A STUDY OF TRAVELERS' FOODIE ACTIVITY DIMENSIONS, DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS, AND TRIP BEHAVIORS

By

Erin Green

April, 2013

Director of Thesis: Dr. Carol Kline

Major Department: Sustainable Tourism

People who identify themselves as foodies may do so for vastly different reasons. From interests in sustainable agriculture to gardening, they differ in their lifestyles and behaviors. These interests can be grouped into foodie activity dimensions. Through a tourism lens, someone with a strong interest in one of these dimensions may travel longer or spend more money during their travels.

This study looks at potential tourists to Minneapolis, Minnesota. Using the theory of involvement, travelers' travel habits and demographics will be studied based on their interest in foodie activity dimensions. These dimensions are segmented based on factor analysis of their enjoyment of food-related activities. The travel habits dimensions are investigated to learn more about their effect on the destination. This information is valuable for destination marketing organizations in order to know which foodie activity dimensions should be targeted through destination marketing efforts or which food-related activities they may want to advertise to potential tourists based on their food-related interests.

A STUDY OF TRAVELERS' FOODIE ACTIVITY DIMENSIONS, DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS, AND TRIP BEHAVIORS

A Thesis

Presented To the Faculty of Sustainable Tourism

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

M.S. Sustainable Tourism

by

Erin Green

April, 2013

A STUDY OF TRAVELERS' FOODIE ACTIVITY DIMENSIONS, DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS, AND TRIP BEHAVIORS

by

Erin Green

APPROVED BY:

DIRECTOR OF THESIS_____

(Carol Kline, PhD, Assistant Professor, Sustainable Tourism)

COMMITTEE MEMBER_____

(Huili Hao, PhD, Research Director, Center for Sustainable Tourism)

COMMITTEE MEMBER_____

(Alleah Crawford, PhD, Assistant Professor, Hospitality Management)

COMMITTEE MEMBER_____

(Kevin Hanstad, MBA, Director of Market Research, Meet Minneapolis)

DIRECTOR M.S. SUSTAINABLE TOURISM _____

(Patrick Long, PhD, Center for Sustainable Tourism)

DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL _____

(Paul J. Gemperline, PhD)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my committee for all of their support throughout this project. Kevin, when I first called you to approach the idea of partnering on this research, I only could have dreamed that I would receive the enthusiastic and welcoming response that I did. I have been so lucky to have been able to work with you and the resources you and Meet Minneapolis have been able to provide me. Dr. Crawford, you are always such a pleasure to talk with and I've appreciated your ideas and feedback throughout this process. Dr. Hao, you are a stats goddess. Thank you for multiple office sessions of working through research challenges. Finally, Dr. Kline, I am so grateful for the attention you have given me and this project. You are the queen of multi-tasking, and knowing how much you have on your plate (foodie pun intended) affirms the commitment you have to assisting your students to do the best work they can do. From Cuba to butter carving conversations, I have truly appreciated your mentoring throughout my time at ECU.

Dr. Fridgen, you proved the fact I can always find some Minnesota nice wherever I may end up. Thank you for making my years at the Center a knee-slapping good time. Dr. Long, from the first phone call I received from my "NC Visit Planning Team" to our ice skating afternoons, you have been such a joy to get to work for and get to know. The opportunities I have been provided through you and this program have been invaluable and I can't thank you enough for your guidance and friendship. My fellow SUTO students, you are the ones that have made grad school an incredibly fun time. Finally, a giant life-long thank you to my family. In the parent message section of my high school yearbook, you wrote "you've got roots, you've got wings, enjoy the flight." I have the deepest roots I could hope for and have had the best flight I could ever want with your support. Thank you now and forever.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

A Study of Travelers' Foodie Activity Dimensions, Demographic Characteristics, and Trip Behaviors

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine potential visitors to Minneapolis, Minnesota based on their enjoyment of food-related activities to produce a scale of foodie activity dimensions and compare visitor characteristics and travel behavior according to their level of enjoyment on the various dimensions. For the purpose of this study, a foodie is defined as someone that has a very strong interest in food (Barr and Levy, 1985). This definition is broad, and the term encompasses a population of people with varying interests and participation in activities related to food, which is why investigating how the population's enjoyment of various food-related activities fall into different foodie activity dimensions is important. Once the dimensions are identified, it will be possible to take a closer look at the kind of characteristics and visitor behavior associated with each dimension. This information is valuable for marketing the destination as it will provide insight into the activities and habits of foodies that they would like to attract to their destination. Destination marketing organizations and businesses that offer food experiences can decide how to best market the destination to the most desirable groups.

Attracting visitors is important for the sustainability of a destination. Learning more about the interests of potential tourists will help a destination to ensure the viability of continuing to profit from the economic impact of visitors. Many visitors desire authentic experiences while traveling, and local foods and beverages are one important way to offer those experiences. Local foods are also a way for visitors to connect with the community, spend money in ways that support local businesses and farmers, and discourage emissions associated with transporting food

(Sims, 2009). This study will provide insights into the food-related activities tourists are interested in so that a destination can consider how to best feature its food and beverage experiences in order to attract tourists and support local businesses.

1.2 Objectives/Research Questions

The first objective of this study is to investigate whether a survey instrument can be reliable and valid in producing foodie activity dimensions. In the case that it is, the second objective is to describe the different foodie activity dimensions based on the respondents' enjoyment of the food-related activities listed on the survey. The final objective is to compare the characteristics and travel behaviors of the participants according to their foodie dimension scores. The following research questions will be investigated:

1. Can foodie activities be factored into activity dimensions?
2. Are there differences in foodie activity dimension scores among respondents with varying socio-demographic characteristics?
3. Are there differences in foodie activity dimension scores among respondents with varying travel behaviors?
4. How do the respondents with varying foodie activity dimension scores rate themselves when asked to what degree they identify as a foodie?

1.3 Linkages between Food-related Activities and Sustainable Tourism

The World Tourism Organization defines sustainable tourism as "tourism, which meets the needs of present tourists and host regions while protecting and enhancing opportunity for the future," (World Tourism Organization, 1993, p. 7). The concept is oriented around three pillars: social, economic, and environmental and aims to foster sustainable growth in all three of these dimensions (Sims, 2009).

According to Fons, Fierro, and Patiño (2011), the economic side of sustainable tourism encompasses "viability of tourism in the destination area, viability of companies" and "demand satisfaction" (p. 552). In order for a destination to be sustainable, a continued flow of satisfied visitors is very important. This study will provide valuable insights about the food-related interests of potential tourists, and will illustrate if certain dimensions are more economically valuable for a destination to attract, through its investigation of vacation expenditures and other aspects of travel behavior.

A key principle of sustainability is to preserve human heritage (Bramwell & Lane, 1993). Through tourism, traditional aspects of the host culture can be shared and preserved. Some visitor markets seek out authentic experiences, and food consumption is one way to experience the unique flair of a region (Everett & Aitchison, 2008; Sánchez-Cañizares & López-Guzmán, 2012; Scarpato & Daniele, 2003; Sims, 2009; Reynolds, 1993). Reynolds argues that food is "perhaps one of the last areas of authenticity that is affordable on a regular basis by the tourist" (1993, p. 49).

The environmental pillar of sustainability can also be supported by food-related tourism. Agritourism experiences that allow a visitor to learn more about the cultivation and production of food has the potential to impact people in a way that increases their awareness of environmental issues and sustainability (Knowd, 2006; Sims, 2009; Spurlock, 2009). Promoting sustainably produced food-related products to visitors can also be a method of encouraging and strengthening sustainable agriculture (Sims, 2009)

Destinations hoping to foster sustainable tourism development should understand the linkages between food-related activities and community and environment. Featuring sustainable food attractions and products will help support local business owners, encourage sustainable

agriculture, preserve cultural heritage, and bring a sense of authenticity that so many visitors are seeking.

2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1 What is a Foodie?

One of the first formal uses of the term "foodie" was in 1982 in an essay called 'Cuisine Poseur' published in Harpers and Queen magazine (Barr & Levy, 1985). The "foodie" movement rose to a new level when a book devoted to this 'class' of people was published in 1985 by Ann Barr and Paul Levy: *The Official Foodie Handbook*. The tagline of the book reads "Be Modern – Worship Food." Barr and Levy define a foodie simply as "a person who is very, very, very interested in food" (1985, p. 6). Their book contains a timeline of historical events that relate to the foodie world, discusses the relationship between health and food, famous recipes, restaurants, and chefs, global food, foodie society, and many other topics, written in a light-hearted and entertaining fashion.

A more recent contribution to the world of foodie literature comes from Johnston and Baumann (2010) through their book *Foodies: Democracy and Distinction in the Gourmet Foodscape*. The authors interviewed 30 participants on a range of topics including their personal definition of a foodie, food media, shopping habits, cooking habits, eating out, authenticity, and exoticism, as well as demographic information including age, ethnicity, highest educational degree achieved occupation, and income. The authors offer a detailed history of "foodie-ism" beginning with the 1940's when French haute cuisine was fashionable to the present day popularity of organic and local foods and the impact on technology on foodie culture. Additionally, they delineated four ways that foodies can be defined: education, identity, exploration, and evaluation. While one assumption might be that a foodie is someone who is well educated about food or cooking, Johnston and Baumann (2010) make a distinction that foodies usually have an interest and enthusiasm for learning about food, regardless of their

knowledge level. In terms of identity, a foodie incorporates food as a part of their inner-self, whether that is through family traditions that shaped their upbringing or a lens through which they view the world. The "exploration" characteristic often means a foodie is always trying new foods or types of cuisines, or perhaps always trying new recipes. Finally, enjoyment is "synonymous with evaluation of food" (Johnston and Bauman, 2010, p. 65) for foodies. They enjoy trying new foods and the process of discussing and evaluating the food. They may have high standards for their food, but this doesn't necessarily mean their food needs to be expensive or gourmet, which is also a common perception of foodies (Johnston & Baumann, 2010). The popularity of food trucks and unique fair foods are examples of up and coming foodie culture that shirks the idea of being expensive or gourmet (Hermosillo, 2012; Mayerowitz, 2009). Additionally, they note that foodies are often represented as elitist, snobby, or patronizing. This idea is supported in other literature as well (Ambrozas, 2003; Cairns, Johnston, & Baumann, 2010).

Beyond Johnston and Baumann's book, scholarly research on foodies is somewhat sparse. Cairns, Johnston, and Baumann (2010) investigated the role of gender in foodie culture. Their definition of foodies is "people with a long-standing passion for eating and learning about food but who are not food professionals" (Cairns, Johnston, and Baumann, 2010, p. 592). Ambrozas (2003) defined a foodie as someone "whose identity is formed in some way by eating 'good food' and by regularly consuming a range of food related products from food magazines and cooking television shows to highly specialized kitchen tools" (p. 13). Robinson and Getz (2012, p.3) define a foodie as someone that has an "underlying passion, or involvement, with food" in their study of foodies and their travel experiences (their results are discussed later in the literature review). Ruth Bourdain (2012) notes that 'foodies' is "…an umbrella term for people

with an interest in food, cooking, and restaurants. It has come to acquire an unsavory association with snobbishness or faddishness" (p. 25). The Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary also includes the concept of fads in its definition of a foodie: "a person having an avid interest in the latest food fads" (2012).

Additionally, the tourism industry itself is embracing the term, and is beginning to cater marketing messages to self-proclaimed foodies. The Calaveras County Convention and Visitors Bureau in California operates a website titled GoCalaverasFoodie.com. The site lists local restaurants, food-related events, features recipes and chefs, and explains their Calaveras Grown program for labeling local produce. The site has a page called "What is a Foodie?" which explains the difference between a foodie and a gourmet. They define foodies as "amateurs who simply love food for consumption, study, preparation, and news" (para. 1). They further note, "gourmets simply want to eat the best food, whereas foodies want to learn everything about food, both the best and the ordinary, and about the science, industry, and personalities surrounding food" (para. 1). In short, foodies have various hobbies within the food realm (GoCalaverasFoodie, 2012).

The convention and visitors bureau of Asheville, North Carolina has a section of their website dedicated to what they refer to as their "foodtopian society." This unique food movement intertwines local and sustainable food into daily life and is strongly propelled at the grassroots level. Whether it is farmers markets, microbreweries, or farm-to-table restaurants, Asheville realizes its food assets and markets them to potential visitors. Their website features "forest to table" experiences that involve gathering edibles from the woods and learning to cook them, the "Taste of Asheville" culinary event, culinary travel packages, and vegan and vegetarian cooking classes. Food is an extremely important part of the Asheville community and

the convention and visitors bureau realizes the potential it has to attract visitors (Explore Asheville, 2013).

While there have been attempts to define a foodie, these definitions are broad and encompass a range of people who may be very different in their food interests and food-related activities. A foodie might cook exclusively with produce from his or her own garden, frequent upscale restaurants, be politically active in changing government regulations on food production, or blog about their cooking and eating adventures. This study examines the food-related activities and habits of the traveling public, and potential foodies, in order to identify different dimensions of foodie activities.

2.2 Foodie Typologies

Barr and Levy (1985) developed a foodie typology that designates seven different foodies (See Table 1). These seven types were a first attempt at classifying foodies and depict many different food-related interests.

Table 1. Barr and Levy's Foodie Types

Foodie Type	Description
Whole-foodier Than Thou	Uses only organic methods growing their own produce and flowers, slaughters their own meat, uses simple ingredients in their cooking
Squalor Scholar Cook	Does their research and knows the history of their favorite foods and recipes, sticks to traditional recipes, has the academic and historical knowledge of food to set them apart from others
Made in Paris	Starts off learning basic cooking techniques in small restaurants and manages to move themselves up the ranks through their connections to make a living cooking in Paris, a foodie mecca
Paris C'est un Dump	Ultimate upscale foodie that spends much of their time in expensive restaurants, subscribes to important food magazines, and is extremely picky
Gorgeous East in Me	Drawn to ethnic and foreign foods, constantly wants to try new things and experience new cultures through food
Foodies on Ice	Regards food as artistic material, aims to impress by creating ice sculptures, elaborately decorated cakes, or butter statues
All-American	Small-town foodie that searches out local food and ingredients that deserve attention, constantly attempts to improve their crops and create new dishes

A more recent foodie typology was published by a food writer on the Huffington Post internet newspaper in 2011 and included ten types of foodies: Made it Myself, Organivore, Europhile, One Upper, Snob, Anti-Snob, Avoider, Blogging Food Pornographer, Bacon Lover, and DIYer (Do-It-Yourself-er) (Brones, 2011). The Made It Myself and the DIYer differ in the type of product they are making. Where the Made It Myself foodie aims to impress with the fancy dishes they can create, the DIYer makes their own granola or grows their own herbs. The Organivore is often shopping at farmers markets and want to know exactly where their food is coming from. The Europhile has a strong interest in European food trends. The One-Upper likes to share the unique food experiences that they have had at any chance they get. The Snob is extremely picky with upscale tastes, while the Anti-Snob scoffs at upscale tastes and yet still has a specific taste in restaurants, often small diners or food trucks. The Avoider is one that latches onto a trendy health-focused diet that avoids gluten, dairy, meat, or another specific ingredient.

The Blogging Food Pornographer is constantly taking pictures of something they cooked or their meal at a restaurant and uploading them to social media. As expected, the Bacon Lover has an obsession for anything involving the popular fried meat. The presence of this article on the Huffington Post, a popular source of news on the Internet, demonstrates that the trend of foodie culture has continued to grow and develop since *The Official Foodie Handbook* was released two decades ago.

Taking an even lighter approach, Ruth Bourdain's book *Comfort Me with Offal* (2012) contains an extensive guide to modern foodies with 85 types. Table 2 features a few examples.

