

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-2016

The Market Potential for Food and Agricultural Tourism in Utah

Miranda Bradshaw
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Other Economics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bradshaw, Miranda, "The Market Potential for Food and Agricultural Tourism in Utah" (2016). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 4754.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/4754>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



THE MARKET POTENTIAL FOR FOOD AND
AGRICULTURAL TOURISM IN UTAH

By

Miranda Bradshaw

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Applied Economics

Approved:

Kynda R. Curtis
Major Professor

Ryan Bosworth
Committee Member

Ruby Ward
Committee Member

Roslynn Brain
Committee Member

Mark McLellan
Vice President for Research and
Dean of the school of Graduate Studies

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

2016

Copyright © Miranda Bradshaw 2016

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

The Market Potential for
Food and Agricultural Tourism in Utah

by

Miranda Bradshaw, Master of Science

Utah State University, 2016

Major Professor: Dr. Kynda R. Curtis
Department: Applied Economics

Utah is a popular tourism destination, evidenced by the 10.7 million visitors who spent \$7.5 billion in 2013 (BEBR, 2015). The tourism industry is an important component of Utah's economy, but who are Utah tourists? A key research purpose of this study is to provide the demographic and psychographic information necessary to improve tourism industry practices through targeted marketing and development. Data were collected from Utah tourists in 2013-2014 through an in-person survey in various tourist locations throughout Utah.

The characteristics, behaviors, and interests of Utah tourists, especially in regards to food and agricultural tourism, were examined in the context of consumer profiles. Exploratory factor and cluster analysis were used to group tourists according to demographic variables and participation in food and agriculture related activities when at home and while traveling. Seven factors underlying respondents' perceptions of food and

agriculture related practices when at home and while traveling were identified. Four consumer segments were then constructed using cluster analysis.

Examining the characteristics of tourists who make repeated return trips to Utah was another research purpose of this study. An ordered logit regression model was used to explore the relationship between return tourism and demographics, travel motivation, destination image, and travel experiences. Results suggested a positive correlation between propensity to return and certain travel motivations, such as traveling for business or to visit culture and heritage related sites, destination image, and travel experiences. Traveler age and traveling with children were negatively correlated with propensity to return.

Results suggested that marketers, tourism industry providers, businesses, and local governments may improve their operations through a better understanding of the characteristics and behaviors of specific consumer segments. The consumer segments explored in this study provide the information necessary for the development of targeted marketing campaigns directed towards specific tourist types. The information provided and examined in this study may also be used to develop attractions, activities, and products that encourage Utah tourists to spend their trip budget in ways that are most favorable to local businesses and producers. The importance of quality food and agriculture related offerings in the Utah tourism experience were also highlighted.

PUBLIC ABSTRACT

The Market Potential for Food and Agricultural Tourism in Utah

Miranda Bradshaw

Tourism is one of the largest and most economically important industries in Utah. Local businesses and government agencies may increase their tourism-related profits through targeted marketing and product development. As tourists may differ from one another in terms of trip planning, party size, the activities they participate in, and more, it is important to understand who tourists are. The primary research purpose of this study was to explore and better understand the different types of tourists who visit Utah.

Data on tourists were collected through an in-person survey. This data was then used to place tourists into groups according to their demographics, interests, perceptions of Utah, and behaviors. Tourism industry professionals and other local businesses may use the results of this study to create products and experiences specifically designed to meet the needs and interests of specific types of tourists. Tourism industry profits may be improved through developing such products and experiences, as well as through marketing campaigns specifically targeted to certain tourist groups.

DEDICATION

To my parents for giving me a foundation to build my life upon.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank all those whose influence, friendship, and mentorship have helped me to perform this research and to be successful here at Utah State University. It would be difficult to thank everyone individually, however I would like to specifically thank a few.

I would like to thank Dr. Kynda R. Curtis for making this research project possible and for her mentorship throughout the research and writing process.

I would like to thank Grayson Dubose and the Utah State University Women's Volleyball team for making my experience here unforgettable.

Finally, I would like to thank God, my parents, family, friends, and roommates for their never-ending support, encouragement, and guidance. I owe so much of this accomplishment to all of you.

Miranda Bradshaw

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
PUBLIC ABSTRACT	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
CHAPTER	
I. STUDY PURPOSE AND LITERATURE REVIEW	1
Introduction.....	1
Literature Review.....	5
Food and Agricultural Tourism.....	5
Agritourism.....	9
Local Foods	12
Rural Tourism.....	16
Return Tourism.....	17
II. UTAH TOURIST TYPES.....	20
Overview of Tourism in Utah	20
Sampling Methods.....	22
Survey Descriptive Statistics.....	24
Study Design: Factor Analysis.....	27
Factor Analysis Results.....	28
Discussion.....	28
Study Design: Cluster Analysis.....	30
Cluster Analysis Results.....	30
Discussion.....	31
III. RETURN TOURISM POTENTIAL.....	35
Model Design: Ordered Logit Regression Model	35
Ordered Logit Regression Results.....	38

Discussion.....	39
IV. CONCLUSION.....	42
REFERENCES	50
APPENDIX.....	60

LIST OF TABLES

1. Sample Survey Statistics.....	61
2. At Home Activities Included in Factor Analysis.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3. While Traveling Activities Included in Factor Analysis	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4. Survey Descriptive Statistics	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5. Factor Analysis of At Home Behaviors	66
6. Factor Analysis of "When Traveling" Behaviors	67
7. Elements Used in Cluster Analysis.....	68
8. Cluster Analysis Results	70
9. Descriptive Statistics for Explanatory Variables, Models 1 - 4.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
10. Coefficient Significance and Sign, Models 1 - 4	732

CHAPTER I

STUDY PURPOSE AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of this thesis is to address issues related to the profitability of the tourism industry in Utah. Tourism operations in Utah can be improved through targeted marketing strategies, which increase overall industry profits and provide opportunities for small producers and business owners to profit from tourist activity. A better understanding of tourist needs and motives can be enhanced through the analysis of underlying tourist behaviors, the creation of consumer profiles, and through the analysis of the factors related to repeat tourism behavior (Bond, Thilmany, & Bond, 2008). Tourism is considered one of Utah's most important and largest industries (Leaver, 2015). The effective marketing of local foods to tourists may be a powerful rural economic development strategy by connecting Utah's flourishing tourism industry with local growers, ranchers, and small food producers. Encouraging repeat visits by tourists to Utah may be another influential means of improving tourism profits in the state. In order to address these issues, this thesis examines the types of tourists that visit Utah, including the types of experiences and activities they seek, how they research and plan their travel, the reason for their visit, their spending habits, how long they stay, and their propensity to make a return visit.

Tourism in Utah is a well-developed billion dollar industry that saw \$7.5 billion in traveler spending in 2013 (Bureau of Economic and Business Research [BEER], 2015). In 2013, over 10.7 million people visited Utah thanks to national parks, state

parks, ski resorts, world-class universities, festivals and special events, convention centers, and unconventional historic and religious sites (BEBR, 2015). Visitor spending drives economic activity in the parks and recreation, leisure, and hospitality sectors (Olson, 2014). Tourism is responsible for job creation and increasing levels of tax revenue (BEBR, 2015). Tourism opportunities exist all over the state, in both urban and rural settings. For example, tourism related jobs accounts for up to 40% of the job market in rural counties (Leaver, 2014).

Tourists may visit Utah for a variety of purposes, but all tourists need to eat (Hall, Sharples, Mitchell, Macionis & Cambourne, 2011). Consumer interest in where and how foods are produced has given rise to the local foods movement in many locations around the world (Martinez et al., 2010). Some consumer groups have shown a willingness to pay a premium for foods that are produced according to certain production practices, environmental or ethical standards, or that are produced locally (Bond et al., 2008; Nygard & Storstad, 1998). The high quality and diversity of Utah's agriculture combined with Utah's popularity as a vacation destination may potentially provide unique opportunities for tourists interested in food or culinary tourism activities.

The study of return tourism has garnered the attention of researchers for the past several decades. Return or repeat tourism is characterized by the destination loyalty of tourists who choose to revisit a location, potentially many times (Caneen, 2004). Repeat tourists share several characteristics that are distinct from other types of tourists. Notably, repeat tourists exhibit a desire to reduce risk which is realized, at least in part, by visiting familiar destinations (Lehto, O'Leary, & Morrison, 2004; Niininen & Riley, 2004). Return tourism is heavily dependent on destination image and is economically desirable

in that repeat tourists tend to engage in word of mouth advertising and spend more than first-time visitors (Oom do Valle, Correia, & Rebelo, 2008; Wang, 2004). Understanding what motivates tourists to make return trips to Utah and what characteristics they share may be an effective way to further increase tourism revenues in the state.

Agricultural producers, especially small producers, face unique challenges and may be uniquely benefited by marketing campaigns directed toward food and culinary tourists (Bond et al., 2008). Mass agricultural production is often too governed by strict contracts, middle-men, and disproportionately small revenues for producers. Unreliable weather patterns, capricious growing seasons, and fluctuating markets combine for uncertain yields, prices, and profits (Fleisher, 1990). Direct outlet marketing of agricultural goods through roadside stands, farmers markets, and food hubs to residents and tourists alike may improve bargaining terms and profits for producers. Food and culinary tourism encourages tourists to spend their food budget in a way that is beneficial to local producers, especially small producers (Getz, Robinson, Andersson, & Vujicic, 2014). Repeat tourists interested in food tourism may represent intertemporal, reliable local foods costumers. Understanding the characteristics, motives, and behaviors of food tourists and repeat tourists is key to attracting them (Getz et al., 2014).

Between the 1950s and 1970s the number of small farms steeply declined as the U.S. food system transitioned to monoculture and relied more and more heavily on imports and exports (Pirog, Miller, Way, Hazekamp, & Kim, 2014; Martinez et al., 2010). While the ability to transport food products around the globe translated into the year-round availability of foods that had once been seasonal, sacrifices in freshness, taste, and texture led to concerns about overall food quality and safety (Martinez et al., 2010).

In response to these concerns, an increasing number of consumers and producers have participated in direct to consumer sales, which consists of the sale of local agricultural products through roadside stands, farmers' markets, food hubs, food co-ops, and other direct markets. Direct to consumer sales have exhibited positive growth for every year on record and between 1978 and 2012 the total value of direct to consumer sales increased by nearly 240% (Low et al., 2015). Some of this growth, especially in the 1970s, has been attributed to the passing of the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976 which appropriated \$3 million worth of grants to fund various methods of direct to consumer marketing (Brown, 2002). More recent growth, such as the 185% increase in farmers' markets from 2000 to 2014, the 288% increase in regional food hubs from 2007-2014, and the 275% increase in community supported agriculture from 2004-2014 has been attributed to changing consumer preferences for local foods (Low et al., 2015). The remarkably consistent growth of direct to consumer sales indicates the strength and popularity of the local foods movement.

In response to the potential benefits that agricultural producers may experience as a result of targeted food tourism marketing, this study includes a factor analysis of some of the key food and agriculture related behaviors exhibited by Utah tourists. Cluster analysis is then used to group tourists according to similar demographics, interests, and trip characteristics. The resulting clusters may be used by tourism industry providers and agricultural producers to develop targeted marketing plans. The logit regression model examines the nature of Utah's repeat tourists, which may lead to better understanding and development of a destination image attractive to repeat tourists.

Destination image itself has been the subject of a vast array of multidisciplinary studies since a tourists' perception of a destination may have an influence on behavior and choice (Gallarza & Saura, 2001). Therefore, destination image has been included in this study as a possible explanatory factor in return tourism behavior. For the purposes of this study, destination image will be defined as the “expression of knowledge, impressions, prejudice, imaginations and emotional thoughts an individual has of a specific object or place” (Lawson & Bond-Bovy, 1977).

