SAC

LAND ECONOMY WORKING PAPER SERIES

_____

Number: 48 **Bread Prices, Consumption and Nutrition Implications for Scotland: A Regional Analysis Using Supermarket Scanner Data**

Corresponding Author:

Cesar Revoredo-Giha
Land Economy Research Group
SAC Research Division
SAC Edinburgh

EH9 3JG
Tel: 0131-535-4344
Email: Cesar.Revoredo@sac.ac.uk

BREAD PRICES, CONSUMPTION AND NUTRITION IMPLICATIONS FOR SCOTLAND: A REGIONAL ANALYSIS USING SUPERMARKET SCANNER DATA

Cesar Revoredo-Giha, Chrysa Lamprinopoulou, Luiza Toma, Philip Leat, Beata Kupiec-Teahan, and Luca Cacciolatti

ABSTRACT

The recent rise in food prices has increased the concern about the choice of a healthy food basket, especially in the context of the discussion around the formulation of a National Food Policy for Scotland. This concern has brought back the interest in the price and expenditure demand systems as they provide information about consumers' food decisions. The paper focuses on the consumption of brown and white bread, as they are the most typical ways of cereals use in the UK and nutritionists recommend the consumption of wholemeal or brown bread in contraposition to white bread as part of an appropriate diet due to its health benefits. This paper aims to answer whether changes in bread prices affect the quantity and composition of the Scottish demand for bread, and whether the latter has been the same for different regions and socioeconomic groups. We used supermarket scanner data to estimate three demand systems and compute their elasticities. All the models showed statistically significant own price and expenditure elasticities and the Hicksian elasticities show that different types of bread are net substitutes. After simulating an increase in all the bread prices we found that brown bread consumption decreases more than white bread just the opposite to what is recommended by the nutritionists.

I.   Introduction

All over the world there is a growing concern about the increase in food prices and how this may affect the access to and affordability of food, and, ultimately, consumers' well being. Recent official figures for UK inflation (ONS, 2008b) indicate that the largest contribution to the change in the consumer price index (CPI) over the past year comes from the food and non-alcoholic beverages category. Although traditionally a category with prices growing at a rate below the average for all the items in the economy, bread inflation since January 2005 has grown above the overall inflation following the trend in the price of cereals. Thus, whilst the retail price index (RPI) for all the items has grown by 13 per cent between January 2005 and September 2008, the RPI for bread has grown by 33 per cent over the same period. Furthermore, if one considers specific average prices, the price of the white loaf, sliced, 800 grams has grown by 102 per cent and the wholemeal loaf, sliced, 800 grams, by 58 per cent during the same period (ONS, 2008b).

The choice of bread prices and consumption as the subject of study in this paper is associated, first, to the fact that bread represents a significant almost 5 per cent of the household expenditure on food and non-alcoholic drinks. Furthermore, according to the Flour Advisory Bureau (2008), bread remains one of the UK's favourite foods, with 99 per cent of households buying bread, of which white bread accounts for 70 per cent of the consumption. It should also be noted the increasing importance of the so called "Premium bread". According to the Flour Advisory Bureau, when introduced in the early 1990s, premium bread proved extremely successful, and currently accounts for around 21 per cent of the plant white bread market. This was reinforced by the launch in late 1998 of premium brown and wholemeal loaves.

The second reason for choosing to study bread is because nutritionists' recommendations make a clear distinction between the consumption of wholemeal or brown bread in contraposition to white bread as part of an appropriate diet (e.g., Mooney, 1990). Furthermore, the latter is part of the recommendation that regular consumption of wholegrain foods has been associated with a reduction in the incidence of cardiovascular disease and diabetes, reductions in cancer mortality and an overall reduction in premature death (Lang and Jebb, 2003).

The main motivation behind the paper is to provide information for food policy in Scotland. Specifically as regards food education – supporting consumers and the food and drink industry to make healthier and more environmentally sustainable choices. Thus, analysing how consumers respond to prices, choosing or not healthy options, contributes to providing evidence for policy. Furthermore, this is more important as to increase bread intake by 45 per cent from its 1995 level daily intake of 106g by year 2005 (mainly using wholemeal and brown breads) was one of the targets from the Scottish Diet Action Plan (The Scottish Office Department of Health, 1996). However, as regards Scottish eating habits according to the 2003 Scottish Health Survey fewer people consumed at least two slices of any bread a day in 2003 than in 1995 (Scottish Executive, 2005). In this context, if bread consumption is price-responsive then the rise in cereal and bread prices during 2005 to 2008 might have worsened the situation.

The purpose of this paper is to estimate the effect that changes in bread prices may have had on the Scottish consumption of the different types of breads (e.g., white versus wholemeal bread) through the estimation of different demand system for different types of breads.

It is important to note that the available consumer surveys for the estimation of demand systems are UK based with a small number of observations for Scotland (e.g., Expenditure and Food Survey). This situation makes difficult to analyse the consumption behaviour of regions and socioeconomic groups within Scotland. Due to this reason data from supermarket scanners was used in this study.

Supermarket scanners information is a really promising data source for demand analysis, as it allows studying a number of different issues not possible with conventional consumer surveys. Thus, according to Cotterill (1994), supermarket scanner data have been particularly useful in demand modelling and empirical analysis of price, advertising retailer push, and consumer pull market strategies at the brand as well as product category or industry level. It is important also to point out that as source of consumption, supermarket data is not perfect as it does not include all the consumption outside the household, which has grown overtime. Furthermore, according to the Flour Advisory Bureau the consumption of bread, e.g., in the form of sandwiches, is a category that has grown significantly in the last years in the UK.

The structure of the paper is as follows: first, an overview of the benefits of the wholegrain food consumption is sketched. Second, the methodology is presented, comprising a description of the data used and the estimated models, which are three: the Rotterdam demand system (Theil, 1965 and Barten, 1967) and the static and dynamic versions of the Linear Approximation of the Almost Ideal Demand System (LA/AIDS) (Deaton and Muellbauer, 1981, Edgerton et al., 1996). This is followed by a discussion of the results and their implications in terms of nutrition.

II.   Bread consumption and nutrition

Whole-wheat flour is produced by the whole cereal grains, which comprise three structural layers: the endosperm, the bran and the germ (Anderson et al., 2000). The bran constitutes the outer "shell" of the grain that protects the germ (the inner layer) and the endosperm, the middle layer, which is predominantly carbohydrate and accounts for approximately 80 per cent of the grain.

During the milling process, refined grains retain only the starchy endosperm. Products of refined cereal grains such as white flour, include neither the bran which is rich in B vitamins, unsaturated fatty acids, phytochemicals such as flavonoids, indoles, phyto-oestrogens and fibre (Southgate, 1995), nor the germ that has abundance of minerals such as Fe, Zn, Mg, Ca, S and Zn as well as the antioxidant vitamin E (Sidhu et al., 2007). The removal of bran and germ results in a substantial loss of important nutrients, therefore whole grain products are nutritionally superior to the refined grain ones. Wholemeal and

brown bread belong to the most commonly consumed sources of wholegrain in the Western cultures, together with breakfast cereals, oatmeal, crackers, brown rice and popcorn (Richardson, 2000).

The lack of a uniform definition of whole grain foods and the inconsistency in estimates of serving sizes hinder the comparison between different studies on whole grain consumption (Lang and Jebb, 2003). According to the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the wholegrain claim can be only related to foods that contain at least 51 per cent wholegrain ingredients such as wholegrain wheat, maize, oats and rice, by weight per reference amount customarily consumed (RACC) per day (Pape et al., 1999). The food must include all portions of the grain kernel as naturally occurring and at least 16g wholegrain/RACC. Companies in the UK follow the same definition for wholegrain products in order to be harmonised with the US law. In contrast to the European countries, the US have specified exact quantities of whole grain foods for dietary recommendations, setting the target of at least three servings per day as a nutrition objective for 2010 (US Department of Health and Human Services, 2000).

Since wholegrain foods contain increased proportion of fibres that are not digested, they have lower energy content, which can lead to reduced energy intake compared to refined grains. Moreover, the consumption of dietary fibres promotes satiation and reduces the return of hunger, illustrating their impact on the maintenance of body weight. Fibres can also interfere with the secretion of gut hormones that are related to the metabolism of glucose and involved into satiety (Koch-Banerjee and Rimm, 2003). Water-soluble fibres are subject to fermentation in the small intestine yielding end products which may have health-protective action. Non-soluble fibres have hypdrophilic properties that increase the bulk of intestinal contents and decrease the transit time, reducing constipation and the risk not only of colon cancer but also of neoplasms across the whole intestinal track.

Despite the aforementioned health benefits, the consumption of wholegrains remains below the dietary recommendation of three servings per day in both the US and UK (Lang and Jebb, 2003). Wholemeal and brown bread contribute over 40 per cent to whole grain intake for British adults (Land et al., 2001), followed by wholegrain breakfast cereals.

