|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | | | | |