



Exploring Foodie Segmentation

By: **Carol S. Kline**, Jerusha Greenwood, and Leah Joyner

Abstract

Previous research studies have explored the activities, motivations, and outcomes for the culinary tourist, and researchers have theorized certain segments of culinary travelers (Boniface, 2003; Mitchell, Hall & McIntosh, 2000). Contrasting to this, investigation into “the foodie” and his or her activities at home has been strikingly infrequent. Exploring the foodie ‘at home’ or the foodie’s everyday behavior is critical to understanding different types of foodies, how to market to foodies, and their decision-making processes for culinary travel. The purpose of this study is to test, via an online survey, a scale that distinguishes between different types of foodies, and determine if their home-foodie habits are the same while traveling. The study includes five samples: all of the populations were selected to attempt to get a variety of respondents; some settings were food-focused and some were not. Factor analysis was used to group like respondents together; factors that overlapped across samples includes Sustainable Food Activist, Cooking, Cooking Competitor/Do-It-Yourself, Trendy Traveler, Gardening, and Drinking activity dimensions. Food-related businesses and tourism marketers would benefit from greater distinction between types of foodies so as to develop and market specific products to them, to create new packages with complementary activities, and to convert ‘crossover’ markets who visit for one reason but who could be convinced to ‘cross over’ to participate in other activities.

Kline, Carol S.; Greenwood, Jerusha; and Joyner, Leah (2015) "Exploring Foodie Segmentation," *Journal of Tourism Insights*: Vol. 6: Iss. 1, Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.9707/2328-0824.1049>. Publisher version of record available at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/jti/vol6/iss1/3>

Exploring Foodie Segmentation

INTRODUCTION

Researchers have investigated the activities, motivations, and outcomes of the culinary tourist, and have theorized certain segments of culinary travelers (Boniface, 2003; Mitchell, Hall & McIntosh, 2000). Many of these segments are defined by varying levels of interest in engaging in culture, heritage, and authenticity through food (Boniface, 2003; Johnston & Baumann, 2009). Contrasting to this, investigation into “the foodie” and his/her activities at home has been limited until most recently (Getz & Robinson, 2014a, 2014b; Robinson & Getz, 2014; von Meyer-Höfer, von der Wense, & Spiller, 2015). While tourists tend to explore their interests while traveling, behavior at home might vary from behavior while traveling. Exploring the foodie’s everyday behavior is critical to understanding different types of foodies, how to market to foodies, and their decision-making processes for culinary travel. Determining their lifestyle preferences and priorities for sustainability, gardening, cooking, visiting farmers markets at home, attending culinary classes, wine purchasing, and other activities related to food can be vital information for any destination wishing to develop its culinary products and experiences.

Furthermore, the foodie market has been conceptualized as part of a larger Slow Food movement (Dunlap, 2012) that sits at the intersection of social change, agriculture, and recreation and leisure – what Amsden and McEntee (2011) termed *agrileisure*. Boniface (2009) attributes the rise in culinary tourism to an interest in counter-acting food industrialization. Johnston and Baumann (2009) also conjecture that foodies value ecological sustainability and authenticity in their food experiences and that many of their choices are based on a desire to curb the industrialization of the food production system. Dunlap (2012) surmises that these members of the Slow Food movement are actually engaging in a form of reflective practice, and are therefore organized by their interest in furthering their knowledge about food. Despite the growth in culinary tourism and culinary tourist research, most knowledge surrounding the behaviors and characteristics of foodies still exists in the realm of speculation (Dunlap, 2012). The purpose of this study is to test a scale that distinguishes between different types of foodies, so that future research can take steps toward understanding more about their travel behavior.

CULINARY FOOD TOURISM, THE LOCAL FOOD MOVEMENT, AND SUSTAINABILITY

Once food and drink advanced from their role as simple sustenance into sources

of ritual and pleasure, humans began to travel for the purpose of experiencing “the exotic” through them (Boniface, 2009; Johnston & Baumann, 2009). Yet there are complexities to the relationship between food and tourism that cannot go unmentioned; a discussion of these complexities gives rise to some underlying issues related to the authenticity of the touristic experience, the relationship of that experience to the sustainability of a destination, and how the tourism industry’s reliance on food as both a core and tangential component of the tourism system influences the overall sustainability of a destination.

Amsden and McEntee (2011), argued that agrileisure can be used “as a tool to explore the balance between leisure, necessity, and subsistence” (p. 43). Food is a necessity for all, but is often transformed into an act of recreation for those who have the luxury to and interest in doing so. And while a popular assumption is that most people *should* have access to nutritious food, it is not a reality for everyone to access “the most highly valued foods and food experiences,” (Johnston & Baumann, 2009, p. 13). Individuals with little or no access to fresh and nutritious food may have limited interest in how that food is grown, where it was grown, or who grew it. Similarly, it may be inaccurate to assume that just because a food is organically grown and is available at a chain supermarket that it has a low social or environmental footprint; the miles that food has traveled or the work conditions of the people who harvested it may nullify any environmental benefits behind the “certified organic” stamp (Pollan, 2008).

A response to these dilemmas has manifested itself in a number of different forms/terms: the Slow Food movement, localism, agrileisure, and foodies. Slow Food, which is often paired with the Foodie movement, is an approach to both food production and consumption that “attempts to recreate individuals, communities, and even entire cultures through a process of leisure education,” (Dunlap, 2012, p. 39). These foodies are characterized by the level of value they place on the authenticity of food, as well as the connection the food provides to the producer, the land, the culture, and the traditions communicated through the food (Johnston & Baumann, 2009). Specifically, food can be “regarded as an intrinsic part of the development of regional identity” (Everett & Aitchison, 2008, p. 156), and can imbue a region with sense of place for both a resident and a tourist (Amsden & McEntee, 2011). Further, issues of food justice (Bradley & Galt), food sovereignty (Desmarais & Wittman, 2014), and corporate responsibility (Gendzheva, 2014) are no longer the domains of a minority of activists.

This idea of ‘sense of place’ for a destination is related to a concept that is important to discuss in the spheres of food and tourism: authenticity. In most tourism discourse and research about authenticity, the focus has been primarily around cultural experiences; however, the purpose of the experience may not be as important to the feeling of authenticity as are facets of “sincerity, effort,

involvement, and quality” within the experience (Pearce, 2005, p. 142). Authenticity, however, is a social construct (Johnston & Baumann, 2009), and is contextual in relation to the self, the thing being observed, and others (Beer, 2008).

Authenticity has been well examined in the food and foodie-oriented tourism literature (Beer, 2008; Johnston & Baumann, 2009; Molz, 2007; Robinson & Clifford, 2012; Sims, 2009). Johnston and Baumann (2009) found that authenticity is manifested in how the food is produced (food manufactured at a factory farm is ‘inauthentic’), and how the food connects the eater with the grower, heritage, and/or tradition. Even foodies who travel to experience ‘exotic’ foods seek those foods and the origins they help define (Johnston & Baumann, 2009). Molz (2007) for example, posited that food tourists may not be engaging in the experience because they want to know or experience another culture ‘through food,’ but because food is a vehicle by which a tourist can engage in adventure with cultures that are authentically ‘Other’. Even in heavily contrived experiences, like medieval festivals, visitors perceive experiences as authentic because they perceive the food associated with the experience as authentic (Robinson & Clifford, 2012).

