Jomat

Journal of multidisciplinary academic tourism
2025, 10 (1): 49-63
https://doi.org/10.31822/jomat.2025-10-1-49

ISSN: 2645-9078

Are religious orientations effective on eating motivation?*

Merve Uçkan Çakır*, Şenol Çavuş

Keywords:
Gastronomy,
Eating motivation,
Sociology of food,
Religious orientations,
Food choices.

Article History:
Submitted: 27.09.2023
Revised:08.12.2023
Revised:24.03.2024
Revised:01.04.2024
Accepted: 04.01.2025
Published Online: 04.01.2025

ABSTRACT

The phenomenon of food consumption has evolved over time, influenced by social interactions, leading to diverse nutritional practices based on beliefs, politics, culture, and economic foundations. This research aims to determine eating motivations and reveal the effects of religious orientations on these motivations. The convenience sampling method, a non-probability sampling method among quantitative research sampling methods, was used in the study. Van province was chosen as the population of the research, and individuals living in the central districts of Van province (İpekyolu and Tuşba), where the population density is high, were selected as the sample. Since the eating motivations scale was applied for the first time in the Van population, exploratory factor analysis was performed. In this context, a 3-dimensional religious orientations scale and a newly structured 10-dimensional eating motivations scale were reached. As a result of the research, it is seen that individuals' religious orientations explain their eating motivations at a rate of 10.5%. The most affected sub-dimension of eating motivation is taste and habits, with 14.2%; The second dimension is health and naturalness, with 11.8%; The third dimension is convenience, with 7.9%. It was concluded that the dimension that least explains the regression model is the price dimension with 1.7%. Analysis results showed that there was a significant relationship between individuals' religious orientations and eating motivations. The research analysis supported and accepted all hypotheses established in the research model.

1. Introduction

Food, which has been given different meanings throughout history, has been an essential phenomenon in the social life of human beings. The need for nutrition is considered the most basic need of human beings. Among all human activities, food is one of the elements essential to breathing and affects social life the most (Mintz & Du Bois 2002). Food, the primary source of energy and vitality for living things, is a common need for all living things. Naturally, beyond their biological and physiological needs, food transportation and war direct individuals to a social, economic, and cultural environment (Ünsal, 2020).

With globalization, a crucial sociological basis has been formed in human life, and human life has begun to be questioned on various issues such as migration, multiculturalism, politics, economy, and media. Eating and drinking as a physical need directly affect individuals' social understanding. Individuals enable the formation of food culture with the identities they construct with cultural and religious codes. Food research has become essential at this point, where humankind's primitive nutrition styles come from cooking with the invention of fire and industrialized food production with developing technologies (Fernández-Armesto, 2002; Geertz, 1973; Conner, 2008; Cardello, 1996). It is known as an ethnographic fact that people value food and drink and try to preserve their traditional diets.

On the other hand, archeology and history show that traditional diets change repeatedly as new foods or preparation methods emerge or as economic and demographic contexts change (Harris & Ross, 1987). The preservation of conventional diets by societies and the emergence of new ones are contradictory phenomena that need to be resolved by sociological and ethnographic research in recent years (O'Dea, 1991; Simopoulos, 2004). An individual's nutritional system consists of actual behaviors resulting from the individual's conscious and unconscious decisions (Robinson et al., 2013). For this reason, the explanation of the history of eating behavior is meaningful in terms of individuals' attitudes and actions.

When the studies on individuals' food choices are examined, it is seen that there are many different models in

**Corresponding Author* — *Research Paper*

Merve Uçkan Çakır: *Research. Assistant., Van Yuzuncu Yil University, Van, Turkey, Email: uckanmerve@gmail.com, Orcid Id: 0000-0001-8935-2800*

Şenol Çavuş: *Prof. Dr., Sakarya Applied Science University, Sakarya, Turkey, Email: senolcavus@subu.edu.tr, Orcid Id: 0000-0002-1994-9721*

**This study is based on the author's thesis prepared at Sakarya University of Applied Sciences (Yök Thesis No: 696269).*

which food choices are discussed. While in the first of these models, foods are classified according to their physical and chemical properties, individual factors, and social-emotional factors (Shepherd, 1985), it is seen that there are studies in which cultural factors are at the forefront (Sobal & Bisogni, 2009). At the same time, individuals' food choices have been investigated using neuroscience applications, magnetic resonance imaging techniques, and neurotechnological developments (Berridge, 2004; McClure et al., 2004). When the studies are examined, it is seen that the most essential factor affecting food choices is the characteristics of the food. Foods look like (Beaver et al., 2006), taste (Holm & Kildevang, 1996; Land, 1998; Grankvist & Biel, 2001; Torjusen et al., 2001), smell (Shepherd & Farleigh 1989), naturalness (Wandel & Bugge, 1997), and freshness characteristics (Land, 1998; Torjusen et al., 2001) are essential factors in food choices. At the same time, studies draw attention to the fact that sensory elements are among the critical factors in food selection. Food choice is classified as food-related factors, individual-related factors, and environmental-related factors (Bell & Meiselman, 1995; Rozin & Tuorila, 1993; Eertmans et al., 2001).

Although the basic instincts of human beings for life include the need for nutrition and shelter to protect themselves from external factors, there is also a need for spiritual support that can protect their soul. Individuals' belief in a being higher and more significant than themselves stems from the instinct of self-preservation, and throughout history, it has not been possible for individuals to live without and away from the feeling of religion. Therefore, human beings are religious and need communication between their soul and body to live. He needs the power to resist his desires and desires by accepting a being more significant than himself. Scientific research, archaeological excavations, and holy books in the history of humanity have not reported that any civilization lived without religion (Kahraman, 2018; Duran, 2018; Belzen & Seyhan, 2012). Naturally, religion is one of the influential factors in forming individuals' nutrition styles. Religion, which is influential in forming socio-cultural structures of societies and the design of society, also directly affects the socialization process (Beşirli, 2017).

Individuals' nutritional diets are primarily shaped by their culture, socioeconomic status, geography, and beliefs. Lévi-Strauss (1958), one of the structural sociologists, states that instinctively fed animals turn to what is accessible in their feeding processes. However, he emphasizes that individuals choose edible foods and turn to foods that comply with social habits. Therefore, it is argued that boiled meat is a feature of democratic societies and fried meat is an extravagance and reflects the aristocracy's lifestyle (Kızılçelik, 1994). On the other hand, Bourdieu associates taste with social status; It emphasizes that the palates of working-class individuals are accustomed to experiencing bad and heavy tastes.

The sociology of religion deals with all manifestations of individuals that are reflected in society through their beliefs. Turkey's traditional history creates difficulties in religious studies because it requires sensitivity and causes researchers to become blocked (Subaşı, 2015). In this context, there is a limitation in the literature due to the limited number of studies examining the relationship between food and belief. This study is essential in terms of contributing to the field. This study, designed to determine the effects of religious orientations on eating motivations without restricting individuals' fundamental rights and freedoms, was planned within the framework of ethical concerns and carried out for this purpose.

Individual lifestyle changes vary for social, economic, and cultural reasons. Many factors such as geographical, cultural, socio-economic, belief, and health cause differences in eating behaviors. In this context, "Do the religious orientations of individuals living in Van affect the factors affecting eating motivation?" was determined as the research problem. In this context, "Do the religious orientations of individuals living in Van affect the factors affecting eating motivation?" was determined as the research problem. The research examined the effects of the belief factor on eating behavior, eating motivation, and the differentiation resulting from this choice. This research explores the impact of belief, which significantly affects individuals' lifestyles, on motivations consisting of sociological, physical, and emotional inputs that affect food choices.

2. Conceptual Framework

Food Choices Motivations

The food choices of individuals are not actions taken with conscious decisions. Food choices usually consist of many dimensions depending on the past's cultural characteristics, traditions, and emotional meanings (Janas et al., 1993; Falk et al., 1996). The choices of individuals affect the lives of individuals economically and sociologically by expressing the identity and cultural meanings of that person. When examined in terms of the food sector, food choices constitute the basis of the product range created depending on consumer demand (Sobal, 1998). In this context, individuals' food choices are formed by changes in people's life flow, including social structure, economic conditions, historical periods, and physical environment (Devine, 2005).

