Business & Social Science
IJRBS

Research in Business & Social Science

IJRBS VOL 10 NO 2 ISSN: 2147-4478

Available online at www.ssbfn.net
Journal homepage: <https://www.ssbfn.net/ojs/index.php/ijrbs>

Commensality and responsive food consumption behavior in community based canteen: An ethnography study

Dilayehu Desta Gebreyohannes

School of Management, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, No.1037, Luoyu Road, Wuhan City, P.R. China

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 17 February 2021

Received in rev. form 28 Feb. 2021

Accepted 05 March 2021

Keywords:

Commensality; Food Consumption;
Behavior; Community Canteen

JEL Classification:

G21, G23, O31

ABSTRACT

The present study aims to recognize the commensality phenomena and the role of empathy in emerging ethical food consumption behaviour at a social level. The study applied qualitative research using an ethnographic method to construct situational and emotional factors of commensality as food consumption behavior in the social meal context. Finding demonstrates that social context influence eating behavior of individual through empathy. It explores a segmented social practice concerning a different viewpoint of food consumption and preference. It is a more theoretical contribution to the sociology of food as a social practice. Additionally, we define responsive eating behavior in conjunction with belief matching.

© 2021 by the authors. Licensee SSBFNET, Istanbul, Turkey. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Introduction

Food has a social symbolic meaning and identity; it brings value to the culture. It has a role in a business deal, discussion, and information exchange in some societies and has considerable spiritual benefits. Food choices and eating habits are now envisioning related to the phenomenon of hospitality and social binding, the construction of communal identities beneath which lie logics of social peculiarity and the institution of life in society (Ma, 2015). The practical approach to food consumption spotlights social action dynamics, particularly on how practices change, the sequential and contextual formation of social activities, and the strain involving habit and reflexivity (Warde, 2014).

This research might identify circumstances that enhance the ethical tendency of consequentiality. For instance, could convivial commensality and empathy tendencies toward ethical consumption behaviour? Empathy meditation shows to reduce the hedonic consumption of foods (Alberts et al., 2012) and decrease rigid thinking patterns (Greenberg et al., 2012). Food sociology studies struggle with a permanent paradox on the topic of consistency and behavioural transition. Modifying food consumption habits and practice within society seems reluctant. Indeed, as the failure of responsible diets suggests, get it difficult even if they unambiguously want to change. Yet, noticeably, changes in what is available and eaten occur frequently and rapidly over time. The rate of change in the manners of eating and the best way to explain them has occasioned vibrant sociological debate and controversy. It gives the impression that every generation assumes that the rate of change is rapid and often that it is speeding up a tendency more often condemned than welcomed. Because revolutionizing is more likely to trigger fear, it is a subject of particular concern (Warde, 2015).

The food we consume, for the majority, is driven by hedonic that have overwhelming consequences, particularly for our relation alert to changing our knowledge of food consumption and filter into the mainstream. Along with these non-sensory qualities, social health benefits are still considered to play a critical role in consumer choices for organic food (Hansen, et al., 2018). Widespread consumption of meat and alcohol comprises an excessive ecological footprint. Furthermore, it is not suitable for our health, mentally, physically, spiritually, and emotionally (Rana & Paul, 2017).

The study navigates the relevant research gap, and drowning theories concerning the relationship between commensality, responsible food consumption behaviour, the role of empathy. The study presents what already know about commensality factors on responsible

* Corresponding author. ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1849-9412

consumption behaviour and empathy part. The research gap gives the road map to justify how responsible food consumption behaviour addresses various contexts and the involvement of different food practices in the group concerning responsible consumption.

The paper draws on the ideas of the work of cultural symbols and social practices. It explores the situational and emotional concerns of the commensality of having an impact on responsible eating behaviour. Thereby, we endeavour to drown the emotional and situational factors that link with other consumption-related responses.

Literature Review

Theoretical Background

Ethnological Approaches in Theory

Ethnologists apply a bricolage approach to theory that draws on theoretical perspectives from many disciplines (Yee, 2010). Ethnology uses theory as a tool or a frame applied to the data to narrow it, direct it, and find patterns. As the method informs the way of thinking, doing, engaging, and interpreting data. As O'Dell & Willim (2011) write, ethnography as both method and writing is not linear. Instead, it is composed of multiple interactions with the field, data, and analysis. This process of continually going back and forth between data and analysis, method and theory, makes theory concrete action and practice. In this way, to theorize is to look at the world through concepts that frame the world into something we can look at as the context.

This study uses an emergent cultural analytical approach to the study of responsible consumption communities. The cultural analysis treats the mundane, overlooked, and often taken-for-granted parts of everyday life as starting points for understanding more significant social phenomena (Ehn, Löfgren, & Wilk, 2016). Regular habits and routines embody and implicit the shared knowledge that "makes society work" but is "seldom reflected upon by the unconscious mind" (Ehn, Löfgren, & Wilk, 2016, p. 6).

Eating is something that everyone, in every society, must do. Apart from the festivals and holidays and ceremonial eating, the eating and feeding we do throughout our everyday lives can be such a mundane activity that it hides the normalization processes that determine how, when, what, and with whom we eat (Ruiz & Gerhardt, 2019). This study looks at everyday eating and commensality that is disrupted due to responsible behaviour or dietary restriction, such as the gluten-free diet.

Social Psychology Theories

According to Ruiz & Gerhardt (2019), societies endeavour to foster well-being by more social cohesion and better incorporation of members in the community; thus, it is significant to study customs to achieving better interpersonal relationships. According to Dovidio, John, Jane, David, and Louis (2006), prosocial behaviour is influenced by biological, psychological, environmental, and social factors. "Prosocial behaviour is voluntary behaviour intended to benefit another. Thus, it includes helping, sharing, or providing comfort to another (Baumeister & Vohs, 2007p.1). Besides, Baumeister & Vohs (2007) argue that prosocial behaviour is essential for the quality of close relationships and interactions with other individuals and groups. People in groups help each other more in times of need or distress, and societies need people to have a healthy and peaceful society successfully.

The study would explain three social psychology theories; the need-to-belong theory, the self-categorization theory, and the sociometer theory. These theories would discuss with research about situational factors that affect the likelihood of prosocial behaviour and how societies could increase these probabilities.

Three psychology theories examine the situational factors that affect the likelihood that people will engage in prosocial behaviour. According to Fiske (2012), these theories link with social core motives: these need-to-belong theories are related to the social need to belong and reflect why people want to be part of groups. Secondly, the self-categorization theory is related to the social motive of understanding people's motivation for sharing social accounts. Thirdly, a sociometer theory is associated with the social basis of self-enhancing where people assert themselves.

Research and Methodology

This study was used in the qualitative research design that explores other forms of interpretive analysis. In this way, to theorize is to look at the world through concepts that frame the world into something we can look at as the context. Interpretive or inductive methods, such as observation research and ethnography, employ multiple methodologies to arrive at a theoretically comprehensive understanding of a group or culture. The issue for the observer is how the particulars in a given situation are interrelated. In other words, ethnography attempts to explain the web of the interdependence of group behaviours and interactions (Berger and Luekmann, 1967). Compared to the positivist approach, where the research strategy continues with theoretical postulates. It aims to extract the factors of the phenomena of concern from the data observed (Lincoln and Guba's, 1985).

An ethnography study was conducted explaining the relationship between situational and emotional factors of commensality towards food consumption behaviour at social meal place. Direct observation was employed to determine interactions, facilitation, and contextual situation during eating together. A field note provides the faultless environment to test the observations that being in a personal influence and then environmentally conscious surrounding can educe consumption behaviour. Observations have been taken

the whole phenomena going on surroundings in communal eating place by the specific group of people. Furthermore, food consumption behaviour among the group and habitual action involves deciding how to choose food items, food intake, and food disposal mechanism for exploring and understanding the sense of individuals or groups ascribe to a social.

Observation

The study was employed the observation method to collect data from a group within the canteen, how people conscious in the food consumption process that means including entrance action to the process, their feeding activities, and food waste disposal bin during dinner hours across weeks. The mealtimes were selected and consisted of dinner meals ($n = 25$). The researcher observed twenty-one groups, and four observations were made independently by others to compare and validate the collected data. The final data consisted of 20 hours of observation, and hand-written field notes and memos were collected daily over 21 days. Field notes included details of what was seen, what participants have been doing, what has been behaving, and details of mealtimes' structure. The study coded observed behaviours live during mealtime sessions and used video recorders to ensure interactions' accuracy. The whole coding referred with the two research team obtained observational measures of field note eating activities. An overview of each observation coding interpreter reliability is presented.