This orientation toward authenticity in a culinary experience can lead to more sustainable practices at a destination (in regard to food production). Because food-oriented visitors are perceived to be interested in buying local food, and supportive of value production practices that maintain the environmental integrity of the agricultural system, “it is possible to use the tourist’s desire for authenticity to encourage the development of products and services that will boost sustainability,” (Sims, 2009, p. 322). Sims (2009) also highlighted the assumption that a destination involved with local food initiatives can provide experiences for tourists that will connect them with the local agricultural system. According to Green and Dougherty (2009), “[culinary tourism] supports the tourism and agricultural sectors [of a destination] and builds bridges between the two industries” (p. 156). Tourism, however, can be a source of conflict between the agricultural sector of a rural region and nearby communities; visitors can compete with residents, farmers, and ranchers for resources (Amsden & McEntee, 2011).

Destinations may be able to increase the sustainability of their tourism product through an active embrace of a regional food identity. Everett and Aitchison (2008) found in their study of food tourism in Cornwall that restaurant operators actively pursued locally sourced foods in response to tourist demand. When tourists are encouraged to spend their money on local products, they may not only increase their expenditures in that area, but the value of those expenditures is multiplied because it stays within the economic boundaries of that region (Everett & Aitchison, 2008). These connections can be increased through

experiences that encourage visitors to connect engage with the food landscape at the destination. Food themed attractions, according to Amsden and McEntee (2011) and Everett and Aitchison (2009), help foster and retain local food identity, and can contribute to sense of place and place attachment for both visitors and residents. Similarly, Green and Dougherty (2009) underlined the importance of these food themed attractions – particularly trails – to maximizing the economic benefits and the distribution of those benefits across the stakeholders in a destination.

Research in the area of food/culinary tourism has been focused primarily on the supply-side of the equation: attractions and activities. However, a better understanding of the demand side of the foodie travel equation is needed to improve marketing efforts, especially in segmentation of the foodie target market.

MARKET/SPECIFIC FOOD NICHES/STUDIES

The unique demands by different types of foodies present significant opportunities through which niche food activities might be leveraged and advertised. Henderson (2009) reviewed the existing literature on food tourism, covering many topics on food related travel, including the prediction that food tourism will be the next big trend to rival ecotourism within the industry. She argued that that food tourism can be leveraged by a destination as a competitive advantage, and called for further research on the role of food as a determinant and motivator for travel.

The many layers of foodie involvement and interest in food experiences are especially visible within the proliferation of local sustainable food systems (Kline, Knollenburg & Deale, 2014). Niche activities can include raising livestock for consumption, volunteering at farms/orchard tours, participating in Community Supported Agriculture or Fisheries, and participating in Slow Food groups. In an excerpt from the book, *Sustainable culinary systems; Local foods, innovation, tourism and hospitality*, Nilsson (2013) introduced how the relationship of environmental degradation to increasingly industrialized agricultural systems has contributed to consumer awareness of the impacts of their food choices. Von Meyer-Höfer, von der Wense, and Spiller (2015) explored the ‘convinced’ sustainable food consumer and found that they felt their individual food choices could influence larger patterns of sustainable development.

The many tourists that seek out adventure as a component of their culinary tourism experience present yet another case of interesting supply and demand interactions. In Norway, tourists are exhibiting their demand for this type of culinary experience through their consumption of Smalahove (salted, smoked, and cooked sheep's head). Local culture within destination places the consumption of this food within context of nostalgia and authenticity, whereas tourists seem to

crave the delicacy as part of a 'trophy' culinary experience, bringing a thrill-seeking element to culinary travel (Gyimóthy & Mykletun, 2009). This case study reveals significant potential for marketing to foodies with an 'adventurous' bent. There also exists a market demand for food and beverage festivals. Mason and Paggiaro (2012) introduced the concept of a 'festivalscape' as an integral part of the tourist experience, asserting that patrons to food and wine festivals scrutinize the style and aspect of the physical elements related to the event. These authors' findings highlight the interaction of the elements of the festivalscape on the emotional experience and satisfaction of the visitor, implying that an understanding of the attributes that affect participant satisfaction (i.e. motivation and demand) is crucial for festival success. Other factors that may affect food consumption within tourism settings might include cultural and religious influences, food related personality traits, food content, food availability, seasonality, and elements of the service environment (Mak, Lumbers, Eves, & Chang, 2012).

In a series of research publications, Getz and Robinson outline a wealth of information on the Australian foodie including the meaning of being a foodie, levels of involvement with food, and patterns and preferences related to travel and events (Getz & Robinson, 2014a, p. 315). In their study, food events encompassed a wide variety of food-related activities such as participating in a wine or food tasting event, visiting a farmers market, attending a cultural or ethnic food festival, patronizing an expensive restaurant, taking a professional cooking class, and going to a food competition. The foodies that participated in the study felt very strongly that similar food events were critical elements of a successful trip and are vital parts of the tourism product for destinations. Additionally, they profiled foodies as primarily female, under 40, educated, and over one third had a current or previous background in food-related occupations (Robinson & Getz, 2014). Commonalities among this sample regarding food-related attractors at destinations included the presence of wine, local produce, and foodservice. Additionally, foodies looked for culturally-authentic food experiences, educational experiences regarding heritage foods or food traditions, and opportunities to socialize through food experiences when they travel (Getz & Robinson, 2014b).

The rise in social media has also shaped the way consumers interact with food (Rutsaert, Regan, Pieniak, McConnon, Moss, Wall, & Verbeke, 2013), presenting an opportunity to suppliers of food experiences to leverage this to their advantage. Starbucks uses social media to engage consumers into feeling they are actively participating in the process of innovation, while simultaneously sourcing information about customer behaviors and preferences (Chua & Banerjee, 2013). The authors note that other food and beverage firms use the tool of social media

to engage in customer knowledge management, which is inextricably linked to those customers' motivations and behaviors.

“Upscale” cooking activities reflect a consumer preference for shopping at specialty cookware/food stores, attending cooking classes, and reading about nutrition (Green, Kline, Hao & Crawford, *forthcoming*). Understanding the motivations of this type of foodie is especially important, given the nature of cooking and recipes as pieces of not only consumer culture, but also larger cultural values and narratives (Brownlie, Hewer, & Horne, 2006). DiPietro, Cao, & Partlow (2013) investigated customer perceptions and purchase intentions related to green practices within an upscale, green certified restaurant, finding that many of the surveyed customers considered themselves to be knowledgeable about green practices, exhibiting preferences to visit restaurants that are environmental friendly. The authors also found that gender and education were particularly relevant within this market segment, as the results revealed that females with higher education levels made more conscious choices regarding green practices (Di Pietro et al, 2013). These differences in market characteristics (age and gender, for example) were also seen by Ignatov and Smith (2006), who found that food tourists in Canada tended to be female, whereas tourists who were described as wine tourists or food and wine tourists were older and male.

And finally, food is taking center stage within political discourse, probably best illustrated by the popularity of books such as *Omnivore's Dilemma* (Pollan, 2006) and *Animal Vegetable Miracle* (Kingsolver, Hopp, & Kingsolver, 2008), and the movie *Food, Inc.* (Weyermann & Kenner, 2009). Flowers and Swan (2011) discussed how the aforementioned film has contributed to a specific food movement through the critique of the globalist capitalist food system. In the same vein, Staley (2010) writes about how the proponents of trendy food segments, such as those who practice veganism, vegetarianism, or clean eating, seek to politicize food choices. Indeed, the concepts of food sovereignty, food justice, and food security are in the forefront of discourse on social movements (Alkon & Mares, 2012), comprising an assimilation of political beliefs and ideas about food that should be considered in the marketing of food experiences.

