

Factors Affecting the Usage Pattern and Satisfaction of Delivery Food according to the Food-Related Lifestyle of Chinese Students in Gyeonggi Area

[†]Jae-Seon Jang

Professor, Dept. of Food & Nutrition, Gachon University, Seongnam 13120, Korea

Abstract

This study was performed to provide fundamental data on the convenience foods purchase according to the food-related lifestyle. This study was conducted on 398 Chinese international students residing in Gyeonggi area between October and December 2019. Among the total 373 survey subjects, gender was 183 male students (49.1%) and 190 female students (50.9%). This study was conducted by questionnaire method with reference to previous studies. There are significant differences in economic pursuit and taste pursuit for delivery food use, economic pursuit and taste pursuit for delivery food information, health pursuit and taste pursuit in delivery food ordering method, and economic pursuit and convenience pursuit for delivery food use ($p < 0.05$). Delivery food usage time was significantly different in convenience pursuit, health pursuit, eating out pursuit, and taste pursuit ($p < 0.05$), and the delivery food preference menu was significantly different in economic pursuit, health pursuit, eating out pursuit, and taste pursuit ($p < 0.05$). The menu positive factors among satisfaction factors showed statistically significant differences in economic pursuit ($\beta = 0.188$, $t = 3.531$) and health pursuit ($\beta = 0.160$, $t = 3.099$) among food related lifestyle factors. In conclusion, this study presented the desirable direction of delivery food usage in Chinese students.

Key words: delivery food, food-related lifestyle, Chinese students

Introduction

According to the current status of foreigners registered in Korea, the number of foreign students continued to increase from 80,985 in 2009 to 88,468 in 2011, 96,357 in 2015, and 180,131 in 2019. According to the foreign policy statistics monthly report in February 2020, there were 182,487 foreign students in Korea, of which 70,416 were Chinese students, accounting for 38.6% of all foreign students (Korean Immigration Service 2020).

Delivery food can be defined as a form in which a consumer makes food at a restaurant and delivers it to a place desired by the consumer. In other words, delivery food can be said to be a service that orders food through various media and delivers it to consumers (Kim BR 2013).

University students have low interest in health, and irregular eating and breakfast meals have been pointed out as undesirable problems (Hong & Lee 2006). It is known that dietary habits

in college have a great influence on the health of the life connected to old age. It has been reported that in order to maintain desirable health, the dietary habits of foreign students should be formed in a desirable direction for future health (Park & Choi 2006). In the dietary habits of foreign students, it shows a tendency to prefer eating out or convenience food due to the changed living environment and time constraints due to academic studies, and constrained in society's adaptation due to language limitations or social exchange relations, and food intake behavior is generally irregular (Lu WF 2012).

The main problems that shape the lifestyle are frequent eating, eating out, binge eating and overeating, as well as excessive drinking and smoking (Lee HW 2010). It is known that a rapid socio-cultural and economic change also changes the way of eating and has a great influence on the overall eating habits such as human eating habits and food consumption (Lee YG 2007).

Prior studies related to food related lifestyle include convenience

[†] Corresponding author: Jae-Seon Jang, Professor, Dept. of Food & Nutrition, Gachon University, Seongnam 13120, Korea. Tel: +82-31-750-4767, Fax: +82-31-750-5974, E-mail: jangjs@gachon.ac.kr

food purchase according to food related lifestyle (Jang JS 2017), analysis of consumption attitude of rice processed foods according to dietary lifestyle (Lee HW 2010), and wine selection attributes according to dietary lifestyle (Lim GM 2006). In addition, there are red pepper paste consumption patterns according to the eating habits of housewives (Kim & Kim 2009), and coffee shop selection actions according to eating lifestyles (Woon YE 2010).

In addition, HMR (Home Meal Replacement) selection attribute factors, dietary lifestyle (Kim & Kwon 2007), and Chinese consumers' Korean food consumption behavior (Kim & Kim 2010) are reported. Kim JY (2008) reports that well-being lifestyle differs in wine selection attributes, and Jung & Yoon (2007) differs in food consumption tendencies according to dietary lifestyle types. However, there has been a lack of research on the relationship between delivery food use patterns and dietary light style among Chinese students living in Korea.

In this study, the purpose of this study was to investigate the use pattern of delivery food for Chinese students living in Gyeonggi area, and to analyze the relationship with delivery food according to the food related lifestyle, and to suggest a desirable direction for the use of delivery food by Chinese students.