Several studies have been performed to identify demographic variables related to high consumption of wholegrain foods. Particularly, the consumption was found to increase with age, income and educational level in the US and UK (Adams and Engstrom, 2000). Men seem to consume more wholegrain foods than women, but this may be due to the overall larger quantity of food consumed by men (Jacobs et al., 2001). North American and British consumers of wholegrain foods were likely to be also associated with other health living habits such as non-smoking, regular exercise and consumption of fruit and vegetables (Johansson et al., 1999; Adams and Engstrom, 2000). Qualitative research conducted by Adams and Engstrom (2000) in the US indicated as reasons for the low consumption of wholegrain foods the difficulty to identify, prepare and cook these particular products, as well as the dry and bitter taste of wholegrain breads.

In Scotland, Wrieden et al. (2006) evaluated, using the Expenditure and Food Survey and the National Diet and Nutrition Survey, how close Scottish consumers were to the nutritional targets set by the Scottish Government by analysing the mentioned survey data by Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation[1] (SIMD) and rural and urban population. Their results showed that the least deprived quintile had the highest weekly consumption of brown/wholemeal bread and breakfast cereals. This result was also found for the Scottish rural population in comparison to the urban population.

III. Methodology and results

The purpose of this section is to present the empirical work carried on. It starts with a description of the data used, followed by the models estimated and ends with a presentation of the results and discussion.

III.1 Data

The information used in the paper for the demand analysis, i.e., Scottish prices and purchases, was provided by the Centre for Value Chain Research (VCR[2]) at the Kent Business School for the project "Assessing the Effect of the Rise in Food Prices on the Purchasing Power of Consumers in Scotland" (Revoredo-Giha et al., 2008). The dataset provides information about the evolution of the total weekly purchases from a panel of loyalty customers from one of the "big-4" supermarkets in the UK.[2] The descriptive statistics of the data are presented in table 1.

The data consisted of information on the value of bread purchases in GB pounds, number of purchased units, number of customers and prices per unit in GB pounds, all variables at product level (a total of 244 bread products). Two main bread categories were considered: brown (e.g., brown, wholemeal, multigrain) and white bread due to the requirement of studying their reaction to prices and whether their consumption is somewhat related (i.e., presence of a substitution or complementarity effect). These categories were further subdivided into non-premium and premium. Therefore a total of four categories were considered in the analysis, namely: brown bread, premium brown bread, white bread and premium white bread.

---

[1] A geo-demographic index constructed by the Scottish Government used to measure the level of deprivation according to a number of indicators collected by for different areas.
[2] The "big-4" supermarkets in the UK are Tesco, Asda, Sainsbury's and Morrisons. They represent approximately 75 per cent of the sales in the groceries market.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics 1/2/

	Borders				Central				North				Scotland			
	Group A	Group B	Group C	All	Group A	Group B	Group C	All	Group A	Group B	Group C	All	Group A	Group B	Group C	All
Bread quantities (grams per week)																
Brown	1,001.6	968.1	907.5	957.0	932.8	898.8	883.0	906.7	932.8	898.8	883.0	906.7	932.8	898.8	883.0	906.7
Std. Dev.	45.2	48.1	38.7	31.8	25.4	25.6	25.4	23.5	25.4	25.6	25.4	23.5	25.4	25.6	25.4	23.5
Min	915.1	857.4	819.6	878.9	870.4	836.7	837.3	850.8	870.4	836.7	837.3	850.8	870.4	836.7	837.3	850.8
Max.	1,100.0	1,100.4	1,007.0	1,034.8	1,015.4	988.2	958.0	986.9	1,015.4	988.2	958.0	986.9	1,015.4	988.2	958.0	986.9
Premium brown	751.7	658.1	678.8	705.9	712.7	677.2	659.7	688.5	712.7	677.2	659.7	688.5	712.7	677.2	659.7	688.5
Std. Dev.	42.0	50.0	47.0	36.2	29.8	33.5	34.2	29.7	29.8	33.5	34.2	29.7	29.8	33.5	34.2	29.7
Min	666.0	572.8	577.8	628.9	664.3	629.0	617.3	649.6	664.3	629.0	617.3	649.6	664.3	629.0	617.3	649.6
Max.	861.2	803.5	838.3	815.0	801.7	800.0	796.3	789.8	801.7	800.0	796.3	789.8	801.7	800.0	796.3	789.8
White	1,182.3	1,103.1	1,098.7	1,128.6	1,048.4	1,005.4	1,023.5	1,029.2	1,048.4	1,005.4	1,023.5	1,029.2	1,048.4	1,005.4	1,023.5	1,029.2
Std. Dev.	51.6	45.6	47.0	41.9	25.1	21.3	24.5	22.5	25.1	21.3	24.5	22.5	25.1	21.3	24.5	22.5
Min	1,052.6	987.4	1,012.0	1,034.2	983.5	934.7	960.5	964.0	983.5	934.7	960.5	964.0	983.5	934.7	960.5	964.0
Max.	1,310.9	1,203.4	1,229.1	1,238.4	1,137.9	1,062.7	1,130.5	1,121.8	1,137.9	1,062.7	1,130.5	1,121.8	1,137.9	1,062.7	1,130.5	1,121.8
Premium white	723.7	666.5	673.8	693.3	678.4	661.5	649.0	664.5	678.4	661.5	649.0	664.5	678.4	661.5	649.0	664.5
Std. Dev.	36.2	46.6	36.6	30.7	23.1	23.6	21.6	21.3	23.1	23.6	21.6	21.3	23.1	23.6	21.6	21.3
Min	646.3	554.1	606.3	641.1	630.6	625.7	612.4	633.4	630.6	625.7	612.4	633.4	630.6	625.7	612.4	633.4
Max.	844.6	828.6	827.3	809.4	750.1	734.8	714.4	733.1	750.1	734.8	714.4	733.1	750.1	734.8	714.4	733.1
Bread prices (pence/10 gr.)																
Brown	1.10	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.11	1.12	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.12	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.12	1.11	1.11
Std. Dev.	0.11	0.18	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.17	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.17	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.17	0.10	0.10
Min	0.90	0.94	0.90	0.91	0.92	0.90	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.90	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.90	0.92	0.92
Max.	1.30	1.61	1.26	1.27	1.28	1.52	1.29	1.28	1.28	1.52	1.29	1.28	1.28	1.52	1.29	1.28
Premium brown	1.22	1.26	1.21	1.23	1.24	1.25	1.23	1.24	1.24	1.25	1.23	1.24	1.24	1.25	1.23	1.24
Std. Dev.	0.17	0.18	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.18
Min	0.93	0.94	0.82	0.89	0.92	0.90	0.90	0.91	0.92	0.90	0.90	0.91	0.92	0.90	0.90	0.91
Max.	1.52	1.61	1.56	1.53	1.52	1.52	1.51	1.51	1.52	1.52	1.51	1.51	1.52	1.52	1.51	1.51
White	1.08	1.08	1.07	1.08	1.08	1.10	1.07	1.08	1.08	1.10	1.07	1.08	1.08	1.10	1.07	1.08
Std. Dev.	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.12
Min	0.86	0.89	0.89	0.88	0.91	0.93	0.90	0.91	0.91	0.93	0.90	0.91	0.91	0.93	0.90	0.91
Max.	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.33	1.31	1.32	1.31	1.33	1.31	1.32	1.31	1.33	1.31	1.32
Premium white	1.27	1.29	1.26	1.27	1.30	1.30	1.26	1.29	1.30	1.30	1.26	1.29	1.30	1.30	1.26	1.29
Std. Dev.	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15
Min	1.04	1.01	1.04	1.03	1.08	1.09	1.04	1.07	1.08	1.09	1.04	1.07	1.08	1.09	1.04	1.07
Max.	1.54	1.63	1.60	1.56	1.55	1.53	1.52	1.53	1.55	1.53	1.52	1.53	1.55	1.53	1.52	1.53

Source: Based on data provided by the Centre for Value Chain Research (VCR[2]), Kent Business School.

Notes:

1/ The quantities are per customer.

2/ The first row for each product is the mean of the variable

3/ Group A= affluent, group B=middle, group C=poorer

In order to aggregate the products into the four aforementioned categories, the quantities purchased were transformed into grams using the weight information provided for each product. Furthermore, the quantities purchased were expressed as quantities per customer. Prices were also re-expressed as GB pounds per gram.

As regards the data availability, it consisted of 104 points of weekly data starting the week of the 9th of October 2006 and ending the 29th of September 2008 for three Scottish TV advertising regions (i.e., Borders, Central and North Scotland) and by ten socio-economic groupings (i.e., using CAMEO-UK, a geo-demographic classification system for assessing the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of residential neighbourhoods). Due to the sparse information for some of the socioeconomic groups, the ten groups were merged into three groups (Group A=affluent group, Group B=middle group, and Group C=poorer group).