Individual relationships with food, beyond its role in sustenance, are a complex phenomenon that have only begun to be explored in a post-modern context. The development of a scale is appropriate for exploring underlying nuances and dimensions of enjoying food, particularly when items within the scale share a common cause. Each item on the scale is an indicator of part of a latent variable, in this case ‘being a foodie,’ however items should not be mistaken as the variable itself (DeVellis, 2012). When developing an item pool, Clark and Watson (1995, p. 312) declared “the fundamental goal ... is to sample systematically all content that is potentially relevant to the target construct.” The items on a scale should be relatively consistent in their level of specificity, not

excessively long, and written in layman's language. Additionally, a scale should contain some construct redundancy (DeVellis, 2012) and demonstrate moderate inter-item correlations (Clark & Watson, 1995). In terms of response options, variability is also desired. DeVellis (2012, p. 89) stated "if a scale fails to discriminate differences in the underlying attribute, its correlations with other measures will be restricted and its utility limited." In the current study, four force-choice response options were provided. Having a panel of experts review the scale twice during its evolution, as well as adding items suggested by respondents strengthened the content validity of the scale.

In light of the myriad of reasons and ways that people interact with food, and because foodie-ism continues to grow, the purpose of this study is to test a scale of food-related activities toward the end of segmenting the diverse market of 'foodies.' The research questions are:

1. Can food-related activities be aggregated into food activity dimensions?
2. Are the items within each factor (dimension) similar regardless of the sample?
3. Is there a difference between gender and age in propensity toward various food activity dimensions?
4. Is there a difference among foodies as to how they fall into multiple dimensions?

The following hypotheses are therefore tested in this study.

H1: Food-related activities cannot be aggregated into food activity dimensions.

H2: Food-related activities factor into different dimensions across various samples.

H3a: There is no difference between male and females regarding food activity dimensions.

H3b: There is no difference between age groups regarding food activity dimensions.

H4: There is no correlation between/among food activity dimensions.

Research questions/hypotheses one and two was addressed through factor analysis. Research question/hypothesis three was addressed through the use of t-test and ANOVA. Research question/hypotheses four was addressed using Pearson's correlation. All analyses were performed with SPSS 20.0.

METHODS

Survey Design

The survey instrument contains four sections. In the first section, the respondent was provided a list of food-related activities and asked to record how often they participate in those activities: always, sometimes, rarely, or never. By phrasing the response options in this graduated manner, a 'neutral' response such as 'neither agree nor disagree' was avoided. Respondents were also provided a space where they could list other food-related activities in which they participate. The second section focused on demographics. The food-related activities were adapted from tourism and food studies literature (Bell & Marshall, 2003; MacLaurin, Blose, & Mack, 2007; Henderson, 2009; Nilsson, 2013; Shenoy, 2005; Tikkanen, 2007; Yun, Hennessey, & MacDonald, 2011).

The initial instrument (containing 37 food-related activities) developed in 2010 was reviewed by a panel of experts representing destination marketing, sustainable agriculture, agritourism, farming education, food festivals, restaurants, and tourism research. The final version of the instrument consisted of 58 items as activities were added by the panel (e.g. taking photos of food, participating in cooking classes, eating at food trucks, and reading the food section of the newspaper) and from suggestions of other activities from respondents. Because the intercept instruments were limited by their physical size, few demographic questions were included. Year of birth and gender were included on all instruments, however household composition, education, and income were included on the online version.

Survey Distribution/ Sample Selection

This study includes five samples. Because the primary goal of the study was to test a new scale, a variety of food-related audiences were desired. The first sample was made up of attendees to the TerraVita sustainable food and wine festival on October 16, 2010 in Chapel Hill, North Carolina (NC). The annual event showcases sustainable foods from local chefs in North Carolina and sustainable beverages from all over the United States, and was primarily attended by NC residents who live in the local area (80% of sample); the ages of event attendees was spread fairly evenly from 26-65. The researchers selected this event because it was an accessible sample of people interested in sustainable food and beverage.

The second sample is composed of members and affiliates of the Central Coast of California Agriculture Network, and specifically those who receive the electronic newsletter. Members and affiliates of the organization are farmers, ranchers, chefs, and restaurant owners who embrace the values of sustainability, innovation, and collaboration in order to promote the Central Coast as a sustainable food system. There are approximately 70 farm/ranch members and 22 restaurant/chef members.

The next population was undergraduate students at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (Cal Poly). The Cal Poly student body is composed primarily of California residents who originate from the San Francisco Bay, Los Angeles, San Diego, and Central Coast regions of the state. They have an average age of 20.2 years, and the gender distribution is 54% male, 46% female (Cal Poly, 2014). This group was selected for two purposes: first, their participation was solicited because they are members of the millennial generation, a population that will wield a great deal of influence over tourism trends in general, and food/food tourism in particular. Second, the students are part of an academic program housed within a college of agriculture on a campus with easy access to locally-produced food.

As the project evolved, the researchers wished to increase response rate, therefore the method for data collection for the fourth and fifth sample was changed to intercepts. The fourth population is attendees to the 2012 Festival of Legends medieval fair in Pittsboro, North Carolina. Surveys were collected on April 21, 2012, which was the first day of the two-day event. The festival was chosen as it provided a large audience in a setting where specialty food was provided. The final population included in this study is visitors to the 7th Street Public Market in Charlotte, North Carolina. This facility operates as a year-round indoor farmer's market in a downtown urban setting. This setting was ideal to reach a large sample of people with varied interests related to food as the market offers a variety of food-related businesses (e.g. wine/beer market, chef demonstrations, pizza stand, local produce). All of the populations were selected to attempt to get a variety of respondents that were involved in the consumption of local or specialty foods. For the public market and medieval fair sample, respondents completed a paper survey on site. For the Terra Vita food festival sample, email addresses were collected at the festival, and a solicitation to participate in an online survey was sent subsequently. For the student and food cooperative sample, an existing database of email addresses was used to solicit participation in an online survey. For each of the three online surveys, two reminder emails were sent following the initial ask.

Insert Table 1 approximately here

RESULTS

Survey efforts resulted in a total of 800 usable surveys from the five audiences. Of all respondents, 43.6% were between 18-29 years of age, followed by 30-39 (22.0%), 40-49 (14.0%), 50-59 (12.5%) and 60 and above (7.9%) and predominately female (64.6%). For a further breakdown of demographic characteristics, see Table 2.

Insert Table 2 approximately here

Food activity dimensions

To address the first two research questions, *Can food-related activities be aggregated into food activity dimensions?* and *Are the items within each factor (dimension) similar regardless of the sample?*, a principle component analysis with Varimax rotation was conducted on the foodie scale items in the three samples that had a large enough sample size (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). The initial analysis was run without any restrictions and produced a correlations matrix, communalities, Eigenvalues, scree plot and factor loadings. The goal of factor analysis is two-fold, to identify the number of factors in the data and to identify which items load onto each factor. Through this process, variables that do not significantly load onto a factor or that loaded on multiple factors were dropped from the model. The criteria used to interpret the factor analysis were: corrected inter-item correlation, factor loadings, and operational goodness-of-fit.

Results from the undergraduate students, urban market, and medieval festival are displayed in Table 3. Bartlett's test of sphericity was statistically significant at the .000 level and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin statistics (.889, .888, and .845 respectively) met the recommended value of at least .6 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). The total variance explained by the models ranged from 53.6% to 58.9%, while the number of factors varied from six to eight. Factor loadings were similar across the samples, however, the variance that each factor, or food activity dimension, explained varied among the different samples (Table 4). More discussion on this follows in the next section. Dimensions from the student sample are *Sustainable Food Activist*, *Cooking*, *Cooking Competitor/Do-It-Yourself*, *Trendy Traveler*, *Gardening*, and *Drinking* activity dimensions. Responses from the urban market responses also factored into these six dimensions but included a *Social Media/Networking* dimension. Responses from the medieval festival sample included these seven, as well as an *Informed/Specialty* Dimension.