We used the Computer-Aided Qualitative Data Analysis ATLAS.ti 7 and Tabealu 10.4.3 data visualization software. ATLAS.ti has received high praise from qualitative researchers for its utility in managing and coding data in both text and audiovisual formats (Lewis, 2004). Thus it served as a valuable platform to deal with all the data formats generated throughout this project in a single easy-to-use interface. With allusion to the Greek mythological hero, ATLAS.ti is designed to allow researchers to explore and make sense of extensive data collections to map the world by archiving meaningful documents (Méndez, 2016). The following qualitative coding schema adopted from Neuman (2011) guided my basic process of coding the data after it had been appropriately formatted and loaded into ATLAS.ti: 1. Open coding: explore the data to condense into analytic categories or codes.

Ethical Issues and Confidentiality

In this study, ethical issues were given priority, especially those based on the researched society's culture, the research itself, the research context, the method involved in data gathering, and the type of data to be collected. Participants were given room to agree to participate in a study or to reject. In this study, ethical issues such as informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality have been reflected. I was prepared with an information sheet explaining the study. After observation, the participants had the right to reject my data for the study or give consent.

Furthermore, the filed notes were dismissed in front of them while they were not happy and unwilling to use the data. The consent was explained about the researcher's background, study intentions, benefits of the study, the participants' role, and the participants' Confidentiality and data to be collected. Participants' names were not being taken; instead, I used special codes to keep participants' secrets. It is unethical to expose the terms of the research participants (Dudovski, 2013). The university's ethics committee has approved this research.

Data Analysis and Results

For the study, a group was held with 145 people who eat two or more than themed canteen in Huazhong University of Science and Technology to achieve the intended objective. A filed note and short videos were used to record data about the groups' perception concerning eating together and how individuals actively engage in eating together in the canteen. The group was a research technique that collects data through group interactions when discussing special events occurring and some behaviour among the group. As a technique, it occupies an independent position between participant observation and in-depth interpretation.

We consulted with the researcher team present in the same project to modify coding results to familiarise each service's daily activities and how eating occasions occurred within the context of other activities. It can also be defined as a resource for recognizing the mechanism of constructing human groups' perceptions, behaviours, and social representations (Lange, 2002).

Following the group, transcripts of the feedback collected, and with Atlas.ti software (Muhr, 1991), the content analysis Bardin & Weinreb (2009) categorization was conducted to classify hospitality-related categories and respondents' impressions of the locations surveyed. Atlas.ti program is a practical resource for creating all content analysis phases (Bardin & Weinreb, 2009). To promote the researcher's work and lead to forming relationships that culminate in the treatment and inference of data.

Table 1: Observation Group Demography Characteristics

Observed group	Gender		Duration
	Male	Female	
Group 1	6		1h
Group 2	5	2	50 min
Group 3	2	3	46 min
Group 4	8		1h:15min
Group 5	4	1	45 min
Group 6	5		35 min
Group 7	3		30 min
Group 8	6	2	1h
Group 9	2	4	1h
Group 10	2	2	40 min
Group 11	3	1	45 min
Group 12	7		55 min
Group 13	5	1	48 min
Group 14	3	3	52 min
Group 15	5	3	1h:30 min
Group 16	6		49 min
Group 17	4		40 min
Group 18	3	4	50 min
Group 19	5		38 min
Group 20	6	3	45 min
Group 21	4	4	1h
Group 22	4		42 min
Group 23	2	3	50 min
Group 24	6		48 min
Group 25	3		39 min
Total	109	36	20h:87 min

After analyzing the observed data, identified a single emergent theme as eating together at one table. This emergent theme was constructed from three thematic categories: Social interaction, food environment, and social facilitation.

Social Interaction

The significant and enduring impact that eating together may have on eating behaviours by researching the neurobiological processes involved in group food preference. Sensory triggers linked to social interactions, in particular, profoundly change the neuronal associations of the food option networks, demonstrating the social transmission of food preference (Gordon, Lent, & Merlo, 2020). Moreover, social ties in the perception of sensory input and the capacity to respond to the environment. Although food and the process of eating may have numerous non-biological connections and interpretations, this is no more apparent than in the typical social contact interactions of daily life (Velasco, Nijholt, & Karunanayaka, 2018).

Table 2: Results of Data Analysis and Interpretive Coding Technique.

Emergent Theme	Thematic Categories	Focused Codes	Initial Codes
	Social interaction	Attraction, consciousness, self-control, need to selective eating, wisdom, interpersonal attraction, relaxation self-regulation, carefulness, happiness, relaxation	Attraction, consciousness, self-control, need to selective eating, wisdom, interpersonal attraction, relaxation, anxiety, unconsciousness, disengagement, self-regulation, carefulness, happiness, relaxation, losing attention
Eating together at one table	Food environment	experience, encourage others to eat, food choice utensil competency	Interaction, influence, collaboration, common interest, open to new experience, encourage others to eat, food choice
	Social facilitation	food familiarity, Social order, norms, facilitation, communal behaviour, sharing	Social order, norms, facilitation, communal behaviour, sharing, task seeking, inconvenience, pleasure, cooking activity, commenting on the food, interest variation, food familiarity, information seeking, test seeking

Food is a way of communicating friendship, of smoothing social contact, of displaying interest. It is often ridden with class symbolism and manipulated to show social rank disparities, implicitly or overtly. There may almost be a diet that says that two or three individuals gather together and only encourage food and drink.

2:2 [Some people follow the group diet and eat comfortably, but many do not taste the same foods. Besides, most people tend to run out of food over and over again....], (7:7) (Super) 1:17 [one of the group members finish early from others and waiting for them until they finish...] (6:6) (Super),

Food consumption changes in social partnerships are also reflected symbolically by exhibits, exchanges, and food intake. To encourage social interactions and ingratiate themselves, individuals can mimic how others around them behave (Robinson, Blissett, & Higgs, 2013). Individuals are granted a beneficial environmental effect, whether reflected in inter-personal relationships and friendship connections (Dabbaghian, Mago, Fritz, & Alimadad, 2012).

7: 6:10 [The diners brought their food and waited for everyone to take their place. They all sat down and tasted their food, and some of them tasted the food of others. Their food choices were often varied, but they tended to taste and bring one another if desired. The diners mixed the food to be cooked together, and everyone tended to participate and suggest the process. On the other hand, one of them talked about the food, while the others were eager to taste it. Eating calmly and carefully, while most people do not seem to be satisfied, they seem to have been consumed by the person who described it...] (Super)

(10:10), 6:10 [They are often friends who eat together, and their behaviour, attitudes, and interests can be seen in the fact that the members of the group use the food they know when they are hungry, and the others tend to choose to eat the next meal.] (6:6) (Super)

Social meaning is impacted by eating through various processes, including issues of identification signalling and self-presentation. Social influences may have a particular impact on a diet because adaptive activity follows others' actions. Social expectations warn people of habits that are likely to be ideal ('if someone else does it, I can certainly be'). Driven by the awareness of the plausible underlying processes, we address how societal expectations may be used to support healthy (Robinson, Blissett, & Higgs, 2013). In considering food consumption initiatives to improve community eating habits, social contextual characteristics are central to food choice behaviours and should draw exposure to these (Delormier, Frohlich, & Potvin, 2009).

1:18 [They laughed and talked about the situation when they found something special in the middle of the chopstick. Meanwhile, one of the diners took a long piece of meat to the plate, and another friend grabbed the other piece of meat and split it in two. Then one of the diners tried to eat by mentioning their own bread crumbs. The other friends laughed and commented.] (6:6) (Super), 4:12 [Identifying something's from f...] (5:5) (Super)

The social background significantly affects eating behaviour. We're consuming when we are around other friends, and it's different due to when we feed alone. Often, our food choices seem to overlap with those of our near social ties. One explanation for this is that it is adaptive to conform to others' actions, and we find it satisfying (Higgs & Thomas, 2016).

5:16 [watching the cylinders to conc...] (16:16) (Super), 4:9 [invite to set with them] (5:5) (Super)

Social interaction is complex to understand how to have fuel, prepare, and feed. In its various aspects, the sharedness and conventionality of repetitive and reflexive ways of carrying out food tasks rely on social interaction (Halkier, 2020). The social interaction theme included communication aspects like attraction verse anxiety differentials, identification with the consumption and principles, eating setting from satisfactory to overconsumption, relationships to partners, and receiving recognition for eating together. In ATLAS.ti, fifteen categories, 18 Codes, and 35 Quotations found for query present this theme.