Table 2. Examples of Bourdain's Foodie Types

Foodie Type	Description
Chefestants	Culinary contestants vying for fame and cash prizes on television reality cooking shows
Coffeegeeks	A species of highly caffeinated humans with an unhealthy addiction to coffee, brewing techniques, and coffee-making equipment and gear
Dining Digerati	Recently evolved species of gastronomes who communicate in the form of blog posts, tweets, and message-board posting
Locapours	Individuals who seek to drink only wine, beer, and spirits produced locally
Pizzaratti	These pizza snobs are on the eternal quest for pizza perfection and endlessly debate the merits of various types of pizza crust, cheese, sauce, and toppings

While Bourdain's categories of foodies is devoid of empirical support and was developed for entertainment purposes only, it is offered here as a testament to the increased presence of popular literature about foodies, and to emphasize the uniqueness of a research-based description of dimensions of foodie activities.

2.3 Food in Tourism

Food is an important part of the tourist experience. However, a growing number of visitors are traveling with the principal motivation of food or food-related activities and upwards

of 25% of all tourist spending is on food (Green & Dougherty, 2009; Quan & Wang, 2004; Sánchez-Cañizares & López-Guzmán, 2012). In 2004, Long defined culinary tourism as "the intentional, exploratory participation in the foodways of an other – participation including the consumption, preparation, and presentation of a food item, cuisine, meal system, or eating style considered to belong to a culinary system not one's own" (Long, 2004, p. 21). This phenomenon has other names, including food tourism, gastronomic tourism, and gourmet tourism (Okumus, Okumus, & McKercher, 2007; Sánchez-Cañizares & López-Guzmán, 2012).

Quan and Wang (2004) attempted to build a model of the tourist experience using food as an example. They discuss the difference between the peak experience and the supporting experiences that make up tourism. The peak experience is the primary reason one is traveling, and is most often studied in social science literature. The supporting experience is usually studied in marketing and management literature and involves such experiences as lodging, food, and transportation. While these are complementary to the peak experience, they are extremely important to ensuring that the visitor is satisfied with their visit. If the visitor has a poor experience with hotel and meals, they may not be satisfied with their visit, even if the peak attraction was rewarding (Quan & Wang, 2004). Food is a valuable aspect of the tourism experience to study, as it is a part of every tourist's supporting experience, and is the peak experience for a growing number of culinary tourists. Even those that may travel for sightseeing or other more mainstream tourism attractions often discover that the local food may be worth more of their time or discover food-related attractions that capture their attention. Food consumption habits are an extremely important part of destination marketing as it is a unique aspect of culture (Quan & Wang, 2004).

Sims (2009) investigated the role of local foods in the tourism industry. Interviews with tourists to two United Kingdom regions found that sixty percent of tourists said that they had chosen to experience local food and beverage products. Sánchez-Cañizares and López-Guzmán (2012) interviewed 206 visitors to ten restaurants in Córdoba, Spain about travel motivations as related to food, and found that 68% of tourists take local cuisine in account when deciding where to visit. There is a quest among visitors to seek out authentic experiences that provide a unique experience to the destination, and food consumption is one way to do this (Sims, 2009). As foodies already hold a vested interest in food, seeking out unique food products while traveling is most likely a common trait of their travel behavior.

2.4 Profiles of Culinary Tourists

As mentioned previously, most every tourist participates in culinary experiences simply by making the choice to consume food or beverage at the destination. However, culinary tourists represent a niche of the tourist market that is motivated to travel for culinary purposes, and numerous studies have been done to describe them (Ignatov & Smith, 2006; MacLaurin, Blose, & Mack, 2007; Sánchez-Cañizares & López-Guzmán, 2012; Seery, 2010; Shenoy, 2005; Smith & Costello, 2009; Yun, Hennessey, & Mac Donald, 2011).

Sánchez-Cañizares and López-Guzmán (2012) profiled culinary tourists based on interviews with visitors to ten restaurants in Córdoba. They segmented the participants into three groups: those that stated local cuisine was the principal reason for traveling; those that said local food was important to take into account when planning a trip, but isn't the primary reason for traveling; and those whose food is a secondary reason to travel. The study then compared socio-demographics and details of travel such as country of origin, reason for visit, and length of stay, but found little difference between the segments according to education, gender, length of stay,

or nationality. One interesting conclusion of the study is that the culinary tourists that traveled primarily for local cuisine were the most satisfied of all three groups with the visit and the local food experience during the visit (Sánchez-Cañizares & López-Guzmán, 2012).

Yun et al. (2011) used two different approaches to segment individuals who had requested visitor information packets from Tourism Prince Edward Island. One approach classified participants based on the level of participation in food experiences and food-related activities as primary motivations to travel, while the second approach segmented the sample based on attitudes towards food-related behavior at home and when traveling. The first approach resulted in four segments: deliberate culinary tourists, opportunistic culinary tourists, accidental culinary tourists, and uninterested culinary tourists (See Table 3).

Table 3. Culinary Tourist Segmentation Based on Participation in Food Experiences and Food-related Activities as Trip Motivation

Segment	Percentage	Description
Deliberate Culinary Tourists	15.4%	"Often identified as 'foodies' and compared to other respondents they participate in more food-related activities and at higher than average rates" (Yun et al., 2011, p. 4)
Opportunistic Culinary Tourists	38.7%	Do not travel primarily for culinary experiences but take advantage of food-related activities while traveling
Accidental Culinary Tourists	39.1%	Participate in food-related activities that they may run across such as a going to a farmer's market or eating at a restaurant that features local foods, but do not deliberately seek out such experiences
Uninterested Culinary Tourists	6.9%	Have not participated in food-related activities while traveling in the past two years

Source: Yun, Hennessey, & MacDonald (2011)

The second approach to segmentation (food-related behavior at home and traveling) results in three segments: culinary-balanced tourists, culinary-oriented tourists, and familiarity-oriented tourists. Culinary-balanced tourists have a moderately high interest in organic foods, and in food-related experiences while traveling. The culinary-oriented tourists have high or

moderately high interest in the previously mentioned categories, as well as cooking and wine/beer related experiences. The familiarity-oriented tourists are more likely than the other segments to participate in food experiences that are familiar to them. This study also investigates the relationship between the two approaches of segmentation. They found that culinary-balanced tourists were more likely to be opportunistic and accidental culinary tourists, which means they tend to take advantage of culinary experiences while traveling, but balance them with other activities. Culinary-oriented tourists were most likely to be deliberate and opportunistic culinary tourists who often build culinary experiences into their trip, as well as participate in experiences they encounter during the trip. Finally, familiarity-oriented tourists were found to be mostly accidental and uninterested culinary tourists, whom despite a lack of interest, may participate in culinary experiences if they happen upon them (Yun et al., 2011).

The current study aims to move away from studying the culinary tourist and focus on the general traveling publics with specific attention being paid to their interest in food-related activities, at home and while traveling. Market segmentation is used in many fields but within the realm of tourism, it has been used to segment a wide range of tourism activities, from Wyoming snowmobilers to potential ecotourists in Scotland (May, Bastian, Taylor, & Whipple, 2001; Zografos & Allcroft, 2007). While segmentation studies often include demographic questions, it is commonly accepted that it is better to segment based on psychographic factors or involvement in order to investigate tourist behavior (Johns & Gyimóthy, 2002). González and Bello (2002) characterize two principal methodologies used in market segmentation of tourists. The first classifies visitors based on general lifestyle choices and the second focuses on lifestyle choices pertaining only to the product being investigated. They argue that “market segmentation

by general lifestyle would allow more in-depth awareness of variables influencing consumers' behavior" (González & Bello, 2002, p. 57).

While many of the segmentation studies in the literature related to food and tourists are based on food-related travel motivations, this study aims for a more general approach, based on lifestyles related to food at home, as well as while traveling. However, these may or may not be similar, as many tourists bring their habits from home with them when they travel (Quan & Wang, 2004). The literature on culinary tourists is growing, but there is no analysis of the traveling public based on their involvement with food while at home.

2.5 Food-Activity Involvement

There are a plethora of studies within the tourism literature that focus on involvement as it relates to consumers' search for products as well as their purchasing decisions. Kyle and Chick (2002) describe involvement as "the degree to which a person devotes him or herself to an activity or associated product." Previous research has found that producing involvement profiles is a valid method of finding distinct target markets (Kyle, Kerstetter, & Guadagnolo, 2002). For destination marketing organizations that focus their marketing based on customer needs and desires, involvement is an important issue to consider. Food and food-related activities are key products marketed to tourists and therefore, food involvement should be considered in marketing destinations.

This study uses involvement with food-related activities as a way to investigate how demographics and travel behaviors vary among foodie activity dimensions. Bell and Marshall (2003) constructed a food involvement scale (Table 4) to investigate whether participants highly involved with food could discriminate between food samples better than those less involved.

Bell and Marshall (2003) used Goody's five stages of the life cycle of food to create their scale. The five stages are acquisition, preparation, cooking, eating, and disposal (Goody, 1982). They asked 30 participants to come up with statements that reflected each stage in terms of food involvement, and created their scale based on those responses. The participants were lab employees, public health graduate students, and military academy undergraduate students.

Table 4. Bell and Marshall's Food Involvement Scale

Food involvement scale item
1. I don't think much about food each day.
2. Cooking or barbequing is not much fun.
3. Talking about what I ate or am going to eat is something I like to do.
4. Compared with other daily decisions, my food choices are not very important.
5. When I travel, one of the things I anticipate most is eating the food there.
6. I do most or all of the clean up after eating.
7. I enjoy cooking for others and myself.
8. When I eat out, I don't think or talk much about how the food tastes.
9. I do not like to mix or chop food.
10. I do most or all of my own food shopping.
11. I do not wash dishes or clean the table.
12. I care whether or not a table is nicely set.

Bell and Marshall (2003) concluded that the scale has reliability through a test and retest method with two samples of respondents. Items with low item-total correlations or low face validity were removed, leaving the final scale with 20 items. They emphasized that food involvement is important in many food choice behaviors, beyond taste discrimination, and declared that further research in food choice behavior should consider food involvement. Yun et al. (2011) also note that food-related behavior of tourists helps marketing agencies target specific groups of consumers, e.g. culinary tourists.

2.6 Foodie Travel Behavior

Robinson and Getz (2012) performed a study about foodies and their travel experiences. They based their study on the assumption that foodies are travelers who look for and participate

in food tourism experiences. The survey instrument itself was developed from a food involvement scale Robinson and Getz developed based on a leisure involvement scale by Kyle, Absher, Norman, Hammitt, and Jodice (2007) and Goody's life cycle of food (1982). The online survey, targeting Australians who consider themselves foodies, asked about involvement in food related activities, food related events, travel activities, and demographics; over 700 responses were received (Robinson and Getz, 2012). The majority of the sample was females, under the age of 40, well educated, and affluent. The results indicated that there were high levels of food involvement among the respondents. Just over one third (34%) of participants subscribed to or regularly purchased food magazines. About one-fifth (19%) participated in online food blogs or communities, while 6% of participants belonged to a food club and 11% belonged to a wine club. As far as travel behavior is concerned, one third of respondents (33%) were planning a domestic food travel experience within the next year (Robinson & Getz, 2012). Table 5 shows the highest food involvement items from the survey.

Table 5: Robinson and Getz Highest Ranking Food Involvement Scale Items (n=541)

Item	Mean*	Standard Deviation
I really hate having a bad meal experience	6.26	1.209
I like to experiment with food from different cultures	5.87	1.227
Being careful not to waste food is important to me	5.83	1.118
My special family occasions are often marked with a truly great meal	5.76	1.212
A well equipped kitchen is important to me	5.73	1.145
Table etiquette says a lot about a person	5.63	1.271
Nothing satisfies me more than eating a splendid meal	5.60	1.378
Dining out is one of the most enjoyable things I do	5.60	1.287
My kitchen and equipment are always clean	5.59	1.370
Sharing memorable dining experiences bonds me with my friends	5.58	1.199

Note: 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree

The most popular food-related events respondents participated in were farmers markets, ethnic or cultural festivals, wine or food tasting events, food-themed festivals, and visiting very expensive restaurants. These results suggest that foodies enjoy activities in which they are actively participating (Robinson and Getz, 2012). When asked about their preferred Australian destination food-related experiences, the most preferred experience is "enjoying authentic regional cuisine in local restaurants." The following results support the idea that the respondents like to participate in active experiences, and show a preference for cultural attractions (Robinson and Getz, 2012). Robinson and Getz's (2012) study is unique as it investigates self-designated foodies and their interests in food tourism whereas most research studies designated food tourists.

2.7 Summary of Literature Review

In today's world of technology, one can "travel" around the world from the comfort of their living room via television and the Internet. However, the tastes and smells of local foods are something that must be experienced firsthand. *The Official Foodie Handbook* proclaims that "this is why Foodies, above all people, love travel" (Barr & Levy, 1985, p. 80). There remains a significant gap in the academic literature regarding foodies. A research-supported framework of foodie activity dimensions has yet to be developed. The varying travel behavior of people with different levels of interest in dimensions of food activities also has yet to be investigated. According to Quan and Wang, "…it is necessary to segment markets of tourists in terms of their different food habits and preferences" (2004, p. 302). This study aims to fill those gaps.

3. METHODS

3.1 Description of Sample

The population for this study is individuals that have demonstrated an interest in visiting Minneapolis. The sampling frame is made up of people who have made an inquiry for travel information to the Meet Minneapolis Convention and Visitors Bureau. This study's intent is to investigate the general traveling public, therefore participants were included in the results even if they did not end up visiting Minneapolis.

3.2 Survey Development and Distribution

The instrument used (Appendix A) was based on a previously validated survey developed and tested on four smaller populations (Green & Kline, 2012; Green & Kline, 2013). While this instrument was used as a foundation for the current study, the items on the scale were refined based on the above literature, and questions about last vacation or getaway were added.

The first section of the survey instrument asks the participant to rate themselves on a foodie scale from ten to zero, ten being a 'total foodie' and zero meaning 'not a foodie at all'. For this question the following definition of the term 'foodie' was developed and offered:

> *'A "foodie" is someone who has strong interest in food. A foodie might be interested in eating high quality food, cooking with local foods or trying new recipes, following trends in nutrition, restaurants, chefs, or food, or traveling to try new foods or drinks.'*

Following that, 58 food-related activities were listed using the phrase 'I enjoy participating in…'; respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with each. The response choices (strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, disagree, strongly disagree) were based on a 6-point Likert scale, with an additional "No opinion" option. Studies have found that a 6-point scale has high reliability and is suitable for research with many

variables such as this one as six is not enough to overwhelm the participant with too many response options (Chomeya, 2010; Green & Rao, 1970). An even number of points forces respondents to have an opinion, which encourages deeper processing of the item and minimizes social desirability bias (Smyth et al., 2006; Garland, 1991). The items on the questionnaire that were not included on the original instrument are listed in Table 6.

Table 6. Items Added to or Changed from Previous Instrument

Item	Reference
I regularly visit farms/orchards	Yun, Hennessey, & MacDonald, 2011
I regularly shop at specialty cookware/food stores	MacLaurin, Blose, & Mack, 2007
I regularly purchase locally grown and/or organic food	MacLaurin, Blose, & Mack, 2007
I think about food a lot during the day	Bell & Marshall, 2003
I enjoy discussing activities related to food	Shenoy, 2005
Participating in activities related to food is one of the most enjoyable things I do	Shenoy, 2005
When I eat out, I think or talk a lot about how the food tastes	Bell & Marshall, 2003

The second section of the survey instrument investigated seven aspects of the participants food-related travel behavior using the same question format as described above. The third section asked questions about their last leisure vacation and included questions about their length of stay, primary purpose of travel, number in the travel party, type of lodging utilized, method of travel to destination, tools used to plan the trip, and an approximation of expenditures on lodging, food, activities, and transportation (Stynes & White, 2006; Etzel & Woodside, 1982; Leeworthy, English, & Kriesel, 2001; Long & Perdue, 1990). Finally, the last part of the survey included questions about socio-demographics including age, gender, household income, and zip code or country of origin (Sánchez-Cañizares & López-Guzmán, 2012; Robinson & Getz, 2012).

