

Consumer Embeddedness and Motivations for Farmers Market Patronage:

A Qualitative Study

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BY

Alanna Norton

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER'S OF SCIENCE

Dr. Hye-Young Kim, Adviser

JULY, 2019

Alanna Kathleen Norton
2019 copyright

ABSTRACT

The rise in popularity of farmers markets in the United States reflects consumers' negative response to more traditional food distribution systems. Farmers markets provide consumers with a more local and often more personal food purchasing experience. This paper examines consumer motivations to attend farmers markets in Minnesota using the concept of embeddedness. Values of social embeddedness, spatial embeddedness, and natural embeddedness are used as a framework to analyze the range of non-economic motivations and values sought by patrons of farmers markets. This work contributes to existing literature on non-economic motivations to patronize farmers markets and support local food systems.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	v
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study.....	2
Significance of the Study.....	3
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Farmers Markets.....	5
Farmers Markets in Minnesota.....	7
Characteristics of Farmers Market Shoppers.....	9
Conceptual Framework: Embeddedness	11
Focal Research Questions.....	18
CHAPTER III. METHODS	19
Overview of Qualitative Research	19
Rationale for the Chosen Methodology: Phenomenology.....	21
Researcher Positionality.....	22
Sample Selection and Participant Recruitment.....	22
Participant Characteristics	23
Data Collection Procedure.....	24
Interview Protocol.....	24
Data Analysis and Coding.....	25
CHAPTER IV. RESULTS	27
Social Embeddedness	28
Local Vendors and Other Shoppers	28
Family and Friends	30
Senses.....	30
Exploring and Learning	32
Spatial Embeddedness	34

Freshness.....	34
Support Local Business	35
Natural Embeddedness	36
Health of Self and Environment	36
Other Factors	37
Convenience	37
Price	39
CHAPTER V. CONCLUSION	41
Theoretical Implications	41
Practical Implications	44
Suggestions for Future Research	44
REFERENCES	46
APPENDIX A. PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT EMAIL	51
APPENDIX B. CONSENT FORM	52
APPENDIX C. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	55
APPENDIX D. INTERVIEW NOTES SAMPLE.....	56
APPENDIX E. CODING SAMPLE.....	57

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Qualitative Approaches by Creswell (2003).....	20
Table 2	Participant Characteristics	23
Table 3	Themes and Subthemes	28

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Theoretical Model	17
Figure 1	Updated Theoretical Model	34

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Watts and Goodman noted in 1997 that while the agricultural system has undergone rapid changes over the past decades, food production and consumption have been tailored to local taste and even major food corporations have been forced to adapt to local preferences and circumstances. This market trend can be understood as firms' strategic responses to increased variation in consumers' food consumption, purchasing habits, and sales transactions. Interestingly, consumers' need for market specialty has allowed smaller producers to challenge the global food complex through alternative systems. An emphasis on health and food safety, the environmental impact of industrial food systems, animal welfare and workers' rights are all related issues which result in consumers' focus on the patronization of small local businesses.

Notably, with the emergence of "locavores" (i.e., people whose diet consists only or principally of locally grown/produced food) ("New Oxford American Dictionary," n.d), farm-to-table retailing largely represented by farmers markets has grown rapidly in recent years. According to the USDA Farmers Market Directory (2019), the number of farmers markets in the United States has increased from just under 2,000 in 1994 to currently more than 8,600 markets. The 2016 Minnesota Grown guides, a directory of local food resources, published by the Minnesota Department of Agriculture listed 177 farmers markets in Minnesota. Consistent with the national trend, this figure indicates a more than four-fold increase in the span of fifteen years (Kaul, 2016).

One area of research highlights farmers market patronage as a complex phenomenon as consumers' motivations associated may be multifaceted in nature.

Hinrichs (2003) employs the concept of embeddedness and defines farmers market patronage as consumers' economic behavior embedded in a complex web of social factors. Farmers market studies have utilized the general concept of embedded values as consumer patronage and the quantity of markets has risen (Hinrichs, 2000; Feagan et al., 2004; Kirwan 2004; Feagan & Morris, 2009). These values include support for local businesses, interactions based on trust, food safety and health, and environmental sustainability. The Feagan and Morris (2009) study drew on previous research from Hinrichs (2000), Kirwan (2004) and Penker (2006) to develop three spheres of embeddedness: social, spatial and natural. This study needs to be replicated and validated with a qualitative method to confirm that specific sets of embedded values are universally manifested in repeated farmers market patronage and not reported merely on site or in a survey. As consumer motivations partly reflect their historic and situated contexts, the embeddedness concept has the potential to deepen our understanding of farmers market patronage.

Purpose of the Study

This study attempts to identify FMP and consumer motivations to shop at farmers markets through qualitative methods. This research will provide theoretical implications that involve consumer motivations and attitudes to the manifestation of consumer behavior in FMP. It can enrich our understanding of the broader sets of values tied to FMP. This paper categorizes and examines various consumer motivations in the greater Minneapolis/St. Paul area using the concept of embeddedness. Considering previous research on FMP and embeddedness, the research questions that developed are as follows: 1) Is embeddedness an applicable framework through which FMP motivations

can be examined in detail? 2) If not, how can this concept be further developed or altered to better explain the consumer behavior?

This study uses a phenomenological approach which considers experiences of specific individuals rather than generalized data. Farmers market shoppers' preferences and motivations will be explored through in-depth interviews which will be fully described and interpreted.

Significance of Study

The findings of this study provide both theoretical and practical implications. From the theoretical perspective, this study will investigate the validity of embeddedness as a framework to examine farmers market patronage in depth, not simply grocery versus market but also which markets and why. Previous literature on farmers market patronage and embeddedness often used a quantitative or mixed methods approach, gathering data which demonstrates which motivations seem to motivate more than others, but may not capture the complexity or contradictions present in consumer motivation to make food purchases.

From the practical perspective, this study will provide implications for policy makers and health educators. Farmers markets have a great potential to increase community-wide fruit and vegetable consumption, while reconnecting consumers with the land, revitalizing neighborhoods, and promoting a green and sustainable environment. Also, farmers markets are important contributors to not only local economies but also community cultures. They bring farmers and consumers together to solidify bonds of local identity and solidarity, while allowing individual entrepreneurs and their families to contribute to the economic life of local communities via farm-to-table retailing. In this

regard, this research providing an in-depth view of FMP will help policy makers and health educators understand consumers' unmet needs and wants and design effective public education on local food consumption or cooking methods.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter II reviews previous literature on the characteristics of farmers markets, farmers market patrons and embeddedness. This chapter first offers a literature review on farmers market research across the globe then focuses on the phenomenon in Minnesota specifically, highlighting some of the elements which make this market similar or dissimilar to others. Second, characteristics of farmers market shoppers in previous studies are discussed. Finally, the concept of embeddedness within the research and specifically within the context of the farmers market is described.

Farmers Markets

The globalization and industrialization of the agricultural food system has been met with some resistance which has kept open other food systems which are smaller and more local in scale. As an alternative, there is a deliberate intention to promote otherness and produce change in connectivity between the production and consumption of food through direct interaction between farmer and consumer (Kirwan, 2004). It is also a result of the distrust of large-scale, industrial agriculture (Hinrichs, 2000) and interest in freshness or variety not found in the more traditional channels (Feagan & Morris, 2009). Alternative systems including farmers markets allow producers to gain some control over the display and price of goods while consumers control the assessment of goods they are purchasing.

A farmers market can be defined as a public and recurring assembly of farmers or their representatives selling the food that they produced directly to consumers (Farmers Market Coalition, 2017). Shoppers can enjoy the summer breezes and the aroma of

ripened fruit and fresh vegetables at farmers markets while socializing with their neighbors and local farmers (Moss, 2015), experiences which are not always possible in traditional grocery retailing formats. Consumers appreciate fresh produce grown in their local area even when prices at farmers markets are not necessarily better than at local stores (Moss, 2015) and may be less convenient to acquire (Betz & Farmer, 2016). One issue of farmers market ideas of reconnection to nature and community value is it limits the range of motivations to shop at such places. Farmers market patrons may already engage in local food consumption in multiple avenues and thus the markets may not transform the food system but rather function alongside it.

The rise in the popularity of farmers markets matches the general grocery retail trend of polar size preferences. The dominance of big-box chains as well as the popularity of very small, local retailers as an alternative demonstrate consumer partialities for the ends of the spectrum while those in the middle disappear. Large grocery retailers (8600 feet squared) give greater convenience to consumers by offering the ability to satisfy multiple wants and needs in one shopping trip rather than the consumer needing to make purchases at multiple retailers for different categories of product like grocery, home improvement and apparel (Reutterer & Teller, 2009). Walters and Jamil (2003) found the type of shopping trip impacts consumer behavior while in store (those on a shopping trip to look for deals are more likely to read sales signage than those on other types of trips). Those casually stopping by a store to pick up few items are more likely to make impulse purchases than those on price-driven or large-volume trips.

Bell and Lattin (1998) discuss the unique relationship in grocery between shopping behavior and preference for different price formats. Consumers typically

purchase more than one product in a single grocery trip, they are often unable to determine price before entering the store, and typically follow a pattern of behavior regarding basket size and frequency (Bell & Lattin, 1998). Price shopping then is likely based on price expectations rather than actual price due to the inability to research ahead of the trip itself. Perceived prices of both items and overall basket can influence product and store choice and experience with them may play a factor in perceived cost.

Farmers markets then, considering the limited space and intimate format are an inherently different shopping experience as well as type of trip than the conventional box grocery stores. Consumers looking for a retail space which offers convenience and a single-destination trip likely will not be drawn to the farmers market format, but those who are interested in items specifically offered at the market would be. The layout of the farmers market allows different business strategies for the vendors as well. André et al. (2010) found some Australian farmers market vendors used it as a platform to expand their businesses internationally rather than the entirety of their business, benefitted by government programs. Some of the more unique Australian products sold well as a local good but could return a higher profit internationally where it would be seen as more of a unique commodity. A farmers market can function both as an significant alternative to industrial agriculture while providing exposure to small businesses looking to expand.