III.2 Models

For comparison purposes three demand systems were estimated in the paper: the Rotterdam demand system and two versions (static and dynamic) of the so-called Linear Approximation of the Almost Ideal Demand System (LA/AIDS). This section presents the models briefly, as they are well-known models in the economic literature and extensive information about their characteristics can be found elsewhere (e.g., Deaton and Muellbauer, 1991).

The choice of these three models was due to the fact that they have been previously used in the literature for demand systems estimation using supermarket scanner data.[3] The Rotterdam demand system was used, for instance, by Capps and Love (2002) to study the demand for chilled and shelf stable fruit juices and drinks.[4] The equation for each sub-category within the demand system is given by equation (1):

The Rotterdam demand system was used, for instance, by Capps and Love (2002) to study the demand for chilled and shelf stable fruit juices and drinks.[5] The equation for each sub-category within the demand system is given by equation (1):

$$\overline{\omega}_i \cdot d\log Q_i = \overline{\alpha}_i \left(d\log E - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \overline{\omega}_k \cdot d\log P_k \right) + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_{ij} \cdot d\log P_j + \overline{\mu}_i$$

---

[3] Other demand systems used with supermarket scanner data are the double- double log model (e.g., Capps, 1989) and the LA/AIDS model (e.g., Cotterill, 1994).

[4] Other applications are Nayga and Capps (1994) on the demand for meat products; Seo and Capps (1997) and Capps, Seo and Nichols (1997), both papers on the demand for spaghetti sauces.

[5] Other applications are Nayga and Capps (1994) on the demand for meat products; Seo and Capps (1997) and Capps, Seo and Nichols (1997), both papers on the demand for spaghetti sauces.

Where $d \log$ represents the differential of the logarithm, approximated (for any variable x) by $d \log x_t = \log x_t - \log x_{t-1}$ and $\omega_k = \frac{P_k \cdot Q_k}{E}$ is the expenditure share of the sub-category within the category, and the other variables and parameters have already been defined.

In order to be consistent with the theory, the system has to satisfy the following constraints (in addition to the negative semi-definitiveness of the Hessian matrix on prices):

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i = 1 ; \quad \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_{ij} = 0 \quad \text{Adding up}$$

$$(2) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_{ij} = 0 \quad \text{Homogeneity}$$

$$\alpha_{ij} = \alpha_{ji} \quad \text{Symmetry}$$

The Marshallian (i.e., uncompensated) elasticities in the Rotterdam demand system are given by (4), where ε_{ij} is the own and cross price elasticity and η_i is the expenditure elasticity.

$$(3) \quad \varepsilon_{ij} = \frac{\alpha_{ij} - \omega_j \alpha_i}{\omega_i}$$

$$\eta_i = \frac{\alpha_i}{\omega_i}$$

The own (ε_{ii}) and cross price Hicksian (i.e., compensated) elasticities (ε_{ij}) are given by (4)

$$(4) \quad \varepsilon_{ij} = \frac{\alpha_{ij}}{\omega_i}$$

The LA/AIDS model can be found, for instance, in Cotterill (1994) applied to the market of regular carbonated soft drinks[6]. The equation for each sub-category within the demand system is given by (5):

$$(5) \quad \omega_i = \alpha_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_{ij} \cdot \log P_j + \alpha_{ik+1} \cdot \log \frac{E}{P} + \mu_i$$

Where P is a geometric price index (Stone price index) defined as $\log P = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \omega_i \cdot \log P_i$.

Similar to the Rotterdam demand system, the LA/AIDS needs to satisfy a number of constraints in order to be consistent with the economic theory. These are given in (6):

---

[6] Also see, Capps, Church and Love (2002) applied to the demand for spaghetti sauces.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_{ik} + 1 = 1 \;;\; \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_{ij} = 0 \quad \blacktriangleleft \text{Adding up} \quad \overline{}$$

$$\blacktriangleleft \overline{6} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_{ij} = 0 \quad \blacktriangleleft \text{Homogeneity} \quad \overline{}$$

$$\alpha_{ij} = \alpha_{ji} \quad \blacktriangleleft \text{Symmetry} \quad \overline{}$$

The Marshallian elasticities are given by ε_{ii} (own price elasticity), ε_{ij} (cross price elasticity and η_i (expenditure elasticity) in (7):

$$\varepsilon_{ii} = -1 + \frac{\alpha_{ii}}{\omega_i} - \alpha_{ik+1}$$

$$\blacktriangleleft \overline{7} \quad \varepsilon_{ij} = \frac{\alpha_{ij}}{\omega_i} - \alpha_{ik+1} \frac{\omega_j}{\omega_i}$$

$$\eta_i = 1 + \frac{\alpha_{ik+1}}{\omega_i}$$

The own (ε_{ii}) and cross price Hicksian (i.e., compensated) elasticities (ε_{ij}) are given by (8)

$$\blacktriangleleft \overline{8} \quad \varepsilon_{ii} = -1 + \frac{\alpha_{ii}}{\omega_i} - \omega_i$$

$$\varepsilon_{ij} = \frac{\alpha_{ij}}{\omega_i} + \omega_j$$

The dynamic version of the LA/AIDS model can be found, for instance, in Edgerton et al. (1996) applied to food demand in the Nordic Countries. The reason for using the dynamic version of the LA/AIDS model and not the static version is that the results from the estimation of the latter showed significant autocorrelation problems. In the LA/AIDS model the share equations are given by (9):

$$\blacktriangleleft \overline{9} \quad \omega_{i,t} = \alpha_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \phi_j \omega_{j,t-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_{ij} \cdot \log P_{j,t} + \alpha_{ik+1} \cdot \log \frac{E}{P}_t + \mu_{i,t}$$

Where P is the Stone price index. In addition to the restrictions imposed to the LA/AIDS static model, for identification purposes the model requires additional constraints. In this

paper, we follow Edgerton et al. (1996) and use $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \phi_j = 0$.

The short term Marshallian elasticities and Hicksian elasticities are given by (7) and (8) and the long term elasticities can be estimated by computing the steady-state version of the model (i.e., when $\omega_{i,t} = \omega_{j,t-1}$) and applying (7) and (8) formulas.

8

The previously described models were estimated using Iterative Seemingly Unrelated Regressions (SURE).

III.3   Results and discussion

Although the specific results from the models are of interest and they are available from the authors upon request, for brevity purposes we only present the estimated Marshallian or uncompensated elasticities, the Hicksian or compensated elasticities and their degree of significance (the elasticities are presented in annex tables A.1 and A.2).

In order to facilitate the analysis, the elasticities are presented in Figures 1 and 2. Figure 1 presents the Hicksian own price elasticity (i.e., income effect is excluded) and Figure 2 the expenditure elasticity. Both figures have similar structure. They comprise three horizontal panels that represent the results from each model (i.e., Rotterdam, static LA/AIDS and dynamic LA/AIDS). The figures plot the regional elasticity in the y-axis and the Scottish average elasticity in the x-axis. The 45 degree line in the figures indicates the points where the regional elasticity is equal to the average Scottish elasticity. Those (for each socioeconomic group) elasticities corresponding to the region of Borders are shown in red, the Central region in blue and the Northern region in green.

All the estimated models produced own prices elasticities for all the regions and socio-economic groups that were not only statistically significant at 1 per cent but also with the correct sign (i.e., negative sign). Moreover, most of the expenditure elasticities were significant and positive. However, the previous statement does not mean that all the models showed similar results. At the level of Scotland, on the one hand, the double log and the Rotterdam models showed similar own price elasticities, which were lower than in absolute value (i.e., price inelastic) for all the bread categories. On the other hand, the elasticities from the LA/AIDS model were mixed. It showed that consumption of brown bread and premium white bread was elastic, whilst the consumption of premium brown bread and white bread was inelastic. The own price elasticity for premium white bread was -3.5, indicating high sensitivity to prices.

The expenditure elasticities for Scotland also differed by model, with the double log system showing all the elasticities lower than one, Rotterdam's elasticities equal to one or close to it and the LA/AIDS' ones above one, especially in the case of white premium bread, which showed an elasticity of two.

The results by region (i.e., groups in Table 2 identified as "altogether") were similar to those observed for Scotland, although some differences appear. In term of similarities, the own price elasticities of the double log model and Rotterdam were all below the unity, indicating that the consumption of all the categories was price inelastic. The elasticity for premium white bread in all the regions for the LA/AIDS model was quite high (between 2.8 and 3.4). In addition, the expenditure elasticities from the three models were below, around and most of the time, above the unity for the double log, Rotterdam and LA/AIDS models, respectively. In terms of differences, the own price elasticities for

brown bread were slightly below one for Borders and Northern Scotland and above one for Central Scotland.

In terms of the results by socioeconomic groups (i.e., results for groups A, B, and C in the Scotland panel of Table 2), these were quite similar to those observed for Scotland. The similarity in terms of own price elasticities between double log and the Rotterdam models held by socioeconomic group. The LA/AIDS model predicted that brown bread own price elasticity was around one, whilst premium brown and white bread were price inelastic and the own price elasticity for premium white was highly price elastic. In addition, the relationship between the expenditure elasticity for the three models also held as in the Scottish case.

