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Abstract

Food has the power to bring communities together but it also has the power to pit societal ideologies surrounding food and food sourcing against each other. The farm-to-table movement reached a turning point in the early 2000s, when consumers started to care more about where their food came from. In response to growing concerns about food quality, transparency, local sourcing, and “knowing where your food is coming from,” fast food franchises started to push their menus to be more fit the bill. With more and more of these fast-food meccas pushing a “clean” or “locally sourced” menu, non-franchise restaurants are having to compete to bring in these “locavore” consumers.

This exploratory content analysis was conducted because there is a gap between the consumer and these farm-to-table restaurants. These restaurateurs need to understand the influence that websites have on consumer perceptions about the restaurant and its sourcing habits. Consumers can judge a website in as little as 3.42 seconds based solely on the aesthetics of the site. This three-second window is all the time that websites have to captivate their consumers.

This study aimed to see if the farm-to-table restaurants in the Columbus metropolitan area are following suit with their franchise competitors. More specifically, this study described the visual aesthetics of farm-to-table restaurant websites and menus,
identified themes seen throughout the terminology used by the farm-to-table restaurants, and described how farm-to-table restaurants share information about their locally sourced products or ingredients.

The results of this study demonstrated that farm-to-table restaurants rely heavily on logotypes, likely because they can be seen easily from a moving vehicle. These restaurants also used high-quality photos across their websites to portray menu items and the interior and exterior of the restaurant. Color selections tended to stay in the neutral category of black, white, and gray. There are multiple reasons behind this color scheme selection that can be explained by color theory. Textual content contained more labeling themes were noted than production themes. While this study focused on farm-to-table restaurants, only 23.3% of the 30 restaurants sampled listed farm and sourcing information on their websites. This could cause an issue when marketing these farm-to-table restaurants since they are claiming to be farm-to-table yet are not discussing where their products are being sourced from.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

“But is it local?”

In the last decade, consumers have wanted basic, yet better food. Terms like “farm-to-table,” “artisan,” “from-scratch,” and “house-made/cured/aged” have dominated the menus of restaurants, making it clear to patrons that the restaurants are embracing high-quality ingredients and using crafted preparation techniques. In 2011, a list of “5 Food Trends to Embrace Now” was published in Restaurant Hospitality. At the top of the trend list was this “basic, only better” trend (Rowe, 2011). The primary focus of this “basic, only better” was the farm-to-table movement.

In 2017, six of the top-ten concept trends centered around this “local” or “basic, only better” mindset. These trends included hyper-local sourcing, natural/clean ingredients and menus, locally sourced produce, meat and seafood, and simplicity/back to basics. Hudson Riehle, senior vice president of research of the National Restaurant Association, states, “[m]enu trends today are beginning to shift from ingredient-based items to concept-based ideas, mirroring how consumers tend to adapt their activities to their overall lifestyle philosophies” (2017 Culinary Forecast, 2017). Additionally, nine out of the top 20 food trends included house-made charcuterie (cured meats), house-made condiments, heirloom fruits and vegetables, house-made/artisan ice creams, and artisan cheeses. These trends can be seen across fast-food menus, local brick-and-mortar
restaurants, and everywhere in between.

**The Farm-to-Table Movement**

Food has the power to bring communities together. It also has the power to pit societal ideologies surrounding food against each other: vegans against vegetarians; vegetarians against carnivores; calorie counter against those seeking indulgence; the organic/all natural consumers against those consumers seeking convenience (Malcom, 2014). With the emergence of seasonal and year-round farmers markets and farm-to-table restaurants, America’s consciousness is being drawn back to the local food movement. Unfortunately, a drawback of the farm-to-table movement is the cost: it is expensive (Malcolm, 2014). However, this drawback doesn’t seem to stop all consumers. Consumers feel that if they purchase local food, they are supporting the social ideology of a farmer or business (Darby, Batte, Ernst, & Roe, 2006). By buying these local products, consumers have the chance to have personal interactions with farmers who grew the products being sold (Brown & Miller, 2008; Hunt, 2007). Figure 1.1 shows that consumers are typically willing to pay a higher price for “local” food regardless of socioeconomic status.

*Figure 1.1:* Consumers from various backgrounds are willing to pay more for local food (Rushing & Ruehle, 2013).
The farm-to-table movement did not start with a bottom line in mind. Alice Waters of Cheze Panisse in Berkeley, California, and Jerry Traunfeld of Herbfarm in Washington State began the idea of farm-to-table restaurants (Farm-to-Table, 2013). When Waters first listed the names of farms on the menu of Chez Panisse, she wanted to remind people that food really did grow on farms and isn’t just found in the supermarket. More importantly, she wanted to re-establish the link between the seasons of the year and the food that was being served at Chez Panisse and to credit everyone who produced every part of the meals being produced:

Alice and Chez Panisse are convinced that the best-tasting food is organically and locally grown and harvested in ways that are ecologically sound by people who are taking care of the land for future generations. The quest for such ingredients has always determined the restaurant’s cuisine. Since 1971, Chez Panisse has invited diners to partake of the immediacy and excitement of vegetables just out of the garden, fruit right off the branch, and fish straight out of the sea. In doing so, Chez Panisse has established a network of nearby suppliers who, like the restaurant, are striving for both environmental harmony and delicious flavor. (Chez Panisse, 2017, p. 5)

A shortcoming of the farm-to-table movement is the how “local” is defined. A 2012 study conducted by A.T. Kearney, a global management consulting firm, noted that when consumers were asked what “local” means to them, there was no specific answer. Sixty-four percent of the 1,300 U.S. respondents consider food “local” if it is produced within a 100-mile radius of the store, while 37% considerd products sourced from the
same state to be “local” (Rushing & Ruehle, 2013). However, the term “local” as defined by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, also known as the 2008 Farm Act (H.R. Rep. No. 110-627, at 283, 2008), defined “local” as “less than 400 miles from the origin of the product or the State in which the product is produced” (p. 283).

Farm-to-Table and National Fast Food Chains

The farm-to-table movement reached a turning point in the early 2000s as consumers started to care more about where their food came from (CIA-Harvard Menus of Change, 2016). Although that was almost 17 years ago, the farm-to-table movement hasn’t left consumer’s minds. In response to growing concerns from consumers about food quality, transparency of food sourcing, local products, and “knowing where your food is coming from,” fast food franchises started to push their menus to promote “farm fresh” and “local” foods (Watral, 2015).

In 1984, before the farm-to-table movement, Craig Culver, founder of Culver’s, had an idea for the ‘perfect’ restaurant: a restaurant that focused on cooking burgers to order and handcrafting batches of their signature custard daily (Culver’s, 2017a). The Culver’s website states,

Culver’s ButterBurgers are made the way they are today because that’s how his [Craig Culver’s] mom always did it. Still, we use fresh, never frozen, 100% Midwest beef... Sure, it takes a bit longer doing it that way, but boy is it worth the wait. (Culver’s, 2017a)

The company prides itself on its relationships with the farmers, ranchers, and producers that supply Culver’s with Midwestern beef, Wisconsin dairy, and chicken from Georgia (Culver’s, 2017b). This has also lead to a partnership with National FFA
Organization, an intracurricular student organization for those interested in agriculture and leadership.

Jeni Britton Bauer was also ahead of the farm-to-table movement. In 2002, Jeni’s Splendid Ice Creams was opened in the North Market in Columbus, Ohio. Jeni’s ice creams are made using whole ingredients and dairy from grass-pastured cows (Jeni’s, 2017a). The company is also a Certified B Corporation endorsed by the international nonprofit B Lab as a company that meets rigorous standards of social and environmental performance, accountability, and transparency (Jeni’s, 2017b).

Panera Bread, a fast-casual establishment, opened its first restaurant in 1987. In 2004, the company noticed the demands of customers were changing and introduced chicken raised without antibiotics (Panera, 2017). The company looked more closely at what they were serving customers and their sourcing practices. In 2014, the company announced plans to remove all artificial colors, sweeteners, flavors, and preservatives from its food menu by 2016 and released its first ever animal welfare progress report. By 2016 Panera Bread had achieved 100% antibiotic-free chicken and pork, 95% grass-fed and pasture-raised beef, and 16% cage free eggs (Panera Bread, 2016). By 2017 Panera had achieved a menu that is 100% “clean,” meaning there are no artificial colors, sweeteners, flavors, or preservatives (Panera Bread, 2017).

In 2011, McDonald’s launched its “What We’re Made Of” campaign. This campaign was intended to make their customers “feel good about the high-quality ingredients that go into our [McDonald’s] menu” (Kummer, 2015, p. 10). In 2017, McDonald’s has committed to “The Simpler, The Better” food philosophy. All McDonald’s chicken is antibiotic-free, beef is sourced from sustainable practices, their
eggs come from cage-free chickens, coffee and seafood are both sustainably sourced, and milk comes from cows not treated with rbST (McDonald’s, 2017).

Farm-to-Table on a “Local” Scale

Many states have taken part in the farm-to-table movement. In 2002, the Kentucky State Fair hosted a cooking school demonstration focusing on cooking with Kentucky-grown foods and ingredients (Bastin, 2002). This state-based branding for agricultural and food products can now be found in all 50 states (Onken & Bernard, 2010). Examples of these state-branded items include Jersey Fresh, Fresh from Florida, and Ohio Proud products.

Created in 1993 by the Ohio Department of Agriculture, the Ohio Proud marketing program identities and promotes food and products that were either made or grown in Ohio (Ohio Proud, 2017). Agriculture is Ohio’s number one industry, contributing more than $105 billion to the state’s economy (Ohio Proud, 2017). With more than 1,000 food processing companies and more than 200 commercial crops, it is not surprising that Ohio is a leading producer in more than 35 product sectors (Ohio Proud, 2017).

Consumers prefer local and state-branded foods, and this preference has also increased their willingness to pay more for these products (Ruth & Rumble, 2016). Carpio and Isengildina-Massa (2008) concluded that customers were willing to pay up to a 27% premium on locally produced food. Similarly, a 2007 customer survey produced by the Ohio Department of Agriculture reported that 93% of the customers surveyed preferred to buy Ohio-branded products over national brands, and 90% of respondents
surveyed said they would be willing to pay up to 50 cents more for these Ohio Proud products (Ohio Proud, 2017). Additionally, Nganje, Hughner, & Lee (2011) discovered that consumers in Arizona were willing to pay more for state-branded spinach because the consumers associated a higher level of safety with the product. This willingness to pay for state-grown or state-branded produces increases with age and income. Additionally, women were willing to pay more for local animal products over men (Ruth & Rumble, 2016).

*Columbus a Case Study*

Columbus is the capital of Ohio, as well as the home of The Ohio State University, and multiple professional sporting teams. The city of Columbus is a fast-growing area. In 2015, the population within the Columbus metro area hit and exceeded the 2 million mark (Rouan, 2016). In 2011, the “Think Columbus First” campaign was launched by an organization called Support Our Local Economy (SOLE) that aimed to inform residents within the Columbus metro area about the “living local” scene.

Columbus first arrived in the Ohio food scene in the mid-1970s (Houser, 2015). In 2010, Michael Ruhlman, a successful author and chef, declared Columbus “the best restaurant city in Ohio” (Houser, 2015). In 2017, Experience Columbus, a Columbus-based tourist company, launched the “Made in CBUS Trail.” This ‘trail’ features 20 businesses, including distilleries, cold-pressed juice shops, locally designed clothing and accessories stores, and home goods shops. Columbus is also home to North Market. In North Market consumers can find a variety of prepared foods, produce, and products from independent merchants and local farms. The North Market is the last remaining public market in Columbus and greets over 1 million guests per year (Experience
Columbus, 2017). In addition to the “Made in CBUS Trail” and North Market, Columbus is home to multiple local breweries, distilleries, and a large organization of food trucks.