Literature Review

Food and Agricultural Tourism

Segmenting tourists by demographics, trip motivation, interests, provenance, or other characteristics is a common practice employed by researchers in order to provide valuable information to marketers, tourism industry providers, businesses, and local governments (Gascoigne, Sullins, & McFadden, 2008; McFadden, Umberger, & Wilson, 2009; Wolf, 2014). Defining food tourism, or profiling so-called food tourists, is challenging due to a lack of general consensus in regards to the definition of local foods and what determines whether any given tourist is considered a “food tourist” (Martinez et al., 2010). One definition states that food tourism is “visitation to primary and secondary food producers, food festivals, restaurants and specific locations for which food tasting and/or experiencing the attributes of a specialist food production region are the primary motivating factor for travel” (Hall et al., 2011, p. 10).

Getz et al. (2014) explain that “foodies” are self-declared food experience seekers who choose to consume local, sustainably grown foods and whose lifestyle and mindset towards travel differ from the typical tourist. Although participating in the local foods movement doesn’t necessarily make one a “foodie” or a “food tourist,” the recent emergence of the foodie movement may indicate that locality is a salient food attribute for some consumer segments. Despite the lack of an industry-wide accepted definition of food tourism, profiling food tourists may lead to a better understanding of exactly how the needs, expectations, and behaviors of food-minded tourists differ from the average tourist (Wolf, 2014).

Food tourism takes the shape of a variety of activities and experiences including, but not limited to guided tours of farms or wineries, foodways, cooking classes, food and wine festivals, eating at local-source restaurants, and shopping at farmers’ markets or other direct to consumer outlets (Croce & Perri, 2010; Smith, Costello, & Muenchen, 2010). The authenticity of local foods and food-related experiences may affect an area’s destination image and the ability to attract food tourists to an area (Getz et al., 2014). Some national cuisines lack historical background because they have developed more recently; however, as long as these cuisines are authentic, local, and unique, a region can still market itself as a food tourism destination (Hall et al., 2011, p. 159).

While many tourists’ primary travel motivation is not to participate in food tourism, all tourists must eat and many become incidental food tourists (Hall, et al., 2011; Yun, Hennessey, & MacDonald, 2011). Many people appreciate quality food, not just foodies. Therefore, improving the offering of local food in a region may lead to an improved destination image (Getz et al., 2014). Yun et al. (2011) note that “product

development of culinary tourism must be enjoyable, easy to consume, and presented in a manner that is connected to other cultural activities and attractions” in order to achieve its maximum positive impact on tourists, producers and the community (p. 11). Not only does food tourism attract those interested in food-related experiences, but it encourages those visiting for other reasons to spend their food budget in a way that may favor local producers (Getz et al., 2014). Wolf (2014) poses the question, “all tourists eat, but what do you offer them?” (p. 310).

Food tourists are typically more experienced travelers, between the ages of thirty and sixty, and are equally represented among men and women (Wolf, 2014). In a study conducted on visitors to South Carolina, food tourists tended to be more educated and earn higher incomes than the average non-food oriented tourist (Shenoy, 2005). In the study, exploratory factor and cluster analysis were used to categorize travelers into three groups. Five factors underlying participation in food tourism were eventually identified and labeled as purchase local, dine local, drink local, dine elite, and familiarity.

These factors were then used in a cluster analysis where respondents were placed into groups and labeled as culinary tourists, experiential tourists, or general tourists based on differences in food tourism related behaviors. For example, the culinary tourist cluster was characterized by respondents who ranked highly on the dine local and drink local factors. This means that culinary tourists were likely to seek out local sourcing restaurants, sample local foods, and consume local beverages and drinks. The experiential tourist cluster ranked highly on dine local, but also ranked highly on the familiarity factor. Therefore, experiential tourists not only sought out local sourcing restaurants, but

also dined at fast food and chain restaurant establishments. General tourists scored somewhat evenly on purchase local, dine local, drink local, dine elite, and familiarity.

Sanchez-Canizares and Lopez-Guzman (2012), profiled tourists into consumer segments according to the role that food and gastronomy played in their visit to Cordoba, Spain. Data was gathered from visitors at ten restaurants in Cordoba regarding their demographic characteristics, travel motivations, perceptions of tourist activities, and perceptions of food and drink in Cordoba. Results indicated that visitors whose primary reason for visiting the city was gastronomy were more likely to be males who were familiar with local wines. They also found significant differences in tourists' enjoyment of attractions in Cordoba, their satisfaction with gastronomy, and overall satisfaction with their trip according to which consumer segment the respondent belonged.

Culinary Tourism. Long (2004) defines culinary tourism as “the intentional, exploratory participation in the foodways of an other—participation including the consumption, preparation, and presentation of a food item, cuisine, meal system, or eating style considered to belong to a culinary system not one’s own” (p. 21). By experiencing the food culture of others, culinary tourists engage in “a form of experiential tourism based on the search for and participation in new and deep cultural experiences of an aesthetic, intellectual, emotional, or psychological nature” (Stebbins, 1997, pg. 450). Understanding the local foods movement and what motivates its participants is key to attracting tourists who are food experience seekers (Getz et al., 2014). Similarly, the appeal, availability, and authenticity of local foods are important aspects of attracting culinary tourists through agritourism ventures (Getz et al., 2014; Curtis & Monson, 2004).

Agritourism

Agritourism includes a variety of activities including farm stays, “pick your own” activities, farm tours, farmers’ markets, hay rides, pumpkin patches, corn mazes, and even recreational activities such as fishing, hunting, and horseback riding (Lobo et al., 1999; Wilson, Thilmany, & Sullins, 2006). Wilson et al. (2006) define agritourism as “anything that connects consumers with the heritage, natural resources or culinary experiences unique to the agricultural industry, or a particular region of the country’s rural areas” (p. 1). Agritourism is “an alternative farm enterprise” (Ilbery, Bowler, Clark, Crockett, & Shaw, 1998, p. 355) which incorporates “both a working farm environment and a commercial tourism component” (Weaver & Fennell, 1997, p. 357). While a variety of activities fall under the broad umbrella of agritourism, Wilson, Thilmany, and Watson (2006) observe that “farming/ranching and recreational income appear to be substitute enterprises rather than complementary in nature” (p. 394).

Agritourism has been demonstrated to have a significant influence on local economies in the form of job creation, increased sales of agricultural products, and tourism (Lobo et al. 1999, Barbieri & Tew, 2008). Based on their analysis of agritourism in 11 western states, Wilson et al. (2006) argued that, in the long run, agritourism will generate increasingly higher levels of income for producers and tourism providers. In a study of Missouri farms, Barbieri et al. (2008) found that farms that offered agritourism activities experienced a myriad of benefits, including consistent, year-round income from agritourism activities. They also found that agritourism farms experienced higher revenues than non-agritourism farms. While agritourism farms in the Barbieri et al. (2008) study tended to be larger than the average farm, Curtis and Cowee (2009) found

that small scale farmers also use agritourism as an additional source of revenue.

Agritourism not only affects tourists visiting a region, but the local population as well.

Lobo et al. (1999) suggested that agritourism may have a positive impact on the amount of local agricultural products sold to residents of the community as “agritourism also showcases the diversity and uniqueness of local agriculture, thereby increasing the visibility and the appeal of locally grown products” (pg. 1).

A number of studies have been dedicated to understanding the characteristics, motivations, and behaviors of agritourists (Carpio, Wohlgenant, & Boonsaeng, 2008; Gascoigne et al., 2008; Lobo et al., 1999; Thilmany, Sullins & Ansteth, 2007).

Agritourism may be a primary trip motivator for some tourists. For example, in a study of the Flower Fields in Carlsbad, CA, 81% of visitors surveyed considered the Flower Fields an important reason for their trip to Carlsbad (Lobo et al., 1999). The Flower Fields are located on a working farm of ranunculus plants whose blooms attract thousands of visitors each year. The Flower Fields are an interesting example, since Carlsbad is located near the highly metropolitan area of San Diego, CA. The Flower Fields demonstrate that agritourism may have a considerable influence on tourists’ trip planning even when large traditional tourist markets exist nearby.

Observable differences exist among those tourists whose primary reason for their trip is agritourism compared to those for whom agritourism is a secondary reason for traveling. For example, Gascoigne et al. (2008) analyzed an internet survey of travelers to and within Colorado in order to explore the importance of agritourism to their trip. A multinomial logit model was used to explore the characteristics and differences between travelers whose primary and secondary reasons for travel was agritourism. Middle-aged

tourists without children and traveling in small parties tended to place agritourism as their primary reason for travel. They also note that tourists for whom agritourism is a secondary reason for traveling are more likely to have participated in agritourism in the past and are likely to visit areas with high amounts of natural amenities.

Tourists participate in agritourism for a variety of educational, recreational, and entertainment reasons (Wilson et al., 2006). A key motive for participating in agritourism may be a desire to explore the natural environment, rather than commercially developed tourist attractions (Curtis & Monson, 2004). A survey conducted by the USDA Forest Service, Wilderness, and Demographic Trends Research Group (2002) asked tourists why they chose to visit farms and found that 71% wanted to learn where food comes from, 64% wanted to participate in farm activities, 43% wanted to pick fruit or produce, 39% wanted to purchase agricultural products, and 27% wanted to hunt and fish.

Understanding the role that agritourism plays in trip motivation and activities sought after by tourists is important to understanding how to promote and develop agritourism opportunities offered by farmers, ranchers, and communities (Gascoigne et al., 2008).

Researchers have found that a variety of sociodemographic factors correlate with demand for agritourism activities. Carpio et al. (2008) employed a univariate probit model and a hurdle count model to study the results from the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (2000). They found that race and location of residence had the greatest impact in determining the number of farm trips taken per visitor per year. They found that white respondents were 10% more likely to visit a farm, relative to the base-line respondent, whereas Hispanic respondents were 13% less likely to visit a farm.

They also found that someone living in an urban area is 5% less likely to visit a farm than the base-line respondent.

Age, marital status, and family characteristics may also be important. For instance, in a survey of Colorado agritourists, the average agritourist was 46 years-old, 73% were married, and 28% were young couples without children (Thilmany et al., 2007). Qualitative comparisons were also made between in-state and out-of-state travelers, travel frequency, and participation in agritourism activities.

Barbieri et al. (2008) used a questionnaire administered to 164 Missouri farms to discover the common characteristics of agritourism farms and their visitors. Data were analyzed using multiple linear regression tests. They found that Missouri agritourists tend to be senior citizens or families with young children. However, in direct contrast, a study by Thilmany, Bond, and Bond (2008) found that demographics appear to be poor predictors of a consumers' preference for purchasing fresh produce through community supported agriculture programs, roadside stands, and farmers' markets. While buying through local vendors may not always fall under the umbrella of agritourism, these findings suggest that consumers interested in agricultural production and local foods may be a highly non-homogenous group.

Local Foods

Direct outlet marketing is an essential component of the local foods movement and is critical in creating authentic food tourism and agritourism offerings in a region that will benefit the local economy. Food tourism can create greater profits for producers by shortening the supply chain through direct outlet markets, such as farmers' markets, farm

shops, and roadside stands (Hall et al., 2011). Participation in direct to consumer sales may help large-scale farmers to reduce debt and corporate dependence (Guptill & Wilkins, 2002; Macias, 2008). Benefits of direct outlet marketing include benefits to consumers, producers, and the environment in the form of improved diet, increased feedback between consumers and producers, regular cash flow and higher financial returns for producers, and reduction in packaging and transportation (Hall et al., 2011).