Insert Table 3 approximately here

Cronbach's alpha tests of reliability were conducted to assess the internal consistency of each dimension. Alphas at .7 or above indicate a good fit of items. Reliability scores for the factors are presented in Table 3, where alpha coefficients ranged from $\alpha(4) = .664$ for a *Drinking* dimension to $\alpha(11) = .928$ for *Sustainable Food Activist* dimension.

In two of the samples, exploratory factor analysis was not possible due to the small sample size. In these cases, variables were grouped on face validity and internal consistency using Cronbach's coefficient alpha (Table 4). Each of the dimensions was found to have coefficients of .724 or higher. Data for both of

these samples were collected early in the instrument's history, and therefore the instruments contained fewer items than the urban market and medieval festival.

Insert Table 4 approximately here

Gender differences

To address research question three, *Is there a difference between gender and age in propensity toward various food activity dimensions?*, t-tests and ANOVAs were run for each dimension within each sample (Table 5). When the significance value for Levene's test was larger than .05, equal variances were assumed.

Within the student sample, there was a significant difference in the scores for males ($M = 1.96$, $SD = 0.437$) and females ($M = 2.39$, $SD = 0.657$; $t(112.984) = 4.67$, $p < .000$) in the *Cooking* dimension, and in the *Gardening* dimension: males ($M = 1.29$, $SD = 0.418$) and females ($M = 1.50$, $SD = 0.597$; $t(107.614) = 2.48$, $p < .000$).

Insert Table 5 approximately here

In the Charlotte urban market sample, a significant difference between males and females was found in the *Gardening* dimension [Males $M = 1.50$, $SD = .614$; Females $M = 1.68$, $SD = .656$; $t(292) = 2.50$, $p < .05$], the *Competition/DIY* dimension [Males $M = 1.30$, $SD = .612$; Females $M = 1.18$, $SD = .422$; $t(292) = 2.13$, $p < .05$], and the *Drinking* dimension [Males $M = 2.12$, $SD = .812$; Females $M = 1.92$, $SD = .722$; $t(292) = 4.36$, $p < .05$].

Within the Festival of Legends sample, a significant difference between males and females was found in the *Gardening* dimension [Males $M = 1.66$, $SD = .682$; Females $M = 2.01$, $SD = .828$; $t(184) = 3.11$, $p < .05$]. There were no significant differences between gender in the Terra Vita or California Cooperative sample.

Age differences

Within the Charlotte urban sample, ANOVA was used to investigate age group differences within the dimensions that met the assumption of homogeneity; the Brown-Forsythe test was performed to find the adjusted F statistic for the four dimensions that did not meet the assumption of homogeneity. The results revealed significant mean differences on *Travel Trendy* [$F(4,291) = 3.602$, $p < .01$], *Drinking* [$F(4,291) = 5.114$, $p < .01$], *Gardening* [Adjusted $F(4,154.398) = 6.169$, $p < .01$], and *Social Media* [Adjusted $F(4,189.813) = 6.954$, $p < .01$] dimensions. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated for the *Drinker* dimension, the mean score for 30-39 year olds ($M = 2.29$, $SD = 0.774$) was

significantly different from 18-29 year olds ($M=3.05$, $SD=1.43$), the 40-49 year olds ($M=3.05$, $SD=1.43$), and the 50-59 year olds ($M=2.95$, $SD=1.46$). This analysis shows that the '30-something group' reported greater involvement with activities in the Drinker Dimension that the other respondents (Table 6). For the Travel Trendy dimension, the Tukey test indicated the highest enjoyment by 30-39 year olds, also demonstrating that the 30-39 year olds reported higher involvement than their older counterparts.

Insert Table 6 approximately here

The Games-Howell test indicated that for the Gardening dimension, the mean score for 60+ year olds ($M=1.86$, $SD=.74$) was significantly different from 40-49 year olds ($M=1.49$, $SD = .594$) and the 18-29 year olds ($M=1.4$, $SD = .506$) at the $p<.05$ level. For the Social Media dimension, the 30-39 year olds ($M=2.17$, $SD =.993$) and 18-29 year olds ($M=2.08$, $SD =.950$) had the highest involvement. The older groups demonstrated greater involvement with the activities in the Gardening dimension, while the reverse is true for the Social Media dimensions. There were no significant differences among age groups in the Terra Vita, California Cooperative or Festival of Legends sample. Because 98% of the student sample fell within the same age category (18-29 years), the ANOVA was not performed with this sample.

Relationship between dimensions

To address research question four, *Do different types of foodie activity dimensions trend together?*, a Pearson's correlation was run between all combinations of dimensions within each of the samples. Within the three larger samples, statistically significant positive correlation existed between all dimensions at the $p<.01$ level (Tables 7 and 8); most of them were moderate to very strong.

Insert Tables 7, 8 & 9 approximately here

Within the smaller samples, more variation occurred (Table 9). Many of the correlations were weak or moderate, however, in the sustainable food festival sample, there were strong, positive correlations between Food-related Travel dimension and Sustainable Food Activist [$r = .51$, $n = 71$, $p < .01$], Cooking [$r = .53$, $n = 71$, $p < .01$], Trendy [$r = .58$, $n = 71$, $p < .01$], and Drinking [$r = .45$, $n = 71$, $p < .01$] dimensions, between the Cooking and Sustainable Food Activist [$r = .42$, $n = 71$, $p < .01$] and Drinking [$r = .45$, $n = 71$, $p < .01$] dimensions, and between the Trendy and Drinking dimensions [$r = .43$, $n = 71$, $p < .01$]. Within the cooperative sample, strong positive relationships existed between the Food-related Travel and Niche Meats dimension [$r = .44$, $n = 71$, $p < .01$], and between

the Gardening and Cooking dimensions [$r = .49, n = 71, p < .01$].

DISCUSSION

Results indicate that food related activities can be aggregated into food activity dimensions, and while they factor into different dimensions across various samples, the variation is slight. There appear to be a solid relationship between various food activity dimensions, however only few differences were found between age groups or between males and females (Table 10).

Insert Table 10 approximately here

The instrument used within this study was designed as a first step toward understanding variances within the foodie market, so that this understanding might be applied within the tourism context. It has been argued that while many studies have explored the culinary tourist, few have examined the ‘everyday’ enjoyment of food activities (Green, Kline, Hao & Crawford, *forthcoming*), and how that might translate into decision-making in tourism. While it was beyond the scope of this study to delve into the latter, the findings lay the groundwork for future work to examine the nuances and complexities of the foodie market.

Foodie activities were found to factor into definitive dimensions reflecting themes that fit at face value. Food activities that overlap with cooking, drinking, sustainable food issues, gardening, travel, and social media have become mainstream in middle-class society. However, the number of related activities that statistically factored together validates and begins to distinguish an area of research that has not yet been formally established within cultural food studies. The similarity of dimensions that resulted across samples suggests consistency in individuals’ perception of food concepts, however the fact that the instrument evolved over the course of the study begs for future testing, as well as length optimization. Development of a new scale is an iterative process (Clark & Watson, 1995), therefore these first five samples serve only as a platform for further refinement.

The supportive findings of H3a regarding gender differences are, interestingly, dissimilar to what DiPietro et al (2013) found within their sample of consumers and green preferences, however the results are in line with what Ignatov and Smith (2006) as well as Robinson and Getz (2014) found in their study of Canadian food and wine tourists and Australian food tourists. Both studies found a disproportionate number of females to males interested in food tourism. However, it should be noted that these studies each studied a specific market – patrons to an upscale ‘green’ dining establishment, “food and wine”

tourists to Canada, and food tourists in Australia – compared to the current study that surveyed respondents across various and diverse market segments.