Smith (1980) notes in his review of market literature that separating economic and noneconomic factors in a consumer's decision to attend a particular market is difficult. Social interaction and support for the community are now considered major factors for farmers market patronage but little research was conducted prior to 2000 to prove significance and most studies combine economic with social or local factors. Hilchey et

al. (1995) looked at the relationship between public markets and local economies to conclude markets are beneficial for “business incubation”. Markets (including farmers markets) help transition personal interests into a business through low barriers to entry and an atmosphere which encourages experimentation or variety. Farmers markets help keep money within the local community which would otherwise be spent on goods grown or made elsewhere (Hilchey et al., 1995). Markets are particularly beneficial in rural areas where they can attract tourists and provide supplemental income to farmers, craftsman or hired workers.

Considering the dramatic increase in the number of farmers markets in the United States, it is important to consider some of the challenges market managers face, including sustaining operations. Many new markets fail after only one to four years, with geographic location and population density as key factors in the lifespan of the markets (Stephenson, Lev and Brewer, 2008). The authors conducted a survey of Oregon farmers markets and found high management turnover, low resources and inexperience as major reasons for market failure. Four of the nine closed markets were located in a rural setting and only one within a city center. Wilson et al. (2018) found location of markets determined the challenges managers face including parking and transit, data collection, and relationships with vendors and the community.

In rural and suburban areas, a recommended strategy was to attract both customers and vendors, particularly smaller vendor farmers who are able to support economies relying on the flow of product and traffic. The authors write that metropolitan areas should focus on vendor policies (applications, inspection documents, auditing), activities (community outreach, cobranding, food assistance programs) and transit issues.

These difficulties are often intertwined and require a cohesive plan. For example, a positive relationship with the community and local government could result in the use of additional parking during farmers market hours, decreasing difficulty of access for shoppers. A focus on policy could create consistency and a more positive experience for shoppers who will then continue to make purchases or bring friends and family with them to shop. Stephenson, Lev and Brewer (2008) also note small, young markets are more likely to fail as well as those with high manager turnover due to the instability. Consistent management plans allow farmers markets to retain vendors whose presence will attract shoppers, generating more dollar flow overall.

Saturation of farmers market presence in urban areas has become a recent concern for managers and vendors, however, as a presence at multiple markets limits revenue (Zepeda & Reznickova, 2013). Increasing the number of farmers markets may make attendance more convenient for shoppers but does not necessarily increase trip frequency or basket size. Rather, it may create competition between markets. Zepeda and Carroll (2018) conducted a survey of the Dane County farmers market in Madison, Wisconsin, which at 45 years-old is one of the oldest farmers markets in the United States. Shoppers at this market are twice as likely to have completed a bachelor's degree as the average consumer (77% versus 32%) and three times more likely to have completed a graduate or professional degree (38% versus 12%) and have a household income higher than the national average (Zepeda and Carroll, 2018).

Lev, Brewer and Stephenson (2003) looked at ten markets in Oregon and Idaho from 1998 and 2003. They found the presence of a downtown farmers market often led to increased consumer spending at neighboring businesses. Farmers markets not only

facilitate the marketing and growth of small farms but also other enterprises through low entry and operational costs (O’Hara & Shideler, 2018). Farmers markets anchored by farmers can aid restaurants, bakers and other food retail businesses in gaining revenue through a presence at a farmers market. Marketing ingredients as local can increase interest and demand of these other businesses (O’Hara & Shideler, 2018). Additionally, consumers may be inclined to spend more at these establishments, particularly when the products are of high quality. Farmers markets can function in partnership with local businesses as both a supplier and a venue which can actually benefit both parties, including the farmers.

In summary, there are multiple consumer and seller benefits at the farmers market: (a) through buying locally grown produce at farmers markets, consumers can support local farmers and contribute to revitalizing rural economies; (b) farmers also benefit through retaining more of the value of their produce by circumventing the “middlemen” in the supply chain; and (c) creating markets where consumers can buy produce from local farmers reduces the distance that food travels between farmers and consumers, which decreases associated fossil fuel consumption, air pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions.

Farmers Markets in Minnesota

Farmers markets in Minnesota generally have some form of open-air construction style, are found in larger metropolitan areas and serve as a wholesale platform for farmers and small businesses (Stephenson & Lev, 2004). There are several vendor restrictions within the markets, and some allow only growers to sell goods, not third parties. They are community driven, with managers organizing weekly events and educational activities

with local shoppers to create an environment and public image for the market (Minnesota Growers, 2018). In Minneapolis, non-profit organizations or associations generally manage farmers markets and make decisions through a board (Stephenson & Lev, 2004). Due to an emphasis on produce and farmers, local growers from central Minnesota and Western Wisconsin are given preference as vendors over craft goods.

One exception to these rules and regulations is the Minneapolis farmers market, which boasts up to 240 vendors including farmers, food trucks, craftsman and, notably, resellers of goods purchased wholesale (Counihan & Van Esterik, 2012). Not all goods sold at this market were grown, crafted or even purchased by local companies but rather local and national businesses are mixed together at the market, which does not require identification (Counihan & Van Esterik, 2012).

André et al. (2010) observed the significance of policy on the competition and sourcing or export of goods. Economic constraints, scope or regulations can result in vendors who sell within both the alternative and conventional food systems. Vendors selling products at Minnesota urban markets often do so in parallel with physical retail stores or restaurants (Minnesota Growers, 2018; Mill City Farmer Market.org). Local businesses generating publicity and awareness for their business is not necessarily an issue with locavores because their spending stays within the community, but resellers of non-local goods may be.

At the Minneapolis market, spaces for vendors can be handed down through generations within the same farm and so vendors without a permanent spot can be assigned different locations each week depending on the availability of unused stalls (Stephenson & Lev, 2004). The predominance of farmers and managers of European

descent shifted in the 1970s with the arrival of Hmong immigrants (Hmong American Farmers Association). Hmong people constituted around one percent of Minnesota's population but 40 percent of the farmers market vendors. This led to greater variation in produce and crafts sold at Minnesota farmers markets, potentially creating a more uniquely exploratory climate than other areas previously explored within agricultural research.

The Mill City Market, in contrast with the Minneapolis market, is relatively small and located beneath the train shed of the Mill City Museum in Minneapolis. It's view of the Mississippi is vastly different than the cramped Minneapolis farmers market location underneath a highway overpass. The market website states its vision as: "to be a nationally recognized marketplace model that connects, educates and empowers a community to support a healthy, sustainable food system to contribute to the success of local food growers and producers" (Mill City Farmer Market.org). Started in 2006 by restaurant owner Brenda Langton, it is involved in a variety of educational programs and outreach to educate those who live in Minneapolis about growing and cooking fresh produce. Mill City's unique partnership with the museum also allows for winter markets, a rarity in a state with such extreme weather fluctuations. The contrast of interest in healthy eating with limitations in climate allow for direct comparison to the previous studies conducted in Canada, though farmers market patronage has not been investigated within Minnesota directly.

Characteristics of Farmers Market Shoppers

To date, researchers have developed a profile of consumers patronizing farmers markets in a particular state or regional context. For example, a study conducted in

Tennessee reported that a typical farmers market patron was female, 45 or older with some college education and an above-average income (Eastwood, Brooker and Gray, 1998). Andreatta and Wickliffe (2002) found 88% of respondents shopped at farmers markets for fresh produce, 64% for local products and 16% for inexpensive food. They listed distance to travel, seasonal variation in availability and hours of operation as disadvantages to farmers markets. Two studies in Canada found a higher percentage of older individuals at farmers markets than the population, with about 70% aged 50 or more (Feagan et al., 2004; Feagan & Morris, 2009). Again, the majority were female and did not utilize the farmers market for the majority of their grocery shopping but rather as a supplement.

Another study conducted in California reported that farmers market shoppers were more likely to be female, married, and have completed post graduate work than non-shoppers (Wolf et al., 2005). They also found greater variation in middle or high-income households in the study than in a previous study they conducted ten years earlier. This suggests farmers markets may be attracting a more diverse group of shoppers now than in the late 1990s. Landis et al. (2011) found patrons tended to be mostly female, nonsmokers and consumed the recommended amount of fruits and vegetables per day. In contrast to the Canadian studies, the majority of the participants in the study purchased at least 40% of that produce from the market.

(Betz & Farmer, 2016) created a profile which was 90.6% white, 66% female and had a household income higher than the average in the region. The authors note that farmers market research often does not control for the dominance of female food shoppers overall, and thus do not necessarily indicate women are more likely to shop at a

farmers market than a grocery store, but rather that they do the majority of the grocery shopping overall. Participants in this study reported the belief that consuming local goods was positive for the environment as the main motivation for making purchases at a farmers market.

Respondents in the Zepeda and Carroll (2018) study spent just 25.9% of their grocery budget at the farmers market. Most of participants in the study shopped in groups of two to three people, supporting the idea that farmers markets are just as much a social outing as a task to acquire fruits and vegetables (Zepeda & Carroll, 2018). The authors found shoppers aged 55 and older spent on average \$6 more at the market than those under 55, which reflects the household income difference of \$95,562 and \$78,758.

Consumers generally do not shop at farmers markets which are inconvenient to get to or that they have not heard of, however, so distance plays a role in which market is preferred by specific shoppers (Swanson & Lewis, 1991; Saphores et al., 2006). Both vendors and customers are more likely to travel greater distances to attend a more desirable market or if they are more scattered as is the case in many rural areas (Brown, 2002). Therefore, the identification of patrons and potential patrons is an important task in order to determine who to attract and from what distances.

Stephenson and Lev (1998) found 46% of those surveyed in Oregon visited the farmers market 1-9 times per year and 13% visited over 10 times. Swanson and Lewis (1991) reported 43% of urban Alaskan shoppers patronize a farmers market or road stand several times per year. Location and convenience are significant elements to patronage location and frequency for these shoppers. While there is some conflicting literature on

the income and education level of farmers market patrons, the most frequent shoppers appear to be older females concerned about healthy eating.

Conceptual Framework: Embeddedness

The theory of reasoned action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1980) states intention is the most important predictor of behavior and that consumers are rational surveyors and processors and information. In this theory, intention is the extent to which consumers are willing/interested in patronizing a farmers market or other alternative food system and is considered a predictor of behavior (Ajzen, 1991). This theory only addresses consumer control and fails to address required opportunities and resources. For example, consumers may be interested in supporting local businesses through farmers market patronage but do not have the funds or a method of transportation. Control factors were incorporated into theory of planned behavior to heighten the accuracy of the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen, 1985). This framework has been applied to organic, sustainable and environmentally-friendly products as well as “green” behaviors like recycling (Paul, Modi and Patel, 2016). Underlying beliefs provide detailed descriptions needed to gain subjective information about the determinants of a behavior and the unique factors which cause someone to engage in one course of action or another (Ajzen, 1991). Theory of planned behavior utilizes three predictors of intention: attitude towards the behavior, subjective norm and perceived behavioral control.

