Onesimo Cuamea
Universidad Autónoma de Baja California

Karen Ramos
Universidad Autónoma de Baja California

Gourmet Food Trucks: Predictors of Revisit Intentions

The aim of this study was to find out the predictors of revisit intention (RI) to gourmet food trucks (GFTs) located in Gastronomic Collectives. The information was obtained by applying a survey to a sample of 450 customers from the eight Gastronomic Collectives in Tijuana, Mexico. An Exploratory Factorial Analysis was carried out. Five dimensions were identified and included in the multiple regression analysis. The results show that four dimensions positively affect RI to GFTs: food quality, personnel efficiency, hedonic shopping value, and perceived value. The generalization of the results may be limited since GFTs in Gastronomic Collectives have a different operational scheme than the traditional food trucks located in the streets.

Keywords: Revisit intention; street food; gourmet food trucks.

Dr. Onesimo Cuamea
Full-Time Research Professor
Universidad Autónoma de Baja California
Phone: +52 (664) 682-16-97.
Baja California, Mexico
Email: onesimo@uabc.edu.mx

Dr. Karen Ramos
Full-Time Research Professor
Universidad Autónoma de Baja California
Baja California, Mexico
Phone: +52 (664) 682-25-66
Email: karen.ramos38@uabc.edu.mx

Onesimo Cuamea is a Full-time Research Professor at Facultad de Turismo y Mercadotecnia, Universidad Autonoma de Baja California, campus, Tijuana. He has a Ph.D. in Global Development Studies. He is also a Member of the Integral Management of Tourism and Marketing academic group. National Executive President of the Mexican Association of Tourism Faculties and a member of the Mexican Academy of Tourism Research (AMIT).

Karen Ramos is a Full-time Research Professor at Facultad de Contaduría y Administracion, Universidad Autonoma de Baja California, campus, Tijuana. She also has a Ph.D. in Global Development Studies.

Introduction

Street foods are ready-to-eat foods and beverages prepared and/or sold by vendors and hawkers, especially in streets and other similar public places. This type of food is sold in pushcarts, bicycles, baskets, mobile trucks, booths, or stalls (FAO, 2012). Food Trucks (FTs) are vehicles that cook and sell from fast food to gourmet food. They are popular in several countries and usually offer food in different locations of a city. Besides their usual street location, several FTs work during music concerts, festivals, and other events (Rivolli, Parker & De Carvalho, 2018). In sum, FTs are defined as motorized vehicles registered and able to be operated on public streets, in which ready-to-eat food is cooked, wrapped, packaged, processed, or portioned for sale or distribution (Ley, 2018). The perception of FTs was that trucks only supplied food at low prices for construction workers.

All forms of street vending, including FTs, generate discussions on five main issues that require attention: 1) protecting property interests, 2) preventing pedestrian congestion, 3) keeping the streets tidy, 4) sanitation/ health regulations, and 5) trash/recycling, (Ehrenfeucht, 2017; Ley, 2018 and CRCOG, 2018). For their part, Freybote, Fang & Gebhardt (2017) found that food trucks represent a negative externality to homeowners. The closer a home is to a food truck, the lower the property sale price. Some explanations for this effect include increased parking shortages and trash issues in a neighborhood due to the presence of consumers.

In this regard, the World Health Organization (WHO, 2010) affirmed that street food vendors are often untrained in food safety and do not appreciate the safe handling of food. As a consequence, street foods are perceived as a major public health risk, mainly due to the lack of

infrastructure and basic services, such as the supply of drinking water; difficulty in controlling a large number of operations due to their diversity, mobility, and temporary nature, and inadequate public awareness of the hazards posed by certain street foods, among others. Therefore, government efforts and interventions, monitoring of street food regulations, and involving appropriate stakeholders are required to accomplish street food safety initiatives (Al Mamun & Turin, 2016).

Nevertheless, the new generation of FTs appeals to a mainstream audience and white-collar demographics looking for branded food trucks designed with style and clean appearance (Ibrahim, 2011; Mokhtar, Othman, Arsat, & Bakhtiar, 2017). The emerging enterprises accomplished their goals through FTs that are well equipped with preparing facilities, which serve a diversity of food from fast and simple to gourmet and cultural cuisines with the same quality as in established restaurants (Wessel, 2012; Esparza, et al., 2014). In this sense, Alfiero et al. (2017) identified two categories of vendors: Traditional Food Trucks (TFT) and Gourmet Food Truck (GFT), both FTs types are inserted in the street food concept.

TFT service is usually provided during concerts and/or sports events as part of the nightlife. The gastronomic offer involved in this sector is characterized by very cheap and fast food. GFT is a new kind of food trucker, operating with a new philosophy oriented to satisfying various requests for quality food. These GFTs specialized in serving higher quality food at higher prices, using selected products, aesthetic presentations, and renewed traditional recipes. (Anenberg & Kung, 2015).

This new version is located near office areas during lunch hours and at night, near residential areas (Mokhtar et al., 2018). The FT concept is not new. However, in the last decade,

the number of food trucks increased. Many countries in the world have followed the trend of the mobile food business (Bandaru &Venkateshwarlu, 2017).

In this sense, there are very few efforts in academic research to help guide food truck owners to attract and maintain their clientele (Sen, Savitskie, Ranganathan, & Brooks, 2014). Food trucks are rising in popularity and becoming a potential business. Therefore, a greater understanding of this business's customers' behavioral intentions is necessary. Furthermore, the academic literature that discussed this topic is still sparse (Mokhtar et al., 2017). The literature on food truck service has not yet been fully developed, and some gaps still have to be filled in (Alfiero et al., 2017); for example, the customer revisits intentions to food trucks has been scarily studied (Sen et al., 2014; Mokhtar, Othman & Ariffin, 2018).