The instrument was piloted with 12 students in a graduate-level sustainable tourism course at East Carolina University and reviewed by an expert panel including faculty at East

Carolina University, staff at the Meet Minneapolis Convention and Visitors Bureau, and members of the food service industry (see Table 7).

Table 7. Expert Panel

Name	Title
Dr. Stephanie Jilcott-Pitts	Assistant Professor, Department of Public Health, East Carolina University
Dr. Patrick Long	Director, East Carolina University Center for Sustainable Tourism
Dr. Jason Oliver	Assistant Professor, Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management, East Carolina University
Dr. Jon Kirchoff	Assistant Professor, Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management, East Carolina University
Kevin Hanstad	Director of Market Research, Meet Minneapolis Convention and Visitors Bureau
Matthew Teichert	Market Research Associate, Meet Minneapolis Convention and Visitors Bureau
Jacqueline Venner Senske	Operations Director, 7th Street Public Market, Charlotte, NC
Neha Shah	Director of Travel and Tourism, Pittsboro-Siler City Convention and Visitors Bureau
Delia Liuzza	Owner, The Tipsy Teapot, Greenville, NC

The survey was created on a web-based platform and a link to the survey was distributed to 4,725 email addresses; respondents were incentivized to complete the survey through a drawing for a two-night hotel stay at the Normandy Inn in downtown Minneapolis. A reminder email was sent one week later, and a final email was sent one week after the first reminder (see Appendices B-D). The survey was available from November 12, 2012 to December 5, 2012.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Descriptive Results

In just over three weeks of data collection, 690 usable responses were amassed, resulting in a 14.6% response rate. Most of the respondents were women (69.5%) and between the ages of 30-39 (26.7%) and 50-59 (26.2%). The largest portion of the sample had a total household income of $50,000-$99,999 (42.6%). The results can be seen in Table 8.

Table 8. Socio-demographic Profile of Participants

Variable	Percentage of Respondents (n=690)
Gender	
Male	30.5%
Female	69.5%
Missing responses	31
Age Range	
18-29	10.9%
30-39	26.7%
40-49	23.1%
50-59	26.2%
60+	13.0%
Missing responses	50
Household Income	
Under $25,000	7.4%
$20,000-$49,999	18.6%
$50,000-$99,999	42.6%
$100,000-$149,999	21.5%
Over $150,000	9.9%
Missing responses	94

The most cited occupational category was the health care industry (11%), followed by general business (10%) and retirees (9.3%). Table 9 displays the occupations of respondents.

Table 9. Occupation of Respondents

Occupational Category	Percentage of Respondents	Occupational Category	Percentage of Respondents
Healthcare - Medical Services and Products	11%	Services (retail sales, clerk, etc.)	3.8%
General Business (middle management, analyst, programmer, etc.)	10%	Student	3.8%
Retired	9.3%	Artistic/Crafts	2.8%
Teacher/Educator	8.7%	Hospitality and Recreation	2.2%
Financial Services	7.5%	Skilled Trade (electrician, plumber, construction, etc.)	2.2%
Upper Management/Administrator	7.3%	Manufacturing - Consumer/Industrial Goods	0.8%
Office Worker (clerical, secretary, word processor, data entry, etc.)	6.8%	Real Estate Services/Property Management	0.8%
Government/Public Services	5.8%	Transportation Services	0.8%
Homemaker	5.2%	Agricultural/Farmer	0.5%
Professional/Technical	4.7%	Other	1.7%
Sales (salesperson, broker, etc.)	4.2%		

There were 627 respondents that reported their zip code. Of those, most live in the United States (90.0%), with the majority (63.2%) from Midwestern states and 14.8% from Minnesota. Nearly one-eighth of respondents (12.4%) are from the Minneapolis /St. Paul metro area.

Respondents were asked about their food consumption habits. Most respondents eat all types of meat regularly (59.4%) or eat meat in limited portions (34.8%). A total of 7.0% of respondents have a food intolerance or allergy. More detailed results can be seen in Table 10.

Table 10. Food Consumption Habits

Food Consumption Habit	Percentage of Responses
I eat all types of meat regularly	59.4%
I eat meat, but in limited portions	34.8%
I have a food intolerance or allergy (e.g. peanut allergy, gluten intolerant)	7.0%
I am a lacto-ovo or ovo vegetarian (I eat dairy and/or eggs)	4.2%
I eat fish only	2.5%
I am vegan	1.2%
I eat according to a religious doctrine	0.7%
Other	2.8%

Note: As respondents could select more than one answer, percentages may not add to100%.

Participants were to rank themselves on a foodie scale from 10 to 0 with 10 being a "total foodie," 7 being "mostly a foodie," 4 being "somewhat a foodie," and 0 being "not a foodie at all." The majority of the respondents (19.3%) rated themselves as a 3 on the foodie scale, which is relatively low. However, other large percentages were spread along the scale: 7 (14.6%), followed by 10 (12.3%) and 5 (11.2%) (Table 11).

Table 11. Self-reported Foodie Rating (n=690)

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
12.3%	7.5%	9.0%	14.6%	7.5%	11.2%	5.2%	19.3%	5.7%	4.5%	3.2%

Through grouping these self-reported scores, the results denote 43.4% as strong foodies (7-10), 23.9% as moderate foodies (4-6), and 32.7% as marginal foodies (0-3).

The most popular food-related activities were trying new restaurants (86.9% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed), trying new recipes (80.1%), cooking (74.4%), attending food and beverage festivals (71.1%), baking (68.4%), trying food from other cultures (68.0%), grilling (66.1%), trying heritage/traditional foods (64.0%), watching the Food Network or

cooking shows (62.2%%), shopping at specialty cookware stores (60.8%), and visiting farms/orchards (60.7%) (Table 12). Respondents were also given the opportunity to list other activities they enjoy. Several respondents reported activities related to nutrition such as avoiding fat and sugar in their diet, or nutrition related events such as gluten-free food expos. Drink-focused activities such as happy hours, drink fads, and bar crawls were also commonly mentioned. Events mentioned were chocolate shows, progressive dinners, and volunteering at food banks. Cooking-related activities listed were getting recipes from Pinterest, teaching food classes, reading cookbooks, and participating in baked good exchanges during the holidays.

Table 12. Food-related Activities

Answer Options	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Opinion	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
I enjoy trying new restaurants	0%	0.30%	1.00%	5.80%	24.90%	**62.00%**	6.00%	687	5.23	1.49
I enjoy trying new recipes	1.20%	1.60%	2.50%	10.10%	29.20%	**50.90%**	4.50%	682	5.04	1.48
I enjoy cooking	2.20%	3.10%	4.70%	13.40%	29.90%	**44.50%**	2.30%	688	4.92	1.40
I enjoy trying food from other cultures	1.90%	4.50%	5.60%	15.10%	27.40%	**40.60%**	4.80%	682	4.69	1.62
I enjoy baking	2.20%	4.90%	5.40%	16.00%	29.90%	**38.50%**	3.20%	689	4.72	1.51
I enjoy trying heritage/traditional foods (i.e. soul food, shrimp and grits)	4.50%	4.80%	7.00%	16.00%	26.50%	**37.50%**	3.60%	686	4.57	1.64
I enjoy attending food and beverage festivals	2.30%	3.30%	4.80%	16.60%	34.10%	**37.00%**	1.90%	687	4.82	1.36
I enjoy grilling	3.30%	3.60%	7.30%	16.60%	29.40%	**36.70%**	3.10%	687	4.66	1.53
I enjoy watching the Food Network or cooking shows	6.00%	6.30%	6.00%	14.60%	26.50%	**35.70%**	5.10%	687	4.41	1.79
I enjoy participating in wine-tastings	11.70%	9.00%	5.70%	14.00%	19.20%	**35.40%**	5.10%	687	4.11	1.97
I enjoy shopping at specialty cookware stores	4.80%	4.50%	6.40%	18.80%	29.20%	**31.60%**	4.70%	686	4.44	1.67
I enjoy attending county/state fairs to eat "fair food"	8.70%	6.80%	9.70%	18.00%	23.40%	**29.30%**	4.10%	689	4.16	1.79
I enjoy visiting farms/orchards	3.20%	3.50%	6.70%	22.50%	**31.50%**	29.20%	3.50%	689	4.53	1.50

Table 12. Food-related Activities (cont'd)

Answer Options	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Opinion	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
I enjoy participating in beer-tastings	18.40%	11.70%	7.60%	11.40%	18.50%	**27.70%**	4.80%	686	3.69	2.04
I enjoy hosting food-centered gatherings at home (e.g. fondue party, cookout)	7.30%	8.20%	11.90%	16.40%	23.30%	**27.40%**	5.50%	687	4.06	1.82
I enjoy reading food magazines	5.70%	7.90%	11.10%	20.10%	**26.30%**	**26.30%**	2.60%	687	4.25	1.62
I enjoy reading about nutrition	4.90%	6.70%	9.20%	20.20%	**29.30%**	25.60%	4.10%	687	4.27	1.65
I enjoy creating new recipes	7.60%	9.30%	10.20%	21.70%	21.70%	**25.30%**	4.50%	687	4.02	1.76
I enjoy going on food-centered outings or vacations	6.00%	9.10%	10.50%	18.30%	24.90%	**25.30%**	5.90%	683	4.05	1.79
I enjoy reading the food section of the newspaper	7.40%	9.90%	9.80%	18.10%	27.10%	22.70%	5.00%	686	4.01	1.77
I think about food a lot during the day	8.40%	11.00%	14.40%	20.70%	19.40%	22.60%	3.70%	682	3.88	1.73
I try to avoid chain restaurants	7.50%	11.80%	17.60%	20.30%	16.70%	22.00%	4.00%	676	3.81	1.73
I enjoy trying new food fads	4.00%	6.30%	13.00%	25.50%	24.70%	21.80%	4.70%	683	4.12	1.61
I enjoy keeping up with local restaurant/ chef happenings	5.80%	10.10%	13.90%	20.30%	23.60%	21.80%	4.50%	685	3.98	1.70
I enjoy gardening (flowers)	8.90%	12.50%	10.00%	20.60%	25.70%	20.10%	2.20%	688	3.95	1.68
I enjoy gardening (food)	8.90%	13.20%	9.20%	19.30%	26.80%	19.20%	3.40%	683	3.89	1.73

Table 12. Food-related Activities (cont'd)

Answer Options	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Opinion	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
I enjoy participating in community/church potlucks	9.60%	9.50%	12.40%	17.20%	**23.90%**	18.30%	9.20%	687	3.64	1.92
I enjoy eating at food trucks	10.70%	8.60%	10.90%	**22.20%**	20.60%	18.10%	8.90%	689	3.61	1.90
I enjoy attending cooking classes	7.60%	12.20%	13.70%	19.20%	**21.00%**	17.30%	8.90%	686	3.59	1.86
I enjoy keeping up with sustainable agriculture happenings	9.60%	11.50%	16.70%	**24.70%**	15.70%	13.50%	8.40%	689	3.41	1.78
I enjoy reading food blogs	11.40%	15.60%	16.40%	**21.60%**	17.50%	12.70%	4.70%	684	3.42	1.71
I enjoy following state or national food issues	9.20%	12.20%	13.00%	**24.60%**	18.30%	12.40%	10.20%	683	3.37	1.84
I enjoy taking photos of food	**19.00%**	**19.00%**	14.10%	12.70%	10.80%	12.30%	12%	683	2.78	1.91
I enjoy participating in wine or beer clubs	**18.90%**	16.70%	13.40%	13.50%	12.90%	11.90%	12.60%	688	2.83	1.94
I enjoy organic gardening	13.30%	15.80%	11.40%	**19.80%**	19.20%	11.30%	9.20%	683	3.22	1.86
I enjoy participating in Community Supported Agriculture	13.40%	14.50%	13.60%	14.30%	14.60%	11.10%	**18.50%**	685	2.80	2.01
I enjoy posting on social media about food	**23.20%**	19.10%	10.70%	12.50%	12.50%	10.10%	11.90%	681	2.67	1.90
I enjoy seeing movies about sustainable food (Food Inc., Fresh, Fast Food Nation, King Korn, etc.)	13.10%	15.90%	15.10%	19.20%	14.30%	9.90%	12.50%	687	2.98	1.86

Table 12. Food-related Activities (cont'd)

Answer Options	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Opinion	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
I enjoy participating in dinner clubs	13.20%	16.90%	15.10%	16.70%	12.20%	9.60%	16.30%	688	2.78	1.91
I enjoy canning fruits or vegetables	19.80%	18.20%	14.00%	14.10%	12.50%	8.70%	12.80%	688	2.69	1.86
I enjoy reading books about sustainable food (Omnivore's Dilemma, Animal Vegetable Miracle, Slow Food)	15.70%	**19.00%**	16.30%	16.40%	8.90%	7.40%	16.30%	688	2.57	1.81
I enjoy attending food competitions	14.90%	**18.70%**	17.10%	16.00%	11.40%	7.30%	14.70%	686	2.68	1.81
I enjoy being politically active on food issues	14.40%	**19.80%**	16.90%	18.30%	10.60%	6.60%	13.40%	687	2.70	1.76
I enjoy participating in Community Supported Fisheries	17.10%	17.70%	14.20%	11.00%	8.60%	5.80%	**25.50%**	689	2.17	1.86
I enjoy volunteering at farm/orchard tours	16.10%	18.60%	20.40%	10.40%	5.90%	5.70%	**23.00%**	683	2.19	1.76
I enjoy seed-saving of heirloom varieties	17.40%	**23.90%**	13.50%	13.60%	11.60%	5.60%	14.50%	683	2.51	1.76
I enjoy participating in food or recipe competitions/ contests	18.90%	**22.90%**	19.90%	12.20%	6.10%	4.70%	15.30%	687	2.32	1.64
I enjoy attending food industry meetings	13.40%	**20.30%**	19.40%	13.40%	9.50%	4.50%	19.50%	686	2.40	1.75
I enjoy attending sustainable agriculture events/meetings	13.60%	18.40%	18.20%	16.40%	9.80%	4.10%	**19.50%**	683	2.44	1.76
I enjoy contributing to food blogs	25.70%	**26.20%**	17.60%	9.90%	6.00%	3.80%	10.70%	680	2.24	1.54

Table 12. Food-related Activities (cont'd)

Answer Options	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Opinion	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
I enjoy participating in slow food groups	16.80%	17.90%	14.90%	10.30%	5.80%	3.60%	**30.60%**	686	1.90	1.75
I enjoy raising livestock for my own consumption	**40.30%**	20.90%	10.20%	4.50%	3.90%	3.30%	16.80%	689	1.70	1.47
I enjoy learning specialty butchering techniques	**40.10%**	21.80%	9.40%	7.00%	5.10%	2.20%	14.40%	688	1.78	1.45

Participants were also asked about their food-related travel behavior (Table 13). The most popular activities were seeking out locally-owned restaurants while on a vacation or getaway (70.6% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed), seeking out special types of food products while on a vacation or getaway (58.7%), seeing out local drink products while on a vacation or getaway (57.1%), traveling more than 50 miles to attend a food/beverage festival (45.0%), and seeking out special types of food experiences while on a vacation or getaway (44.9%).