Nutritional preferences are mostly made with individual motivations. Therefore, personal preferences are shown as an essential variable in food selection (Rangel, 2013). It has been shown that the most common factors among individuals' food choice motives and motivations are taste, cost, convenience, health, social relations, nutrition, and comfort (Glanz et al., 1998). Individuals organize their eating situations according to these values, prioritize certain conditions, and balance their eating patterns. Numerous scientific studies point out that the perception of

flavor and taste occurs along several dimensions that are not limited to the chemistry of food. These dimensions are shaped by individuals' motivations, identities, and beliefs (Asp, 1999; Birch, 1999; Bellisle, 2005).

When the motivations affecting food choice are examined, it is seen that social, cultural, and economic variables are influential. It has been observed that many factors, such as the increase in healthy food consumption, ideological factors, sensory characteristics of food, and body image, are practical (Steptoe et al., 1995; Rozin, 2007; Ergönül, 2013). The attitudes of individuals toward food choices should be evaluated from a holistic perspective, using sociological and psychological phenomena (Armitage & Conner, 2004). Conscious behavior towards a particular food in individuals' food choices and intended consumption behavior against the possible effects of that food is likely to their attitudes, routines, and habits. At the same time, the desires and wishes of individuals are also practical in food choices (Rogers & Blundell, 1990; Teff & Engelman, 1996; Rozin, 2006). A study investigating the factors affecting individuals' food choices determined that factors such as liking, habits, need, hunger, and health were the variables that most influenced their eating behaviors. Added to these factors, such as social image, social norms, and emotional state, motives that rarely affect food choice are among the factors that influence food choice (Steptoe et al., 1995). Another study determined that pleasure, sociability, and social norms were practical (Jackson et al., 2003). The eating motivations scale is applied by many researchers today and is among the scales still being developed (Sun, 2008; Honkanen & Frewer, 2009; Renner et al., 2012; Sproesser et al., 2019). In this context, a research problem has emerged about the eating motivations of the Turkish people.

Religious approaches of individuals and food relationship

Individuals' belief systems have the power to affect daily life and have many different meanings and applications. Belief systems, following certain rituals, visiting religious centers, and reading sacred texts can be seen as integrating one's beliefs into life (Nye, 2008). In this context, spiritual identity, which affects individuals' attitudes, behaviors, and ways of thinking, is thought to arise from the person's need to belong to a community.

Allport (1950) argues that individuals' religious tendencies are affected by their religious experiences. In this context, the concepts of internal religiosity and extrinsic religiosity emerged in line with the internal orientation of individuals (Allport & Ross, 1967). These concepts, which are used to express the influence of religion in the lives of individuals, are used to express the internal and external orientations of religion. These orientations are another way of saying how well individuals comply with the rules in the belief systems they belong to, avoid prohibitions, and adopt rituals and orders (Korkmaz & Dal, 2019). In this context, the degree of adoption and disapproval of people is expressed by religious orientation (Onay, 2002). Religion, like cultural identity, impacts food choices, lifestyle, and consumption patterns in a community (Heiman et al., 2001).

The phenomenon of food, together with its sociological meanings, has a mediating role in expressing the spiritual transformation of individuals (Méndez-Montoya, 2012). While individuals show a series of food avoidance behaviors due to their beliefs, they accept the necessity of their beliefs and religious authority. By adopting the food rules prescribed by their beliefs, individuals strengthen the sense of belonging to a community and build a social identity (Fieldhouse, 2017). The behaviors of individuals to avoid food culturally or because of their beliefs are called food taboos. These taboos are the rules that determine edible foods and their consumption periods (Samuel & Makhani, 2016). In this respect, it has the same characteristics as the food rules and restrictions in belief systems. Fasting and feast tables reveal the effects of beliefs on the food-purchasing behavior of individuals (Bailey & Sood, 1993).

Millions of people worldwide have a religious identity that shapes their thinking and behavior. The number of religions worldwide also varies depending on what is defined as religion. There are often multiple religions worldwide with a specific population and a significant number of followers. These are Bahaism, Buddhism, Christianity, Confucianism, Hinduism, Islam, Jainism, Judaism, Shinto, Sikhism, Taoism, and Arianism (Fieldhouse, 2017). Each religion has different rituals and different dimensions. Each dimension may gain more or less relative importance depending on individuals' beliefs. Religion has a very high impact on individuals' behavior. Through empirical rules, religion regulates individuals' lives and behaviors (Argyle, 2006). In this context, religion is seen as an important phenomenon that has the power to affect human life (Allport, 1950; Petersen & Roy, 1985; Smarth, 2002).

Relation between religious orientation and food choices

The relationship between religion and food considered an integral part of human history, is a popular research topic by anthropologists, psychologists, historians, and sociologists (Harris, 1995; Rani, Reddy & Sreedevamma, 2003). It establishes a connection between food sources, traditions, and needs, influenced by cultural preferences and the social environment (Barth, 1994). Individuals' food choices reflect social, economic, political, and cultural influences, ethical codes, and personal preferences. Influences on individuals' food choices are often shaped by their beliefs and faith teachings. In religions, food is seen as material, social, and sacred (Fieldhouse, 2017). At the same time, food rules that impact individuals' food choices are determined through holy stories, myths, and taboos (Barth, 1994).

The roles mediated by religion across cultures affect all stages of life at both individual and social levels in different

world societies. The culture in which an individual lives is strongly influenced by the dominant religious characteristics of the society, and religion is an integral part of cultural activities in all cultural contexts. It is considered the spiritual framework of people's behaviors, ideas, and beliefs they can relate to daily (Nye, 2008). The fact that individuals have an intense aversion to certain foods and eliminate them from their diet with the thought that their purity is violated is often identified with their cultural characteristics (Rozin, 2007). Although the sugary taste found in breast milk shows that all individuals start life by consuming the same taste, sugar consumption inherently varies depending on the cultural characteristics of societies (Mintz, 1982). Mintz's sugar study is one of the most classic examples of differentiating individuals' tastes and food preferences. However, food is not only a physiological need but also a cultural need (Douglas, 2003).

Belief systems are a phenomenon that has the power to regulate individuals' lives and behaviors through empirical rules (Allport, 1950; Petersen & Roy, 1985; Smarth, 2002; Argyle, 2006). Some features are characterized by religious behaviors and experiences at every level of society and culture (Turner, 2018). Individuals' social approaches and perceptions of religion are research topics that have psychological and sociological effects (Lenski, 1961; Anderson, 1970; Greeley, 1977). Faith is a part of human life, the milestone of great moments, and it is in a position mixed with past experiences in every modern culture (Dugan, 1994). Many individuals seek to express their beliefs through their diet. Every religion has dietary rules and norms that are easy to accept. The dietary restrictions of religions are readily accepted by believers who want to communicate with the divine. These rules specify what, how, and when to eat or which foods to avoid (Sabate, 2004). In this regard, those belief systems significantly impact food choices.

People's religious activities and beliefs often differ. While some individuals have a more spiritual approach than others, other individuals may not have this approach. The richness of religious behaviors and experiences characterizes every level of human culture and society (Turner, 2018). There are also psychological and sociological approaches regarding individuals' social behaviors and perceptions of religion (Lenski 1961; Anderson 1970; Greeley 1977). Allport (1950) argues that spiritual experiences affect individuals' religious tendencies. In this context, intrinsic religiosity emerged in line with individuals' internal orientation, and extrinsic religiosity was in line with their external orientation (Allport and Ross, 1967). These concepts, which are used to express the influence of religion in the lives of individuals, are used to express the internal and external tendencies of religion. As a carrier of meanings embedded in cultural symbols, food has a vital role in representing the values and beliefs of a broader culture. In this context, food serves to institutionalize the characteristics and beliefs of a culture with the meanings it symbolizes (Usha Rani et al., 2003). Therefore, eating behaviors are influenced by both socio-economic and socio-cultural factors. In addition to religion, food is a physiological and cultural need (Harris, 1995).