Regarding the consumer's attitude and behavioral intentions toward food-truck dining service, Yoon & Chung (2017) affirmed that this topic has been scarcely researched. Revisit intention (RI) has been discussed in numerous research related to food and beverage, but mostly in brick-and-mortar restaurants and fast-food restaurants (Esmaeilpour, Sayadi & Mirzaei, 2016; Namin, 2017; Pham, Do & Phung, 2016).

Nevertheless, few studies explained how and why consumers decide to patronize them. It is essential to conduct research to understand consumer behavior because the industry has grown rapidly and is highly competitive (Shin, Kim & Severt, 2018).

Literature Review

In Mexico, a new entrepreneurial scheme emerged in Tijuana to reduce the negative effects that characterize FTs to attend the new mainstream segment. This new business strategy is called Gastronomic Collective and it grouped GFTs with different operational features that distinguish it from the way FTs operate in other countries. In this regard, the study aimed to find the predictors

of RI to GFTs located in the Gastronomic Collectives in Mexico and contribute to the body of knowledge about the factors influencing revisit intention to the food truck service.

Street Food and behavioral intentions

Gastronomy differs from one country to another and even from one region to another because they are the result of a local collective historical process of contextual knowledge based on a combination of particular resources related to physical and climatic characteristics and the human resources responsible for emphasizing those characteristics (Priviteria & Saverio, 2015).

In this sense, street food results from the process and contributes to an authentic gastronomic experience for tourists and residents (Priviteria & Saverio, 2015).

The street food sector offers ready-to-eat food and beverages prepared and sold by vendors, especially on the streets and other public places. Due to the low cost and convenience, street food is consumed by millions of low- and middle-income consumers, especially in developing countries, but is not to be put in the same category as fast foods (Priviteria & Saverio, 2015; Von Bargen, 2016).

This food tends to be based on local, seasonal, and fresh ingredients that represent the local culinary culture of the countries in which they are found (Von Bargen, 2016; Priviteria & Saverio, 2015; Rittman & Finnestad, 2011). Street food vendors have developed their culture and contributed to the culinary world (Baldwin, 2017).

In the revised literature, the behavioral intention concept is often interchangeable with the terms of loyalty. Both terms loyalty and behavioral intention frequently include the element of RI (Hutchinson Lai & Wang, 2009, Han, 2013, Tanford & Jung, 2017). In the same sense, Hutchinson et al., (2009) and Menga & Hanb (2018) sustained that there is a direct relationship between satisfaction and RI.

Analyzing the behavioral intention of restaurant consumers, Han, Back & Barrett (2009) and Namin (2017) argued that RI could be improved through customer satisfaction as an intermediary. Although dimensions used to assess customer satisfaction in different studies are not identical, satisfaction as a determinant factor of post-purchase behavior is consistent in different research (Yan, Wang, & Chau, 2015).

According to Han et al. (2009) and Han & Hyun (2017), customer satisfaction is based on a cognitive process determining commitment and directly and indirectly engenders behavioral intentions. When consumers feel satisfied, it increases their favorable intentions and desires toward repurchasing.

Revisit intention has been discussed in numerous research related to food and beverage and mostly in restaurants (Esmaeilpour et al., 2016; Namin, 2017; Pham et al., 2016). According to Han & Hyun (2017), satisfaction with their overall experiences in a restaurant was identified to strongly influence intentions to visit the restaurant repeatedly. Hence, to generate these positive post-purchase intentions, practitioners should seek to improve patrons' overall satisfaction level by boosting diverse restaurant attributes.

Regarding the factors customers consider to revisit a food and beverage enterprise, most researchers emphasize food quality as a determinant factor. Therefore, there are several reasons to explain this factor. Firstly, the food appearances and taste (Alfiero et al., 2017; NAlfieroamin (2017), as well as the temperature (Yan et al., 2015; Sen et al., 2014), are the most important variables influencing behavioral intentions. In sum, food quality is directly related to the RI (Alfiero et al., 2017; Han & Hyun, 2017; Yan et al., 2015; Ryu et al., 2012; Weiss et al., 2008). Hence, this study proposed the following hypothesis:

H0 1. The quality of food has a positive effect on the revisit intention to the gourmet food trucks of the gastronomic collectives.

Personnel efficiency

Personnel efficiency has been analyzed from the following aspects: the service's reliability (Alfiero et al.,2017), staff responsiveness, and empathy (Namin, 2017; Sen, 2014). Due to this situation, Weiss et al. (2008), Yan et al. (2015), and Han & Hyun (2017) affirmed that highly qualified staff and personal interactions are directly related to the RI. In summary, considering that customer revisit intention depends on this dimension, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H0 2. The personnel efficiency has a positive effect on Revisit Intention to the gourmet food trucks of the gastronomic collectives.

The atmosphere

According to the literature, the atmosphere or physical environment is related to repurchase intention and the intention to return to food and beverage companies. On the one hand, Weiss et al. (2008), Han & Hyun (2017), and Yan et al. (2015) affirmed that atmosphere is a significant attribute that has a strong relationship to customer satisfaction and the RI. Moreover, the atmosphere includes the following aspects: the cleanliness of the facilities (Yan et al., 2015) and the physical appearance of the facilities (Sen et al., 2014).