Particularly considering some of the newer ways that people may interact with food (e.g. social media, food trucks, DIY butchery), the results lend themselves to future research directions in foodie-ism and in tourism. For example, while social media has been discussed as a key piece of the engaged or trendy dimension, it may also be a method through which culinary tourism destinations might leverage the overlap between foodie activity dimensions. In this unique type of media outlet, consumers actually reveal to the marketer their motivations (Chua & Banerjee, 2013), not only through the subject matter of their shared posts, photographs, hashtags, and comments.

Ultimately, destinations management organizations must consider the multidimensionality of the tourism-food experience. Food has become an accessible form of leisure through its popularization on television (The Food Network, The Cooking Channel), multitudes of food blogs, and the proliferation of do-it-yourself resources distributed through social media sites like Pinterest. Destinations who wish to use food as a marketing tool will need a savvy understanding of how food tourists will want to bring their experiences from their kitchens to their travel experiences, as well as transfer their food experiences while traveling back to their kitchens.

Limitations and Future Research

While this study contributes to the understanding of individual involvement in and enjoyment of food activities, there remain vast and murky areas to explore. Activities are undertaken for many motivations and in anticipation of varying benefits. For example, participation in a cooking class may be motivated by a desire to learn as well as desire to participate in a popular trend. Hosting a dinner party may be as much about engaging with friends as it is to share knowledge about food trends. This is supported by Robinson and Getz (2014) who found that foodies are interested in active participation with food, there is a broad range of activities, and that the interest is multi-faceted. Future scales in food activities should determine ways to measure multiple motivations and the implications that these inter relationships between motivations might have for food marketing and product design.

Take for example, the ‘trophy’ culinary experience Gyimóthy and Mykletun (2009) presented, in which tourists eating smoked sheephead may fall into the adventure dimension, but since that protein is locally produced it may also be considered to lie within the farmer-friendly or sustainable agriculture dimension. Similarly, Yun et al. (2011) concluded that “culinary experiences at destinations... are highly related to attitudinal, psychological, and perceptual” factors (p.11), and that individuals exhibit similar attitudes toward food at home

and while traveling. Through the lens of Maslow's hierarchy, it becomes clear that the fulfillment of basic human needs is indeed a complex psychological process, one which may actually flow between levels of the hierarchy and be too intricate to load into separate dimensions. This echoes the claim made by Pearce (2005) in the Travel Needs Ladder, where motivation is better understood as several travel needs (e.g. rungs of the ladder) work together.

The survey design was refined as the study advanced; some of the questions on the first version of the instrument were asked in a slightly different format on later versions. Additionally, items were added as the instrument evolved. Future instrument might consider other items, starting with items provided by a focus group. For example, other activities that were provided by respondents on the last version of the instrument were *participating in community/church potlucks*, *taking classes on nutrition*, and *participating in specialty cooking events such as oyster roasts or shrimp boils*.

At least ten items on the survey involve sustainability or farm issues, therefore the number of items may have influenced the factor loadings (Sustainable Food Activist was the first factor in each sample). One limitation in the student sample is that it is overwhelmingly female. The males who did respond reported a high level of participation in food related activities, which may indicate self-selection bias among that sub-sample. Additionally, this study includes participants within the U.S. (albeit on both the east and west coast), and thus cannot be generalized to other populations. Certainly food has a deep history in traditions around the world, therefore foodie-ism should be explored in multiple contexts.

One area for future inquiry is the influence of social circles and family members; for example, individuals who are raised in or exposed to environments where the preparation of meals (or the cultivation of home gardens) is a central part of daily life may have different attitudes about being foodies than those who are not. The same may be said about the prominence of travel or exposure to diverse cultures during an individual's development. Additionally, future research could align the involvement with foodie related activities to the types of foodie-related travel preferred. For example, are decisions about travel destinations being made based on interest in culture, or with food preparation techniques? Are tourists being drawn to specific cities famous for a foodie culture? Do tourists consider the destination's reputation as a foodie 'haven,' and if so, how much does this weigh into their decision to travel there?

This study offers a first step in distinguishing 'types' of foodies by developing dimensions of common food activities in which they participate. Food-related businesses and tourism marketers would benefit from greater distinction between types of foodies so as to develop and market specific products to them, to create new packages with complementary activities, and to convert

'crossover' markets who visit for one reason but who could be convinced to 'cross over' to participate in other activities. Clearly, additional quantitative and qualitative research must be undertaken to understand the motivations, decision-making, expectations, and activities of foodies. Utilizing this study as a first step, future research should investigate further distinctions of this very general term.

REFERENCES

- Alkon, A. H., & Mares, T. M. (2012). Food sovereignty in US food movements: Radical visions and neoliberal constraints. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 29(3), 347-359.
- Amsden, B. & McEntee, J. (2011). Agrileisure: Re-imagining the relationship between agriculture, leisure, and social change. *Leisure/Loisir*, 35(1), 37-48.
- Beer, S. (2008). Authenticity and food experience – commercial and academic perspectives. *Journal of Foodservice*, 19(3), 153-163.
- Bell, R., & Marshall, D. (2003). The construct of food involvement in behavioral research: Scale development and validation. *Appetite*, 40(3), 235-244.
- Boniface, P. (2003). *Tasting tourism: Travelling for food and drink*. Surrey, UK: Aldershot/Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Bradley, K., & Galt, R. E. (2014). Practicing food justice at Dig Deep Farms & Produce, East Bay Area, California: self-determination as a guiding value and intersections with foodie logics. *Local Environment*, 19(2), 172-186.
- Brownlie, D., Hewer, P., Horne, S. (2005). Culinary tourism: an exploratory reading of contemporary representations of cooking. *Consumption Markets & Culture* 8 (1), 7-26.
- Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo (2014). *Admissions: Student profile*. Retrieved from <http://admissions.calpoly.edu/prospective/profile.html>.
- Chua, A. & Banerjee, S. (2013). Customer knowledge management via social media: the case of Starbucks. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 17 (2), 237 – 249.
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological assessment*, 7(3), 309.
- Desmarais, A. A. & Wittman, H. (2014) Farmers, foodies and First Nations: getting to food sovereignty in Canada, *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 41:6, 1153-1173,
- DeVellis, R.D. (2012). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (Vol. 26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

DiPietro, R., Cao, Y., Partlow, C. (2013). Green practices in upscale foodservice operations: Customer perceptions and purchase intentions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, (25) 5, 779 – 796.

Dunlap, R. (2012). Recreating culture: Slow Food as a leisure education movement. *World Leisure Journal*, 54(1), 38-47.

Everett, S. & Aitchison, C. (2008). The role of food tourism in sustaining regional identity: A case study of Cornwall, South West England. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(2), 150-167.

Gendzheva, N. (2014). Model of Corporate Social Responsibility in food tourism. *International Journal for Responsible Tourism*, 3(1), 44-63.

Getz, D., & Robinson, R.N.S. (2014a). Foodies and food events. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 14(3).

Getz, D., & Robinson, R. N. (2014b). “Foodies” and their travel preferences. *Tourism Analysis*, 19(6), 659-672.

Green, G. P. & Dougherty, M.L. (2009). Localizing linkages for food and tourism: Culinary tourism as a community development strategy. *Community Development*, 39(3), 148-158.

Green, E.G., Kline, C.S. Hao, H. & Crawford, A. (2015). Tourist behavior among foodie activity dimensions. *Gastronomy and Tourism* (forthcoming).

