|  |
| --- |
| Table 1: Themes and sub-themes from the farmers’ market focus groups, n=8 |
| Theme | Sub-theme |
| Managers’ role | * Point person
* Liaison between the vendors and community
* Face of the market
* Getting the word out
* Doing education
* The messenger
* Quick decision making
 | * The messenger
* Gracious host
* Cop
* Decide who can vend
* Manage the bucks system
* Communicating with the public
* Represent the market
* Organizing the market
* Bouncer
 |
| Motivation | * Preserving farmers’ markets
* Helping small business get a foothold
* I like farmers
* Educate the underserved
 | * Importance of local food
* Support farmers
* Teach people farmers need to pay their bills
* Make food available proximally
* Serve new people
 |
| Enjoyment | * Culture of community
* Love working with people
* The event
* Receiving gratitude
* Share ideas, knowledge, and stories
* Like family
 | * Big party every week
* Fun
* Camaraderie
* Relationships
* Relationships with vendors
* Relationships with customers
 |
| Community contribution | * Ability to learn about growing
* Brings people to town
* Access to local food
* Closest “grocery”
* Only weekday market
* Vendor fees support community programs
 | * Doubling SNAP funds/Wholesome Wave Grant
* Outreach
* Economics
* The food
* The event
* Outlet for the farmers
* Contact with the farmers/growers
 |
| Challenges | * Being the liaison
* Politics
* Timing the market
* Lack of experience
* Host site conflicts
* Parking
* State tax policies
* Product mix
 | * Being a vendor and a manager
* Steering committee conflicts
* Being the messenger
* Not being local
* Unhappy vendors
* Being professional
* Pricing products
 |
| SNAP/EBT perceptions | * Limited success
* People thrilled
* Low participation rate
* Program is growing
* Program brought people to the market
 | * SNAP customers are families
* SNAP customers are elderly
* Very successful
* Farmers accept SNAP
* NO vendor problems
* Farmers wanted SNAP
* Low priority
 |
| SNAP/EBT barriers | * Struggle to reach people
* Low priority for vendors
 | * Too expensive
* Need help
 |
| Rules and regulations | * No middlemen
* Local
 | * Diverse product mix
* Expectation of helping others
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Table 2: Themes and sub-themes from interviews with farmers, n=8 |
| Theme | Sub-theme |
| Direct-to-consumer sales | * Had to sell our product
* Meeting customers
* Premium price
* Interaction with customers
* Interaction with vendors
 | * Sell surplus vegetables from garden
* Scaling up production
* Business diversification
* Communities supporting small farmers
 |
| Characteristics of an attractive market | * Good reputation
* Foot traffic
* Time and day (logistics)
* Close to home
* Sales
* Producer only market
 | * Roof over our heads
* Rural setting
* Community oriented
* Other organic farmers
* No pecking order
* Limited competition
 |
| Characteristics of a good manager | * Promoter
* Works well with the public
* Planning activities to entice customers
* Keeping vendors up-to-date
* Keeping the public up-to-date
* Gets musicians
* Organized
 | * Features products
* Is “fair”/enforces rules
* Friendly disposition
* Problem solver
* Forward thinking
* Creative
* Flexible
* Willing to enforce rules
 |
| Influence of manager on sales | * Advertising (Facebook, TV, Radio)
* Weekly newsletter
* Sociable with customers
* Vendor space assignment