Food uniquely impacts self-perception and social groups due to its symbolic meanings (Pilcher, 2012). Socially integrated and collectively produced food has historically formed the foundations of the culture of many communities (Anderson, 1970). Food is cohesive in social groups by providing a sense of togetherness. While stuffed turkey is a unique accompaniment to holidays in many societies, breaking bread together, that is, sharing it, represents the transfer of togetherness through the metaphor of food. Equality and unity are essential social motivations for all religions (Caplan et al., 1998; Feeley-Harnik, 1995). Bailey and Sood (1993: 328) emphasize the effects of religious beliefs and practices and the connections between religion and consumer behavior: "Food purchasing patterns are prominent examples of the importance of fasting and feasting for belief in taboos." In this context, the roles that religion affects individuals' food choices can be summarized as nutritional restrictions, identity expression, dietary control, eating habits, togetherness and social belonging, mood, health, and food taboos (Geertz, 1973; Sabate, 2004; Albala & Eden, 2011; Blix, 2001; Fieldhouse, 2017). Therefore, the following hypotheses have been developed to examine the effects of religious orientations on food choices;

H1: Individuals' religious orientations have a statistically significant effect on motivation to eat.

H1a: Individuals' religious orientations statistically affect the pleasure dimension from their eating motivation.

H1b: Individuals' religious orientations statistically affect the social image dimension, one of their eating motivations.

H1c: Individuals' religious orientations have a statistically significant effect on the sociability dimension, one of their eating motivations.

H1d: Individuals' religious orientations have a statistically significant effect on the dimension of health and naturalness anxiety, which is one of their eating motivations.

H1e: Individuals' religious orientations statistically affect the convenience dimension, one of their eating motivations.

H1f: Individuals' religious orientation has a statistically significant effect on the emotional state dimension, one of their eating motivations.

H1g: Individuals' religious orientation has a statistically significant effect on the price dimension, one of their eating motivations.

H1h: Individuals' religious orientations have a statistically significant effect on the weight control dimension, one of their eating motivations.

H1i: Individuals' religious orientations have a statistically significant effect on the dimensions of eating motivations, liking, and habits.

H1j: Individuals' religious orientations have a statistically significant effect on the dimension of visual attraction, one of their eating motivations.

3. Data and Method

Instrument

A questionnaire technique was used to collect data in the study. In the first part, there are eight questions to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants. In the second part, 16 statements with the scale of religious orientations, and in the third part, there are 78 statements to determine the eating motivations that the participants attach importance to in choosing food. Religious Orientations Questionnaire: The original scale was developed by Allport and Ross (1967). Korkmaz and Dal's (2019) study titled "The Purchase of Domestic and Foreign Products of Nationalism, Religiosity, and Materialism" was adapted into Turkish, and its validity and reliability tests were conducted. The statements in the scale consist of 16 statements and three dimensions following the 5-point Likert scale (5: I completely agree, 4: I agree, 3: I somewhat agree, 2: I do not agree, 1: I strongly disagree). The Eating Motivation Scale (TEMS), which was used to measure the eating motivation of the participants in the study, was created based on the study of Steptoe et al., (1995), developed by Renner et al., (2012), and translated into Turkish by the researcher. The translation was double-sided by three experts, and its suitability was checked. The scale consists of 15 dimensions covering 78 expressions. Each statement (1: Never true, 2: Very rarely true, 3: Rarely true, 4: Occasionally true, 5: Often true, 6: Usually true, 7: Always true) on a 7-point Likert-type scale rate. The compliance of the measurement tool with ethical standards was approved by the Sakarya University of Applied Sciences Rectorate Ethics Committee with the board decision dated 24/03/2021 and numbered 100/8112.

Sampling and data collection

A quantitative research method was adopted in this study, which aims to measure the effects of religious orientations on the eating motivations of individuals living in Van. The research used the deductive approach (Cooper & Schindler, 2013). The population of this research consists of adult individuals living in the province of Van. According to TUIK data, As of 31 December 2020, the population of Van province is 1,149,342 (TUIK, 2021). Since Van is one of the provinces with the highest population in the Eastern Anatolia Region, it was chosen as the research universe. The population of İpekyolu district is 334,470, and the population of Tuşba district is 162.153 in 2020. A total of 496,623 people live in the İpekyolu and Tuşba districts, the central districts of Van province (TUIK, 2021). In this study, when the size of the universe is accepted as 500,000 people, in cases where the population size is known, the sample number was calculated as n=384 according to the 95% confidence level (Altunışık et al., 2012). The convenience sampling technique, one of the non-probabilistic sampling methods, was preferred in the sample selection (Berg & Lune, 2017). 436 questionnaires were collected online between April 2021 and June 2021 to reach more than the targeted number of participants. The six questionnaire forms returned were excluded from the sample because the demographic data information was incomplete or unsuitable for evaluation. Analyzes were conducted using data from 430 valid and complete questionnaires.

Data analysis

Since the eating motivation scale used in the study was used for the first time in the Van population, a pilot test was conducted before the scale was finally used. A pilot test was applied to 150 people living in Van province with a convenient sampling method in January 2021 to determine the reliability of the survey. According to the findings of the pilot test, it was determined that the eating motivation scale was reliable (α: 0.726; α: 0.952). In this research, quantitative research methods were applied, and hierarchical regression analysis was performed to implement hypothesis tests using the data screening process suggested by Hair et al. (2009) with a deductive approach.

The data were subjected to a screening process. Following this, frequency statistics are used to check for missing values and whether the normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity assumptions were met. Missing values and the correct method were determined by following the steps suggested by Hair et al., 2009. Accordingly, the mean substitution method was used to assign the missing values. Second, the Mahalanobis distance was used to detect outliers, and none were identified (Mahalanobis D [51] 121.14893, $p < .001$) (Hair et al., 2009). Third, the normality of the data was checked by evaluating the Skewness and Kurtosis values (+/−3), which are among the recommended values (Kline, 2015). As a result of the applications, it was seen that the data set was suitable for hierarchical regression analysis. First, descriptive analysis, factor analysis, and hierarchical regression analysis were performed. The assumptions of regression analysis (absence of missing data and extreme values, normality distribution, multicollinearity problem, lack of multicollinearity, and autocorrelation between independent variables) were examined in addition to the data screening process, VIF values, and Durbin-Watson coefficients are given in the hypothesis tests table.

4. Findings

Sample demographics

In this part of the study, findings regarding the demographic characteristics of the participants living in the central districts of Van (İpekyolu, Tuşba) are evaluated. In this context, information regarding descriptive analysis is given in Table 1.

Tablo 1. Findings on the Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Variables		n	%
Gender	Woman	245	57.0
	Male	184	43.0
Marital Status	Married	210	48.8
	Single	220	51.2
Age	18-24	89	20.7
	25-31	106	24.7
	32-38	89	20.6
	39-45	67	15.6
	46-52	47	10.9
	53+	32	7.4
Income Status	less than 1500	72	16.7
	1500-3000	59	13.7
	3001-4500	38	8.8
	4501-6000	51	11.9
	6001-7500	43	10.0
	7501-9000	41	9.5
	above 9000	126	29.3
Religion	Islam	412	95.8
	Christianity	3	0.7
	Deism	2	0.5
	Atheism	3	0.7
	None	10	2.3
Educational Status	Primary education	12	2.8
	High school	38	8.8
	Bachelors	170	39.5
	Master	89	20.7
	Doctorate	121	28.1
Total		430	100.0

Source: Elaborated by Authors

According to the results of the descriptive analysis of the research sample, 57.0% (245 people) of the participants were women, and 43.0% (184 people) were men. 20.7% (89 people) of the participants were in the range of 18-24, 20.6% (106 people) were in the range of 25-31, 20.6% (89 people) were in the range of 32-38, 16.6% (67 people) Between 39-45, 10.9% (47 people) are between 46-52 and 7.4% (32 people) are over 53 years old. 16.7% (72 people) of the participants were less than 1500 TL, 113.7% (59 people) 1500-3000, 8.8% (38 people) 3001-4500, 11.9% (51 people) 4501-6000, 10% (43 people) 6001-7500, 9.5% (41 people) 7501-9000, and 29.3% (126 people) 9000 TL or more is seen. When the educational status of the participants is examined, it is seen that 39.5% have undergraduate, 20.7% graduate, 28.1% PhD and above, 8.8% have high school, and finally, 2.8% have primary education. The majority of the individuals participating in the research (95.8%) consist of individuals belonging to the Islamic religion.