Columbus is also home to organizations focusing on local food. These organizations include Dine Originals Columbus, Slow Food Columbus, Local Matters, and Cooking Matters. Dine Originals Columbus is a community of locally, independently owned and operated restaurants in the central Ohio area (Dine Originals, 2017). Slow Food Columbus aims to educate the public about sustainable food systems while strengthening the foundations of “pleasurable” eating (Slow Food Columbus, 2017). Local Matters is a non-profit organization based in Central Ohio that is working to transform the food system in the Columbus area by creating healthier communities through food education, access, and advocacy (Local Matters, 2016). Cooking Matters, a part of the No Kid Hungry campaign, focuses on providing families with the knowledge about food budgeting and providing recipes for healthy, home-cooked meals (Cooking Matters, 2017).

**Websites as Marketing Tools**

Buhalis and Law (2008) reported that websites are an effective marketing and advertising tool that provides consumers with information about products and services being provided by that website. While navigating through a website, customers formulate opinions about the products and services offered as well as the company that is offering them (Hwang, Yoon, & Park, 2011). A good quality website can help these potential consumers form positive judgements about the company; however, a poor quality web may result in a loss of both potential sales and repeated visits because the consumer has formed negative judgements about the company (Cunliffe, 2000).
Web Design

Today, image truly is everything. Visual communication becomes a reality as soon as a font and font color are selected, a background image or color is chosen, or text is displayed on the screen.

First impressions can influence the search for information and can sway the judgement and selection process (Lindgaard, Fernandes, Dudek & Brown, 2006). One of the most notable sources of first impressions is visual appearance. There is also growing evidence suggesting that evaluations of interactive systems are influenced in general by the systems’ visual appearance and by the appearance of web pages (Tractinsky et al., 2000; Tractinsky et al., 2006).

Web Aesthetics

Web aesthetics, a relatively newer field of study, is built upon the long tradition of aesthetics (Lazard et al., 2016). Perception of aesthetics influences website use, especially for first impressions (Thielsch et al., 2014). Evaluations of Web aesthetics are made quickly with a lasting impact for perceived usability, trust, satisfaction, and intentions to visit (or revisit) a website (Lazard et al., 2016).

Web colors are based from additive color. Additive color works with anything that emits light, like a computer screen (Eckstut & Eckstut, 2013). These web colors are based from RGB (red, green, blue) values and hexadecimal codes. In additive color, white is the combination of all the colors and black is the absence of color. When designing for the web it is important to consider that, while some contrasting colors complement each other (i.e. black and white, a pale yellow and black, navy and cream), other contrasting colors will cause a visual strain and give the illusion that the website is
shaking because the viewer’s eyes cannot (and will not) focus (i.e. orange and blue, black and blue) (Specht, *Typefaces and Color*, 2017).

The choice of color scheme for a website can be determined by the existing corporate color scheme or a strong thematic association. Common sense tells us that color matters. It is one of the first things we, as humans, look at when selecting a new dress or a new car. Society has primed us to associate certain colors with certain meanings. This association serves as the basis for color theory within the realm of visual aesthetics.

**Color Theory**

Color is a fundamental aspect of all visually represented messages and is one of the most quickly identified design features for first impressions of websites (Cyr, Head, & Larios, 2010; Seckler, Opwis, & Tuch, 2015). Food marketers are well aware of associations of color and food for flavor (Levitan, Zampini, Li, & Spence, 2008), appropriateness (Stillman, 1993), and intensity (Zellner & Durlach, 2003). Potential customers engaged in information-seeking behavior find increased color appeal leads to greater satisfaction with and trust of the website (Cyr et al., 2010).

Additionally, certain colors are associated with different emotions. Warm colors, (reds, oranges, and yellows) are colors that are vivid, energetic, passionate, and typically positive (Eckstut & Eckstut, 2013). These colors tend to represent the colors of fire, the leaves of fall, sunrises and sunsets. Red and yellow are both classified as primary colors and orange is falling in the middle as a secondary color. Cool colors include green, blue, and purple and are often more subdued than warm colors. They are the colors of night, of water, and of nature and are usually calming, relaxing, and somewhat reserved (Eckstut & Eckstut, 2013). Blue is the only primary color in the cool spectrum, which means the
other colors are created by combining blue with a warm color (yellow for green and red for purple) (Eckstut & Eckstut, 2013). Neutral colors often serve as a background color for websites and are often combined with brighter accent colors. However, when used on their own, neutral colors can create a very sophisticated design (Eckstut & Eckstut, 2013).

Colors and Branding

John Deere, Tiffany & Co., and universities have “trademarked” colors that are associated with the brand (Tzatzev, 2012). Consumers often associate these colors with the company’s visual brand identity and can identify an advertisement from the company before even seeing the logo for the company (Phillips, McQuarrie & Griffin, 2014).

Additionally, within design aesthetics, color is often used to attract the eyes of potential buyers and eliciting brand-appropriate emotional responses within the consumer (Eckstut & Eckstut, 2013). For example, if a consumer catches a glimpse of the green in a John Deere logo or the red of a Case IH logo, they (the consumer) could imagine these tractors out working in the field planting or harvesting crops. Companies such as Coca-Cola, Tiffany & Co., and the United Postal Service have trademarked their signature colors (Eckstut & Eckstut, 2013).

Purpose and Objectives of Study

The Internet has become essential for many Americans in their daily lives. In 2016, 88% of all adults in the United States used the Internet (Pew Research Center, 2017). Consumers can judge the trustworthiness of a website in as little as 3.42 seconds based solely on the aesthetics of the site (Alsundani & Casey, 2009). This three-second
window is all the time that websites have to captivate their consumers. If a website is hard to navigate, visually unpleasant, or does not load, the viewer is less likely to continue past the homepage of that website. Ultimately, the consumers are also passing judgement on the content.

One thing that Culver’s, Jeni’s Splendid Ice Creams, Panera Bread, and McDonald’s all have in common is having bright, attention-grabbing websites. These sites have been designed with visual aesthetics with the idea of drawing the consumer into the site in mind. Bright colors and large, crisp images of “drool-worthy” food can be seen across all the homepages of these websites. The fast food industry is aware of their customer’s demographics and psychographics, or personality traits – the “why they buy traits” – and have built their visual identity around them. Visual identity refers to the visuals aesthetics being used by companies to make their organizations, or in this case, restaurants, recognizable (McQuarrie & Phillips, 2008; Schroeder, 2004). Logos and logotypes, color schemes, typefaces, and imagery all fall under this category. This visual identity can then be used to establish branding. This study aimed to see if the small farm-to-table restaurants within the Columbus metropolitan area are following suit with their franchise competitors. This research will assist the research in tailoring websites for new restaurants wanting to break into the farm-to-table niche.

This study was guided by the following research objectives:

1. To describe the visual aesthetics of local farm-to-table restaurant websites and menus.

2. To identify themes seen in the terminology used on local farm-to-table restaurant websites and menus; and
3. To identify and describe how local farm-to-table restaurants share information on their websites about the locally sourced products or ingredients that are being used or sold in the restaurants.

**Definition of Terms**

For the purposes of this study, local foods, production agriculture terms, and food labeling and/or marketing terms were defined as follows:

**Local Foods**

*Local*, as defined by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (H.R. Rep. No. 110-627, at 283, 2008), is “less than 400 miles from the origin of the product or the State in which the product is produced.” When using the term “local,” many restaurants and food service providers have a very broad definition. To eliminate any confusion, “local” shall be defined, for this research, as 400 miles from Columbus, Ohio.

**Production Agriculture Terminology**

*Production agriculture terminology* referred to text content that described how the products were raised. Free-range, cage-free, pasture raised, grass fed, sustainable, heirloom, environmentally thoughtful, specific livestock breeds, antibiotic free, steroid free, and seasonal, were just a few of the example terms that were placed into this category.

**Labeling Terminology**

*Labeling terminology* referred to text content that could be found on a label in a grocery store or on a product. Local, natural, organic, artisanal, gluten-free, fresh, farm-to-table, house made, Ohio proud, and USDA classifications, were just a few of the
example terms that were placed into this category.

**Logo Styles**

**Iconic**

*Iconic* logos consist of symbols or images that represent a company. They are suitable for global markets. These logos don’t need to be translated in different languages. See Figure 1.2 for examples of iconic logos.

![Iconic Logo Examples](image)

*Figure 1.2: Examples of iconic logos used by farm-to-table restaurants.*

**Logotype**

*Logotypes* use typefaces as the “building material” for logo. No images are involved with this type of logo. See Figure 1.3 for examples of logotype logos.

![Logotype Logo Examples](image)

*Figure 1.3: Examples of logotype logos used by farm-to-table restaurants.*

**Combination Mark**

A logotype used with an iconic logo to make a logo that has both a central image or icon and typeface. *Combination marks* are essentially a combination of an iconic logo
and a logotype. See Figure 1.4 for examples of combination mark logos.

*Figure 1.4:* Examples of combination mark logos used by farm-to-table restaurants.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

A review of literature was conducted to provide background information on topics related to this study. The related topics included in this literature review are: online relationship building, the restaurant industry and websites, social presence and visual perceptions, priming, and the Visual Aesthetics of Website Inventory.

Online Relationship Building

In 1999, Day and Montgomery noticed businesses focusing on relationships rather than looking at the individual transactions. With new marketing techniques being implemented, businesses now focus on interactive marketing, one-on-one marketing, mass customization, and customer relationship management. These strategies are designed to fit individual user needs and tastes (Hamel & Prashantham, 2001). Each one of these techniques has the objective of building long-term relationships. The Internet provides these businesses with the opportunities to establish, build, and maintain new customer relationships (Geissler, 2001; Yoon, Choi, & Sohn, 2008).

Jap and Ganesan (2010) discussed the importance of the Internet in terms of building relationships between consumers and the businesses. Unlike traditional media sources, the Internet allows businesses to provide constant and up-to-date information to consumers, allowing easier relationship-building (Yoon et al., 2008). For example, many
farm-to-table restaurants have menus that change daily; the Internet allows these businesses to share their daily menus with consumers. The Internet provides an opportunity for businesses (in the case of this study, restaurants) to collect consumer data that can then be use to effectively build relationships with new customers, retain existing customers, and maintain customer loyalty (Hanson, 2000). For businesses (restaurants) to be effective in building relationships with consumers, it is important for them to understand how consumers experience relationships and interact online (Jap & Ganesan, 2010).

This interaction is the main way that the Internet facilitates consumers’ active participation in online communities (Yoon et al., 2008). In traditional media forms, business relationships are initiated by the company through various promotional efforts such as advertising, direct mail, and sales promotions (White, 2013). In contrast to traditional media, the Internet allows consumers to initiate the relationships with businesses. Due to certain aspects being integrated into websites now, such as contact pages and automatic chat bubbles, the interactivity of websites has increased. This increase in interactivity has allowed consumers to become involved in two-way communication to acquire information and gives the consumers greater control over obtaining their own information about products or the businesses (Feinberg & Kadam, 2002; Fiore, Jin, & Kim, 2005; Heldal, Sjovold, & Heldal, 2004; Thorbjornsen, Supphellen, Nysveen, & Pedersen, 2002).
Restaurants and the Internet

In 1996, Murphy, Forrest and Wotring published an early review of the Internet-marketing applications that could be used by restaurants. Murphy et al. noted that this emerging technology, while still in a chaotic phase, was being used to benefit the restaurants that had adopted it (Litvin, Blose, & Laird, 2005). “With a little effort and research, restaurateurs can take the necessary and relatively easy steps to employ a new means of marketing via interactive communication technologies” (Murphy et al., 1996, p. 71). The authors concluded that the restaurateurs who decided not to use the Internet were losing an important competitive advantage.