Food Environment

The food environment limits and signals what to eat for consumers; this requires the availability, affordability, and convenience of different foods. The food environment is often influenced by the group members' impact and facilities around food providing system (Herforth & Ahmed, 2015). Food environments probably lead to a rise in healthier eating and person variables, including experience, expertise, and inspiration (Story, Robinson, & Glanz, 2008). Although the supply and proximity to food sources affect safe eating habits, these aspects can be overshadowed by other non-physical environmental influences, such as food restrictions and socio-cultural preferences (Belon, Nieuwendyk, Vallianatos, & Nykiforuk, 2016).

1:8 [The facial expression tells us... they are reading from social media...] (6:6) (Super), 1:7 [Most of them bring the same types of meal and the same amount of various foods ...] (6:6) (Super)

Consumers may adjust their food utensils preferences to influence their diets and minimize food consumption should use a shallow chopstick tray (Kuo & Lin, 2019). The perceived customer activeness was favourably linked to psychological well-being. Green food intake often mediated the connection between perceived market activeness and psychological well-being. Besides, social confidence has moderated the association between perceived green food use (Wang, Nguyen, & Bu, 2020). Intimate interactions and a new speed of life; affect the eating behaviour of residents in a communal way (Sandín Vázquez, Rivera, Conde, Gutiérrez, Díez, Gittelsohn, & Franco, 2019). Pre-exposure to palatable food indices dramatically improved food intake by the limited eater, but not by unregulated eaters. The thought cue had a significant effect on food consumption and negligible impact on the subjective ranking of the urge to feed (Fedoroff, Polivy, & Herman, 1997).

4:12 [Identifying something's from food part that they do not need it...] (5:5) (Super), 5:15 [most of them close-knit, other. talking at the same time, watching others eat and starting to eat after a while...] (16:16) (Super), 5:16 [managing the cylinders to concentrate on the warm-up workout...] (16:16) (Super)

Group members and the food climate are significant factors in dietary consumption. Consumers' preferences are also Social eating guidelines that can often offer reinforcement for healthier food decisions as colleagues swap suggestions or motivation, make choices on when to dine for lunch, and carry treats or potluck meals to share (Larson & Story, 2009). A significant interaction between table setting and food position in hedonic food presence was a willingness to eat the served food and the amount consumed (García-Segovia, Harrington, & Seo, 2015). The plate's colour has a significant impact on people's views of the food, but this impact differed based on the dessert served. The results cannot be described purely in colour comparison (Piqueras-Fiszman, Giboreau, & Spence, 2013).

1:11 [Their setting is not relaxed instead they bent their neck into the dish...] (6:6) (Super), 1:12 [they are very near to the dish sometimes take the meal by their moth from the dish...] (6:6) (Super), 1:16 [They eat very speedy] (6:6) (Super), 1:18 [They talk each other in very body close manner...] (6:6) (Super)

Those who eat socially are more likely to be happy and happier with life, are more confident with others, are more involved in their local groups, and have more people to count on for help (Dunbar, 2017).

2:5 [In the same way, they are free to eat, laugh, and have fun...] (8:8) (Super), 6:3 [I understand that there is a need to see and ask about whom chooses what...] (5:5) (Super), 6:5 [so they decide what kind of food to eat for themselves...] (5:5) (Super)

Environmental factors that unwaveringly relate to how food is provided or presented as its salinity, structure, size of the dish, the dish's design, the lighting, the range of involvement of others, and how it is served. It can increase food consumption much more than people can realize (Wansink, 2004). It has been well-founded that other people's involvement affects not just what is consumed but also how much they eat. Eating with familiar faces may contribute to a long lunch. In some other cases, merely watching another person's eating habits, such as a role model, relative, acquaintance, or even stranger, will offer a level of intake and often affect how often the observer consumes.

Distractions such as reading or watching television may increase consumption by initiating, obscuring, and expanding consumption (Dunbar, 2017). Distractions can trigger script-based habits of food intake that are not related to hunger, cover one's ability to control consumption, and prolong a meal's length.

Social Facilitation

The relationship between the presence of other people and the size of the food may be artificial. A positive correlation might result from the co-variation of the third factor, the time of day. Breakfast is the smallest meal of the day and may have been eaten with the least number of other people present, while dinner is the largest meal and may have the greatest number of other people present (Marriott, 2019 p.26). People just wished to socialize together; there would be no need for additional food. Social eating appears to

include extra food, suggesting that indulging in other foods and making a feast is an integral part of social eating. We eat together because we want to socialize, but part of the explanation that we want to socialize is to eat more (Herman, 2017).

Food tastes healthier, and customers consume more of it when they eat with the business than they eat individually. While a variety of theories have been suggested for this social facilitation of feeding, they share the simple belief that this effect is accomplished through the presence of co-eating others (Nakata & Kawai, 2017).

7:3 [some of them tasted the food of others...] (10:10) (Super), 7:2 [They all sat down and tasted t...] (10:10) (Super), 8:1 [After serving the food to the joint cylinder, they helped each other to clean the cylinder, heating the food, and picking it up in their own bowls. Then, one by one, they all began to pick up their plates, holding them in their hands. Talking about eating, they were all eating and having a lively discussion...] (6:9) (Super)

People tend to consume better when they eat with mates than when they eat alone (Ruddock, Brunstrom, Vartanian, & Higgs, 2019). Social facilitation of consuming typical food could be used to synchronize eating behaviours inside communities. Previous research findings found that participants absorbed more overall food calories and raised the size of their meals when advised to eat with other people than to eat alone. When participants were told to eat, as usual, they ingested extra meals when they ate with others than when they were alone. These findings indicate that other people's involvement is also a source of enhanced consumption (Galloway, Addressi, Fragaszy, & Visalberghi, 2005).

Women typically have more facilitation roles for friends than men do. Eating plays a crucial position in many social practices. There is enough evidence to show that the social environment has a pervasive and influential effect on what people consume (Collins, Thomas, Robinson, Aveyard, Jebb, Herman, & Higgs, 2019). People often choose to adjust their food choices to others, and that people tend to conform their food choices to others. Diners in the restaurant were more inclined to make healthier decisions when the information was given on the healthy options of other eateries in the restaurant (Collins, Thomas, Robinson, Aveyard, Jebb, Herman, & Higgs, 2019)

6:8 [They have the same characteristics when choosing and eating food...] (6:6) (Super), 6:9 [I have seen, the women are the urge to bring others around the table to encourage others to eat...] (6:6) (Super), 6:10 [encourage others to eat] (6:6) (Super), 6:11 [their role in asking for] (6:6) (Super), 6:12 [commenting on the food] (6:6) (Super)

Social norms play a role in shaping young people's food intake, and the influence of norms seemed to be limited to the types of food typically consumed in the presence of peers (Stok, de Vet, de Ridder, & de Wit, 2016). Individuals adapt their diet directly to their feeding companions; they consume more as others eat more and fewer when others suppress their intake. This modelling phenomenon's possible reason is that both food intake companions are synchronized through behavioural mimicry processes (Hermans, Lichtwarck, Bevelander, Herman, Larsen, Engels, 2012). Social expectation advertisements stressing that most customers consume vegetables in their meals in a restaurant have been correlated with a rise in the proportion of food consumed with vegetables (Thomas, Ursell, Robinson, Aveyard, Jebb, Herman, & Higgs, 2017).

1:19 [After they were completed their eating all individual returns their dish to the place where the waste collected...] (6:6) (Super), 6:12 [commenting on the food] (6:6) (Super), 8:1 [After serving the food to after seeing each other and eating happily, they shared their food and returned to the delivery area to finish their meal. ...] (6:9) (Super)

The results are relevant for understanding how social impacts on eating activity are engaging with the feeding area—eating in a social setting interaction between the sex makeup of the party and the group of the eater.

Social Food Identity

Food serves as a medium for the expression of society and a symbolic cultural artefact. It does not suggest that food and culture are stagnant, as demonstrated by globalization's recent phenomenal, which has expanded human contact and overlapping of cuisines. Therefore, the conditions we eat enable us to communicate and 'forge alliances' with others. Food is nearly often shared; people eat together; dinners are occasions where the entire family or village falls together. Food is an ability to give the expression of altruism.' This influential act of food exchange, which can include essential daily foods and extravagant ceremonial foods, is also fundamentally layered with significance for cultures worldwide (Fox, 2014, p. 2.). The sharing of food, activities, and entertainment with other society members was essential in collective identity performance (Campbell, 2017.P. 49-100.).

Food interaction has created at least two types that have defined identity: one that is distinguished by the stigma of the past, and the other by ideals that, above all, suggest the answer to stigma; the response to stigma is related to work that also sustains the dignity of the family, the consumption of food/goods famous in the city, participation in broader society, and loyalty to the group (Ruiz & Gerhardt, 2019). Food choices made by citizens, either as individuals or as a group, expose beliefs, passions, context experience, assumptions, and personalities. Food preferences tell communities, relocation, assimilation, opposition, transition over time, and personal and community identification. The appropriate usage of food and activities linked to civilized dietary practices, often known as etiquette or labels, indicates group membership (Almerico, 2014).