Factor analysis

When the data on the reliability tests of the scales used in the research were examined, it was determined that the Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the religious orientations scale was 0.86; the TEMS scale was found to be 0.97. As a result of this analysis, it was seen that the scales had internal consistency (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

In the study, KMO values were 90.8% and 95.9%. Barlett's test of sphericity 0.00 ($p<0.05$) was observed (Howard, 2016). The Maximum Likelihood model and Direct Oblimin rotation technique were used in factor analysis. The maximum likelihood technique, is aimed to obtain the most suitable dimensions for the original dimensions of the scales (Rabe-Hesketh et al., 2003). Since the number of participants was less than 1000, the direct oblimin rotation technique was preferred. In the factor analysis, statements with a factor load of more than 0.40 were included in the research (Howard, 2016). In this context, a 3-dimensional structure was determined in the scale of religious orientations in accordance with the original scale structure

Table 2. Explanatory Factor Analysis of the Religious Orientation Scale

Inner Religiosity	**Expl. Var. 38.726**	**Cr. Alpha 0.941**	**Mean 4.0372**	**Std. Dev. 1.06907**	**Factor Load**
I have no doubts about the existence of the Creator.					0,917
My religion is important because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.					0,911
The prayer I pray alone is as important as the prayer I pray in the house of worship.					0,836
It is important to me to take time to worship and be alone with the creator.					0,888
The most important thing religion has to offer me is that it provides relief in disturbing and distressing situations.					0,710
I enjoy reading about my religion.					0,807
Although it is difficult to live my life in line with my religious beliefs, I strive for it.					0,710
Worship is for peace and happiness.					0,665
Personal External Religiosity	Expl. Var. 12.015	Cr. Alpha 0.672	Mean 2.5494	Std. Dev. .99094	Factor Load
Although I have religious beliefs, many other things are more important in life.					0,703
It doesn't matter what I believe as long as I'm a good person.					0,907
Sometimes I have to ignore my religious beliefs because of what people may think about me.					0,540
Even though I'm religious, I don't let it affect my daily life.					0,662
Social Extrinsic Religiosity	Expl. Var. 10.034	Cr. Alpha 0.807	Mean 2.1802	Std. Dev. .99405	Factor Load
I enjoy going to a temple because I am happy to see people I know there.					0,688
I go to the temple because it helps me make friends.					0,694
My whole perspective on life is based on religion.					0,409
I often go to the temple to be with my friends.					0,547

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis with Direct Oblimin Rotation: *Total Variance Explained: 60.77%; Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin Sample Size: 0.908; Barlett Test of Sphericity (0.00): p<0.05; df. 120; Chi-Square: 4339,178 Evaluation Range (For All Dimensions [1] Strongly Disagree – [5] Strongly Agree)*

Source: Elaborated by Authors

(Allport & Ross, 1967). The findings related to the scale of religious orientations are shown in Table 2.

It was observed that the loads related to the factor values of the expressions in the scale of religious orientations ranged from 0.917 to 0.409. The dimensions created by these expressions are named "Inner Religiosity", "Personal External Religiosity" and "Social External Religiosity" (Allport & Ross, 1967; Korkmaz & Dal, 2019). While the explained variance of these dimensions was determined as 60.77%, the reliability coefficients were calculated as 0.94 for the intrinsic religiosity dimension, 0.67 for the personal extrinsic religiosity dimension, and 0.80 for the social extrinsic religiosity dimension.

Explanatory factor analysis was applied the eating motivation scale. As a result of the analysis, a new 10-dimensional scale structure was reached by removing the 15 expressions that distorted the factor structure and remained below 0.40. These dimensions are different from the original scale structure from which 13 and 15-dimensional structures were obtained (Renner et al., 2012). It is thought that this difference is due to the social and cultural characteristics of the sample in which the scale was applied.

Statements extracted from the scale are "It is part of my daily diet," "I need energy," "It satisfies me pleasantly," "It keeps me in shape (e.g., energetic, motivated)," "I eat because of traditions (e.g., family traditions, special occasions)", "I grew up eating it," "So I can socialize," "So I can spend time with other people," "You get what you pay for," "I feel lonely," and "My doctor says I should eat." These expressions were excluded from EFA because their factor loadings remained below 0.40, a factor load of 0.30 was loaded under the alternative factor, or there was a difference greater than 0.20 between the primary factor and alternative factor loadings (Hinkin, 1998; Costello & Osborne, 2005; Hair et. al., 2006; Howard, 2016). The findings regarding the eating motivations scale are shown in Appendix 1.

It was determined that the factor loadings of the eating motivation scale took values between 0.918 and 0.422. It was observed that the total variance explained was 73.43%. Of the total variance explained in the scale, 42.96% was the first factor called "Pleasure", 9.82% was the second factor named "Social Image", 4.45% was the third factor named "Socialism", 3.36% was "Health and The fourth factor named as "Natural Concern", the fifth factor named as "Convenience" with 2.96%, the sixth factor named as "Emotional State" with 2.33%, the seven-factor named as "Price" 2.17%, the factor named "Price" 2.02% The eighth factor named as "Weight Control", the ninth factor named as "Like and Habits" with 1.41%, and the ten factors named as "Visual Attraction" with 1.28% were explained. Cronbach Alpha values for the reliability analysis applied to the newly formed 10-dimensional factor structure were 0.94 for the first factor; 0.93 for the second factor; 0.95 for the third factor; 0.94 for the fourth factor; 0.93 for the fifth factor; 0.94 for the sixth factor, 0.92 for the seventh factor, 0.90 for the eighth factor, 0.94 for the ninth factor and 0.91 for the tenth factor. Since these values were above 0.60, the scale was accepted as reliable (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988).

Hypothesis testing

Before the hypotheses of the research, the suitability of the data for regression analysis was examined. In this context, the validity of the absence of extreme values and missing data in the data set, normality assumption, linearity assumption, and autocorrelation assumptions were evaluated. As a result of the analysis, it was seen that the data met the assumptions of the regression analysis, and then hierarchical regression analysis was applied with the forward method. The results of the hierarchical regression analysis conducted in the study are shown in Appendix 2.

Based on findings, according to the model (H1) that examines the effects of religious orientations on the dimensions of eating motivation, it is seen that the variables of intrinsic religiosity and personal extrinsic religiosity are significant predictors of the dimensions of eating motivations ($p<.05$). Social extrinsic religiosity was not found to be an essential predictor ($p=0.374$ $p>.05$).

In the regression model examining the H2 hypothesis, intrinsic religiosity, personal extrinsic religiosity, and social extrinsic religiosity explain 9% of pleasure motivation. The hypothesis "H2: Individuals' religious orientations affect the pleasure dimension from their eating motivation" was accepted regarding intrinsic, personal, extrinsic, and social extrinsic religiosity.

For the H3 model, internal religiosity and extrinsic religiosity variables were significant predictors of social image eating motivation ($p<0.05$). Personal extrinsic religiosity was not a significant predictor of social image eating motivation ($p=.284$). It is seen through beta values that the variables of intrinsic religiosity and social extrinsic religiosity positively affect social image eating motivation.