Consumer interest in alternatives to conventional food systems continues to grow as information about these products spreads, as demonstrated by both the rise in farmers markets and community supported agriculture (CSA) projects. One area of interest which overlaps both conventional and unconventional food systems is organic and fair-trade

products. Organic product production and consumption has grown around 15 percent annually from 1990 to 2016 and an average of \$65.8 billion in sales per year (Organic Trade Association). Fair Trade is “an approach to business and to development based on dialogue, transparency, and respect that seeks to create greater equity in the international trading system” (Fair Trade Federation). The market success of these products has helped increase alternative growing practices in the United States, leading to fewer uses of pesticides in farms of varying sizes and production scales (Howard & Allen, 2010).

Some confusion around the term organic still exists, with many consumers generally understanding it to refer to chemical-free farming practices but are unfamiliar with the standards and specifics (Davies et al., 1995). Standards vary worldwide, but the general concept of organic products is farming or animal raising methods without the use of growth stimulants, antibiotics, or pesticides (“New Oxford American Dictionary,” n.d). Generally, consumers of organic food are a similar consumer group as those who shop at farmers markets: they tend to be older females with children living in the home (Davies et al., 1995; Schifferstein & Ophuis 1998). Regular organic food consumers consider organic purchasing behavior to be an extension of their value system which involves concern for the environment, animal welfare and physical health (Hughner et al, 2007).

Organic product consumers often contribute their physical health to their diet, using healthy eating as a way to stave off illness (Schifferstein & Ophuis 1998) and avoid chemicals used in traditional agricultural practices. Some consumers believe organic food is more nutritious as well as healthier and of higher quality (Hill & Lynchehaun, 2002), though is there is no concrete evidence this is the case. Much like the perceived superior

quality and taste of local goods, customers often believe organic foods taste better than the conventional counterparts (Schifferstein & Ophuis, 1998; Hill & Lynchehaun, 2002). Brand can have a strong influence on perceived quality and buying behavior in the organic foods market. Bruschi et al. (2015) used a mixed-methods approach to investigate the attitudes of consumers in Russia towards organic food as well as the factors that encourage or prevent them from purchasing those products. They found consumption of organic foods is motivated mainly by concerns for personal health rather than environmental or animal concerns.

There is often a disconnect in literature on sustainable consumption between concerns and opinions reported in surveys and actual behavior, however. Lehner (2015) found that while consumers often claim to care about their impact on the environment, environmentally-friendly products do not possess significant market share, even when retailers are investing considerable funds into sustainable food consumption. The author called for grocery retailers to find a balance between meeting societal and governmental expectation regarding sustainable practices and continuing to drive sales and foot traffic. He notes the importance of exchanging information and ideas of sustainable consumption between employees and customers in order to do so. Bartels et al. (2015) also found a connection between retail manager's personal connections to environmentally sustainable consumer groups and company initiatives, suggesting those who are passionate about sustainability communicate with customers as a more personal, social exchange.

The use of convenience in retail began as a descriptor of products and developed into a concept with an emphasis on time and effort saving elements (Bednarz & Ponder 2010). It is now commonly defined as the reduction in non-monetary costs associated

with products. Saphores et al. (2006) argue convenience and cost significantly impact sustainable behavior. In literature, there are four dimensions of convenience relevant to retailers: access, search, transaction, and possession. Access convenience is defined as “the speed and ease with which consumers can reach a retailer” (Seiders et al. 2007). This access does not necessarily need to be in person but includes mobile and internet access as well. This is one of the most crucial forms of convenience because a consumer who cannot reach a retailer is unable to make purchases or form positive attitudes. For sustainability, access includes availability of recycling stations, reusable bags, and other environmentally friendly options for consumers to choose. Search convenience is the speed and ease with which consumers can identify products and services they wish to buy (Seiders et al. 2007) and includes market layout, displays, signage, and sellers. This allows customers to make purchase decisions quickly and without confusion. Merchandising and product assortment of organic and non-organic foods, paired with knowledgeable vendors and paid workers, can facilitate positive customer engagement and sales (Lehner, 2015).

Transaction convenience (ease with which customers make transactions) has not been explored in farmers market literature, though the recent technological innovations allowing card usage through cell phones and electronic registers could be considered a positive development for farmers market transactions which previously were mainly through physical bills. Finally, possession convenience relates to obtaining desired products (Seiders et al. 2000) including production and quick delivery. This commonly relates to traditional food systems versus alternative food systems. For all convenience measures in Bednarz and Ponder’s study, convenience was measured in time and effort-

saving abilities. Customers bring past experiences and expectations with them when patronizing a farmers market, however, and perceived convenience or inconvenience is a strong motivator to avoid parking troubles and crowding at a market compared to a grocery store.

Enjoyment has previously been examined as an antecedent variable impacting perceived convenience in literature (Seiders et al. 2007). Enjoyment affects the consumers' perceptions of experiences and involves positive emotions towards the process, and thus can positively impact perceived convenience. Seiders et al. (2007) found shopping enjoyment related positively to all dimensions of service convenience. In the frame of sustainable practices, enjoyment needs to be analyzed from a different perspective. Sustainable behaviors are not always enjoyable to engage in but may become interesting or pleasing because of their results. Those who perform actions identified as sustainable may find satisfaction and enjoyment in those actions which offsets potential inconvenience. In the case of farmers markets, momentary inconveniences like driving a greater distance or searching for a place to park may be offset by the enjoyment gained from the hedonic experiences unique to the market.

In the literature published since 2000, researchers have shown a growing interest in the role of "embeddedness" in farmers market patronage. Previous research on sustainable agriculture and consumption of local goods focused primarily on production practices and preference for alternative food sources (Hinrichs, 2000). It separately analyzed the development of environmentally positive agricultural practices and the consumer resistance to more conventional methods of farming and production without considering some of the more experiential and social factors involved in the choice of

where to buy and who from. Hinrichs (2000) proposed analyzing alternative food production and sales from an economic sociology perspective which “explicitly addresses the context, process and outcomes of exchange”. Embeddedness, specifically social embeddedness, is a major factor in economic sociology as a concept of non-economic motivations “embedded” in institutions (Polanyi, 1957). Embeddedness as a concept of social connection, reciprocity and trust has been more recently applied to the study of alternative agricultural sales.

Farmers markets, as stated above, often involve more than the exchange of money and goods including experience, community and social exchanges. Reciprocity involves one party exchanging resources with another and in business exchanges, customers can expect more in return from sellers whom they patronize frequently and regularly (Huppertz, Arenson, and Evans, 1978). Sellers who maintain relationships with consumers may gain a competitive advantage over vendors who must seek out buyers each market, and shoppers may benefit from vendor knowledge or special treatment. Resources being exchanged between vendor and shopper include information, money, goods and services. These relationships can build from immediate payment for product to friends taking care of each other’s needs (communal relationship) without counting debts or need for immediate payment (Cutrona, 1996). In communal relationships, both parties are willing to ask for and accept help from the other, and in the case of the farmers market, can result in greater trust and loyalty between the parties. Vendors gain a steady flow of customers likely to purchase their goods and customers gain a source of quality goods they can rely on.

Farmers market allow consumers to have direct contact with growers or sellers which generates value and is distinct from traditional grocery stores devoid of much social interaction or special accommodation (Feagan & Morris, 2009). Garner (2017) found “farmers and customers provide one another mundane, ritualized support, but more importantly, these actors also provide one another social support during stressful crises. The data illustrate how the customer-to-farmer exchange relationship can develop into a communal tie”. This is not to say all vendor-customer relationships develop into a communal relationship, some remain more shallow, economic transactions. Farmers and vendors who develop relationships with customers can receive valuable social support and sympathy during difficult periods (Garner, 2017). Consumer interest in supporting local farmers extends beyond the economic by taking an interest in the farmers’ lives and their difficulties with seasonal crops as well as providing some mental ease through product flow and friendly conversation. Regularly purchasing produce may also provide some mental ease through an easier workday, but the social aspects may make the economic interactions more enjoyable for vendors. Consumers experience similar benefits as well. They appreciate the ability to support local businesses within their community but also the access to high quality products at a fair price (Brown, 2002; Feagan & Morris, 2009; Garner, 2017).

Hinrichs (2000) argued that farmers markets rely on the social capital and trust gathered through embedded values to draw consumers to the venue despite less convenient locations, transaction methods or a more limited selection of goods. Support of local farmers, trust, environmental concern and awareness of food origin (Feagan & Morris, 2009) are more recent additions to the scope of embeddedness in agricultural

literature. Analyzing these values helps generate a greater understanding of the factors influencing consumer behavior and purchasing decisions within the farmers market context. The Feagan and Morris study (2009) developed three spheres of embeddedness to use as a framework for their analysis: social, spatial and natural.

Social embeddedness is a set of values which includes social interaction, trust and general responsibility (Feagan & Morris, 2009). It is an umbrella term for consumer desire for connection, belonging, community and loyalty (Brown, 2002). To date, few studies have examined experiential aspects of farmers markets. Farmers markets may offer consumers a more enjoyable and sociable shopping experience. Customers may consider farmers markets to be more friendly, personal and happier settings than mainstream food retailers. Shoppers may be offered the opportunity to taste produce before buying, and they may be able to ask questions about the produce and where it comes from, restoring consumer confidence and increasing product traceability (Trobe, 2001). The more social elements of the market partnered with the ability of vendors to allow shoppers to explore the products sensorially as well as learn new recipes and techniques. Therefore, food novelty as a concept in farmers market research is a measurement of shopper's assessment of the food products' quality and value while the significance differs depending on the interests of the consumer.

Natural embeddedness consists of patrons' desires for food which is considered better for the environment like organic or sustainable farming methods, contrasted with larger-scale food production methods (Halweil, 2002; Murdoch et al., 2002). Concerns about food quality and safety can be included in this concept including genetically modified foods, food contamination and pesticides. Through this set of values, local

foods or foods of known origin can be associated with safety and trust (Halweil, 2002). Qendro (2015) found consumers in Albania and the UK trust farmers markets more than traditional supermarkets as a provider of good quality and organic fruits and vegetables. That study also revealed differences in perception of organic foods: UK shoppers consider organic foods pesticide free and environmentally sustainable while Albanian shoppers relate organic foods to those which were grown with traditional agricultural techniques. Therefore, terms associated with natural embeddedness may not translate the same way for all farmers market patrons. Pitts et al. (2015) wrote that sustainable direct farmer to consumer produce distribution increases fruit and vegetable consumption among low income shoppers.