Figure 1: Visualizing Network Diagram Semantic Relationship of Eating Together in ATLAS.Ti

Food choices derive not only from a person's eating patterns but often embody personal beliefs and consumer knowledge. Food identity reaches outside the food sphere: the food left side has a strong interest in socio-environmental concerns. The food right-wing has a higher interest in a massive shopping centre and economically conservative issues. In comparison, the social encounters between left-wing and right-wing food factions indicate divided systems, suggesting distinct knowledge intake trends (Sasahara, 2019). Food and cooking could bring social harmony and build social representations that relate to those communities or cultures, and, to a certain degree, create new groups and cultures within society. The love for food and cooking builds a modern social identity (Ranteallo & Andilolo, 2016).

5:16 [watching the cylinders to concentrate on the warm-up workout...] (16:16) (Super), 5:21 [it works to encourage someone who doesn't eat well...] (17:17) (Super), 6:8 [They have the same characteristics when choosing and eating food...] (6:6) (Super), 5:18 [there are fewer eating patterns at the same time...] (16:16) (Super)

Social identity may shape the perception of food satisfaction, exposing a novel mechanism through which social recognition can impact food choices (Hackel, Coppin, Wohl, & Van, 2018). Tracing behaviour networks offer us the ability to understand communities' development through their culinary limits, acts, and routines. The Incarnation and Agent of Social Identification are conveyed utilizing a meal, expressed in the daily objects of table etiquette, ingredients variations, and actions, sharing participation by activities (Hastorf, 2016. P.272.).

Eating Together at One table

Collaborative food consumption in everyday life is a universal human being practice, but unpredictably little evolutionary focus has been drawn to it, both social and individual advantages. People who eat socially are more likely to be happy and more pleased with life, are more optimistic with others, are more involved with their local groups, and have more friends to count on for help. Evening meals that help respondents feel closer to them for whom they feed, there are more individuals, more fun and reminiscence, as well as alcohol. Path research shows that the causal path is from eating together to bonding rather than the other way around (Dunbar, 2017). I propose that social eating may have developed as a method to promote social bonding.

To evaluate Atlas Ti programs' co-occurrence table(Appendix –I), we consider the meaning of the relationship between the categories: The more remarkable and closer to 1, the better the relationship between the classes is viewed. The more critical food environment and social facilitation are the types of influence the other tends to choose (0.67). It can be seen in the field note as "There are mostly friends who eat together, and their behaviour, behaviors, and desires can be seen in the way that the members of the party use the food they recognize when they are hungry, and the others choose to prefer to eat the next meal." Moretti, Budowle, & Bucketon (2015). The author notes that an encounter between influence and tends to choice occurs in eating together context.

Following the relationship between empathy and concussions (0.33), happiness and Food Choice (0.33), interpersonal attraction with food choice and happiness (0.33), pleasure and empathy (0.33), and the other tends to choose with attraction (0.33). When examining the ties between the key reasons for commensality (Table 2), collaboration-related anxiety due to social interaction (c-coefficient 0.1), and attraction (c-coefficient 0.13). Respectively, the consciousness had a high anxiety relation (c-coefficient 0.25) which was also illustrated by a general concern regarding the collaboration and food environment. Cooking activities related to simplifying the

complexities and difficulties of consuming food and preferring a need-based diet group often suggested that they encourage their food intake. Still, their relatives were trying to govern the food intake. However, this not explain as a challenge rather than a remark. Thus, there is a link between encourage others to eat and cooking activities (c-coefficient 0.25). It was the same as in social facilitation-based diets, where the connection between facilitation and consciousness was the highest (c-coefficient 0.25). Again, social interaction sometimes replied that they would increase their food environment, but found it difficult because of the resistance in disentanglement and anxiety. However, it is good to recognize that the group's overall influence and attraction were ranked high (0.25). Therefore the connection seems to be higher than it might be food consumption practices. Interactions better mitigating the anxieties correlated with discrepancies. This argument is profoundly relevant to the day-to-day functions of food-sharing programs. My goal is to explain how to examine the content, ritual, and social contexts in which food is cooked and eaten (Wise, 2011). The size and form of the tables used for commensal feeding are directly important to the structure and manner of relationships between the participants in the meal and the circumstances. The actual room delimited by the shape of the table is a social area. The structure of the participants surrounding it both represents and influences the interaction between them. It even positions them in a corporate system (Fischler, 2011).

The relationship of pleasure with anxiety (0.25), pleasure with facilitation (0.25), the need for selective eating with facilitation and food choice (0.2), and information-seeking with concussions (0.17), facilitating with compassion, and the need for selective eating with influence (0.17), information-seeking with facilitation and encouraging others to eat with collaboration (0.13), a standard of empathic and information (0.13). (0.2). Eating Together discusses the various ways in which social ties can be reconciled, binds us to power systems and each other, and not only enables but also encourages mutual awareness (Ferguson, 2015). The cultural change in humanities and social sciences aimed to demonstrate how food affects personal and group culture in intensifying media contact, globalization, and aestheticization. We have learned a lot from this about the effects of global popular culture, migration, and other modes of movement and the public ratification and promotion of national cuisines (Warde, 2015). The features of both extraordinary and daily commensality emphasizing the importance of three key dimensions: first, eating together is perceived to be an engaging task, an act of contact between participants; second, as Giacomani (2016) has already pointed out, shared meals have a normative component, 'the staging of norms by diners and the supervision of eateries. The commensality includes a symbolic element, encompassing various concepts attributed to eating together in diverse cultures (Marovelli, 2019).

Situational Factors

Through direct observation, the study found that eating together within one table facilitates social ties, which are especially important for regulatory actions of food sharing and as a marker of social belonging and intimacy. They were also an essential part of the social food community, used to encourage social interaction and to symbolize the novelty of eating and group identity.

Eating activity is highly affected by the social context. Our food choices often appear to converge with those of our close social links. One explanation for this is that conforming to others' actions is adaptive, and we find it satisfying. Acceptable eating practices are dictated by other individuals' actions and shared societal expectations and environmental recommendations. We are more inclined to obey the food standard if considered influential based on a social contract. The related standards are set by the likes of others and others for which we identify. If the norm is essential, so the actions can be aligned to the model. However, this may depend on other considerations, such as how much importance is given to the norm, how worried we are with societal recognition, and the existence of different conflicting standards, such as personal norms and market stereotypes. Standard matching includes mechanisms such as coordination of eating behavior, control of intake, and changing food tastes. There is emerging research that social eating standards may play a role in creating and sustaining social eating.

Figure 2: Thematic Maps of Communal Food Consumption Influences.

Emotional and Psychological Factors

Eating together uses food as a coping strategy to cope with emotions such as fatigue, boredom or anxiety, or to prolong feelings of pleasure. While this can aid in the short term, eating to others soothe and relieve our emotions also contributes to remorse and shame,

which can also raise unpleasant feelings. We are not dealing with the tension crisis. Furthermore, our self-image can suffer when we are out of the social norms or encounter other undesired consequences on our well-being. Eating in reaction to depressive feelings in comparison to rage, anxiety, and dissatisfaction link has been identified between anger management abilities and emotional

The Proposed Framework of Responsive Eating Behavior in a Communal Food Place

social identity strengthens their enforce desires on others; this segment would demonstrate how individuals have used food traditions to negotiate their place in culture and how those actions have contributed to improvements in food practices in the early modern century (Campbell, 2017.P. 101-134.). Food can assess participation. Anyone who modifies diet depending on a metaphysical point of view will testify to the sharp discursivity of this current affiliation in the nation (Hastorf, 2016. P.272.). A strong matching effect was observed in the overall sample. Both personal self-esteem and empathy were associated with a more substantial matching effect. According to Robinson, Tobias, Shaw, Freeman, & Higgs (2011), social ingratiation attempts may be an essential factor behind social matching of food intake. Lower dyadic self-esteem scores associated with a greater degree of matching and higher dyadic empathy scores were also related to a stronger matching effect. Food consumption viewpoint correlations suggested that the matching effect in the belief matching may have been strongly influenced by empathy which contained at least one individual who was low in self-esteem or high in empathy. Matching effects were observed for group eating consisting of individuals in self-esteem or empathy. However, only a small number of groups contained participants with high self-esteem

Figure 3: Proposed Frameworks on Responsive Eating Behavior in Social Setting¹.

