes and CSAs showed similar patterns: Undoubtedly, the quality and healthiness of food was the most important individual factor, while supporting local economies was the most important community-related factor. Finally, at the individual level, gardening in community gardens fosters self-fulfillment, and participants belonging to the community may also aspire to carry out some sort of work in the name of sustainability.

The new classifications help to capture additional patterns. The results confirm that food itself can satisfy an entire range of needs, as it can not only meet the physiological needs of sustenance but can also have an influence on how people feel; additionally, it can strengthen social and cultural identity and improve self-esteem and self-actualization (Perianova,

2013). During the close examination of the *individual* factors, we can distinguish a hierarchy related to the different types of AFNs and the commitment to them. Parallels can be drawn between this concept and Maslow's theory of needs (Maslow, 1943). This study applies Maslow's theory for the first time to AFNs: farmers' markets and zero waste stores incorporate the level of physiological and safety needs, while we can move towards belonging and esteem when participating in CSAs and reach self-actualization when gardening in community gardens. However, as food might satisfy both higher- and lower-level needs at the same time, a whole range of motivations may be present at the same time. New patterns can be found regarding *community-based* motivators as well. The new concept demonstrates a new relationship between different motivators and alternative food network types. With low commitment (farmers' markets), motivation is directly linked to the community and moves towards higher commitment to embrace abstract, comprehensive goals related to society (CSAs, community gardens).

The results are in line with the motivational factors seen in the international and Hungarian literature (e.g., Venn et al., 2006; Feagan & Morris, 2009; Seyfang, 2008; Lang, 2010; Spilková, 2017; Birtalan et al., 2019; Szabó & Juhász, 2015), although the importance of each factor changes in some cases. The most significant difference was related to farmers' markets.

However, it is still necessary to better understand the motivational factors of producers as well to have a complete picture of AFN participants. In addition, it would be useful to conduct further interviews with those who buy only at farmers' markets and zero waste stores (and who do not take part in other AFNs at the same time) and to carry out a cross-cultural comparison. As motivations are not fixed and might change over time, future research should pay special attention to temporality. To further investigate this issue, interviews should be analyzed based on the classification of the interviewees, for example, whether they are new (maximum one year in the network) or experienced (minimum three years in the network) members.

6. REFERENCES

Ares, G., Machín, L., Girona, A., Curutchet, M. R., & Giménez, A. (2017): "Comparison of motives underlying food choice and barriers to healthy eating among low medium-income consumers in Uruguay", *Cadernos de saude publica*, 33, e00213315.

Balázs, B., Pataki, Gy. & Lazányi, O. (2016): "Prospects for the future: Community supported agriculture in Hungary", *Futures*, 83, 100-111.

Bende, Cs. & Nagy, Gy. (2016): "Effects of community gardens on local society: the case of two community gardens in Szeged", *Belvedere Meridionale*, (28) 3, 89-105.

Benedek, Z. & Balázs, B. (2014a): "Az élelmiszertermelés relokalizációjának térbeli-társadalmi különbségei Magyarországon", *Tér és Társadalom*, 28:4, 63–76.

Benedek, Z., & Balázs, B. (2014b): "A rövid ellátási láncok szocioökonómiai hatásai", *Külgazdaság*, 58(5-6), 100-120.

Benedek, Z., & Fertő, I. (2015): "Miért választják a termelők a rövid ellátási láncokat?", *Statisztikai Szemle*, 93(6), 580-597.

Berg, B.L. (2001): *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Birtalan, I. L., Kis, B., Bárdos, G., Rácz, J., Oláh, A., & Rigó, A. (2019): "Egészség a közösség által támogatott mezőgazdálkodásban", *Alkalmazott pszichológia*, 19(3), 81-100.

Blades, M., & Tikkanen, I. (2009): M*aslow's hierarchy and pupils' suggestions for developing school meals*, Nutrition & Food Science.

Eertmans, A., Baeyens, F., & Van Den Bergh, O. (2001): "Food likes and their relative importance in human eating behavior: review and preliminary suggestions for health promotion", *Health education research*, 16(4), 443-456.

Feagan, R. B. and Morris, D. (2009): "Consumer quest for embeddedness: a case study of the Brantford Farmers' Market", *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 33(3), 235-243.

Fotopoulos, C., Krystallis, A., Vassallo, M., & Pagiaslis, A. (2009): "Food Choice Questionnaire (FCQ) revisited. Suggestions for the development of an enhanced general food motivation model", *Appetite*, 52(1), 199-208.

Guitart, D., Pickering, C., & Byrne, J. (2012): "Past results and future directions in urban community gardens research", *Urban forestry & urban greening*, 11(4), 364-373.

Hwang, J. (2016): "Organic food as self-presentation: The role of psychological motivation in older consumers' purchase intention of organic food", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 28, 281-287.