Food safety has been a critical concern throughout the previous decades with the increase in the industrialization and transport of foods. In agricultural literature, food safety and food quality appear frequently together, with foods of high quality and freshness often perceived as safer, particularly in the case of farmers markets. Concern for food safety is a strong driver for purchasing and consuming local foods (Halweil, 2002; Feagan & Morris, 2009; Qendro, 2015). Consumers' perceptions of food quality not only effect purchase decisions but also increase consumer loyalty and word-of-mouth intentions (Ha & Jang, 2010).

Food quality and concern for the environment are frequent motivations to make local purchases and appear often in literature on farmers markets (Bloom & Hinrich, 2011; Feagan & Morris, 2009; Qendro, 2015). With the volume of food production needed to feed the United State's population, the care given to the produce as well as handling, chemical pesticides and transportation are issues for consumers. More

consumers are purchasing locally due to concerns for these practices (Bloom & Hinrich, 2011).

Spatial embeddedness is associated with the desire to buy local goods, where the producer and purchaser are more closely linked. This includes the perception that farmers markets contain fresher foods due to the physical proximity of the farmer to the point of sale. In contrast, larger retailers use a more complex production system which often results in a greater physical distance between farmer and consumer (Murdoch et al., 2000). Prior research also reveals that consumers are willing to pay higher prices for local foods (Darby et al., 2008), and that many people would prefer buying local (versus non-local) produce (see a review by Adams and Adams, 2011). Also, prior research identified barriers such as inconvenience and lack of accessibility often prevent consumers from purchasing local foods (Stephenson & Lev, 2004).

However, what is vague from previous work is the issue of how consumers conceptualize the term ‘local food’ sold at farmers markets, and how this conceptualization interacts with their FMP. In other words, questions still remain regarding the constitution of this ‘local’ notion in consumers’ minds and hearts in a particular geographic region. While most researchers accept that eating locally means minimizing the distance between production and consumption, perceptions of what makes up “local food” still differ by region due in large part to varying climates, soil types, and populations (Peters et al, 2009).

Focal Research Questions

Building on the literature review above, this study aims to explore the multi-faceted motivations for farmers market patronage using the concept of embeddedness.

Toward this end, research questions are developed as follows: 1) What motivations drive consumer patronage of farmers markets? 2) Is embeddedness an applicable framework through which FMP motivations can be examined in detail?

If so, what specific themes can define social embeddedness in the context of FMP? What specific themes can define natural embeddedness in the context of FMP? What specific themes can define spatial embeddedness in the context of FMP? What other motivations drive consumer patronage of farmers markets? Do non-embedded motivations applicable to general grocery shopping behavior (e.g., pricing, product and service quality) still matter in FMP?

CHAPTER III

METHODS

The purpose of the present qualitative study is to explore farmers market patronage in Minnesota. Chapter III explains this study's methods. First, the rationale for choosing a qualitative approach is discussed. Second, the procedures are described.

Overview of Qualitative Research

Three elements should be considered when determining approaches to research: knowledge claims, strategies of inquiry, and specific methods (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Knowledge claims include epistemology (the theory of knowledge behind the theoretical perspective) and the philosophical stance of the researcher. Strategies of inquiry refer to methodology, the researcher's choice of methods. Finally, methods are techniques to collect and analyze the data. Qualitative research is an approach which probes individual as well as group experiences (Creswell, 2003). This approach involves developing questions, collecting data in the participants' setting, building data analysis to generate themes and interpreting the meaning of the data. Epistemology, how "knowing" can be defined, has two different positions of the researcher: objective and subjective (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Objectivism claims there is a concrete reality that exists independently of thinking or interpretation. Subjectivism states there is no reality completely separated from the thinking process or interpretations because knowledge is filtered through the cognitive lens.

A theoretical perspective in research is a philosophical stance which supports a methodology (Creswell, 2003). The four stances are: post-positivism, constructivism, transformative framework and pragmatism. Qualitative research is often developed in

constructivism, as the researcher seeks to understand the participants experiences and reality. The researcher is a tool for analyzing the data and interpretations are influenced by the researcher's own experiences and biases. Thus, researchers should position themselves in the research to recognize how their own experiences can alter or influence the interpretation of the data.

Table 1 Qualitative Approaches by Creswell (2003)

Approach	Purpose	Data Collection Procedure
Narrative	Study the lives of individuals and ask them to provide stories about their lives chronologically	Primarily through interview and documents
Phenomenology	Describe lived experiences of individuals around a phenomenon described by the participant	Primarily interviews, though supporting documents and observations can be collected
Grounded theory	Develop an abstract theory about a process, action or interaction grounded in the views of participants	Multiple stages of interviews with 20-60 participants
Ethnography	Studying shared patterns of behavior and language of a cultural group in a natural setting	Primarily observations and interviews but other sources can be collected during observation
Case study	In-depth analysis of a case	Multiple sources including interviews, observations and documents

Rationale for the Chosen Methodology: Phenomenology

Phenomenology is the chosen method for this study because it investigates the personal experiences of those who patron farmers markets and is better suited to this study than other qualitative research approaches. Phenomenology is the study of phenomena (Creswell & Poth, 2018) and is best applied to understanding several individuals' common experiences. Considering farmers markets are prevalent in Minnesota but not the default or main source of grocery, particularly during the colder months, and patronage can be considered a unique phenomenon which can be described through in-depth interviews. Grounded theory, a systematic approach to inquiry for theory development (Creswell, 2013), allows researchers to conceptualize a subject based on data. The goal of this study is to describe farmers market patronage from an individual perspective, and therefore phenomenology is the preferred approach.

The procedure for conducting this research comes from Moustaka's (1994) model which includes systematic steps for preparing the questions and collecting data as well as conclusions drawn. Research questions were developed through a comprehensive literature review and the framework of the Feagan and Morris (2009) farmers market patronage embeddedness spheres.

Researcher Positionality

This research uses a phenomenological, qualitative approach. Though I am familiar with both qualitative and quantitative methods, the topic of embeddedness as a motivator for farmers market patronage can best be explored through a qualitative approach. Given the nature of the constructivism philosophical stance of this style of research, I position myself as the researcher of this study. While I seek to accurately

record and analyze the experiences of the participants, I acknowledge my analysis will be influenced by my own personal experiences, feelings and cultural background. I am not a patron of farmers markets, though I have been to several within the greater Minneapolis-St. Paul area. I have no personal ties with farmers and do not possess strong opinions on farming practices. I therefore need to be aware of different experiences participants discuss to ask the appropriate follow-up questions on different aspects of farmers markets I have not experienced or become aware of. As a qualitative researcher, I try to set aside my experiences and values toward the phenomenon to create accurate and meaningful conclusions from the data.

Sample Selection and Participant Recruitment

As this research seeks to describe a wide variety of experiences and commitments to farmers market shopping, participants were chosen through email communication. Snowball sampling was used to reach the target population. Through snowball sampling, those interested in participating in the research can identify other potential participants who also qualify to participate. As not every consumer in Minnesota shops at farmers markets, this is a useful technique to recruit participants. Emails which included information of this study were sent to recruit participants as well as describe the purpose (see Appendix A for recruitment email). A total of ten participants were recruited for this study. Data was collected until saturation.

Participant Characteristics

Participant characteristics in this study reflect previous literature on farmers market patrons (Eastwood, Brooker, and Gray, 1998; Wolf et al., 2005; Landis et al. 2011). Seven of the ten participants were female, all were employed full-time with an

education of a bachelor’s degree or higher and were white. All shopped at the farmers market at least once in the past year with frequencies between 1-15 trips during the Spring/Summer season. Distance from downtown Minneapolis was included in the table below due to the influence of convenience on trip frequency.

Table 2 Participant Characteristics

Participant Pseudonyms	Gender	Age	Education	Ethnicity	Distance from Downtown Mpls (miles)	Visits per Year
Amelia	F	20-29	Bachelor	White	5-10	5-10
Thomas	M	50-60	Masters	White	15-20	1-5
Jayne	F	30-40	Masters	White	10-15	1-5
Randy	F	50-60	Bachelor	White	15-20	5-10
Charles	M	40-50	Bachelor	White	5-10	5-10
Evelyn	F	20-30	Bachelor	White	0-5	10-15
Claire	F	60-70	Bachelor	White	0-5	10-15
Penelope	F	50-60	Bachelor	White	10-15	5-10
James	M	50-60	Bachelor	White	10-15	5-10
Gretta	F	50-60	Bachelor	White	10-15	5-10

Data Collection Procedure

Data for this research was collected through semi-structured, in-depth interviews, gaining information through in-person contact with participants. This method is useful for exploring details and more elaborate reasoning behind behaviors. The semi-structured interview style uses a set of predetermined questions based on the research question and literature review (Creswell & Poth, 2018). It allows participants to speak freely in

response to the questions and gives the interviewer freedom to ask for follow-up responses. The interviews were conducted in both public and private settings which allowed for private conversations, such as participants' homes, or coffee shops and libraries nearby. The length of each interview was approximately 45-60 minutes. The interviews were recorded using a personal cellphone as well as through taking notes (See Appendix D for field notes sample). They were then transcribed verbatim and reviewed by reading while listening to recording for accuracy and completeness.

Interview Protocol

Participants were given consent forms before the interview. This researcher read through the general information on the form to ensure understanding and asked for verbal confirmation that the information on the form was understood (See Appendix B for consent form). The participants signed the agreement and the forms are kept by this researcher for record. Major interview questions included:

1. Have you ever shopped at a farmer's market? Why?
2. Have you been to more than one FM? Did you notice any differences or similarities?
3. Where do you do the majority of your grocery shopping? Does this change depending on the season?
4. Do you shop at farmer's markets planning to purchase particular products? Where and which ones?
5. How do you decide which products to buy and from whom?
6. Is it important to buy local products? Why?

7. Do you think FM produce is different from grocery store produce? Why or why not?
8. What benefits are there to shop at one over the other?
9. Do you see or meet people from your community at the FM?
10. Where did your family purchase groceries while you were growing up?