 On the other hand, Ryu et al. (2012) affirmed that restaurant customers do not perceive atmosphere as a significant additional attribute because many customers might be primarily driven by food taste and low prices instead of the environment. Given this discrepancy, this study proposed the following hypothesis:

H0 3. The gastronomic collectives' atmosphere positively affects customers' Revisit Intention to gourmet food trucks.

Perceived value

Perceived value is an important determinant of RI (Ryu et al., 2012; Alfiero et al., 2017; Mokhatar et al., 2018). In particular, Namin (2017) confirmed that perceived value is the most important predictor of repurchase. In the same sense, Alfiero et al (2017), stated that GFT operates with a new philosophy, serving higher quality food at higher prices, for these reasons, perceived value is an important factor for GFT. In summary, considering that most of the studies in the area include the price and perceived value as determinants for repurchase intention, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H0 4. There is a statistically significant positive relationship between perceived value and RI to the gourmet food trucks of the gastronomic collectives.

Hedonic shopping value

Finally, hedonic shopping values refer to an overall assessment of experiential benefits and sacrifices, such as pleasure and fun. In this regard, Sen et al. (2014) studied attributes like the time to pay for and receive the food (serving time), crowding during lunch hours, and the presence of tables and chairs. They concluded that there is no relationship between hedonic shopping value and the customer's behavioral intentions because customers are willing to go under the FT experience, which includes crowding during lunch service and increasing the waiting time. Similarly, Yoon & Chung (2017) argued that perceived hedonic value benefit positively affects customers' favorable food-truck-service attitude. Suhaily, Farha & Nor (2019) found that hedonic value significantly influenced food trucks' visit intention.

In the same way, Isoni et al. (2019) pointed out that consumers dining in FTs are consuming experiences, taste, and pleasure, as well as establishing group bonds, which means that they are

involved in FT consumption primarily for hedonic reasons such as fun, excitement, and emotional worth. Based on the literature, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H0 5. The hedonic shopping value has a positive effect on Revisit Intention to the gourmet food trucks of the gastronomic collectives. Lastly, Table 1 shows the variables used in the RI to restaurants and food truck customers.

Table 1. Variables influencing the revisit intention

Author (s)	Independent Variables
Weiss, Feinstein, & Dalbor (2008)	1) Food quality 2) Service quality 3) Atmosphere 4) Novelty
Yan, Wang & Chung (2015)	1) Food quality: taste, temperature, variety, and appearance 2) Service quality: employee appearance, employee attitude 3) Atmosphere: cleanliness of the facilities 4) Price and value,
Han & Hyun (2017)	1) Highly qualified staff 2) Physical environment 3) Quality food
Ryu, Lee & Kim (2012)	1) Physical environment 2) Food 3) Service
Namin (2017)	1) Service reliability 2) Food taste 3) Price value 4) Staff responsiveness 5) Staff empathy 6) Expected time to receive the food and check
Sen, Savitskie, Ranganathan, & Brooks (2014)	1) Food-truck image (physical appearance) 2) Food quality (taste, presentation, and temperature) 3) Hedonic shopping value (crowding, longer wait times, dynamic lunch menus, or a variety of locations) 4) Employee friendliness
Alfiero, Lo Giudice, & Bonadonna (2017)	1) Evaluation of the service obtained, e.g., serving time, the presence of a table and/or chair; 2) satisfaction level as to the flavor of the food; 3) level of quality/perceived value 4) Aesthetic presentación
Mokhtar, Othman & Ariffin (2018)	1) Brand awareness 2) Brand image 3) Perceived quality

Source: Own elaboration based on Weiss et al. (2008); Yan et al. (2015); Han & Hyun (2017); Ryu et al. (2012); Namin (2017); Sen et al. (2014) and Mokhtar et al., (2018).

Methodology

Materials and methods

The significance of this research lies in analyzing the relationship between 13 attributes and the effect on the revisit intention to Gastronomic Collectives. Based on the literature review, some variables have been scarcely included in the research on food trucks. Therefore, it was decided to use a combination of indicators from multiple conceptual models presented in the literature, incorporating the most studied (Weiss et al., 2008; Ryu et al., 2012); and the least analyzed factors (Alfiero et al., 2017; Namin, 2017; Sen et al., 2014) (see Table2).

Table 2. Variables influencing revisit intention used in this study

Variable	Authors
Dining area cleanliness	Alfiero, et al., (2017); Yan et al., (2015); Ryu et al., (2012)
Washrooms cleanliness	Yan et al., (2015); Han & Hyun (2017); Ryu et al., (2012); Weiss et al., (2008).
Quality of food compared to established restaurants	Alfiero, et al., (2017); Mokhtar et al., (2018).
Responsiveness (Food order procedure)	Alfiero, et al., (2017); Namin (2017); Sen et al., (2014)
Dining area capacity	Alfiero, et al (2017); Namin (2017); Sen et al. (2014).
Time to receive the food	Alfiero, et al (2017); Namin (2017); Sen et al. (2014).
Food taste	Alfiero, et al., (2017); Ryu et al., (2012); Yan et al., (2015); Han & Hyun (2017); Weiss et al., (2008).
Food presentation	Alfiero, et al., (2017); Ryu et al., (2012); Yan et al., (2015); Han & Hyun (2017); Weiss et al. (2008).
Food temperature	Ryu et al. (2012); Yan et al. (2015); Han & Hyun (2017); Weiss et al., (2008).
Staff reliability	Alfiero, et al., (2017); Han & Hyun (2017); Namin (2017); Weiss et al., (2008).
Food truck's staff empathy	Sen et al., (2014).
Waiters empathy	Han & Hyun (2017); Namin (2017); Weiss et al., (2008).
Price related to the food truck products	Ryu et al., (2012); Alfiero, et al., (2017); Mokhtar et al., (2018).

