### Appendix A: Farmers’ participation in actions targeting diffuse pollution in Allier and Héricourt-en-Caux

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual technical support</th>
<th>Analyses</th>
<th>Agri-environmental contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livestock manure analyses</td>
<td>Soil analyses</td>
<td>Rapeseed plant analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allier</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72 farmers on average</td>
<td>12 farmers on average</td>
<td>59 farmers on average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Héricourt-en-Caux</strong></td>
<td>15 farmers</td>
<td>31 farmers on average</td>
<td>36 farmers on average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix B: List of interviews conducted in Allier and Héricourt-en-Caux

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of organization</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Date/location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allier</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supplier</td>
<td>Syndicat Mixte des Eaux de l’Allier (SMEA)</td>
<td>Facilitator for the nonagricultural action plan</td>
<td>14/06/2016 E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supplier</td>
<td>Syndicat Intercommunal à Vocation Multiple (SIVOM) Sologne Bourbonnaise</td>
<td>Director of the water utility</td>
<td>10/06/2016 Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Chamber</td>
<td>Chambre d’agriculture de l’Allier</td>
<td>Facilitator for the agricultural action plan</td>
<td>18/05/2016 Saint Pourçain sur Sioule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial state administration</td>
<td>Direction Départementale des Territoires de l’Allier (DDT Allier)</td>
<td>Head of the Environment Department</td>
<td>07/06/2016 Yzeure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local office of the Loire-Bretagne water agency</td>
<td>Délégation Allier-Loire amont de l’Agence de l’eau Loire-Bretagne</td>
<td>Project coordinator – Agriculture</td>
<td>24/05/2016 Lempdes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural cooperative</td>
<td>Val Limagne Coop</td>
<td>-President of the cooperative -Director of the cooperative</td>
<td>27/06/2016 Bellenaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Héricourt-en-Caux</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supplier</td>
<td>Syndicat Mixte d’Eau et d’Assainissement du Caux Central (SMEACC)</td>
<td>-President of the water utility -Director of the water utility -Facilitator for the agricultural action plan</td>
<td>03/05/2017 Yvetot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed management board</td>
<td>Syndicat Mixte du Bassin Versant de la Durdent (SMBV)</td>
<td>Project coordinator – Agriculture and water</td>
<td>01/06/2017 Cany-Barville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Chamber</td>
<td>Chambre d’agriculture de la Seine-Maritime</td>
<td>Head of the Environment Department</td>
<td>11/05/2017 Rouen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial state administration</td>
<td>Direction Départementale des Territoires et de la Mer de la Seine-Maritime (DDTM Seine-Maritime)</td>
<td>Deputy director of the Agriculture Department</td>
<td>10/05/2017 Rouen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local office of the Seine-Normandie water agency</td>
<td>Agence de l’Eau Seine Normandie-Direction Seine Aval</td>
<td>Project coordinator – Agriculture</td>
<td>11/05/2017 Rouen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional group of organic farmers</td>
<td>Groupement Régional des Agriculteurs Bio (GRAB) de Haute-Normandie</td>
<td>Project coordinator – Water and territory</td>
<td>10/05/2017 Val-de-Reuil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Les Défis Ruraux</td>
<td>Project coordinator – Crops</td>
<td>08/06/2017 Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural cooperative</td>
<td>CapSeine</td>
<td>Project coordinator – Sustainable Development</td>
<td>15/05/2017 Rouen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C: Descriptive statistics