Data Analysis and Coding

The data was analyzed using the three steps based on the Moustaka (1994) model as previously discussed. First, the text from each participant interview was coded. A code in qualitative research refers to a word or phrase that represents a summary or attribute for language-based data (Saldaña, 2015). The data can include interview transcripts, journals, field notes, videos and email correspondence. Interview transcripts will be broken down into pieces of text, closely examined and compared using initial/open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The goal of open coding in studies based in grounded theory is to remain open to potential directions and results of the data. During the first round, potential codes were written next to the related transcript text but were tentative. Some codes were reworded as the analysis progressed through multiple readings (See Appendix E for coding sample). Once themes and subthemes emerged, multiple experiences expressed by participants overlapped and confirmed the data had reached saturation. Each participant was given a pseudonym for anonymity and relevant quotes describing the participants' individual experiences of farmers markets were highlighted.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this chapter, the results of the analyzed data are discussed to answer the research questions: 1) What motivations drive consumer patronage of farmers markets? 2) Is embeddedness the best framework through which FMP motivations can be examined? Motivations for shopping at farmers markets within the embeddedness framework are described. As stated above, this study uses a phenomenological approach and considers farmers market patronage a unique phenomenon which includes common experiences. These were expressed through in-person interviews which comprised of open-ended general questions and follow-up questions, allowing participants to speak freely about the variety of experiences and opinions on the research topic.

The concept of embeddedness includes the transaction environment outside price which influences purchasing behavior (Hinrichs, 2000). Support of local farmers, trust, environmental concern and awareness of food origin (Feagan & Morris, 2009) all illustrate embedded values within the farmers market context. Within the three spheres of embeddedness considered for farmers market attendance, nine sub themes emerged. In the following section, each of the nine themes is elaborated with supporting quotes and organized by spheres with the greatest to least significance.

Table 3 Themes and Subthemes

Theme	Subtheme	Sample Statement
Social Embeddedness	Local Vendors and Other Shoppers	It's just a wonderful community that we can walk to and we've gotten to know all the vendors over the years and I've learned so much from them...we go every Saturday in the summer.
	Family and Friends	My grandpa came over from Italy and he would go to the farmers markets... And I thought it was a good thing and I kind of pass it on to my daughters too.
	Senses	And just walking down the aisles, the smells of all the fresh vegetables. It's just wonderful. And the herbs, then I got hooked right away. So it's sensual and it's all the senses. It's the bright colors, it's the smells.
	Exploring and Learning	There's even things there that I ate growing up would have considered a weed and never get given a second thought to. But now working with the farmers now I know well, you can make tea out of something or you know enhance the pesto or whatever.
Spatial Embeddedness	Freshness	And as far as freshness I think the farmers market's the freshest. It's picked within days of when they sell it verses at a Target, they're gonna have to transport it.
	Support Local Business	I always question if the people at the Minneapolis farmers market are actually farmers or if they're getting it from somewhere else and passing off as their own.
Natural Embeddedness	Health and Environment	And then plus it's also good for the human body not to have the GMO. Genetically modified. Just because I know [my] body does better and I know my wife does.... My garden is completely organic
Other Factors	Convenience	At grocery stores, when I go, you generally don't have to deal with traffic. The farmers market is always busy no matter what time you go.
	Price	I think the prices at the farmers market have been very fair. I'm sure that they're watching to see what their neighbor in the next stall is selling because the prices are pretty much across the board for anything you want.

Social Embeddedness

I mean if it's just that it's just an outdoor supermarket,

What's the point? (James)

Local Vendors and Other Shoppers

Previous studies (Brown, 2002; Feagan and Morris, 2009) looked at social interactions as a general experience when shopping at FM, focusing on vendor and community relationship building. In this study, however, only one respondent reported relationship building as a motivator for FMP. Claire goes the most frequently out of the participants (every Saturday if possible) and was also the only participant to remember the names of the vendors she tended to purchase from. She also shopped only at the Mill City market, which is relatively small compared to the Minneapolis market and where the same vendors return each week. She stated:

It's just a wonderful community that we can walk to and we've gotten to know all the vendors over the years and I've learned so much from them...we go every Saturday in the summer.

Several participants living in Minneapolis reported social interaction with vendors and other shoppers as a benefit of FM. An element of trust as a result of these personal interactions still seemed to develop, however, despite a lack of personal relationships. Respondents noted the ability to discuss produce with the growers and ask questions about the season convinced them of the seller's expertise. The majority of them mentioned often trying new foods at farmers markets and relying on these sellers to explain how to prepare or what other foods to pair with them. For example, Penelope mentioned:

That corn guy, which I was trying to think of his name, at the one on campus. I always go get his corn...and that's locally grown corn. This is the best.

Trust appears to be not so much developed with each grower as an individual but rather as a result of expectations about knowledge possessed by the farmers or sellers paired with consistent quality of goods. Consumers in this study developed trust based on displayed or implied knowledge about the products being sold. Positive experiences with products from specific vendors also developed trust. Participants reported returning to the same vendors, though they often could not recall the name of the grower or the company, to purchase the same produce or product because they believed the vendor would produce a good of similar quality again. However, socialization with vendors and other shoppers seems more of a bonus which adds to the hedonic nature of the trip but is not necessarily a strong enough motivator on its own to attend the market.

Family and Friends

The greatest social motivator for FMP for all the respondents appeared to be time spent with close friends or family at the market. Six participants were introduced to farmers markets by family members. Notably, Thomas mentioned FMP in a family ritual context as a fond memory with his grandfather he has passed on to his daughters.

My grandpa came over from Italy and he would go to the farmers markets. I'd go with him and he'd bicker with them on prices, buy cases of things that he didn't know what they were. But he wanted to try, so I learned how, I've eaten a lot of different vegetables and a lot of different fruit. And I thought it was a good thing and I kind of pass it on to my daughters too.

On the other hand, four participants began going with friends while in college. The participant who goes to farmers markets least often and who displayed weaker social embeddedness began going and continues to go with a friend a few times a year. The others began attending farmers market at various ages. One participant holds fond memories of farmers markets with his grandfather as a child, while another was introduced to them by a daughter who continues to shop with her at the farmers market today. Being able to participate in a family activity at the local market looking around and chatting appears to be one of the greatest influences of FMP for the participants.

Senses

Because the strength of social embeddedness appears within interpersonal relationships rather than with vendors, participants do not always buy their goods from the same vendors. Therefore, they develop strategies to determine what to buy and from whom. For example, Amelia emphasized:

I'll run the rows first because sometimes if I buy something when I see it, I might find a cheaper price somewhere else or something better later on. So I run the rows first and then I go back to the beginning.... I get the coffee at the end and then go back to the beginning to get whatever I had made a mental note of.

Three participants described nearly identical behaviors when first arriving at the FM. The first action taken when arriving at a farmers market is to walk down the main aisles to make note of prices or the appearance of the goods before retracing steps to make the final purchasing decision. Only two participants did not mention any type of surveying behavior, while one would compare prices of items while wandering with the friend with whom she goes to farmers markets, but does not necessarily make a full

survey before beginning to make purchases. When asked, participants agreed this behavior is unique to farmers markets and that they shop in a much more task-oriented manner in grocery stores. Randy stated:

And just walking down the aisles, the smells of all the fresh vegetables. It's just wonderful. And the herbs, then I got hooked right away. So it's sensual and it's all the senses. It's the bright colors, it's the smells. It's the people walking around and it's listening to people talk about, you know, what they're making.... I just like the whole experience.

One of the reasons given for wandering before making purchases is to experience sensory elements of the market without the interruption of bartering or paying for goods. Participants engage multiple senses when walking through the market including hearing chatter from vendors to other customers, the smell of herbs and produce, and the crisp feel of the air early in the morning. Participants noted this was a unique experience they enjoyed, which encouraged them to wake up early in the morning to make a trip to their preferred FM. Evelyn highlighted:

I also think like one of my little internal joys in life is, I love when..... you just look down the aisle it is just color and diversity of crops. And so I love when you're somewhere like a farmers market and you just see all these crops like purple bell peppers or like all the stuff you just didn't even know. This beautiful diversity, so I think I really appreciate the quality of food and the diversity of food at farmers markets.

The choice of who to produce from was generally driven by inspiration from how colorful or delicious the products looked, and therefore a full survey of the market

allowed shoppers to not only compare but also determine what products looked tempting enough to buy. This behavior frequently led to impulse purchases for participants who attend looking for a large amount of produce to eat and flexible meal preparation or planning.

Exploring and Learning

Seven of the participants said the ability to be exposed to new foods and discussed uses of products with vendors was a benefit to shopping at a farmers market over a grocery store. Because foods grow in seasons, participants said they often do not create a list of foods they plan to buy but rather wander the market to determine what looks the most delicious or most ripe. One participant noted the friendliness of the vendor determined if they were willing to ask questions about produce he was unfamiliar with. Several others mentioned purchasing unknown produce because the vendor explained the taste and how it could best be prepared. Claire said:

They bring a wealth of information. As far as you know what to do with this kind of produce and the benefits of it that sort of thing and there's even things there that I ate growing up would have considered a weed and never get given a second thought to. But now working with the farmers now I know well, you can make tea out of something or you know enhance the pesto or whatever. So, the learning aspect is one thing but also knowing where the meats and produce and cheeses come from.

Claire also said the Mill City Market hosts cooking demonstrations as well as children's events to increase awareness of different types of fruits and vegetables. Two participants mentioned they discuss uses of produce with other shoppers to gather

cooking ideas or help fellow shoppers decide what they should buy based on their own past experience with the particular grower. For example, Charles specifically mentioned:

Interacting with the people, just kind of generalized crowd interaction. You know, you bump into people or you're looking at something they're looking at it too, so you kind of just start up a little dumb conversation about whatever it is you're looking at.

The majority of this behavior seems to be related to produce exploration, but a few participants also said they like to try food from other vendors like local restaurants or bakers. An interest in food and cooking seems to be a driver for this behavior among the participants.

Spatial Embeddedness

Freshness

All ten participants said freshness, specifically fresh fruits and vegetables, was an element of farmers markets which was superior to traditional grocery stores. Participants' reasoning appeared to be perceived proximity of the farm to the market as well as time the produce spent in bins or on trucks before being sold. Thomas specifically mentioned:

They'll look the same, I still think the farmers markets' [products] are gonna taste better. And as far as freshness I think the farmers market's the freshest. It's picked within days of when they sell it verses at a Target, they're gonna have to transport it. It's probably a week to 2 weeks old not that that's a big difference but I'd rather have something fresher.