After that, the indicators were grouped to create dimensions through exploratory factor analysis (EFA). The dimensions proposed in the study were food quality, personnel efficiency, atmosphere, hedonic shopping value, and perceived value (Table 3).

Table.3. Dimension for revisit intention

Food Quality	Food presentation
	Food temperature
	Food taste
	Time to receive the food
Personnel Efficiency	Staff reliability
	Waiters empathy
	Food truck's staff empathy
Atmosphere	Dining area cleanliness
	Washrooms cleanliness
Hedonic Shopping value	Dining area capacity
	Responsiveness (Food order procedure)
Perceived value	Quality of food compared to established restaurants
	Price related to the food truck products
Source: Own elaboration.	

It was decided to survey customers at the Gastronomic Collectives in Tijuana, Mexico. To evaluate their most recent experience, a face-to-face survey was applied only to customers who agreed to participate in the study. The surveys were applied at the eight Gastronomic Collectives located in the city. Random sampling was used to apply the survey, distributed proportionally, 56 or 57 surveys in each one of the Gastronomic collectives. To determine the sample size, a confidence level of 95% and a margin of error of ± 4% were established, which allowed for defining the sample of 450 customers (Rea & Parker, 1991).

Gastronomic Collectives have a different operational scheme than traditional food trucks located in the streets, having four characteristics. 1) All of them are GFT of different types of food; 2) GFTs are located in the same area permanently, and they share common facilities; 3) GFTs have their waiters; and 4) It is distinguished by including only these types of FTs and all share the following features.

First, GFTs are no longer located in the suburbs, neither, just when festivals are held downtown. Gastronomic Collectives are now located in specific and permanent areas of the city. Second, these businesses pay rent for the space in the Gastronomic Collective. Third, GFTs have

waiter service to attend to customers, which reduces waiting times and improves attention. Once the customer buys their meal in any establishment, the waiter serves the food at the customer´s table. Fourth, they are grouped in one place and share common facilities (chairs, tables, trash cans, parking, etc.), allowing to attend a greater demand of customers who seek a variety of food at the same place. Fifth, they have common washrooms for their clients, improving the perception of hygiene and comfort. Sixth, GFTs no longer move around the city; therefore, the customer already knows where to find them instead of looking for their current location through social networks; and seventh, they are known and promoted as collectives of urban gourmet food.

The final questionnaire for the study was refined after two pre-tests were carried out in March and April of 2017. Each pilot study was conducted on a sample of 40 respondents leaving the Gastronomic Collectives. A relevant fact worth mentioning is that during the pre-tests, it was identified that most respondents tended to select the "neutral" response, which generated a bias in the information collected.

Based on the results of the previous tests, it was decided to modify the Likert scale from five to four points, incorporating the forced choice format -without a neutral option- because it increases the number of survey responses that can be used for analysis and encourages participants to provide a real response. Neutral responses were eliminated to reduce this potential bias and considering that the exclusion of the neutral option has been found to not necessarily change the proportion of responses that incline toward certain sides of a Likert response scale (positive or negative) (Dhar & Simonson, 2003; Hair, Black, Babin & Tatham, 2006; Lavrakas, 2008; and Brown & Maydeu-Olivares, 2011).

The final survey includes the socioeconomic and sociodemographic data and thirteen factors regarding their experience at the Gastronomic Collectives to be evaluated with a four-point

Likert scale: 1=Very Poor, 2=Below Average, 3=Above Average, and 4=Excellent. Lastly, respondents were asked to evaluate their revisit intention as 1=Totally Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3=Agree, and 4= Totally Agree.

The validity of the dimension

In order to test the consistency of the instrument, Cronbach's Alpha analysis was performed; the results of the analysis confirmed that the instrument and items used were reliable with a coefficient Alpha value of 0.736, above the generally accepted score of Nunnally (1978) of 0.7; this result shows the internal consistency of the questionnaire. Then the Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin (KMO) analysis was calculated as 0.709, which is greater than 0.50, indicating that the data set of 450 is adequate for exploratory factor analysis (EFA) (Hair et al., 2006).

The EFA explained 68.89 % of the total variance with five dimensions, as presented in Table 4. EFA confirms that customer revisit intention has five constructs: food quality, personnel efficiency, atmosphere, hedonic shopping value, and perceived value.

Table 4. EFA factor structure (n=450)

	Food Quality	Personnel Efficiency	Atmosphere	Hedonic Shopping Value	Perceived value	Total
Food presentation	0.877					
Food temperature	0.857					
Food taste	0.856					
Time to receive the food	0.623					
Staff reliability		0.850				
Waiters empathy		0.832				
Food truck's staff empathy		0.609				
Dining area cleanliness			0.944			
Washrooms cleanliness			0.937			
Dining area capacity				0.751		
Responsiveness (Food order procedure)				0.698		
Quality of food compared to established restaurants					0.792	
Price related to the food truck products					0.653	
Eigenvalue	3.585	1.791	1.377	1.208	.998	
Variance %	27.57	13.778	10.593	9.292	7.653	68.891

The measurement scale constructed with EFA was confirmed with convergent and divergent validity. The convergent validity of each dimension is assured with an average variance explained (AVE) above 0.50 and composite reliability (CR) higher than 0.6 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981), as presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Measurement properties for RI