Table 13. Food-related Travel Behavior

Answer Options	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Opinion	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
I seek out locally-owned restaurants while on a vacation or getaway	2.8%	3.6%	3.6%	16.7%	28.8%	**41.8%**	2.6%	687	4.83	1.46
I seek out local drink products (wine, beer, mead, moonshine, cider, colas, ades) while on a vacation or getaway	9.6%	10.6%	5.7%	14.8%	25.7%	**31.4%**	2.2%	688	4.24	1.78
I seek out special types of food products (local, artisanal, heritage) while on a vacation or getaway	5.2%	9.0%	6.8%	18.0%	28.3%	**30.4%**	2.3%	690	4.39	1.62
I seek out special types of food experiences (cooking class, farm tour, wine tasting) while on a vacation or getaway	7.7%	11.9%	12.6%	19.8%	22.2%	**22.7%**	3.1%	688	3.96	1.71
I would travel more than 50 miles to attend a food/beverage festival	9.1%	13.9%	11.5%	19.3%	**24.5%**	20.5%	1.2%	689	3.94	1.66
I consider food when deciding where to vacation	7.5%	15.7%	13.4%	22.1%	**23.9%**	15.7%	1.7%	689	3.81	1.60
I look for restaurants that serve organic food while on a vacation or getaway	11.3%	17.4%	16.3%	**22.5%**	11.8%	13.2%	7.4%	688	3.23	1.77

The final section of descriptive results reflected information about the respondent's last vacation or getaway. The first question asked the respondent to report the destination of their last vacation. The results of this question are divided into three categories: states and Canadian provinces, Minnesota destinations, and international. Minneapolis had the overall highest number of response (n=157). California (n=34), Florida (n=33), Wisconsin (n=33), and Illinois (n=28) had the highest responses among states and provinces. The Caribbean (n=4), France (n=4), and Ireland (n=3) were the most popular international destinations.

Half of the trips lasted 2-4 days (50.1%), and just under one-third lasted 5-7 days (29.3%). The majority of respondents had 2 people in their travel party (48.1%). Most respondents stayed in a hotel (74.5%), while 15.4% stayed with friends and relatives. The majority of respondents used a personal vehicle to travel to their destination (52.8%), and 39.7% used an airplane. Participants were able to choose more than one response for lodging and method of travel used, so percentages may not add to 100%. More detailed results about respondents' vacations can be found in Table 14.

Table 14. Profile of Last Vacation

Variable	Percentage of Responses
Length of Trip	
One day (no overnight)	2.9%
2-4 days	50.1%
5-7 days	29.3%
7-14 days	14.6%
14+ days	4.7%
Number of People in Party	
One	9.8%
Two	48.1%
Three	12.9%
Four	14.7%
5 or more	14.5%
Number of Adults in Party	
One	12.8%
Two	61.4%
Three	9.4%
Four	9.2%
5 or more	7.2%
Type of Lodging Utilized*	
Hotel	74.5%
Stayed with friends or relatives	15.4%
Rental property (i.e. cabin, condo)	8.6%
Bed and Breakfast	5.2%
Camping	2.3%
RV	0.7%
Other	4.9%
Method of Travel*	
Personal Vehicle	52.8%
Airplane	39.7%
Rental Car	12.8%
Train	4.3%
Bus	4.2%
Other	3.0%

Note: Percentages do not add up to 100%.

Respondents were also asked to estimate their expenditures during their last vacation within the categories of transportation, lodging, food and beverages, shopping, activities and entertainment, and other. The total expenditures were dived by the number of people in the travel party to calculate the expenditures per person. The average total expenditures per party

and per person can be seen in Table 15. Transportation was the category with the highest average expenditure ($693.71), closely followed by lodging ($668.56).

Table 15. Average Expenditures on Last Vacation

Category	Average Amount per Party	Average Amount per Person
Transportation	$693.71	$285.42
Lodging	$668.56	$259.95
Food/Beverages	$430.12	$175.30
Shopping	$317.07	$86.84
Activities/Entertainment	$227.15	$120.38
Other	$155.00	$29.42
Total Trip	$2355.68	$995.64

4.2 Foodie Activity Dimensions

Data were analyzed in SPSS version 20. To address the first research question, 'Can foodie activities be factored into activity dimensions?', exploratory factor analysis was performed using pairwise exclusion for missing data. The KMO value was checked to ensure it was at a level of .6 or above; the initial factor solution had a KMO value of .933. Additionally, the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity value was checked to be sure it was significant (.05 or less). The strengths of the inter-item correlations were investigated to ensure factor analysis was appropriate. The majority of the correlations fell between .2 and .7 indicating an appropriate level of correlation for factor analysis (Pallant, 2006). After examining the scree plot, the eigenvalues of the initial solution, and face value of the factors, Varimax rotation was used to preform further exploratory analysis and the ten-factor solution was chosen as the best result. Reliability was calculated for each factor by finding the Cronbach's Alpha based on standardized items (Table 16). The ten factors explain 58.72% of the variance.

Table 16. Descriptions, Factor Loadings, Reliability Coefficients, and Variance Explained for Foodie Activity Dimensions

Foodie Activity Dimension	Factor Loading Score	Cronbach's Alpha based on standardized items	Variance Explained
Sustainable Agriculture Dimension		.90	10.29%
I enjoy raising livestock for my own consumption	.70		
I enjoy learning specialty butchering techniques	.69		
I enjoy participating in Community Supported Fisheries	.67		
I enjoy volunteering at farm/orchard tours	.67		
I enjoy participating in food or recipe competitions/contests	.67		
I enjoy attending food industry meetings	.63		
I enjoy attending sustainable agriculture events/meetings	.63		
I enjoy participating in slow food groups	.61		
I enjoy attending food competitions	.59		
I enjoy participating in Community Supported Agriculture	.54		
I enjoy canning fruits or vegetables	.53		
I enjoy home-brewing	.49		
I enjoy participating in dinner clubs	.46		
Adventure Dimension		.89	9.60%
I seek out special types of food products (local, artisanal, heritage) while on a vacation or getaway	.72		
I would travel more than 50 miles to attend a food/beverage festival	.69		
I enjoy trying heritage/traditional foods (i.e. soul food, shrimp and grits)	.69		
I seek out special types of food experiences (cooking class, farm tour, wine tasting) while on a vacation or getaway	.67		
I seek out locally-owned restaurants while on a vacation or getaway	.65		
I consider food when deciding where to vacation	.65		
I enjoy attending food and beverage festivals	.62		
I seek out local drink products (wine, beer, mead, moonshine, cider, colas, ades) while on a vacation or getaway	.60		
I enjoy attending county/state fairs to eat "fair food"	.51		
I enjoy eating at food trucks	.480		
I enjoy going on food-centered outings or vacations	.47		
Home Cooking Dimension		.87	7.98%
I enjoy trying new recipes	.81		

I enjoy cooking	.80		
I enjoy grilling	.69		
I enjoy creating new recipes	.66		
I enjoy baking	.63		
I enjoy trying new restaurants	.61		
I enjoy trying food from other cultures	.51		
I enjoy reading food magazines	.48		
I enjoy watching the Food Network or cooking shows	.47		
Political Activist Dimension		.87	6.47%
I enjoy reading books about sustainable food (Omnivore's Dilemma, Animal Vegetable Miracle, Slow Food, etc.)	.65		
I enjoy following state or national food issues	.63		
I enjoy seeing movies about sustainable food (Food Inc., Fresh, Fast Food Nation, King Korn, etc.)	.60		
I enjoy being politically active on food issues	.60		
I look for restaurants that serve organic food while on a vacation or getaway	.56		
I enjoy keeping up with sustainable agriculture happenings	.52		
Earthy Dimension		.82	4.80%
I enjoy gardening (food)	.81		
I enjoy gardening (flowers)	.74		
I enjoy organic gardening	.74		
I enjoy seed-saving of heirloom varieties	.60		
Trendy Dimension		.74	4.33%
I enjoy keeping up with local restaurant/chef happenings	.55		
I enjoy reading food blogs	.53		
I enjoy contributing to food blogs	.49		
I enjoy reading the food section of the newspaper	.49		
Drinking Dimension		.76	4.08%
I enjoy participating in beer-tastings	.74		
I enjoy participating in wine-tastings	.74		
I enjoy participating in wine or beer clubs	.62		
Farmer Friendly Dimension		.80	4.04%
I enjoy purchasing locally grown and/or organic food	.72		
I enjoy visiting farmer's markets	.64		
I enjoy eating at farm-to-table restaurants	.61		
Engaged Dimension		.81	3.89%
I enjoy taking photos of food	.73		
I enjoy posting on social media about food	.71		
I think about food a lot during the day	.60		
I enjoy discussing activities related to food	.49		
Upscale Cooking Dimension		.69	3.24%
I enjoy shopping at specialty cookware/food stores	.52		
I enjoy attending cooking classes	.51		
I enjoy reading about nutrition	.51		

There were 5 items removed from the scale due to low factor loading scores and/or cross loading (Garson, 2012). These items can be seen in Table 17.

Table 17. Items Excluded from Scale

Item	Reason for Exclusion
I enjoy participating in community/church potlucks	Low loading score
I enjoy trying new food fads	Low loading score/cross loading
I enjoy hosting food-centered gatherings at home (e.g. fondue party, cookout)	Low loading score
I try to avoid chain restaurants	Low loading score
I enjoy visiting farms/orchards	Low loading score/cross loading

The Sustainable Agriculture dimension consists of 13 items, which is the largest of the factors, and explains 10.29% of the variance of the model. This dimension includes educational activities focused on sustainable food, buying from local farms, and being involved with food production, such as butchering or canning. The Adventure factor includes eleven items and explains 9.60% of the variance of the model. This dimension involves seeking unique food experiences and spending money on local food or beverage products and locally owned restaurants while traveling. The Home Cooking dimension consists of nine items and explains 7.98% of the variance of the model. This dimension includes making food in various methods such as grilling and baking, as well as trying/creating new recipes. There are six items making up the Political Activist dimension, which explains 6.47% of the variance of the model, involving activities focused on learning about, following, and/or being politically involved in current food issues. The Earthy dimension consists of four items and explains just under 5% of the variance. This dimension consists of gardening-related activities. The Trendy dimension consists of four items, explains 4.33% of the variance of the model, and focuses on being informed and up to date on restaurant and chef happenings and food blogs. The Drinking

dimension consists of three items that focus on wine and beer experiences and explains just over 4% of the variance of the model. The Farmer Friendly dimension contains three items and explains just over 4% of the variance of the model. The dimension centers on activities involving consuming food from local producers. The Engaged dimension, explaining 3.89% of the model variance, includes four activities that relate to sharing food experiences with others, whether through photos, social media, or talking. Finally, the Upscale Cooking dimension contains three items, explains 3.24% of the model variance, and consists of activities that involve investing in cooking-related things such as specialty cookware or cooking classes. Factor means were calculated for each dimension and can be seen in Table 18.

Table 18. Factor Means and Standard Deviations

Foodie Activity Dimension	Mean	Standard Deviation
Sustainable Agriculture Dimension	2.29	1.17
Adventure Dimension	4.20	1.14
Home Cooking Dimension	4.63	1.10
Political Activist Dimension	3.03	1.40
Earthy Dimension	3.37	1.43
Trendy Dimension	3.38	1.25
Drinking Dimension	3.53	1.64
Farmer Friendly Dimension	4.44	1.37
Engaged Dimension	3.26	1.46
Upscale Cooking Dimension	4.08	1.36

4.3 Socio-demographic Test Results

The second research question addressed the socio-demographic differences of the respondents with varying foodie activity dimension scores. The socio-demographic characteristics investigated were gender, age, and household income. Skewness and kurtosis were investigated to ensure normality of data. Skew and kurtosis values should normally fall between -2 and 2, however -3 to 3 is also acceptable (Garson, 2012). The skewness and kurtosis

values of the dimensions and variables all fell between -3 and 3.. Therefore, the assumption of normality was met and parametric tests were used.

4.3.1 Gender

An independent samples t-test was used to compare gender in each foodie activity dimension. The means and standard deviations for gender for each dimension can be seen in Table 19.

Table 19. Means and Standard Deviations of Genders

	Gender			
	Female (n=458)		Male (n=201)	
Foodie Activity Dimension	**M**	**SD**	**M**	**SD**
Sustainable Agriculture Dimension	2.29	1.18	2.24	1.14
Adventure Dimension	4.10	1.13	4.37	1.15
Home Cooking Dimension	4.58	1.05	4.76	1.16
Political Activist Dimension	2.93	1.39	3.21	1.40
Earthy Dimension	3.36	1.45	3.37	1.38
Trendy Dimension	3.33	1.22	3.46	1.30
Drinking Dimension	3.49	1.63	3.57	1.67
Farmer Friendly Dimension	4.35	1.37	4.58	1.32
Engaged Dimension	3.24	1.43	3.24	1.51
Upscale Cooking Dimension	4.01	1.38	4.21	1.32

The assumptions of independence and normality were met. The assumption of equal variance was investigated through a Levene's Test for Equality of Variances. None of the F values were significant at the $p<.05$ level; therefore, equal variances were assumed. The Adventure, Political Activist, and Farmer Friendly dimensions were significant at the $p<.05$ level (Table 20).

Table 20. T-test Statistics for Gender

Foodie Activity Dimension	t Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance
Sustainable Agriculture	.43	657	.664
Adventure	-2.84	657	.005
Home Cooking	-1.89	657	.059
Political Activist	-2.38	657	.017
Earthy	-.07	657	.944
Trendy	-1.25	657	.211
Drinking	-.56	657	.576
Farmer Friendly	-2.03	657	.043
Engaged	.05	657	.961
Upscale Cooking	-1.71	657	.088

Within the Adventure dimension, the mean score for males (M=4.37, SD=1.15) was significantly higher than the mean score for females (M=4.10, SD=1.13). Within the Political Activist dimension, the mean score for males (M=3.21, SD=1.40) was significantly higher than the mean score for females (M=2.93, SD=1.39). Within the Farmer Friendly dimension, the mean score for males (M=4.58, SD=1.32) was significantly higher than the mean score for females (M=4.35, SD=1.37).

4.3.2 Age

One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to investigate differences among age groups within the foodie activity dimensions. The means and standard deviations are reported in Table 21.

Table 21. Means and Standard Deviations of Age Ranges

	Age Range									
	18-29 (n=70)		30-39 (n=171)		40-49 (n=148)		50-59 (n=168)		60+ (n=83)	
Foodie Activity Dimension	**M**	**SD**	**M**	**SD**	**M**	**SD**	**M**	**SD**	**M**	**SD**
Sustainable Agriculture	2.42	1.27	2.23	1.30	2.36	1.12	2.26	1.08	2.17	1.04
Adventure	4.50	1.14	4.49	1.10	4.24	1.07	3.98	1.14	3.97	1.11
Home Cooking	4.86	0.97	4.61	1.21	4.60	1.17	4.54	1.05	4.60	1.04
Political Activist	2.93	1.49	2.94	1.39	3.12	1.46	3.05	1.36	2.99	1.29
Earthy	2.98	1.48	3.06	1.49	3.43	1.39	3.53	1.31	3.56	1.40
Trendy	3.24	1.41	3.41	1.31	3.38	1.26	3.32	1.24	3.48	1.07
Drinking	4.25	1.70	3.80	1.58	3.38	1.56	3.29	1.64	3.29	1.56
Farmer Friendly	4.45	1.31	4.41	1.46	4.34	1.52	4.37	1.33	4.63	1.06
Engaged	4.14	1.53	3.61	1.50	3.21	1.37	2.92	1.28	2.78	1.23
Upscale Cooking	4.19	1.36	4.09	1.38	4.23	1.34	3.88	1.42	4.01	1.17

The assumptions of independence and normality were both met. The Levene's Test for Equality of Variances indicated that the Farmer Friendly and Engaged dimensions did not meet the assumption of homogeneity as the F statistic was significant at the $p<.05$ level. The other eight dimensions did meet the assumption of homogeneity.

Welch and Brown-Forsythe's tests were performed to find the adjusted F statistic for the two dimensions that did not meet the assumption of homogeneity (Table 22). The test demonstrated that the adjusted F statistic for the Engaged dimension was significant at the $p<.001$ level.

Table 22. Welch and Brown-Forsythe's Test of Equality of Means for Age Ranges

Foodie Activity Dimension	Test	Adjusted F Statistic	df1	df2	Significance
Farmer Friendly	Welch	.97	4	264.32	.427
	Brown-Forsythe	.72	4	558.20	.578
Engaged	Welch	14.03	4	256.50	.000
	Brown-Forsythe	14.70	4	482.85	.000

ANOVA was used to investigate the dimensions that met the assumption of homogeneity. The results revealed significant mean differences on Adventure [$F(4,635)=6.80$, $p<.001$], Earthy [$F(4,635)=4.34$, $p<.005$], and Drinking [$F(4,635)=6.45$, $p<.001$] dimensions (Table 23).