Gyimóthy, S., & Mykletun, R. J. (2009). Scary food: Commodifying culinary heritage as meal adventures in tourism. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 15(3), 259-273.

Ignatov, E. & Smith, S. (2006). Segmenting Canadian culinary tourists. *Current Issues in Tourism* 9(3), 235-255

Henderson, J.C. (2009). Food tourism reviewed. *British Food Journal*, 111(4), pp. 317-326.

Johnston, J. & Baumann, S. (2009). *Foodies: Democracy and distinction in the gourmet foodscape*. New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

- Kline, C., Knollenburg, W., & Deale, C. (2014). Food and Tourism: A research approach to value chain management [book chapter]. *Managing Ethical Consumption in Tourism*. Taylor & Francis.
- Kingsolver, B., Hopp, S., Kingsolver, C. (2007) *Animal, vegetable, miracle: a year of food life* New York ; Harper Collins Publishers.
- von Meyer-Höfer, M., von der Wense, V., & Spiller, A. (2015). Characterising convinced sustainable food consumers. *British Food Journal*, 117(3), 1082-1104.
- MacLaurin, T., Blose, J., & Mack, R. (2007). Marketing segmentation of culinary tourists. *7th Annual Conference on Business & Economics*, Rome, Italy.
- Mason, M., Paggiaro, A. (2012). Investigating the role of festivalscape in culinary tourism: The case of food and wine events. *Tourism Management* 22 (6), 1329-1336.
- Molz, J.G. (2007). The cosmopolitan mobilities of culinary tourism. *Space and Culture*, 10(1), 77-93.
- Nilsson, J.H. (2013). Nordic eco-gastronomy: the Slow Food concept in relation to Nordic gastronomy. In Hall, C. Gössling, S., *Sustainable Culinary Systems: Local Foods, Innovation, Tourism and Hospitality* (189-204). Routledge. Florence, KY, USA.
- Pearce, P. (2005). *Tourist behavior: Themes and conceptual schemes*. Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.
- Pollan, M. (2006). *The omnivore's dilemma*. New York, NY: Penguin Group.
- Robinson, R.N.S. & Clifford, C. (2012). Authenticity and festival foodservice experiences. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 571-600.
- Robinson, R.N.S., & Getz, D. (2014). Profiling potential food tourists: An Australian study. *British Food Journal*, 116(4), 690-706.
- Rutsaert, P., Regan, A., Pieniak, Z., McConnon, A., Moss, A., Wall, P., Verbeke, W. (2013). The use of social media in food risk and benefit communication. *Trends in Food Science & Technology* 30(1), 84-91.
- Sims, R. (2009). Food, place, and authenticity: local food and the sustainable

tourism experience. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(3), 321-336.

Shenoy, S. S. (2005). *Food Tourism and the Culinary Tourist*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Clemson, South Carolina: Clemson University.

Staley, L. (2010). Cupcake consumerism. *Institute Of Public Affairs Review*, 62(3), 30.

Tabachnick, B. & Fidell, L. (2001). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Tikkanen, I. (2007). Maslow's Hierachy and food tourism in Finland: five cases. *British Food Journal* 109 (9), 721-734.

Weyermann, D. (Executive Producer) & Kenner, R. (Director). (2009). *Food, Inc.* [Motion Picture]. United States: Magnolia Pictures.

Yun, D., Hennessey, S., & MacDonald, R. (2011). Understanding culinary tourists: Segmentations based on past culinary experiences and attitudes toward food-related behaviour. *2011 Annual ICHRIE Summer Conference*, Denver, Colorado.

Table 1. Survey samples, data collection period and method

Sample	Data Collection Period	Data Collection Method	Number
TerraVita Attendees, Chapel Hill, NC	September 2010	Online	71
Central Coast Agriculture Network Members, California	June 2011	Online	79
Undergraduate students from California Polytechnic Institute	October 2011 and April 2012	Online	159
7 th Street Public Market Visitors, Charlotte, NC	March 2012 and October 2012	Intercept	301
Festival of Legends Attendees, Pittsboro, NC	April 2012	Intercept	190

Table 2. Demographic Profile of Participants

Variable	Terra Vita attendees (N=71)	Cal Poly students (N=159)	California CSA/Cooperative (N=79)	Charlotte 7th Street Market (N=301)	Festival of Legends (N=190)
<i>Gender</i>					
Female	75.7%	72.8%	80.0%	58.5%	54.3%
Male	24.3%	27.2%	20.0%	41.5%	45.7%
<i>Age</i>					
18 - 29 years old	8.6%	98.1%	26.1%	32.8%	34.6%
30 – 39 years old	21.4%	.6%	8.7%	29.1%	34.1%
40 – 49 years old	18.6%	.6%	11.6%	16.9%	19.8%
50 – 59 years old	28.6%	0%	30.4%	13.5%	8.8%
60+	22.9%	.6%	23.1%	7.8%	2.7%
<i>Number of adults in household</i>					
Zero	0%			.3%	0%
One	20.0%		18.7%	22.9%	12.9%
Two	71.4%		64.0%	66.0%	66.1%
Three	4.3%		6.7%	5.1%	13.4%
Four or more	4.3%		10.7%	5.8%	7.6%
<i>Number of children in household</i>					
None	42.5%		75.0%	69.9%	65%
One	22.5%		15.0%	9.2%	13.1%
Two	30.0%		10.0%	14.0%	16.4%
Three	5.0%		0%	5.1%	3.8%
Four or more	0%		0%	1.7%	1.6%
<i>Education</i>					
High School	4.3%		8.1%		
Arts Training	1.4%		0%		
Community College			13.5%		
Technical School	2.9%		0%		
Four-year College or University	40.6%		48.6%		
Advanced Degree	49.3%		29.7%		
<i>Income</i>					
Under \$50,000	11.8%		41.3%		
\$50-100,000	36.8%		28.6%		
\$100-150,000	19.1%		14.3%		
\$150-200,000	16.2%		11.1%		
More than	16.2%		4.8%		

\$200,000

Table 3. Foodie Activity Dimensions

Dimension	Cal Poly students (N=159) <i>Six factors</i>	Charlotte 7 th Street Market (N=301) <i>Eight factors</i>	Festival of Legends (N=190) <i>Eight factors</i>
Number of scale items	49 items	51 items	56 items
KMO	0.889	0.881	0.845
Total variance explained	58.9%	52.4%	56.2%
Sustainable Food Activist	<p>Attending a farm tour</p> <p>Attending sustainable agriculture events/meetings</p> <p>Being politically active on food issues</p> <p>Contributing to food blogs</p> <p>Following state or national food issues</p> <p>Keeping up with sustainable agriculture happenings</p> <p>Participate in Community Supported Agriculture</p> <p>Participate in Community Supported Fisheries</p> <p>Read books about sustainable food</p> <p>Reading food blogs</p> <p>See movies about sustainable food</p> <p>Volunteering at a farm tour ($\alpha = .928$; Factor 1; explained 14.8% of variance)</p>	<p>Attending a farm tour</p> <p>Attending food industry meetings</p> <p>Attending sustainable agriculture events/meetings</p> <p>Being politically active on food issues</p> <p>Following state or national food issues</p> <p>Keeping up with sustainable agriculture happenings</p> <p>Participate in Community Supported Agriculture</p> <p>Read books about sustainable food</p> <p>Volunteering at a farm tour ($\alpha = .899$; Factor 1; explained 12.1% of variance)</p>	<p>Attending a farm tour</p> <p>Attending food industry meetings</p> <p>Attending sustainable agriculture events/meetings</p> <p>Being politically active on food issues</p> <p>Following state or national food issues</p> <p>Keeping up with sustainable agriculture happenings</p> <p>Learning specialty butchering techniques</p> <p>Participate in Community Supported Agriculture</p> <p>Participate in Community Supported Fisheries</p> <p>Raising livestock for your own consumption</p> <p>Read books about sustainable food</p> <p>See movies about sustainable food</p> <p>Volunteering at a farm tour ($\alpha = .895$; Factor 1; explained 11.8% of variance)</p>
Cooking	<p>Baking</p> <p>Cooking</p> <p>Creating new recipes</p> <p>Hosting food-centered gatherings at home</p> <p>Posting something on social media about</p>	<p>Baking</p> <p>Cooking</p> <p>Creating new recipes</p> <p>Grilling</p> <p>Trying new recipes</p>	<p>Baking</p> <p>Cooking</p> <p>Creating new recipes</p> <p>Grilling</p> <p>Trying new recipes</p>