The sale of local foods has increased over the past several decades for a variety of reasons. The local foods movement began in part as a reaction to the globalization of food markets between the 1950s and 1970s (Pirog et al., 2014). In addition, some consumers have argued that “there is a clear social responsibility argument for stocking local and regional foods” (Institute of Grocery Distribution, 2005, p. 16). Furthermore, direct to consumer (DTC) sales of local foods are an increasingly popular strategy used by small farmers to increase product margins and compete against large monoculture-type farms (Pirog et al., 2014). 1978 was the first year that the Census of Agriculture recorded DTC sales, but even with a limited number of census years, the overall trend is sufficiently clear. The average value of DTC sales per farm has increased every single year on record and the total value of DTC sales has increased by nearly 240% from 1978 to 2012 (United States Department of Agriculture [USDA], 2012).

The amount of DTC sales can be combined with sales through intermediated markets to give a clear picture of the amount of agricultural goods being sold through local food systems. Intermediated markets are marketing outlets where products are sourced locally, then sold through local retail. Examples include food co-ops, farmers markets, and food hubs (Low et al., 2015). When intermediated markets are included, the

amount of sales of goods locally produced and consumed totaled \$6.1 billion in 2012. Between 2007 and 2012, farms that engaged in these types of sales were more likely to stay in business (Low et al., 2015). If DTC and intermediated market sales are a true proxy for the local foods movement, then the current and growing popularity of the movement is significant.

Although the local foods movement has grown impressively over the past decade (Martinez et al., 2010), defining what makes a food “local” is as difficult as ever. Localism is considered an aspect of progressive agrifood research (Friedland, 2008). But what meaning does the word “local” convey in the context of food? Some attach the local foods label to foods that are produced within a certain geographical distance. The 2008 Farm Act designates a 400 mile radial limit; meaning that any foods consumed within 400 miles of production can legally be advertised as having been locally produced (Martinez et al., 2010). However, food co-op managers across the country, who specialize in the retail of locally sourced foods, report different mileage-based definitions of local, suggesting that the term is flexible (Katchova, 2013). The work done by Durham, King and Roheim (2009) highlights the difficulty in determining a mileage-based definition that can be used across regions. They find that residents of different states have different expectations regarding the proximity of production of “local foods”, suggesting that absolute distance is not the only determining factor in what makes a food “local.”

In some cases, county, state and national boundaries seem to be part of the equation of what makes food “local.” Some states have state-branding initiatives where foods produced within the state can be easily identified by a single logo placed on the

product. For example, utahsown.org lists dozens of participating producers that benefit from the Utah's Own brand recognition. Some reports have used State-branded products as a proxy for locally grown foods (Jekanowski, Williams, & Schiek, 2000). However, considering the variation in the geographic size of different states, it's easy to see that the criteria that a food be produced and consumed within the same state to be considered local would be an inconsistent requirement (Durham et al., 2009). Logically, the same inconsistency would also exist to some extent at the county and regional levels as well. Interestingly, the population density of a region also seems to influence the local opinion as to what foods are or are not considered local (Martinez et al., 2010).

Finally, after considering the challenges associated with determining a geographic definition of local foods, it becomes apparent that other attributes may also be considered when defining local foods. Physical, psychological, and cultural factors may play a role in how people perceive and define local foods (Durham et al. 2009). Production techniques, especially those perceived as being sustainable or environmentally friendly, may be important pieces of the local foods puzzle (Thompson, Harper, & Krauss, 2008). Some consumers may even include fair production practices, such as fair wages for farm workers and animal welfare in their conception of local foods (Martinez et al., 2010). Owing to the difficulty in defining local foods they are considered throughout this paper as any food purchased by a consumer who perceived the product as having been locally produced.

Rural Tourism

Food tourism and agritourism are distinct from rural tourism, but share obvious conceptual similarities (Phillip, Hunter, & Blackstock, 2010). Rural tourism is defined as “the natural life tourism, through which the customer may access the natural environment as opposed to commercially developed tourist activities and locations” (Hill, Sunderland, O’Cathain, & Daily, 1996, p. 50). Rural tourism can potentially increase employment, attract investment, increase the value of property, and support a cultural identity (Croce & Perri, 2010). Both food tourism and agritourism are highly adaptable, lend themselves especially well to rural tourism, and are sustainable methods of economic development (Croce & Perri, 2010). Rural tourism operations often tend to be small family-owned businesses (Getz & Carlson, 2000). Food tourism can be thought of as a development strategy, especially for rural areas, because of its potential benefits to agriculture, manufacturing, and service (Hall et al., 2011).

Rural tourism is distinct from agritourism in that rural tourists often pursue experiences that are not connected directly to agricultural heritage (Phillip et al., 2010). Research by McIntosh and Goeldner (1990) suggests that educated travelers seek changes to their environment and are interested in exploring new areas, including rural areas. In a study of Finnish tourists, aesthetic beauty was important for rural tourists who generally tended to appreciate visual landscapes (Tyrvaainen, Silvennoinen, Nousiainen, & Tahvanainen, 2001).

In a study of rural tourism in Southeastern Spain, Molera and Albaladejo (2007) explored consumer segments through factor and cluster analysis according to socioeconomics and travel behavior. A multinomial logit model was then used to

determine the nature of the influence of certain demographic and psychographic factors on rural tourists. They found that nature and peacefulness, physical and cultural activities, family, trip features, and rural life were important interests for rural tourists. Tourists were placed into groups based upon those interests and four groups emerged: family rural tourists, relax rural tourists, active rural tourists, and rural life tourists.

Return Tourism

Food tourism, agritourism, and rural tourism offerings, as well as many other factors, all play a role in a tourist's propensity to make a repeat visit to a specific geographic location. In a study conducted by Thilmany et al. (2007), 89% of surveyed visitors indicated that they wanted to visit Colorado again within the next year. In addition, 53% of respondents said that agritourism would be the primary or secondary reason for their return trip. Food tourism and food experiences are sources of motivation for repeat tourism. In a qualitative study done by Kivela and Crofts (2009), 20% of the interviewed participants indicated that "they would return to the same destination because of its gastronomy" (p. 180).

The propensity to repeatedly visit a location shares behavioral aspects with the concept of brand loyalty (Caneen, 2004). Work by Pollak (1970) explains the apparent differences between long-run and short-run demand functions and highlights the influence of past consumption on current consumption. In the field of habit formation, Pollak (1976) suggests that, in certain cases, long-run demand functions may be rationalized by a current utility function. Some consumers may have a higher psychological disposition to exhibit loyalty in the purchasing behaviors of specific

products or brands (Niinen & Riley, 2004). According to Caneen (2004), “successful mass tourism destinations depend on repeat visitors” (p. 266). Lehto et al. (2004) affirm that the repeat vacation market is an important aspect of business strategies designed to influence visitors to visit more than once. Their study finds support for the concept that first-time visitors behave differently than repeat visitors. A corroborative finding by Do Valle et al. (2008) suggests that tourist loyalty and profitability are positively correlated. Wang (2004) found that repeat visitors are distinct from first-time visitors in that they participate in different activities and spend more money than first-time visitors. However, evidence to the contrary suggests that repeat visitors may be more price-sensitive and spend less than first-time visitors (Petrick, 2004).

Repeat tourism may be influenced by a variety of factors, but is heavily affected by a given tourist’s desire to reduce risk (Lehto et al., 2004; Niinen & Riley, 2004). Vacations can be a high-risk expenditure, due in part to the perceived unknowns of traveling to a new destination. Visiting a destination more than once is a strategy for reducing that risk (Caneen, 2004). In a study performed by Do Valle et al. (2004) the more experience tourists had with a destination, the more likely they were to plan a return trip.

Do Valle et al. (2004) analyzed the characteristics of over 100 Portuguese tourists traveling to Brazil and their likelihood to make a repeat visit. Data were collected through a randomly distributed questionnaire given to tourists en route to Brazil on Air-Luxor flights. A logit model was then used to explore the relationship between return tourism and trip motivation, tourist characteristics, and travel expectations. The authors found that return visits are primarily motivated by emotional connections to a destination, such as

leisure and socialization, regardless of travel cost, destination facilities, or landscape features. Another finding was that return tourists were likely to report a more positive expectation for their vacation. This may suggest that destination image has an influence on repeat tourism behaviors. Repeat tourists preferred to return to Brazil regardless of the cost.

The study of event tourism is an established field within the tourism literature and consists of the study of all planned events which tourists may attend (Getz, 2007). A variety of different event-types can encourage repeat tourism. Taks, Chalip, Green, Kesenne, and Martyn (2009) found that participation in classic tourism activities, such as sightseeing or visiting museums, surrounding a one-time sporting event encouraged the intention to make a repeat visit. Events that occur successively each year have also been associated with repeat tourism. Visitors to large shopping events marketed to tourists in the United Arab Emirates tended to be repeat visitors and to visit multiple tourism-related facilities throughout their trip (Anwar & Sohail, 2003).

CHAPTER II

UTAH TOURIST TYPES

Overview of Tourism in Utah

Utah boasts a unique variety of tourist attractions ranging from outdoor recreation to cultural attractions and more (Leaver, 2015). Utah offers an impressive amount of outdoor recreation opportunities with five national parks, seven national monuments, two national recreation areas, and 43 state parks (Leaver, 2014). Landscapes range from arid deserts and red sandstone formations in the south to high mountain peaks and lakes in the north. Utah is also home to the Golden Spike National Historic Site and a variety of other historic and cultural attractions. Utah's location and climate lend themselves to world-famous skiing and attracted over 4 million visitors from around the state, country, and world to Utah's fourteen ski resorts in 2012 (Leaver, 2014).

The economic impact of tourism in Utah is significant and has grown in the recent past. Tourism not only attracts non-resident visitor spending, but increases tax revenue for the state and creates jobs (Leaver, 2015). In 2012, for instance, non-resident visitor spending was \$5.3 billion and tourism and recreation related tax revenues totaled an estimated \$960.6 million (Leaver, 2014). In 2013, traveler spending, both resident and non-resident, exceeded \$7.5 billion; the highest ever in state history (BEBR, 2015). The following year, in 2014, total taxable sales in the leisure and hospitality industry increased by 7% (BEBR, 2015). The tourism industry accounted for about 10% of jobs in Utah (Leaver, 2014) and in 2014, "every tourism-related job sector experienced growth"

(The University of Utah: The Policy Institute, 2015). When compared to Utah's export industries in 2013, the tourism industry (\$6.4 billion) is the second largest behind primary (\$8.3 billion) metals and ahead of computers and electronics (\$2.6 billion) (Leaver, 2015).

The economic impact of tourism is especially important in Utah's rural counties. In rural counties, such as Daggett, Garfield, Grand, Kane, Summit, and Wayne counties, tourism, leisure, and recreation jobs account for up to 40% of the job market. National parks and ski resorts attracted over 3.5 million visitors and their spending to rural counties in 2012 (Leaver, 2014). The impact of tourism spending on rural counties is evidenced by the observation that the top ten tourism impacted counties in 2013 were all rural counties (Leaver, 2015). Support for rural development through tourism is evidenced by programs offered through the Utah Office of Tourism geared towards expanding Utah's tourism economy through partnerships in infrastructure and marketing with small rural counties (Utah Office of Tourism, 2015).

Food and culinary tourism has seen increasing popularity all over the United States as 27 million travelers participated in wine or culinary-related activities over a three-year period (Sohn & Yuan, 2013). *Brand USA*, which is responsible for marketing the U.S. as a tourism destination, includes regional cuisines as a means of encouraging visitors to come to the United States.

Food and culinary tourism in Utah is a niche tourism market that may be poised for additional development and growth. In an article that appeared in *Business in Utah*, an official publication of the Utah Governor's Office of Economic Development, Utah was described as entering a new era of culinary tourism driven by the quality of local foods.

