

**The Creation and Pilot Testing of a Model
To Estimate the Economic Impact
of the
HomegrownHandmade
Internet Web Site Promotion**

March 2007



Submitted by

**Hans Vogelsong, PhD
&
April Evans**

**Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies
East Carolina University**

This project was funded by the Golden LEAF (Long-term Economic Advancement Foundation)



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction.....	4
Methods.....	4
Results.....	7
Discussion.....	15
Appendix 1 – Survey Instruments.....	19
Appendix 2 – List of HGHM Venues	24
Appendix 3 – Research Team Members.....	25

List of Tables

Table 1. Data Collection and Response Rate.....	6
Table 2. Visitor Sample Profile	7
Table 3. Was HGHM Site Primary Purpose of Trip.....	8
Table 4. Visitor Expenditures Directly Related to Site Where Interviewed.....	9
Table 5. Visitor Expenditures Not Directly Related to Site but Incurred During Trip.....	9
Table 6. Per Person Visitor Expenditures Directly Related to Site Where Interviewed	10
Table 7. Per Person Visitor Expenditures Not Directly Related to Site but Incurred During Trip	11
Table 8. Influence of Visit to the HomegrownHandmade.com Web site on travel plans.....	12
Table 9. Type of influence on Travel.....	12
Table 10. Total Direct Impacts Directly Related to Visits to HGHM Sites	13
Table 11. Total Direct Impacts Not Directly Related to Site but Incurred During Visit.....	13
Table 12. Total Economic Impacts Directly Related to Visits to HGHM Sites	15
Table 13. Total Economic Impacts Not Directly Related to Site but Incurred During Visit.....	15

Executive Summary

The purpose of this project was to create and pilot test a methodology to assess the economic impact of the HomegrownHandmade (HGHM) in North Carolina Web site promotional effort. Specifically, the project investigated the potential of a method using a combination of on-site interviews as well as mail-back and e-mail surveys to estimate the marginal increase in economic development attributable to the HGHM Web site promotion. Data was collected during a 25 week period from June through November, 2006 and yielded 104 on-site interviews, 55 completed mail-back surveys, and 53 completed Web site surveys. The following are highlights of the finding from this project:

- The average age of the HGHM visitors was 45 years old, and there were very few (less than 3%) visitors under the age of 23. The majority of visitors attended the sites in groups of 2-4 people and reported that they were repeat visitors. Almost 90% of the visitors were residents of North Carolina who traveled an average of 62 miles to attend the site where they were surveyed
- The majority (86%) of respondents indicated that their visit to the HGHM site was the primary purpose of their visit. This indicates that the HGHM sites are acting as true visitor destinations rather than just stopovers or ancillary targets for people who happen to be in the area or are just passing through. However, significant differences were found between the three sites in relation to how respondents answered the question
- 55.8% of respondents reported that the HGHM Web site influenced their travel plans. Of these, 53.6% answered affirmatively that the Web site influenced them to visit a region that they would otherwise not have traveled to.
- On average, each visitor to HGHM sites accounted for \$10.79 of expenditures directly related to the HGHM site and an additional \$37.35 of expenditures not directly related to their site visit but incurred as a result of their trip to the region.
- The tested model estimates that 29,803 people are annually influenced by the Web site to visit a region that they otherwise would not have visited. The economic impact from these visitations is estimated as \$489,822.37 with the creation of 7.4 new jobs. An additional \$1,558,882.05 of impacts and 22.5 jobs were estimated to be created by converted visitors to HGHM sites, but not directly related to their site visits.

Overall, the results indicate that the tested model can be used to estimate the marginal increase in economic impact associated with promotional campaigns. Discussion focuses on how the survey instruments can be improved, the need for including additional HGHM sites in future efforts, the need for increasing all sample sizes, and suggestions for increasing stakeholder buy-in for the project.

Introduction

Since 2003 the HomegrownHandmade in North Carolina program has been developing and maintaining a Web site and a network of trails that encourage visitors to experience the arts and agricultural venues in rural North Carolina. Currently sites in 72 counties are being showcased through this internet promotional effort. These sites include farms, art galleries, artists' studios, retail stores, restaurants and lodging venues among others.

In order to determine how effective this promotional effort has been, an economic analysis has been called for to create and test a model designed to measure the outcomes and benefits of this on-going effort. Specifically, the purpose of this project was to create and pilot test a methodology capable of exploring the following research questions:

- Do visitors to the Web site fulfill their on-line investigation with actual site visits?
- Is there an increase in tourism or economic growth attributed to tourism in communities featured on the Web site?
- Do venues participating on the Web site receive direct benefits, such as increased income or visitors?
- Is there a relationship between program participants and other community cultural assets?