Table 23. ANOVA Results for Age

Foodie Activity Dimension		Sum of Squares	df	F	Sig.
Sustainable Agriculture	Between Groups	3.88	4	.71	.586
	Within Groups	868.34	635		
	Total	872.21	639		
Adventure	Between Groups	33.39	4	6.80	.000
	Within Groups	779.43	635		
	Total	812.82	639		
Home Cooking	Between Groups	5.28	4	1.07	.371
	Within Groups	785.05	635		
	Total	790.33	639		
Political Activist	Between Groups	3.51	4	.45	.771
	Within Groups	1235.33	635		
	Total	1238.84	639		
Earthy	Between Groups	34.42	4	4.34	.002
	Within Groups	1259.15	635		
	Total	1293.57	639		
Trendy	Between Groups	3.06	4	.48	.751
	Within Groups	1014.43	635		
	Total	1017.49	639		
Drinking	Between Groups	66.16	4	6.45	.000
	Within Groups	1628.53	635		
	Total	1694.69	639		

Upscale Cooking	Between Groups	11.16	4	1.52	.195
	Within Groups	1166.90	635		
	Total	1178.06	639		

Post-hoc comparisons used the Tukey HSD test to investigate the Adventure, Earthy, and Drinking dimensions, and the Games-Howell test to investigate the Engaged dimension. The Tukey HSD test indicated for the Adventure dimension, the mean scores for 18-29 year olds (M=4.50, SD=1.14) and the 30-39 year olds (M=4.49, SD=1.10) were significantly different from the 50-59 year olds (M=3.98, SD=1.14) and the 60 years and older group (M=3.97, SD=1.11) at the $p<.05$ level. This analysis shows that the youngest groups more often sought out the activities in the Adventure dimension than the two oldest groups.

Within the Earthy dimension, the mean score for the 50-59 year olds (M=3.53, SD=1.31) was significantly different from the 18-29 year olds (M=2.98, SD=1.48) and the 30-39 year olds (M=3.06, SD=1.49). This shows that the 50-59 year olds showed greater enjoyment of Earthy activities than the two youngest groups.

Within the Drinking dimension, the mean score for 18-29 year olds (M=4.25, SD=1.70) was significantly different from 40-49 year olds (M=3.38, SD=1.56), 50-59 year olds (M=3.29, SD=1.64), and the 60 years and older group (M=3.29, SD=1.56) at the $p<.005$ level. The mean score for the 30-39 year olds (M=3.80, SD=1.58) was significantly different than the 50-59 year olds (M=3.29, SD=1.64) at the $p<.05$ level. This analysis shows that the youngest group reported greater enjoyment of activities in the Drinking Dimension that the participants above the age of 40 years, and the 30-39 year olds showed greater enjoyment than the 50-59 year olds.

For the Engaged dimension, the Games-Howell test indicated the mean score for 18-29 year olds (M=4.14, SD=1.53) was significantly different from 40-49 year olds (M=3.21, SD=1.37), 50-59 year olds (M=2.92, SD=1.28), and the 60 years and older group (M=2.78,

SD=1.23) at the p<.001 level. The mean score for 30-39 year olds (M=3.61, SD=1.50) was significantly different from 50-59 year olds (M=2.92, SD=1.28) and the 60 years and older group (M=2.78, SD=1.23) at the p<.001 level. This analysis shows that the younger groups indicated greater enjoyment of the activities in the Engaged dimension.

4.3.3 Income

ANOVA was used to investigate differences between household incomes. The means and standard deviations are reported in Table 24.

Table 24. Means and Standard Deviations of Household Income

	Household Income									
	Under $25,000 (n=44)		**$20,000-$49,999 (n=111)**		**$50,000-$99,999 (n=254)**		**$100,000-$149,999 (n=128)**		**Over $150,000 (n=59)**	
Foodie Activity Dimension	**M**	**SD**	**M**	**SD**	**M**	**SD**	**M**	**SD**	**M**	**SD**
Sustainable Agriculture	**2.45**	**1.31**	**2.19**	**1.27**	**2.37**	**1.15**	**2.28**	**1.07**	**2.30**	**1.26**
Adventure	**4.03**	**1.32**	**4.22**	**1.23**	**4.29**	**1.05**	**4.33**	**0.98**	**4.32**	**1.16**
Home Cooking	**4.63**	**1.03**	**4.63**	**1.10**	**4.66**	**1.05**	**4.58**	**1.15**	**4.49**	**1.35**
Political Activist	**3.06**	**1.62**	**2.97**	**1.43**	**3.06**	**1.35**	**3.01**	**1.30**	**3.30**	**1.50**
Earthy	**3.06**	**1.68**	**3.23**	**1.45**	**3.49**	**1.34**	**3.22**	**1.47**	**3.46**	**1.32**
Trendy	**3.27**	**1.48**	**3.22**	**1.32**	**3.41**	**1.22**	**3.38**	**1.23**	**3.61**	**1.29**
Drinking	**3.77**	**1.65**	**3.59**	**1.72**	**3.51**	**1.59**	**3.68**	**1.56**	**3.68**	**1.66**
Farmer Friendly	**4.11**	**1.55**	**4.39**	**1.45**	**4.46**	**1.37**	**4.41**	**1.38**	**4.71**	**1.28**
Engaged	**3.59**	**1.69**	**3.39**	**1.46**	**3.25**	**1.44**	**3.28**	**1.36**	**3.35**	**1.48**
Upscale Cooking	**3.98**	**1.41**	**3.84**	**1.55**	**4.11**	**1.29**	**4.15**	**1.27**	**4.29**	**1.41**

The assumptions of independence and normality were both met. The Levene's Test for Equality of Variances indicated that the Adventure and Upscale Cooking dimensions did not meet the assumption of homogeneity as the F statistic was significant at the p<.05 level. The other eight dimensions did meet the assumption of homogeneity.

Welch and Brown-Forsythe's tests were performed to find the adjusted F statistic for the two dimensions that did not meet the assumption of homogeneity (Table 25). The test demonstrated that the adjusted F statistic was not significant at the $p<.05$ level for both dimensions.

Table 25. Welch and Brown-Forsythe's Test of Equality of Means for Income

Foodie Activity Dimension	Test	Adjusted F Statistic	df1	df2	Significance
Adventure	Welch	.54	4	168.65	.708
	Brown-Forsythe	.62	4	281.82	.646
Upscale Cooking	Welch	1.14	4	170.46	.341
	Brown-Forsythe	1.29	4	329.32	.272

ANOVA was used to investigate the eight dimensions that did meet the assumption of homogeneity. The results revealed that there were no significant mean differences between the income levels at the $p<.05$ level (Table 26).

Table 26. ANOVA Results for Household Income

Foodie Activity Dimension		Sum of Squares	df	F	Sig.
Sustainable Agriculture	Between Groups	3.66	4	.66	.622
	Within Groups	823.11	591		
	Total	826.77	595		
Home Cooking	Between Groups	1.72	4	.35	.847
	Within Groups	733.36	591		
	Total	735.08	595		
Political Activist	Between Groups	4.40	4	.57	.685
	Within Groups	1144.06	591		
	Total	1148.46	595		
Earthy	Between Groups	13.05	4	1.63	.166
	Within Groups	1184.54	591		
	Total	1197.59	595		
Trendy	Between Groups	6.71	4	1.04	.387
	Within Groups	955.35	591		
	Total	962.06	595		
Drinking	Between Groups	4.71	4	.45	.774
	Within Groups	1555.16	591		
	Total	1559.86	595		
Farmer Friendly	Between Groups	9.74	4	1.26	.286
	Within Groups	1146.00	591		
	Total	1155.74	595		
Engaged	Between Groups	5.37	4	.64	.635
	Within Groups	1240.14	591		
	Total	1245.51	595		

4.4 Travel Behavior Test Results

The third research question addressed the travel behavior differences of the respondents with varying foodie activity dimension scores. The travel behavior characteristics investigated were length of last vacation, size of travel party, and food and beverage and total expenditures on last vacation. The assumption of normality was met, therefore parametric tests were used.

4.4.1 Length of Last Vacation

ANOVA was used to investigate differences between the lengths of the participants' last vacation. While the survey offered 5 response options for this question, due to unequal group

sizes, the answers were collapsed into three categories: 1-4 days, 5-7 days, and 8 or more days. The means and standard deviations can be seen in Table 27.

Table 27. Means and Standard Deviations of Length of Stay

	Length of Stay					
	1-4 days (n=341)		5-7 days (n=194)		8+ days (n=128)	
Foodie Activity Dimension	**M**	**SD**	**M**	**SD**	**M**	**SD**
Sustainable Agriculture	**2.13**	**1.12**	**2.44**	**1.27**	**2.43**	**1.17**
Adventure	**4.07**	**1.21**	**4.31**	**1.07**	**4.41**	**1.05**
Home Cooking	**4.57**	**1.03**	**4.66**	**1.13**	**4.75**	**1.22**
Political Activist	**2.86**	**1.39**	**3.17**	**1.47**	**3.23**	**1.32**
Earthy	**3.23**	**1.36**	**3.44**	**1.47**	**3.55**	**1.52**
Trendy	**3.25**	**1.37**	**3.36**	**1.33**	**3.71**	**1.08**
Drinking	**3.38**	**1.65**	**3.71**	**1.65**	**3.64**	**1.57**
Farmer Friendly	**4.27**	**1.42**	**4.49**	**1.32**	**4.71**	**1.28**
Engaged	**3.16**	**1.49**	**3.37**	**1.43**	**3.43**	**1.39**
Upscale Cooking	**3.91**	**1.35**	**4.15**	**1.37**	**4.36**	**1.34**

The assumptions of independence and normality were both met. The Levene's Test for Equality of Variances indicated that the Adventure and Trendy dimensions did not meet the assumption of homogeneity as the F statistic was significant at the $p<.05$ level. The other eight dimensions did meet the assumption of homogeneity.

Welch and Brown-Forsythe's tests were performed to find the adjusted F statistic for the Adventure and Trendy dimensions, as they did not meet the assumption of homogeneity (Table 28). The test demonstrated that the adjusted F statistics were significant for both dimensions at the $p<.01$ level.

Table 28. Welch and Brown-Forsythe's Test of Equality of Means for Length of Stay

Foodie Activity Dimension	Test	Adjusted F Statistic	df1	df2	Significance
Adventure	Welch	5.21	2	334.38	.006
	Brown-Forsythe	5.53	2	523.01	.004
Trendy	Welch	7.80	2	333.44	.000
	Brown-Forsythe	6.70	2	525.96	.001

ANOVA was used to investigate the rest of the dimensions; the results revealed significant mean differences between lengths of stay within the Sustainable Agriculture [$F(2,660)=5.81$, $p<.005$], Political Activist [$F(2,660)=4.78$, $p<.01$], Farmer Friendly [$F(2,660)=5.37$, $p<.01$], and Upscale Cooking [$F(2,660)=5.74$, $p<.005$] dimensions (Table 29).

Table 29. ANOVA Results for Length of Stay

Foodie Activity Dimension		Sum of Squares	df	F	Sig.
Sustainable Agriculture	Between Groups	16.10	2	5.81	.003
	Within Groups	914.54	660		
	Total	930.64	662		
Home Cooking	Between Groups	3.38	2	1.40	.247
	Within Groups	796.99	660		
	Total	800.37	662		
Political Activist	Between Groups	18.69	2	4.78	.009
	Within Groups	1291.59	660		
	Total	1310.28	662		
Earthy	Between Groups	11.37	2	2.80	.061
	Within Groups	1339.38	660		
	Total	1350.75	662		
Drinking	Between Groups	14.88	2	2.78	.063
	Within Groups	1768.42	660		
	Total	1783.31	662		
Farmer Friendly	Between Groups	20.02	2	5.37	.005
	Within Groups	1229.86	660		
	Total	1249.88	662		
Engaged	Between Groups	9.52	2	2.25	.106
	Within Groups	1395.22	660		
	Total	1404.74	662		
Upscale Cooking	Between Groups	21.07	2	5.74	.003
	Within Groups	1212.43	660		
	Total	1233.50	662		

Post-hoc comparisons used the Tukey test to investigate the differences for the dimensions that met the assumption of homogeneity as equal variances were assumed, and the Games-Howell test to investigate the Adventure and Trendy dimensions, as equal variances were not assumed.

The Tukey test indicated for the Sustainable Agriculture dimension, the mean score for respondents that stayed 1-4 days (M=2.13, SD=1.12) was significantly different than those that stayed 5-7 days (M=2.44, SD=1.27) and those that stayed over a week (M=2.43, SD=1.17) at the $p<.05$ level. This analysis shows that those that traveled for longer amounts of time reported higher enjoyment of Sustainable Agriculture activities than those that only traveled for 1-4 days.

The Tukey test indicated that for the Political Activist dimension, the mean score for those that traveled for 1-4 days (M=2.86, SD=1.39) was significantly different than those that stayed 5-7 days (M=3.17, SD=1.47) and those that stayed over a week (M=3.23, SD=1.32) at the $p<.05$ level. This analysis shows that those who traveled longer reported greater enjoyment of activities in the Political Activist dimension.

For the Farmer Friendly dimension, the Tukey test indicated the mean score for those that traveled for 1-4 days (M=4.27, SD=1.42) was significantly different than those that traveled over a week (M=4.71, SD=1.28) at the $p<.01$ level. This analysis shows that those that traveled longest indicated greater enjoyment of the activities in the Farmer Friendly dimension than those that only traveled a few days.

The Tukey test indicated that for the Upscale Cooking dimension, the mean score for those that traveled 1-4 days (M=3.91, SD=1.35) was significantly different than those that stayed over a week (M=4.36, SD=1.34) at the $p<.005$ level. This shows that those that traveled longest

indicated greater enjoyment of the activities in the Upscale Cooking dimension than those that only traveled a few days.

The Games-Howell test indicated that for the Adventure dimension, the mean score for respondents that stayed 1-4 days (M=4.07, SD=1.21) was significantly different than those that stayed 5-7 days (M=4.31, SD=1.07) and those that stayed over a week (M=4.41, SD=1.05) at the $p<.05$ level. This analysis demonstrates that those that traveled for longer periods of time more often sought out the activities in the Adventure dimension than those that only traveled a few days.

For the Trendy dimension, the Games-Howell test indicated that the mean score for respondents that stayed over a week (M=3.71, SD=1.08) was significantly different than those that traveled for 1-4 days (M=3.25, SD=1.37) and those that traveled 5-7 days (M=3.36, SD= 1.33) at the $p<.05$ level. This analysis demonstrates that those that traveled over a week showed greater levels of enjoyment of the Trendy dimension than those that traveled for shorter periods of time.

4.4.2 Size of Travel Party

ANOVA was used to investigate differences among respondents that traveled with different party sizes during their last vacation. The means and standard deviations are reported in Table 30.