In the regression model established for the H4 hypothesis, it was observed that the internal religiosity variable was a significant predictor ($p<.05$) of the sociability variable. According to the analysis results, the intrinsic religiosity variable is a significant predictor of the sociability variable ($p<.05$). Accordingly, the model established with the intrinsic religiosity variable explains 4% ($R2 = 0.040$) of the sociability eating motivation dimension. It is thought that 96% of sociability eating motivation can be explained by other variables not included in the research.

In the H5 model, on the other hand, social extrinsic religiosity and intrinsic religiosity were significant predictors ($p<.05$) of health and naturalness anxiety. As can be seen from the beta values, the variable of internal religiosity positively affects the dimension of health and naturalness concern, and the variable of social extrinsic religiosity negatively affects the dimension of health and naturalness concern.

In the analysis of the H6 model, internal religiosity and personal extrinsic religiosity were significant predictors ($p<.05$) of the convenience variable. It is seen that the variables of intrinsic religiosity and personal extrinsic religiosity positively affect the motivation to eat conveniently (ß:0.258; 0.114).

As a result of the analysis of the H7 hypothesis, it was determined that the variables of intrinsic religiosity and personal extrinsic religiosity were significant predictors of the emotional state variable ($p<.05$). It is observed that the variables of intrinsic religiosity and personal extrinsic religiosity positively affect the motivation to eat convenience (ß: 0.194; 0.102).

As seen in the H8 model, the internal religiosity variable is a significant predictor of the price variable ($p<.05$). While it was observed that the intrinsic religiosity variable had a positive effect on the price dimension, one of the eating motivations (ß: 0.129).

As a result of the regression analysis for the H9 weight control variable, the independent variables of intrinsic religiosity and personal extrinsic religiosity are significant predictors of the dependent variable of weight control, which is one of the sub-dimensions of eating motivations ($p<.05$). When beta values are examined, it is seen that the variables of intrinsic religiosity and extrinsic religiosity affect the eating motivations positively.

According to the results of the analysis, intrinsic religiosity, personal extrinsic religiosity, and social extrinsic religiosity independent variables were found to be significant predictors of the sub-dimensions of taste and habits, which are sub-dimensions of eating motivations in the H10 model ($p<.05$). While intrinsic religiosity and personal extrinsic religiosity variables seem to affect eating motivations positively (ß: 0.398; 0.123), it is seen that social extrinsic religiosity affects negatively (ß: -0.140).

In the analysis of the H11 hypothesis, it was observed that the intrinsic religiosity, personal extrinsic religiosity, and social extrinsic religiosity independent variables were significant predictors ($p<.05$) of the visual attraction dependent variable, one of the sub-dimensions of eating motivations. It is seen that the internal religiosity variable affects the visual attraction positively, while the social external religiosity variable affects the visual attraction variable negatively. Based on the findings, it was seen that all hypotheses were accepted, albeit partially.

5. Discussion and Conclusions

In the study by Steptoe et al. (1995), the TEMS scale was developed to examine individuals' food choices. The religion factor is counted among individuals' food choices in this scale. The study, which produced a multidimensional motivation measure for food choice, concluded that health, cost, comfort, and taste influence dietary choices. The study measures the effects of religious orientations in the Van sample on eating motivations. The research is similar to many studies in the related literature that focus on the factors that affect individuals in food choices (Drenowski, 1992; Delaney & McCarthy, 2014; Lau et al., 1984; Rappaport et al., 1992; Renner et al., 2012; Steptoe et al., 1995).

Exploratory factor analysis was performed because the eating motivation scale used in the study was applied for the first time in the Van population. As a result of this analysis, a new 10-dimensional scale structure emerged. Applying this scale in future studies of the Turkish population is essential in terms of the generalizability of the results. It is seen that the dimensions of liking and habits are combined within the new factor structure. This is because individuals living in Van identify their feelings of liking and habit. Factor confluence also has recurring consequences for the dimensions of naturalness and health. This situation reflects the idea that food can only be healthy if it is natural. As a result of the analysis, it was seen that the scale of eating motivations had a new structure with ten valid and reliable dimensions. This situation is thought to arise from the socio-economic and cultural characteristics of the individuals living in Van. In the factor analysis of the scale of religious orientations, it was concluded that the dimension with the highest explained variance was the dimension of internal religiosity. The liking of the food to be eaten by the individual in food consumption is an important motivation that increases the frequency of consumption of that food (Berridge, 1996; Finlayson et al., 2007). Unconscious and repetitive habits of individuals can lead to stable food preferences. In this context, the study results are compatible with the literature (Delener, 1994; Steenkamp, 1993).

As a result of the regression analysis made in the research, it was concluded that the religious orientation of the individuals was influential on their eating motivation. As a result of the study, it was seen that while intrinsic religiosity and personal extrinsic religiosity religious orientations were practical on eating motivations, the social extrinsic religiosity variable was not. This situation is thought to be because it is impossible to explain individuals' whole eating motivation by considering only religious factors. Food choices are a multidimensional preference mechanism in the life cycle. It has been observed that all sub-dimensions of religious orientations affect individuals' feelings of liking and habits. Religion has influenced consumers' attitudes, behaviors, psychology, life, and decisions on purchasing. As a result of the analysis, it has been seen that religious orientations are practical in each dimension that creates eating motivations. While it was determined that the religious orientation of individuals was most effective on the dimension of tastes and habits, it was seen that the most negligible effect was on the price dimension.

Since all hypotheses created following the research's purpose were partially accepted, it is thought that the research achieved the predicted results. Among the

research hypotheses, the effects of religious orientations on taste and habit-eating motivation had the highest impact power (R2=0.142). In contrast, the price factor had the lowest impact power (R2=0.017) among eating motivations.

The findings revealed in this research will benefit sector representatives in the food and beverage industry who aim to know the motivations that govern their customers' food preferences. Since the service sector is labor-intensive, it requires specialization in customer behavior. Therefore, being informed about the eating motivations of customers or guests will provide an advantage in the industry. At the same time, this study, which is planned to make sense of the effects of religious orientations on eating motivations without segregating religions, examines the impact of individuals' beliefs on their eating motivations, regardless of right or wrong. In this context, some suggestions have been made for public institutions and organizations, private sector enterprises, and researchers interested in the subject. Eating practices can be developed by food companies, food and beverage businesses, tourism professionals, and hotel businesses in Turkey, considering their customers' religious orientations. Guests with high religious sensitivity may prefer companies with a wide range of products. The private sector, public institutions, and organizations can cooperate in food and beverage supply and facilitate access to products that comply with the restrictions of every religion in Turkey. Marketing activities can be carried out to increase interest in religious foods by using existing infrastructure and resources. Religious foods can be developed using technological production methods. Religious products planned to be affordable and hygienic can be sold abroad and domestically, thus increasing tourism and export revenues. For researchers, the indicators determined in this study can be tested in a destination with high religious ethnicity in Turkey to test whether there is a differentiation situation. In future research, comparative studies can be conducted with countries with differences in socio-economic and socio-cultural context. These indicators' performance can be tested using qualitative research tools such as observation and interviews. In this context, this study is considered necessary in examining the effects of individuals' belief perceptions on their eating motivations. It is hoped that it will help future studies in sectoral and academic terms.

References

Albala, K., & Eden, T. (2011). *Food & Faith in Christian Culture.* Columbia University Press.

Allport, G. W. (1950). *The Individual and His Religion: A Psychological Interpretation.* Macmillian, New York.

Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal Religious Orientation and Prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*(4), 432.

Altunışık, R., Coşkun, R., Bayraktaroğlu, S., & Yıldırım, E. (2012). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri: SPSS Uygulamalı.* Sakarya: Sakarya Yayıncılık.

Anderson, C. (1970). *White Protestant Americans: From National Origins to Religious Group.* Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.

Argyle, M. (2006). *Religious Behaviour.* Routledge.

Armitage, C. J., & Conner, M. (2004). The effects of attitudinal ambivalence on attitude-intention-behavior relations. *Contemporary Perspectives on the Psychology of Attitudes,* 121-143.

Asp, E. H. (1999). Factors affecting food decisions made by individual consumers. *Food Policy, 24*(2-3), 287-294.

Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of the structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 16*(1), 74-94.