The article quoted Seth Winterton, the deputy director of marketing for Utah's Own, as saying "Utah is now known for artisan cheese, beer, milling, grass-fed beef—it's changed so much over the past few years" (Olson, 2014). Local food sourcing provides benefits to producers in terms of higher income (Adam, Balasubrahmanyam, & Born, 1999) and greater control over production and processing methods (Martinez, et al., 2010). Sourcing local foods provides benefits to consumers in terms of improved economic development in rural communities, better outcomes in public health, and enhanced environmental sustainability (Jensen, 2010)

Additional evidence of the developing food tourism scene in Utah occurred when Salt Lake City was named as one of America's five new foodie cities in 2014 by Wine Enthusiast Magazine (Bernstein & Korman, 2014). Local organizations have also contributed to the development of a local food culture in Utah. The Utah Farm-Chef-fork program was instituted in 2012 and has since trained restaurant owners, chefs, and local producers on how to interact, communicate, and collaborate one with another (Brain, Curtis, & Hall, 2015). Considering that food and beverage purchases were one of the top three spending categories for non-resident travelers in Utah in 2012, the economic impact of food and culinary travelers is potentially large (Leaver, 2014).

Sampling Methods

Data for this study were collected between summer of 2013 and winter of 2014 through an in-person survey, administered by trained surveyors in various Utah locations. Sites included the entrances of ski areas, airports, national parks, convention centers, and

visitor information centers in locations such as Cedar City, Park City, Moab, Green River, Zion's National Park, Bear Lake, Logan, Vernal, St. George, and Salt Lake City. The survey was first pre-tested on participants at a week-long "summer college" event on the Utah State University campus in Logan, Utah. Every third person was approached by a surveyor wearing a Utah State University t-shirt and asked if they would like to participate in a survey.

A total of 709 participants registered their responses on iPads of which 700 were ultimately used in analysis. The only responses used in analysis were collected from tourists whose permanent residence was in a different state from Utah or a different country. Some responses were eventually eliminated from the study due to unintelligible answers, while others were discarded because the respondents lived permanently in Utah. Survey participants were not offered compensation of any kind and no information was collected on those who declined to participate.

Survey participants were asked to answer a variety of questions designed to assess their participation in agricultural and food practices and events, both when at home and while traveling, such as community supported agriculture, farmers markets, and food or wine festivals. Some questions targeted the nature of the participants' experience in Utah, including what kind of establishment they stayed in, the number of times they had previously visited, and the duration of their stay. Other questions focused on the participants' motivation for visiting Utah and their primary leisure interests. The participants' destination image of Utah culture, food, and tourist activities was also assessed through a variety of questions. Question types included basic demographic

questions, short answer, dichotomous choice, and multiple choice. Table 1, located in the appendix, provides sample summary statistics.

Survey Descriptive Statistics

Survey results show that 52% of respondents were men and 68% were married. The average respondent was 50 years old, with the youngest being 14 and the oldest 89. About 60% of participants were between the ages of 40 and 70 years old, showing that the majority of the respondents could broadly be termed as “middle-aged” to “aging.” The vast majority of respondents were Caucasian (84%) with 5% and 4% identifying as Asian and Hispanic, respectively. Most respondents had a college degree with only 29% stating that they did not. Forty-nine percent were employed full-time, 10% part-time, and 29% were retired. The average annual household income in 2012 was about \$103,000.

The most common primary reason for traveling to Utah was outdoor recreation (43%). Other notable reasons included visiting cultural and heritage sites (24%), national parks (9%), and agritourism (9%). Only 1% of respondents indicated that business was the primary reason for travel. Considering that Forbes ranked Utah as the 2014 Best State for Business (Badenhausen, 2014) and that Americans made 2.1 billion business trips in the same year (U.S. Travel Association, 2014), it seems unlikely that only 1% of all Utah travelers would cite business as their primary travel purpose. For this reason, the 1% of participants who responded in this manner on the survey are unlikely to be representative of Utah travelers as a whole.

On average, visitors stayed 10.6 days and were most likely to stay in hotels or motels (54%), although 20% indicated that they were camping. Twenty-nine percent of visitors had never been to Utah before while 35% had visited Utah at least four times previously. In planning their trip, the internet was the most popular resource (41%) with only 10% using brochures or booklets. Thirty-two percent of respondents stated that their trip was based on tradition.

Visitors traveled in small groups which typically consisted of about three adults (2.9) and one to two children (1.5). Nearly one-third of the travel groups (30%) included children under the age of 18. On average, travelers spent about \$570 per person for the duration of their trip. Of the total trip budget, about 18% was spent on food. Table 1 contains a summary of all descriptive statistics.

Respondents were asked to rank on a scale of one to five their level of participation in food-related activities when at home and while traveling. Low rankings corresponded with less participation and high rankings corresponded with more participation. Table 2 and Table 3 summarize the responses for this portion of the survey.

When at home, respondents showed strong preferences for buying local foods from local producers, cooking and trying new foods, and recycling. Among alternative agriculture activities, buying locally grown foods (3.52) and shopping at farmers' markets (3.08) ranked the highest among respondents. Among food related behaviors, cooking at home (4.29), trying new food items or recipes (3.86), and eating ethnic foods (3.57) all ranked highly. Food canning (1.80) and beer and wine making (1.35) were the

least popular food related behaviors. Recycling (4.35) was the highest ranked sustainable activity and the highest ranked activity overall.

While traveling, respondents also showed noticeable preferences for certain activities food-related activities. Trying new food items (3.48), trying local recipes (3.12), and seeking out restaurants that source locally (2.97) were the highest ranked food-related activities. Buying locally sourced food (2.80) and shopping at farmers' markets (2.46) were again the most popular agriculture related activities. Once again, recycling (3.67) was the highest ranked activity overall.

On a similarly designed scale, respondents were asked to rank their likelihood of returning to Utah, their agreement with several characterizations of Utah's destination image, and certain interests and experiences regarding their trip to Utah. Table 4 summarizes the responses for this portion of the survey.

Respondents felt that Utah is best known for its outdoor activities (4.48) and for its landscapes (4.63). While respondents indicated that they had seen food advertised as "Utah's Own" or "Local First Utah" (3.89) to a certain extent, they felt less strongly about how well local food is advertised (2.94) and were even less likely to feel that the food they had eaten in Utah was good (2.73). Among statements related to experiences, interests, and satisfaction, respondents indicated that they planned to return to Utah (4.10) and would recommend Utah to their family and friends (4.43). Respondents generally disagreed with the statement that they had had sufficient time to see and do everything they had wanted to while in Utah.

Study Design: Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is a statistical technique used to find underlying dimensions or “factors” that describe the primary sources of variation between variables. Each individual factor has a corresponding factor weight that can be described as the relationship between each variable and the factor itself (Bond et al., 2008). Factor analysis simplifies data interpretation by reducing a large number of variables into a smaller number of factors that represent the multidimensional decisions often made by consumers. For example, a traveler may choose a destination based on variables such as the cost of travel, lodging, and food that all share an underlying factor (price).

The Utah survey asks a variety of questions about the behavior of respondents either when at home or when traveling. Understanding the behavior of Utah visitors and identifying the underlying factors of that behavior are crucial components of this study. Using factor analysis, the number of variables is reduced to the underlying factors which may simplify the interpretation of visitor behavior (Statacorp, 2011). Two separate exploratory factor analyses were performed; one on each set of questions regarding either behavior at home or when traveling. Table 2 and Table 3 contain descriptive statistics for the items used in both analyses.

Factor analysis was performed on 27 items representing behaviors associated with culinary and farm-based activities both when traveling and when at home in order to estimate the number of underlying dimensions of these behaviors. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test of sampling adequacy (0.8) indicated that the various items share enough variance to warrant the application of factor analysis. The Stata command `factor` was

used to conduct a principal component factor analysis using varimax rotation. Varimax rotation was used to ensure that the factors would not have inter-correlated components (Statacorp, 2011). According to the Kaiser criterion, which essentially suggests that factors should provide at least as much information as a single variable, only factors with an associated eigenvalue greater than or equal to one were retained (Kaiser, 1958).

Factor Analysis Results

In the first factor analysis, regarding the “at home” variables, four factors emerged which cumulatively explained 53.59% of the total variance. The second factor analysis, regarding the “while traveling” variables, returned three factors which together explained 54.48% of the total variance. Table 5 and Table 6 show the factor loadings for each question set.

Discussion

The various factors represent the multidimensionality of visitor behavior by grouping like behaviors together. Although Utah visitors exhibit a variety of behaviors, the factor analysis finds that some of those behaviors are interrelated and can be grouped into factors. Each individual factor represents a distinct, uncorrelated dimension to visitor behavior. For example, the behaviors of gardening, canning/preserving, and composting are all grouped, or condensed, into the “do it yourself” factor which was the factor name assigned the latent variable that underlies all three behaviors.

Between both factor analyses, seven total factors were created. These factors may be simpler to interpret and easier for tourism providers, agricultural producers, and

policymakers to put into use than the original 26 variables from which they were drawn.

The factor loadings for each variable express how strongly the variable is associated with the factor. For example, trying new foods is more strongly associated with the “food tourism” factor than buying food gifts or souvenirs.

Tourism industry professionals may infer that tourists who participate in one element of a factor are likely to also participate in the other elements of the same factor. Understanding how tourists view the connections between different, yet related, activities may help tourism industry providers to market activities more effectively to certain consumer segments. For example, shopping at farmers’ markets and visiting farms both loaded highly on the Alternative Agriculture factor; therefore, farm tours which are promoted at a nearby farmers’ markets may have a greater chance of advertising to interested consumers.

Study Design: Cluster Analysis

A partition clustering method was used in order to explore the natural target markets occurring among respondents based on the similarity of their responses to a variety of survey questions. The cluster analysis draws upon responses to the questions included in Table 7 as well as financial information provided by respondents:

Before clustering the data, the Stata command `standardize` was used to standardize the variables. Standardizing the variables is one method that prevents variables with greater variability from dictating the results of the cluster analysis (Statacorp, 2011). For example, the variable *party size* ranges from 0 to 55, whereas the variable *expense per person* ranges from 0 to 6300. Standardizing the variables ensures that *expense per person* doesn't have a greater impact on the clustering algorithm than *party size*. `Standardize` transforms the variables so that each has a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one.

Clustering was performed using the Stata command `cluster kmeans` which performs a partition cluster analysis. A random number seed was used to randomly select observations from across the range of the data to form initial group centers. Observations were then assigned to mutually exclusive groups based on the amount of similarity between the mean of the observation and the group mean (Statacorp, 2011).

Cluster Analysis Results

Forming a reasonable and useful number of groups from the data was important to interpreting the results from the cluster analysis. In this case, the Calinski-Harabasz

pseudo-F index was used to determine the optimal number of groups. Essentially, larger values of the index indicate that the groups formed through the cluster analysis are more distinct (Calinski & Harabasz 1974). The highest Calinski-Harabasz pseudo-F score (19.5) occurred when the cluster analysis formed six clusters. However, two of the clusters contained only 5% of the total number of observations each. Interpretation and analysis of a cluster that accounts for so little of the overall sample seemed unlikely to result in truly beneficial information for tourism industry providers, agricultural producers, or policymakers. For the sake of simplicity and useful interpretation of the data, a cluster analysis forming four clusters was instead selected. Table 8 reports the results of the cluster analysis.

Discussion

Cluster Analysis detected four reasonably distinct groupings within the data. Each cluster represented a group of Utah visitors with behavioral characteristics that were distinct from the other clusters. Below, a brief summary highlights the most distinct characteristics of each group:

- Cluster 1: “Large Family Trip” (9%). The average age of this group was 52 years old. Sixty-seven percent were married and well educated as 14% had a graduate degree. They traveled in the largest groups comparatively (on average 4.8 people) and had visited Utah many times, staying 5 days on average. About 52% used the internet in trip planning and were unlikely to use brochures. They were unlikely to participate in outdoor recreation or visit national parks. This group was the most

likely to participate in agritourism activities when traveling and to participate in things like canning composting, and gardening when at home.