Additionally, Bonn, Fun, and Susskind noted that consumers were beginning to want and expect more information about hotels, restaurants, attractions, and other tourism destinations to be available online. Palmer & McCole (2001) noted that as Internet usage grew, the Internet was becoming an integral part of businesses, specifically the food and beverage sectors. The Internet also had the potential to enhance the relationship between businesses and guests, adding value to their products (Palmer & McCole, 2000).

In 2001, the National Restaurant Association polled their members and discovered that approximately half of their table-service members reported having a website (Ebbin, 2001). The restaurants that were earlier adopters of the Internet indicated that the purpose of their websites was primarily to offer consumers information about their establishments and to provide details about where the restaurant was located (Litvin, Blose, & Laird, 2005). However, in the National Restaurant Association study, there was no information regarding the effectiveness of the medium in the marketing of the restaurant products.
Social Presence and Visual Persuasion

Social presence theory focuses on the extent to which users of a medium (in the case of this study, websites) feel the presence of others during their user experience (Cyr, Head, Larios, & Pan, 2009; Lombard & Ditton, 1997; Short, Williams, & Christie, 1976). A perceived social presence on a website can increase the potential that it will be viewed as warm or personal and a sense of community creation (Cyr et al., 2009; Yoo & Alavi, 2001). Social presence can be experienced through a variety of visual design elements, such as the use of human imagery (Cyr et al., 2009); interpersonal text content, such as user comments or cues for potential social interaction (Kumar & Benbasat, 2006); and human audio or video content (Lombard & Ditton, 1997). This study investigated human imagery as a source of social presence.

The use of human images plays a powerful role in perceived social presence when consumers view a website, leading to increased levels of trust (Cyr et al., 2009). Cyr et al. (2009) noted when a website used images of humans (e.g., staff photos or patron photos), it website and images were more likely to hold the viewer’s attention. The perceived usefulness of the site also increased (Riegelsberger, Sasse, & McCarthy, 2002; Hassanein & Head, 2007). In a case of low social presence, text and basic images and included; medium-level social presence includes basic product picture(s) with strong, descriptive text; and high-level social presences has pictures that depict human figures and emotive text (Cyr et al., 2009).

These human images can lead to increased media richness, a framework that is used to identify a communication medium's (e.g., face-to-face contact, phone calls, emails, flyers) ability to reproduce the information that is being sent through it, and may
lead to a more favorable judgement of the website (Cyr et al., 2009; Hassanein & Head, 2007). Media richness postulates that online text-based communication is perceived to be less “rich” than other media sources (Daft & Lengel, 1986). Simon (2001) suggests “that information rich, consumer oriented websites should help reduce ambiguity, increase trust/reduce risk, and encourage users to purchase with lower levels of consumer dissonance” (p. 26). Although research linking human images to consumer trust is very limited, previous research does suggest there is a relationship between the presence of human images and trust on websites (Steinbrück et al. 2002).

This understanding of the role that human images play within social presence can build on the framework of visual persuasion. Visual persuasion has proven to be an effective form of communication (Carney & Feigenson, 2004). Visual persuasion can be used by websites to express ideas that go beyond the capabilities of textual representation (van Schaik & Ling, 2009). A persuasive image can have the underlying intention to persuade the viewer by its visuals (Joo, Li, Steen, & Zhu, 2014). Visual persuasion is widely used on mass media outlets, such as TV news, advertisement, or for political campaigns (Joo et al., 2014). For example, politicians are often shown interacting with children, arguing that they are dependable and warm.

In the case of this study, visual persuasion could include images of the farmers that these farm-to-table restaurants source their products from, images of chefs working in their gardens, or images of patrons enjoying these farm-to-table dishes that are being prepared with these “local” products. For example, on the “our story” page of The Crest Gastropub’s website, is an image of chefs collecting lettuce from one of the restaurants raised garden beds.
**Priming**

Consumers may encounter terminology like “organic,” “fair trade,” “locally grown,” “GMO-free,” and “antibiotics free” when viewing restaurant websites and menus online. The terms relating to fair trade and local products usually reflect a valuation of working conditions, labor practices, fair prices for farmers, and supporting family farms (Jeong & Lundy, 2015). The terms “organic,” “GMO-free,” and “antibiotics free” usually reflect consumer concerns surrounding natural resources or the environment, the use of fertilizers, and other agricultural production practices (McCluskey & Loureiro, 2003).

Psychological literature refers to these terms as “buzzwords” being used within farm-to-table websites and menus. Roskos-Ewoldsen, Roskos-Ewoldsen, and Carpentier (2002) define priming as “the effect of some preceding stimulus or event on how we react, broadly defined, to some subsequent stimulus” (p. 97). In the case of this study, the stimulus is the visual aesthetics and text-based content of farm-to-table websites. “Text-based” priming has a very effect limited duration: 700 milliseconds, to be exact (Roskos-Ewoldsen, Klinger & Roskos-Ewoldsen, 2007). However, this text-based priming is still very important since it can still influence consumer judgements (Benoit & Holbert, 2010).

Research (Elliot et al., 2007; Elliot & Niesta, 2008; Maier et al., 2008) suggests that color can communicate specific information, the meaning of which depends on the situation or context. For example, Elliot et al. (2007) demonstrated that brief exposure to red resulted in decreased performance on intelligence tests. The authors proposed that red primes the threat of failure in an academic context due to learned associations between failing a class and red ink marks on a term paper or exam. The threat of failure in turn
evokes avoidance motivation and can result in diminished test performance. Additionally, Nenkov and Scott (2014) evaluated the priming effects of “cute” products and consumer consumption. “Cuteness” was defined as being attractive to consumers by having adorable or endearing qualities, the authors primarily focused on kindchengschema (Nenkov & Scott, 2014). Previous research on priming and the perception-behavior link has shown that perception and behavior are linked (Nenkov & Scott, 2014). These perceptions can have direct and unconscious effects on a wide range of consumer behaviors. The authors concluded that priming effects did not increase “cute” product consumption because the “cute” stimuli primed consumer’s mental representations of vulnerability and caretaking rather than indulgence (Nenkov & Scott, 2014). This research is what sparked the idea of blending visual aesthetics and priming.

**Visual Aesthetics of Website Inventory**

One of the most notable sources of first impressions is visual appearance. First impressions can influence the search for information and can sway the judgement and selection process (Lindgaard, Fernandes, Dudek & Brown, 2006). As humans, we are affected by the aesthetics of nature and of architecture, as well as the beauty of everyday objects and artifacts (Tractinsky et al., 2006). There is also growing evidence suggesting that evaluations of interactive systems are influenced in general by the systems’ visual appearance and by the appearance of web pages (Tractinsky et al., 2000; Tractinsky et al., 2006). The principles associated with web aesthetics are simplicity, diversity, craftsmanship, and colorfulness.

*Simplicity*, closely associated with classical aesthetics, is the perception that a website’s interface is designed for ease of processing with concepts of figural goodness
from Gestalt psychology (e.g., orderliness, grouping, balance). Simplicity has been shown to positively influence information-seeking behavior (Lavie & Tractinsky, 2004; van Schaik & Ling, 2009). In web design, simplicity is best. If a designer attempts to make an “extravagant” website, it will mostly likely appear cluttered and lower the perceived credibility of the website, resulting in the potential customer clicking off the website (Cunliffe, 2000).

*Diversity,* or expressive aesthetics, encompasses perceptions of creativity, visual richness, dynamics, and novelty, often shown through design elements that have a high arousal rate and are complex in nature (Lavie & Tractinsky, 2004; Moshagen & Thielsch, 2010). Diversity evokes interest for the user through use of pleasantly varied and inventive elements within a webpage, which can be potentially influential for consumers looking for information regarding farm-to-table restaurants (Hekkert, Snelders, & van Weringen, 2003; van Schaik & Ling, 2009). These inventive elements can range from contrasting accent colors for buttons that link the user to a PDF version of a menu to scrolling image headers or backgrounds.

*Craftsmanship* is the “skillful and coherent integration of all relevant design dimensions” (Moshagen & Thielsch, 2010, p. 689). This is displayed within a website that is harmoniously designed with artistic skill and care. Layouts that are up-to-date, display a clear concept, and are designed with care and skill are considered displays of craftsmanship (Moshagen & Thielsch, 2010).

*Colorfulness* can be demonstrated through color selection, combination, and placement (Moshagen & Thielsch, 2010). Colors that appear to be matching, not offensive, and selected with care are considered displays of colorfulness that lead to
favorable aesthetic appraisals. If a designer selects a bright, bold yellow for the background, designers could be communicating a sense of friendliness or caution, however if the designer selected, say purple, this would communicate a completely different message. Previous research has noted the relationship between colors and emotions, especially how color selection can impact consumer feelings and their reactions (Bonnardel et al., 2011; Bellizzi & Hite, 1992).
Chapter 3: Methods

In this study, the researcher assessed the online content of farm-to-table restaurants in the Columbus metropolitan area. The primary focus of the study was to describe the visual aesthetics of menus and websites, identify themes throughout the text content, and to identify and describe how these restaurants share information about product sourcing. A codebook and coding sheet were used to analyze four specific categories related to farm-to-table restaurant websites and menus: (a) logos (aesthetics and text content); (b) website (aesthetics and images); (c) menus (presentation, aesthetics, and text content); and (d) text content (homepage, about page, farm/sourcing page, and event page). Describing the aesthetics of the websites and menus, identifying the prevalent themes within the terminology used, and identifying and describing how these restaurants share information about product sourcing will assist the research in tailoring websites for new restaurants wanting to break into the farm-to-table niche.

This study was guided by the following research objectives:

1. To describe the visual aesthetics of local farm-to-table restaurant websites and menus;

2. To identify themes seen in the terminology used on local farm-to-table restaurant websites and menus; and

3. To identify and describe how local farm-to-table restaurants share information on
their websites about the locally sourced products or ingredients that are being used or sold in the restaurants.

**Research Design**

The research design for this exploratory study utilized a mixed methods content analysis to describe the visual aesthetics of menus and websites, to identify themes throughout the text content, and to identify and describe how these restaurants share information about sourcing.

Content analysis can be defined as a research method that utilizes a set of procedures to make valid inferences from text or visuals, and the inferences drawn from content analysis can be about the sender(s) of the message, the message itself, or the audience (Weber, 1990). For this content analysis, the researcher created a codebook that can be found in Appendix E. The codebook and content analysis methodology used in this research incorporated both quantitative and qualitative components.

Quantitative data was gathered and analyzed for visual aesthetics of the websites, images, and logos; these constructs were analyzed for frequencies using Microsoft Excel. The qualitative portion of this research dealt with identifying and describing emergent themes gathered from the terminology being used on the farm-to-table restaurant websites and menus. Using MAXQDA, a qualitative data analytic software, the researcher analyzed the homepage, about page, menus, and, if applicable, the farm/sourcing page(s) of the farm-to-table restaurant websites to determine messaging about production terminology, labeling terminology, and sourcing information. These data were reported as short phrases on the code sheet. All of the coding data from the code sheet for each website were input into an Excel spreadsheet. Utilizing the
spreadsheet and following the constant comparative method (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), similar phrases about production, labeling, and sourcing were grouped together as emergent themes. The occurrences of each of these themes were then reported as frequencies.