Several stated they liked when stalls listed the name or location of the farm where the produce was grown, as a reassurance that it was indeed grown locally. Though there

is no set definition of local, participants mentioned the St. Paul farmers market required vendors to only sell goods grown within a 50-mile radius of the market, which gave those participants a definition of local goods they then referenced later when judging locality at other markets. When asked, however, some could not identify where the idea of 50-miles as an indicator of locality came from, and often clarified that they would consider a farm in Wisconsin relatively local as well. Randy said:

But I just feel like it's fresher and probably more healthy. I don't know. My grandparents had a farm. I liked the vegetables that they had, so I like going there.

Participants implied the timing of the picking or production generated a superior-quality product because it was not damaged in transit or sitting in a large bin for long periods of time. Preference for food which has not been transported for a long period of time seems directly tied to perceived quality of the food in participants' minds.

Support Local Businesses

Supporting a local farmer or business as a motivation to shop at farmers markets was listed by nine of the participants to varying degrees of importance. One participant admitted she knew of no particular reason why she felt buying local goods was a positive thing, just that she felt that way. Thus, this interest does not drive the majority of her shopping and is a secondary benefit to other aspects of FMP. Another felt strongly that shopping local is important because she has personal involvement, stating her husband is a small business owner and she likes to support small businesses with her purchases when she can or when the price is reasonable. Claire, who shops at the Mill City farmers market every Saturday, believes support of small businesses is extremely important and

purchases a variety of goods from the market including canned foods, cheese and sauces. She said about the contrast between her market and the Minneapolis market:

I have heard the downtown Minneapolis farmers market has sold pineapples...

Okay, we don't grow bananas here or pineapples or so many other things. And it's like, this is not a farmer's market. This is just reselling something you bought at Costco. Come to real farmers market and you know....

Most of the respondents fell somewhere between on the spectrum, noting they felt supporting small businesses was a positive action but that they would not necessarily go out of their way to do so. This behavior is demonstrated particularly in their shopping behavior in traditional grocery stores. Those who expressed a desire to buy local goods when possible do so at grocery stores as well, but the lack of evidence of locality is a major factor. For example, Jayme expressed:

I liked the one that I went to when I was in college in Menominee is the best because it felt more like it was more localized...I always question if the people at the Minneapolis farmers market are actually farmers or if they're getting it from somewhere else and passing off as their own.

Participants expressed suspicion that the products at a farmers market are truly local unless the location of the farm or restaurant is explicitly stated. Because Minnesota has a limited variety of produce which can grow here, vendors selling products which are unable to be made or grown in this area generate suspicion. A surprising number of participants recalled seeing those pineapples sold at the Minneapolis farmers market and used it as an example of blatant selling of non-local goods. Signage stating the location of the business or farm was deemed the best way to communicate locality, though a few

participants stated being able to talk about seasonality of the foods in Minnesota built trust in that particular vendor as being a knowledgeable local worker.

Natural Embeddedness

Health of Self and Environment

Three participants mentioned concern for purchasing organic or non-genetically modified foods. The participants which mentioned these concerns felt very strongly about the issue and demonstrated knowledge on a range of agriculture concerns such as the honey bee population, the use of pesticides and seeds that have not been genetically modified. Two implied these foods were better for their health but the main issue was avoiding chemicals and additives. Thomas specifically mentioned:

And then plus it's also good for the human body not to have the GMO. Genetically modified. Just because I know [my] body does better and I know my wife does.... My garden is completely organic. Haven't put any chemicals on for 6 years now.

Notably, all three grow their own produce when possible and supplement their own gardens with products they are unable to grow or wish to try. Other participants expressed little to no direct concern about the environment but rather issues relating to the agriculture industry's harm on the environment as a whole. The use of plastic packaging and bags at traditional grocery stores was seen as harmful to the environment and unnecessary. Gretta mentioned:

Well, it's a climate change things and it's my foot print...strawberries and blueberries but you know they come in the plastic clam shells which now Minneapolis is not going to recycle. They were recyclable so I didn't have a lot of

guilt for awhile but now they're not going to recycle those. So I'll probably be buying my last from Costco.

Pollution related to the transportation of goods was directly stated by only one participant but several implied it was positive for the environment to purchase produce and canned goods locally. This theme was discussed significantly less by participants than the other two, though those who did mention the environment were deeply informed, passionate and directly involved in natural or organic growing methods.

Other Factors

Convenience

Farmers market proximity to participants' homes was mentioned as a strong motivating factor for a majority of the participants. Three mentioned frequenting their local market more often when it was or now that it is within walking distance of their homes. The ability to easily access markets without difficulty appears to be an issue for participants who drove and needed to park near the market in order to shop. City markets in particular were highlighted for having parking issues which often discouraged attendance except when the participants made a point to go very early in the morning to avoid both crowds and parking difficulties. Amelia said:

If you go to the farmers market you can actually get that relationship going but sometimes it's more convenient to go to the grocery store than go to the farmers market...at grocery stores, when I go, you generally don't have to deal with traffic. The Farmers Market is always busy no matter what time you go.

The two participants living in Prior Lake and Eden Prairie did not mention parking or transportation issues, which suggests the amount and ease of access to parking

near farmers markets within cities is a concern for patrons. The participant who walks and bikes to her local market did not mention transportation issues either, but pointed out the need for a wheeled basket or bike to be physically able to bring products home.

Jayne said:

But the only thing I would change [is] the parking lot at the Minneapolis one because it's awful. Just very crowded and then it takes forever to get to where you need to be in terms of parking.

Crowds too were mentioned as an issue within cities. Participants shopping at the relatively large Minneapolis and St. Paul markets noted how crowded they often become during peak hours. Five developed a strategy to avoid crowds by shopping the market early in the morning, while one participant stopped bringing his dog because it became too much of a hassle. An interesting distinction three participants made about this concern is an expectation of there being crowds at these places, which appeared to give participants more patience about wait time or crowds than traditional grocery stores. Otherwise, there seemed to be a general dislike of crowding of both shoppers and stalls at the market. Participants living in the city expressed a desire for a balance in the size of the market itself, disliking too many options and preferring a more condensed market to shop. Those in the suburbs did not make these comments, which may be due to the general smaller sizes of the local markets in the suburbs compared to the much larger central city markets.

Price

In contrast with previous literature (Darby et al., 2008), the three youngest participants mentioned low prices as a draw to attend farmers markets particularly when

buying in bulk. Previous studies found patrons to be less concerned about the price of goods with more focus on growing practices freshness. Jayme specifically mentioned:

And I like to support farmers that are not necessarily local but trying to make their own money. When I went to school, the farmer's market was all local farmers so I felt like I was actually supporting people and it was actually less expensive than the grocery store.

Despite the apparent price flexibility of the other respondents, the majority of those interviewed described a very similar process for choosing which vendor to purchase from. Notably, those who went less frequently tended to price compare more than those who go often. Six of the ten participants listed price as an important factor to their purchasing behavior within the market. Consumers do not always compare farmers market prices to grocery store prices but seem to frequently compare different stands to one another within the same space. Randy said:

I think the prices at the farmers market have been very fair. I'm sure that they're watching to see what their neighbor in the next stall is selling because the prices are pretty much across the board for anything you want. There you're pretty much paying the same price.

Participants said they would make note of prices of goods they were interested in during their survey of the FM as mentioned above and would create a mental plan or route to make their purchases. This route could be adapted depending on the interests of the other members of their shopping group but this mental model based on the original survey helped shoppers recall which vendors had better products and prices. Participants believing farmers market products to be generally superior to grocery store products may

explain the comparison behavior between vendors but not between farmers markets and grocery stores. It is important to note this behavior is not necessarily a motivator to patron farmers markets but rather money is a factor in the general behavior, specifically once the shopper is at the market.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to explore farmers market patronage in Minnesota through the concept of embeddedness. A phenomenological approach was used and in-depth interviews were conducted to understand shared experiences among the participants. Ten farmers market shoppers were recruited. They were asked ten open-ended questions as well as several follow-up questions to understand their motivations to shop at farmers market when available in the state of Minnesota. The goals of this chapter are to discuss the implications of the study in both theory and practice and to provide suggestions for future research.

Theoretical Implications

Overall, participants expressed the majority of their FMP motivations in two of the three embeddedness spheres. All showed non-economic values in their farmers market purchasing behavior, though the significance of each value differed greatly. Similar to the Feagan and Morris (2009) study, spatial embeddedness themes of buying fresh produce in support of local farmers and business were discussed by participants as key factors in their reason to shop at nearby farmers markets. The significance of social embeddedness was also demonstrated in participants' answers. However, participants did not place as much importance on social connections and relationship building with vendors and the community as was shown in previous literature (Brown, 2002; Feagan and Morris, 2009). Rather, one of the greatest influences on consumer decisions to go to the market appeared to be family and friends with whom participants would travel to the market to shop. They did not report developing relationships with vendors but rather

making note of vendors who sold good products in the past who they would buy from again. Only Claire and Gretta could easily recall the names of any vendors or businesses at her preferred farmers market, though a few other participants said they enjoyed discussing produce and details of the growing season with the farmers when shopping.

The limited expression of concern for natural embeddedness demonstrated in the Feagan and Morris study (2009) was also reflected in the results of this study. Thomas, Claire and Evelyn directly mentioned growing practices as a motivation to shop produce, while others indirectly mentioned a desire for more naturally developed produce not often found in traditional grocery stores. More than an environmental concern, the desire for 'misshapen' or 'more natural' produce was preference for taste and color. In the Canadian study, age and years attending farmers markets are negatively associated with natural embeddedness motivations, but this was not reflected in the results of this study. Age did not appear to influence the level of concern for 'natural' or organic foods as Claire is in her 60s, Thomas his 50s and Evelyn is in her early 20s.

Price comparisons within the farmers market contradict previous studies which demonstrated a lack of concern or focus on price as a purchase motivator. Amelia and Jayme mentioned low prices on bulk goods as a draw for farmers markets, but a more universal behavior was price comparisons within the FM to determine which vendors to make purchases from. A lack of meaningful vendor relationships may result in price becoming the determining factor for purchases within the market. This behavior has not been discussed in farmers market research perhaps due to the focus on motivation to attend rather than behaviors and purchasing decisions made once there. Hinrich (2000) noted in the early application of embeddedness and non-economic motivational factors in

alternative agriculture research that studies tended to focus too much on elements of embeddedness (social familiarity, trust, community) and minimize the importance of marketness and price as part of the process. The author questioned if research on embeddedness should include the more mechanical elements of markets for accuracy.