The results regarding the cross-price elasticities for the different models, regions and socioeconomic groups were interesting and in some way puzzling. Many of the cross price elasticities were significant, however, in contrast with what one may have expected, they indicated that the different types of bread were complements instead of substitutes. This result is not new and can be found in Cotterill (1994) in his study of carbonated soft drinks using scanner data, who found complementary demand relationships between competing soft drinks. Furthermore, observing his Table 1 (pp. 137) one can realise that several of the cross price elasticities with negative signs were significant. He explained it by the fact that all the soft drinks are in the same aisle in supermarkets, something common with the way that bread is sold (especially if one considers bread baked in the supermarket). However, it is also possible to attribute this result to the aggregation problem, as expenditure recorded every period considers a number of different customers buying different products at the same time. If one considers this aggregate as a representative individual, then one may obtain spurious cross price elasticities (although they might be useful to predict aggregate consumption).[7]

What are the implications of the results in nutritional terms? In other terms, what is it possible to say in terms of the consumption of brown and white bread based on the estimated models? Given the difference in the elasticities obtained from the models, certainly the answer depends on which one is used.

If the double log demand system or the Rotterdam demand system were used, then the rise in price would not have any dramatic effect on the consumption of any bread category. However, if one also considers the results of the cross section elasticities, i.e., the large number of significant complement elasticities, then the effect would be greater than that predicted by the own price elasticities (note that this would also be true in the case of the LA/AIDS model as it also contains a large number of significant negative cross price elasticities). This can be observed by comparing the results from Table 2 with those from Table 3, which reports the results from a simulation of an increase by 1 per cent in all bread prices.

---

[7] See Deaton and Muellbauer (1991), pp. 80 about a discussion on consumption across individuals and commodities.

Figure 1: Comparison of own price elasticities (Hicksian) between Scottish regions and Scotland

A. Rotterdam model results

Brown bread

Premium brown bread

White bread

Premium white bread

B. LA/AIDS static model results

Brown bread

Premium brown bread

White bread

Premium white bread

C. LA/AIDS dynamic model results

Brown bread

Premium brown bread

White bread

Premium white bread

11

Figure 2: Comparison of expenditure elasticities between Scottish regions and Scotland

A. Rotterdam model results

| Brown bread | Premium brown bread | White bread | Premium white bread |

B. LA/AIDS static model results

| Brown bread | Premium brown bread | White bread | Premium white bread |

C. LA/AIDS dynamic model results

| Brown bread | Premium brown bread | White bread | Premium white bread |

Table 2: Simulation of the effect of the change in bread prices on the demand of the different type of bread according to model, region and socioeconomic group (%) 1/

Socioeconomic group and bread type	Scottish Regions												Scotland			
	Borders				Central				Northern				Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Average change in price 2/
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Average change in price 2/	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Average change in price 2/	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Average change in price 2/				
Group A																
Brown	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.26	-0.03	-0.02	0.01	0.25	-0.02	0.06	0.03	0.24	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.25
Premium Brown	-0.09	0.03	-0.03	0.41	-0.05	-0.01	-0.01	0.38	-0.03	0.10	0.01	0.29	-0.06	0.05	0.00	0.36
White	-0.03	-0.04	-0.01	0.31	0.00	-0.03	-0.01	0.29	-0.04	0.03	-0.05	0.30	-0.04	0.00	-0.03	0.30
Premium White	-0.06	0.14	0.03	0.25	0.00	0.31	-0.01	0.18	-0.06	-0.07	-0.05	0.31	0.00	0.17	0.00	0.23
All bread	-0.04	0.02	0.00		-0.02	0.05	0.00		-0.04	0.03	-0.02		-0.02	0.05	0.00	
Group B																
Brown	-0.03	-0.10	0.00	0.26	0.00	-0.02	0.00	0.27	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.17	-0.02	0.00	0.01	0.24
Premium Brown	-0.06	-0.15	-0.05	0.36	-0.06	0.00	-0.01	0.32	-0.06	0.06	-0.01	0.31	-0.09	0.02	-0.01	0.33
White	0.00	-0.08	0.00	0.26	-0.03	-0.01	-0.02	0.30	-0.04	0.02	-0.03	0.24	-0.03	0.00	-0.01	0.27
Premium White	0.01	0.00	0.04	0.14	-0.01	0.26	0.02	0.18	-0.07	-0.04	-0.04	0.26	-0.01	0.20	0.02	0.19
All bread	-0.02	-0.08	0.00		-0.02	0.05	0.00		-0.03	0.02	-0.01		-0.03	0.04	0.00	
Group C																
Brown	-0.02	-0.06	0.00	0.23	-0.05	-0.05	0.02	0.23	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.20	-0.02	-0.02	0.03	0.22
Premium Brown	-0.08	-0.11	-0.12	0.36	-0.07	-0.07	-0.05	0.35	-0.07	0.04	-0.06	0.30	-0.03	-0.03	-0.05	0.34
White	-0.04	-0.11	-0.02	0.30	-0.07	-0.07	-0.03	0.32	-0.04	0.02	-0.01	0.27	-0.04	-0.05	-0.02	0.30
Premium White	0.00	0.18	0.09	0.09	0.04	0.37	0.03	0.12	-0.03	-0.01	0.00	0.26	0.02	0.27	0.04	0.16
All bread	-0.03	-0.04	-0.01		-0.04	0.02	-0.01		-0.02	0.02	-0.01		-0.02	0.03	0.00	
Altogether																
Brown	0.00	-0.04	0.01	0.25	-0.02	-0.02	0.01	0.25	0.00	0.06	0.03	0.22	-0.03	0.01	0.02	0.24
Premium Brown	-0.05	-0.05	-0.02	0.38	-0.04	-0.03	-0.05	0.36	-0.02	0.08	-0.01	0.29	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.34
White	-0.02	-0.08	-0.03	0.30	-0.03	-0.03	-0.02	0.31	-0.04	0.04	-0.04	0.28	-0.04	-0.01	-0.03	0.30
Premium White	-0.02	0.07	0.02	0.17	-0.01	0.37	0.03	0.15	-0.05	-0.05	-0.04	0.29	0.03	0.23	0.01	0.20
All bread	-0.02	-0.04	-0.01		-0.03	0.05	-0.01		-0.03	0.04	-0.01		-0.02	0.05	0.00	

Source: Own elaboration based on data provided by the Centre for Value Chain Research (VCR[2]), Kent Business School.

Notes:

1/ 'Model 1' corresponds to the Rotterdam model, 'Model 2' to the static LA/AIDS model and 'Model 3' to the dynamic LA/AIDS model.

2/ Average weekly change in price during the period.

It should be noted that, in general, the double log model predicts brown bread own price elasticities that are higher than those for white bread. None of the other two models show this pattern. Moreover, the Rotterdam model shows similar elasticities for both categories.

If the model used is the LA/AIDS, the results indicate that brown bread consumption will decrease almost in the same proportion as the increase in prices (or more). Furthermore, the consumption of premium white bread will also decrease but on a higher percentage as shown in Table 3. The results for premium brown bread and white bread showed lower impact on their consumption due to a change in prices as compared with the other categories.

Overall, the results indicate that the elasticities by region and by socioeconomic groups are not too different showing approximately similar responses to the increase in prices. Also, the results indicate that consumption for both brown and white bread are quite price elastic (if both prices change) and therefore an increase in their prices may reduce their consumption, however in most of the cases with a higher decrease in brown bread, i.e., just in opposite direction to that recommended by the nutritionists.

IV.   Conclusions

The purpose of this paper has been to analyse the consumption of bread in Scotland due to two reasons: first, to see the effect in the consumption of different types of breads due to rise in the price of bread, reflecting the overall increase in the price of cereals. Second, due to the fact that nutritionists recommend substituting the consumption of white bread for brown or wholemeal bread due to its health benefits.

Overall results show that although all the models report statistically significant own price and expenditure elasticities, they differ in terms of their implications. Thus, whilst according to the first two models the consumption of brown bread is price inelastic (based on their own price elasticity), according to the LA/AIDS model the demand for brown bread is price elastic. However, if one simulates an increase in all the bread prices such as the one experimented in the last three years in the UK, then, given the results which indicate that consumption for both brown and white bread are quite price elastic (almost according to all the models as shown in Table 3), and although brown and white bread will decrease, brown bread consumption will decrease more, quite the opposite to what is recommended by the nutritionists.

V.   References

Adams, J.F., and Engstrom, A. (2000). Dietary intake of whole grain versus recommendations, *Cereal Foods World*, 45, 75–79.

Anderson, J.W., Hanna, T.J., Peng, X. and Kryscio, R.J. (2000). Whole grain foods and heart disease risk. *Journal of the American College of Nutrition*, 19, 291–299.