Table 30. Means and Standard Deviations of Party Size

Foodie Activity Dimension	Party Size											
	One (n=65)		Two (n=318)		Three (n=85)		Four (n=97)		Five (n=32)		Six or More (n=64)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Sustainable Agriculture	2.04	1.08	2.29	1.19	2.26	1.30	2.29	1.15	2.42	1.15	2.43	1.16
Adventure	3.98	1.41	4.20	1.13	4.20	1.13	4.39	0.99	4.23	1.14	4.19	1.21
Home Cooking	4.31	1.37	4.62	1.10	4.72	1.06	4.61	1.12	4.71	0.94	4.86	0.91
Political Activist	2.86	1.36	3.07	1.40	3.15	1.39	3.01	1.49	3.29	1.35	2.74	1.37
Earthy	2.92	1.58	3.40	1.46	3.33	1.48	3.38	1.37	3.77	1.22	3.36	1.17
Trendy	3.13	1.46	3.38	1.27	3.37	1.30	3.39	1.14	3.59	1.19	3.44	1.23
Drinking	3.16	1.78	3.54	1.65	3.46	1.64	3.59	1.49	3.49	1.63	3.81	1.58
Farmer Friendly	4.26	1.56	4.45	1.29	4.35	1.56	4.45	1.46	4.44	1.25	4.40	1.27
Engaged	3.18	1.36	3.31	1.48	3.37	1.49	3.21	1.47	3.66	1.43	3.04	1.37
Upscale Cooking	3.73	1.62	4.05	1.36	3.98	1.44	4.40	1.11	4.22	1.25	4.07	1.32

The assumptions of independence and normality were both met. The Levene's Test for Equality of Variance indicated that the Adventure, Home Cooking, Earthy, and Upscale Cooking dimensions did not meet the assumption of homogeneity as the F statistics were significant at the $p<.05$ level. The other six dimensions did meet the assumption of homogeneity.

Welch and Brown-Forsythe's tests were performed to find the adjusted F statistic for the four dimensions that did not meet the assumption of homogeneity (Table 31). The tests demonstrated that the adjusted F statistic was not significant at the $p<.05$ level for any of the dimensions.

Table 31. Welch and Brown-Forsythe's Test of Equality of Means for Party Size

Foodie Activity Dimension	Test	Adjusted F Statistic	df1	df2	Significance
Adventure	Welch	.99	5	160.02	.427
	Brown-Forsythe	.97	5	322.34	.437
Home Cooking	Welch	1.67	5	163.28	.144
	Brown-Forsythe	1.88	5	351.78	.097
Earthy	Welch	1.78	5	164.42	.119
	Brown-Forsythe	1.97	5	375.25	.082
Upscale Cooking	Welch	2.29	5	161.60	.049
	Brown-Forsythe	2.10	5	339.59	.066

ANOVA was used to investigate the six dimensions that did meet the assumption of homogeneity (Table 32). The results revealed that there were no significant mean differences between party size within any of the dimensions at the $p<.05$ level.

Table 32. ANOVA Results for Party Size

Foodie Activity Dimension		Sum of Squares	df	F	Sig.
Sustainable Agriculture	Between Groups	5.94	5	.85	.518
	Within Groups	921.12	655		
	Total	927.06	660		
Political Activist	Between Groups	11.05	5	1.12	.346
	Within Groups	1287.29	655		
	Total	1298.34	660		
Trendy	Between Groups	5.76	5	.71	.613
	Within Groups	1056.82	655		
	Total	1062.58	660		
Drinking	Between Groups	14.52	5	1.09	.364
	Within Groups	1742.13	655		
	Total	1756.65	660		
Farmer Friendly	Between Groups	2.40	5	.25	.938
	Within Groups	1243.40	655		
	Total	1245.80	660		
Engaged	Between Groups	10.18	5	.96	.441
	Within Groups	1387.09	655		
	Total	1397.27	660		

4.4.3 Food Expenditures

Participants were asked to report an estimate of how much money they spent on food and beverages on their last vacation. This amount was divided by the number in their travel party in order to find the amount spent per person on food and beverages. For the purpose of this analysis, respondents that did not fill out the expenditures section of the survey, or who chose the 'six or more' response to the party size question were not included as the precise party size was unknown. An association between food expenditures and the different foodie activity dimensions was investigated using the Pearson product-moment correlation (Table 33).

Table 33. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations for Food Expenditures (n=537)

Foodie Activity Dimension	Pearson Correlation	df	Significance	Percentage of Variance
Sustainable Agriculture	.03	535	.543	.09%
Adventure	.12	535	.007	1.44%
Home Cooking	.01	535	.872	.01%
Political Activist	.05	535	.305	.25%
Earthy	.04	535	.376	.16%
Trendy	.11	535	.02	1.21%
Drinking	.06	535	.208	.36%
Farmer Friendly	.07	535	.128	.49%
Engaged	.11	535	.013	1.21%
Upscale Cooking	.07	535	.095	.49%

There were weak positive correlations between food and beverage expenditures and enjoyment of the Adventure [$r(535)=.12$, $p<.01$], Trendy [$r(535)=.11$, $p<.05$], and Engaged [$r(535)=.11$, $p<.05$] dimensions, indicating that higher food spending was correlated with increased enjoyment levels of the Adventure, Trendy, and Engaged dimensions.

4.4.4 Total Expenditures

A total expenditure variable was created from summing all spending categories reported. Once again, this amount was divided by the number in their travel party to find the amount spent per person on the respondent's last vacation and respondents that did not fill out the expenditures section or that chose the 'six or more' response to the party size question were not included. The relationship between expenditures and the different foodie activity dimensions was investigated using the Pearson product-moment correlation (Table 34).

Table 34. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations for Expenditures (n=537)

Foodie Activity Dimension	Pearson Correlation	df	Significance	Percentage of Variance
Sustainable Agriculture	.08	535	.076	.64%
Adventure	.13	535	.004	1.69%
Home Cooking	.06	535	.194	.36%
Political Activist	.10	535	.026	1.0%
Earthy	.05	535	.297	.25%
Trendy	.16	535	.000	2.56%
Drinking	.10	535	.027	1.0%
Farmer Friendly	.13	535	.003	1.69%
Engaged	.13	535	.004	1.69%
Upscale Cooking	.13	535	.004	1.69%

There were weak positive correlations between total expenditures and enjoyment of the Trendy [$r(535)=.16$, $p<.001$], Adventure [$r(535)=.13$, $p<.005$], Farmer Friendly [$r(535)=.13$, $p<.005$], Engaged [$r(535)=.13$, $p<.005$], Upscale Cooking [$r(535)=.13$, $p<.005$], Political Activist [$r(535)=.10$, $p<.05$], and Drinking [$r(535)=.10$, $p<.05$] dimensions, indicating that higher vacation spending was correlated with increased levels of enjoyment of activities associated with all dimensions except for Sustainable Agriculture, Home Cooking, and Earthy.

4.5 Foodie Rating

Participants were asked to rate themselves on a scale of 0 to 10 with 0 being 'not a foodie at all' and 10 being 'a total foodie.' The relationship between the foodie rating and the different foodie activity dimensions was investigated using the Pearson product-moment correlation (Table 35).

Table 35. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations for Foodie Rating (n=690)

Foodie Activity Dimension	Pearson Correlation	df	Significance	Percentage of Variance
Sustainable Agriculture	.24	688	.000	5.76%
Adventure	.53	688	.000	28.09%
Home Cooking	.33	688	.000	10.89%
Political Activist	.28	688	.000	7.84%
Earthy	.19	688	.000	3.61%
Trendy	.45	688	.000	20.25%
Drinking	.32	688	.000	10.24%
Farmer Friendly	.28	688	.000	7.84%
Engaged	.42	688	.000	17.64%
Upscale Cooking	.42	688	.000	17.64%

There was a strong positive correlation between the foodie rating and the Adventure dimension [$r(688)=.53$, $p<.001$], indicating that a higher foodie rating was correlated with increased seeking out of Adventure activities. There were moderate positive correlations between the foodie rating and enjoyment of the Trendy [$r(688)=.45$, $p<.001$], Engaged [$r(688)=.42$, $p<.001$], Upscale Cooking [$r(688)=.42$, $p<.001$], Home Cooking [$r(688)=.33$, $p<.001$], and Drinking [$r(688)=.32$, $p<.001$] dimensions, indicating that a higher foodie rating was correlated with increased levels of enjoyment of activities within those dimensions. There were low positive correlations between the foodie rating and enjoyment of the Political Activist [$r(688)=.28$, $p<.001$], Farmer Friendly [$r(688)=.28$, $p<.001$], Sustainable Agriculture [$r(688)=.24$,

p<.001], Earthy [r(688)=.19, p<.001] dimensions, indicating that higher foodie ratings were correlated with increased levels of enjoyment of activities associated with those dimensions.

4.6 Summary of Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate food-related activities of potential tourists to Minneapolis to produce foodie activity dimensions and investigate the demographics and travel habits of the respondents, differentiated by their enjoyment levels of various foodie activity dimensions: Sustainable Agriculture, Adventure, Home Cooking, Political Activist, Earthy, Trendy, Drinking, Farmer Friendly, Engaged, and Upscale Cooking.. Together, these factors explained 58.72% of the variance of the model, and satisfied the first research question: 'Can foodie activities be factored into activity dimensions?'.

The second research question investigated socio-demographic differences of the respondents as related to the various foodie activity dimensions. Results revealed that men had a significantly higher enjoyment of the Adventure, Political Activist, and Farmer Friendly dimensions than women. Regarding differences between age groups within dimensions, the 50-59 year olds had a significantly higher level of enjoyment of the Earthy dimension than the younger groups. The younger groups reported higher enjoyment of the Adventure, Drinking, and Engaged dimensions than the oldest groups. There were no statistically significant differences between income levels for any of the dimensions.

The third research question investigated differences in travel behavior by asking respondents details about their last vacation, including length of stay, size of travel party, food and beverage expenditures, and total trip expenditures. Respondents that traveled for longer amounts of time reported significantly higher enjoyment of Sustainable Agriculture, Adventure,

Politically Active, Trendy, Farmer Friendly, and Upscale Cooking activities than those that only traveled for 1-4 days. Size of party revealed no statistically significant differences. There were weak positive correlations between the Adventure, Trendy, and Engaged dimensions and both food expenditures and total vacation expenditures. There were weak positive correlations between the Farmer Friendly, Engaged, Upscale Cooking, Political Activist, and Drinking dimensions and total vacation expenditures.

The final research question investigated how respondents with varying foodie activity dimension scores rate themselves when asked to what degree they self-identify as a foodie. The foodie scale ranged from 0 to 10 with 0 being 'not a foodie at all' and 10 being 'a total foodie'. All of the dimensions had positive correlations with the foodie rating, with the Adventure dimension have the strongest correlation. In the final chapter, these results will be discussed and future research topics will be suggested.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

This study examined potential visitors to Minneapolis based on their enjoyment of food-related activities to produce foodie activity dimensions and to compare visitor behavior and demographics among dimensions. This chapter is organized by research question:

1. Can foodie activities be factored into activity dimensions?
2. Are there differences in foodie activity dimension scores among respondents with varying socio-demographic characteristics?
3. Are there differences in foodie activity dimension scores among respondents with varying travel behaviors?
4. How do the respondents with varying foodie activity dimension scores rate themselves when asked to what degree they identify as a foodie?

5.2 Foodie Activity Dimensions

The first question explored the possibility of creating foodie activity dimensions based on people's enjoyment of various food related activities. The factor analysis identified ten dimensions, which are discussed below.

5.2.1 Sustainable Agriculture Dimension

The activities that loaded onto this factor were mostly focused on being informed about events and activities related to sustainable food. There were a few items in this factor that seem slightly unrelated based on face value, such as attending food competitions, participating in food or recipe competitions/contests, and attending food industry meetings. Because these items are

not very specific, they could have been interpreted differently by each respondent. For example, the items related to participating in or attending food competitions may have loaded onto the Sustainable Agriculture factor because sustainable-minded respondents could have interpreted this item as small-scale events designed to promote the use of local foods (for example, a salsa-making contest at a local food cooperative). Respondents may have associated the food industry meeting item with the item asking about sustainable agriculture events/meetings even though food industry meetings do not necessarily have an association with sustainability, which could explain why it loaded onto the Sustainable Agriculture factor with a .63 loading score. The factor mean for the Sustainable Agriculture dimension was the lowest of all the factors (M=2.29, SD=1.17). Most of the items in this factor are activities that require a strong interest in sustainable food systems. This dimension shares some characteristics with the "Whole-foodier than thou" foodie type in Barr and Levy's *The Official Foodie Handbook* (1985), such as raising their own livestock.

5.2.2 Adventure Dimension

Many of the items in this dimension asked about various food-related activities respondents may seek out while traveling, such as special food and drink products and experiences and considering food when deciding where to vacation. These activities are closely related to authentic food and travel experiences, which encourages sharing and preserving human heritage, which is an important aspect of sustainable tourism (Bramwell & Lane, 1993; Sims, 2009; Sánchez-Cañizares & López-Guzmán, 2012; Reynolds, 1993). This dimension is similar to results found in Robinson and Getz's study (2012), which states that foodies seek "authentic, traditional, and regional food experiences when traveling" (p. 19). The food and beverage festival aspect of this dimension is one that is supported by other research that has also found

festivals to be an important travel motivator (Robinson and Getz, 2012). This dimension is also similar to Barr and Levy's "Gorgeous East in Me" foodie, who is drawn to new foods and likes to experience other cultures through their food choices (1985).

5.2.3 Home Cooking Dimension

The activities within the Home Cooking dimension are centered on making food in various ways and trying/creating recipes. This dimension had the highest mean (M=4.63, SD=1.10). Many people cook on a daily basis in order to feed themselves, but also enjoy it as a hobby. The activities constituting the dimension are accessible to almost anyone, e.g. trying new recipes, grilling, baking. Yun et al. (2011) found a cluster in their food-related behavior study they designated as "Interests in Cooking" that shares similar interests with the Home Cooking dimension (p. 7).

5.2.4 Political Activist Dimension

Most of the activity items in the Political Activist Dimension are related to being an active participant in activities related to food issues, such as seeing films and reading books about food issues and following and being active in state and national food issues. Some of the items are similar to the items in the Sustainable Agriculture dimension but the Political Activist activities are more involved and require direct action.

5.2.5 Earthy Dimension

The Earthy dimension activities include gardening flowers and food, practicing organic gardening methods, and seed-saving. Organic gardening and seed-saving are both activities that could be linked to sustainable agriculture, yet they became their own factor with the gardening

items. It is possible that someone participating in organic gardening is practicing that method due to simplicity. A gardener that uses fertilizer or pesticides needs to be somewhat educated on how to use those products, where as anyone can attempt to grow flowers or vegetables by simply watering their seeds, which could be considered organic gardening. They may not be doing it for the sake of being sustainable. It also could have factored separately as gardening activities are hands on physical activities whereas the sustainable agriculture activities are more about being interested and informed on the big picture of sustainable agriculture issues.

5.2.6 Trendy Dimension

These activities center on using media to stay informed of food, restaurant, and chef happenings through blogs and the newspaper. Ambrozas (2003) also found that that some foodies were especially interested in trying new restaurants and in reading food blogs, going so far as to have computers installed in their kitchens for the purpose of looking up recipes on blogs (p. 159).

5.2.7 Drinking Dimension

All of the items in this dimension are related to consuming alcoholic beverages. The survey instrument did not include non-alcoholic beverage items such as coffee or tea, which should be included in future revisions of the instrument for those respondents that enjoy beverage-related activities, such as coffee cuppings or tea tastings. A “Wine and Beer related Experiences” cluster was also a result in the study by Yun et al. (2011, p. 7).

5.2.8 Farmer Friendly Dimension

The activities in this dimension include purchasing local or organic food, eating at farm-to-table restaurants, and visiting farmers markets. It is interesting to note that these items loaded onto a separate factor, as they are very similar to the items within the Sustainable Agriculture dimension. While farmers markets are closely linked to sustainable agriculture, visitors often frequent them to have fun and relax, escape daily life, and spend time with family (Silkes, 2012). Those motivations are not necessarily linked to an interest in Sustainable Agriculture, which could be an explanation for why the item factored separately. Robinson and Getz (2012) found farmers markets to be the most frequently attended food-related event in their study. The "Organivore" foodie in Brones' article (2011) is similar to the Farmer Friendly dimension in that they like to visit farmers markets and know where their food originates.

5.2.9 Engaged Dimension

The activities making up this dimension primarily involve social interactions that relate to food, including discussing food-related activities or posting on social media about food as well as activities that indicate a strong general interest in food such as thinking about food a lot or taking pictures of food. Brones' "One-upper" and "Blogging Food Pornographer" foodies share characteristics with this dimension as the former enjoys boasting to others about unique or new food experiences they have, and the latter enjoys taking and sharing pictures of their meals (2011).