 | * Product mix/market product balance
* Promote the market
* Be organized
* Maintaining decorum with vendors and customers
 |
| SNAP/EBT experiences | * Increased sales
* Additional sales/new customers
* Matching funds at markets
 | * Healthy food for more people
* Proud to participate
* Great program
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Table 3: Characteristics of North Carolina Farmers Market Managers and the Markets They Manage, n=70 |
|  | **n** | **Mean (SD)** | **Range** |
| **Manager Characteristics** |
| Manager’s age | 67 | 47.8(15.0) | 22-88 |
| Years managing the market | 68 | 4.9(4.2) | 1-20 |
| Paid managers; n(%) | 69 | 41(59.4) |  |
| **Market Characteristics** |
| Volunteers | 63 | 7.7(37.6) | 0-300 |
| Years in operation | 67 | 10.9(9.8) | 1-41 |
| Total vendors, 2013 | 69 | 30.9(27.1) | 3-150 |
| Average number of vendors per week, 2013 | 69 | 19.4(15.9) | 2-65 |
| Number of local vendors, 2013 | 67 | 17.5(20.9) | 0-125 |
| Average number of customers per week, 2013 | 54 | 358.9(512.5) | 10-3000 |
| Markets with SNAP/EBT; n(%) | 67 | 13(19.4) |  |
| Markets with vendors who operate SNAP/EBT; n(%) | 68 | 8(11.6) |  |
| Value of market SNAP/EBT sales, 2013\* | 12 | 1958(3107) | 0-8000 |
| SNAP/EBT customer count, 2013 | 10 | 131.3(277.3) | 0-900 |
| \*Amount in US dollars |

|  |
| --- |
| Table 4: Distribution of survey items used to create binary food access and business motivation scores among North Carolina farmers’ market managers |
| **Food Access Motivation Score, n=63** | **n(%)** |
|  High food access motivation | 25(39.7)38(60.3) |
|  Low food access motivation |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Item responses***  | **n** | **Mean (SD)** | **Variance** | **Range** |
|  Role: Making food more affordable\* | 59 | 3.47(1.39) | 1.94 | 1-6 |
|  Role: Making food more accessible\* | 63 | 4.36 (1.43) | 2.04 | 1-6 |
| **Business Motivation Score, n=67** | **n(%)** |
|  High business motivation | 19(28.4)48(71.6) |
|  Low business motivation |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Item responses***  | **n** | **Mean (SD)** | **Variance** | **Range** |
|  Role: Supporting local agriculture\* | 63 | 4.83(1.23) | 1.50 | 2-6 |
|  Role: Supporting local artisans\* | 64 | 2.20 (1.22) | 1.49 | 1-5 |
|  Role: Supporting the local economy in general\* | 63 | 3.19(1.67) | 2.80 | 1-6 |
| \* Possible responses range 1-6, 1 (least important) to 6 (most important)  |

|  |
| --- |
| Table 5: Regression of SNAP/EBT Availability and Business Vitality Variables on Food Access and Business Motivation Scores  |
| *Regression of SNAP/EBT Availability on Food Access Motivation Score among North Carolina Farmers Market Managers* |
|  |  | OR  | SE | p |
| **Model 1,** n=62 | Food access motivation score | 1.33 | 0.68 | 0.67 |
| **Model 2,** n=60 | Food access motivation score | 1.57 | 0.69 | 0.51 |
|  | *Manager characteristics* |  |  |  |
|  |  Age | 0.99 | 0.28 | 0.71 |
|  |  Years managing the market  | 0.86 | 0.15 | 0.31 |
|  |  Pay status (Y/N) ¥ | 1.24 | 0.69 | 0.75 |
| **Model 3,** n=54 | Food access motivation score | 2.08 | 0.87 | 0.40 |
|  | *Manager characteristics* |  |  |  |
|  |  Age | 0.99 | 0.04 | 0.95 |
|  |  Years managing the market | 0.75 | 0.23 | 0.19 |
|  |  Pay status (Y/N) ¥ | 0.69 | 0.91 | 0.68 |
|  | *Market characteristics* |  |  |  |
|  |  Volunteers | 0.99 | 0.02 | 0.86 |