- Cluster 2: “Outdoor Enthusiasts” (29%). This group tended to be more male than female, was the least likely to be married, and traveled in the smallest groups (average of 2.8 people). Comparatively, they were the least educated and 48 years old on average. They spent the least time in Utah (average of 4.7 days) and were the most likely to have used a brochure in trip planning. They were highly interested in outdoor recreation. They spent about 22% of the total trip budget on food, but had the smallest trip budget of all the groups. This group was the least likely to seek out local foods when traveling.
- Cluster 3: “Sophisticated Food Travelers” (30%). This was the oldest group (average age was 53) and the most likely to be married. Nearly 60% had graduate degrees, making this the most educated group. Seventy-four percent used the internet in trip planning and their average trip lasted 14.3 days. This group was the most likely to travel for business reasons, but they also visited national parks, and cultural and heritage sites. They spent about 22% of the total trip budget on food. This group was the most likely to seek out local foods when traveling and participated in sustainable behaviors (recycling, etc.) when at home. At home, they tended to do a lot of their own cooking and buy local foods.
- Cluster 4: “Food and Culture Pilgrimage” (22%). This group was the youngest and about 64% were married and female. This group was the most likely to have a bachelor’s degree and traveled in groups of about 3.8 people. The least likely to

use the internet in trip planning, this group traveled mostly based on tradition.

They were likely to have visited Utah previously. This group was the most likely to visit culture and heritage sites. They spent about 15% of the trip budget on food and spent the most overall per person (\$960) on what tended to be a 10.5 day vacation. This group was the most likely to seek out food experiences and buy food gifts when traveling and to try new foods and local foods when at home. They belonged to beer and wine clubs.

The examination of these consumer segments implies that each Utah visitor tends to belong to a distinct group that shares similar characteristics in terms of demographics, interests, behaviors, and motivations. The careful consideration of these groups may benefit the tourism industry in several ways. Tourism industry professionals and local producers may improve their offerings by considering the type of Utah tourist most likely to participate in their operations, their interests, and their behavioral patterns. In addition, an improved understanding of the type of person who may be interested in particular aspects of Utah tourism may help in the promotion and marketing of different tourism experiences.

Every group, regardless of demographic or psychographic factors, needs to eat throughout their stay in Utah; this means that every group is a potential market for local foods and culinary tourism. However, those belonging to the groups Sophisticated Food Travelers and Food and Culture Pilgrimage are the most favorable for culinary tourism participation and may provide the greatest marketing opportunities for local producers. Improved understanding of these groups may help local producers to best interact with these consumers. For example, advertising local foods, culinary tourism, and agritourism

opportunities in the context of sustainability may have a special appeal for those belonging to the Sophisticated Food Travelers group since they participate in sustainable activities at home.

CHAPTER III
RETURN TOURISM POTENTIAL

Model Design: Ordered Logit Regression Model

Ordered logit regression models are an estimation technique commonly used when the dependent variable is described by a number of discrete choices. The choices are ordinal in nature, meaning that higher values correspond with higher outcomes. An ordered logit regression model was employed in order to explore the impact of multiple explanatory variables on the dependent variable, RETURN. RETURN is defined by the respondents' reply to the prompt, "I am planning to return to Utah." Respondents' options were strongly disagree, disagree, unsure, agree, and strongly agree. Ascending numerical values were attached to each option. The ordered logit model assumes that the underlying propensity to return to Utah is governed by an unobserved variable that is a linear function of several variables, as seen in equation (1):

$$(1) \quad y^* = X'\beta + \varepsilon$$

Where y^* is the unobserved propensity to return to Utah, X is a vector of observed variables, and β is a vector of coefficients to be estimated. We assume that the error term follows a logistic distribution and assign the following categories of responses for y :

$$(2) \quad y = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y^* \leq \mu_1, \\ 2 & \text{if } \mu_1 < y^* \leq \mu_2, \\ 3 & \text{if } \mu_2 < y^* \leq \mu_3, \\ 4 & \text{if } \mu_3 < y^* \leq \mu_4, \\ 5 & \text{if } \mu_4 < y^* \end{cases}$$

The μ_i are cutoff parameters to be estimated and y takes on a value of 1 for “strongly disagree, a value of 2 for “disagree”, etc. With these assumptions the coefficients and cutoff values can be estimated via maximum likelihood. This model was estimated four times with different sets of variables appearing in each estimation.

The first model focused on the impact of destination image on a given tourists’ likelihood to return and vacation in Utah again. Do Valle et al. (2008) found that tourist expectation in the form of destination image had a significant, positive impact on a tourist’s likelihood of returning to a destination. American tourists have been found to have a desire to experience the local culture of a destination, then return to the destination with friends and family to “show off” the culture to them (Caneen, 2004). Chi and Qu (2008) found that destination image is directly linked to both destination attributes and overall satisfaction with a destination. In addition, the number of previous visits to a location has been found to be positively related to destination loyalty in a number of studies (Niinenen & Riley, 2004; do Valle et al., 2008; Oppermann, 2000). A positive correlation was hypothesized between the destination image variables listed in Table 9 and stated intention to return. All of the dependent variables that appear in Models (1) through (4) are also included in table 9.

The second model focused on the influence of demographic variables on a tourists’ likelihood to vacation in Utah again. Although research has been conducted regarding the nature of this relationship, current scholarship is limited and somewhat contradictory. For example, Wang (2004) found that demographic characteristics were largely insignificant indicators of repeat tourism. However, according to Li, Cheng, Kim, and Petrick (2008), repeat tourists tended to be older and were more likely to be married

than first-time visitors. McKercher and Wong (2004) also found that repeat tourists were older, more experienced travelers and noted that gender didn't appear to be a significant factor of repeat tourism. Niininen and Riley hypothesized that return tourism may be highly correlated with demographic factors, but provided no empirical evidence (2004). The second model was exploratory in the sense that the relationship between several of the included demographic variables and repeat tourism is less than well-defined.

The third model was designed to explore the relationship between trip motivation and return tourism. Devesa, Laguna, and Palacios (2010) reported that return tourists tend to seek leisure experiences and consider the quality of heritage conservation in the decision making process. Huang and Hsu (2009) likewise found a relationship between intention to revisit and visit purpose among visitors to Hong Kong. In light of current scholarship, a positive relationship was hypothesized between the visit purpose variables and repeat tourism.

The fourth and final model was designed to follow a more holistic approach to repeat tourism and contains certain variables from the preceding three models, as well as several distinct variables. A notable addition to this model was the likelihood of a person to recommend Utah as a travel destination to others. A number of studies have found a connection between willingness to recommend a destination to others and the likelihood of returning to vacation in that location (Caneen, 2004; Chi & Qu, 2008; do Valle et al., 2008). Another addition was a variable representing the tourists' opinion regarding their experience with the food they ate while on their trip to Utah. Devesa et al. (2010) found that gastronomic quality, restaurant facilities, and restaurant availability were all connected to repeat tourism.

The ordered logit models were performed after running a series of auxiliary regression models to check for multicollinearity among the regressors. The variance inflation factor (VIF) was calculated for each regression using equation (3):

$$(3) \quad VIF(\hat{\beta}_i) = \frac{1}{(1-R_i^2)}$$

Where $\hat{\beta}_i$ is the observed coefficient for each X_i , R_i^2 is the unadjusted coefficient of determination for each auxiliary regression, and i is an index of the regressions. None of the auxiliary regressions exhibited evidence of strong multicollinearity among the variables.

Ordered Logit Regression Results

Results from the first model highlight the importance of the number of times a person has visited Utah and his or her perception of Utah as a tourist destination. A positive correlation between the number of times a person has visited Utah and their stated intention to return to Utah was confirmed. The image of Utah as a place to participate in outdoor activities also had a positive correlation with intention to return. The perceptions that Utah is known for Native American culture and Mormon culture were also positively correlated with the dependent variable. These results, as well as the results for all subsequent models are summarized in Table 10.

The results for the second model place emphasis on the somewhat tenuous relationship found in recent scholarship between demographic variables and repeat tourism. None of the included demographic variables demonstrated a significant correlation with intention to return. The low value for the Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square

test (7.54) indicated that there was an 18% chance that all of the independent variable coefficients were jointly equal to zero.

Results for the third model demonstrated the relationship between travel motivation and stated intention to return. The travel motivations of business, visiting national parks, visiting cultural and heritage sites, and participating in agritourism all exhibited a significant positive correlation with intention to return to Utah. The Likelihood Ratio Chi² Test statistic (35.06) indicated that the possibility that all of the coefficients were simultaneously equal to zero was sufficiently low.

Results for the fourth model represent the fullest context for repeat tourism, relative to the other models. UTAHVISITS, OUTDOORACT, GOODFOOD, DIDEVERYTHING, and RECOMMEND were all significant at the 0.01 level. AGE, CHILDREN, and GRADUATE were significant at the 0.05 level and CULTURE&HERITAGE was significant at the 0.1 level. All of the significant coefficients had a positive sign, except for DIDEVERYTHING, AGE, and CHILDREN. The Likelihood Ratio Chi² Test Statistic (392.21) showed that the likelihood of all of the coefficients being simultaneously equal to zero was sufficiently unlikely.

Discussion

Each of the different models considered represents a different context surrounding repeat tourism. The first model focuses on elements of destination image. The positive correlations between the dependent variable, PLANTORETURN, and UTAHVISITS, OUTDOORACT, NACULTURE, and MOCULTURE suggest the importance of destination image for repeat tourists. Tourism industry professionals may better

encourage repeat tourism by promoting Utah as a tourism destination characterized not only by outdoor activities, but culture as well.

The second model exclusively considered the relationship between demographic factors and repeat tourism. While other studies have found some evidence of demographic influences on repeat tourism, the absence of statistically significant variables in this model may suggest that demographics alone are a poor predictor of repeat tourism. Destination marketing intended to promote repeat tourism should therefore appeal to a diverse range of tourists.

The third model highlighted the importance of travel motivations and demonstrated the positive correlations between several different travel motivations and repeat tourism. The dependent variables BUSINESS, VISITNATIONALPARKS, CULTURE&HERITAGE, and AGRITOURISM were all positively correlated with PLANTORETURN. Those traveling for business purposes may be obliged to plan a return trip, regardless of the quality of their experience in Utah. However, those whose travel motivation was to participate in a specific activity may indicate their desire to return to Utah due to a high quality experience with that activity. More research in this area may help tourism industry professionals to better understand how trip satisfaction and return tourism intention are linked to specific activities.

The fourth model provided the fullest context for examining repeat tourism and included all of the elements of the previous models in addition to several variables regarding tourists' experience while in Utah. In this model, AGE and CHILDREN were negatively correlated with PLANTORETURN, which suggests that certain demographic factors may have some predictive power when considered as a part of the "big picture."

GOODFOOD was positively correlated with PLANTORETURN, along with several other dependent variables. Tourism industry professionals may wish to place greater emphasis on the development of high quality food experiences in order to encourage repeat tourism.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine and interpret consumer segments in order to further inform policy makers, tourism industry providers, and agricultural producers of the characteristics, interests, and perceptions of Utah tourists. Seven-hundred in-person surveys were gathered from tourist locations across Utah. All respondents were tourists visiting from outside of Utah. The responses gathered were used in a series of statistical analyses designed to explore the behaviors, backgrounds, and expectations of the varying types of people who visit Utah. Targeted food and agricultural tourism marketing, as well as the development of tourist attractions, activities, and products, may be greatly enhanced through the results from the analyses performed in this study.

One key area of investigation regarded how tourists' participation in varying food-related activities was interrelated. As evidenced by the results of the factor analysis, Utah tourists appear to combine or relate certain food and agriculture related behaviors based on underlying factors. Understanding how tourists view and participate in certain behaviors and activities may have important policy, marketing, and production implications.