Barten, A.P. (1967). Evidence on the Slutsky conditions for demand equations. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 49, 77-84.

Barten, A.P. (1977). The systems of consumer demand functions approach: a review. *Econometrica*. 45, 23–51.

Capps, Jr., O. (1989). Utilizing scanner data to estimate retail demand functions for meat products. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 71, 750–760.

Capps, Jr., O., Seo, S.C., and Nichols, J.P. (1997). On the estimation of advertising effects for branded products: an application to spaghetti sauces. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*, 29, 291–302.

Capps, Jr., O. and Love, H.A. (2002). Econometric considerations in the use of electronic scanner data to conduct consumer demand analysis. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 84: 807–816.

Capps, Jr.,O., Church, J. R. and Love, H.A. (2002). Specification issues and confidence intervals in unilateral price effects analysis. *Journal of Econometrics*. 113: 3-31.

Cotterill, R.W. (1994). Scanner data: New opportunities for demand and competitive strategy analysis. *Agricultural and Resource Economic Review*, 23: 125–139.

Deaton, A. and Muellbauer, J. (1980). An almost ideal demand system. *American Economic Review*, 70, 312–326.

Deaton, A. and Muellbauer, J. (1991). Economics and consumer behaviour. Cambridge University Press: New York.

Edgerton, D., Assarsson, B., Hummelmose, A, Laurila, I., Rickertsen, K., Vale, P. (1996). The Econometrics of Demand Systems: With Applications to Food Demand in the Nordic Countries. Kluwer Academic Publishers: Boston.

Flour Advisory Bureau (2008). Flour Advisory Bureau Website. Accessed: November 2008. URL: http://www.fabflour.co.uk/content/1/31/facts-about-bread-in-the-uk.html.

Jacobs, D.R., Meyer, K.A., Kushi, L.H. and Folsom, A.R. (1998). Wholegrain intake may reduce the risk of ischemic heart disease death in postmenopausal women: the Iowa Women's Health Study, *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 68, 248–257.

Johansson, L., Thelle, D., Slovoll, K., Bjoerneboe, G.E.A. and Drevon, C.H. (1999). Healthy dietary habits in relation to social determinants and lifestyle factors, *British Journal of Nutrition* , 81, 211–220.

Koch-Banerjee, P. and Rimm, E. B. (2003). Whole grain consumption and weight gain: a review of the epidemiological evidence, potential mechanisms and opportunities for future research, *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 62, 25–29.

Lang, R., Thane,C.W., Bolton-Smith, C. and Jebb, S.A. (2001). Wholegrain food consumption by British adults from two national dietary surveys, *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 60, 218.

Lang, R. and Jebb, S. A. (2003). Who consumes whole grains, and how much? *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 62, 123–127

Mooney, C. (1990). Cost and availability of healthy food choices in a London health district. *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics*, 3: 111-120.

Office for National Statistics (ONS, 2008a). Family Spending: 2007 edition: Palgrave MacMillan: Hampshire.

Office for National Statistics (ONS, 2008b). Focus on Consumer Price Indices - Data for September 2008, October 20th. Available online.

Pape, S.M., Kracov, D.A., Spokes, J.J., and Boggs, P., (1999). Whole grain foods authoritative statement claim notification. Submitted on behalf of General Mills, Inc. to the Food and Drug Administration, Washington.

Revoredo-Giha, C., Leat, P., Kupiec-Teahan, B., Lamprinopoulou, C. and Cacciolatti, L. (2008). Assessing the Effect of the Rise in Food Prices on the Purchasing Power of Consumers in Scotland. AA211 Special Study Report to RERAD, November. Edinburgh.

Richardson, D.P. (2000). The grain, the wholegrain and nothing but the grain: the science behind wholegrain and the reduced risk of heart disease and cancer. *British Nutrition Foundation Bulletin*, 25, 353–360.

Seo, S.C. and Capps, Jr. (1997). Regional variability of price and expenditure elasticities: the case of spaghetti sauces. *Agribusiness: An International Journal*, 13, 672–695.

Sidhu, G.S., Kabir, Y., and Huffman, F.G. (2007) Functional Foods from Cereal Grains, *International Journal of Food Properties*, 10, 231 – 244.

The Scottish Office Department of Health (1996) Eating for Health: A Diet Action, Plan for Scotland London, HMSO

Scottish Executive (2005). The Scottish Health Survey: summary of key findings. Scottish Executive: Edinburgh.

Stone, R. (1954). Linear expenditure systems and demand analysis: an application to the pattern of British demand. *The Economic Journal*, 64, 511-527.

Southgate, D.T., (1995) The structure of dietary fibre. In: Kritchevsky, D., and Bonfield, C., (1995) Dietary Fibre in Health and Disease pp. 25–36, St Paul: Eagan Press.

Theil, H. (1965). The information approach to demand analysis. *Econometrica*, 33, 67–87.

US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion (2000) Healthy People 2010, Vols. I and II, Washington, US Government Printing Office.

Wrieden, W. L., Barton, K. L., Armstrong, J., McNeill, G. (2006). A review of food consumption and nutrient intakes from national surveys in Scotland: comparison to the Scottish dietary targets. Report commissioned by the Food Standards Agency Scotland.

Annex

Table A.1: Marshallian price and expenditure demand elasticity by region, geo-demographic group and demand system 1/ 2/