Data Collection

Restaurant Selection

To find a sample of restaurants for the study, the researcher compiled a list of Columbus metropolitan restaurants. The preliminary list included restaurants from the Eat614’s 2017 Restaurant Week list, members of Dine Originals Columbus, and restaurants that appeared in a Boolean query on Google and Yelp that included terms like ‘local,’ ‘locally sourced,’ ‘hyperlocal sourcing,’ ‘farm-to-table,’ ‘farm-to-fork,’ ‘farm-to-table restaurant,’ and ‘farm-to-fork restaurant.’ Restaurants fitting the initial requirements for this study can be found in Appendix B.

This prospective list of restaurants was further analyzed to determine if they met the requirements to be included in the study. To be included, the restaurant’s website or menu had to include a minimum of two of the key term(s): local, locally sourced, farm-to-table/fork, scratch/scratch kitchen, chef-driven, sustainable, organic, Ohio proud, farm/farmer. Of the original 120 restaurants listed, 84 potential restaurants met this criterion for the study.

Once the restaurant list had been narrowed, the researcher visited each restaurant website to determine if any of the key terms were mentioned. If no key terms were mentioned, the restaurant was removed from the list. If a key term was mentioned on
either the website or menu, the site was coded with the initial coding sheet. Appendix C provides the initial coding sheet that was used by the researcher to analyze the restaurant websites and menus. To further limit the list, the restaurants had to be a non-chain or franchise, non-fast food (e.g. Chipotle Mexican Grill, Panera Bread, McDonald’s) restaurant that can only be found in the Columbus metropolitan area. The researcher decided to eliminate chains, franchises, and fast-food restaurants because these corporations can have in-house designers whose sole responsibility is to create eye-catching advertisements and websites. This study aimed to assess the locally owned and operated Ohio-based, brick-and-mortar farm-to-table restaurants in the area.

Key terms and filtering requirements were met by all restaurants included on the final list, either on their websites or on their menus. For example, under the ‘Our Story’ tab, The Crest Gastropub’s website states,

[w]e grow as much food as possible in our carefully-designed raised beds and rooftop gardens at the Crest Garden at our Clintonville restaurant…What we can’t grow in our garden, we source from our strong Ohio farmer network. The love our local farmers and growers pour into their products is the highlight of our favorite dishes. (The Crest Gastropub, 2017)

On Skillet’s website, the restaurant mentions that “[o]ur restaurant features local products and local flavors by working with a dedicated network of farmers, producers, and craftsmen. We allow the seasons and what is available to us daily to drive our menu and in doing so it will change often” (Skillet, 2017). Table 3.1 contains the final selection of restaurants that were analyzed for this study. Cuisine type, price point, and location
within the Columbus metropolitan area were also noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restaurant Name</th>
<th>Cuisine Type</th>
<th>Price Range*</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 State Bistro</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Westerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Clintonville, Upper Arlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona Restaurant and Bar</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>German Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basi Italia</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Victorian Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Creek Bistro</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Olde Towne East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC Restaurant</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Brewery District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copious</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Brewery District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dempsey's</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatiron Bar &amp; Diner</td>
<td>Southern, American</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Michael's Bistro</td>
<td>Italian, American</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Clintonville, Dublin, German Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest Pizzeria</td>
<td>Pizza, American</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>German Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard Grille</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Short North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katzinger's Delicatessen</td>
<td>Deli</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>German Village, North Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude 41</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Roots</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Powell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market 65</td>
<td>Salads</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone 229</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palio by Moretti's</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Grandview Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skillet</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Schumacher Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Crest Gastropub</td>
<td>Gastropub, American</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Schumacher Place, Clintonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guild House</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Short North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Refectory</td>
<td>French, American</td>
<td>$$ $$ $$</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Table</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Short North, Italian Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Worthington Inn</td>
<td>French, American</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Worthington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trattoria Roma</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Grandview Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucci's</td>
<td>Seafood, Steakhouse</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Café</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Short North, Italian Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westies Gastropub</td>
<td>Gastropub</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Brewery District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z Cucina Ristorante &amp; Bar</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Grandview Heights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Inexpensive - $  Moderate - $$  Pricy - $$$  Ultra High-End - $$$$
**Codebook and Coding Sheet**

A researcher-developed codebook and coding sheet were used in the data collection process. To develop the codebook, the researcher randomly selected one of the restaurants listed in Table 3-1. This website served as the ‘model’ site for generating the codebook and coding sheet. The codebook was divided into four main sections (Appendix E). Section One of the codebook focused on the logos present on the farm-to-table restaurants and menus. This section comprised four categories: type of logo, colors used within the logo, images used in the logos, and the text content. An example of the type of categories and variables used in Section One are displayed in Figure 3.1.

![Figure 3.1: An example from the Logo section of the codebook.](image-url)
Section Two of the codebook focused on the visual aesthetics and images used that were being used on the websites of farm-to-table restaurants. This section was broken down into two distinctive categories: the color/color scheme of the websites and the imagery being used within the websites. The color scheme section focused on the background, header, footer, accent colors, and font colors being used. A header was defined as anything above the where the content started. This commonly included navigation bar, images, logo, and search bars. Accent colors were defined as buttons, content boxes, logos other than the restaurants’, anything that drew the consumers’ attention to a specific area within the website. Similar to the footer of a document, the footer of a website contains information such as an additional navigation bar, contact information, social media links, subscription buttons, or logos of affiliated restaurants or membership organizations. Figure 3.2 provides an example of a website header. Figure 3.3 provides an example of a website accents. Figure 3.4 provides an example of a website footer. Figure 3.5 provides an example the farm-to-table websites being analyzed.

![Figure 3.2](image2.png)

*Figure 3.2: The examples of various farm-to-table websites that were included in the study.*
Figure 3.2: Continued

Figure 3.: Note the golden accent colors used to highlight the ‘Ohio Proud’ and ‘Hours’ sections of the Copious website.

Figure 3.4: The footer used by Hubbard Grille.
Each variable for the first category had 14 options. Twelve of the options were basic colors: blue, red, green, purple, black, orange, yellow, gold, white, pink, gray, and brown. Option 13 was reserved for images used. If this option was selected, coders made notes of what type of image it was (e.g., photo, texture, gradient) and what it was depicting. The last option was an “other” option. Similar to option 13, coders specified why this option was selected.

Category Two focused the types of images being used (e.g. photos, logos, promotional material, vector graphics/clip art), what the images depicted, the aesthetics of the images (e.g., well lit, high resolution, low resolution, poorly lit), and if there was a gallery of images present within the site.

![Image of homepages of two local farm-to-table restaurants](image)

*Figure 3.5: An example the homepages of two local farm-to-table restaurants and the content that was analyzed in Section Two of the codebook.*

In Section Three of the codebook, the coders analyzed the menus of the farm-to-table restaurants. This included noting the menu presentation (if it was a webpage, PDF, or both), the visual aesthetics being used on the menus and what they depicted, if
specialty icons were present on the menu and how they were represented, and the text
content and terminology being used within the menu. Section Four of the codebook
focused solely on the text content of the farm-to-table websites’ homepage, “about” page,
sourcing/farm page, and the event page.

**Website Data Collection**

Over the course of 10 days in March 2017, the researcher collected screenshots
from the 30 website used for the study. The screenshots included the logo, home page(s),
“about” page(s), image galleries, farm/sourcing page(s), and menus. If a PDF menu was
available, it was downloaded and put into the corresponding folder that contained
information about that specific website on the researcher’s computer. Any websites that
were not available during the data collection period were removed from the list \(n=1\).

Data collected during the response period were held on a secure, environmentally
controlled computer with 24/7 security monitoring. A backup of all the data collection
files were also uploaded to BuckeyeBox, a cloud-based server that is password-protected.

For the data analysis of the screenshots, coders were only allowed to code data
that was provided within the screenshot. The coders were not allowed to access and code
the sites outside the screenshots. Regarding the logos of the restaurants, the coders only
analyzed the logos that were present and available on the farm-to-table restaurants’
websites.

**Data Analysis**

Upon the completion of the data collection, the coded data were imported into a
Microsoft Excel workbook. Data were then exported and analyzed using MAXQDA, a
qualitative data analysis software. MAXQDA allowed for one researcher – the author – to complete the coding of the data set.

Once the coding was completed, a decision was made not to report certain aspects of the coded results. Because the coders were not photography professionals and did not inspect the metadata of the images on the farm-to-table websites the terms “appear professionally taken” and “appear to be taken on a cell phone” were removed from the results. Also, the researchers originally coded the event pages of these restaurants. After the data analysis was completed, the researcher realized these farm-to-table restaurants either had no event pages or out-of-date event pages, and the information being provided on the event pages was not what the coders were coding for.

Validity

Validity is the degree to which the instrument – in this case the codebook, – measures what it supposed to measure (Ary et. al., 2010). To establish validity, this study analyzed 30 farm-to-table restaurants in the Columbus metropolitan area. After narrowing the restaurants from the initial list of over 100 restaurants, the researcher determined that all the restaurants should include, at minimum, two key terms that established them within the “farm-to-table” category, could not be a chain or franchise, could not be a fast-food restaurant (e.g. Chipotle Mexican Grill, Panera Bread, McDonald’s, Culver’s), and, lastly, must only be found within the Columbus metropolitan area. Additionally, construct validity was established through a codebook and coding sheet that was reviewed by a panel of experts in visual communications and Web design. Based on the initial inspection of codebook, several items were rearranged or rewritten for increased clarity. The codebook and code sheets used to analyze the
websites also serves as an audit trail of the research.

**Reliability**

Prior to data analysis, inter- and intra-coder reliability was addressed. To ensure inter-coder reliability the researcher randomly selected ten percent ($n=3$) from the total website samples ($n=30$) and conducted coder training with the additional two coders (Lombard, Snyder-Duch, & Bracken, 2010). After the three coders had completed coding one website, percent agreement was calculated percentage agreement between raters per the Kappa Coefficient proposed by Cohen (1960), and the coders compared analyses and reconciled differences through rewriting and rewording certain variables of the codebook for added clarity (Weber, 1990). This was process was repeated until ten percent of the selected websites had been analyzed. Typically, an agreement level of 80% is acceptable for inter-coder reliability (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010), and in this instance the three coders’ agreement level was between 86.6% and 96.9%. The coders reached a 90.9% inter-coder reliability average across the coder training process. Since the inter-coder reliability was greater than 80%, the research team deemed the codebook reliable. Intra-coder reliability was accounted for by the creation and use of a code sheet during analysis, which ensured coding was conducted similarly for each website.

**Limitations**

This study was conducted using content analysis; therefore, coding error and inter-coder reliability must be considered. When coding the data, there is the potential for it to be coded differently depending on the researcher who is coding the data set (Berger et al., 1987). For example, one researcher may have a background in agriculture and graphic and Web design. Having this background, they would be more likely to pick up
on subtle difference and aesthetic choices compared to an individual with a limited background in graphic/Web design and agriculture. Since content analysis, by nature, is a subjective process, a random selection of ten percent \( (n=3) \) of the total website samples \( (n=30) \) and conducted coder training with the additional coders. After coder training was completed, the inter-coder reliability rating was calculated before coders could continue onto their perspective assignments. For an exploratory study like this, the minimum inter-coder reliability would be 70% (Lombard et al., 2010). The coders reached a 90.9% inter-coder reliability rate for this study.