Subjects and Method

1. Research subjects and period

This study randomly distributed 400 persons of Chinese students living in Gyeonggi area between October and December 2019, and 398 persons were collected. A total of 373 persons (response rate 93.7%) data were used for statistical analysis, except for 25 persons data with insufficient contents. In this study, based on the random sampling method, the researcher explained to the Chinese students the purpose of the survey and how to fill out the survey, and selected the person who signed the agreement for this survey. This survey was conducted after being reviewed by the Gachon University Research Ethics Review Committee (1044396-201909-HR-173-01).

2. Research content and method

This study was conducted after a preliminary survey by completing a questionnaire with reference to a prior study (Woon YE 2010; Jang JS 2017). The questionnaire used in the study measured six items such as gender, belong, residence time in Korea, residence type, body mass index (BMI), and allowance

per month. The food-related lifestyle was divided into five groups: economic pursuit, convenience pursuit, health pursuit, eat out pursuit, and taste pursuit. Twenty questions for measuring the food-related lifestyle were scored from 5 points for "very good" to 1 point for "not at all" according to the 5-point Likert scale for each item. The question about the usage pattern of delivery food was investigated whether it was used, the proportion of delivery food in eating out, the store used, information about delivery food, how to order delivery food, usage, usage time, and preferred menu.

3. Statistical analysis

The questionnaire data surveyed were statistically analyzed using SPSS program(version 25.0, IBM Corp., Armonk NY, USA), and the frequency and proportion of general characteristics of the survey subjects were analyzed. The difference in the use form of the delivery foods according to the food-related lifestyle types was analyzed by analysis of variance (One-way ANOVA) and then post-tested by Duncan's multiple range test. After using the delivery food, satisfaction was divided into quality factors, service factors, and menu positive factors, and multiple regression analysis was performed. Verification of significance was performed at $p < 0.05$.

Result and Discussion

1. General characteristics of the subject

Table 1 shows 183 male students (49.1%) and 190 female students (50.9%) among the total 373 survey subjects, and 130 Korean language schools (34.9%) and 243 university students (65.1%). According to the residence period, 217 (58.2%) less than 1 year, 60 (16.1%) less than 2 years, 39 (10.5%) less than 3 years, 33 (8.8%) less than 4 years, more than 4 years 24 people (6.4%). In the form of residence, 274 dormitory (73.5%), 49 lodging (13.1%), 38 board oneself (10.2%), 9 gositel (2.4%), 3 other (0.8%). And, the BMI was followed by normal 195 (52.3%), overweight 79 (21.2%), underweight (19.6%), and obesity 26 (7.0%).

2. Delivery food usage patterns according to food-related lifestyle

Table 2 shows the difference from the delivery food use pattern according to the food-related lifestyle. Delivery food usage showed a significant difference in economic pursuit, con-

Table 1. General characteristics of the subjects

	Specification	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	183	49.1
	Female	190	50.9
Belong	Language schools	130	34.9
	University	243	65.1
Residence period	Less than 1 year	217	58.2
	Less than 2 year	60	16.1
	Less than 3 year	39	10.5
	Less than 4 year	33	8.8
	More than 4 year	24	6.4
Residence form	Dormitory	274	73.5
	Lodging	49	13.1
	Board oneself	38	10.2
	Gositel	9	2.4
	Other	3	0.8
BMI*	Underweight	73	19.6
	Normal	195	52.3
	Overweight	79	21.2
	Obesity	26	7.0

*BMI(Body mass index): weight(kg) / height(m²) (underweight: <18.5, normal: 18.5~22.9, overweight: 23.0~24.9, obese: ≥25).

venience pursuit, eating out pursuit, and taste pursuit ($p<0.05$), but did not show a significant difference in health pursuit. There were statistically significant differences in the number of uses of delivery food in economic pursuit, convenience pursuit, and eat out pursuit ($p<0.05$), whereas the rest of health pursuit and taste pursuit did not. The proportion of food delivered out of all meals was significantly different between convenience and eat out service ($p<0.05$), while there was no significant difference in economic, health, and taste pursuits. Stores using delivery food showed significant differences in economic and taste pursuits ($p<0.05$), but did not show significant differences in convenience pursuit, health pursuit, and eat out pursuit.