	Rotterdam demand system										LA/AIDS										LA/AIDS Dynamic									
	Brown	Sig.	Premium Brown	Sig.	White	Sig.	Premium White	Sig.	Expenditure	Sig.	Brown	Sig.	Premium Brown	Sig.	White	Sig.	Premium White	Sig.	Expenditure	Sig.	Brown	Sig.	Premium Brown	Sig.	White	Sig.	Premium White	Sig.	Expenditure	Sig.
Borders																														
Group A																														
Brown	-0.716	*	-0.167	*	0.002		-0.021		0.902	*	-0.955	*	-0.298	*	-0.318		0.446		1.125	*	-0.779	*	-0.162	*	-0.046		-0.052		1.039	*
Premium Brown	-0.227		-0.570	*	-0.114		-0.092		1.003	*	-0.348	*	-0.636	*	-0.359	*	0.258		1.084	*	-0.192	*	-0.594	*	-0.153	*	-0.088		1.028	*
White	-0.009		-0.069		-0.762	*	-0.104		0.943	*	-0.277		-0.269		-1.050	*	0.460		1.136	*	-0.041		-0.113		-0.778	*	-0.112	*	1.044	*
Premium White	-0.102		-0.133		-0.219	*	-0.740	*	1.193	*	-0.519		-0.628		-0.580		-3.426	*	2.072	*	-1.212		-1.047		-1.486		-1.696	*	2.024	*
Group B																														
Brown	-0.744	*	-0.136		-0.033		-0.033		0.946	*	-0.910	*	-0.161		-0.103		0.083		1.091	*	-0.822	*	-0.079		0.000		-0.076		0.977	*
Premium Brown	-0.203		-0.605	*	-0.034		-0.209	*	1.052	*	-0.198		-0.643	*	-0.113		0.121		1.055	*	-0.077		-0.673	*	0.025		-0.080		0.889	*
White	-0.058		-0.024		-0.821	*	-0.150	*	1.054	*	-0.067		-0.146		-0.814	*	0.027		0.999	*	0.011		-0.083		-0.713	*	-0.153	*	0.938	*
Premium White	-0.040		-0.178	*	-0.175		-0.549	*	0.942	*	-1.063		-0.899	*	-1.305		-2.156	*	1.922	*	-1.394		-1.062		-1.691		-1.661	*	2.026	*
Group C																														
Brown	-0.749	*	-0.155	*	-0.068		-0.096		1.069	*	-0.843	*	-0.277	*	-0.435	*	0.131		1.424	*	-0.757	*	-0.121	*	-0.181	*	-0.072		1.132	*
Premium Brown	-0.161		-0.543	*	-0.145		-0.116		0.965	*	-0.149		-0.575	*	-0.278	*	0.336		0.708	*	-0.052		-0.624	*	-0.098		-0.001		0.767	*
White	-0.024		-0.096	*	-0.705	*	-0.117	*	0.942	*	-0.382		-0.256	*	-0.972	*	0.119		1.491	*	-0.161	*	-0.098		-0.754	*	-0.153	*	1.166	*
Premium White	-0.103		-0.127		-0.192	*	-0.612	*	1.034	*	-0.675		-0.700		-0.800		-2.465	*	2.858	*	-1.178		-1.055		-1.507		-1.627	*	2.423	*
Altogether																														
Brown	-0.646	*	-0.188	*	0.004		-0.070		0.900	*	-0.838	*	-0.279	*	-0.314		0.258		1.173	*	-0.759	*	-0.143	*	-0.038		-0.079		1.020	*
Premium Brown	-0.262	*	-0.491	*	-0.132		-0.146	*	1.031	*	-0.292		-0.621	*	-0.316		0.361		0.996	*	-0.145	*	-0.580	*	-0.012		-0.070		0.908	*
White	-0.054		-0.112	*	-0.786	*	-0.166		1.119	*	-0.312		-0.288	*	-0.995	*	0.264		1.331	*	-0.061		-0.132		-0.772	*	-0.161	*	1.126	*
Premium White	-0.090		-0.119		-0.170	*	-0.545	*	0.924	*	-0.665		-0.621		-0.715		-2.890	*	2.416	*	-1.250		-1.039		-1.532		-1.622	*	2.258	*
Central Scotland																														
Group A																														
Brown	-0.721	*	-0.152	*	-0.216	*	-0.109	*	1.198	*	-1.110	*	-0.449	*	-0.547	*	0.481		1.626	*	-0.820	*	-0.162	*	-0.143	*	-0.102	*	1.227	*
Premium Brown	-0.187	*	-0.599	*	-0.244	*	-0.202	*	1.232	*	-0.483	*	-0.794	*	-0.571	*	0.391		1.458		-0.165	*	-0.590	*	-0.200	*	-0.176	*	1.131	*
White	-0.094		-0.094	*	-0.458	*	-0.169	*	0.815	*	-0.357		-0.359	*	-0.862	*	0.472		1.106	*	-0.007		-0.072		-0.549	*	-0.136	*	0.764	*
Premium White	-0.018		-0.101		-0.210	*	-0.449	*	0.777	*	-0.097		-0.211		-0.270		-3.574	*	1.515	*	-1.213		-1.129		-1.526		-1.526	*	1.501	*
Group B																														
Brown	-0.713	*	-0.058		0.056		-0.003		0.719	*	-0.845	*	-0.328	*	-0.505	*	0.412	*	1.266	*	-0.716	*	-0.093		-0.088		-0.084		0.982	*
Premium Brown	-0.354	*	-0.676	*	-0.460	*	-0.306	*	1.795	*	-0.387	*	-0.715	*	-0.583	*	0.507		1.250	*	-0.182	*	-0.656	*	-0.185		-0.162	*	1.253	*
White	0.065		-2.899	*	-0.516	*	-0.111	*	0.666	*	-0.365		-0.303		-0.643	*	0.418		0.893		-0.016		-0.104		-0.504	*	-0.111	*	0.735	*
Premium White	-0.071		-0.118		-0.230	*	-0.555	*	0.974	*	-0.505		-0.490		-0.651		-3.357	*	1.549	*	-1.301		-1.077		-1.523		-1.633	*	1.420	*
Group C																														
Brown	-0.551	*	-0.154	*	-0.184	*	-0.116	*	1.006	*	-0.994	*	-0.354	*	-0.599	*	0.291		1.655	*	-0.752	*	-0.135	*	-0.197	*	-0.157	*	1.241	*
Premium Brown	-0.242	*	-0.463	*	-0.290	*	-0.211	*	1.206	*	-0.246		-0.665	*	-0.479	*	0.545		0.946		-0.042		-0.589	*	-0.086		-0.079		0.774	*
White	-0.137	*	-0.145	*	-0.530	*	-0.094	*	0.907	*	-0.439		-0.331	*	-0.860	*	0.323		1.307	*	-0.099		-0.108		-0.601	*	-0.147	*	0.955	*
Premium White	-0.118		-0.147		-0.133		-0.519	*	0.917	*	-0.381		-0.438		-0.489		-3.063	*	2.302	*	-1.346		-1.087		-1.588		-1.575	*	2.098	*
Altogether																														
Brown	-0.551	*	-0.154	*	-0.222	*	-0.104	*	1.031	*	-1.015	*	-0.423	*	-0.654	*	0.424		1.668	*	-0.748	*	-0.145	*	-0.198	*	-0.141	*	1.231	*
Premium Brown	-0.235	*	-0.531	*	-0.255	*	-0.201	*	1.222	*	-0.361		-0.714	*	-0.583	*	0.657	*	1.120		-0.090		-0.608	*	-0.130		-0.088		0.915	*
White	-0.198	*	-0.148	*	-0.506	*	-0.173	*	1.024	*	-0.478		-0.376	*	-0.826	*	0.430		1.250	*	-0.087		-0.096		-0.546	*	-0.158	*	0.886	*
Premium White	-0.039		-0.088	*	-0.136	*	-0.447	*	0.709	*	-0.181		-0.280		-0.316		-3.491	*	2.036	*	-1.288		-1.089		-1.555		-1.542	*	1.873	*

Continues

Source: Based on data provided by the Centre for Value Chain Research (VCR[2]), Kent Business School.

Notes:

1/ "*" stands for statistically significant at 1 per cent.

2/ Elasticities read from left to right in the table

Table A.1: Marshallian price and expenditure demand elasticity by region, geo-demographic group and demand system 1/ 2/ (cont.)