Individuals belonging to expressly specified groups of anatomy, status, age, profession, and faith have some expectations regarding corrective actions and proper relationships with others. Such actions and relationships could be reflected in various apparent forms, such as clothes, address circumstances, or relative place in a procession. In a society that prized appearances and depended on these recognizable signals for the proper preservation of social order, food was a precious tool for achieving social identification. Dining behaviors could make people's social public (Campbell, 2017.P. 175-178).

Empathy could stimulate prosocial behaviours (Batson, 2006). Some evidence is: firstly, some argue that prosocial behaviour is always based on selfish reasons. People help to improve their attitude, for example, or to prevent destructive emotions. (Eisenberg, Gollust, Golberstein and Hefner, 2007). Second, Batson (2006) concludes that empathy provides an altruistic desire to support others independent of self-motivation. Third, Findlay, Girardi, & Coplan (2006), argue that more empathic children are linked to more prosocial behaviour. Fourthly, Simpson & Simpson & Willer (2008) conclude that prosocial behaviour is taking place even though there are no reputable rewards. Finally, Eisenberg et al. (2007) conclude that compassion encourages, in part, early-stage prosocial arrangements and is stable over time. According to the need-to-belong hypothesis, the expression of empathy is a feature of culture. Self-categorization theory may mean that empathy may be internalized in community beliefs and improve prosocial behaviour. Finally, the sociometer hypothesis would argue that empathy would improve the member's relationship worth to another and be more widely adopted in culture; thus, citizens would pursue them more if they were more strongly recommended to society.

¹ Note: A responsive eating behavior model: Responsive eating is the design approach that suggests that design and development should respond to the consumer behavior and environment based on empathic platform and orientation. The practise consists of a mix of social interaction and space layouts; as the user switches from their irresponsible consumption behaviour, the social viewpoint should automatically switch to accommodate recklessly and dissipate eating behaviour. One may also have to consider the belief matching on their tribes; if they have the same goal, the consumption preference should not block the consumer access to the verity deity. In other words, health and sustainability issues should have automatically responded to consumer preferences. It would eliminate the need for a different hedonic and irresponsible eating phase for each new entrance on the market

Why do people behave prosocially? The need-to-belong theory, the theory of self-categorization, and the sociometer theory demonstrate the psychology behind it, the collective's key aspect and power. An embodied feeling of acceptance, Social psychology theory can be applied to prosocial behavioural studies, including biological, social and cultural effects, empathy and altruism, and situational causes.

These findings indicate that many causes, such as parenting, socialization, degree of sympathy, generosity, and disposition, play an essential role in internalizing prosocial ideas in a community. There is a strong likelihood of raising the possibility of prosocial actions by showing citizens the value of contributing to the group.

Implications

Consumer behavior in the context of the emergence of commensality

First and primary, the direct observation provided a more detailed narrative contextual explanation of the themes identified in the factor analysis, which answers research question number one and defines the meaning of convivial commensality for better understanding. The qualitative data shed light on how convivial commensality and groups exist in a communal eating space; the interaction is interrelated to activities and concurrent events. Evaluation of behavioral narratives where engagement, facilitation and food climate are viewed from a core quality point of view provides evaluators and their listeners with more detailed insight into the "how" and "why" of communal food processes.

The ethnography study allows us to explore that groups who eat together were more likely to cooperate and communicate with a broader network capable of providing prosocial and emotional support. The ethnography study shows that Eating with someone makes one interact with them more actively. That laughter and more prosocial acting to reminiscences occur, especially likely to enhance closeness feelings. Group interaction had an especially significant attraction in these respects, other than to confirm that, as noted in facilitating others' consuming well, women typically have more facilitation roles for friends than men do. Intriguingly, the analyses suggest that feeling engaged with the food environment is unrelated to feelings of personal happiness and satisfaction with one's circumstances.

The food environment is complex to determine the correlation code. One prospect is that those who eat regularly with others have a widely affecting food environment and thus feel more surrounded by eating food. However, we cannot rule out the alternative option that having a wider circle of contacts or being entrenched in the group for facilitation reasons causes those to eat socially more often. Nevertheless, in their more qualitative responses, a large proportion of group members typically engaged that facilitating the meal intake process that was a primary way of making or reinforcing individuals having a quality of food, suggesting that this may be why they ate with others (Higgs & Thomas, 2016). Indeed, the fact that eating together with in the same table develops responsible consumption sense of belongs to the personality concerned (figure 2) would be intricate to interpret as reversed causality: it is rationally unfeasible for feeling responsive after eating to cause one to eat with other partners beforehand since; usually, causes have to appear before, rather than after, their effects.

It is not clear about eating together that what causes responsible consumption through the ethnography study suggests in figure 3. In this case, prosocial behaviour in social facilitation plays an important role, aided and abetted by the consumption of common dishes (Dunbar et al., 2017). Both common dish and facilitation to cooperation on cylinder dish boiling food (are known to attract the food consumption system (Gianoulakis, 2004). The principle of neurophysiological mechanisms observes and understands action by activating neuroanatomical features. It underpins the primate and human social bonding (Machin and Dunbar, 2011). A possible function of food engagement has explicitly been evaluated and estimates terms of intake. Partners may facilitate the feeding process, reflect healthy eating habits, maintain regular and reliable mealtime schedules, and stress the importance of delivering quality food in a positive mealtime environment. Activation is known to be associated with encouraging responsible eating behaviour (Bohm, 2016).

The findings argue: the senses, interaction, social facilitation, and food environment are fundamental in enhancing consumer identities. Prosocial behaviour is perceived as the driving sense, which mediates the food consumer identity. However, most enriching experiences entail the senses working conviviality. The commensality of the food social identity is deemed equally important as the central in shaping consumer experiences. The co-occurrence of the code shows (Appendix –I) the experience of customer relationships, collaboration, empathy, satisfaction, and others' control. It is ensured through 'success experience,' as customers' strengthen existing definitions and improve one's current identification' (Rosen, Brand, & Kalbe, 2016) by their food choice and intake experience. The findings elaborate that eating together at one table should combine hospitality to intensify a sense of empathy and responsible consumption that more effectively alter food consumption behaviour. The ethnographic approach provided the results supposed to food identity through symbolic reaction. The need to belong theory justifies social identity development within social interaction and social facilitation during food consumption practice. The peripheral identity has a pivotal role in altering food consumption behaviour experience. The social identity was detected through others' emotions; however, the collective identity was deemed equally important. It reflected the importance of consuming more valuable and quality food, particularly the system to provide an origin of food. The sense of belonging provokes and drives the group's intensity, suggesting this is the pivotal sense that mediates the social identity.

Furthermore, a new angle of research on the communal of food consumption and their sentiment and connection with social identities has emerged from this research. Research indicates 'eating together at one table' was the strongest social interaction, followed by 'social facilitation (Giacoman, 2016). This paper argues that the food environment was the strongest sense that consumers were most predisposed to, followed by social interaction and social facilitation. However, the findings indicate social interaction and facilitation were utilized in a 'means to an end' manner, suggesting group needs to utilize the convivial approach to intensify the social interaction and facilitation experience. The sense of food environment promoted comfort, further supporting the 'conviviality of consumption phenomenon' (Björk and Kauppinen-Räsänen, 2016). However, this paper argues that combining social interaction, social facilitation, and food environment intensify consumption behaviour when eating together at one table. It is argued that all partners' senses within the group are just one feeling and belief towards what they consumed. Their hospitality creates feelings of fantasy and fun (Pollan & GoBig, 2008) to mediate identities and enhance experiences.

Convivial commensality was identified as a major complex network of collaboration. The food sharing initiatives are the way they felt during the meal, describing the atmosphere as 'positive,' 'warm,' (Wise, 2011) by communal eating place. Fischler (2011) suggests that convivial commensality is induced through food culture, and the social identity of food consumption is symbols. Therefore, it is evident that the elements of eating together, collaboration, authenticity, gathering, and identity are holistically connected. Thus, the suggested model of responsive consumption activity experience (Figure 3) not only fills the gap between theory and reality. It also gives psychological reasoning as to how these aspects are experienced. It means that all of our most imperative social behaviors occur at the feast; these items' responsibility seems to have added 'spiritual nutrition.' Yet almost no one seems to have commented on this. In a recent analysis of soldiery consumption practice among veganism, Wiessner (2014) celebrated that social topics predominate in everyday conversations, whereas meat consumption practice conversations are typically more factual and functional.

Dunbar (2017) noted that shifting social perspectives on vegan consumption may extend more robust habits. It is crucial because humans have mitigated healthy eating trends that would otherwise have prevented further increases in unsustainable eating practices. Moving all one's social viewpoint to the proper consumption when eating together can eat and talk around the table would have freed off a significant amount of change on consumption behaviour for foraging and other essential activities. The eating on the same table may have had made eating-related social activities more 'impressive' and engaging and given rise to a preference for facilitating such activities in the social setting. It would also have to be found a best on vocal channels of communication, and gestural communication helps influence food consumption practice (Dunbar, 2017).