Bailey, J. M., & Sood, J. (1993). The effects of religious affiliation on consumer behavior: A preliminary investigation. *Journal of Managerial Issues,* 328-352.

Barth, F. (1994). I gruppi etnici ei loro confini. In Maher, V. (a cura di), *Questioni di etnicità,* Rosenberg & Sellier, Torino.

Beaver, J. D., Lawrence, A. D., Van Ditzhuijzen, J., Davis, M. H., Woods, A., & Calder, A. J. (2006). Individual differences in reward drive predict neural responses to images of food. *Journal of Neuroscience, 26*(19), 5160-5166.

Bell, R., & Meiselman, H. (1995). The role of eating environments in determining food choice. In *Food Choice and the Consumer,* 292-310.

Bellisle, F. (2005). Nutrition and health in France: Dissecting a paradox. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 105*(12), 1870-1873.

Belzen, J. A., & Seyhan, B. Y. (2012). Din Psikolojisindeki Metodolojik Kaygılar: Değişmeyenler, Değişenler ve Dönüştürücü Perspektifler. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 16*(1), 685-747.

Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2017). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences.* Pearson.

Berridge, K. C. (1996). Food reward: Brain substrates of wanting and liking. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, 20,* 1–25.

Berridge, K. C. (2004). Motivation concepts in behavioral neuroscience. *Physiology & Behavior, 81*(2), 179-209.

Beşirli, H. (2017). *Yemek Sosyolojisi: Yiyeceklere ve Mutfağa Sosyolojik Bir Bakış.* Phoenix.

Birch, L. L. (1999). Development of food preferences. *Annual Review of Nutrition, 19*(1), 41-62.

Blix, G. (2001). Religion, spirituality, and a vegetarian dietary. In Sabate, J. (Eds.), *Vegetarian Nutrition,* pp. 507–532. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Caplan, P., Keane, A., Willetts, A., & Williams, J. (1998). Studying food choice in its social and cultural contexts: Approaches from a social anthropological perspective. In

Murcott, A. (Ed.), *The Nation's Diet: The Social Science of Food Choice.* London: Longman, 168-182.

Cardello, A. (1996). Food choice, acceptance and consumption (pp. 239-263). In Meiselman, H. L. (Ed.), *The contextual basis for food acceptance, food choice and food intake: The food, the situation and the individual*. Springer, Boston.

Conner, C. (2008). Culinary omnivorousness: The relationship between social class and food consumption patterns. *M.Sc. Thesis in Applied Sociology*, Clemson University. UMI Number: 1450769.

Cooper, D., & Schindler, P. (2013). *Business research methods* (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, *10*, 1–9.

Delaney, M., & McCarthy, M. B. (2014). Saints, sinners and non-believers: The moral space of food. A qualitative exploration of beliefs and perspectives on healthy eating of Irish adults aged 50–70. *Appetite, 73*, 105-113.

Delener, N. (1994). Religious contrasts in consumer decision behaviour patterns: Their dimensions and marketing implications. *European Journal of Marketing, 28*(5), 36-53.

Devine, C. M. (2005). A life course perspective: Understanding food choices in time, social location, and history. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior, 37*(3), 121-128.

Douglas, M. (2003). *Purity and danger: An analysis of concepts of pollution and taboo*. Routledge.

Drenowski, A. (1992). Nutritional perspectives on biobehavioral models of dietary change. In K. K. DeRoos (Ed.), *Promoting dietary change in communities* (pp. 96–112). Washington: Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center.

Dugan, B. (1994). Religion and food service. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 35*(6), 80-85.

Duran, M. E. (2018). Din-korku ilişkisinin psikolojik olarak incelenmesi. *Journal of Institute of Economic Development and Social Researches, 4*(8), 84-87.

Eertmans, A., Baeyens, F., & Van Den Bergh, O. (2001). Food likes and their relative importance in human eating behavior: Review and preliminary suggestions for health promotion. *Health Education Research, 16*(4), 443-456.

Ergönül, B. (2013). Consumer awareness and perception to food safety: A consumer analysis. *Food Control, 32*(2), 461-471.

Falk, L. W., Bisogni, C. A., & Sobal, J. (1996). Food choice processes of older adults. *Journal of Nutrition Education, 28*, 257–265.

Feeley-Harnik, G. (1995). Religion and food: An anthropological perspective. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion, 63*(3), 565-582.

Fernández-Armesto, F. (2002). *Near a thousand tables: A history of food*. Simon and Schuster.

Fieldhouse, P. (2017). *Food, feasts, and faith: An encyclopedia of food culture in world religions [2 volumes]*. ABC-Clio.

Finlayson, G., King, N., & Blundell, J. E. (2007). Liking vs. wanting food: Importance for human appetite control and weight regulation. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, 31*, 987–1002.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures* (Vol. 5019). Basic Books.

Glanz, K., Basil, M., Maibach, E., Goldberg, J., & Snyder, D. A. N. (1998). Why Americans eat what they do: Taste, nutrition, cost, convenience, and weight control concerns as influences on food consumption. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 98*(10), 1118-1126.

Grankvist, G., & Biel, A. (2001). The importance of beliefs and purchase criteria in the choice of eco-labeled food products. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 21*(4), 405-410.

Greeley, A. (1977). *The American Catholic: A social portrait*. Basic Books.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., & Anderson, R. E. (2009). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). New York: Prentice Hall.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (Vol. 6). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Harris, M. (1995). The sacred cow. *Cultural Anthropology*. Harper Collins College Publishers, New York.

Harris, M., & Ross, E. B. (1987). *Food and evolution: Toward a theory of human food habits*. Temple University Press.

Heiman, A., Just, D. R., McWilliams, B., & Zilberman, D. (2001). Incorporating family interactions and socioeconomic variables into family production functions: The case of demand for meats. *Agribusiness: An International Journal, 17*(4), 455-468.

Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*, 104–121.

Holm, L., & Kildevang, H. (1996). Consumers' views on food quality: A qualitative interview study. *Appetite, 27*(1), 1-14.

Honkanen, P., & Frewer, L. (2009). Russian consumers' motives for food choice. *Appetite, 52*(2), 363-371.

Howard, M. C. (2016). A review of exploratory factor analysis decisions and overview of current practices: What we are doing and how can we improve? *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 32*(1), 51-62.

Jackson, B., Cooper, M. L., Mintz, L., & Albino, A. (2003). Motivations to eat: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37*(4), 297-318.

Janas, B. G., Bisogni, C. A., & Campbell, C. C. (1993). Conceptual model for dietary change to lower serum cholesterol. *Journal of Nutrition Education, 25*(4), 186-192.

Kahraman, A. (2018). *Dinler tarihi.* Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları.

Kızılçelik, S. (1994). *Sosyoloji teorileri.* Yunus Emre Grafik Tasarım Yayıncılık.

Kline, R. B. (2015). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. Guilford Publications.

Korkmaz, İ., & Dal, N. E. (2019). Milliyetçilik, dindarlık ve materyalizmin yerli ve yabancı ürünlerin satın alma (Nationalism, religiosity and materialism buying domestic and foreign products). *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *11*(3), 2094-2113.

Land, B. (1998). Consumers dietary patterns and desires for change. Centre for Market Surveillance, Research and Strategy for the Food Sector. Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus School of Business.

Lau, D., Krondl, M., & Coleman, P. (1984). Psychological factors affecting food selection. In J. Galler (Ed.), *Nutrition and behavior* (pp. 397–415). New York: Plenum Press.

Lenski, G. (1961). *The religious factor*. Doubleday.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1958). *Anthropologie structurale* (Vol. 171). Paris: Plon.

McClure, S. M., Li, J., Tomlin, D., Cypert, K. S., Montague, L. M., & Montague, P. R. (2004). Neural correlates of behavioral preference for culturally familiar drinks. *Neuron, 44*(2), 379-387.

Méndez-Montoya, A. F. (2012). *The theology of food: Eating and the Eucharist*. John Wiley & Sons.