Information on delivery food showed a statistically significant difference between economic and taste pursuits ($p<0.05$), but did not show a significant difference in convenience pursuit, health pursuit, and eating out pursuit. In the order method of delivery food, there was a statistically significant difference in pursuit of health and taste ($p<0.05$), but there was no significant difference in pursuit of economic, convenience, and eat out. Significant differences were found in the use of delivery food in economic pursuit and convenience pursuit ($p<0.05$), but there was no

significant difference in health pursuit, eating out pursuit, and taste pursuit. There were statistically significant differences in convenience time, health pursuit, eating out pursuit, and taste pursuit while using delivery food ($p<0.05$), but did not show significant difference in economic pursuit. The preference menu of delivery food showed significant difference in economic pursuit, health pursuit, eating out pursuit and taste pursuit ($p<0.05$), while convenience pursuit did not show any significant difference.

According to the food related lifestyle, it was reported that the degree of purchase of convenience food was significantly different between health pursuit, taste pursuit in the cooking method of convenience food, and convenience pursuit and fashion pursuit for purchasing reasons (Jang JS 2017). In a study by Oh & Kim (2012), the consumer's coffee consumption behavior was reported to have a statistically significant difference from the food related lifestyle. In this study, the usage pattern of delivery food also showed a statistically significant difference from economic pursuit, convenience pursuit, health pursuit, eating out pursuit and taste pursuit, which are types of dietary lifestyle.

3. Relationship between satisfaction after using delivery food and food-related lifestyle

Tables 3, 4 and 5 are the results of multiple regression analysis of the relationship between satisfaction after delivery food use (quality factor, service factor, and menu positive factor) and food related lifestyle (economic pursuit, convenience pursuit, health pursuit, eat out pursuit, taste pursuit).

As shown in Table 3, as a result of regression analysis with quality factors among satisfaction factors after using food lifestyle and delivery food, there was a significant difference at significance level $p<0.05$ with $R^2=0.051$ and $F=3.970$. Among the style factors, there was a statistically significant difference in health pursuit ($\beta=0.126$, $t=2.382$, $p=0.018$) and taste pursuit ($\beta=0.121$, $t=1.972$, $p=0.049$). This was found to be an important factor in health pursuit and taste pursuit among food related lifestyles.

As shown in Table 4, as a result of regression analysis with service factors among satisfaction factors after using food lifestyle and delivery food, there was a significant difference at significance level $p<0.05$ with $R^2=0.068$ and $F=5.333$. Among the style factors, there was a statistically significant difference in economic pursuit ($\beta=0.193$, $t=3.561$, $p=0.000$). It was found