Over the past decade, considerable indication has emerged that the number and quality of close friendships have a significant and direct impact on the quantity and quality of food consumption (Szatrowski, 2014). Indeed, a related effect has been illustrious in numerous ways of food consumption practice: the met eating reduction and increasing of consuming vegetables of a social network (mainly that with other adult females) associates with keeping physical fattiness and healthy consumption habit (Graça, Calheiros, & Oliveira, 2016). If so, it is potential that eating together may have healthy and survival benefits both directly and, through more and improved social networks, indirectly connected.

Commensality relationship to activities and services convenience

Eating together is all critical contexts of social food pleasure applications, leading to a responsible food consumption experience. When we are in the context of eating together on the same table, the norms are derived by the presence of others with whom we socialize and interact, leading to a state of mindfulness and reflection. When we experience eating together, pleasure is more connected to food consumption sharing and self-presentation, emphasizing the role that connectivity possesses. Finally, in the sense of belonging within society, responsible consumption contributes to the better community while eating, giving a second chance to socialize.

In responsible consumption behavior in social food cases, a sense of attraction, caring, and empathy enter the picture, and responsibility plays a key role. Figure 1 provides a graphic depiction of the code of co-occurrence, linking the single context of presence to the main factors that the user is most involved in when considering that form of eating together (i.e. mindful food enjoyer, connected food enjoyer, and responsible food enjoyer). Notably, the contexts of applications, i.e., responsive consumption behavior, are not meant to be distinct and separate; they sometimes overlap and intersect into what we label a "mindful, connected and responsible food enjoyer consumer.

The mindful, connected, and responsible food enjoyer achieves social food consumption goals by simultaneously mixing and experiencing other partners. An excellent example of this typology is a consumer who approaches the canteen like "China catering" (community meals). Here, consumers can eat and drink with their friends and families, spend valuable time with them, and share a pleasant experience through various social activities. Moreover, while eating, consumers use technology to facilitate their eating to become responsible citizens capable of entering society (sharing for a community). Another possible occasion is where the layout of the canteen, payment system, and mobile overlap might create enjoyment or pleasure during eating. During those particular times, group members gather and eat together to get more fun with a group. They can virtually share posts with others about what they eat, and maybe they have decided to bring food to their tables that can contribute to some worthwhile causes.

This ethnography study contributes to food and food consumption behavior proposing the new framework "responsive food eating behavior" and deepening the knowledge of what characterizes food's social dimension (Dabbaghian, Mago, Wu, Fritz, & Alimadad,

2012). Moreover, by conceptualizing food consumption factors during eating together, this research encourages a reflection on how social contexts might be positively used to stimulate proper consumption practices and achieve overall consumers' well-being.

First, eating together is essential for stimulating the act of sharing. It positively contributes to happiness and inclusion (Hovasapian and Levine, 2018) while avoiding loneliness, depression, and illnesses (Herforth & Ahmed, 2015). For example, this also means that the atmosphere of different places where we eat should be developed to increase the desire to share something with others, such as friends, family, and colleagues, especially for poor eating at school. Secondly, eating together can also be thought of as a way to help others in the cases of connections with socially responsible consumption and taking the perspective of others, stimulating in consumers a desire to help other human beings by showing empathy, altruism, and caring (Lee & Ma, 2012). It seems particularly relevant for attracting new generations (Arnett, German, & Hunt, 2003) that demand the creation of successful sustainable consumption that contributes to society's well-being and individuals (Larson & Story, 2009). Moreover, given consumers' pleasure when eating food and their willingness to communicate it to others, sharing food for society becomes particularly relevant for expressing an optimistic self-identity (e.g., consumers like to be perceived as "responsible food enjoyers"). Specifically, this seems essential for new generations, such as younger ones, which generate self-identity through social interactions and activities (Barrena, Garcia, & Sanchez, 2015).

Third, our concept of convivial commensality aims to debate how social factors put into the assimilation of food consumption behavior and influences personal food intake. Recent research has been scant in emphasizing how social factors may also contribute to building a mindful and pleasurable experience with food (Wehling & Lusher, 2019). For instance, consumers appreciate healthy food consumption. They like to comment on that (Cornil and Chandon, 2016), or they want to present themselves as "healthy food enjoyers" engaging in a healthy lifestyle (Kinard, 2015).

Ethnographic observations so far, studies have primarily investigated how social factors (e.g., others' consumption) affect food choices and intake behavior. Still, less is known about the factors influencing food consumption behavior that such shared consumption generates—recognizing the idea of contributing to the common well-being while eating. In contrast, more individualistic cultures can be strongly connected to self-esteem and self-identity improvement, where consumers might like to project an image of mindfulness food consumption. Finally, variations in the place, social, cultural, environmental, and technological where the food is physically consumed might also influence food consumption practice. In a survey, the study finds it worthwhile to investigate emotional and psychological factors that influence ethical food consumption behavior in a social setting. Furthermore, we assessed whether and how eating together and the emotion of group influence consumption when consumed in a communal meal at the canteen or a public setting and on various social standards. It also investigates which single consumption behavior better contributes to happiness, healthy practices, or well-being.

Conclusions

The findings of the present study can be used to draw different imperatives for scholars. The current research has four main theoretical implications. First, this study extends the emerging literature on ethical food consumption practice in the context of different dimensions by providing insights into the unstudied associations. This study's novelty lies in examining the interaction between the dark side of convivial commensality and prosocial behaviour intentions and choice behaviour towards responsible food consumption, a distinctive contribution in need to belong theory and social practice theory. Second, the present study is among the few eating together studies that have examined social behavior with emotional self-consciousness in the context of a less studied social practice of food consumption. It implies that social and cognitive marketing. Third, unlike a series of recent studies that focused on organic food consumption and met consumption reduction behaviour, the current research focused on how community-based driven towards responsive food consumption behaviour and exploring the interaction between situational and emotional factors in social action. Previous studies have shown that community-based practice and trend in consuming organic food, and less met consumers are different from responsive food consumers in both needs and behaviour. Therefore, convivial commensality and their association with empathy intentions and choice behaviour are also unlike in the context of community-based ethical food consumption behaviour.

This study applied an ethnography approach in a sociological study of food consumption to provide further insights into defining the meaning of eating together within the same table and conceptual framework opportunities for responsible food consumption behavior. In this way, it hopes to provide an alternative vista to the more emotional and situational psychological-based perspectives currently applied to much of the research on responsible food consumption, i.e., perspectives which focus on social influencing on quantities and quality of food (O'Dell & Willim, 2011). Thus, food consumption behaviour changes ethically significantly according to the regulation and imitation of the other. Focusing the attention on food consumption practices has proven helpful in revealing the complexities of responsible ordinary, everyday consumption (Campbell, 2017). Here, people may cognitively represent responsible consumption as an abstract and high prosocial goal, but low emotional motives can stimulate their actual ethical consumption.

Using the ethnography study approach (Berger and Luekmann, 1967) allows commensality to be seen as socially and physically interrelated daily activities. It offers a systematic way to consider what is happening at the group of food consumption, at the interfaces or interactions between the partners and environment, when interaction among group member and incorporate social facilitation. In this context, the consumer is a practitioner who partakes in a specific context or food environment, who is more/less engaged with the group eating activities, or more/less inclined to 'consume responsibly.' In this way, 'consumption' is not an expression of a

subjective value structure but social interaction with a specific setting. Such a theoretical approach offers exciting perspectives on responsible food consumption transitions in everyday life. For example, Lindeman & Anttila (2018) have provided insights into the role of solidarity in organic food consumption, i.e., bundles of experience and practice-specific knowledge and routines in responsible consumption. This study clarifies that different groups of consumers have diverse practice portfolios ('practitioners' experience/knowledge/skill) for specific food consumption types, with their various food choices and food environments and arrangements. Similarly, the present study identifies (groups of) consumers with diverse portfolios about responsive food behaviours, acting within and through a range of food contexts or sites while being more or less supported or constrained by the food environment of food provisioning to consume responsibly.