	λ	CR	AVE
Food Quality		0.882314	0.65587
Food presentation	0.877		
Food temperature	0.857		
Food taste	0.856		
Time to receive the food	0.623		
Personnel Efficiency		0.81221	0.59541
Staff reliability	0.850		
Waiters empathy	0.832		
Food truck's staff empathy	0.609		
Atmosphere		0.93897	0.88496
Dining area cleanliness	0.944		
Washrooms cleanliness	0.937		
Hedonic Shopping value		0.68889	0.52576
Dining area capacity	0.751		
Responsiveness (Food order procedure)	0.698		
Perceived value		0.68805	0.52674
Quality of food compared to established restaurants	0.792		
Price related to the food truck products	0.653		

The discriminant validity of customer revisit intention to the Gastronomic Collectives measurement scale was examined by comparing AVE values vs. squared correlations between pairs of dimensions. The squared correlations were smaller than AVE (0.50), assuring sufficient discriminant validity of measurement scales. The correlation matrix in Table 6 confirms that each dimension is distinctly different from each other, as the squared correlations (0.133), (0.034), (0.045), (0.057), (0.049), (0.047), (0.012) (0.035), (0.000) and (0.005) are smaller than AVE values presented in Table 5, which is evidence for discriminant validity.

Table 6. Descriptive statistics and correlations

n=450	M	SD	FQ	PE	FC	HSV	PV
Food quality (FQ)	3.34	.517	1.000				
Personnel efficiency (PE)	3.36	.399	.364	1.000			
Atmosphere (AT)	2.96	.614	.185	.220	1.000		
Hedonic shopping value (HSV)	2.89	.399	.213	.218	.187	1.000	
Perceived value (PV)	2.62	.314	.239	.111	.001	.068	1.000

After identifying the five constructs, multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine which construct has an effect on the RI to the GFTs of Gastronomic Collectives.

Results

Table 7 shows the socio-demographic profile of participants; 59.60% of the respondents fall in the 18 to 29 age category, 26.80% of the sample is in the 30 to 41 age group, and 13.6% of the respondents are 42 years old and above. Also, 51.10% of the respondents are male, and 48.90% are female. Regarding the days of the week customers prefer to visit the gastronomic collectives, the results showed that 44.2% prefer Saturday and Sunday. It was found that 92.7% of the respondents are accompanied, most of them, by friends and family. Among the main sources to get information about gastronomic collectives, word of mouth (41,8%) is the most important, followed by the business sign on the façade (36.2%). Finally, most participants were employees (57.1%), followed by students (18.2%).

Table 7: Socio-demographic characteristics of participants

Variable	Characteristics	Frequency	%
Age	18 to 29	268	59.6
	30 to 41	121	26.8
	42 to 53	48	10.6
	54 to 65	11	2.3
	66 and above	2	0.7
Gender	Male	230	51.1
	Female	220	48.9
Preferred day of the week to visit	Saturday-Sunday	199	44.2
	Thursday-Friday	164	36.5
	Monday-Wednesday	87	19.3
Accompanying persons	Friends	175	38.9
	Family	122	27.1
	Couple	90	20.0
	Coworkers	33	7.3
	None	30	6.7
Source of information	Recommendation	188	41.8
	Business signs on facade	163	36.2
	Social networks	91	20.0
	Web page	4	1.0
	Flyers	4	1.0
Occupation	Employee	257	57.1
	Student	82	18.2
	Part-time student worker	59	13.1
	Self-employed	32	7.1
	Home	18	4.0
	Retired	2	0.4

Regarding the assessment of the dimensions, for the food quality, the means of four items were: food taste (Mean=3.37; SD=0.517), food presentation (Mean=3.36; SD=0.541), food temperature (Mean=3.32; SD=0.562), and time to receive the food (Mean=3.29; SD=0.496) were evaluated as above average.

With respect to personnel efficiency, the three items were assessed as above average: Waiters' empathy (Mean=3.333; SD=.490), food truck's staff empathy (Mean=3.30; SD=.496), and staff reliability (Mean=3.16; SD=.437).

In the atmosphere dimension, one item was assessed as above average: Dining area cleanliness (Mean=3.05; SD=.520). The lowest-rated item is washroom cleanliness (Mean=2.87; SD=.774), graded below average (Table 8).

Table 8. Means and std. deviation by dimensions

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
Food Quality	**3.34**	**.517**
Food taste	3.37	.541
Food presentation	3.36	.544
Food temperature	3.32	.562
Time to receive the food	3.29	.496
Personnel Efficiency	**3.26**	**.399**
Waiters empathy	3.33	.490
Food truck's staff empathy	3.30	.496
Staff reliability	3.16	.437
Atmosphere	**2.96**	**.614**
Dining area cleanliness	3.05	.520
Washrooms Cleanliness	2.87	.774
Hedonic Shopping value	**2.89**	**.399**
Responsiveness (Food order procedure)	3.00	.414
Dining area capacity	2.78	.416
Perceived value	**2.62**	**.314**
Quality of food compared to established restaurants	3.26	.450
Price related to the food truck products	1.98	.374

In relation to the descriptive analysis of research variables, in the hedonic shopping value, the food order procedure had a mean of 3.00 (SD=0.414), evaluated as above the average, and dining area capacity (Mean=2.78; SD=0.416) rated as below the average.

Lastly, in the perceived value dimension, one item was assessed as above average: quality of food-related to an established restaurant (Mean=3.26; SD=.450). The only item evaluated as very poor was the price related to the food truck's product (Mean=1.98; SD=.374).