food
 Reading about nutrition
 Reading food magazines
 Taking photos of food
Trying new recipes
 Visiting farmer's market
 Watching Food Network or cooking shows
 ($\alpha = .875$; Factor 2; explained 12.6% of variance)

($\alpha = .821$; Factor 2; explained 7.3% of variance)

($\alpha = .804$; Factor 4; explained 6.4% of variance)

Trendy
 Traveler

Eating at food trucks
Food influences your decision of where you take a vacation
 Keeping up with local restaurant happenings
 Seek out special types of animal products when traveling
Seek out special types of food experiences when traveling
Trying new food fads
Trying new restaurants
 ($\alpha = .805$; Factor 4; explained 7.7% of variance)

Attending food and beverage festivals
 Eating at food trucks
Food influences your decision of where you take a vacation
 Going on food-centered outings or vacations
 Keeping up with local restaurant/chef happenings
Seek out special types of food experiences when traveling
 Seek out special types of food products when traveling
Trying new food fads
Trying new restaurants
 ($\alpha = .865$; Factor 3; explained 6.4% of variance)

Attending county/state fairs to eat "fair food"
 Attending food/beverage festivals while traveling
 Eating at food trucks
Consider food when deciding where to vacation*
 Going on food-centered outings or vacations
 Seek out local drink products while traveling
Seek out special types of food experiences while traveling
 Seek out special types of food products while traveling
 Trying food from other cultures
Trying new food fads
Trying new restaurants
 ($\alpha = .859$; Factor 2; explained 8.0% of variance)

Gardening

Gardening (flowers)
Gardening (food)
Organic gardening
Seed-saving of heirloom varieties

Canning fruits or vegetables
Gardening (flowers)
Gardening (food)
Organic gardening

Gardening (flowers)
Gardening (food)
Organic gardening
Seed-saving of heirloom varieties

	($\alpha = .834$; Factor 5; explained 6.4% of variance)	Seed-saving of heirloom varieties ($\alpha = .812$; Factor 4; explained 6.4% of variance)	($\alpha = .852$; Factor 6; explained 6.0% of variance)
Cooking Competitor/DIY	Are a member of a Slow Food group Attend food competitions Attending a cooking class Attending food industry meetings Canning fruits or vegetables Learning specialty butchering techniques Participate in food or recipe competitions/ contests Raising livestock for your own consumption ($\alpha = .903$; Factor 3; explained 11.1% of variance)	Attend food competitions Participate in food or recipe competitions/ contests ($\alpha = .794$; Factor 6; explained 5.1% of variance)	Attend food competitions Attending a cooking class Canning fruits or vegetables Participate in food or recipe competitions/ contests ($\alpha = .759$; Factor 7; explained 5.8% of variance)
Drinking	Attending food and beverage festivals Beer-tasting Participating as a member of a wine or beer club Participating in a dinner club Wine-tasting ($\alpha = .820$; Factor 6; explained 6.2% of variance)	Beer-tasting Wine-tasting Participating as a member of a wine or beer club ($\alpha = .694$; Factor 8; explained 4.9% of variance)	Attending food and beverage festivals Beer-tasting Home-brewing Participating as a member of a wine or beer club Wine-tasting ($\alpha = .768$; Factor 5; explained 6.3% of variance)
Social Media / Networking	<i>Note: the social media and photo variables displayed under the Charlotte sample loaded onto the Cooking for the student sample</i>	Posting something on social media about food Taking photos of food ($\alpha = .855$; Factor 7; explained 4.9% of variance)	Contributing to food blogs Hosting food-centered gatherings at home Participating in a dinner club Posting something on social media about food Taking photos of food ($\alpha = .723$; Factor 8; explained 5.1% of variance)
Informed/		Attending a cooking class	Keeping up with local restaurant/chef

Specialty		Contributing to food blogs Reading about nutrition Reading food blogs Reading food magazines Shopping at specialty cookware stores Watching Food Network or cooking shows ($\alpha = .782$; Factor 5; explained 5.4% of variance)	happenings Reading food blogs Reading food magazines Reading the food section of the newspaper Shopping at specialty cookware stores Watching Food Network or cooking shows ($\alpha = .781$; Factor 3; explained 6.7% of variance)
Items with poor and/or multiple loadings	Going on food-centered outings or vacations Shopping at specialty cookware stores	Are a member of a Slow Food group Home-brewing Hosting food-centered gatherings at home Learning specialty butchering techniques Participate in Community Supported Fisheries Participating in a dinner club Raising livestock for your own consumption Visiting farmer's market	Are a member of a Slow Food group Traveling specifically to attend food/beverage festivals Visiting farmers market

Scale: 4=*always*; 3=*often*; 2=*sometimes*, 1=*never*

Cronbach's Alpha based on standardized items; items in bold are similar across all three samples

*Verbiage adapted from *Food influences your decision of where you take a vacation*

Table 4. Reliability tests for two smaller samples

Dimension	Terra Vita attendees (<i>N</i> =71)	California CSA/Cooperative (<i>N</i> =79)
Number of scale items	33 items	33 items
Sustainable Food Activist	Attend food and beverage festivals (could also go with drinking) Attending food industry meetings Attending sustainable agriculture events/meetings Keeping up with sustainable agriculture happenings Read books about sustainable food See movies about sustainable food Visiting farmers markets (α =.870)	Attending food industry meetings Attending sustainable agriculture events/meetings Keeping up with sustainable agriculture happenings (α =.707)
Cooking	Baking Cooking Creating new recipes Hosting food-centered gatherings at home Trying new recipes (α =.850)	Baking Cooking Creating new recipes Read books about sustainable food See movies about sustainable food Trying new recipes (α =.826)
Trendy	Contributing to food blogs Keeping up with local restaurant happenings Reading food blogs Reading food magazines Trying new food fads Watching Food Network or cooking shows (α =.790)	Contributing to food blogs Keeping up with local restaurant happenings Reading food blogs Reading food magazines Trying new food fads Trying new restaurants Watching Food Network or cooking shows (α =.767)
Gardening	Gardening (flowers) Gardening (food)	Gardening (flowers) Gardening (food)