|  |  Years in operation | 1.12 | 0.04 | 0.01\* |
| **Model 4,** n=60 | Food access motivation score | 1.89 | 0.78 | 0.41 |
|  | Years in operation | 1.09 | 0.04 | 0.01 |
| *Regression of Total Vendor Count on Business Motivation Score among North Carolina Farmers Market Managers* |
|   |  | β | SE | p |
| **Model 1,** n=64 | Business motivation score | 11.76 | 7.31 | 0.11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Model 2,** n=62 | Business motivation score | 12.79 | 6.89 | 0.07 |
|  | *Manager characteristics* |  |  |  |
|  |  Age | 0.28 | 0.24 | 0.25 |
|  |  Years managing the market  | 0.28 | 0.95 | 0.77 |
|  |  Pay status (Y/N) ¥ | 22.99 | 6.33 | 0.00\* |
| **Model 3,** n=54 | Business motivation score | 10.78 | 7.91 | 0.18 |
|  | *Manager characteristics* |  |  |  |
|  |  Age | 0.15 | 0.29 | 0.62 |
|  |  Years managing the market | 0.23 | 1.10 | 0.84 |
|  |  Pay status (Y/N) ¥ | 23.33 | 7.61 | 0.00\* |
|  | *Market characteristics* |  |  |  |
|  |  Volunteers | -0.01 | 0.09 | 0.89 |
|  |  Years in operation | 0.44 | 0.39 | 0.26 |
| **Model 4,** n=65 | Business motivation score | 11.18 | 6.67 | 0.09 |
|  | Pay status (Y/N) ¥ | -23.01 | 6.13 | 0.00\*\* |
| *Regression of Average Number of Vendors per Week on Business Motivation Score among North Carolina Farmers Market Managers* |
|  |  | β | SE | p |
| **Model 1,** n=66 | Business motivation score | 6.92 | 4.30 | 0.11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Model 2,** n=64 | Business motivation score | 6.82 | 3.95 | 0.09 |
|  | *Manager characteristics* |  |  |  |
|  |  Age | 0.06 | 0.14 | 0.65 |
|  |  Years managing the market  | 0.09 | 0.55 | 0.88 |
|  |  Pay status (Y/N) ¥ | 15.01 | 3.63 | 0.00\*\* |
| **Model 3,** n=56 | Business motivation score | 4.02 | 4.33 | 0.36 |
|  | *Manager characteristics* |  |  |  |
|  |  Age | -0.01 | 0.16 | 0.75 |
|  |  Years managing the market | -0.03 | 0.60 | 0.96 |
|  |  Pay status (Y/N) ¥ | -13.82 | 4.16 | 0.00\* |
|  | *Market characteristics* |  |  |  |
|  |  Volunteers | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.74 |
|  |  Years in operation | 0.45 | 0.21 | 0.04 |
| **Model 4,** n=64 | Business motivation score | 5.82 | 3.82 | 0.13 |
|  | Pay status (Y/N) ¥ | 13.89 | 3.66 | 0.00\*\* |
|  | Years in operation | 0.35 | 0.18 | 0.06 |
| *Regression of Local Vendor Count on Business Motivation Score among North Carolina Farmers Market Managers* |
|  |  | β | SE | p |
| **Model 1,** n=64 | Business motivation score | 13.05 | 5.67 | 0.03\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Model 2,** n=62 | Business motivation score | 12.93 | 5.67 | 0.03\* |
|  | *Manager characteristics* |  |  |  |
|  |  Age | 0.03 | 0.20 | 0.89 |
|  |  Years managing the market  | 0.49 | 0.78 | 0.52 |
|  |  Pay status (Y/N) ¥ | 12.37 | 5.12 | 0.02\* |
| **Model 3,** n=54 | Business motivation score | 11.41 | 6.62 | 0.09 |
|  | *Manager characteristics* |  |  |  |
|  |  Age | -0.79 | 0.25 | 0.75 |
|  |  Years managing the market | 0.43 | 0.9 | 0.64 |
|  |  Pay status (Y/N) ¥ | 11.64 | 6.22 | 0.67 |
|  | *Market characteristics* |  |  |  |
|  |  Volunteers | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.55 |
|  |  Years in operation | 0.46 | 0.36 | 0.21 |
| **Model 4,** n=64 | Business motivation score | 12.55 | 5.45 | 0.03\* |
|  | Pay status (Y/N) ¥ | 12.42 | 4.95 | 0.02\* |
| \*p <.05, \*\*p<.01, ¥ referent category is “Y”, manager is paid to manage the market |