Regression Analysis

Taking into account the adjusted R^2 (0.201) result (Table 9), it is affirmed that 20% of the revisit intention is explained by the dimensions used in this study. The significance of each indicator of the multiple linear regression indicates that four of the five dimensions have a statistically significant relationship with revisit intention to Gastronomic Collectives.

According to the beta and significance coefficients, the food quality dimension (β=0.227) (p=0.000), had a positive statistical relationship with the revisit intention, and it is the most

important dimension influencing this variable. Similarly, the personnel efficiency dimension (β=0.215) (p= 0.000) is the second dimension with a significant statistical relationship with RI.

Concerning the hedonic shopping value dimension (β=0.136) (p =0.002), the third dimension had a significant statistical relationship with return intention. Likewise, the perceived value dimension (β=0.133) (p =0.003) is the fourth and last dimension influencing this variability. Moreover, the atmosphere dimension (p=0.845) had no statistical relationship with RI.

Table 9. Results of regression analysis

Input factors	R	R²	Adjusted R²	Δ R²	F	β	t	p
Food quality	.458ᵃ	.210	.201	.456	23.591	.227***	4.914	.000
Personnel efficiency						.215***	4.822	.000
Atmosphere						-.008	-.195	.845
Hedonic shopping value						.136	3.138	.002
Perceived value						.133	2.948	.003

a. Dependent Variable: Revisit Intention
***p<0.001

Discussion

The study's findings contribute to the existing knowledge about gourmet food trucks. With the results presented above, it was observed that only four out of the five dimensions had a positive statistical relationship with intention: 1) Food quality, 2) Personnel efficiency, 3) Hedonic shopping value, and 4) Perceived value. Therefore, the hypothesis H01, H02, H04, and H05 were approved. On the other hand, H03 was rejected because the atmosphere was not statistically related to the revisit intention of the GFTs of the Gastronomic Collectives.

The food quality is the most important dimension for the revisit intention, because it has the greatest effect on this variable, while the personnel efficiency and hedonic shopping value occupied the second and third place, respectively.

Regarding revisit intention, it was established that food quality is the first and most important dimension. These findings are in accordance with the results of Alfiero, et al., (2017);

Han & Hyun, (2017); Yan et al., (2015); Ryu, et al., (2012), and Weiss et al. (2008) who affirmed that the food quality, have a positive effect on RI, hence the importance of this dimension.

The personnel efficiency dimension (waiters' empathy, food truck staff empathy, and staff reliability) was the second factor influencing RI (Alfiero et al., 2017; Namin, 2017; Weiss et al., 2008; Sen et al., 2014; Yan et al., 2015, and Han & Hyun, 2017).

It was found that hedonic shopping value is an important predictor of RI. The results agree with Alfiero et al. (2017), who affirmed that serving time and the presence of tables and chairs increments de level of efficiency of the GFTs. On the other hand, the findings disagree with Sen et al. (2014) and Namin (2017), who argued that there is no relationship between hedonic shopping value and the customer's behavioral intentions because customers are willing to go under the GFT experience which includes crowding during lunch service, increasing the waiting time. The results of this study showed that the hedonic shopping value is the third factor influencing the RI to gastronomic collectives.

Perceived value is the fourth factor influencing RI to GTFs; the results agree with Alfiero et al. (2017), who affirmed that GFTs operate with a new philosophy, serving higher quality food at higher prices, and also coincide with Namin (2017), who argued the importance of perceived value as one of the most important predictors for RI (Ryu et al., 2012; Mokhtar, 2018).

In the study, it was found that the atmosphere has no relationship between RI to GTFs. Ryu et al. (2012) argued that customers do not perceive the atmosphere as a significant additional benefit, considering that many customers might be primarily driven by price instead of the physical environment. The results disagree with Weiss et al. (2008), Sen et al. (2014), and Han & Hyun (2017), who affirmed that the atmosphere or physical environment is a dimension related to the return intention.

Conclusion

This research has three key contributions. First, the study analyses a new movement of GTF offering a diversity of gourmet food and cultural cuisines. This framework may be used in other regions with similar contexts. Second, the analysis focuses on Gastronomic Collectives, which are conformed by GFTs, and normally consider street food (FAO, 2012; WHO, 1996; Ley, 2018; Priviteria & Saverio, 2015 and Rittman & Finnestad, 2011). Nevertheless, it focuses on GFTs and their mainstream audience (Ibrahim, 2011; Mokhtar et al., 2018), a segment that has been scarcely studied and contributes to the small body of knowledge about this segment (Alfiero et al., 2017). Third, the empirical results enrich the conceptual framework and provide a more extensive description of each one of the dimensions.

The aim of this research was to find out the predictors for the customer RI to GFTs located in Gastronomic Collectives. It was found that the main predictors for RI are: 1) Food quality, 2) Personnel efficiency, 3) Hedonic shopping value, and 4) Perceived value. Food quality is the most important dimension for the revisit intention. Further research must be done to continue identifying the variables of RI to GFTs.

Moving theory to practice, the practical implications obtained from this investigation, which could be taken into account by the GTFs owners, refer to the possibility of implementing some of the characteristics of the gastronomic collectives. Owners could strengthen and consolidate in one place, attending to the health risk and the negative externalities. Furthermore, vendors could implement a dining area, hire waiters and improve their food order procedure to improve efficiency (Alfiero et al., 2017) and offer a better gastronomic experience.