Table 2. Relation between delivery food usage and food related lifestyle

		Economic pursuit	Convenience pursuit	Health pursuit	Eat out pursuit	Taste pursuit
Availability	Yes	3.49±0.49	3.34±0.54	3.30±0.62	3.55±0.56	3.49±0.60
	No	3.11±0.69	2.88±0.59	3.29±0.73	3.13±0.65	3.20±0.45
<i>t</i> value		14.850*	18.641*	0.017	14.092*	6.149*
Number of use	1~2 times a month	3.60±0.43 ^b	3.15±0.45 ^b	3.28±0.60	3.53±0.63 ^b	3.46±0.69
	3~4 times a month	3.43±0.42 ^b	3.33±0.50 ^{bc}	3.24±0.67	3.56±0.52 ^b	3.44±0.60
	5~6 times a month	3.46±0.54 ^b	3.55±0.53 ^d	3.30±0.48	3.68±0.41 ^b	3.67±0.42
	7~8 times a month	3.50±0.45 ^b	3.46±0.54 ^{cd}	3.50±0.56	3.52±0.54 ^{ab}	3.55±0.61
	More than 9 times a month	3.47±0.62 ^b	3.51±0.55 ^{cd}	3.29±0.68	3.48±0.67 ^{ab}	3.35±0.58
	Never	3.18±0.58 ^a	2.92±0.60 ^a	3.25±0.71	3.30±0.55 ^a	3.37±0.49
	<i>F</i> value	4.809*	12.053*	1.217	2.339*	2.147
Proportion of food delivered out of all meals	Less than 10%	3.40±0.49	3.12±0.54 ^a	3.22±0.64	3.41±0.60	3.39±0.57
	Less than 10~20%	3.53±0.41	3.31±0.47 ^b	3.39±0.63	3.59±0.49	3.59±0.59
	Less than 20~30%	3.52±0.61	3.43±0.61 ^b	3.17±0.56	3.62±0.54	3.43±0.65
	Less than 30~40%	3.35±0.54	3.37±0.50 ^b	3.45±0.60	3.46±0.63	3.50±0.51
	50% or more	3.59±0.64	3.69±0.56 ^c	3.36±0.62	3.63±0.61	3.42±0.71
<i>F</i> value		2.253	9.698*	2.363	2.570	1.559
Store form	Franchise	3.53±0.52	3.31±0.53	3.36±0.63	3.49±0.61	3.38±0.61
	Private store	3.41±0.52	3.30±0.57	3.26±0.62	3.53±0.55	3.53±0.57
	<i>t</i> value	5.577*	0.017	2.243	0.323	5.265*
Information	Media advertising	2.90±1.12 ^a	3.70±0.27	3.50±0.00	3.15±0.13	3.10±0.14 ^a
	Leaflet	3.46±0.54 ^b	3.29±0.58	3.33±0.66	3.53±0.60	3.58±0.63 ^{ab}
	Order delivery application	3.57±0.51 ^b	3.29±0.58	3.30±0.68	3.55±0.58	3.49±0.61 ^b
	Internet search	3.56±0.51 ^b	3.27±0.58	3.30±0.55	3.73±0.49	3.27±0.63 ^b
	Recommended around	3.35±0.41 ^b	3.34±0.49	3.26±0.56	3.43±0.55	3.27±0.47 ^{ab}
<i>F</i> value		4.053*	0.799	0.271	2.055	4.747*
How to order	Internet	3.48±0.46	3.36±0.61	3.68±0.68	3.34±0.63	3.36±0.62
	Telephone	3.43±0.52	3.31±0.48	3.24±0.55	3.49±0.49	3.39±0.52
	Mobile app	3.52±0.54	3.28±0.61	3.27±0.67	3.61±0.66	3.59±0.67
	Toll phone	3.03±0.51	3.53±0.89	3.35±0.49	3.42±0.19	3.71±0.44
	<i>F</i> value	2.372	0.624	6.310*	2.750	3.835*
Purpose of use	Eat once	3.49±0.50 ^b	3.33±0.53 ^b	3.29±0.63	3.53±0.57	3.46±0.60
	Snack	2.97±0.61 ^a	2.94±0.82 ^a	3.39±0.55	3.21±0.58	3.29±0.48
	Wine snacks	3.28±0.34 ^{ab}	3.25±0.41 ^b	3.25±0.54	3.50±0.20	3.75±0.35
	Guest	3.71±0.59 ^b	3.39±0.84 ^b	3.50±0.95	3.71±0.57	3.71±0.82
<i>F</i> value		7.661*	3.359*	0.385	2.308	1.485
Hours of use	Before 12:00	3.32±0.35	3.19±0.38 ^a	3.68±0.71 ^b	3.61±0.58	3.29±0.48 ^a
	12~2 pm	3.47±0.45	3.23±0.51 ^a	3.23±0.64 ^b	3.52±0.62	3.42±0.58 ^{ab}
	2~3 pm	3.41±0.61	3.12±0.71 ^a	3.25±0.68 ^b	3.40±0.63	3.46±0.60 ^{ab}
	4~6 pm	3.66±0.54	3.67±0.64 ^b	3.50±0.71 ^b	3.80±0.55	3.81±0.70 ^b
	6~8 pm	3.46±0.48	3.17±0.48 ^a	3.27±0.52 ^b	3.39±0.50	3.38±0.54 ^{ab}
	8~10 pm	3.47±0.60	3.44±0.56 ^{ab}	3.35±0.62 ^b	3.56±0.56	3.48±0.54 ^{ab}
	10~12 pm	3.32±0.72	3.63±0.53 ^b	3.26±0.52 ^b	3.42±0.57	3.58±0.72 ^{ab}
	After 12 PM	3.20±0.41	3.50±0.39 ^{ab}	2.70±0.32 ^a	3.75±0.50	3.45±0.72 ^{ab}
<i>F</i> value		1.472	5.754*	2.494*	2.373	2.441*
Preferred menu	Diet	3.35±0.44 ^a	3.19±0.49	3.30±0.71 ^{ab}	3.58±0.53 ^{ab}	3.36±0.48 ^a
	Health	3.41±0.48 ^a	3.21±0.64	3.39±0.65 ^{ab}	3.38±0.66 ^a	3.28±0.56 ^a
	Fusion	3.47±0.51 ^a	3.30±0.52	3.16±0.52 ^a	3.54±0.52 ^a	3.45±0.61 ^a
	Season	3.70±0.52 ^b	3.38±0.59	3.55±0.69 ^b	3.76±0.45 ^b	3.91±0.43 ^b
	<i>F</i> value	2.201*	1.755	3.743*	2.327*	5.884*

Value are Mean±S.D., Means with different letters in the column are significantly different ($p<0.05$) according to Duncan's multiple range test. * $p<0.05$.