The factors identified in this study regarding at home behaviors were named *Local Foods*, *Food Experiences*, *Do It Yourself*, and *Food Connections*. The factors regarding behaviors while traveling were named *Food Tourism*, *Agritourism*, and *Local Foods*. Each factor was made up of several related behaviors and activities, or

dimensions, which implies that if a consumer participates in one dimension of the factor they will also be likely to participate in the other dimensions.

Those interested in promoting, advertising, or developing tourism opportunities may use these factors to combine different, but related, activities into an integrated tourism experience. For example, the *Local Foods* factor explored in the analysis of at home behaviors loads highly on both shopping at farmers' markets and visiting farms. This information would suggest that a local producer or firm wishing to advertise a farm visit experience may benefit by advertising the experience at local or regional farmers' markets.

Additionally, the items related in the at home behaviors factor *Food Experiences* suggest that tourists interested in trying ethnic foods may also be interested in trying new kinds of produce and new recipes. A farmers' market, road side produce stand, or farm experience designed to satisfy all three of those interests may represent a more holistic experience for the tourist. A tourism experience that addresses several related areas of interest may lead to higher tourist satisfaction than an experience or activity that misses one or more of those interests.

Whereas factor analysis was used to examine meaningful groups of variables, cluster analysis was used to place respondents into groups with similar characteristics. These clusters represented consumer segments based on demographics, interests, perceptions, behaviors, and travel motivations. A partition clustering method was used to place tourists into the groups, *Large Family Trip*, *Outdoor Enthusiasts*, *Sophisticated Food Travelers*, and *Food and Culture Pilgrimage*.

The respondents grouped into the *Large Family Trip* cluster represented 9% of the sample and tended to travel in groups of nearly five people for an average of five days. Fourteen percent of this group had graduate degrees and they were the most likely to seek out agritourism activities. This group was unlikely to use brochures in their travel planning, however 52% used the internet to plan their trip. In general, this tourists in this group had visited Utah multiple times.

The characteristics of this group suggest that agritourism activities developed in a manner that is educational and friendly to families or other large groups may target this group particularly well. Agricultural producers who are considering the development of agritourism opportunities as a part of their operations should consider activities that are conducive to large groups and a wide range of ages. For example, hayrides, educational demonstrations, and some farm tours may accommodate tourists of all ages. In instances where one activity is more conducive to a particular age group, complementary activities may be paired with one another in order to appeal to a wider range of ages. An example could be pairing a corn maze, which may be less appealing to some older or younger tourists, with a hay ride or educational demonstration. Online advertisement is likely to be an effective way to market activities to this group.

Those clustered into the group *Outdoor Enthusiasts* accounted for 29% of the overall sample, tended to have the shortest stay in Utah, and spent the least amount of money. This type of tourist was likely to travel in smaller groups of unrelated people on shorter trips, comparatively. They were highly interested in outdoor recreation and tended to be male. This group spent 22% of its total budget on food, which may provide opportunities for local producers.

While outdoor recreation is their primary travel motivation, local producers may still benefit by promoting food-related experiences and food products to this group. Expos, conventions, and festivals related to outdoor recreation may be a good venue for exploring these travelers' interest in purchasing local foods tailored to their specific needs and interests. For example, producers may find that this group is interested in foods that can be prepared easily in the outdoors or that can be transported and stored easily, such as jerky, dried fruit, or other dehydrated foods.

The *Sophisticated Food Travelers* group represented 30% of the sample and was the oldest and most educated group on average. This group was the most likely to travel for business reasons, but also traveled in order to visit national parks, cultural, and heritage sites. They traveled for an average of 14.3 days and their interests included local foods and sustainable behaviors. They were also the most likely to use the internet in trip planning.

Tourism industry providers and local producers should consider using the internet in the marketing and development of tours, restaurants, farm experiences, and local foods targeted towards this group. This group has a wide variety of interests and visits national parks as well as culture and heritage sites. Advertising and developing culinary tourism opportunities in connection to other tourist attractions may be an effective way to interact with this group. For example, a tourist experience combining a food, wine, or beer tasting with a museum tour, natural history tour, or historic site tour may particularly suit the needs and interests of this group. Since this is the oldest tourist segment, comparatively, limited mobility and other age-related factors may need to be taken into consideration in the development of tourism experiences.

The *Sophisticated Food Travelers* group also participates in sustainable activities when at home. Therefore, presenting culinary tourism opportunities as a part of sustainable tourism or a sustainable life-style may be another way to attract members of this group. For example, a local-sourcing restaurant may particularly appeal to this tourist segment by seeking to develop a pro-sustainability reputation. This may be accomplished in a variety of ways, including local and online advertising, participation in educational community events, or the development of “meet the grower” type activities.

The *Food and Culture Pilgrimage* group was the youngest group and made up 22% of the sample. About 64% of this group are married and female. This group is made up of repeat tourists whose travel planning is mostly based on tradition. They are the most likely to visit culture and heritage sites, spend the most per person relative to the other groups, and are the most likely to belong to beer and wine clubs.

The development and promotion of culture and heritage-related activities alongside wine-tastings, beer-tastings, and drink related festivals, may be an effective way to interact with this group. For example, a tour of a historic building in downtown Salt Lake City that culminates in a tasting of locally produced foods and beers would represent an activity specifically tailored to this group’s interests. This group is also highly likely to buy food related gifts. Therefore, the availability and transportability of food related gifts at the site of culture and heritage related attractions and activities may provide an opportunity for local producers to market their products to this tourist segment.

Examining the determinants of repeat tourism propensity for Utah tourists was another area of investigation in this study. Understanding the perceptions and interests of

tourists who repeatedly visit Utah may help tourism industry providers and local producers to develop tourism experiences tailored to the distinct expectations and behaviors of this tourist segment. Several models were examined with the intention to highlight different possible aspects of repeat tourism behavior. In the final and largest model, a person's perception of Utah as a destination for outdoor activities and culture and heritage-related activities had a positive relationship with his or her propensity to return to Utah. Other positively correlated variables included whether the respondent felt that the food they had eaten in Utah was good, whether the respondent would recommend Utah as a tourism destination to others, the number of times the respondent had visited Utah, and whether the respondent was traveling for business purposes. Negatively correlated variables included whether the respondent felt they had done everything they had wanted to while in Utah, whether or not the respondent was traveling with children, and the respondent's age.

These findings appear to confirm many of the relationships already investigated in repeat tourism literature. The relationship between the respondents' opinion of the food they ate while in Utah and their propensity to make a return trip to Utah is of special interest for the purposes of this study. While the perception that Utah is known for its food culture wasn't statistically significant, the respondents' actual experience with food in Utah was positive and statistically significant at the .01% level. This may imply that while tourists with a desire to return to Utah don't think of Utah as having a particularly strong food culture, their food experiences in Utah have nevertheless been positive. While efforts to improve Utah's food image may have a myriad of positive effects on the

tourism industry, these results demonstrate a clear need to focus on the development of high quality food experiences for tourists.

Older respondents and respondents with children were less likely to indicate that they planned to make a return trip to Utah. This may be due to the added challenges of traveling later in life or the added expenses of traveling with children. Respondents who felt that they had done everything they wanted to do while in Utah were also less likely to indicate a desire to make a return trip. These results suggest that affordable family-friendly activities may increase the likelihood of planning a return trip to Utah for groups traveling with children. In addition, the continual promotion and development of new tourism opportunities may encourage some individuals to plan a return vacation despite having accomplished everything they wanted to on their trip.

According to Fakeye and Crompton (1991), “images are of paramount importance because they transpose [the] representation of an area into the potential tourist’s mind and give him or her a pre-taste of the destination” (pg. 10). The results of this study may help tourism industry providers and local producers to improve their operations through a better understanding of Utah’s destination image. This could take many forms including targeted advertising and the development of tourism experiences that conform to tourists’ expectations. Through the effective use of the findings in this study in future tourism development and marketing, the destination image of Utah and specific Utah locations may also be transformed to appeal to a broader range of tourists. This could occur through the development of sites with multiple offerings, such as outdoor recreation, food experiences, and cultural experiences.

Utah tourists are a diverse group who exhibit differing behaviors, expectations, and motivations when at home and while traveling. Developing food and agricultural tourism experiences and effective marketing is essential in order for local businesses and producers to best attract, serve, and profit from tourists visiting Utah. Through the examination and implementation of the information provided in this study, tourism industry providers and local producers may be able to better adapt their operations to the varying types of tourists who visit Utah.

REFERENCES

- Adam, K., Balasubrahmanyam, R., & Born, H. (1999). *Direct Marketing*. (NCAT Publication No. IP113). Butte, Montana.
- Anwar, S. A., & Sohail, M. S. (2003). Festival Tourism in the United Arab Emirates; First-time Versus Repeat Visitor Perceptions. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 10(2), 161-170.
- Badenhousen, K. (2014, November 12). Utah Heads the Best States for Business 2014. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/kurtbadenhousen/2014/11/12/the-best-states-for-business-2014/>
- Barbieri, C., & Tew, C. (2010). The Economic Benefits of Agritourism in Missouri Farms. *Missouri Department of Agriculture*.
- Bernstein, N., & Korman, A. (2014). *America's 5 New Foodie Cities*, Retrieved from <http://www.winemag.com/August-2014/Americas-New-Foodie-Cities/index.php/cparticle/1>
- Bond, C.A., Thilmany, D., & Bond, J.K. (2008). Understanding Consumer Interest in Product and Process-Based Attributes for Fresh Produce. *Agribusiness*, 24(2), 231-252.
- Brain, R., Curtis, K.R., & Hall, K. (2015). Utah Farm-Chef-Fork: Building Sustainable Local Food Connections. *Journal of Food Distribution Research*, 46(1), 1-10.
- Brown, A. (2002). Farmers' Market Research 1940-2000: An Inventory and Review. *American Journal of Alternative Agriculture*, 17(4), 167-176.

- Bureau of Economic and Business Research. (2015). Economic Report to the Governor. Retrieved from https://bebr.business.utah.edu/sites/default/files/2015_erg.pdf
- Calinski, T., & Harabasz, J. (1974). A Dendrite Method for Cluster Analysis. *Communications in Statistics*, 3, 1-27.
- Caneen, J. (2004). Cultural Determinants of Tourist Intention to Return. *Consumer Psychology of Tourism, Hospitality and Leisure*, (3), 265-273.
- Carpio, C. E., Wohlgenant, M.K., & Boonsaeng, T. (2008). The Demand for Agritourism in the United States. *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, 33(2), 254-269.
- Chi, C., & Qu, H. (2008). Examining the Structural Relationships of Destination Image, Tourist Satisfaction and Destination Loyalty: An Integrated Approach. *Tourism Management*, 29, 624-636.
- Croce, E., & Perri, G. (2010). *Food and Wine Tourism: Integrating Food, Travel, and Territory*. Cambridge, MA: CAB International.
- Curtis, K.R., & Cowee, M.W. (2009). Direct Marketing Local Food to Chefs: Chef Preferences and Perceived Obstacles. *Journal of Food Distribution Research*, 40(2), 26-36.
- Curtis, K.R., & Monson, J. (2004). *Agritourism: Opportunity for Farm Diversification in Nevada* [Fact Sheet] Retrieved from www.unce.unr.edu/publications/files/ag/2005/fs0538.pdf
- Devesa, M., Laguna, M., & Palacios, A. (2010). The Role of Motivation in Visitor Satisfaction: Empirical Evidence in Rural Tourism. *Tourism Management*, 31, 547-552.