References

- Almerico, G. M. (2014). Food and identity: Food studies, cultural, and personal identity. *Journal of International Business and Cultural Studies*, 8(8). <http://www.aabri.com/OC2014Manuscripts/OC14055>.
- Arnett, D. B., German, S. D., & Hunt, S. D. (2003). The identity salience model of relationship marketing success: The case of nonprofit marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 67(2), 89–105. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.67.2.89.18614>
- Bardin, J. C., & Weinreb, S. (2009). A 0.1–5 GHz Cryogenic SiGe MMIC LNA. *IEEE Microwave and Wireless Components Letters*, 19(6), 407–409. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LMWC.2009.2020041>
- Barrena, R., Garcia, T., & Sanchez, M. (2015). Analysis of personal and cultural values as key determinants of novel food acceptance. Application to an ethnic product. *Appetite*, 87, 205–214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2014.12.210>
- Batson, C.D. (2006). Not all self-interest after all: Economics of empathy-induced altruism. In D. De Cremer, M. Zeelenberg, & J. K. Murnighan (Eds), *Social psychology and economics* (pp. 281–299). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. eBook ISBN9780203726594
- Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2007). Self-Regulation, Ego Depletion, and Motivation. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1(1), 115–128. <https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fj.1467-8721.2007.00534.x>
- Belon, A. P., Nieuwendyk, L. M., Vallianatos, H., & Nykiforuk, C. I. J. (2016). Perceived community environmental influences on eating behaviors: A Photovoice analysis. *Social Science & Medicine*, 171, 18–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.11.004>
- Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Björk, P. & Kauppinen-Räsänen, H. (2016), Local food: a source for destination attraction, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28 (1), 177–194. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-05-2014-0214>
- Bohm, I. (2016). We're made of meat, so why should we eat vegetables? Food Discourses in the School Subject Home and Consumer Studies. OAI: oai:DiVA.org:umu-128176
- Bohm, I. (2016). We're made of meat, so why should we eat vegetables? Food Discourses in the School Subject Home and Consumer Studies.
- Campbell, J. (2017). Status and change. In *at the first table: Food and social identity in early modern Spain* (pp. 101–134). Lincoln; London: University of Nebraska Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1hfhfnq1.7>
- Collins, E. I., Thomas, J. M., Robinson, E., Aveyard, P., Jebb, S. A., Herman, C. P., & Higgs, S. (2019). Two observational studies examining the effect of a social norm and a health message on the purchase of vegetables in student canteen settings. *Appetite*, 132, 122–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.09.024>
- Cornil, Y., & Chandon, P. (2016). Pleasure as a substitute for size: How multisensory imagery can make people happier with smaller food portions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53(5), 847–864. <https://doi.org/10.1509%2Fjmr.14.0299>
- Dabbaghian, V., Mago, V. K., Wu, T., Fritz, C., & Alimadad, A. (2012). Social interactions of eating behaviour among high school students: a cellular automata approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-12-155>
- Delormier, T., Frohlich, K. L., & Potvin, L. (2009). Food and eating as social practice - understanding eating patterns as social phenomena and implications for public health. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 31(2), 215–228.
- Dovidio, John F., Jane Allyn Piliavin, David A. Schroeder, and Louis A. Penner. (2006). *The Social Psychology of Prosocial Behavior*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315085241>
- Dudovskiy, J., (2013). Consumer Buyer Behaviour Definition - Research Methodology. [online] Research Methodology. <https://research-methodology.net/consumer-buyer-behaviour-definition>
- Dunbar, R. I. M. (2017). Breaking Bread: The Functions of Social Eating. *Adaptive Human Behavior and Physiology*, 3(3), 198–211. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9566.2008.01128.x>
- Ehn, B., Löfgren, O., & Wilk, R. (2016). *Exploring everyday life: strategies for ethnography and cultural analysis*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Eisenberg, D., Gollust, S. E., Golberstein, E., & Hefner, J. L. (2007). Prevalence and correlates of depression, anxiety, and suicidality among university students. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 77(4), 534–542. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0002-9432.77.4.534>
- Fedoroff, I. D. C., Polivy, J., & Herman, C. P. (1997). The Effect of Pre-exposure to Food Cues on the Eating Behavior of Restrained and Unrestrained Eaters. *Appetite*, 28(1), 33–47. <https://doi.org/10.1006/appe.1996.0057>

- Ferguson, P. P. (2015). Eating Together: Food, Friendship, and Inequality. *Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews*, 44(3), 368–370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0094306115579191v>
- Findlay, L. C., Girardi, A., & Coplan, R. J. (2006). Links between empathy, social behavior, and social understanding in early childhood. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 21(3), 347–359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2006.07.009>
- Fischler, C. (2011). Commensality, society, and culture. *Social Science Information*, 50(3–4), 528–548. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0539018411413963>
- Fiske, S. T. (2012). Warmth and competence: Stereotype content issues for clinicians and researchers. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, 53(1), 14–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0963721417738825>
- Fox, R. (2014). Food and eating: an anthropological perspective. Social Issues research centre. Ed. SIRC. SIRC, n.d. Web.
- Galloway, A. T., Addressi, E., Fragaszy, D. M., & Visalberghi, E. (2005). Social Facilitation of Eating Familiar Food in Tufted Capuchins (*Cebus apella*): Does it Involve Behavioral Coordination? *International Journal of Primatology*, 26(1), 181–189. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/s10764-005-0729-7>
- García-Segovia, P., Harrington, R. J., & Seo, H.-S. (2015). Influences of table setting and eating location on food acceptance and intake. *Food Quality and Preference*, 39, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2014.06.004>
- Giacoman, C. (2016). The dimensions and role of commensality: A theoretical model drawn from the significance of communal eating among adults in Santiago, Chile. *Appetite*, 107, 460–470. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2016.08.116>
- Gianoulakis, C. (2004). Endogenous opioids and addiction to alcohol and other drugs of abuse. *Current Topics in Medicinal Chemistry*, 4(1), 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.2174/1568026043451573>
- Gordon, E.L., Lent, M.R. & Merlo, L.J. (2020). The Effect of Food Composition and Behavior on Neurobiological Response to Food: a Review of Recent Research. *Curr Nutr Rep* 9, 75–82. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13668-020-00305-5>
- Graça, J., Calheiros, M. M., & Oliveira, A. (2016). Situating moral disengagement: Motivated reasoning in meat consumption and substitution. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 90, 353–364. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.11.042>
- Greenberg, J., Reiner, K., & Meiran, N. (2012). Mind the Trap: Mindfulness Practice Reduces Cognitive Rigidity. *PLoS ONE*, 7(5), e36206. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0036206>
- Hackel, L. M., Coppin, G., Wohl, M. J. A., & Van Bavel, J. J. (2018). From groups to grits: Social identity shapes evaluations of food pleasantness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 74, 270–280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.09.007>
- Hackel, Leor and Coppin, Géraldine and Wohl, Michael and Van Bavel, Jay. (2015). From Groups to Grits: *Social Identity Shapes Evaluations of Food Pleasantness*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2662835>
- Halkier, B. (2020). Social interaction as key to understanding the intertwining of routinized and culturally contested consumption. *Cultural sociology*, 14(4):399–416. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1749975520922454>
- Hansen, T. & Sørensen, M.I. & Eriksen, Riewerts, M.L. (2018). How the interplay between consumer motivations and values influences organic food identity and behavior, *Food Policy, Elsevier*, 74(C), 39–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2017.11.003>
- Hastorf, C. A. (2016). The Social Archaeology of Food. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316597590>
- Herforth, A., & Ahmed, S. (2015). The food environment, its effects on dietary consumption, and potential for measurement within agriculture-nutrition interventions. *Food Security*, 7(3), 505–520. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-015-0455-8>
- Herman, C. P. & Polivy, J., (2017). The social facilitation of eating or the facilitation of social eating? *Journal of Eating Disorders*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40337-017-0146-2>
- Hermans, R. C. J., Lichtwarck-Aschoff, A., Bevelander, K. E., Herman, C. P., Larsen, J. K., & Engels, R. C. M. E. (2012). Mimicry of food intake: The dynamic interplay between eating companions. *PLoS ONE*, 7(2), e31027. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0031027>
- Higgs, S., & Thomas, J. (2016). Social influences on eating. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 1–6. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.cobeha.2015.10.005>
- Hovasapian, A., & Levine, L. J. (2018). Keeping the magic alive: social sharing of positive life experiences sustains happiness. *Cognition and Emotion*, 32(8), 1559–1570. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2017.1422697>
- Kinard, B. R., & Kinard, J. L. (2015). Visual Effects of Variety and Area Saliency on Food Product Volume Estimates. *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, 22(1), 89–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10454446.2014.949995>
- Kuo, S.-H., & Lin, H.-C. (2019). Effects of food environments and eating environments on consumers' food consumption volume. *Journal of Food Quality*, 2019, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/7237602>
- Lange, Jeffrey K. (2002). Review: Richard A. Krueger & Mary Anne Casey (2000). Focus Groups. A Practical Guide for Applied Research (3rd Edition) [10 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 3(4), 28. <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0204280>.
- Larson, N., & Story, M. (2009). A review of environmental influences on food choices. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 38(S1), 56–73. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-009-9120-9>
- Lee, C. S., & Ma, L. (2012). News sharing in social media: The effect of gratifications and prior experience. *Computers in human behavior*, 28(2), 331–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2011.10.002>
- Lewis, R. (2004). Communication technology in the developing nations. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 20(2), 159–159. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2004.00077.x>
- Lincoln, YS. & Guba, EG. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