### Table C.1: Descriptive statistics – participation in collective action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All (N=120)</th>
<th>Nonparticipants (N=52)</th>
<th>Participants (N=68)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm size (ha) ***</td>
<td>152.9</td>
<td>122.1</td>
<td>176.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(104)</td>
<td>(81.3)</td>
<td>(113.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min:</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Min: 1.7</td>
<td>Min: 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max:</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>Max: 321</td>
<td>Max: 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible area (%) ***</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(33.7)</td>
<td>(34.5)</td>
<td>(30.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min:</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Min: 0.8</td>
<td>Min: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max:</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Max: 100</td>
<td>Max: 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arable farming</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment ***</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
<td>Max: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor (AWUs) *</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min:</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Min: 0.1</td>
<td>Min: 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross operating surplus ***</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 117)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm income</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.99)</td>
<td>(11.6)</td>
<td>(8.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Min: 21</td>
<td>Min: 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max:</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Max: 80</td>
<td>Max: 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College education</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous participation **</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental concern *</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural network diversity ***</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Max: 3</td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonagricultural network diversity ***</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Max: 3</td>
<td>Max: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Héricourt-en-Caux</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² tests or Student’s t-tests: * p value < 0.1; ** p value < 0.05; *** p value < 0.01
Table C.2: Descriptive statistics – participation in collective action – Allier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All (N=60)</th>
<th>Nonparticipants (N=24)</th>
<th>Participants (N=36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm size (ha) **</td>
<td>183.7</td>
<td>145.6</td>
<td>209.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(111.2)</td>
<td>(85.1)</td>
<td>(120.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min: 14.5</td>
<td>Min: 15</td>
<td>Min: 14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max: 100</td>
<td>Max: 321</td>
<td>Max: 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible area (%) ***</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(28.8)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min: 1</td>
<td>Min: 1</td>
<td>Min: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max: 100</td>
<td>Max: 100</td>
<td>Max: 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arable farming</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment **</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max: 6</td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
<td>Max: 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor (AWUs)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min: 0.5</td>
<td>Min: 0.5</td>
<td>Min: 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max: 3</td>
<td>Max: 2</td>
<td>Max: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross operating surplus ≥ 50 000 € ** (N=58)</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=58)</td>
<td>(N=23)</td>
<td>(N=35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm income</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.7)</td>
<td>(9.4)</td>
<td>(8.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min: 26</td>
<td>Min: 26</td>
<td>Min: 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max: 66</td>
<td>Max: 66</td>
<td>Max: 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College education</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous participation *</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental concern **</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural network diversity ***</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(l)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max: 4</td>
<td>Max: 3</td>
<td>Max: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonagricultural network diversity *</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max: 3</td>
<td>Max: 3</td>
<td>Max: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² tests or Student’s t-tests: * p value < 0.1; ** p value < 0.05; *** p value < 0.01
Table C.3: Descriptive statistics – participation in collective action – Héricourt-en-Caux