Kamiyama, C., Hashimoto, S., Kohsaka, R., & Saito, O. (2016): "Non-market food provisioning services via homegardens and communal sharing in satoyama socio-ecological production landscapes on Japan's Noto peninsula", *Ecosystem services*, 17, 185-196.

Kerényi, N., & Török, Á. (2019): "The consumers of the farmers' markets–global and local outlook", *Köz-gazdaság-Review of Economic Theory and Policy*, 14(4).

Köster, E. P. (2009): "Diversity in the determinants of food choice: A psychological perspective", *Food quality and preference*, 20(2), 70-82.

Kujáni, K. (2014): "Az alternatív élelmiszer-ellátó rendszerek meghatározásának és csoportosításának tényezői", *Gazdálkodás: Scientific Journal on Agricultural Economics*, 58(80-2016-1016), 30-40.

Lang, K. B. (2010): "The Changing Face of Community Supported Agricultur", *Culture & Agriculture*, 32(1), 17-26.

Maslow, A. H. (1943): "A Theory of Human Motivation", *Psychological Review*, 50.4, 370-396.

Maslow, A. H. (1987): *Motivation and personality* (3rd ed.), Delhi, India: Pearson Education.

McClintock, N., & Simpson, M. (2018): "Stacking functions: identifying motivational frames guiding urban agriculture organizations and businesses in the United States and Canada", *Agriculture and Human Values*, 35(1), 19–39.

Michaelidou, N., & Hassan, L. M. (2008): "The role of health consciousness, food safety concern and ethical identity on attitudes and intentions towards organic food", *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 32(2), 163-170.

Neulinger, A., Bársony, F., Gjorevska, N., Lazányi, O., Pataki, G., Takács, S., & Török, A. (2020): "Engagement and subjective well being in alternative food networks: The case of Hungary", *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 00, 1–10.

Ostrom, M. R. (2007): "Community supported agriculture as an agent of change", *Remaking the North American food system, ed. C. Hinrichs, and T. Lyson*, 99120.

Patton, M. Q. (2002): *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Perianova, I. (2013): *The polyphony of food: Food through the prism of Maslow's Pyramid*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Plieninger, T., Kohsaka, R., Bieling, C., Hashimoto, S., Kamiyama, C., Kizos, T., Saito, O. (2018): "Fostering biocultural diversity in landscapes through place-based food networks: a "solution scan" of European and Japanese models", *Sustainability Science*, 13(1), 219–233.

Prescott, J., Young, O., O'Neil, L., Yau, N. J. N., & Stevens, R. (2002): "Motives for food choice: a comparison of consumers from Japan, Taiwan, Malaysia and New Zealand", *Food Quality and Preference*, 13, 489–495.

Renting, H., Marsden, T. K. and Banks, J. (2003): "Understanding alternative food networks: Exploring the role of short food supply chains in rural development*", Environment and Planning*, 35(3), 393–411.

Ritzer, G. and Jurgenson, N. (2010): "Production, consumption, presumption", *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 10(1), 13–36.

Satter, E. (2007): "Hierarchy of food needs", *Journal of nutrition education and behavior*, 39(5), S187-S188.

Seyfang, G. (2008): "Avoiding Asda? Exploring consumer motivations in local organic food networks", *Local Environment*, 13(3), 187-201.

Spilková, J. (2017): "Producing space, cultivating community: the story of Prague´ s new community gardens", *Agriculture and Human Values*, 34(4), 887-897.

Szabó, D., & Juhász, A. (2015): "Consumers' and producers' perceptions of markets: service levels of the most important short food supply chains in Hungary", *Studies in Agricultural Economics*, 117(2), 111-118.

Steptoe, A., Pollard, T. M., & Wardle, J. (1995): "Development of a measure of the motives underlying the selection of food: the food choice questionnaire", *Appetite*, 25(3), 267-284.

Van Lenthe, F. J., Jansen, T., & Kamphuis, C. B. (2015): "Understanding socio-economic inequalities in food choice behaviour: can Maslow's pyramid help", *British Journal of Nutrition*, 113(7), 1139-1147.

Venn, L., Kneafsey, M., Holloway, L., Cox, R., Dowler, E. and Tuomainen, H. (2006): "Researching European 'alternative' food networks: some methodological considerations", *Area*, 38 (3), 248-258.

Weber, C. L., & Matthews, H. S. (2008): "Food-miles and the relative climate impacts of food choices in the United States", *Environmental Science and Technology*, 42, 10, 3508–3513.

Zhang, Y., & Wildemuth, B. M. (2009): "Qualitative analysis of content. Applications of social research methods to questions in information and library science", *Human Brain Mapping*, 30 (7), 2197-2206.

Zoll, F., Specht, K., Opitz, I., Siebert, R., Piorr, A., Zasada, I. (2018): "Individual choice or collective action? Exploring consumer motives for participating in alternative food networks", *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 42, 101-110.