It was found that the hedonic shopping value and perceived value are important to this segment, they do not want to wait in a crowded area or for a long time to receive their food, as

well, they expect quality food and service. Within these findings, it should be noted that Gastronomic Collectives and its customers differ from street food because, in this case, GFTs are permanently located in the same place and no longer offer their products on the streets of the city, which reduces negative externalities highlighted by Ehrenfeucht, (2017), Ley (2018), CRCOG (2018) and Freybote et al., (2017). They also have a dining area and personnel attending to the customers at their assigned tables, which improves the hedonic shopping value.

In addition, by reducing the mobility of the vendors in the streets, they no longer interfere with the pedestrians on the sidewalks, and the image of the streets can be improved. By establishing food trucks in one place, public authorities can allocate resources to carry out actions aimed at improving the quality of health and implementing visits to supervise the hygiene of food and drinks. Furthermore, the government and association can develop training programs for cookers, waiters, and owners. In this way, the dangers posed by certain street foods can be reduced.

According to WHO (2010), another risk to public health is the lack of infrastructure and basic services. In this sense, Gastronomic Collectives have different features than GFTs; vendors have potable water, washrooms, and trash cans for all clients in this common area. These characteristics reduce the risk to public health and allow the collection of waste generated by food trucks. Finally, the gastronomic collective's vendors pay rent, allowing for the subsiding of the abovementioned services.

Furthermore, according to the definition of street food, the only types of vendors are food trucks and food stalls. Each vendor is responsible for cooking, wrapping, packing, processing, serving, and selling. In addition, they contribute to an authentic gastronomic experience and represent the local culinary culture (FAO, 2012; WHO, 1996; Ley, 2018; Priviteria & Saverio, 2015; Rittman & Finnestad, 2011). Gastronomic Collectives coincide with the characteristics of

street food because, besides being in the same common area, every GFT designs its menu and has its cookers and waiters responsible for cooking and serving their products.

The generalization of the results may be limited because Gastronomic Collectives are not full-service restaurants, although they are permanently located in one place. Vendors do not offer their products on the streets of the city. Therefore, this scheme is not equal to the common street food concept. In this sense, gastronomic collectives represent an emerging hybrid between brick-and-mortar restaurants and street food.

Further research is necessary to fulfill the gaps in the new street food movements and the factors influencing the new segment looking for quality and gourmet food in this kind of establishment (Mokhtar et al., 2018; Alfiero et al., 2017). The effect of brand awareness obtained from different sources, such as word of mouth (WOM), online information, social network information, or electronic word of mouth (E-WOM), requires further investigation.

REFERENCES

Alfiero, S., Lo Giudice, A. and Bonadonna, A. (2017). Street food and innovation: the food truck phenomenon, *British Food Journal*, Vol. 119 No. 11, pp. 2462-2476. doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-03-2017-0179

Al Mamun, M., & Turin, T. C. (2016). Safety of street foods. Food Hygiene and Toxicology in Ready-to-Eat Foods, 15–29. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-801916-0.00002-9

Anenberg, E. and Kung, E. (2015). Information technology and product variety in the city: the case of food trucks, Journal *of Urban Economics*, Vol. 90, pp. 60-78. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2645968

Baldwin, W. (2017). The transference of Asian hospitality through food: Chef's inspirations taken from Asian cuisines to capture the essence of Asian culture and hospitality. *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science*, Volume 8, Pages 7-13, ISSN 1878-450X, Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijgfs.2017.01.002.

Bandaru, R. & Venkateshwarlu, H. (2017). Customer's Perception Towards Food Truck Products in India. *Global Journal of Engineering Science and Research Management, 4*(8), 15-19.

Brown, A. & Maydeu-Olivares, A. (2011). Item Response Modeling of Forced-Choice Questionnaires. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. Vol.71(3), pp. 460–502.

CRCOG (2018). Food Trucks. Centre Region Council of Governments. State College Borough. Available at https://www.crcog.net/

Dhar, R. & Simonson, I. (2003). The Effect of Forced Choice on Choice. *Journal of Marketing Research.* Vol. 40, No. 2, pp. 146-160.

Ehrenfeucht, R. (2017). Do food trucks and pedestrians conflict on urban streets? *Journal of Urban Design*, 22:2, pages 273-290, Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/13574809.2017.1281731

Esmaeilpour, M., Sayadi A, & Mirzaei M. (2017). Investigating the Impact of Service Quality Dimensions on Reputation and Brand Trust. *International Journal of Business & Economic Sciences Applied Research*;10(3):7-17. Doi:10.25103/ijbesar.103.01

Esparza, N., Walker, E. T., & Rossman, G. (2014). Trade Associations and the Legitimation of Entrepreneurial Movements: Collective Action in the Emerging Gourmet Food Truck Industry. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 43(2_suppl), 143S-162S. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764013512723

FAO (2012). Selling street and snack foods, Diversification booklet number 18, Rome: Rural Infrastructure and Agro-Industries Division Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Freybote, J., Fang, Y. & Gebhardt, M. (2017). The impact of temporary uses on property prices: the example of food trucks, *Journal of Property Research*, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/09599916.2017.1288163

Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. & Tatham, R.L. (2006) *Multivariate Data Analysis,* 6th Edition, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Han, H. (2013). Effects of in-flight ambience and space/function on air travelers' decision to select a low-cost airline. *Tourism Management*, 37, pp. 125–135.

Han, H., & Hyun, S. (2017). Impact of hotel-restaurant image and quality of physical-environment, service, and food on satisfaction and intention. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* Volume 63, Pages 82-92.