Additionally, the researcher completed the data analysis over a ten-day period. Many of these local farm-to-table restaurants have a menu that rotates daily. Since the data analysis was completed via screenshots and not a “live” website, the researcher could be missing information that could relate to the study.
Chapter 4: Results

This study assessed the online content of farm-to-table restaurants within the Columbus metropolitan area. More specifically, this study described the visual aesthetics of farm-to-table restaurant websites and menus, identified themes seen throughout the terminology used by the farm-to-table restaurants, and described how farm-to-table restaurants share information about their locally sourced products or ingredients. The theories that guided this study included online relationship building, the restaurant industry and websites, social presence and visual perceptions, priming, and the Visual Aesthetics of Website Inventory. A qualitative and quantitative content analysis was used to analyze 30 farm-to-table restaurant websites and menus. Descriptive statistics were calculated using the data. This chapter will detail the findings of the study.

Results by Objective

ROI1: Describe the visual aesthetics of farm-to-table restaurant websites and menus.

Results for Research Objective One were analyzed using the data collected from the logo aesthetics, the website visual aesthetics and imagery, and the menu presentation and aesthetics sections. Logo aesthetics included the type of logo being used, the color usage, and the imagery used within the logo of the farm-to-table restaurants. The most prevalent type of logo was the logotype at a rate of 46.7% \((n=14)\), followed closely by combination marks at 43.3% \((n=13)\), and 10.0% \((n=3)\) for iconic logos. Among the colors
used in logos by farm-to-table restaurants were white at 63.3% \((n=19)\) and black at 50.0% \((n=15)\).

Overall, the farm-to-table logos contained minimal images. Out of the 30 farm-to-table logos, 63.3% \((n=19)\) did not contain agrarian imagery, while 36.7% \((n=11)\) did. Those logos that did include agrarian imagery had images like wheat tufts, trees, or farm animals (e.g., horse, cow, chicken, pig) present within the logo. Text was the most common type of imagery in the logos at 93.3% \((n=28)\), followed by vector images/clip art at 36.7% \((n=11)\). As far as the descriptive aspects of the logos, shapes were used in 23.3% \((n=7)\), followed by numbers, livestock animals, and crops (most commonly wheat tufts) at 13.3% \((n=4)\) for each. Table 4.1 summarizes these findings.
Table 4.1
*Logo Aesthetics of Farm-to-table Restaurants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Logo</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logotype</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination Mark</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iconic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Color Usage</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images Used</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Images</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrarian Imagery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Images Used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vector Images</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icons</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Descriptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm/Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flags</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Certain frequencies may either be above or below 100% or *n=30*, the frequencies were calculated based on how many times the variable was present within the given section.
The website visual aesthetics section identified the color(s) or images used for the background, header, footer, accents (e.g., buttons, content boxes, logos), and font colors used throughout the sites. White was the most common color utilized for headers at 36.7% \( (n=11) \), background at 50.0% \( (n=15) \), fonts at 70.0% \( (n=21) \), and accents at 23.3% \( (n=7) \) and the second most prevalent color for footers at 30.0% \( (n=9) \). Black was the second-most common color being used for headers at 33.3% \( (n=10) \), background at 20.0% \( (n=6) \), and fonts at 66.7% \( (n=20) \) and the most prevalent color for footers at 43.3% \( (n=13) \) (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2
Colors Used by Farm-to-table Restaurant Websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Header</th>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Font</th>
<th>Accents</th>
<th>Footer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images Used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood/Planks</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textures</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradients</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{A}\) Certain frequencies may either be above or below 100%, the frequencies were calculated based on how many times the variable was present within the given section.
The imagery section for the visual aesthetics included the types of images being used on the sites, descriptive characteristics of what the images portrayed (e.g., menu items, agriculture, interior of the restaurant, etc.), the image quality, and if there was a gallery of images present or not and what was included within the gallery if present. All sites used photos as part of their imagery, while 33.3% \((n=10)\) used logos and 20.0% \((n=6)\) each used flyers and promotional material. The images on the farm-to-table websites commonly displayed photos of menu items \((93.3\%, n=28)\) and the interior of the restaurant \((60.0\%, n=18)\). The images that were present on the websites were well lit and appeared to be high-resolution photos.

Overall, most websites contained a gallery of images in some fashion. Out of the 30 websites, 60.0% \((n=18)\) contained an image gallery, while 40.0% \((n=12)\) did not. Those websites that did include a gallery commonly had images of menu items \((53.3\%, n=16)\) and the interior of the restaurants \((43.3\%, n=13)\). Table 4.3 summarizes these findings.
Table 4.3  
*Images Used on Farm-to-table Restaurant Websites*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of Images Used</strong>&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logos</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyers/Promotional</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vector Images</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Depictions</strong>&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menu Items</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior of Restaurant</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Chef</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrons</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Front</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce/Crops</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields/Orchards</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming Equipment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Quality</strong>&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Lit</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Resolution</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Resolution</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor lighting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gallery Present</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Images in Gallery</strong>&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menu Items</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior of Restaurant</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Chef</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Front</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrons</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce/Crops</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming Equipment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields/Orchards</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>A</sup> Certain frequencies may either be above or below 100% or n=30, the frequencies were calculated based on how many times the variable was present within the given section.
Menu presentation and aesthetics included how the menu was presented (webpage, PDF, or both), the types of images that appeared on the menus, what these images depicted, their quality, if specialty icons were present on the menu and if so, how they were portrayed. Menu presentation was broken down into two sections: the main menu and specialty type menus (e.g., catering, brunch, happy hour). Thirteen (43.3%) of the 30 farm-to-table restaurant main menus were presented in a webpage fashion, 10 (33.3%) were presented as a PDF, and 7 (23.3%) were presented as both a webpage and a PDF. For the specialty type of menus, PDFs tended to be more prevalent (33.3%, n=10).

Of the online menus, 46.7% (n=14) did not contain any images. These menus were either a PDF or a webpage with text only. (Refer to Appendix E for examples of the menu variations.)

Overall, the images present on the menus tended to be photographs (n=11). The images on the farm-to-table menus commonly displayed photos of menu items (n=10) or shapes (n=3). The images that were present on the various websites were well-lit, high-resolution photos. Of the 30 websites, 30.0% (n=9) contained specialty icons (e.g., GF for gluten free, V for vegan, V for vegetarian), while 70.0% (n=21) did not. Those websites that did include specialty icons commonly used ‘V for vegetarian’ (n=4) and ‘GF for gluten free’ (n=4). Table 4.4 summarizes these findings.
Table 4.4

Menu Presentation and Aesthetics of Farm-to-table Restaurants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Menu Presentation</th>
<th>Frequency^ (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Menu</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webpage</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialty Menu</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webpage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of Images Used</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vector Images</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logos</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Depictions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menu Items</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior of Restaurant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce/Crops</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Front</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Chef</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Lit</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Resolution</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Resolution</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor lighting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialty Icons Present</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gluten Free</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetarian</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio/Ohio Proud</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialty Icon Description</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V for Vegetarian</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF for Gluten Free</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V for Vegan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G for Gluten Free</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio for Ohio made/proud</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat tufts with a prohibition sign</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ Certain frequencies may either be above or below n=30, the frequencies were calculated based on how many times the variable was present within the given section.
**RO 2: Identify themes seen in the terminology used on farm-to-table restaurant websites and menus.**

Results for Research Objective Two were analyzed using the data collected from the terminology used within the logos, and the production and labeling terminology used across the home page, about page, and menus. Logo terminology was broken down into three categories: restaurant name, production terms, and labeling terms. The most prevalent terminology used in the logos was the use of the restaurant name in the logos at a rate of 96.7% (n=29), followed by labeling terms at 26.7% (n=8), and no production related terms were mentioned within the logos. Table 4.5 summarizes this data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminology used in the logos of Farm-to-table Restaurants</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant Name</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labeling Terms</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Terms</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5

Each website was analyzed to identify production and labeling themes within the menus and website pages. Six emergent themes were identified for production terminology, and a majority of website pages or menus contained at least one, if not more, of these themes. The emergent themes were: 1) breed-focused terminology; 2) management-focused terminology; 3) seasonality; 4) sustainability; 5) restaurant/kitchen-related terminology; and 6) heirloom.
The most prevalent emergent production theme found in the menus was management-focused terminology. This theme was found 19 times across the menus. Keywords that denoted this theme included free-range, cage-free, pasture raised, grass fed, antibiotic free, steroid free, and animal welfare approved. The most prevalent emergent production theme found on the homepage and about page was “seasonality.” This theme was found 8 times across the homepages and about pages. Keywords that denoted this theme included season(s), seasonally, seasonal, seasonally inspired, and late harvest. A breakdown of all six production themes can be seen in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6
Emergent Themes About Production Terminology used by Farm-to-table Restaurant Websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>About</th>
<th>Menu^A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breed Focus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Focus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonality</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant/Kitchen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirloom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^A Certain frequencies may either be above or below n=30, the frequencies were calculated based on how many times the variable was present within the given section.

Nine emergent themes were identified for labeling terminology. The majority of website pages or menus contained at least one, if not more, of these themes. The emergent themes were: 1) local terminology; 2) organic; 3) farm-to-table; 4) Amish; 5) “house” produced terminology; 6) Ohio; 7) style; 8) quality; and 9) dietary restrictions.

The most prevalent emergent labeling theme found on the homepage and about page was “local.” This theme was found 16 times across the homepages and 17 times across the about pages. Keywords that denoted this theme included local, locally
produced, locally sourced, locally made, and locally owned. The most prevalent emergent labeling themes found in the menus were “house,” “produced,” and “quality”. Both themes were found 30 times across the menus. Keywords that denoted the “house” produced theme included house, house-made, house-produced, cured in-house, aged in-house, and made-in-house. Keywords that denoted the “quality” theme included wild, fresh, crisp, clean, natural, award winning, and artisan/artisanal. A breakdown of all nine labeling themes can be seen in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7
Emergent Themes About Labeling Terminology used by Farm-to-table Restaurant Websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>About</th>
<th>Menu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm-to-Table</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“House” Produced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietary Restrictions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Certain frequencies may either be above or below n=30, the frequencies were calculated based on how many times the variable was present within the given section.
**RO 3: Identify and describe how farm-to-table restaurants share information on their websites about the locally sourced products or ingredients that are being used within in the restaurants.**

Results for Research Objective Three were analyzed using the data collected from the menu and text analysis sections. A portion of the menu analysis included a section to describe the information available online about the sourcing habits of the farm-to-table restaurants. The majority of the menus included farm names (53.3%, $n=16$). More than three-quarters (76.7%) of the farm-to-table restaurant menus mentioned Ohio-sourced products. Ohio-sourced products included beef (e.g., ground beef and various cuts of steak), poultry (e.g., turkey, chicken, quail, eggs), dairy (e.g., yogurt, cheese, sweet cream, milk), pork (e.g., ham, bacon, ground pork), and maple syrup. Ninety percent ($n=27$) of the menus did not mention specific locations within Ohio. The 10% ($n=3$) of menus that did include specific locations within Ohio mentioned Columbus, Cincinnati, Athens, Lake Erie, and Worthington. Table 4.8 summarizes this data.
Table 4.8
Sourcing Information Present on by Farm-to-table Restaurant Menus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency$^A$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farm Names</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio Mentioned</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef Products</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Products</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry Products</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pork Products</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread/Grains</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Syrup</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chef Specials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud or Produced</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Cider</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio Locations Mentioned</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Erie</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^A$ Certain frequencies may either be above or below 100% or n=30, the frequencies were calculated based on how many times the variable was present within the given section.