- Durham, C.A., King, R.P., & Roheim, C.A. (2009). Consumer Definitions of 'Locally Grown' for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables. *Journal of Food Distribution Research*, 40, 56-62.
- Fakeye, P., & Crompton, J. (1991). Image Differences Between Prospective, First-Time, and Repeat Visitors to the Lower Rio Grande Valley. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30(2), 10-16.
- Fleisher, B. (1990). *Agricultural Risk Management*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc.
- Friedland, William H. (2008). Kevin Morgan, Terry Marsden, and Jonathan Murdoch: Worlds of Food: Place, Power, and Provenance in the Food Chain. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 25, 291-294.
- Gallarza, M.G., & Garcia, H.C. (2001). Destination Image: Towards a Conceptual Framework. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 56-78.
- Gascoigne, W., Sullins, M., & Mcfadden, D.T. (2008). Agritourism in the West: Exploring the Behavior of Colorado Farm and Ranch Visitors. *Western Economics Forum*, 7(2), 12-24.
- Getz, D., & Carlsen, J. (2000). Characteristics and Goals of Family and Owner-Operated Businesses in the Rural Tourism and Hospitality Sectors. *Tourism Management*, 21(6), 547-560.
- Getz, D. (2007). Event Tourism: Definition, Evolution, and Research. *Tourism Management*, 29, 403-428.
- Getz, D., Andersson, T., & Vujicic, S. (2014). *Foodies & Food Tourism*. Wolvercote, Oxford: Goodfellow.

- Guptill, A., & Wilkins, J.L. (2002). Buying into the Food System: Trends in Food Retailing in the U.S. and Implications for Local Foods. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 19, 39-51.
- Hill, D., Sunderland, E., O’Cathain, C., & Daily, G. (1996). Rural Tourism Development in Ireland. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 54-62.
- Hall, C., Sharples, L., Mitchell, R., Macionis, N., & Cambourne, B. (2011). *Food Tourism around the World: Development, Management, and Markets*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Huang, S., & Hsu, C. (2009). Effects of Travel Motivation, Past Experience, Perceived Constraint, and Attitude on Revisit Intention. *Journal of Travel Research*, 48(1), 29-44.
- Ilbery, B., Bowler, I., Clark, G., Crockett, A., & Shaw, A. (1998). Farm-based tourism as an alternative farm enterprise: a case study from the Northern Pennines, England. *Regional Studies*, 32, 355–364.
- Institute of Grocery Distribution. (2005). *The Local and Regional Food Opportunity*. Retrieved March 3, 2015. Retrieved from www.igd.com/consumer
- Jekanowski, M.D., Williams, D.R., & Schiek, W.A. (2000). Consumers’ Willingness to Purchase Locally Produced Agricultural Products: An Analysis of an Indiana Survey. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review*, 29, 43-52.
- Jensen, J. (2010). Local and Regional Food Systems for Rural Futures. (RUPRI Rural Futures Lab Foundation Publication No. 1). Retrieved from http://www.rupri.org/Forms/RUPRI_Rural-FuturesLab_2010_Food_Systems_for_Rural_Futures.pdf.

- Kaiser, H. (1958). The Varimax Criterion for Analytic Rotation in Factor Analysis. *Psychometrika*, 23(3), 187-200.
- Katchova, A.L., & Woods, T.A. (2013). Local foods and food cooperatives: Ethics, economics and competition issues. H.S. James (Ed.). *Ethics and Economics of Agrifood Competition* (227-242). Springer.
- Kivela, J., & Crotts, J. (2009). Understanding Travelers' Experiences of Gastronomy through Etymology and Narration. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 33(2), 161-192.
DOI: 10.1177/1096348008329868
- Lawson, F., & Bond-Bovy, M. (1977). *Tourism and Recreational Development*. London, United Kingdom: Architectural Press.
- Leaver, J. (2014). The State of Utah's Tourism, Travel and Recreation Industry. *Utah Economic and Business Review*, 73(4), 1-15.
- Leaver, J. (2015). The Economic Contributions of Tourism in Utah: A Regional Comparison. *Bureau of Economic and Business Research*, 3, 1-6.
- Lehto, X., O'Leary J., & Morrison, A. (2004). The Effect of Prior Experience on Vacation Behavior. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(4), 801-818.
- Li, X., Cheng, C., Kim, H., & Petrick, J.F. (2008). A Systematic Comparison of First-time and Repeat Visitors via a Two-Phase Online Survey. *Tourism Management*, 29, 278-293.
- Lobo, R., Goldman, G., Jolly, D., Wallace, D., Schrader, W., & Parker, S. (1999). Agritourism Benefits Agriculture in San Diego County. *UC Small Farm Program*. Retrieved from http://sfp.ucdavis.edu/agritourism/Case_Studies/agritourSD/

- Low, S. A., Adalja, A., Beaulieu, E., Key, N., Martinez, S., Melton, A., ... Jablonski, B.B.R. (2015). Trends in U.S. Local and Regional Food Systems. *U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service*. AP-068.
- Macias, Thomas. (2008). Working Toward a Just, Equitable, and Local Food System: The Social Impact of Community-Based Agriculture. *Social Science Quarterly*, 89(5), 1086-1101.
- Martinez, S., Hand, M., Da Pra, M., Pollack, S., Ralston, K., Smith, T., ... Newman, C. (2010). Local Food Systems: Concepts, Impacts, and Issues. *U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service*. ERR 97.
- McFadden, D. T., Umberger, W., & Wilson, J. (2009). Growing a Niche Market: A Targeted Marketing Plan for Colorado Homestead Ranches. *Review of Agricultural Economics*, 31(4), 984-998. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9353.2009.01478.x
- McIntosh, R. W., & Goeldner, C. R. (1990). *Tourism: Principles, Practices, and Philosophies* (6th ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley
- McKercher, B., & Wong, Y.Y.D. (2004). Understanding Tourism Behavior: Examining the Combined Effects of Prior Visitation History and Destination Status. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43, 171-179.
- Molera, L., & Albaladejo, I. P. (2007). Profiling Segments of Tourists in Rural Areas of South-Eastern Spain. *Tourism Management*, 28, 757-767.
- Niininen, O., & Riley, M. (2004). Towards the Conceptualization of Tourism Destination Loyalty. *Consumer Psychology of Tourism, Hospitality and Leisure*, (3), 275-284.

- Nygaard, B., & Storstad, O. (1998). De-globalization of Food Markets? Consumer Perceptions of Safe Food: the Case of Norway. *European Society for Rural Sociology*, 38(1), 35-53.
- Olson, P. M. (2014). *Land of Milk and Honey*. Retrieved from <http://business.utah.gov/publications/land-milk-honey/>
- Oom do Valle, P., Correia, A., & Rebelo, E. (2008). Determinants of Tourism Return Behavior. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 8(3), 205-219.
- Opperman, M. (2000). Tourism Destination Loyalty. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39, 78-84.
- Petrick, J. (2004). Are Loyal Visitors Desired Visitors? *Tourism Management*, 25, 463-470.
- Phillip, S., Hunter, C., & Blackstock, B. (2010). A Typology for Defining Agritourism. *Tourism Management*, 31, 754-758.
- Pirog, R., Miller, C., Way, L., Hazekamp, C., & Kim, E. (2014). The local food movement: Setting the stage for good food. *MSU Center for Regional Food Systems*.
- Pollak, R.A. (1970). Habit Formation and Dynamic Demand Functions. *Journal of Political Economy* 78(4): 745-763.
- Pollak, R.A. (1976). Habit Formation and Long-run Utility Functions. *Journal of Economic Theory* 13: 272-297.
- Sanchez-Canizares, S., & Lopez-Guzman, T. (2012). Gastronomy as a tourism resource: profile of the culinary tourist. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 15(3), 229-245.

- Shenoy, S. (2005). Food Tourism and the Culinary Tourist. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Clemson University, South Carolina.
- Smith, S., Costello, C., & Muenchen R. (2010). Influence of Push and Pull Motivations on Satisfaction and Behavioral Intentions within a Culinary Tourism Event. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 11, 17-35.
- Sohn, E., & Yuan, J. (2013). Who are the Culinary Tourists? An Observation at a Food and Wine Festival. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 7(2), 118-131. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJCTHR-04-2013-0019>
- Stebbins, R. A. (1997). Identity and Cultural Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 450-452.
- StataCorp. (2011). *Stata 12 Base Reference Manual*. College Station, TX: Stata Press.
- Taks, M., Chalip, L., Green, C., Kesenne, S., Martyn, S. (2009). Factors Affecting Repeat Visitation and Flow-on Tourism as Sources of Event Strategy Sustainability. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 14, 2, 121-142.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14775080902965066>
- Thilmany, D., Bond, C.A., & Bond, J.K. (2008). Going Local: Exploring Consumer Behavior and Motivations for Direct Food Purchases. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 90(5), 1303-1309.
- Thilmany, D., Sullins, M., & Ansteth, A. (2007). *Of Wine and Wildlife: Assessing Market Potential for Colorado Agritourism* [Fact Sheet]. Retrieved from <http://dare.colostate.edu/pubs>
- Thompson, E. Jr., Harper, A.M., & Kraus, S. (2008). Think Globally—Eat Locally: San Francisco Foodshed Assessment. *American Farmland Trust*. Retrieved April 14,

2015 (<http://www.farmland.org/programs/states/ca/Feature%20Stories/San-Francisco-Foodshed-Report.asp>)

- Tyrvainen, L., Silvennoinen, H., Nousiainen, I., & Tahvanainen, L. (2001). Rural Tourism in Finland: Tourists' Expectation of Landscape and Environment. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 1(2), 133-149.
- University of Utah: The Policy Institute. (2015). *Utah Travel & Tourism Profile: State of Utah* [Fact Sheet]. Retrieved from http://gardner.utah.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/TourismProfile_StateofUtahCounty.pdf
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2012). *Census of Agriculture*. Retrieved March 15, 2015. (<http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/>)
- U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Wilderness, and Demographic Trends Research Group. (2002). *National Survey on Recreation and the Environment*, NSRE 2002.
- U.S. Travel Association. (2014). *U.S. Travel Answer Sheet* [Fact Sheet]. Retrieved from https://www.ustravel.org/sites/default/files/page/2013/08/US_Travel_AnswerSheet.pdf
- Utah Office of Tourism. (2015). *Pilot In-State Co-op Program*. Retrieved from <http://travel.utah.gov/opportunities/cafeteria-marketing>
- Long, L.M. (2004). Introduction. In Long, L.M. (Ed.), *Culinary Tourism* (1-2). Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.
- Wang, D. (2004). Tourist Behaviour and Repeat Visitation to Hong Kong. *Tourism Geographies*, 6(1), 99-118.

- Weaver, D., & Fennell, D. (1997). The vacation farm sector in Saskatchewan: a profile of operations. *Tourism Management*, 18, 357–365
- Wilson, J., Thilmany, D., & Sullins, M. (2006). *Agritourism: A Potential Economic Driver in the Rural West* [Fact Sheet]. Retrieved from <http://dare.agsci.colostate.edu/csuagecon/extension/pubstools.htm>
- Wilson, J., Thilmany, D., & Watson, P. (2006). The Role of Agritourism in Western States: Place-Specific and Policy Factors Influencing Recreational Income for Producers. *The Review of Regional Studies*, 36(3), 381-399.
- Wolf, E. (2014). *Have Fork Will Travel*. Portland, Oregon: World Food Travel Association.
- Yun, D., Hennessey, S.M., & MacDonald, R. (2011). Proceedings from International CHRIE Conference '11: *Understanding Culinary Tourists: Segmentations based on Past Culinary Experiences and Attitudes toward Food-related Behaviour*. University of Massachusetts-Amherst.