	Rotterdam demand system										LA/AIDS										LA/AIDS Dynamic									
	Brown	Sig.	Premium Brown	Sig.	White	Sig.	Premium White	Sig.	Expenditure	Sig.	Brown	Sig.	Premium Brown	Sig.	White	Sig.	Premium White	Sig.	Expenditure	Sig.	Brown	Sig.	Premium Brown	Sig.	White	Sig.	Premium White	Sig.	Expenditure	Sig.
Northern Scotland																														
Group A																														
Brown	-0.609	*	-0.180	*	-0.095		-0.129	*	1.012	*	-0.917	*	-0.384	*	-0.368		0.337		1.332	*	-0.736	*	-0.194	*	-0.060		-0.174	*	1.163	*
Premium Brown	-0.274	*	-0.499	*	-0.314	*	-0.160	*	1.247	*	-0.419		-0.688	*	-0.459	*	0.357		1.208	*	-0.171	*	-0.540	*	-0.183	*	-0.057		0.952	*
White	-0.042		0.157	*	-0.513	*	-0.126	*	0.838	*	-0.223		-0.290		-0.816	*	0.447		0.882	*	0.034		-0.116	*	-0.655	*	-0.085		0.823	*
Premium White	-0.133		-0.092		-0.189	*	-0.529	*	0.943	*	-0.572		-0.495		-0.604		-3.317	*	1.555	*	-1.356	*	-1.086	*	-1.443	*	-1.632	*	1.781	*
Group B																														
Brown	-0.937	*	-0.138	*	-0.055		-0.157	*	1.287	*	-1.140	*	-0.379	*	-0.361		0.350		1.529	*	-0.874	*	-0.147	*	-0.057		-0.197	*	1.274	*
Premium Brown	-0.088		-0.504	*	-0.228	*	-0.183		1.003	*	-0.350		-0.719	*	-0.292		0.517		1.162	*	-0.100		-0.592	*	0.027		-0.159	*	0.999	*
White	0.104		-0.109	*	-0.582	*	-0.114	*	0.702	*	-0.171		-0.316	*	-0.846	*	0.400		0.933	*	0.092		-0.073		-0.647	*	-0.098		0.725	*
Premium White	-0.119		-0.190	*	-0.245	*	-0.490	*	1.044	*	-0.436		-0.420		-0.587		-3.297	*	1.615	*	-1.329	*	-1.126	*	-1.493	*	-1.515	*	1.578	*
Group C																														
Brown	-0.725	*	-0.096		-0.108		-0.136	*	1.065	*	-0.946	*	-0.339	*	-0.511	*	0.223		1.573	*	-0.777	*	-0.109	*	-0.162		-0.141	*	1.188	*
Premium Brown	-0.183	*	-0.656	*	-0.271	*	-0.211	*	1.321	*	-0.273		-0.668	*	-0.436		0.408		1.068	*	-0.073		-0.644	*	-0.121		-0.111		0.971	*
White	-0.003		-0.071		-0.562	*	-0.063		0.699	*	-0.366		-0.295		-0.825	*	0.315		1.171	*	-0.071		-0.109	*	-0.622	*	-0.090	*	0.893	*
Premium White	-0.139		-0.133	*	-0.165	*	-0.556	*	0.993	*	-0.503		-0.526		-0.543		-2.885	*	1.997	*	-1.267	*	-1.054	*	-1.391	*	-1.632	*	1.844	*
Altogether																														
Brown	-0.608	*	-0.142	*	-0.082		-0.161	*	0.994	*	-0.954	*	-0.401	*	-0.457	*	0.312		1.500	*	-0.750	*	-0.160	*	-0.102		-0.181	*	1.192	*
Premium Brown	-0.202	*	-0.495	*	-0.268	*	-0.162	*	1.126	*	-0.365		-0.688	*	-0.397		0.480		1.094	*	-0.086		-0.549	*	0.001		-0.117		0.804	*
White	-0.047		-0.156	*	-0.552	*	-0.128	*	0.882	*	-0.294		-0.328		-0.819	*	0.428		1.013		-0.008		-0.118	*	-0.625	*	-0.116	*	0.867	*
Premium White	-0.198	*	-0.139	*	-0.204	*	-0.491	*	1.031	*	-0.487		-0.419		-0.520		-3.299	*	1.791	*	-1.363	*	-1.103	*	-1.485	*	-1.606	*	1.976	*
Scotland																														
Group A																														
Brown	-0.572	*	-0.174	*	-0.106		-0.125	*	0.977	*	-1.025	*	-0.444	*	-0.491	*	0.470		1.491	*	-0.776	*	-0.174	*	-0.066		-0.143	*	1.159	*
Premium Brown	-0.231	*	-0.487	*	-0.236	*	-0.127	*	1.081	*	-0.463	*	-0.739	*	-0.520	*	0.452		1.270	*	-0.138	*	-0.544	*	-0.159	*	-0.063		0.904	*
White	-0.098		-0.161	*	-0.544	*	-0.180	*	0.983	*	-0.356		-0.374	*	-0.930	*	0.515		1.146	*	0.007		-0.123	*	-0.669	*	-0.121	*	0.905	*
Premium White	-0.144	*	-0.101	*	-0.228	*	-0.493	*	0.967	*	-0.222		-0.256		-0.285		-3.668	*	1.789	*	-1.308	*	-1.093	*	-1.485	*	-1.613	*	1.931	*
Group B																														
Brown	-0.727	*	-0.148	*	-0.074		-0.098		1.046	*	-0.980	*	-0.383	*	-0.518	*	0.425		1.456	*	-0.769	*	-0.125	*	-0.089		-0.121	*	1.104	*
Premium Brown	-0.212	*	-0.523	*	-0.257	*	-0.185	*	1.178	*	-0.364		-0.699	*	-0.491	*	0.611		1.095		-0.110		-0.594	*	-0.056		-0.107		0.953	*
White	-0.018		-0.126	*	-0.541	*	-0.176	*	0.861	*	-0.372		-0.347	*	-0.804	*	0.447		1.076	*	-0.001		-0.099	*	-0.542	*	-0.159	*	0.801	*
Premium White	-0.090		-0.132	*	-0.253	*	-0.476	*	0.951	*	-0.364		-0.378		-0.480		-3.500	*	1.884	*	-1.340	*	-1.105	*	-1.606	*	-1.579	*	1.762	*
Group C																														
Brown	-0.523	*	-0.122	*	-0.186	*	-0.118	*	0.950	*	-1.001	*	-0.375	*	-0.647		0.295		1.728	*	-0.781	*	-0.107	*	-0.158	*	-0.160	*	1.206	*
Premium Brown	-0.187	*	-0.521	*	-0.200	*	-0.188	*	1.096	*	-0.230		-0.652	*	-0.486		0.582		1.407	*	-0.014		-0.625	*	-0.049		-0.088		0.767	*
White	-0.194	*	-0.138	*	-0.596	*	-0.128	*	1.056	*	-0.491	*	-0.347	*	-0.905	*	0.335		0.874		-0.096		-0.113	*	-0.676	*	-0.153	*	1.038	*
Premium White	-0.126	*	-0.140	*	-0.123	*	-0.501	*	0.890	*	-0.308		-0.413		-0.388		-3.098	*	2.479	*	-1.315	*	-1.074	*	-1.517	*	-1.556	*	2.226	*
Altogether																														
Brown	-0.539	*	-0.164	*	-0.170	*	-0.136	*	1.009	*	-1.010	*	-0.427	*	-0.587	*	0.408		1.616	*	-0.779	*	-0.147	*	-0.117	*	-0.159	*	1.202	*
Premium Brown	-0.182	*	-0.469	*	-0.184	*	-0.125	*	0.959	*	-0.357		-0.689	*	-0.498	*	0.637	*	1.048	*	-0.059		-0.568	*	-0.001		-0.083		0.766	*
White	-0.171	*	-0.165	*	-0.559	*	-0.178	*	1.073	*	-0.426	*	-0.373	*	-0.876	*	0.458		1.217	*	-0.038		-0.115	*	-0.639	*	-0.153	*	0.945	*
Premium White	-0.141	*	-0.119	*	-0.193	*	-0.483	*	0.935	*	-0.257		-0.312		-0.336		-3.516	*	2.073	*	-1.332	*	-1.101	*	-1.540	*	-1.572	*	2.108	*

Source: Based on data provided by the Centre for Value Chain Research (VCR[2]), Kent Business School.

Notes:

1/ "*" stands for statistically significant at 1 per cent.

2/ Elasticities read from left to right in the table

Table A.2: Hicksian price and expenditure demand elasticity by region, geo-demographic group and demand system 1/ 2/

	Rotterdam demand system								LA/AIDS								LA/AIDS Dynamic							
	Brown	Sig.	Premium Brown	Sig.	White	Sig.	Premium White	Sig.	Brown	Sig.	Premium Brown	Sig.	White	Sig.	Premium White	Sig.	Brown	Sig.	Premium Brown	Sig.	White	Sig.	Premium White	Sig.
Borders																								
Group A																								
Brown	-0.480	*	0.029		0.275	*	0.176	*	-0.661	*	-0.054		0.228		0.692	*	-0.507	*	0.063		0.269	*	0.175	*
Premium Brown	0.035		-0.352	*	0.190	*	0.127		-0.064		-0.400	*	-0.034		0.787	*	0.076		-0.371	*	0.262	*	0.167	*
White	0.238	*	0.136	*	-0.477	*	0.102		0.020		-0.022		-0.706	*	0.708	*	0.232	*	0.114	*	-0.462	*	0.116	*
Premium White	0.210	*	0.127		0.142		-0.479	*	0.827	*	0.492	*	0.981	*	-2.300	*	0.210	*	0.136	*	0.161	*	-0.507	*
Group B																								
Brown	-0.489	*	0.062		0.254	*	0.173	*	-0.617	*	0.067		0.228		0.321		-0.559	*	0.126	*	0.296	*	0.137	*
Premium Brown	0.080		-0.385	*	0.285	*	0.020		0.086		-0.422	*	0.207		0.351		0.162	*	-0.487	*	0.294	*	0.114	
White	0.225	*	0.196	*	-0.501	*	0.079		0.202	*	0.063		-0.510	*	0.245		0.263	*	0.114	*	-0.428	*	0.052	
Premium White	0.214	*	0.020		0.111		-0.344	*	0.397		0.235		0.341		-0.973		0.169	*	0.154	*	0.072		-0.395	*
Group C																								
Brown	-0.474	*	0.073		0.261	*	0.140	*	-0.476	*	0.028	*	0.003		0.445	*	-0.465	*	0.121	*	0.167	*	0.177	*
Premium Brown	0.088		-0.337	*	0.152	*	0.097		0.033		-0.424	*	-0.060		0.492	*	0.146	*	-0.460	*	0.138		0.168	*
White	0.219	*	0.106	*	-0.415	*	0.091		0.002		0.063		-0.514	*	0.448	*	0.140	*	0.151	*	-0.396	*	0.104	*
Premium White	0.164	*	0.094		0.126		-0.384	*	0.520	*	0.290		0.624	*	-1.435	*	0.207	*	0.093		0.145	*	-0.446	*
Altogether																								
Brown	-0.411	*	0.006		0.277	*	0.128	*	-0.532	*	-0.026		0.042		0.516	*	-0.493	*	0.076	*	0.271	*	0.145	*
Premium Brown	0.007		-0.269	*	0.181	*	0.081		-0.032		-0.407	*	-0.014		0.580	*	0.093	*	-0.384	*	0.264	*	0.130	*
White	0.238	*	0.128	*	-0.447	*	0.080		0.036		-0.002		-0.591	*	0.557	*	0.233	*	0.111	*	-0.431	*	0.087	
Premium White	0.152	*	0.079		0.110		-0.342	*	0.614	*	0.432		0.769	*	-1.815	*	0.173	*	0.133	*	0.120		-0.426	*
Central Scotland																								
Group A																								
Brown	-0.407	*	0.116	*	0.133		0.158	*	-0.684	*	-0.086		-0.074		0.844	*	-0.498	*	0.112	*	0.215	*	0.171	*
Premium Brown	0.136	*	-0.324	*	0.115	*	0.073		-0.101		-0.469	*	-0.137		0.951	*	0.131	*	-0.337	*	0.201	*	0.163	*
White	0.119	*	0.088	*	-0.220	*	0.013		-0.067		-0.112		-0.540	*	0.719	*	0.193	*	0.099	*	-0.326	*	0.034	
Premium White	0.186	*	0.073		0.017		-0.275	*	0.992	*	0.717	*	0.938	*	-2.648	*	0.202	*	0.077		0.045		-0.323	*
Group B																								
Brown	-0.523	*	0.101	*	0.263	*	0.159	*	-0.511	*	-0.048		-0.140		0.699	*	-0.457	*	0.125	*	0.194	*	0.138	*
Premium Brown	0.121	*	-0.278	*	0.057		0.100		-0.057		-0.438	*	-0.223		0.790	*	0.149	*	-0.378	*	0.176	*	0.121	*
White	0.241	*	0.044		-0.325	*	0.039		-0.129		-0.105		-0.386	*	0.620	*	0.178	*	0.059	*	-0.293	*	0.056	
Premium White	0.186	*	0.098		0.050		-0.334	*	0.817	*	0.619	*	0.790	*	-2.225	*	0.161	*	0.149	*	0.071		-0.381	*
Group C																								
Brown	-0.284	*	0.064		0.117		0.103	*	-0.553	*	0.004		-0.103		0.651	*	-0.422	*	0.133	*	0.175	*	0.114	*
Premium Brown	0.079		-0.202	*	0.071		0.052		0.005		-0.460	*	-0.195		0.751	*	0.164	*	-0.421	*	0.146	*	0.090	*
White	0.104		0.051		-0.259	*	0.103	*	-0.091		-0.048		-0.468	*	0.608	*	0.155	*	0.098	*	-0.314	*	0.061	
Premium White	0.126	*	0.052		0.142	*	-0.320	*	0.795	*	0.518	*	0.835	*	-2.149	*	0.139	*	0.120	*	0.084		-0.343	*
Altogether																								
Brown	-0.279	*	0.073	*	0.081		0.125	*	-0.574	*	-0.055		-0.165		0.794	*	-0.423	*	0.127	*	0.164	*	0.132	*
Premium Brown	0.088	*	-0.261	*	0.104	*	0.069		-0.065		-0.467	*	-0.254		0.905	*	0.152	*	-0.406	*	0.138	*	0.115	*
White	0.073		0.078	*	-0.205	*	0.054		-0.148		-0.100		-0.459	*	0.707	*	0.147	*	0.100	*	-0.286	*	0.039	
Premium White	0.148	*	0.069		0.072		-0.289	*	0.946	*	0.663	*	0.937	*	-2.546	*	0.157	*	0.120	*	0.051		-0.329	*