	Organic gardening Seed-saving of heirloom varieties ($\alpha = .865$)	Organic gardening Seed-saving of heirloom varieties ($\alpha = .845$)
Drinking	Participating as a member of a wine or beer club Participating in a dinner club Trying new restaurants Wine-tasting ($\alpha = .724$)	Attending food and beverage festivals Beer-tasting Hosting food-centered gatherings at home Participating as a member of a wine or beer club Wine-tasting ($\alpha = .801$)
Niche Meats	Look for places that serve and sell animal products that do not contain hormones antibiotics Look for places that serve and sell animal products that were raised according to high standards of animal welfare when travel Seek out special types of animal products (local, artisanal, heritage) when travel ($\alpha = .860$)	Look for places that serve and sell animal products that do not contain hormones antibiotics when you travel Look for places that serve and sell animal products that were raised according to high standards of animal welfare when you travel Seek out special types of animal products (local, artisanal, heritage) when you travel ($\alpha = .840$)
Food-related Travel	Food influences decision of where you take a vacation Going on food-centered outings or vacations Seek out special types of food experiences when travel ($\alpha = .803$)	Food influences your decision of where you take a vacation Going on food-centered outings or vacations Seek out special types of food experiences when you travel ($\alpha = .737$)
Items with poor loadings	Beer-tasting	Participating in a dinner club Visiting farmer's market

Table 5. Gender Differences

Variable	Male Mean and SD	Female Mean and SD
Cal Poly students (N=159)	N=43	N=115
Sustainable Food Activist	1.32 (.503)	1.46 (.545)
Cooking *	1.96 (.437)	2.39 (.657)
Trendy Traveler	2.27 (.541)	2.25 (.607)
Gardening *	1.29 (.418)	1.50 (.597)
Cooking Competitor/ DIY	1.18 (.332)	1.25 (.454)
Drinking	1.57 (.543)	1.55 (.590)
Charlotte 7th Street Market (N=301)	N=122	N=172
Sustainable Food Activist	1.57 (.546)	1.66 (.600)
Cooking	2.60 (.743)	2.72 (.724)
Trendy Traveler	2.41 (.622)	2.74 (.635)
Gardening	1.50 (.614)	1.68 (.656)
Competitive/ DIY	1.30 (.612)	1.18 (.422)
Drinking	2.12 (.812)	1.92 (.722)
Social Media	1.81 (.921)	2.01 (1.01)
Informed	1.828 (.503)	2.11 (.572)
Festival of Legends (N=190)	N=85	N=101
Sustainable Food Activist	1.53 (.503)	1.59 (.537)
Cooking	2.81 (.667)	2.80 (.687)
Trendy Traveler	2.42 (.601)	2.30 (.595)
Gardening	1.66 (.682)	2.01 (.828)
Competitive/ DIY	1.34 (.466)	1.43 (.491)
Drinking	2.03 (.672)	1.84 (.683)
Social Media	1.68 (.617)	1.66 (.520)
Informed	1.86 (.642)	1.94 (.591)

*Statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$

Note: There were no significant differences in the Terra Vita or California Cooperative sample.

Table 6. Age Differences

Variable	18 - 29 years old <i>Mean (SD)</i>	30 – 39 years old <i>Mean (SD)</i>	40 – 49 years old <i>Mean (SD)</i>	50 – 59 years old <i>Mean (SD)</i>	60+ and older <i>Mean (SD)</i>
Charlotte 7th Street Market (N=301)	N=97	N=86	N=50	N=40	N=23
Sustainable Food Activist	1.52 (.501)	1.80 (.694)	1.53 (.425)	1.51 (.517)	1.72 (.663)
Cooking	2.67 (.697)	2.83 (.729)	2.46 (.717)	2.69 (.741)	2.81 (.724)
Trendy Traveler	2.43 (.612)	2.67 (.627)	2.37 (.610)	2.31 (.561)	2.36 (.646)
Gardening	1.40 (.506)	1.79 (.742)	1.49 (.594)	1.75 (.557)	1.86 (.737)
Competitive/ DIY	1.15 (.369)	1.34 (.625)	1.18 (.438)	1.29 (.6293)	1.22 (.331)
Drinking	1.97 (.721)	2.29 (.774)	1.77 (.608)	1.88 (.742)	1.86 (.909)
Social Media	2.08 (.950)	2.17 (.993)	1.87 (.963)	1.38 (.668)	1.54 (.953)
Informed	1.87 (.518)	2.05 (.576)	2.06 (.535)	2.08 (.611)	2.11 (.587)

*p<.05

Note: There were no significant differences among age groups in the Terra Vita, California Cooperative, or Festival of Legends sample. Because 98% of the students fell within the same age category (18-29 years), the ANOVA was not performed with this sample.

Table 7. Correlations across food activity dimensions in student sample

Cal Poly students (N=159)	Sustainable Food Activist	Cooking	Trendy	Gardening	Competition / DIY	Drinking
Sustainable Food	1					
Activist		1				
Cooking	.615**		1			
Trendy Traveler	.542**	.618**		1		
Gardening	.600**	.475**	.352**		1	
Competition/ DIY	.726**	.494**	.404**	.509**		1
Drinking	.537**	.475*	.371**	.353**	.493**	

*p<.05; **p<.01

Table 8. Correlations across food activity dimensions in urban market and medieval festival sample

Festival of Legends (N=190)	Sustainable Food Activist	Cooking	Trendy Traveler	Gardening	Competition / DIY	Drinking	Social Media	Informed
Sustainable Food Activist	1							
Cooking	.270**	1						
Trendy Traveler	.595**	.402**	1					
Gardening	.475**	.298**	.257**	1				
Competitive/ DIY	.486**	.364**	.424**	.311**	1			
Drinking	.446**	.362**	.574**	.223**	.350**	1		
Social Media	.454**	.376**	.562**	.256**	.422**	.384**	1	
Informed	.421**	.505**	.488**	.236**	.440**	.352**	.549**	1
Charlotte 7th Street Market (N=301)	Sustainable Food Activist	Cooking	Trendy Traveler	Gardening	Competition / DIY	Drinking	Social Media	Informed
Sustainable Food Activist	1							
Cooking	.277**	1						
Trendy Traveler	.500**	.481**	1					
Gardening	.436**	.404**	.255**	1				
Competitive/ DIY	.283**	.227**	.282**	.194**	1			
Drinking	.289**	.404**	.537**	.188**	.137**	1		
Social Media	.436**	.336**	.517**	.213**	.153**	.292**	1	
Informed	.453**	.588**	.636**	.341**	.256**	.352**	.407**	1

*p<.05; **p<.01

Table 9. Correlations across food activity dimensions in cooperative and sustainable food festival samples.

	Sustainable Food Activist	Cooking	Trendy	Gardening	Drinking	Niche Meats	Food-related Travel
Terra Vita (N=71)							
Sustainable Food Activist	1						
Cooking	.420**	1					
Trendy	.394**	.443**	1				
Gardening	.249*	.315**	.073	1			
Drinking	.315*	.450**	.428**	.138	1		
Niche Meats	.398**	.348**	.083	.308**	.012	1	
Food-related Travel	.508**	.525**	.577**	.205	.453**	.373**	1
	Sustainable Food Activist	Cooking	Trendy	Gardening	Drinking	Niche Meats	Food-related Travel
California Cooperative (N=79)							
Sustainable Food Activist	1						
Cooking	.362**	1					
Trendy	.190	.231*	1				
Gardening	.374**	.494**	-.030	1			
Drinking	.111	.256*	.270*	-.090	1		
Niche Meats	.206	.169	.166	.043	.172	1	
Food-related Travel	.194	.139	.375**	-.007	.351**	.443**	1

*p<.05; **p<.01

Table 10. Summary of Study Hypotheses

Hypothesis	Study Result
H1: Food-related activities cannot be aggregated into food activity dimensions.	Rejected
H2: Food-related activities factor into different dimensions across various samples.	Partially supported
H3a: There is no difference between male and females regarding food activity dimensions.	Partially supported
H3b: There is no difference between age groups regarding food activity dimensions.	Partially supported
H4: There is no relationship between/among the food activity dimensions themselves.	Rejected