APPENDIX

Tables

Table 1

Sample Survey Statistics

Item	% of Sample	Mean(SD)	N
Demographic			
Age		50(17.05)	635
Gender			668
Male	52		
Female	48		
Marital Status			665
Single	32		
Married	68		
Ethnic Background			673
Caucasian	84		
Asian	5		
Hispanic	4		
Other	2		
Income		\$103,151(\$131,348)	376
Education			671
No College	29		
Bachelor's Degree	31		
Graduate Degree	40		
Employment			672
Full-time employed	49		
Part-time employed	10		
Unemployed	4		
Homemaker	4		
Student	4		
Retired	29		

Table 1 cont.

<i>Sample Survey Statistics</i>			
Item	% of Sample	Mean(SD)	N
Trip Characteristics			
Length of Stay		10.63(21.6)	689
Number of past Utah Visits			692
None	29		
1-3 times	36		
4-6 times	10		
7-11 times	7		
12 or more times	18		
Primary Reason for Trip			611
Business	1		
Visit Family/Friends	5		
Visit National Parks	9		
Outdoor Recreation	43		
Visit Cultural/Heritage Sites	24		
Special Event/Festival	2		
Agritourism	9		
Passing Through	6		
Final Destination if Passing Through			208
Border State (AZ, NM, CO, ID, NV)	33		
California	16		
Las Vegas	17		
Yellowstone	9		
Other	24		
Accommodations			700
Hotel/Motel	54		
Bed and Breakfast	2		
Camping	20		
Resort	2		
Family and Friends	10		
Other	13		

Table 2

At Home Activities Included in Factor Analysis

When at home, how often do you participate in the following activities?
(1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Always)

Behavior	Mean(SD)	N
Alternative Agriculture		
Buy locally sourced food	3.52(1.16)	666
Shop at farmers' markets	3.08(1.14)	667
Participate in consumer supported agriculture	1.73(1.11)	627
Buy organic certified produce	2.79(1.19)	659
Visit local farms	2.05(1.14)	652
Alternative Foods		
Cook at home	4.29(0.80)	665
Try new food items or recipes	3.86(0.91)	659
Buy fruits/veggies you don't recognize	2.93(1.19)	659
Eat ethnic foods	3.57(1.05)	655
Attend beer/wine festivals	2.39(1.27)	658
Food canning	1.80(1.11)	652
Beer/wine making	1.35(0.88)	648
Sustainable Activities		
Home Gardening	2.62(1.50)	656
Composting	2.14(1.49)	655
Recycling	4.35(1.07)	654

Table 3

While Traveling Activities Included in Factor Analysis

While traveling, how often do you participate in the following activities?
(1 = Never, 2 =Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Always)

Behavior	Mean(SD)	N
Alternative Agriculture		
Buy locally sourced food	2.80(1.19)	620
Shop at farmers' markets	2.46(1.16)	624
Visit local farms	1.77(0.95)	607
Spend the night at local farms	1.28(0.65)	609
Participate in agritourism	1.60(0.88)	606
Alternative Foods		
Cook at your accommodations	2.82(1.31)	635
Try new food items	3.48(1.06)	317
Try local recipes	3.12(1.19)	610
Buy food items as souvenirs or gifts	2.72(1.13)	622
Seek out restaurants that source locally	2.97(1.23)	623
Attend beer/wine festivals	2.22(1.28)	620
Sustainable Activities		
Recycling	3.67(1.33)	622

Table 4

Survey Descriptive Statistics

Please state your level of agreement with the following statements
(1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Unsure, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

Item	Mean(SD)	N
Destination Image		
Utah is known for its outdoor activities (skiing, hiking)	4.48(0.69)	678
Utah is known for its landscapes (National Parks, wilderness)	4.63(0.61)	679
Utah is known for its heritage and culture	3.86(0.89)	666
Utah has a strong food culture	3.65(1.00)	664
Local Products and Attractions		
The food I have eaten in Utah is good	2.73(1.27)	665
Local food is well advertised in Utah	2.94(0.79)	665
I have seen food advertised as "Utah's Own" or "Local First Utah"	3.89(0.74)	662
Community-based attractions are well advertised in Utah	2.94(0.87)	658
Locally produced crafts were readily available in tourist shops	2.50(1.07)	655
Experiences, Interests, and Satisfaction		
I am interested in learning more about Native American culture	3.35(0.93)	653
I am interested in learning more about Mormon culture	3.36(0.89)	650
I feel I have an understanding of Utah culture	3.16(0.96)	657
I had enough time to see and do everything I wanted while in Utah	2.79(1.21)	658
I am planning to return to Utah	4.10(0.89)	672
I will recommend Utah as a travel destination to my family and friends	4.43(0.69)	672

Table 2

Factor Analysis of At Home Behaviors (n = 571)

Behavior	Factor Loading	Eigenvalue	% Variance Explained
Local Foods		3.917	8.58
Shop at farmers' markets	0.638		
Buy organic produce	0.61		
Visit farms	0.59		
Food Experiences		1.575	10.5
Try new foods/recipes	0.761		
Eat ethnic foods	0.728		
Try new produce	0.681		
Do it Yourself		1.287	26.11
Gardening	0.795		
Canning/Preserving	0.747		
Composting	0.667		
Food Connections		1.259	8.39
Recycle	0.721		
Cook at home	0.541		
Buy local foods	0.369		
Total Variance Explained			53.59

Table 3

Factor Analysis of "When Traveling" Behaviors (n = 566)

Behavior	Factor Loading	Eigenvalue	% Variance Explained
Food Tourism		3.923	32.69
Try new foods	0.784		
Try local recipes	0.751		
Buy food related gifts	0.571		
Agritourism		1.484	12.37
Spend a night at a farm	0.734		
Agritourism activities	0.722		
Visit farms	0.337		
Local Foods		1.13	0.42
Buy local foods	0.639		
Cook at accommodations	0.632		
Shop at farmers' markets	0.377		
Total Variance Explained			54.48

Table 4

Elements Used in Cluster Analysis

Question	% of Sample	Mean(SD)
How long is your current stay in Utah?		
Open response (in days)		10.63(21.6)
Which of the following categories represents your completed level of education?		
No College	29	
Bachelors Degree	31	
Graduate Degree	40	
What is your gender?		
Male	52	
Female	48	
What is your marital status?		
Single	32	
Married	68	
What is your current age?		
Open Response (in years)		50(17.05)
Why did you decide to visit Utah?		
Internet/website	41	
Brochure/booklet	10	
Recommendation from family/friend	3	
Tradition	32	
Other	14	
What is your primary reason for visiting Utah?		
Business	1	
Visiting family/friends	5	
Visiting National Parks	9	
Outdoor recreational activities (hiking, skiing)	43	
Visiting cultural/heritage sites	24	
Special event/festival	2	
Agritourism	9	
Passing through	6	
Are you currently a member in any of the following food-based organizations?		
Slow Food	10	
Dining Club	11	
Cooperative grocery store	22	
Wine/beer club	27	
Cooking club	8	
Community Supported Agriculture (CSA)	15	
Other	7	

Table 7 cont.

Elements Used in Cluster Analysis

Question	% of Sample	Mean(SD)
Financial Information		Mean(SD)
Amount spent on food as a percentage of total spent		18.89(17.67)
Total expense per person		571.70(835.50)
Number of people in party		3.32(3.71)

Table 5

Cluster Analysis Results

Cluster	N	%
1	36	8.6
2	123	29.3
3	125	29.8
4	91	21.67
Total	375	89.37

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for Explanatory Variables, Models 1 - 4

Variable	% of Sample	Mean(SD)	N
UTAHVISITS		2.48(1.43)	692
<i>How many times have you visited Utah in the past?</i>			
1 =	2 =	3 =	4 =
None	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-11 times
			12 or more times
OUTDOORACT:		4.48(0.69)	678
<i>Utah is known for its outdoor activities (skiing, hiking)</i>			
(Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree...5 = Strongly Agree)			
HERITAGE:		3.86(0.89)	666
<i>Utah is known for its heritage and culture</i>			
(Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree...5 = Strongly Agree)			
NACULTURE:		3.65(1)	664
<i>I am interested in learning more about Native American culture/traditions</i>			
(Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree...5 = Strongly Agree)			
MOCULTURE:		2.73(1.27)	665
<i>I am interested in learning more about Mormon culture/traditions</i>			
(Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree...5 = Strongly Agree)			
FOODCULTURE:		2.94(0.79)	665
<i>Utah has a strong food culture</i>			
(Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree...5 = Strongly Agree)			
NATIONALPARKS:		4.63(0.61)	679
<i>Utah is known for its landscapes (National Parks, wilderness)</i>			
(Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree...5 = Strongly Agree)			
AGE		50(17.05)	635
GENDER	52%		668
<i>1 = Male, 0 = Female</i>			

Table 9 cont.

Descriptive Statistics for Explanatory Variables, Models 1 - 4

Variable	% of Sample	Mean(SD)	N
MARITAL	68%		665
<i>1 = Married, 0 = Single</i>			
CHILDREN			
<i>Number of children in travel party</i>			
GRADUATE	40%	1.56(1.49)	209
<i>1 = Completed graduate degree, 0 = No graduate degree</i>			
VISIT REASON			
<i>What is your primary reason for visiting Utah?</i>			
BUSINESS	1%		611
FAMILY&FRIENDS	5%		
NATIONALPARKS	9%		
OUTDOORREC	43%		
CULTURE&HERITAGE	24%		
SPECIALEVENT	2%		
AGRITOURISM	9%		
GOODFOOD:		3.89(0.74)	662
<i>The food I have eaten in Utah is good</i>			
<i>(Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree...5 = Strongly Agree)</i>			
DIDEVERYTHING:		2.79(1.21)	658
<i>I had enough time to see and do everything I wanted while in Utah</i>			
<i>(Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree...5 = Strongly Agree)</i>			
RECOMMEND:		4.43(0.69)	672
<i>I will recommend Utah as a travel destination to my family and friends</i>			
<i>(Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree...5 = Strongly Agree)</i>			

Table 6

Coefficient Significance and Sign, Models 1 – 4

Variable	Coefficient(SE)			
	Model (1)	Model (2)	Model (3)	Model (4)
UTAHVISITS	0.443(0.056)***			0.57(0.077)***
OUTDOORACT	0.83(0.155)***			0.522(0.189)***
NATIONALPARKS	0.24(0.165)			-0.129(0.203)
HERITAGE	-0.016(0.095)			0.041(0.115)
NACULTURE	0.2(0.083)***			-0.008(0.096)
MOCULTURE	0.146(0.065)***			0.027(0.076)
FOODCULTURE	0.165(0.105)			-0.027(0.130)
AGE		0.008(0.005)		-0.014(0.006)**
GENDER		-0.195(0.150)		-0.036(0.173)
MARITAL		0.244(0.180)		0.067(0.211)
CHILDREN		-0.030(0.070)		-0.160(0.078)**
GRADUATE		0.1(0.155)		0.028(0.178)
BUSINESS			1.355(0.368)***	0.946(0.446)**
FAMILY&FRIENDS			0.458(0.441)	0.319(0.521)
VISITNATIONALPARKS			1.224(0.398)***	0.66(0.487)
OUTDOORREC			0.442(0.328)	-0.102(0.390)
CULTURE&HERITAGE			1.19(0.346)***	0.756(0.410)*
SPECIALEVENT			0.654(0.549)	0.398(0.648)
AGRITOURISM			0.913(0.391)***	0.288(0.470)
RECOMMEND				1.823(0.161)***
GOODFOOD				0.479(0.130)***
DIDEVERYTHING				-0.241(0.076)***
Log likelihood	-739.075	-739.798	-836.902	-537.226
Chi-Square	202.07	7.54	35.06	392.21
Pseudo R2	0.12	0.005	0.02	0.27
N	692	613	700	608

*: Significant at the 0.1 level

**: Significant at the 0.05 level

***: Significant at the 0.01 level