Continues

Source: Based on data provided by the Centre for Value Chain Research (VCR[2]), Kent Business School.
Notes:
1/ "*" stands for statistically significant at 1 per cent.
2/ Elasticities read from left to right in the table

Table A.2: Hicksian price and expenditure demand elasticity by region, geo-demographic group and demand system 1/ 2/ (cont.)

	Rotterdam demand system								LA/AIDS								LA/AIDS Dynamic							
	Brown	Sig.	Premium Brown	Sig.	White	Sig.	Premium White	Sig.	Brown	Sig.	Premium Brown	Sig.	White	Sig.	Premium White	Sig.	Brown	Sig.	Premium Brown	Sig.	White	Sig.	Premium White	Sig.
Northern Scotland																								
Group A																								
Brown	-0.341	*	0.048		0.193	*	0.099		-0.564	*	-0.084		0.011		0.637	*	-0.428	*	0.069	*	0.271	*	0.088	*
Premium Brown	0.056		-0.218	*	0.041		0.121	*	-0.099		-0.415	*	-0.037		0.709	*	0.080	*	-0.325	*	0.268	*	0.065	
White	0.180	*	0.032		-0.275	*	0.063		0.010		-0.091		-0.565	*	0.646	*	0.252	*	0.069	*	-0.421	*	0.100	
Premium White	0.116		0.121	*	0.079		-0.316	*	0.748	*	0.629	*	0.815	*	-2.193	*	0.104	*	0.158	*	0.127		-0.388	*
Group B																								
Brown	-0.599	*	0.149	*	0.317	*	0.134		-0.738	*	-0.038		0.081		0.695	*	-0.539	*	0.137	*	0.311	*	0.091	
Premium Brown	0.175	*	-0.280	*	0.061		0.043		-0.045		-0.460	*	0.044		0.779	*	0.162	*	-0.370	*	0.315	*	0.067	
White	0.288	*	0.047		-0.380	*	0.044		0.074		-0.108		-0.576	*	0.611	*	0.283	*	0.089	*	-0.437	*	0.066	
Premium White	0.156		0.043		0.056		-0.254	*	0.809	*	0.637	*	0.781	*	-2.227	*	0.106		0.092	*	0.084		-0.282	*
Group C																								
Brown	-0.443	*	0.139	*	0.198	*	0.106	*	-0.529	*	0.009		-0.060		0.580	*	-0.461	*	0.154	*	0.179	*	0.129	*
Premium Brown	0.167	*	-0.364	*	0.108		0.089		0.011		-0.432	*	-0.130		0.651	*	0.184	*	-0.430	*	0.157		0.109	*
White	0.183	*	0.083		-0.361	*	0.095	*	-0.055		-0.037		-0.489	*	0.581	*	0.165	*	0.088	*	-0.366	*	0.113	*
Premium White	0.124	*	0.086		0.120	*	-0.330	*	0.677	*	0.457	*	0.734	*	-1.867	*	0.150	*	0.127	*	0.142	*	-0.420	*
Altogether																								
Brown	-0.346	*	0.081	*	0.201	*	0.064		-0.558	*	-0.065		-0.029		0.652	*	-0.435	*	0.108	*	0.239	*	0.089	*
Premium Brown	0.095	*	-0.242	*	0.054		0.093	*	-0.076		-0.442	*	-0.085		0.727	*	0.127	*	-0.368	*	0.230	*	0.065	
White	0.186	*	0.042		-0.300	*	0.072		-0.027		-0.101		-0.530	*	0.657	*	0.221	*	0.076	*	-0.377	*	0.080	
Premium White	0.074		0.092	*	0.091		-0.257	*	0.760	*	0.641	*	0.829	*	-2.230	*	0.104	*	0.143	*	0.101		-0.349	*
Scotland																								
Group A																								
Brown	-0.315	*	0.045		0.177	*	0.094	*	-0.633	*	-0.110		-0.060		0.803	*	-0.471	*	0.085	*	0.270	*	0.116	*
Premium Brown	0.053		-0.245	*	0.077		0.115	*	-0.129		-0.455	*	-0.121		0.904	*	0.100	*	-0.342	*	0.266	*	0.098	*
White	0.160	*	0.059		-0.259	*	0.040		-0.055		-0.118		-0.599	*	0.771	*	0.245	*	0.080	*	-0.407	*	0.082	
Premium White	0.110	*	0.115	*	0.051		-0.277	*	0.943	*	0.737	*	0.996	*	-2.676	*	0.137	*	0.139	*	0.106		-0.382	*
Group B																								
Brown	-0.450	*	0.083		0.230	*	0.137	*	-0.595	*	-0.061		-0.096		0.752	*	-0.477	*	0.119	*	0.232	*	0.127	*
Premium Brown	0.100		-0.264	*	0.084		0.079		-0.074		-0.458	*	-0.173		0.858	*	0.142	*	-0.384	*	0.220	*	0.108	*
White	0.210	*	0.064		-0.292	*	0.018		-0.087		-0.110		-0.492	*	0.689	*	0.211	*	0.078	*	-0.310	*	0.021	
Premium White	0.161	*	0.078		0.023		-0.262	*	0.886	*	0.663	*	0.890	*	-2.439	*	0.150	*	0.137	*	0.027		-0.313	*
Group C																								
Brown	-0.272	*	0.085	*	0.096		0.092	*	-0.545	*	0.001		-0.134		0.678	*	-0.462	*	0.156	*	0.200	*	0.106	*
Premium Brown	0.103	*	-0.283	*	0.125	*	0.055		0.001		-0.462	*	-0.226		0.775	*	0.189	*	-0.458	*	0.179	*	0.082	
White	0.085		0.092	*	-0.282	*	0.105	*	-0.119		-0.040		-0.487	*	0.646	*	0.178	*	0.113	*	-0.368	*	0.077	*
Premium White	0.110	*	0.054		0.141	*	-0.305	*	0.810	*	0.508	*	0.868	*	-2.186	*	0.127	*	0.113	*	0.103	*	-0.343	*
Altogether																								
Brown	-0.273	*	0.060	*	0.124	*	0.089	*	-0.584	*	-0.068		-0.117		0.769	*	-0.462	*	0.120	*	0.233	*	0.109	*
Premium Brown	0.071	*	-0.256	*	0.096	*	0.089	*	-0.081		-0.456	*	-0.193		0.871	*	0.142	*	-0.398	*	0.222	*	0.088	*
White	0.112	*	0.073	*	-0.246	*	0.061	*	-0.105		-0.103		-0.521	*	0.730	*	0.211	*	0.095	*	-0.364	*	0.058	
Premium White	0.105	*	0.089	*	0.080	*	-0.274	*	0.908	*	0.669	*	0.952	*	-2.529	*	0.129	*	0.130	*	0.076		-0.334	*

Source: Based on data provided by the Centre for Value Chain Research (VCR^2), Kent Business School.
Notes:
1/ "*" stands for statistically significant at 1 per cent.
2/ Elasticities read from left to right in the table