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All (N=60)</th>
<th>Nonparticipants (N=28)</th>
<th>Participants (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm size (ha) **</td>
<td>122.1</td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>139.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(86.6)</td>
<td>(73.4)</td>
<td>(94.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 1.7</td>
<td>Min: 1.7</td>
<td>Min: 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 555</td>
<td>Max: 267</td>
<td>Max: 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible area (%) ***</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>(38.3)</td>
<td>(31.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 0.8</td>
<td>Min: 0.8</td>
<td>Min: 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 100</td>
<td>Max: 100</td>
<td>Max: 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arable farming</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment **</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 6</td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
<td>Max: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor (AWUs) **</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 0.1</td>
<td>Min: 0.1</td>
<td>Min: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross operating surplus ≥ 50 000 € * (N=59)</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=59)</td>
<td>(N=27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm income</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>(8.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 21</td>
<td>Min: 21</td>
<td>Min: 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 80</td>
<td>Max: 80</td>
<td>Max: 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College education</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous participation</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental concern</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural network diversity ***</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
<td>Max: 3</td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonagricultural network diversity ***</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 2</td>
<td>Max: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² tests or Student’s t-tests: * p value < 0.1; ** p value < 0.05; *** p value < 0.01
Table C.4: Descriptive statistics – level of participation in collective action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonparticipants (N=52)</th>
<th>One action participants (N=14)</th>
<th>Two-three action participants (N=22)</th>
<th>Four-six action participants (N=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm size (ha) *</td>
<td>122.1 (81.3)</td>
<td>175.9 (121.3)</td>
<td>178.9 (130.05)</td>
<td>164.6 (83.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 1.7</td>
<td>Min: 17</td>
<td>Min: 3.6</td>
<td>Min: 14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 321</td>
<td>Max: 460</td>
<td>Max: 555</td>
<td>Max: 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible area (%) **</td>
<td>31 (34.5)</td>
<td>45.1 (31.4)</td>
<td>55.6 (33.2)</td>
<td>49.9 (28.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 0.8</td>
<td>Min: 4.1</td>
<td>Min: 4.3</td>
<td>Min: 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 100</td>
<td>Max: 100</td>
<td>Max: 100</td>
<td>Max: 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arable farming</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment ***</td>
<td>2.9 (1.6)</td>
<td>3 (1.5)</td>
<td>3.7 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.9 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Min: 2</td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
<td>Max: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor (AWUs)</td>
<td>1.5 (0.9)</td>
<td>1.9 (1.1)</td>
<td>1.8 (0.9)</td>
<td>1.8 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 0.1</td>
<td>Min: 0.5</td>
<td>Min: 1</td>
<td>Min: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
<td>Max: 5</td>
<td>Max: 4</td>
<td>Max: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross operating surplus</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 116) *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm income</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>50 (11.6)</td>
<td>48.4 (9.8)</td>
<td>49.1 (9)</td>
<td>48.7 (8.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min : 21</td>
<td>Min : 32</td>
<td>Min : 28</td>
<td>Min : 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max : 80</td>
<td>Max : 67</td>
<td>Max : 67</td>
<td>Max : 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College education</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous participation</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental concern</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural network diversity ***</td>
<td>1.2 (1)</td>
<td>1.8 (0.6)</td>
<td>1.8 (1.2)</td>
<td>2.3 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min : 0</td>
<td>Min : 1</td>
<td>Min : 0</td>
<td>Min : 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max : 3</td>
<td>Max : 3</td>
<td>Max : 4</td>
<td>Max : 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonagricultural network diversity ***</td>
<td>0.5 (0.7)</td>
<td>0.7 (0.9)</td>
<td>0.9 (0.7)</td>
<td>1.1 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min : 0</td>
<td>Min : 0</td>
<td>Min : 0</td>
<td>Min : 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max : 3</td>
<td>Max : 2</td>
<td>Max : 2</td>
<td>Max : 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Héricourt-en-Caux</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi²/Fisher’s tests or analysis of variance: * p value < 0.1; ** p value < 0.05; *** p value < 0.01
Appendix D: Estimation results of models including alternative forms of the Age variable

Table D.1. Estimation results of the probit model including age as a continuous variable (Age) and the squared form of the variable (Age2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
<th>Average marginal effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-7.668***</td>
<td>2.971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm size</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible area</td>
<td>0.024***</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arable farming</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>0.248**</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.055**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross operating surplus</td>
<td>0.844*</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.197*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm income</td>
<td>0.910**</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.190**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age2</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College education</td>
<td>-0.858**</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>-0.183***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous participation</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental concern</td>
<td>0.701*</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.162**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural network diversity</td>
<td>0.404**</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.090**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonagricultural network diversity</td>
<td>0.443**</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.099**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Héricourt-en-Caux</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model summary

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of observations</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R²</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of correct predictions</td>
<td>79.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Model predictions based on the threshold c=0.57. (*), (**), and (***) represent significance at the 0.1, 0.05 and 0.01 levels, respectively.
Table D.2. Estimation results of the probit model including age as a binary variable (*Young*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
<th>Average marginal effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.363***</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm size</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible area</td>
<td>0.024***</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arable farming</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>0.247**</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.055**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross operating surplus</td>
<td>0.744*</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.174*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm income</td>
<td>0.914**</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.191**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>-0.762*</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>-0.170*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College education</td>
<td>-0.860**</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>-0.183***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous participation</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental concern</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural network diversity</td>
<td>0.454**</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.101***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-agricultural network diversity</td>
<td>0.474**</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.106**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Héricourt-en-Caux</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model summary

Number of observations | 117
Pseudo R²             | 0.41
% of correct predictions a | 81.20

a Model predictions based on the threshold c=0.57. (*), (**) and (***) represent significance at the 0.1, 0.05 and 0.01 levels, respectively.
Appendix E: Test of the association between farmers’ age and education

Table E.1. T-test for equality of means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No college education</th>
<th>College education</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers’ age</td>
<td>51.25</td>
<td>8.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p value < 0.1; ** p value < 0.05; *** p value < 0.01