5.2.10 Upscale Cooking

Two of the items are shopping at specialty cookware/food stores and attending cooking classes. These differ from the Home Cooking dimension, as they are activities that require some investment of time and money.

5.3 Socio-demographics Across Foodie Activity Dimensions

The second research question looks at how the various demographic variables differ in their enjoyment of the foodie activity dimensions. Gender was the first characteristic investigated. The three dimensions with significant differences were Adventure, Political Activist, and Farmer Friendly. In all cases, men reported higher enjoyment of the dimensions than their female counterparts. However, only 201 men took the survey in comparison with 458 females. According to a study by Zalatan (1998), wives are more likely to gather vacation planning materials than husbands are, so it could be inferred that the men in the sample are particularly engaged and interested in food-related activities, and were thus drawn to completing the survey about food activities and travel.

Regarding age, the younger groups also showed significantly higher enjoyment of the Engaged dimension activities than the older groups. The "I enjoy posting about food on social media" item within this dimension may have especially contributed to these results, as young adults are more likely to use social media than older adults (Lenhart, 2009). Social media is a valuable advertising and marketing tool for destinations, therefore the younger generations that are using social media more and are posting more about food are a good target market for social media food-related advertising, especially as advertising efforts spread quickly through social media users themselves. The two youngest groups also sought out activities in the Adventure

dimension significantly more than the oldest groups which may imply that this age group is more likely than their older counter parts to seek out unique food and beverage experiences while they are traveling. The youngest group also showed significantly higher enjoyment of the Drinking dimension activities than the oldest groups (40 years and older) which corresponds with research demonstrating that alcohol is often used more by younger people, than by those who are older (Carey et al., 2009; Hilton, 1988). These results imply that destinations should consider including attractions such as authentic food or beverage experiences their location has to offer, including breweries or unique bars when advertising their destination to younger generations and utilize social media in doing so. Finally, the 50-59 year old age group demonstrated significantly higher enjoyment of the Earthy dimension than the two youngest groups.

Finally, the last demographic investigated was total household income. There were no significant differences between different income levels. This could be due to the fact that almost half the sample was made up of people making $50,000 -$99,999 so differences may have not appeared due restriction of range. Another possible explanation for the lack of differences is that it is possible to find ways to participate in most of the dimensions for people of all levels of income. For example, a wealthy person who enjoys food gardening may have a large piece of property to base a garden and can invest a lot of time and resources into fencing, fertilizers, decorations, high quality seeds or seedling, and tools. However, a person of a lower income may have access to a community garden. While these two gardening experiences are vastly different and require different resources in able to be able to participate, they both are manners in which people of different economic backgrounds can enjoy gardening.

Table 36 summarizes the dimensions that had statistically significant differences for each demographic variable.

Table 36. Summary of Significant Differences within Dimensions for Demographics

Dimension	Gender	Age	Income
Sustainable Agriculture			
Adventure	X	X	
Home Cooking			
Political Activist	X		
Earthy		X	
Trendy			
Drinking		X	
Farmer Friendly	X		
Engaged		X	
Upscale Cooking			

Note: p<.05

5.4 Travel Behavior Across Foodie Activity Dimensions

The third research question investigated how respondents with varying travel behaviors differed in their enjoyment of the foodie activity dimensions. The travel behavior variables explored were length of trip, size of travel party, food expenditures, and total trip expenditures. Data were based on the respondents' last vacation.

Those that traveled for longer amounts of time reported higher enjoyment of Sustainable Agriculture, Adventure, Political Activist, Trendy, Farmer Friendly, and Upscale Cooking activities than those that only traveled for 1-4 days. This is important information for destination marketing organizations as they consider their advertising strategy. This research shows that visitors who are interested in sustainable food issues, authentic food products and experiences, new restaurants, farmers, and/or spending money on cooking products and classes took longer vacations likely spend more money than someone taking a shorter vacation. These are the groups that marketers may want to attract to their destination, and therefore the activities that these groups enjoy are important to understand both in terms of product development and marketing.

Another aspect of travel behavior that was investigated was the size of the travel party during the respondent's last vacation. There were no significant differences between the various travel party sizes in terms of their enjoyment of the dimensions. This information may lead to the conclusion that marketing based on food-related interests is not useful for attracting certain sized travel parties. If a destination wants to attract specific group sizes, for example large groups or couples, other visitor behavior or interests should be investigated in order to target those markets.

This study also looked at the relationship between food and beverage expenditures and total expenditures during the respondents' last vacations and their enjoyment scores in the ten foodie activity dimensions. As up to 25% of visitor spending is on food, food and beverage expenditures are important to consider (Quan & Wang, 2004). While the correlations were weak, the respondents who spent more on food during their last vacation had higher interest in the Adventure, Trendy, and Engaged, dimensions than those who spent less. Travelers with higher scores in the Adventure dimension are interested in seeking unique food or beverage related products or experiences during vacation so it is logical that they would spend more on food and beverages than those with lesser interest in those activities. Respondents with higher enjoyment of the Trendy dimension may spend more as they have a higher interest in restaurant and chef happenings and keep themselves up to date on food-related information, which are activities they can also participate in while traveling. Additionally, because they are interested in food trends, they may spend more on food to participate in food-related activities that they researched ahead of time and that reflect the destination. Those with higher interest in the Engaged dimension may spend more on food as they think and talk about food often, which may inspire them to focus on and try more food-related activities while traveling.

Those that spent more on their total vacation had higher interests in the Adventure, Political Activist, Trendy, Drinking, Farmer Friendly, Engaged, and Upscale Cooking dimensions. As the Political Activist, Drinking, Farmer Friendly, and Upscale Cooking dimensions did not have higher correlations with food and beverage spending, they may be spending more in areas such as shopping for souvenirs. For example, the Upscale Cooking dimension includes shopping for specialty cookware, which is something respondents could do while on vacation, increasing their shopping expenditures. There are many other reasons vacation expenditures could be high for these groups, including spending more on attractions, flying to their destination, or staying in luxury hotels, all of which would raise the cost of their vacation. Table 37 summarizes the statistically significant differences for each travel behavior variable.

Table 37. Summary of Significant Differences within Dimensions for Travel Behavior

Dimension	Length of Stay	Party Size	Food Expenditures	Total Expenditures
Sustainable Agriculture	X			
Adventure	X		X	X
Home Cooking				
Political Activist	X			X
Earthy				
Trendy	X		X	X
Drinking				X
Farmer Friendly	X			X
Engaged			X	X
Upscale Cooking	X			X

Note: $p<.05$

5.5 Foodie Ratings Across Foodie Activity Dimensions

Respondents were asked to rate themselves on an 11-point foodie scale with 0 meaning ‘not a foodie at all’ and 10 meaning ‘a total foodie’. A correlation between this rating and each of the foodie activity dimensions was investigated to determine if respondents with varying

levels of interest in the dimensions rated themselves differently on the foodie scale. There were positive correlations between respondents' foodie rating and interest in all of the dimensions, the strongest correlation being with the Adventure dimension. This demonstrates that despite the fact that some literature finds the word "foodie" is often associated with someone that is snobby or elitist (Johnston & Baumann, 2010; Ambrozas, 2003; Cairns, Johnston, & Baumann, 2010), people with higher enjoyment of food-related activities designate themselves at a higher 'level' of foodie-ism.

5.6 Implications for Sustainable Tourism

As this and other research has shown, there are foodies that are highly interested in having authentic food experiences (Robinson & Getz, 2012; Sims, 2009). Attracting these kinds of tourists will help preserve cultural aspects of destinations as demand is raised for authentic experiences and local business owners see the economic benefits of being able to provide a unique and authentic experience. Additionally, it is important for destinations to advertise local specialty products and experiences, and assist businesses in being able to provide those authentic travel experiences.

Economic sustainability is a pillar of sustainable tourism. Without a continued flow of visitor spending, a destination will cease to become a destination. This research has provided valuable information about potential visitors' interests and hobbies, which destinations can incorporate into their long term planning for sustainable tourism growth. They can focus on groups that they think will help their destination flourish. For example, the respondents who tended to stay longer on vacation and spend more overall indicated higher interest in the Farmer Friendly dimension. A destination may want to target potential Farmer Friendly tourists by

promoting farm-to-table restaurants and farmers markets at their destination in order to attract people that will stay longer and spend more money. The interests of Farmer Friendly visitors also help support local farmers and businesses, which is good for economic, cultural, and environmental sustainability. People with higher interest in the Earthy, Sustainable Agriculture, and Political Activist dimensions also have interests related to environmentally friendly activities such as organic gardening, being aware of sustainable food issues, and being involved in slow food movements. If these foodies bring their interests with them on vacation, it could be beneficial to environmentally sustainable development of a destination.

5.7 Limitations

The data for this study was collected through an internet survey, which restricted data collection to individuals that have access to the Internet. The results are also limited as they are single sourced from one survey. There are also several limitations of the questionnaire design to consider. The survey asked participants to report their enjoyment of various activities. This may not mean that they actively participate in the items, but may like the idea of it or think that they may enjoy it if they did participate. The respondents were also self-reporting which may limit the validity of the data. The survey instrument contained a disproportionate number of items related to sustainable agriculture, which is one possible explanation for why the Sustainable Agriculture food activity dimension contained more items than the other dimensions. The expert panel that reviewed the questionnaire consisted of several people that work in the food industry or faculty, however they were all people with a vested interest in sustainability issues, which could have caused some bias. There are also some items that seem not to fit into their respective factors based on face value, for example, “I enjoy attending food competitions” loaded onto the Sustainable Agriculture dimension. One explanation for this is that the item was not specific

enough. In this case, it's possible that the item was interpreted as a small food competition between amateurs using their own local ingredients, although it could have also been interpreted as a large-budget competition between famous chefs, which seems less likely to have loaded onto Sustainable Agriculture. The participants in this study were primarily American and Canadian residents, so the results are limited in their application globally. More specifically, the majority of the respondents were from the Midwestern part of the United States, which means the results could differ than if the sample was primarily residing in a different region.

5.8 Future Research Directions

This was an exploratory study in a relatively new field of research, as literature about foodies is scarce. There are many opportunities for future research based on the results and conclusions of this study. A few of these are:

- Perform a similar study with a sample that has a more balanced gender ratio
- Perform similar studies in different countries to research food-related travel behavior in other cultures
- Further investigate travel expenditures to determine on which activities, events, or items tourists with higher interest in certain dimensions specifically spend money
- Include a more diverse range of activities to avoid disproportionate loadings on factors
- Include more demographic variables such as level of education, religious affiliation, or race/ethnicity.
- Investigate differences in foodie activity dimensions in varying regions
- Study differences among respondents based on family stage

- Perform cluster analysis to investigate how respondents fall in to specific types of foodies
- A qualitative study concerning the definition of the term ‘foodie’ and perceptions of foodies.
- While this study investigated a few aspects of travel behavior, there are many possibilities of other variables that could be investigated using the foodie activity dimensions such as visitor satisfaction, travel motivations, distance traveled, and risk perception or avoidance.

5.9 Conclusion

This exploratory study was intended to produce foodie activity dimensions based on participants’ food related interests. Ten dimensions were produced: Sustainable Agriculture, Adventure, Home Cooking, Political Activist, Earthy, Trendy, Drinking, Farmer Friendly, Engaged, and Upscale Cooking. Further investigation of each of these dimensions revealed differences in demographics, travel behavior and foodie self-ratings - differences that can be used by DMOs to target advertising and marketing campaigns for foodies. The results can be used by destinations to find ways to attract tourists that will help maintain cultural authenticity and economic stability of the host community.

This study is also an important first step for future academic research. There is very little scholarly literature written about foodies as it is a relatively new field of study, especially when related to travel behavior. Culinary tourism is attracting much more research attention, however much more needs to be done regarding food-interests and tourism of the general market, not tourists already traveling with culinary motivations. This study, therefore, stands as one of the

first research-based descriptions of varying foodie activities based on lifestyles at home and while traveling. There is much more work to be done to define and segment foodies and foodie activity dimensions, as well as study various aspect of their interests or behavior, and hopefully this study will encourage others to continue studying this subject.

REFERENCES

Ambrozas, D. (2003). *Serious feast: Vancouver foodies in globalized consumer society.* (Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy). Simon Fraser University.

Barr, A., & Levy, P. (1985). *The official foodie handbook.* Arbor House Publishing Company.

Bell, R., & Marshall, D. (2003). The construct of food involvement in behavioral research: Scale development and validation. *Appetite, 40*, 235-244.

Bourdain, R. (2012). *Comfort me with offal*. Kansas City: Andrews McMeel Publishing.

Bramwell, B. & Lane, B. (1993). Sustainable tourism: An evolving global approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 1*(1), 1-5.

Brones, A. (2011). *The 10 types of foodies.* Retrieved September 8, 2012, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/anna-brones/the-10-types-of-foodies_b_1170430.html.

Cairns, K., Johnston, J., & Baumann, S. (2010). Caring about food: Doing gender in the foodie kitchen. *Gender & Society, 24*, 519.

Carey, K., McClurg, A., Bolles, J., Hubbell, S., Will, H., & Carey, M.. (2009). College student drinking and ambulance utilization. *Journal of Public Health Management & Practice, 15*(6), 524-528.

Chomeya, R. (2010). Quality of psychology test between Likert scale 5 and 6 points. *Journal of Social Sciences, 6*(3), 399-403.

Etzel, M. J. & Woodside, A. G. (1982). Segmenting vacation markets: The case of the distant and near-home travelers. *Journal of Travel Research, 20*(4), 10-14.

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.

Fons, M., Fierro, J., & Patiño, M. (2011). Rural tourism: A sustainable alternative. *Applied Energy, 88*, 551-557.

Foodie. (2012). Retrieved September 23, 2012, from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/foodie.

Foodtopian Society. (2013). Explore Asheville: Foodtopia. Retrieved March 18, 2013, from http://www.exploreasheville.com/foodtopia/.

Garland, R. (1991). The mid-point on a rating scale: Is it desirable? *Marketing Bulletin, 2*, 66-70.

Garson, D. G. (2012). PA 765 Stat notes: An online textbook. Retrieved January 10, 2012 from www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/statnote.htm.

González, A. M., & Bello, L. (2002). The construct "lifestyle" in market segmentation: The behaviour of tourist consumers. *European Journal of Marketing, 36*(1/2), 51-85.

Goody, J. (1982). *Cooking, cuisine and class: A study in comparative sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Green, E. & Kline, C. (2013). *Are you a foodie? Food related travel study.* Technical report prepared for: 7th Street Public Market, Charlotte, NC.

Green, E. & Kline, C. (2012). *Are you a foodie?* Technical report prepared for: Festival of Legends, Pittsboro, NC.

Green, E. & Rao V. (1970). Rating scales and information recovery – how many scales and response categories to use? *Journal of Marketing, 34*(3), 33-39.

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.

Hermosillo, J. (2012). Loncheras: A look at the stationary food trucks of Los Angeles. (Unpublished Master of Arts). University of California Los Angeles.

Hilton, M. (1988). The demographic distribution of drinking patterns in 1984. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 22*(1-2), 37-47.

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

Johns, N., & Gyimóthy, S. (2002). Market segmentation and the prediction of tourist behavior: The case of Bornholm, Denmark. *Journal of Travel Research, 40*(3), 316-327.

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

Knowd, I. (2006). Tourism as a mechanism for farm survival. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 14*(1), 24-42.

Kyle, G., Absher, J., Norman, W., Hammitt, W., & Jodice, L. (2007). A modified involvement scale. *Leisure Studies, 26*(4), 399-427.

Kyle, G., & Chick, G. (2002). The social nature of leisure involvement. *Journal of Leisure Research, 34*(4), 426-448.

Kyle, G. T., Kerstetter, D. L., & Guadagnolo, F. B. (2002). Market segmentation using participant involvement profiles. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration, 20*(1), 1-21.

