**What Do We Know?**

**Layers of meaning**

- Idiosyncratic intangible attributes
- Subcultural intangible attributes
- Common cultural intangible attributes
- Tangible product attributes

**Source:**


Subsequent contributions relating to conceptual framework include:

- Park, C., Jaworski, B., and MacInnis, D., (1986): Direct Sensory, Idiosyncratic, Subcultural and Cultural

To explore the brand meaning of local food brands

**Why local food?**

“…..the domains of food and clothing are perhaps the most tangible, because we respond to them in a highly tactile and palpable manner” (Hirschman, 1980 p.30) Food can be rich in both symbolic and functional associations and attributes.

There’s been an increasing consumer preoccupation with local sourcing, food miles and a focus on health together with ethical concerns (Grobel, 2013). There has been an increasing demand for local and regional food (Defra, 2008).

“Local” is defined as within a 30 mile radius (FARMA, 2012) albeit this may be more of a general perception than a defined distance (Defra, 2008). A focus on local food brands around the vicinity of west Dorset as the county offers a diversity and breadth of local brands. The south-west of England has over half of all local food production with good access and there is a strong sense that local food is highly developed (Mintel, 2011).

Food can be rich in both symbolic and functional associations and attributes.

**Conceptual framework**

**What do we want to know?**

**Research Objectives**

In relation to the brand meaning of local food brands:

1. To explore the contribution of direct sensory attributes.
2. To understand the contribution of functional attributes.
3. To gain insight as to how these tangible attributes combine with intangible associations to create brand meaning.
4. To gain an in-depth understanding of how these tangible attributes contribute to any hierarchy of brand meaning.

**How do we find out more?**

Through consumer-focused ethnographic methods including accompanied shopping trips, kitchen visits and in-depth interviews (Elliott and Elliott, 2002; de Kervenoael et al., 2014).

**Data collected – examples of consumer conversations**

**Respondent:** …it just tastes better (laughs).

**Interviewer:** …but in what way does it taste better?

**Respondent:** I don’t know. I quite often get a cottage pie and… it always tastes like the one Mum used to make. The meat feels, it tastes like meat rather than, I don’t know, whatever, but it’s really tasty anyway so.

**Interviewer:** …what about the meat that is… different perhaps?

**Respondent:** I don’t know it’s just, a lot of the supermarket stuff it tends to be tasteless these days. Or they tend to put a lot of additives in it and I’d rather have it as natural as it can be I would say.

Data analysis uses Nvivo software.

**Analytical strategy** – Open coding from a prioi or emergent theme.

**Free coding**

**Major themes, sub themes - hierarchy. Cross coding.**

**Contribution**

This study adds to the growing body of brand meaning literature by exploring the tangible attributes of local food brands together with their interplay with the intangible associations from a consumer perspective. This is the major contribution of the paper. This is one of very few interpretivist studies on tangible attributes using ethnographic methods in a highly topical category.
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