- Lindeman, M., & Anttila, J. (2018). Organic Food Appeals to Intuition and Triggers Stereotypes. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 10(3), 66. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijps.v10n3p66>
- Ma, G.(2015). Food, eating behavior, and culture in Chinese society. *Journal of Ethnic Foods*, 2(4), (195–199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jef.2015.11.004>
- Machin, A. J., & Dunbar, R. I. M. (2011). The brain opioid theory of social attachment: a review of the evidence. *Behaviour*, 148(9-10), 985–1025. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23034206>
- Marovelli, B. (2019). Cooking and eating together in London: Food sharing initiatives as collective spaces of encounter. *Geoforum*, 99, 190-201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.09.006>
- Marriott, B. M. (2019). Social Facilitation and Inhibition of Eating. *Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Military Nutrition Research*. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK232442/>
- Méndez Romero, R. A. (2016). Qualitative Data Analysis with ATLAS.ti, por Susanne Friese. *Qualitative Research in Education*, 5(2), 226. <https://doi.org/10.17583/qre.2016.2120>
- Muhr, T. (1991). ATLAS/ti? A prototype for the support of text interpretation. *Qualitative Sociology*, 14(4), 349–371. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00989645>
- Nakata, R., & Kawai, N. (2017). The "social" facilitation of eating without the presence of others: Self-reflection on eating makes food taste better and people eat more. *Physiology & Behavior*, 179, 23–29. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.physbeh.2017.05.022>
- Neuman, W.L. (2011) Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. 7th Edition, Pearson, Boston. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3211488>
- Neuman, W.L. (2011) Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. 7th Edition, Pearson, Boston.
- O'Dell, T., & Willim, R. (2011). Composing Ethnography. *Ethnologia Europaea*, 41(1), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.16995/ee.1075>
- Piqueras-Fiszman, B., Giboreau, A., & Spence, C. (2013). Assessing the influence of the color of the plate on the perception of a complex food in a restaurant setting. *Flavour*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/2044-7248-2-24>
- Pollan, M., & Go Big Read. (2008). In defense of food: an eater's manifesto. *In Open World Cat* (Program).
- Rana, J., & Paul, J. (2017). Consumer behavior and purchase intention for organic food: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 38, 157-165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2017.06.004>
- Ranteallo, I. C., & Andilolo, I. R. (2016). Share What and How You Cook at Home!: Uncovering Social Identity. Proceedings of the 1st UPI *International Conference on Sociology Education* (UPI ICSE 2015). <https://dx.doi.org/10.2991/icse-15.2016.63>
- Robinson, E., Blissett, J., & Higgs, S. (2013). Social influences on eating: implications for nutritional interventions. *Nutrition Research Reviews*, 26(2), 166–176. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0954422413000127>
- Robinson, E., Tobias, T., Shaw, L., Freeman, E., & Higgs, S. (2011). Social matching of food intake and the need for social acceptance. *Appetite*, 56(3), 747–752. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2011.03.001>
- Rosen, J. B., Brand, M., & Kalbe, E. (2016). Empathy mediates the effects of age and sex on altruistic moral decision making. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 10(67). <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/t01093-000>
- Ruddock, H. K., Brunstrom, J. M., Vartanian, L. R., & Higgs, S. (2019). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the social facilitation of eating. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 110(4), 842–861. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/nqz155>
- Ruiz, E. N. F., & Gerhardt, T. E. (2019). Food and social identity: Rural lives that appear through food. *Revista de Nutrição*, 32. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1678-9865201932e180058>
- Sandín Vázquez, M., Rivera, J., Conde, P., Gutiérrez, M., Díez, J., Gittelsohn, J., & Franco, M. (2019). Social norms influencing the local food environment as perceived by residents and food traders: The heart healthy hoods project. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(3), 502. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3390%2Fijerph16030502>
- Sasahara, T. (2019). Classification Theorems for Biharmonic Real Hypersurfaces in a Complex Projective Space. *Results in Mathematics*, 74(4). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00025-019-1062-3>
- Simpson, B., & Willer, R. (2008). Altruism and Indirect Reciprocity: The Interaction of Person and Situation in Prosocial Behavior. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 71(1), 37–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250807100106>
- Simpson, B., & Willer, R. (2008). Altruism and Indirect Reciprocity: The Interaction of Person and Situation in Prosocial Behavior. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 71(1), 37–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250807100106>
- Stok, F. M., de Vet, E., de Ridder, D. T. D., & de Wit, J. B. F. (2016). The potential of peer social norms to shape food intake in adolescents and young adults: a systematic review of effects and moderators. *Health Psychology Review*, 10(3), 326–340. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2016.1155161>
- Story, M., Kaphingst, K. M., Robinson-O'Brien, R., & Glanz, K. (2008). Creating Healthy Food and Eating Environments: Policy and Environmental Approaches. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 29(1), 253-272. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.29.020907.090926>
- Szatrowski, P. E. (2014). Introduction to Language and Food: The verbal and nonverbal experience. *Language and Food*, 3–28. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.238>
- Thomas, J. M., Ursell, A., Robinson, E. L., Aveyard, P., Jebb, S. A., Herman, C. P., & Higgs, S. (2017). Using a descriptive social norm to increase vegetable selection in workplace restaurant settings. *Health Psychology*, 36(11), 1026–1033. <https://doi.org/10.1037/hea0000478>

- Velasco, C., Karunanayaka, K., & Nijholt, A. (2018). Editorial: Multisensory Human-Food Interaction. *Frontiers in psychology*, [796]. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00796>
- Wang, J., Nguyen, N., & Bu, X. (2020). Exploring the Roles of Green Food Consumption and Social Trust in the Relationship between Perceived Consumer Effectiveness and Psychological Wellbeing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(13), 4676. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17134676>
- Wansink, B. (2004). Environmental factors that increase the food intake and consumption volume of unknowing consumers. *Annual Review of Nutrition*, 24(1), 455–479. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.nutr.24.012003.132140>
- Warde A. (2015). On the sociology of eating. *Revue d'etudes en agriculture et environnement – review of agricultural and environmental studies*, Inra editions, pp.7 - 15. hal-01884914
- Warde, A. (2014). After taste: Culture, consumption and theories of practice. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 14(3), 279–303. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1469540514547828>
- Wehling, H., & Lusher, J. M. (2019). Cognitive and Emotional Influences on Eating Behaviour: A Qualitative Perspective. *Nutrition and Metabolic Insights*, 12, 117863881985593. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1177%2F1178638819855936>
- Wiessner, P. W. (2014). Embers of society: Firelight talk among the Ju/'hoansi Bushmen. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(39), 14027–14035. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1404212111>.
- Wise, A. (2011). Moving food: Gustatory commensality and disjuncture in everyday multiculturalism. *New Formations*, 74(74), 82-107. <https://doi.org/10.3898/NewF.74.05.2011>
- Yee. J (2010). Methodological innovation in practice-based design doctorates. *Journal of Research Practice*, 6(2), M15. <http://jrp.icaap.org/index.php/jrp/article/view/196/193>

Publisher's Note: SSBFNET stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

© 2021 by the authors. Licensee SSBFNET, Istanbul, Turkey. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478) by SSBFNET is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Appendix –I Atlas Ti programs' co-occurrence table

	Anxiety	Attraction	Collaboration	Consciousness	Cooking	Empathy	Facilitation	Food Choice	Happiness	Influence
Anxiety			0.1	0.25						
Attraction			0.13							
Collaboration	0.1	0.13		0.14	0.11					
Consciousness	0.25		0.14							
Cooking activities			0.11							
Disentanglement		0.17	0.09							
Empathy	0.17		0.11	0.33						
Encourage others to eat			0.13		0.25					
Facilitation	0.14		0.1	0.25		0.17				
Food Choice										
Happiness								0.33		
Influence		0.25	0.11							
Information seeking	0.11		0.08	0.17		0.13	0.11	0.14	0.14	
Interaction	0.07		0.06	0.08		0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08	
Interpersonal attraction								0.33	0.33	
need to selective eating		0.2	0.1					0.2	0.2	0.17
Norm	0.13		0.09	0.2		0.14	0.13			
pleasure	0.25		0.14	1		0.33	0.25			
the others tend to choose		0.33	0.13							0.67