Leeworthy, V. R., Wiley, P. C., English, D. B. K., & Kriesel, W. (2001). Correcting response bias in tourist spending surveys. *Annals of Tourism Research, 28*(1), 83-97.

Lenhart, A. (2009). Adults and social network Web sites. Retrieved March 11, 2013 from http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2009/Adults-and-Social-Network-Websites.aspx.

Long, L. M. (2004). Culinary tourism: A folkloristic perspective on eating and otherness. In L. M. Long (Ed.), *Culinary tourism* (1st ed., pp. 20-50). Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky.

Long, P. T., & Perdue, R. R. (1990). The economic impact of rural festivals and special events: Assessing the spatial distribution of expenditures. *Journal of Travel Research, 28*(4), 10-14.

MacLaurin, T., Blose, J., & Mack, R. (2007). Marketing segmentation of culinary tourists. *7th Annual Conference on Business & Economics,* Rome, Italy.

Mayerowitz, S. (2009, August 10). Top 10 state fair food favorites. Retrieved March 11, 2013 from: http://abcnews.go.com/Travel/top-10-state-fair-food-favorites/story?id=8279841.

Okumus, B., Okumus, F., & McKercher, B. (2007). Incorporating local and international cuisines in the marketing of tourism destinations: The cases of Hong Kong and Turkey. *Tourism Management, 28*(1), 253-261.

Pallant, J. (2006). *SPSS Survival Manual*. New York: Open University Press.

Quan, S., & Wang, N. (2004). Towards a structural model of the tourist experience: An illustration from food experiences in tourism. *Tourism Management, 25*(3), 297-305.

Reynolds, P. (1993). Food and tourism: Towards an understanding of sustainable culture. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 1*(1), 48-54.

Robinson, R. N. S., & Getz, D. (2012). Getting involved: 'Foodies' and food tourism. *CAUTHE Conference,* Melbourne, Australia.

Sánchez-Cañizares, S. M., & López-Guzmán, T. (2012). Gastronomy as a tourism resource: Profile of the culinary tourist. *Current Issues in Tourism, 15*(3), 229-245.

Scarpato, R., & Daniele, R. (2003). New global cuisine: Tourism, authenticity and sense of place in postmodern gastronomy. In C. Hall, L. Sharples, R. Mitchell, N. Macionis & B. Cambourne (Eds.), *Food tourism around the world* (1st ed., pp. 296-313). Burlington, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Seery, P. S. (2010). *Metropolitan cuisine tourism: Exploring food tourists to the creole cuisine in New Orleans, LA USA.* (Unpublished Master of Arts). Arizona State University.

Shenoy, S. S. (2005). *Food tourism and the culinary tourist.* (Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy). Clemson University.

Silkes, C. (2012). Farmers' markets: A case for culinary tourism. *Journal of Culinary Science & Technology, 10*(4), 326-336.

Sims, R. (2009). Food, place and authenticity: Local food and the sustainable tourism experience. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 17*(3), 321-336.

Smith, S., & Costello, C. (2009). Segmenting visitors to a culinary event: Motivations, travel behavior, and expenditures. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 18*(1), 44-67.

Smyth, J., Dillman, D., Christian, L., & Stern, M. (2006). Comparing check-all and forced-choice question formats in web surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 70*(1), 66-77.

Spurlock, C. (2009). Performing and sustaining (agri)culture and place: The cultivation of environmental subjectivity on the Piedmont Farm Tour. *Text and Performance Quarterly, 29*(1), 5-21.

Stynes, D. J., & White, E. M. (2006). Reflections on measuring recreation and travel spending. *Journal of Travel Research, 45*, 8-16.

What is a foodie? (2012). Retrieved September 23, 2012, from http://www.gocalaverasfoodie.com/what-is-a-foodie.

World Tourism Organization. (1993). *Sustainable Tourism Development: Guide for Local Planners.* Madrid: World Tourism Organization.

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.

Zalatan, A. (1998). Wives involvement in tourism decision processes. *Annals of Tourism Research, 25*(4), 890-903.

Zografos, C., & Allcroft, D. (2007). The environmental values of potential ecotourists: A segmentation study. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 15*(1), 44-66.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board Office
4N-70 Brody Medical Sciences Building· Mail Stop 682
600 Moye Boulevard · Greenville, NC 27834
Office **252-744-2914** · Fax **252-744-2284** · www.ecu.edu/irb

Notification of Exempt Certification

From: Social/Behavioral IRB
To: Erin Green
CC: Carol Kline
Date: 11/7/2012
Re: UMCIRB 12-001908
A Study of Foodie Types and Their Varying Travel Behaviors

I am pleased to inform you that your research submission has been certified as exempt on 11/7/2012. This study is eligible for Exempt Certification under category #2.

It is your responsibility to ensure that this research is conducted in the manner reported in your application and/or protocol, as well as being consistent with the ethical principles of the Belmont Report and your profession.

This research study does not require any additional interaction with the UMCIRB unless there are proposed changes to this study. Any change, prior to implementing that change, must be submitted to the UMCIRB for review and approval. The UMCIRB will determine if the change impacts the eligibility of the research for exempt status. If more substantive review is required, you will be notified within five business days.

The UMCIRB office will hold your exemption application for a period of five years from the date of this letter. If you wish to continue this protocol beyond this period, you will need to submit an Exemption Certification request at least 30 days before the end of the five year period.

The Chairperson (or designee) does not have a potential for conflict of interest on this study.

APPENDIX B: SURVEY

Foodie Types and their Travel Behavior

1. Introduction

You are being asked to take part in this study by completing an online questionnaire. Your participation will take approximately 15 minutes. Please be aware that you are not required to participate in this research and you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty. You may also choose not to answer questions that you would prefer not to answer. There are no risks anticipated through participating in this research. This is an anonymous survey; the researcher will be the only one with access to the data collected and questionnaires will only be identified by code number.

If you agree to participate in this research, please indicate your agreement by clicking the "next" button below and complete the online survey. Thank you for your participation!

2. Are you a "Foodie?"

***1. A "foodie" is someone who has a strong interest in food. A foodie might be interested in eating high quality food, cooking with local foods or trying new recipes, following trends in nutrition, restaurants, chefs, or food, or traveling to try new foods or drinks. Using the scale below indicate the degree to which you consider yourself as a "foodie"?**

Not a foodie at all			Somewhat a foodie				Mostly a foodie			A total foodie
○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Foodie Types and their Travel Behavior

2. Please indicate your level of agreement for each of the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disgree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Opinion
I enjoy gardening (flowers)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy gardening (food)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy organic gardening	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy seed-saving of heirloom varieties	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy cooking	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy grilling	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy baking	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy participating in wine-tastings	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy participating in beer-tastings	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy trying new restaurants	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy trying new recipes	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy creating new recipes	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy trying new food fads	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy reading food blogs	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy contributing to food blogs	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy reading the food section of the newspaper	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy trying food from other cultures	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy keeping up with local restaurant/chef happenings	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy keeping up with sustainable agriculture happenings	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy reading food magazines	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy watching the Food Network or cooking shows	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy hosting food-centered gatherings at home (e.g. fondue party, cookout)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy participating in dinner clubs	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy going on food-centered outings or vacations	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy participating in wine or beer clubs	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy home-brewing	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy visiting farmer's markets	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy purchasing locally grown and/or organic food	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy eating at farm-to-table restaurants	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

3. Food-related Activities

Foodie Types and their Travel Behavior

1. Please indicate your level of agreement for each of the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Opinion
I enjoy attending food and beverage festivals	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy attending food industry meetings	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy attending sustainable agriculture events/meetings	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy reading books about sustainable food (Omnivore's Dilemma, Animal Vegetable Miracle, Slow Food, etc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy seeing movies about sustainable food (Food Inc., Fresh, Fast Food Nation, King Korn, etc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy visiting farms/orchards	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy volunteering at farm/orchard tours	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy following state or national food issues	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy being politically active on food issues	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy attending cooking classes	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy attending food competitions	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy participating in food or recipe competitions/contests	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy canning fruits or vegetables	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy raising livestock for my own consumption	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy learning specialty butchering techniques	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy eating at food trucks	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy attending county/state fairs to eat "fair food"	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy trying heritage/traditional foods (i.e. soul food, shrimp and grits)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy participating in community/church potlucks	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy shopping at specialty cookware/food stores	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy reading about nutrition	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy participating in Community Supported Agriculture	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy participating in Community Supported Fisheries	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy participating in slow food groups	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy taking photos of food	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy posting on social media about food	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Foodie Types and their Travel Behavior

I think about food a lot during the day	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I enjoy discussing activities related to food	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I try to avoid chain restaurants	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

If there are other food-related activities you participate in, please list them here:

2. Please indicate your level of agreement for each of the following statements regarding food and travel:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Opinion
I would travel more than 50 miles to attend a food/beverage festival	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I consider food when deciding where to vacation	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I seek out special types of food experiences (cooking class, farm tour, wine tasting) while on a vacation or getaway	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I seek out special types of food products (local, artisanal, heritage) while on a vacation or getaway	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I seek out local drink products (wine, beer, mead, moonshine, cider, colas, ades) while on a vacation or getaway	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I seek out locally-owned restaurants while on a vacation or getaway	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I look for restaurants that serve organic food while on a vacation or getaway	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

4. Personal Travel Behaviors

Please answer these questions to the best of your ability about your most recent vacation or getaway.

1. Where did you visit on your most recent vacation or getaway? Please be specific.

2. How long was your last trip?

- ○ 1 day (no overnight)
- ○ 2-4 days
- ○ 5-7 days
- ○ 7-14 days
- ○ 14+ days

Foodie Types and their Travel Behavior

3. Including yourself, how many people were in your travel party?

○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 ○ 6 or more

4. Including yourself, how many of the people in your travel party were 18 or older?

○ 1 ○ 2 ○ 3 ○ 4 ○ 5 ○ 6 or more

5. What types of lodging did you utilize during your visit? Please select all that apply.

- ☐ Hotel
- ☐ Bed and Breakfast
- ☐ Stayed with friends or relatives
- ☐ Rental property (i.e. cabin, condo)
- ☐ RV
- ☐ Camping
- ☐ Other

6. What was your method of travel to the destination? Please select all that apply.

- ☐ Airplane
- ☐ Personal Vehicle
- ☐ Rental Car
- ☐ Bus
- ☐ Train
- ☐ Other

7. What tools did you utilize to plan your trip? Please select all that apply.

- ☐ Previous experience
- ☐ Recommendations from others
- ☐ Visitor center/bureau website
- ☐ Visitor guide
- ☐ AAA
- ☐ Food-related blog/website
- ☐ Travel Agent

Other (please specify)

Foodie Types and their Travel Behavior

8. Which of the following activities did you participate in on your trip?

- [ ] Dining out
- [ ] Nightlife/evening entertainment
- [ ] Casino gaming
- [ ] Musical concerts
- [ ] Fairs or festivals
- [ ] Sporting events
- [ ] Theater performance
- [ ] Water sports/activities
- [ ] Biking
- [ ] Golfing
- [ ] Fishing/hunting
- [ ] Winter sports/activities
- [ ] Amusement parks
- [ ] Museums
- [ ] Historic sites
- [ ] State/national parks
- [ ] Shopping
- [ ] Visiting friends/family

9. Please estimate your expenditures in the following categories for your entire party during your visit. Please enter your response in whole dollar amounts (e.g. 456)

Transportation (e.g. airfare, gas, rental costs, tolls)	
Lodging (e.g. hotel costs, campsite fees, rental costs)	
Food/Beverage (e.g. eating out, groceries)	
Activities/Entertainment (e.g. admission fees, tickets, tours)	
Shopping (e.g. souvenirs, gifts)	
Other	

5. About You

These questions are strictly for classification purposes and will be reported in aggregate only.

1. What is your gender?

- ◯ Male
- ◯ Female

Foodie Types and their Travel Behavior

2. What is the year of your birth?

3. What is your occupation?

4. Please select the options below that describe your general food consumption. Please select all that apply.

- [ ] I eat all types of meat regularly
- [ ] I eat meat, but in limited portions
- [ ] I am a lacto-ovo or ovo vegetarian (I eat dairy and/or eggs)
- [ ] I eat fish only
- [ ] I am vegan
- [ ] I eat according to a religious doctrine
- [ ] I have a food intolerance or allergy (e.g. peanut allergy, gluten intolerant)
- [ ] Other

5. What is your total household income?

- ◯ Under $25,000
- ◯ $20,000-$49,999
- ◯ $50,000-$99,999
- ◯ $100,000-$149,999
- ◯ Over $150,000

6. What is your zip code? If you are not a resident of the United States, please enter your country of residence.

Foodie Types and their Travel Behavior

7. If you would like to be entered into a drawing for a two night hotel stay at the Normandy Inn and Suites in downtown Minneapolis, please provide your email. You can view more information about the hotel at http://www.bestwesternnormandy.com. Your email will remain confidential and will not be used for any purpose other than to notify you in the case that you are a winner.

APPENDIX C: INITIAL CONTACT EMAIL

Hello,
You are receiving this email because you asked for travel information from Meet Minneapolis and we value your opinion! We are currently working with the East Carolina University Center for Sustainable Tourism to conduct a study about travelers and their enjoyment of food-related activities. The following survey asks you about these activities, as well as details about your travel behavior. We would greatly appreciate your participation. Upon completion of the survey, you will be entered into a drawing for a TW0-NIGHT HOTEL STAY at the Normandy Inn and Suites in downtown Minneapolis. The survey should only take approximately 10-15 minutes of your time. To take the survey, simply click the link below or copy and paste the text into your browser:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/minneapolisfoodtravel
Thank you for your time and participation.
Best regards,
Erin Green
Graduate Student
ECU Center for Sustainable Tourism

APPENDIX D: SECONDARY EMAIL REQUEST

This is a reminder to participate in our survey in order to be entered into a drawing for a two night hotel stay. If you have already completed the survey, thank you for your participation! Unfortunately, we are unable to remove your email from our distribution list due to the anonymity of the survey. If you haven't filled out the survey, please review the message below. Thank you for your time.

Hello,
You are receiving this email because you asked for travel information from Meet Minneapolis and we value your opinion! We are currently working with the East Carolina University Center for Sustainable Tourism to conduct a study about travelers and their enjoyment of food-related activities. The following survey asks you about these activities, as well as details about your travel behavior. We would greatly appreciate your participation. Upon completion of the survey, you will be entered into a drawing for a TW0-NIGHT HOTEL STAY at the Normandy Inn and Suites in downtown Minneapolis. The survey should only take approximately 10-15 minutes of your time. To take the survey, simply click the link below or copy and paste the text into your browser:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/minneapolisfoodtravel
Thank you for your time and participation.
Best regards,
Erin Green
Graduate Assistant
ECU Center for Sustainable Tourism

APPENDIX E: FINAL EMAIL REQUEST

This is the **FINAL** reminder to participate in our survey. If you have already completed the survey, thank you for your participation! Unfortunately, we are unable to remove your email from our distribution list due to the anonymity of the survey. The survey will close on December 1st and the winner of the hotel stay will be notified through email. If you haven't filled out the survey, please review the message below. Thank you for your time. **THIS IS THE LAST EMAIL YOU WILL RECEIVE.**

Hello,
You are receiving this email because you asked for travel information from Meet Minneapolis and we value your opinion! We are currently working with the East Carolina University Center for Sustainable Tourism to conduct a study about travelers and their enjoyment of food-related activities. The following survey asks you about these activities, as well as details about your travel behavior. We would greatly appreciate your participation. Upon completion of the survey, you will be entered into a drawing for a TW0-NIGHT HOTEL STAY at the Normandy Inn and Suites in downtown Minneapolis. The survey should only take approximately 10-15 minutes of your time. To take the survey, simply click the link below or copy and paste the text into your browser:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/minneapolisfoodtravel
Thank you for your time and participation.
Best regards,
Erin Green
Graduate Assistant
ECU Center for Sustainable Tourism