Table 3. Satisfaction with quality factors of delivery food and food-related lifestyle factors

	B	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> value
Constant	2.543		9.189	0.000
Economic pursuit	0.068	0.064	1.177	0.240
Convenience pursuit	-0.001	-0.001	-0.020	0.984
Health pursuit	0.112	0.126	2.382	0.018
Eat out pursuit	0.021	0.022	0.354	0.724
Taste pursuit	0.112	0.121	1.972	0.049

The dependent variable=Satisfaction with quality factors of delivery food.

$R^2=0.051$, $F=3.970$, p value=0.002.

* $p<0.05$.

Table 4. Satisfaction with delivery food service factors and food-related lifestyle factors

	B	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> value
Constant	2.321		7.995	0.000
Economic pursuit	0.217	0.193	3.561	0.000
Convenience pursuit	-0.032	-0.030	-0.574	0.566
Health pursuit	0.087	0.092	1.753	0.081
Eat out pursuit	0.012	0.011	0.186	0.853
Taste pursuit	0.084	0.085	0.160	0.160

The dependent variable=Satisfaction with delivery food service factors.

$R^2=0.068$, $F=5.333$, p value=0.000.

* $p<0.05$.

Table 5. Delivery food menu positive factor satisfaction and food-related lifestyle factors

	B	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> value
Constant	2.097		8.234	0.000
Economic pursuit	0.189	0.188	3.531	0.000
Convenience pursuit	0.032	0.034	0.658	0.511
Health pursuit	0.134	0.160	3.099	0.002
Eat out pursuit	0.013	0.014	0.231	0.818
Taste pursuit	0.055	0.063	1.047	0.296

The dependent variable=Delivery food menu positive factor satisfaction.

$R^2=0.095$, $F=7.681$, p value=0.000.

* $p<0.05$.

that the most important factor in economic pursuit among food related lifestyles.

As shown in Table 5, as a result of regression analysis with

service factors among the menu positive factors after using food lifestyle and delivery food, there was a significant difference at significance level $p<0.05$ with $R^2=0.095$ and $F=7.681$. Among the lifestyle factors, there were statistically significant differences in economic pursuit ($\beta=0.188$, $t=3.531$, $p=0.000$) and health pursuit ($\beta=0.160$, $t=3.099$, $p=0.002$). It was found that the most important factor in the delivery food menu was the economic pursuit and health pursuit of the food related lifestyle.

In the study of Jang JS (2017), statistically significant differences were found in pursuit of introversion (flavor, calorie, nutrition) and extroversion (price, expiration date, brand) among dietary lifestyle and convenience food purchase factors.

The consumption patterns of carbonated beverages were negative in relation to health and convenience pursuit, and taste pursuit, fashion pursuit, and safety pursuit in case of introvert pursuit among food related lifestyle factors, and taste and safety in extrovert pursuit (Oh & Jang 2014). In the purchase of health functional beverages, the higher the taste pursuit and health pursuit, which are the factors of dietary lifestyle, the higher the composition of introver (Choi et al., 2013). Oh & Kim (2012) showed that health pursuit, food pursuit, and taste pursuit have a positive effect on coffee consumption behavior. Lee WH (2016) found that the satisfaction of the food order selection attribute according to the dietary lifestyle showed a statistically significant effect on the menu positive factor and food quality factor among the three factors.

In this study, it was found that, in the case of Chinese students, the satisfaction after using the delivery food was health and taste pursuit for quality factors, economy for service factors, and economic and health pursuit for menu positive factors.

Conclusion

This study analyzes the relationship between delivery food usage patterns and satisfaction factors after delivery food use according to the food-related lifestyle of Chinese students 373 persons in Gyeonggi area. It was conducted to provide a desirable direction for Chinese students to use food delivery. The results of the analysis are as follows: There are significant differences in economic pursuit and taste pursuit for delivery food use, economic pursuit and taste pursuit for delivery food information, health pursuit and taste pursuit in delivery food ordering method, and economic pursuit and convenience pursuit

for delivery food use. Delivery food usage time was significantly different in convenience pursuit, health pursuit, eating out pursuit, and taste pursuit ($p < 0.05$), and the delivery food preference menu was significantly different in economic pursuit, health pursuit, eating out pursuit, and taste pursuit ($p < 0.05$).