Though this researcher has been to a farmers market, I do not consider myself a farmers market patron but can appreciate them. I sought to deliver an accurate understanding of motivations to shop at farmers markets and represent their experiences through the interview process and data, not as a shopper myself. The findings of this study have theoretical and practical implications. From a theoretical perspective, the current study supports the use of embeddedness as a framework for understanding farmers market patronage motivations for attendance. These results add to the literature through the distinction between motivation to attend the market and shopping behaviors exhibited once there. The findings show certain economic elements of shopping do not greatly affect the choice to shop at the market but can determine who to buy from once inside.

Practical Implications

The current study also provides useful implications for farmers market vendors and policy makers. Participants reported consistent quality of goods as one of the main reasons to not only shop at a farmers market but continue to purchase from the same vendor. Claire and Emily said the produce does not need to look perfect but rather have a good color and appear fresh. Making the display as colorful and plentiful as possible is likely to attract more shoppers than ones that look sparse or not freshly picked. Signage communicating the origin of the produce or products would benefit sellers as well

because there is less likelihood for shoppers to suspect it was not grown or made locally. Policy makers should also communicate if there are any limits on how far farms can be located to be considered 'local' as there is no set definition.

One limitation of this study is the proximity of participants to one another, concentrated mainly in Minneapolis and the southern suburbs of the city. Results may not reflect farmers market patronage motivations in the more rural parts of the state, potentially limiting generalizability for Minnesota as a whole. The diversity of the sample is a limitation of this study as well. Because the snowball recruitment method was used, participants are somewhat homogenous being educated and white with full-time employment. The population of Minnesota is 80% white (Minnesota Census, 2018), so the experiences of these participants may not reflect the full spectrum of experiences with farmers markets.

Suggestions for Future Research

Future farmers market research should consider differences between farmers markets to determine why some farmers markets such as the Mill City market generate passionate consumer loyalty while other markets possess more monetary transactions or do not attract enough shoppers. Participants in this suggested crowding and friendly food education as reasons to attend certain markets over others, but more research could be conducted on a greater scale to determine if these results are widespread and therefore could be applied to improve the success of the markets. Research determining the influence of money, crowding and convenience as factors encouraging patronage of one farmers market over another should also be conducted to see if these issues deter

shoppers or whether they discourage attending one market but move the shopper to another, less problematic market.

The results of this study demonstrated similar findings previous research which found spatial and social embeddedness values influencing FMP, with natural embeddedness showing a much less significant influence. The concept of embeddedness is critical to understanding the range of motivations for FMP, considering the experiential and social components of a farmers market in contrast to the more utilitarian behaviors demonstrated in traditional grocery stores. Deviating from the previous studies, however, participants spoke of money and convenience as important factors in the frequency of FMP as well as the choice of which market to shop. More research is needed into some of the differences shown in the participants, particularly the importance of interpersonal relationships and sensory experiences as indicators of FMP.

REFERENCES

- Adams, D. C., & Adams, A. E. (2011). De-Placing Local at the farmers' market: Consumer conceptions of local foods. *Journal of Rural Social Sciences*, 26(2), 74-100.
- Adams, D. C., & Salois, M. J. (2010). Local versus organic: A turn in consumer preferences and willingness-to-pay. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, 25(4), 331-341.
- Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In *Action control* (pp. 11-39). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Andreatta, S., & Wickliffe, W. (2002). Managing farmer and consumer expectations: A study of a North Carolina farmers market. *Human Organization*, 167-176.
- Andrée, P., Dibden, J., Higgins, V., & Cocklin, C. (2010). Competitive Productivism and Australia's Emerging 'Alternative' Agri-food Networks: Producing for farmers' markets in Victoria and beyond. *Australian Geographer*, 41(3), 307-322.
- Bartels, J., Reinders, M., & Van Haaster- De Winter, M. (2015). Perceived sustainability initiatives: Retail managers' intrinsic and extrinsic motives. *British Food Journal*, 117(6), 1720-1736.
- Bednarz, M. & Ponder, N. (2010). Perceptions of retail convenience for in-store and online shoppers. *Marketing Management Journal*, 20(1), 49-65.
- Bell, D. R., & Lattin, J. M. (1998). Shopping behavior and consumer preference for store price format: Why "large basket" shoppers prefer EDLP. *Marketing Science*,

17(1), 66-88.

- Betz, M., & Farmer, J. (2016). Farmers' market governance and its role on consumer motives and outcomes. *Local Environment*, 21(11), 1420-1434.
- Bloom, J. D., & Hinrichs, C. C. (2011). Moving local food through conventional food system infrastructure: Value chain framework comparisons and insights. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, 26(1), 13-23.
- Boyce, B. (2013). Trends in Farm-to-Table from a Sociological Perspective. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*, 113(7), 892,893,895,897,898.
- Brown, A. (2002) Farmers' market research 1940–2000: an inventory and review. *American Journal of Alternative Agriculture*, 17, 167–176.
- Brown, A. (2010). Qualitative method and compromise in applied social research. *Qualitative Research*, 10(2), 229-248.
- Bruschi, V., Shershneva, K., Dolgopolova, I., Canavari, M., & Teuber, R. (2015). Consumer perception of organic food in emerging markets: evidence from Saint Petersburg, Russia. *Agribusiness*, 31(3), 414-432.
- Byker, C., Shanks, J., Misyak, S., & Serrano, E. (2012). Characterizing farmers' market shoppers: a literature review. *Journal of Hunger & Environmental Nutrition*, 7(1), 38-52.
- Counihan, C., & Van Esterik, P. (2012). Why food? Why culture? Why now? Introduction to the third edition. In *Food and Culture* (pp. 15-30). Routledge.
- Cutrona, C. E. (1996). Social support as a determinant of marital quality. In *Handbook of social support and the family* (pp. 173-194). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Darby, K., Batte, M. T., Ernst, S., & Roe, B. (2008). Decomposing local: A conjoint

- analysis of locally produced foods. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 90(2), 476-486.
- Davies, A., Titterton, A. J., & Cochrane, C. (1995). Who buys organic food? A profile of the purchasers of organic food in Northern Ireland. *British Food Journal*, 97(10), 17-23.
- Eastwood, D. B., Brooker, J. R., & Gray, M. D. (1998). Consumer Attitudes, Perceptions, and Behaviors About Locally Grown Fresh Produce: a Case Study of Six Tennessee.
- Farmers Market Coalition (2017). Resource: What is a farmers market? Retrieved from <https://farmersmarketcoalition.org/education/qanda/>
- Feagan, R., Morris, D., & Krug, K. (2004). Niagara region farmers' markets: local food systems and sustainability considerations. *Local environment*, 9(3), 235-254.
- Feagan, R. B., & Morris, D. (2009). Consumer quest for embeddedness: a case study of the Brantford Farmers' Market. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 33(3), 235-243.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1980). Predicting and understanding consumer behavior: Attitude-behavior correspondence. *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*, 148-172.
- Garner, B. (2017). Communicating social support during crises at the farmers' market: A social exchange approach to understanding customer-farmer communal relationships. *International journal of consumer studies*, 41(4), 422-430.
- Halweil, B. (2002) Home Grown: The Case for Local Food in a Global Market. *Worldwatch Institute World Watch Paper #163*, Washington D.C.

- Hilchey, D., Lyson, T., & Gillespie, G. W. (1995). Farmers' markets and rural economic development: entrepreneurship, business incubation, and job creation in the Northeast. Community agriculture development series (USA).
- Hill, H., & Lynchehaun, F. (2002). Organic milk: attitudes and consumption patterns. *British Food Journal*, 104(7), 526-542.
- Hinrichs, C. C. (2000). Embeddedness and local food systems: notes on two types of direct agricultural market. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 16(3), 295-303.
- Hinrichs, C. C. (2003). The practice and politics of food system localization. *Journal of rural studies*, 19(1), 33-45.
- Howard, P. H., & Allen, P. (2010). Beyond organic and fair trade? An analysis of ecolabel preferences in the United States. *Rural Sociology*, 75(2), 244-269.
- Hughner, R. S., McDonagh, P., Prothero, A., Shultz, C. J., & Stanton, J. (2007). Who are organic food consumers? A compilation and review of why people purchase organic food. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour: An International Research Review*, 6(2-3), 94-110.
- Huppertz, J. W., Arenson, S. J., & Evans, R. H. (1978). An application of equity theory to buyer-seller exchange situations. *Journal of marketing research*, 15(2), 250-260.
- Kaul, G. (2016). Minnesota has more farmers markets than ever. Retrieved from <https://www.minnpost.com/business/2016/09/minnesota-has-more-farmers-markets-evermight-not-be-good-farmers>
- Kirwan, J. (2004). Alternative strategies in the UK agro-food system: interrogating the alterity of farmers' markets. *Sociologia ruralis*, 44(4), 395-415.
- Klimek, M., Bingen, J., & Freyer, B. (2018). Metropolitan farmers markets in

- Minneapolis and Vienna: a values-based comparison. *Agriculture and human values*, 35(1), 83-97.
- Landis, Labarre, & Day. (2011). Health and Dietary Intakes of Farmers Market Patrons. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 111(9), A99.
- Lehner, M. (2015). Translating sustainability: The role of the retail store. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 43(4/5), 386-402.
- Lev, L., Brewer, L., & Stephenson, G. (2003). How do farmers' markets affect neighboring businesses (No. 16). Oregon Small Farms Technical Report.
- Mack, J., & Tong, D. (2015). Characterizing the spatial and temporal patterns of farmers' market visits. *Applied Geography*, 63, 43.
- Mayes, L. (2011). Nutrition Knowledge and Dietary Habits of Farmers Market Patrons: Implications for Promoting Consumption of Locally Grown Fruits and Vegetables. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 111(9), A86.
- McDermott, M. S., Oliver, M., Svenson, A., Simnadis, T., Beck, E. J., Coltman, T., ... & Sharma, R. (2015). The theory of planned behaviour and discrete food choices: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 12(1), 162.
- Moss, R. (2015). Amazon makes the farm-to-table connection. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/retailwire/2015/09/10/amazon-makes-the-farm-to-tableconnection/#607465976de5>
- Murdoch, J., Marsden, T. & Banks, J. (2000) Quality, nature, and embeddedness: some theoretical considerations in the context of the food sector. *Economic Geography*, 76, 107–125.