Farm/sourcing names were also noted during the data collection. Only 23.3% ($n=7$) of the 30 websites had a page(s) or an area somewhere on the website or menu dedicated to their sourcing information. Additionally, only 13.3% ($n=4$) of the websites listed what was actually being sourced from these local farms and producers.
Chapter 5: Conclusion and Recommendations

Chapter 5 summarizes the intent, procedures, findings, conclusions, and implications of this study, in addition to providing recommendations for practitioners and further research. This study explored the visual aesthetics of farm-to-table restaurant websites and menus, identified themes seen throughout the terminology used by the farm-to-table restaurants, and described and identified how farm-to-table restaurants share information about their locally sourced products or ingredients. In doing so, the researcher utilized a content analysis framework to analyze 30 farm-to-table restaurant websites and menus.

The following research objectives were used to guide the study:

1. To describe the visual aesthetics of local farm-to-table restaurant websites and menus.

2. To identify themes seen in the terminology used on local farm-to-table restaurant websites and menus.

3. To identify and describe how local farm-to-table restaurants share information on their websites about the locally sourced products or ingredients that are being used within in the restaurants.

Andrew Grant once said, “[y]ou never get a second chance to make a first impression.” This is especially true when working in the field of web design. A consumer
can make a snap decision about a website in as little as 50 milliseconds, or 0.05 seconds, based on the aesthetics of that site alone (Lingaard et al., 2006). With this knowledge in mind, farm-to-table restaurants have branded themselves in a very modern and clean way.

In comparison to their fast food competitors, who used large, eye-catching images of food and a color scheme congruent with their brand, the local, farm-to-table, brick and mortar restaurants utilized a modern and clean look. These farm-to-table restaurants achieved this by using color schemes that relied heavily on neutrals, such as black and white, with eye catching visuals. For future farm-to-table restaurateurs to fit within this niche market, they will need to decide what branding route they want to take: the clean modern look portrayed by other farm-to-table restaurants within the area, or the bright, image-heavy look being used by fast-food franchises.

Traditionally, logos have focused on identification and differentiation (MacInnis et al., 1999); however, recent research has shown that logos can elicit consumer emotions, as well as convey the meaning behind the brand (Van der Lans et al., 2009), or in this case, a restaurant. A study conducted by Arredondo et al. (2008) showed that even children could recognize fast food iconic logos at a much higher rate than other food logos. Because these fast food chains are located globally, they can utilize these iconic logos to cross language barriers (i.e. McDonald’s golden arches, the Starbucks siren, the bell from Taco Bell). Among the farm-to-table logos that were analyzed, logotypes had a higher rate compared to combination marks or iconic logos. Because these farm-to-table restaurants don’t have the same notoriety of national fast-food chains, it is acceptable for them to use logotypes since these designs will stick in the consumers’ minds (Morones,
Additionally, logotypes can be used across various marketing materials (e.g., menus, storefronts, websites, and advertisements) (Morones, 2016).

The researcher also noted the terminology used by these farm-to-table logos. Apart from one restaurant that utilized an iconic logo, 96.7% (n=29) of the logos included the restaurant name. Because logotypes and combination marks rely on text, it is no surprise that these farm-to-table restaurant logos included the restaurant name. This can link back to the fact that these farm-to-table restaurants are local to the Columbus metropolitan area, so they wouldn’t need to utilize an iconic logo like a national fast food franchise.

The most surprising aspect was the predominant use of black and white on these farm-to-table restaurant websites. Color is one of the most fundamental aspect of web design; it is one of the most quickly identified design features that consumers base their first impressions around (Cyr, Head, & Larios, 2010; Seckler, Opwis, & Tuch, 2015). Black and white both fall into the neutral color category. This color combination often conveys a sense of sophistication and presents the restaurant in a modern and clean way (Eckstut & Eckstut, 2013). Using black and white as the primary colors on these farm-to-table websites allows the images to stand out against these neutral colors; while also reducing the need for extensive photo editing.

Although the farm-to-table restaurants focused on their website aesthetics, it seemed as if these restaurants did not put as much effort into the presentation of their menus. The main menus were typically presented as plain text on a webpage and specialty menus were typically presented as PDFs. Interestingly, the menus lacked images even though they were webpages. The researcher hypothesized these farm-to-
table restaurants utilized the webpage text over PDFs since many of these establishments pride themselves on daily and seasonal menus. Skillet, for example, has a text-based webpage menu that is updated daily. However, some of the restaurants used both webpages and PDF or “printer friendly” versions of their menus online. By offering a PDF version of its menu, farm-to-table restaurants are allowing consumers the option of printing off menus at home.

Each farm-to-table website and menu was analyzed for emergent themes regarding production and labeling terms. Six emergent production themes were identified across the websites and menus. The production themes were as follows: breed-focused terminology, management-focused terminology, seasonality, sustainability, restaurant and kitchen-related terminology, and heirloom products. These production themes focused on how the foods were produced or sourced. Due to focus of farm-to-table restaurants, the researcher wanted to be sure to note these production-related themes. While these terms don’t fall under ‘production agriculture,’ the themes listed are still seen within all aspects of agriculture.

Nine emergent labeling themes were identified on the farm-to-table websites and menus. These labeling themes can not only be seen on the menus of farm-to-table restaurants, they are also seen in grocery stores, online food retailers, and farmer markets. The emergent labeling themes were as follows: local terminology, organic, farm-to-table, Amish, “house-produced” terminology, Ohio, style, quality, and dietary restrictions.

Consumers see terminology like “organic,” “fair trade,” “locally grown,” “GMO-free,” and “antibiotics free” when viewing restaurant websites and menus online. It is not surprising that these farm-to-table restaurants had more labeling themes than production
themes on their menus. It is common to see terms like ‘organic,’ ‘house-made,’ or ‘local’ on menus. The terms “organic,” “GMO-free,” and “antibiotics free” usually reflect consumer concerns surrounding natural resources or the environment, the use of fertilizers, and other agricultural production practices (McCluskey & Loureiro, 2003). By using these labeling terms rather than production agriculture terms, farm-to-table restaurants can convey a sense of “wholesomeness” or “naturalness” about their products in ways the consumer can understand.

Additionally, consumers prefer local and state-branded foods. This preference has also increased their willingness to pay more for these products (Ruth & Rumble, 2016). Carpio and Isengildina-Massa (2008) concluded that customers were willing to pay up to a 27% premium on locally produced food. Similarly, a 2007 customer survey produced by the Ohio Department of Agriculture discovered that 93% of the customers surveyed preferred to by Ohio-branded products over national brands, as well as 90% of those surveyed said the consumer surveyed said they would be willing to pay up to 50 cents more for these Ohio Proud products (Ohio Proud, 2017).

Ohio was mentioned on 76.7% (n=23) of the farm-to-table menus. Most commonly, Ohio was associated with beef-type products, followed by poultry products, then dairy-type products. Agriculture is ranked as Ohio’s number-one industry and contributing more than $105 billion to the state’s economy (Ohio Proud, 2017). Ohio locations were only mentioned in 23.3% (n=7) of the menus. When an Ohio location was mentioned, it was in relation to breweries or distilleries in the state. However, on a few occasions it was related to the sourcing of specific menu items, such as Lake Erie Walleye or the Beef Worthington listed on The Worthington Inn’s online menu.
When it came to the online menus of farm-to-table restaurants, 53.3% (n=16) listed farm names or sourcing information on the actual menu. Typically, when a farm or supplier name was listed within the menu, it was in relation to a menu item. For example, The Crest Gastropub lists “Swainway Mushroom Poutine” as a menu item. Swainway is a certified organic urban farm located in the Columbus metropolitan area that supplies mushrooms, microgreens, specialty vegetables, and seedlings to various farmers markets and restaurants. Listing the sourcing information for certain menu items, this is some way “authenticates” the claims that the restaurant indeed is a farm-to-table restaurant. Additionally, this gives consumers the option to learn more about specific farms and product lines that supply the restaurant.

Interestingly, only 23.3% (n=7) of farm-to-table restaurants had a separate webpage dedicated to farms or sourcing information on their websites or menus, and of those seven websites, only four listed the types of products being sourced. One would imagine that if a restaurant wants to be perceived as an authentic farm-to-table restaurant, it (the restaurant) would list its sourcing information. These farm-to-table restaurants seemed to be more concerned about the aesthetics and the social presence and visual perceptions of their websites. The farm-to-table restaurant websites that did list their sourcing information were actively promoting their business as locally sourced.

When a consumer opens Harvest Pizzeria’s homepage, he or she is are greeted with a message reading “Local tastes better.” Harvest Pizzeria also has a “farm fresh” page dedicated to their producers that lists both the farm name and the items that are being sourced. The Worthington Inn has a page on its website dedicated to listing the local farms and suppliers it works with. This page also links customers to the farms’ and
suppliers’ websites for additional information. In comparison, Skillet lists its sourcing information on its menu page. Like Harvest Pizzeria and The Worthington Inn, Skillet also links consumers to the farm and supplier websites. Acre also has lists a “food sourcing” section on its “about” page. However, this page does not include any farm names, but it does state that products are being sourced from Ohio producers.

The researcher hypothesized that the lack of sourcing information can be due to a financial constraint. Fast food franchise have communication and marketing teams that handle their websites. These local farm-to-table restaurants don’t have the same disposable income and are likely running and managing their own websites. This possibility could mean the restaurants are unfamiliar with website design and are relying heavily on pre-made templates that only have so many tabs or pages.

**Recommendations**

Recommendations for industry practitioners and future research are provided as a result of assessing the visual aesthetics of farm-to-table websites and menus, identifying themes throughout the text used on the websites and menus, and identifying and describing the sourcing habits of farm-to-table restaurants in the Columbus metropolitan area.

**Recommendations for Industry Professionals**

Designers should take into consideration the type of web hosting platform that will be used by potential clients. A content management system (CMS) will provide the restaurateurs with pre-designed layouts where the farm-to-table restaurants can just add their own information and have a fully functioning website within a few hours that they
can manage themselves. Alternatively, the restaurateurs could pay a design firm to design and manage their websites. Additionally, since many farm-to-table websites offer daily menus, it would be easier to use a text-based menu. This allows the restaurateurs easy access to change the menu without much effort. However, if the restaurant also wanted to have a printable version available, the restaurants could add a “click here for printable menu” button that opens a PDF of the menu in a separate page.

To assist with promoting the establishment as local farm-to-table restaurant, a farm or sourcing page should be included on the website. This will allow consumers to see where the restaurants are sourcing their products from. Additionally, many local farms attend farmers markets so theoretically, certain farms could already have an established brand with a consumer following. A farm or sourcing page will also allow consumers to interact with these farms about potentially buying products “direct from the source.” Additionally, agricultural communicators need to be aware of the labeling terms that are being used in agriculture-related marketing. By understanding the terms being used, agriculture communication professionals will be able to better serve their clientele.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Further studies pertaining to the website and menu aesthetics of farm-to-table restaurants are needed. Considering the findings of this study, more research is needed about the sourcing practices about farm-to-table restaurants. Of the 30 farm-to-table restaurants, only 23.3% (n=7) list sourcing information on their websites or menus. To understand this reasoning, the researcher could conduct interviews with the restaurant owners to get a sense of how they wanted to market their restaurants and if marketing
them as farm-to-table (i.e., putting sourcing information on their websites and menus) was an important aspect of their brand.

Additionally, a survey could be disseminated to patrons of these farm-to-table restaurants. The survey could include how they define local, their ethos about food sourcing, what brought them into the restaurant, how they heard about the restaurant, and socio-economic and demographic questions. This survey could help researchers understand the consumer perceptions of these local, farm-to-table restaurants in the Columbus metropolitan area.