Mintz, S. W. (1982). *Sweetness and power: The place of sugar in modern history*. Viking Press.

Mintz, S. W., & Du Bois, C. M. (2002). The anthropology of food and eating. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 31*(1), 99-119.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Nye, M. (2008). *Religion: The basics* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

O'Dea, K. (1991). Traditional diet and food preferences of Australian Aboriginal hunter-gatherers. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences, 334*(1270), 233-241.

Onay, A. (2002). Dini yönelim ölçeği. *İslamiyat Dergisi, 5*(4), 181-192.

Petersen, L. R., & Roy, A. (1985). Religiosity, anxiety, and meaning and purpose: Religion's consequences for psychological well-being. *Review of Religious Research*, 49-62.

Pilcher, J. M. (2012). *The Oxford handbook of food history*. Oxford University Press.

Rabe-Hesketh, S., Skrondal, A., & Pickles, A. (2003). Maximum likelihood estimation of generalized linear models with covariate measurement error. *The Stata Journal, 3*(4), 386-411.

Rangel, A. (2013). Regulation of dietary choice by the decision-making circuitry. *Nature Neuroscience, 16*(12), 1717.

Rani, D. U., Reddy, M. S., & Sreedevamma, M. (2003). Nutrition and religion. Discovery Publishing House.

Rappaport, L., Peters, G., Huff-Corzine, L., & Downey, R. (1992). Reasons for eating: An exploratory cognitive analysis. *Ecology of Food and Nutrition, 28*, 171–189.

Renner, B., Sproesser, G., Strohbach, S., & Schupp, H. T. (2012). Why we eat what we eat. The Eating Motivation Survey (TEMS). *Appetite, 59*(1), 117-128.

Robinson, E., Aveyard, P., Daley, A., Jolly, K., Lewis, A., Lycett, D., & Higgs, S. (2013). Eating attentively: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effect of food intake memory and awareness on eating. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, 97*(4), 728-742.

Rogers, P. J., & Blundell, J. E. (1990). Psychobiological bases of food choice. *BNF Nutrition Bulletin, 15*(Supplement 1), 31-40.

Rozin, P. (2006). The integration of biological, social, cultural and psychological influences on food choice. *Frontiers in Nutritional Science, 3*, 19.

Rozin, P. (2007). Food and eating. In S. Kitayama & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology* (pp. 391–416). Guilford Press.

Rozin, P., & Tuorila, H. (1993). Simultaneous and temporal contextual influences on food acceptance. *Food Quality and Preference, 4*(1-2), 11-20.

Sabate, J. (2004). Religion, diet and research. *British Journal of Nutrition, 92*(2), 199-201.

Samuel, F., & Makhani, N. (2016). Food cultures. In *Community nutrition for developing countries* (pp. 47).

Shepherd, D. (1985). Dietary salt intake. *Nutrition & Food Science, 96*, 10–11.

Shepherd, R., & Farleigh, C. A. (1989). Sensory assessment of foods and the role of sensory attributes in determining food choice. In R. Shepherd (Ed.), *Handbook of the psychophysiology of human eating* (pp. 25–56). Wiley.

Simopoulos, A. P. (2004). The traditional diet of Greece and cancer. *European Journal of Cancer Prevention, 13*(3), 219-230.

Smarth, N. (2002). *One God and others name in the word*. Temple University Press.

Sobal, J. (1998). Cultural comparison research designs in food, eating, and nutrition. *Food Quality and Preference, 9*, 385–392.

Sobal, J., & Bisogni, C. A. (2009). Constructing food choice decisions. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 38*(suppl_1), S37–S46.

Sproesser, G., Moraes, J. M. M., Renner, B., & Alvarenga, M. D. S. (2019). The Eating Motivation Survey in Brazil: Results from a sample of the general adult population. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 2334.

Steenkamp, J. B. E. (1993). Food consumption behavior. *European Advances in Consumer Research, 1*, 401-409.

Steptoe, A., Pollard, T. M., & Wardle, J. (1995). Development of a measure of the motives underlying the selection of food: The Food Choice Questionnaire. *Appetite, 25*(3), 267-284.

Subaşı, N. (2015). Türkiye'de din, dinî toplumsallıklar ve din sosyolojisi. *Sosyoloji Konferansları, 52*, 1-12.

Sun, Y. H. C. (2008). Health concern, food choice motives, and attitudes toward healthy eating: The mediating role of food choice motives. *Appetite, 51*(1), 42-49.

Teff, K. L., & Engelman, K. (1996). Palatability and dietary restraint: Effect on cephalic phase insulin release in women. *Physiology & Behavior, 60*(2), 567-573.

Torjusen, H., Lieblein, G., Wandel, M., & Francis, C. A. (2001). Food system orientation and quality perception among consumers and producers of organic food in Hedmark County, Norway. *Food Quality and Preference, 12*(3), 207-216.

TUIK. (2021). Van Province Address Based Population Registration System (2021). https://www.tuik.gov.tr (Accessed: May 24, 2021).

Turner, V. (2018). *Dramas, fields, and metaphors: Symbolic action in human society*. Cornell University Press.

Ünsal, A. (2020). *İktidarların sofrası: Yemek, siyaset ve simgesellik*. Everest Yayınları.

Vermeir, I., & Verbeke, W. (2008). Sustainable food consumption among young adults in Belgium: Theory of planned behaviour and the role of confidence and values. *Ecological Economics, 64*(3), 542-553.

Wandel, M., & Bugge, A. (1997). Environmental concern in consumer evaluation of food quality. *Food Quality and Preference, 8*(1), 19-26.

Williams, B., Onsman, A., & Brown, T. (2010). Exploratory factor analysis: A five-step guide for novices. *Australasian journal of paramedicine*, 8, 1-13.

APPENDIES

Appendix 1. Explanatory Factor Analysis of the Eating Motivation Scale

Pleasure	**Exp. Var. 42.967**	**Cr. Alpha .942**	**Mean 4.8693**	**Std. Dev. 1.60835**	**Factor Load**
I enjoy eating					.536
I eat to pamper myself					.657
It makes me feel good					.741
I eat to reward myself					.651
It's fun to eat					.639
Social Image	Exp. Var. 9.826	Cr. Alpha .935	Mean 2.6549	Std. Dev. 1.71932	Factor Load
Fashionable					-.860
Makes me look good in front of others					-.918
Because others love					-.918
To show that I'm different from others					-.896
It is considered a special dish					-.529
Sociability	Exp. Var. 4.458	Cr. Alpha .955	Mean 4.2031	Std. Dev. 1.75812	Factor Load
I can socialize.					-.857
So I can spend time with other people					-.890
Makes gatherings with others more comfortable					-.806
Eating with others is enjoyable					-.652
It makes the environments that you come with others more enjoyable.					-.732
Facilitates communication with others (e.g. at business lunches, events)					-.752
Health Concern and Naturalness	Exp. Var. 3.362	Cr. Alpha .944	Mean 4.7907	Std. Dev. 1.53376	Factor Load
Seasonal					.547
To meet my nutritional, vitamin and mineral needs					.467
It is useful for me					.472
Is healthy					.566
I eat it because it is natural (i.e. not genetically modified)					.833
I eat it because it does not contain harmful substances (e.g. pesticides, pollutants, antibiotics)					.826
Is organic					.830
Fair trade product					.460
I eat it because it is environmentally friendly (e.g. production, packaging, shipping)					.592
Convenience	Exp. Var. 2.986	Cr. Alpha .936	Mean 4.5516	Std. Dev 1.58979	Factor Load
Is quick to prepare					-.807
Is the most suitable					-.539
Easy to prepare					-.871
I eat because it is easy and convenient to buy					-.686
Easily available (for example, by hand or offered by someone)					-.571
Emotional Status	Exp. Var. 2.337	Cr. Alpha .945	Mean 3.2426	Std. Dev 1.76241	Factor Load
I am sad					-.812
I'm disappointed					-.822
I feel alone					-.921
Diverts my attention					-.805
I feel stressed					-.892
It pleases me					-.422
Price	Exp. Var. 2.170	Cr. Alpha .920	Mean 3.8116	Std. Dev 1.65917	Factor Load
It is cheap					.745
I don't want to spend any more money					.814
On sale					.795
You get what you pay for.					.432
It's free					.661
I have already paid for					.615