- Northcutt, N., & McCoy, D. (2004). *Interactive qualitative analysis : A systems method for qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- New Oxford American Dictionary. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/>
- O'Hara, J. K., & Shidelerb, D. (2018). Do Farmers' Markets Boost Main Street? Direct-to-Consumer Agricultural Production Impacts on the Food Retail Sector. *Journal of Food Distribution Research*, 49(2).
- Paul, J., Modi, A., & Patel, J. (2016). Predicting green product consumption using theory of planned behavior and reasoned action. *Journal of retailing and consumer services*, 29, 123-134.
- Penker, M. (2006). Mapping and measuring the ecological embeddedness of food supply chains. *Geoforum*, 37(3), 368-379.
- Peters, C. J., Bills, N. L., Wilkins, J. L., & Fick, G. W. (2009). Foodshed analysis and its relevance to sustainability. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, 24(1), 1-7.
- 14
- Pitts, S. B. J., Wu, Q., Demarest, C. L., Dixon, C. E., Dortche, C. J., Bullock, S. L., ... & Ammerman, A. S. (2015). Farmers' market shopping and dietary behaviours among Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program participants. *Public health nutrition*, 18(13), 2407-2414.
- Polanyi, K. (1957). *Societies and Economic Systems*.
- Qendro, A. (2015). Albanian and UK Consumers' Perceptions of Farmers' Markets and Supermarkets as Outlets for Organic Food: An Exploratory Study. *Sustainability*, 7(6), 6626-6651.

- Reutterer, T., & Teller, C. (2009). Store format choice and shopping trip types. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 37(8), 695-710.
- Saphores, J. D. M., Nixon, H., Ogunseitan, O. A., & Shapiro, A. A. (2006). Household willingness to recycle electronic waste: an application to California. *Environment and Behavior*, 38(2), 183-208.
- Schifferstein, H. N., & Ophuis, P. A. O. (1998). Health-related determinants of organic food consumption in the Netherlands. *Food quality and Preference*, 9(3), 119-133.
- Seiders, K., Voss, G., Godfrey, B., & Grewal, A. (2007). SERVCON: Development and validation of a multidimensional service convenience scale. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 35(1), 144-156.
- Stephenson, G., & Lev, L. (2004). Common support for local agriculture in two contrasting Oregon communities. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, 19(4), 210-217.
- Stephenson, G., Lev, L., & Brewer, L. (2008). 'I'm getting desperate': what we know about farmers' markets that fail. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, 23(3), 188-199.
- Swanson, R. B., & Lewis, C. E. (1991). Premium honeys: response of sensory panelists. *Food quality and preference*, 3(4), 215-221.
- Trobe, H. L. (2001). Farmers' markets: consuming local rural produce. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 25(3), 181-192.
- Turner, B., & Hope, C. (2015). Staging the Local: Rethinking scale in farmers' markets. *Australian Geographer*, 46(2), 147-163.
- USDA Farmers Market Directory (2019), Retrieved from:

<https://www.ams.usda.gov/local-food-directories/farmersmarkets>

Walljasper, J. (2012). Minnesota's local food climate. Retrieved from

<https://www.mcknight.org/system/asset/document/32/pdf-185-kb.pdf>

Walters, R. G., & Jamil, M. (2003). Exploring the relationships between shopping trip type, purchases of products on promotion, and shopping basket profit. *Journal of Business Research*, 56(1), 17-29.

Wilson, R. S., Schlea, D. A., Boles, C. M., & Redder, T. M. (2018). Using models of farmer behavior to inform eutrophication policy in the Great Lakes. *Water research*, 139, 38-46.

Wolf, M. M., Spittler, A., & Ahern, J. (2005). A profile of farmers' market consumers and the perceived advantages of produce sold at farmers' markets. *Journal of Food Distribution Research* 36(1), 192-201.

Zepeda, L., & Reznickova, A. (2013). Measuring Effects of Mobile Markets on Healthy Food Choices. University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Zepeda, L., & Carroll, K. A. (2018). Who Shops at a Mature Farmers' Market?. *Choices*, 33(3), 1-7.

APPENDIX A

Participant Recruitment Email

You are invited to participate in a research study concerning farmers market patronage behavior. You were selected as a possible participant because you live in Minnesota. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by Dr. Hye-Young Kim and Graduate Student, Alanna Norton at the University of Minnesota Retail Merchandising Program. The objectives of our research are to investigate consumers' farmers market patronage behavior.

If you have patronized a farmers market before and agree to be in this study, we would ask you to do the following things: The graduate student researcher will schedule an appointment to meet with you for 90 minutes at a place convenient to you. At the meeting, she will interview you by asking some questions about your shopping experience at farmers markets. If you agree, we will audio-tape the interview so that we can refer to them when we are completing the analysis stage of the research.

You will receive a **\$25 Target gift card** for participating in the interview session with us, the researchers from the University of Minnesota Retail Merchandising Program.

If you are interested in taking part in our study, please respond to this email. We would really appreciate your participation.

APPENDIX B

Consent Form

Pilot Interviews for a Qualitative Research Study

You are invited to participate in a research study about farmers market (FM) shopping motivations. You were selected as a possible participant because you have shopped at a FM in the past. We are seeking your input to better understand consumer behaviors.

Background Information

The purpose of this study is to describe FM and grocery shopping behavior. The result of the research will provide information for a better understanding of patronage of FM.

Procedures

If you agree to be in this study, we will ask you to participate in an interview asking for your opinions and needs.

Risks and Benefits of Participating in the Study

The study poses minimal risks. Interview questions will ask for your opinion, along with your needs and desires. You may refuse to answer any question that may make you uncomfortable.

Compensation

A \$25 gift card is offered as compensation for participating in this study.

Confidentiality

Interview answers and observation notes will be kept confidential. No individual will be named on interview or observation sheets. Final reports and presentations will not include any information that would identify a participant. Written permission will be secured before the interview.

Research records will be kept in a secure, safe location and only researchers will have access to those materials.

Voluntary Nature of the Study

All participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate in the study, you are welcome to refuse any answer or withdraw your participation at any time without affecting the aforementioned relationships.

Contacts and Questions

Any questions or comments you may have about the project, interviews, observations, photographs, reports, or presentations may be directed to Alanna Norton, norto219@umn.edu, 952-334-6334

If you have any questions or concerns of the study that you would like to discuss with someone other than Alanna Norton, you are encouraged to contact the Research Subjects' Advocate Line, D528 Mayo, 420 Delaware Street SE, Minneapolis, MN 55455, or (612) 625-1650.

-----initial here if you agree to be recorded

Participant signature _____ Date _____

Investigator signature _____ Date _____

Professor signature _____ Date _____

APPENDIX C

Interview Questions

Have you ever shopped at a farmer's market? Why?

Have you been to more than one FM? Did you notice any differences or similarities?

Where do you do the majority of your grocery shopping? Does this change depending on the season?

Do you shop at farmer's markets planning to purchase particular products? Where and which ones

How do you decide which products to buy and from whom?

Is it important to buy local products? Why?

Do you think FM produce is different from grocery store produce? Why or why not?

What benefits are there to shop at one over the other?

Do you see or meet people from your community at the FM?

Where did your family purchase groceries while you were growing up?

APPENDIX D

Interview Notes

Interview Questions

Have you ever shopped at a farmer's market? Why?

Have you been to more than one FM? Did you notice any differences or similarities?

Where do you do the majority of your grocery shopping? Does this change depending on the season?

Do you shop at farmer's markets planning to purchase particular products? Where and which ones?

How do you decide which products to buy and from whom?

Is it important to buy local products? Why?

Do you think FM produce is different from grocery store produce? Why or why not?

What benefits are there to shop at one over the other?

Do you see or meet people from your community at the FM?

Where did your family purchase groceries while you were growing up?

- 1) Mill City - wife 'talks to' - many farmers - wait time
- many
- sign at produce
- local artists, Museum big building
- very Sit in area Summer
- 2) Manifesto something - options
- 3) Summer Farmers - bus, Trader Joes
- 4)
- 5) Modern - 'Spencer' -
- 6) 'SD miles' can eat while shopping
- 7) Direct farmers - trust
for children's things
- 8) Food to person connections - chemicals
- 9) UCity is still produce
Mill City brings butters - rep for vendors you know
in - what - ...

Grow her own herbs (very delicious)
walk to mill
Yoga, community garden
recipes with lesser known herbs and vegetables
No more of others
Volunteers

APPENDIX E

Coding Sample

funny I: Or would you say maybe given similar options, would you go with the local one if they were equally as convenient

J: Yeah.

I: And do you think farmers market produce is different than grocery store produce?

J: Yes, Cause you get onions at the farmers market that are humongous so ginormous and then you get onions from a grocery store. Not impressive. That's the thing I noticed is the biggest differences the onions and squash, those are always much bigger at a farmers market.

I: And you think there's any difference in like shape or taste at all that you've noticed? Is it just, do you prefer a bigger size?

Wahley J: It feel like I'm getting a better deal when I get a bigger ones. I noticed the cucumbers, the skin on cucumbers is different from the farmer's market and from the grocery store and. I don't know if I've noticed a difference in the taste. Yeah I can't think of anything tastes different that comes to mind.

I: So why then would you buy your produce at a farmers market?

Explains why J: There's a fun aspect to it too. Like the atmosphere is good and you're usually up earlier and I like. Something about that is kind of fun, it's kind of chilly.

I: So you get more than just what you're buying, are you saying?

J: It's an experience that I am willing to waste my time on where as the grocery store I don't see as an experience, I see it as an errand like something that's a thorn in my side to do.

I: Have you noticed that you tend to see the same vendors or the same shoppers if you go to the same, the Minneapolis one is a little harder because it's huge.

not so in 1 J: At the local one like the smaller one in Minominee it's all the same people I haven't paid close enough attention at the St. Paul one or the Minneapolis one.

I: And how did you get introduced to farmers markets like when did you start going or why?

Wahley J: I went in college and it was just like 2 or 3 blocks down from my house and. It was kind of just something to do with my roommates. Like when you're in college you want to be like oh my god I'm getting everything I can out of life we are going to the farmers market it's great! That's like how it started and then I started liking getting the deal like that was cheaper than the grocery store and then as you go later in the season they just throw more food at you because they're trying to get rid of it so I always like that. You get like 6 peppers for a dollar.

I: How often do you, I think I forgot to ask you, how often do you go? Then versus now?

J: Then I used to go every week now I maybe go 3 or 4 times during the summer. I will normally go when I need something to supplement what I'm canning from my own garden. I can a lot of salsa so I'll go there for onions or cilantro, sometimes garlic. Because none of those things I grow.

I: What do you grow?