Han, H., Back, K., & Barrett, B. (2009). Influencing factors on restaurant customers' revisit intention: The roles of emotions and switching barriers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management,* 28, 563–572.

Hutchinson, J., Lai, F. & Wang, Y. (2009). Understanding the relationships of quality, value, equity, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions among golf travelers. *Tourism Management*, 30 (2) (2009), pp. 298–308.

Ibrahim, N. (2011). The Food Truck Phenomenon: A Successful Blend of PR and Social Media. (Master of Arts Strategic Public Relations), University of Southern California.

Isoni, A. L., Cortez, G. V., Dos Santos, L. E., Stedefeldt, E., Costa, A., Yoshio, E., & Puppin, R. (2019). Brazilian Food Truck Consumers' Profile, Choices, Preferences, and Food Safety Importance Perception. *Nutrients*, 11(5), 1175. doi:10.3390/nu11051175

Lavrakas, P. J. (2008). Encyclopedia of survey research methods: SAGE Publications.

Ley, A. (2018). Zoning for Food Trucks. NYPF Conference - April 24, 2018. AKRF, Inc. Ltd. Doi: 10.4135/9781412963947

Menga, B. & Hanb, H. (2018). Working-holiday tourism attributes and satisfaction in forming word-of-mouth and revisit intentions: Impact of quantity and quality of intergroup contact. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management.*

Mokhtar, R., Othman, Z. & Ariffin, H.F. (2018). Brand Equity and Revisit Intention towards Food Truck Business. *International Journal of Engineering & Technology*, 7 (2), 241-245.

Mokhtar, R., Othman, Z., Arsat, A. & Bakhtiar, M.F.S. (2017). Brand equity and customer behavioral intention: A case of food truck business. *Journal of Tourism, Hospitality & Culinary Arts*, 9(2), 561-570.

~~Namin, A., (2017). Revisiting customers' perception of service quality in fast food restaurants. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* Volume 34, Pages 70-81. Doi: 10.1016/j.jretconser.2…016.09.008~~

Nunnally, J. (1978*). Psychometric Theory*. New York, Mc Graw Hill.

Pham, L. T. M., Do, H. N. & Phung, T. M. (2016). The Effect of Brand Equity and Perceived Value On Customer Revisit Intention: A Study in Quick-Service Restaurants in Vietnam. *Acta Oeconomica Pragensia*, 24(5), 14 - 30. Doi: 10.18267/j.aop.555

Priviteria, D. & Saverio, F. (2015). Globalization vs. Local. The Role of Street Food in the Urban Food System. *Procedia Economics and Finance,* Volume 22, Pages 716-722. Doi: 10.1016/s2212-5671(15)00292-0

Rea, L. & Parker, R. (1991). *Survey Research: A practical guide*. Collegiate Publication Service. San Diego.

Rittman, A. & Finnestad, T., (2011). Street food: bringing ethnic to the mainstream: from street food vendors to market cooks, foods are inspired by Latin America, Asia and a multitude of other cuisines and influences. (culinary creations). *Prep. Foods* 180 (9), 61.

Rivolli, A., Parker, L. & De Carvalho, A. (2018). Food Truck Recommendation Using Multi-Label Classification. *Progress in Artificial Intelligence: 18th EPIA Conference on Artificial Intelligence, EPIA,* Proceedings (pp.585-596).

Ryu, K., Lee, H. & Kim, W. (2012). The influence of the quality of the physical environment, food, and service on restaurant image, customer perceived value, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intentions, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 24 Issue: 2, pp.200-223.

Sen, S., Savitskie, K., Ranganathan, S. & Brooks, J. R. R. (2014). Summary Brief Food Truck Marketing: Factors that Impact Value Creation. *Marketing Advances Proceedings,* 56 -57.

Shin, Y., Kim, H. & Severt, K. (2018). Antecedents of consumers' intention to visit food trucks, *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 21:3, 239-256. Doi:10.1080/15378020.2017.1368810

Suhaily, M., Farha, A. & Nor, A. (2019). The Influence of Utilitarian and Hedonic Value on Food Truck Patrons' Behaviour. Maric, *1st multidisciplinary academic research international conference*. Selangor, Malaysia, pp. 108-1 to 108-9.

Tanford, S. & Jung, S. (2017). Festival attributes and perceptions: A meta-analysis of relationships with satisfaction and loyalty. *Tourism Management*, 61, pp. 209–220. Doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2017.02.005

Von Bargen, H. (2016). *Street Foods*. The Culinary Institute of America. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey.

Weiss, R., Feinstein, A. & Dalbor, M. (2008). Customer Satisfaction of Theme Restaurant Attributes and Their Influence on Return Intent, *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 7:1, 23-41. Doi: 10.1300/J369v07n01_03

Wessel, G. (2012). From Place to Non Place: A Case Study of Social Media and Contemporary Food Trucks. *Journal of Urban Design*, 17(4), 511-531. Doi:10.1080/13574809.2012.706362

WHO (2010). Basic steps to improve safety of street-vended food. Geneva International Food Safety Authorities Network (INFOSAN) World Health Organization.

Yan, X., Wang, J. & Chau, M. (2015). Customer revisit intention to restaurants: Evidence from online reviews. *Inf Syst Front* no.17: 645–657.

Yoon, B. & Chung, Y. (2017). Consumer Attitude and Visit Intention toward Food Trucks: Targeting Millennials. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*. Volume 21, Issue 2. Pages 187-199