The results of regression analysis of satisfaction after using delivery food and food related lifestyle are as follows. Quality factors among satisfaction factors showed statistically significant differences in health pursuit ($\beta = 0.126$, $t = 2.382$, $p = 0.018$) and taste pursuit ($\beta = 0.121$, $t = 1.972$, $p = 0.049$) among food related lifestyle factors. Among the satisfaction factors, service factors showed statistically significant differences in economic pursuit ($\beta = 0.193$, $t = 3.561$, $p = 0.000$) among dietary lifestyle factors. The menu positive factor among satisfaction was statistically significant difference between economic pursuit ($\beta = 0.188$, $t = 3.531$, $p = 0.000$) and health pursuit ($\beta = 0.160$, $t = 3.099$, $p = 0.002$) among food related lifestyle factors. As a result, research shows that Chinese students have very high use of delivery food, and even unhealthy diet and nutrition can lead to health problems. It is considered that regular eating and choosing the right food for delivery are essential.

References

- Choi W, Choi JY, Yon HS. 2013. A study on purchasing characteristics on health functional beverage according to food-related lifestyle. *J Hotel Resort* 12:179-196
- Hong HO, Lee JS. 2006. Survey on Korean food preference of college students in Seoul. *J Nutr Health* 39:707-713
- Jang JS. 2017. The comparative study on the purchase of convenience foods according to the food-related lifestyle in Chinese students. *Korean J Food Nutr* 30:105-111
- Jung HS, Yoon HH. 2007. A study on the dining-out consumption pattern of undergraduates by food-related lifestyle. *J Foodservice Manage* 10:93-117
- Kim JY. 2008. Study on the effect of well-being lifestyle toward wine selection attributes. *Tourism Research* 26:19-34
- Kim KH, Kim KM. 2010. A study on Chinese consumers' Korean food consumption behavior based on food-related lifestyle. *Food Distribution Research* 27:41-62
- Kim M, Kim H. 2009. A study on the consumption behaviors regarding red pepper paste according to the food-related lifestyles of housewives. *J East Asian Soc Diet Life* 19:1-8
- Kim SH, Kwon SM. 2007. The study on selection attributes and expenditures according to the HMR (Home Meal Replacement) customers' lifestyle. *J Hosp Tour Stud* 9:16-30
- Korean Immigration Service. 2020. Immigration policy statistics monthly report for February 2020. Available from <http://www.immigration.go.kr/immigration/1569/subview.do?enc=Zm5jdDF8QEB8JTJGYmJzJTJGaW1taWdyYXRpb24lMkYyMjclMkY1MjE3MTQlMkZhcjRjbFZpZXcuZG8lM0Y%3D> [cited 2 April 2020]
- Lee HW. 2010. Consumers attitude toward rice processed foods based on food-related lifestyle. Master's Thesis, Yonsei Univ. Seoul. Korea
- Lee WH. 2016. A study on the types of food delivery service and select properties according to dietary lifestyle. Master's Thesis, Catholic Univ. Seoul. Korea
- Lee YG. 2007. A study on food purchase behavior according to wives' food related lifestyle. Master's Thesis, Sungkyunkwan Univ. Seoul. Korea
- Lim YM. 2006. A study on the wine choice pattern by food-related lifestyle. Master's Thesis, Kyeunghee Univ. Seoul. Korea
- Lu WF. 2012. Acculturation and changes in dietary habits of Chinese students living in Korea. Master's Thesis, Myongji Univ. Seoul. Korea
- Oh SC, Jang JS. 2014. The effects of food-related lifestyle on carbonated beverage consumption behavior of the middle school students. *Korea J Food Nutr* 27:1043-1050
- Oh YG, Kim KJ. 2012. A study on the effects of food-related lifestyle on coffee consumption behavior. *Asia-Pac J Bus Venturing Entrepreneurship* 7:65-75
- Park SJ, Choi SH. 2006. Factors influencing health promotion behavior of Korean students in China. *J Korean Acad Fundam Nurs* 13:269-274
- Woon YE. 2010. A study on the specialty coffee shop selection attributes by the food-related lifestyle. Master's Thesis, Chung-Ang Univ. Seoul. Korea

Received 05 April, 2020
 Revised 05 June, 2020
 Accepted 12 June, 2020