Weight Control	Exp. Var. 2.025	Cr. Alpha .905	Mean 3.6605	Std. Dev 1.63358	Factor Load
I eat to maintain a balanced diet					.835
I want to lose weight					.855
Low in calories					.509
I am overweight					.735
I watch my weight					.792
Low in fat					.445
Likes and Habits	Exp. Var. 1.412	Cr. Alpha .948	Mean 5.0886	Std. Dev 1.29931	Factor Load
I think it's delicious					.722
I am hungry					.571
It tastes good					.854
It feels good to eat it					.729
I eat because I love					.838
I regularly consume					.639
I'm used to eating					.698
Is part of my diet					.617
Food that I know					.466
I eat because I'm hungry					.484
Visual Attraction	Exp. Var. 1.286	Cr. Alpha .917	Mean 4.3186	Std. Dev. 1.64187	Factor Load
Presentation is attractive (e.g. packaging)					.473
I am involuntarily attracted to (e.g. eye-level, attractive colors)					.536
Beautifully presented					.787
Looks attractive					.714

Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis with Direct Oblimin Rotation: Total Variance Explained: 73.43%; Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin Sample Size: 0.959; Barlett Test of Sphericity (0.00): p<0.05; df. 1953; Chi-Square: 30201.79 Evaluation Range ([1] Never True for All Dimensions – [7] Always True)

Appendix 2. Hierarchical Regression Analysis Findings Regarding Hypothesis Tests

Hypothesis	Dependent Variables	Independent Variables	B	Standard Error $_B$	ß	T	P
H1	Eating Motivations	Constant	2,500	0,261		9,584	.000
		Inner Religiosity	0,349	.052	.308	6.72	.000
		Personal Extrinsic Religiosity	0,124	.056	.101	2.22	.027
		R= 0.323; R^2=0.105; F=24.919; P=0,00; VIF: 1.226 (<2,5); D-W: 0,223 (1.5-2.5)					
H2	Pleasure	Constant	2.976	.351		8.481	.000
		Inner Religiosity	.451	.077	.300	5.849	.000
		Personal Extrinsic Religiosity	.226	.075	.139	3.010	.003
		Social Extrinsic Religiosity	-.231	.083	-.143	-2.781	.006
		R= 0.300; R^2=0.090 F=14,020; P<.05; VIF; 1,000(<2,5); D-W: 1.784 (1.5-2.5)					
H3	Social Image	Constant	1.472	.322		4.566	.000
		Inner Religiosity	.167	.084	.104	1.982	.048
		Social Extrinsic Religiosity	.233	.091	.135	2.563	.011
		R= 0.202; R^2=0.041 F=9,108 P<.0; VIF: 1.226 (<2,5); D-W: 1.927 (1.5-2.5)					
H4	Sociability	Constant	2.867	.391		8.818	.000
		Inner Religiosity	.331	.078	.201	4.249	.000
		R= 0.201; R^2=0.040 F=18,056 P<.05; VIF; 1,000(<2,5); D-W: 1,894 (1.5-2.5)					
H5	Health Concern and Naturalness	Constant	3.054	.276		11.074	.000
		Social Extrinsic Religiosity	.545	.072	.380	7.552	.000
		Inner Religiosity	-.213	.078	.138	-2.742	.006
		R= 0.344; R^2=0.118, F=28,670 P<.05; VIF; 1,226 (<2,5); D-W: 1,987 (1.5-2.5)					
H6	Convenience	Constant	2.537	.347		7.315	.000
		Inner Religiosity	.384	.069	.258	5.553	.000
		Personal Extrinsic Religiosity	.183	.075	.114	2.452	.015

		R= 0.281; R^2=0.079; F=18,295; P<.05; VIF; 1,000(<2,5); D-W: 1,865 (1.5-2.5)				
H7	Emotional State	Constant	1.491	.391		3.812	.000
		Inner Religiosity	.319	.078	.194	4.099	.000
		Personal Extrinsic Religiosity	.182	.084	.102	2.163	.031
		R= 0.218; R^2=0.048; F=10,655; P<.05; VIF; 1,000(<2,5); D-W: 2,028 (1.5-2.5)				
H8	Price	Constant	3.003	.311		9.666	.000
		Inner Religiosity	.200	.074	.129	2.693	.007
		R= 0.129; R^2=0.017; F=7,252 ; P<.05; VIF; 1,000(<2,5); D-W: 1,967 (1.5-2.5)				
H9	Weight Control	Constant	1.977	.362		5.467	.000
		Inner Religiosity	.313	.072	.205	4.350	.000
		Personal Extrinsic Religiosity	.164	.078	.100	2.113	.035
		R= 0.227; R^2=0.052; F=11,503 ; P<.05; VIF; 1,000(<2,5); D-W: 2,157 (1.5-2.5)				
H10	Likes and Habits	Constant	3.125	.275		11.353	.000
		Inner Religiosity	.484	.060	.398	8.009	.000
		Social Extrinsic Religiosity	-.183	.065	-.140	-2.816	.005
		Personal Extrinsic Religiosity	.161	.059	.123	2.279	.007
		R= 0.377; R^2=0.142; F=23,594 ; P<.05; VIF: 1,231(<2,5); D-W: 1,817 (1.5-2.5)				
H11	Visual Attraction	Constant	2,981	.275		5.467	.000
		Inner Religiosity	.331	.072	.216	4.569	.000
		R= 0.216; R^2=0.047; F: 20,879 ; P<.05: VIF: 1,000(<2,5); D-W: 1,896 (1.5-2.5)				

Jomat

Journal of multidisciplinary academic tourism

2025, 10 (1): 49-63

https://doi.org/10.31822/jomat.2025-10-1-49

ISSN: 2645-9078

INFO PAGE

Are religious orientations effective on eating motivation?

Abstract

The phenomenon of food consumption has evolved over time, influenced by social interactions, leading to diverse nutritional practices based on beliefs, politics, culture, and economic foundations. This research aims to determine eating motivations and reveal the effects of religious orientations on these motivations. The convenience sampling method, a non-probability sampling method among quantitative research sampling methods, was used in the study. Van province was chosen as the population of the research, and individuals living in the central districts of Van province (İpekyolu and Tuşba), where the population density is high, were selected as the sample. Since the eating motivations scale was applied for the first time in the Van population, exploratory factor analysis was performed. In this context, a 3-dimensional religious orientations scale and a newly structured 10-dimensional eating motivations scale were reached. As a result of the research, it is seen that individuals' religious orientations explain their eating motivations at a rate of 10.5%. The most affected sub-dimension of eating motivation is taste and habits, with 14.2%; The second dimension is health and naturalness, with 11.8%; The third dimension is convenience, with 7.9%. It was concluded that the dimension that least explains the regression model is the price dimension with 1.7%. Analysis results showed that there was a significant relationship between individuals' religious orientations and eating motivations. The research analysis supported and accepted all hypotheses established in the research model.

Keywords: *Gastronomy, Eating Motivation, Sociology of Food, Belief Sensitivities, Food Choices.*

Authors

Full Name	Author contribution roles	Contribution rate
Merve Uçkan Çakır:	*Conceptualism, Methodology, Software, Validation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Resources, Data Curation, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization, Funding acquisition*	*60%*
Şenol Çavuş:	*Methodology, Software, Validation, Formal Analysis, Resources, Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition*	*40%*

Author statement: *Author(s) declare(s) that All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.* ***Declaration of Conflicting Interests:*** *The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article*

Ethics Committee Satatement: Ethics committee report is available for this research and it has been documented to the journal

Ethics committee: **Sakarya Applied Sciences University Rectorate Ethics Committee**

Date of ethics committee decision: **9.04.2021**

Ethics committee decision number: **E.9540**