By understanding how these farm-to-table restaurants present themselves online, it can help other industry professionals to decide how their restaurants should be marketed. With consumers wanting food transparency and the willingness to shop local, the farm-to-table movement in the United States will only grow. The researcher hopes this study can benefit agricultural communicators and restaurateurs as they communicate with consumers about their sourcing practices.
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Appendix A: Examples of The Home and Sourcing Belief Pages of Franchise Restaurants

Culver’s

FROM GRATITUDE TO FULL-FLEDGED SUPPORT

Culver’s is dedicated to getting its products from local, family farmers, and to supporting the communities that support us. Culver’s creates local, family-run farms that are proud to serve. From the cattle ranches of the Great Plains to the dairy farms of Wisconsin and south to Georgia’s chicken country, it’s important to us to make sure farms families across the nation clearly see how thankful we are for their hard work and dedication.

So now, through our support for the National FFA Organization, we are giving back to today’s farm families, while helping ensure the future of the next generation.
Jeni’s Splendid Ice Creams

THE FELLOWSHIP MODEL

It takes a community of people to build ice cream from the ground up: growers, makers, producers, suppliers, customers. We call it the fellowship model—combining values from the good food world with tools from the 21st century. We’ve always worked with a lot of people to make ice cream the way we want to make it, and these relationships have enabled us to do what no other ice cream company has done before. We believe we get higher quality ingredients when we know the people we’re buying from, so we buy direct whenever we can. Making ice cream this way requires more work and skill than traditional ice cream made with flavorings and colorings, but we think it’s worth it.
GRASS-GRAZED OHIO MILK

Dairy is the foundation of everything we do, so we use the best we can find. Smith's, the 110-year-old dairy in Orrville, Ohio, has been sourcing raw cream and grass-grazed milk and pasteurizing it for us for the past couple of years. They work with small family farms within 200 miles of our kitchen. Two are Berg farms and Eichorn Dairy Farm in Richland County. The dairy cattle on both farms are milked twice a day and freely spend the balance of their waking hours grazing lush Northeast Ohio pastures.
Panera Bread

Fresh is in season.

Friday's Soups

For Menus, Deals & Grades.

Food Promise: Raised Responsibly

Animal Welfare

Raised Without Antibiotics

Panera is on a journey to ensure the highest possible animal welfare standards. Learn more about our reduction in use of antibiotics and confinement.

For the second year, Panera was one of only two chains to receive an "A" grade in a recent report grading 25 restaurant companies on their commitment to reducing antibiotic use in their meat supply.
Food Promise

Years ago we began a never-ending journey to serve delicious food that is better for you, for our associates, and for the world we live in.

We believe that food should be:

**Clean**
No artificial preservatives, stabilizers, flavors or colors from artificial sources.

**Savored & Enjoyed**
At a table, alone or together with family and friends.

**Nutrient-Rich**
With wholesome ingredients like fruits and vegetables.

**Raised Responsibly**
Sourced from farms that respect the food they produce.

**Personalized**
Curated and customizable menus so you can eat the way you want.

**Transparent**
A menu that doesn’t hide from the people it feeds.

**Our Journey**
We’re on a journey to serve food as it should be—the foods we want to feed our own families. And you can be sure we’ll never stop.

See Our Progress →
Appendix B: Initial List of Restaurants

- 101 Beer Kitchen
- 8 State Bistro
- Aab India
- Acre
- Arepazo
- Bar 145
- Barcelona Restaurant and Bar
- Bareburger
- Barrel & Boar
- Basi Italia
- Basil
- BBR
- Beer Barrel Pizza
- Black Creek Bistro
- Black Point
- Brazenhead
- Cafe Istanbul
- Cameron’s American Bistro
- Cantina Laredo
- Cap City Fine Diner
- Caribbean Jerks
- Champps
- Chile Verde Gemini Place
- Chile Verde Sawmill Road
- Columbus Brewing Company (CBC) Restaurant
- Columbus Fish Market
- Cooper’s Hawk
- Copious
- Cravings Carryout Cafe
- Cuco’s
- Dempsey’s
- DeNovo
- Dirty Frank’s Hot Dog Palace
- Due Amici
- El Vaquero
- Elevator Brewery & Draught Haus
• Figlio Wood Fired Pizza
• Flatiron Bar & Diner
• Fukuryu Ramen
• G. Michael's Bistro
• Gallerie Bar and Bistro
• Harold's
• Harvest Pizzeria
• Hofbrauhaus
• HomeFare
• Hoof Hearted Brewery & Kitchen
• Houlihan’s
• Hubbard Grille
• Hudson 29
• Hyde Park
• J. Gilbert
• Kabuki
• Katzinger's Delicatessen
• Kona Grill
• Kraft House No. 5
• LaRosas
• LaScala Italian Bistro
• Latitude 41
• Lemongrass
• Level
• Liberty Tavern
• Lindey’s
• Local Roots
• M at Miranova
• MacKenzie River
• Market 65
• Martini
• Matt the Miller’s
• Mazah
• McCormick & Schmick’s
• Mezzo
• Milestone 229
• Mitchell’s Steakhouse
• Moretti’s of Arlington
• Nada
• Nicola Restaurant and Bar
• Old Mohawk Restaurant
• Olivers
• Oscars
• Paddock Pub
• Palle by Moretti’s
• Pat & Gracie’s
• Polaris Grill
• Prohibition
• RAM
• Rodizio
• Shaw’s Restaurant and Inn
• Shish Kebab
• Skillet
• Smith and Wollensky
• Somedays
• Spagio
• Tasi Café
• Texas de Brazil
• The Avenue
• The Barn
• The Boat House
• The Brew Brothers at Eldorado Scioto Downs
• The Crafty Pint
• The Crest Gastropub
• The Guild House
• The Inn & Spa at Cedar Falls
• The Knotty Pine
• The Market Italian Village
• The Melting Pot
• The Refectory
• The Table
• The Top Steakhouse
• The Wine Bistro
• The Worthington Inn
• Tip Top Kitchen & Cocktails
• Trattoria Roma
• Tucci’s
• Union
• Vino Vino Restaurant & Bar
• Watershed Distillery
• Westies Gastropub
• Whole Foods Sawmill
• Wolf’s Ridge
• Z Cucina Ristorante & Bar
• Zoe Café
Appendix C: Restaurant Inclusion/Elimination Evaluation Form

Reviewer: _______________________________________________________

Restaurant: _____________________________________________________

Reviewer viewed: [Website] [Menu] [Facebook page] [Yelp page]

Is it a chain restaurant? [Yes] [No]

Is it a fast food restaurant? [Yes] [No]

Is it original to Columbus, Ohio? [Yes] [No]

Key Terms included:

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 

Accepted or Omitted
Appendix D: Website Links to Final Restaurants


Appendix E: Codebook and Coding Sheet

But is it local:

CODE BOOK

Desiree Seeloff

The Ohio State University: CFAES-ACEL
**Unit of Data Collection:** For this project, we will be coding several different farm to table restaurants within Columbus Metropolitan area. There are four major areas we will be coding: restaurant logo, the website (from a visual standpoint), the menu(s) (visuals), and the textual content (menu and website). When judging visuals, be sure to reference this code book to select the proper category(s) an image(s) fall into. If the code book does not specify a category, select other and denote the visuals. Some areas of the coding sheet will not have a numerical value but rather an open ended response. In addition, only code data that is available within the screen captions of each website.

**Other Coding Instructions:**

*Do not* code the social media accounts or content.

For all coding, use only the information available to you on the website (i.e., do not use information you might have found on a social media page, a previous patron of the restaurant, etc.).

All content for coding will be available within their designated folders in BuckeyeBox. If you have any issue access your folders or BuckeyeBox, please let me know ASAP.

Upon completion of coding, please upload your individual coding sheets to their respective website folders. (i.e. if coder 1 coded Acre’s website, their coding sheet would be uploaded to the folder titled ‘Acre Code Sheet.’)

Please only code the websites you are assigned.

At the end of this document, a blank coding sheet can be found along with an example coding sheet that has already been filled out.

Finally, don’t hesitate to contact me at any point if you have any questions (937) 572-4015 (texts are preferred).
**Website ID:** On each code sheet write the Restaurant ID number from the following list and the URL to the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website ID</th>
<th>Website Title</th>
<th>Website URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 State Bistro</td>
<td><a href="http://www.8statebistro.com">http://www.8statebistro.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Acre</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acretogo.com">http://www.acretogo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barcelona Restaurant &amp; Bar</td>
<td><a href="http://www.barcelonacolumbus.com">http://www.barcelonacolumbus.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Basi Italia</td>
<td><a href="http://basi-italia.com">http://basi-italia.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Black Creek Bistro</td>
<td><a href="http://www.blackcreekbistro.com">http://www.blackcreekbistro.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Columbus Brewing Company (CBC)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cbcrestaurantcolumbusoh.com">http://www.cbcrestaurantcolumbusoh.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Copious</td>
<td><a href="http://www.copiouscolumbus.com/restaurant/">http://www.copiouscolumbus.com/restaurant/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dempsey’s</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dempseysdowntown.com">http://www.dempseysdowntown.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Flatiron Bar &amp; Diner</td>
<td><a href="https://flatironcolumbus.com">https://flatironcolumbus.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>G. Micheael’s Bistro</td>
<td><a href="https://gmichaelsbistroandbar.com">https://gmichaelsbistroandbar.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hubbard Grille</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hubbardgrille.com">http://www.hubbardgrille.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Katzinger’s Delicatessen</td>
<td><a href="http://www.katzingers.com">http://www.katzingers.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Latitude 41</td>
<td><a href="http://www.latitude41restaurant.com">http://www.latitude41restaurant.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Local Roots</td>
<td><a href="http://www.localrootspowell.com/new/">http://www.localrootspowell.com/new/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Market 65</td>
<td><a href="http://www.marketsixtyfive.com">http://www.marketsixtyfive.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurant Name</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Milestone 229</td>
<td><a href="http://milestone229.com">http://milestone229.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Palle by Moretti’s</td>
<td><a href="https://palle-by-moretti.myshopify.com">https://palle-by-moretti.myshopify.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Skillet</td>
<td><a href="http://www.skilletruf.com">http://www.skilletruf.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The Crest Gastropub</td>
<td><a href="https://www.thecrestgastropub.com">https://www.thecrestgastropub.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The Refectory</td>
<td><a href="https://refectory.com">https://refectory.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The Table</td>
<td><a href="https://www.thetablecolumbus.com">https://www.thetablecolumbus.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The Worthington Inn</td>
<td><a href="http://worthingtoninn.com">http://worthingtoninn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Trattoria Roma</td>
<td><a href="http://www.trattoria-roma.com">http://www.trattoria-roma.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Tucci’s</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tuccisdublin.com">http://www.tuccisdublin.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Westies Gastropub</td>
<td><a href="http://www.westiesgastropub.com">http://www.westiesgastropub.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Z Cucina Ristorante &amp; Bar</td>
<td><a href="http://www.zcucina.com">http://www.zcucina.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Gallerie Bar and Bistro</td>
<td><a href="http://www.galleriebarandbistro.com/home">http://www.galleriebarandbistro.com/home</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coder ID: Indicate the individual who coded according to the coder ID list. For example, if Dr. Specht was the coder she would indicate 2 by Coder ID.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coder ID</th>
<th>Coder Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Desiree S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dr. Specht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>April B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dr. Buck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Brittany W.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: Fill in the date that the coding form was completed, in the following format: Month/Day/Year (e.g., 03/13/17).

Page Number: Indicate the page numbers on your designated coding sheet(s): “Page __2__ of __2__” when there are 2 pages total.

URL of Website: Please indicate the URL the website. The coder can refer to the Website ID table above.

Logo

1. **Type of Logo:** Indicate if the logo is an iconic/symbolic logo, a logotype/wordmark, or a combination mark.
   1. Iconic/Symbolic logo: Consist of symbols or images that represent a company. They are suitable for global markets. These logos don’t need to be translated in different languages.
2. Logotype/wordmark: Incorporate text (usually company name). Use typefaces as the “building material” for logo.

3. Combination Marks: A logotype/wordmark used with an iconic/symbolic logo to make a logo that has both a central image or icon and typeface.

2. Colors/color scheme Utilized in Logo: Indicate what colors are being used.
   1. Blue
   2. Red
   3. Green
   4. Purple
   5. Black
   6. Orange
   7. Yellow
   8. Gold
   9. White
  10. Pink
  11. Gray
12. Brown
13. Image used
14. Other: ________________________

3. Images Utilized in the Logo:
   1. Do the logos have any agrarian imagery?
      1. Yes
      1. Specify: _________________
      2. No
   2. What types of images are being used?
      1. Text
      2. Photos
      3. Vector graphics
      4. Icons
      5. Shapes
      6. Other: __________________
   3. Describe the images:
      1. Animals
         1. Specify: _________________
      2. Farm equipment
         1. Specify: _________________
      3. Crops
         1. Specify: _________________
      4. Ohio
         1. Specify: _________________
      5. Flags
         1. Specify: _________________
      6. Numbers
         1. Specify: _________________
      7. Shapes
         1. Specify: _________________
      8. Other: _________________

4. Text Content Being Utilized within the Logo:
1. What text is present within the logo? List all terms that are being used within the logo.

2. What type(s) of production agriculture terms are being utilized? Examples include: cage-free, pasture raised, grass fed, sustainable, heirloom, environmentally thoughtful, 100% angus, antibiotic free, steroid free, etc.

3. What type(s) of food labeling terminology are being utilized? Examples include: local, natural, organic, GMO-free, artisanal, gluten/dairy/sugar-free, fresh, farm to table, house made, Ohio proud, USDA choice, USDA prime, USDA premium, locally grown, etc.

Website (Visual Elements)

1. **Colors/color scheme Utilized within the Site:** Indicate what colors are being used within the website.

   1. Background:
      1. Blue
      2. Red
      3. Green
      4. Purple
      5. Black
      6. Orange
      7. Yellow
      8. Gold
      9. White
      10. Pink
      11. Gray
      12. Brown
      13. Image used. Describe image
      14. Other: ____________________

2. Font Colors:
   1. Blue
   2. Red
   3. Green
   4. Purple
   5. Black
   6. Orange
3. Accent Colors (i.e. buttons, content boxes, etc.):
   1. Blue
   2. Red
   3. Green
   4. Purple
   5. Black
   6. Orange
   7. Yellow
   8. Gold
   9. White
   10. Pink
   11. Gray
   12. Brown
   13. Image used.
   14. Other: _____________________

4. Header Colors:
   1. Blue
   2. Red
   3. Green
   4. Purple
   5. Black
   6. Orange
   7. Yellow
   8. Gold
   9. White
   10. Pink
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11. Gray
12. Brown
13. Image used. Describe image.
14. Other: _____________________

5. Footer Colors:
   1. Blue
   2. Red
   3. Green
   4. Purple
   5. Black
   6. Orange
   7. Yellow
   8. Gold
   9. White
10. Pink
11. Gray
12. Brown
13. Image used. Describe image.
14. Other: _____________________

2. Imagery Utilized within the Site:
   1. What type(s) of imagery are being used?
      1. Photos
      2. Vector graphics/clip art
      3. Logos
      4. Flyers/promotional material
      5. Other: _____________________
   2. What are these images depicting?
      1. Menu items
      2. Agriculture
         1. Produce
            a. Specify: _____________
         2. Animals
            a. Specify: _____________
3. Farming equipment
   a. Specify: _____________
4. Fields or Orchards
   a. Specify: _____________
3. Columbus
4. Store front
5. Interior of Restaurant
6. Staff photos
7. Patron photos
8. Other: _______________

3. Describe the images:
   1. Well lit
   2. High quality
   3. Low quality
   4. Appear professionally taken
   5. Appear taken on a cell phone
   6. Poor lighting quality
   7. Other: _______________

4. Is there a gallery of images on any pages?
   1. Yes
      1. Specify pages: _________________
   2. No

5. If yes, what kind of images are present within the gallery?
   1. Menu items
   2. Agriculture
      1. Produce
         a. Specify: _____________
      2. Animals
         a. Specify: _____________
      3. Farming equipment
         a. Specify: _____________
      4. Fields or Orchards
         a. Specify: _____________
   3. Columbus
4. Store front
5. Interior of Restaurant
6. Staff photos
7. Patron photos
8. Other: _________________

Menu(s)

1. How is the main menu being presented?
   1. Webpage (i.e. the menu is built into the website)
   2. PDF
   3. Other: __________________________

2. If applicable, how are the specialty or catering menu(s) being presented?
   1. Webpage (i.e. the menu is built into the website)
   2. PDF
   3. Other: __________________________

3. What type(s) of imagery are being used?
   1. Photos
   2. Vector graphics/clip art
   3. Logos
   4. Other: __________________________
   5. None

4. What are these images depicting?
   1. Menu items
   2. Agriculture
      1. Produce
         1. Specify: ______________
      2. Animals
         1. Specify: ______________
      3. Farming equipment
         1. Specify: ______________
   4. Fields or Orchards
      1. Specify: ______________
   3. Columbus
   4. Store front
5. Describe the images:
   1. Well lit
   2. High quality
   3. Low quality
   4. Appear professionally taken
   5. Appear taken on a cell phone
   6. Poor lighting quality
   7. Other: ______________

6. Are any icons being used within the menu?
   1. Yes
      1. Gluten free
      2. Dairy free
      3. Sugar Free
      4. Vegetarian
      5. Vegan
      6. Ohio proud
      7. Local
      8. other: __________
   2. No

7. If yes, how are those icons being presented? Explain what the icons look like.

8. Text Content Being Utilized within the Menu:
   1. What type(s) of production agriculture terms are being utilized? Examples include: cage-free, pasture raised, grass fed, sustainable, heirloom, environmentally thoughtful, 100% angus, antibiotic free, steroid free, seasonal, etc.
   2. What type(s) of food labeling terminology are being utilized? Examples include: local, natural, organic, GMO-free, artisanal, gluten/dairy/sugar-free, fresh, farm to table, house made, Ohio
proud, USDA choice, USDA prime, USDA premium, locally
grown, etc.

3. Are farm names being utilized within the menu? Examples
include: Covey Rise Farm’s Chicken, Milligan’s Maple Syrup,
Holistic Acres eggs, Lucky Cat, Snowville, Shagbark, etc.

1. Yes
   1. Specify:______________

2. No

4. Is Ohio mentioned in the menu?

1. Yes
   1. Produce
   2. Beef
   3. Chicken
   4. Fish
   5. Turkey
   6. Lamb
   7. Other:___________________

2. No

5. Are specific places or terms related to Ohio being mentioned?
Examples include: Lake Erie, Worthington, Buckeye, etc.

1. Yes
   1. Places?
   2. Terms?

2. No

**Textual Content (Website)**

1. **Text Content Being Utilized within the Homepage:**
   1. What type(s) of production agriculture terms are being utilized?
   Examples include: cage-free, pasture raised, grass fed, sustainable,
   heirloom, environmentally thoughtful, 100% angus, antibiotic free,
   steroid free, etc.

   2. What type(s) of food labeling terminology are being utilized?
   Examples include: local, natural, organic, GMO-free, artisanal,
   gluten/dairy/sugar-free, fresh, farm to table, house made, Ohio
   proud, USDA choice, USDA prime, USDA premium, locally
   grown, etc.

   3. Other noteworthy terms?

2. **Text Content Being Utilized within the About page:**
   1. What type(s) of production agriculture terms are being utilized?
   Examples include: cage-free, pasture raised, grass fed, sustainable,
   heirloom, environmentally thoughtful, 100% angus, antibiotic free,
   steroid free, etc.
2. What type(s) of food labeling terminology are being utilized? Examples include: local, natural, organic, GMO-free, artisanal, gluten/dairy/sugar-free, fresh, farm to table, house made, Ohio proud, USDA choice, USDA prime, USDA premium, locally grown, etc.

3. Other noteworthy terms?

3. If applicable, Text Content Being Utilized within the Sourcing OR Farm page(s):
   1. What farms are sourcing this restaurant?
   2. What kind of products are these farms sourcing?

4. If applicable, Text Content Being Utilized within the Event page:
   1. Are there specific events promoting farms or farm outreach?
      1. Yes
      1. Specify: ____________________
      2. No
Farm to Table Restaurant Coding Form

Restaurant ID: ______  Restaurant Title: ________________________________

Date: __________  Page: _____ of _____  URL: ________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Categories</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Coding Data</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logos</td>
<td>1. Type of logo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Colors/Color Scheme Utilized in Logo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Images Utilized in the Logo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1. Agrarian imagery?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.1. Specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Image types?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. Describe the images:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.1. Specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Text Content Being Utilized within the Logo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1. Terms used within logo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Production related terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. Labeling related terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website (visuals)</td>
<td>1. Colors/Color Scheme Utilized in Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1. Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Font</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Accents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Header</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Footer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Images utilized within Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1. Types of images</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2. What do these images depict?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2. If ag related, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Description of images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Gallery?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1. Specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Types of images in the gallery?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2. If ag related, please specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Menu

1. **Main** menu presentation?
2. Specialty or catering menu(s) presentation?
3. Types of images
4. What do these images depict?
   4.2. If ag related, please specify
5. Describe the images
6. Icon use
   1.1. Icon denotation?
7. If yes, how are those icons being presented?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Content of Menu</th>
<th>1.1. Production related terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Labeling related terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Farm names?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1. Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Ohio mentioned?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1. Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Term or Places related to Ohio?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1. Places</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2. Terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Production terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Labeling terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Production terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Labeling terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Farm names</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Items sourced from farms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Farm related events?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1. Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual Content</th>
<th>1. Homepage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Production terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Labeling terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual Content</th>
<th>2. About page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Production terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Labeling terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual Content</th>
<th>3. Farm/sourcing page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Farm names</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Items sourced from farms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual Content</th>
<th>4. Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Farm related events?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1. Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix F: Examples of Menu Presentations

A text-based webpage menu from The Table.
An example of web-based menu with images from Acre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bowls</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thai 9.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconut brown rice, carrots, broccoli and curried cauliflower with Bangkok peanut sauce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBQ 9.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roasted sweet potatoes, onions and peppers with stone fruit BBQ sauce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole (High St Only) 9.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roasted mushrooms, peppers, and onions with mole sauce and avocado cream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikka Bowl (Northwest Blvd Only) 9.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry roasted cauliflower, chickpeas, and cherry tomatoes in a creamy tikka masala sauce, garnished with fresh cilantro.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal: Shanghai Bowl 9.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roasted mushrooms with steamed broccoli and shredded carrot in a slightly sweet sesame ginger sauce.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An example of a PDF-based menu with images from The Worthington Inn.
An example of a PDF-based menu with no images from Union Café.