Methods

The purpose of this project was to create and pilot test a methodology to assess the economic impact of the HomegrownHandmade in North Carolina Web site promotional effort. The data gathered through this project provides information regarding visitors' direct, indirect, and induced expenditures within the region.

Data was collected through a combination of on-site interviews and follow-up mail-back questionnaires completed by visitors to HomegrownHandmade sites. Research assistants conducted brief on-site interviews with visitors to HomegrownHandmade sites.

Data gathered at this stage included demographic information, visitors' points of origin, and the collection of names and addresses. Respondents were also given a self-administered follow-up survey at this time to complete after their trip and mail back to the researchers. The follow-up questionnaire was designed to collect more in-depth information regarding visitors' expenditure patterns and characteristics. To maximize the response rate, additional copies of the questionnaire along with a cover letter were sent to visitors who had not responded within an appropriate time after their initial interviews. This methodology is based on the Dillman (1978) Total Design Method and yielded an overall response rate of 53%

Data was collected during a 25 week period from June through November, 2006. The study design anticipated a larger number of surveys being completed than turned out to be feasible. Several problems were encountered during data collection. Some of the sites targeted for sampling have extremely low visitation numbers which resulted in some trips being made to the sites in which no visitors could be found to be interviewed. On other occasions when more visitors were expected, proprietors requested interviewing be postponed because they had the perception that interviews would interfere with visitors' shopping behavior. These problems, along with potential solutions, will be further discussed in the conclusions and recommendations section of this report. Due to very low visitation numbers in some sites during the time frame of the study, a decision was made to reduce the number of data collection sites from four to three. Table 1 provides a summary of the surveys completed for this project.

Table 1. Data Collection and Response Rate

Site	On-Site Surveys	Mail Back Surveys	Mail Back Response Rate
Mike’s Farm Strawberry Patch and Country Store, Onslow County	56	28	50%
Imperial Center for Arts and Sciences, Rocky Mount	31	19	61%
NC Arts Incubator, Siler City, Chatham County	17	8	47%
Total	104	55	53%

Despite the fact that the original sampling goals were not met, it is important to understand that this project was a pilot study designed to test a methodology, rather than a study designed to determine statewide economic impact of the Web site. Although the sample was small, the project still yielded a high enough number of completed surveys to adequately test the model.

In addition to the interviews and mail-back surveys, a link to an on-line survey was also e-mailed to willing individuals who had visited the Web site during the study period. Site administrators provided the research team with 109 e-mail addresses of self selected individuals who visited the Web site. Of these, two were returned as invalid e-mail addresses and two were repeated e-mail addresses. This resulted in a total of 105 valid e-mail addresses. Potential respondents were e-mailed in advance of receiving the on-line survey link, were e-mailed an invitation to participate, and were sent two additional follow-up e-mail reminders to complete the survey. As an added incentive to participate, all respondents were placed into a drawing for a sampling of NC products. This method produced a total of 53 respondents for a 51% response rate. The primary purpose of this on-line survey was to determine the influence that the Web site had in converting potential visitors to visit a site promoted in the HGHM Web site.

Results

One of the first steps in analyzing the data was to create a profile of visitors to the HGHM sites. Table 2 provides a summary of demographic variables on the visitors to the sites, which can be later used as independent variables in comparing expenditure data.

Table 2. Visitor Sample Profile

Age	N	%	State of Residence	N	%
18-22	1	2.4	North Carolina	92	88.5
23-30	7	17.1	Virginia	1	1.0
31-40	10	24.4	Other	11	10.5
41-50	8	19.5			
51-60	11	26.8			
>60	4	9.8			
Mean age = 45					
Gender	N	%	Travel Distance	N	%
Male	30	29.1	>20	43	42.3
Female	73	70.9	20-60	43	42.1
			61-120	8	7.9
			121-180	1	1
			181-240	1	1
			241-300	2	2
			301-360	0	0
			>360	4	4
			Mean Travel Distance = 62.13		
Group Size	N	%	First Time Visitor	N	%
By Self	12	11.5	Yes	47	45.6
2 people	26	25.0	No	55	53.4
3-4 people	31	29.8			
5-6 people	17	16.4			
>6 people	18	17.3			
Mean Group Size = 4.79					

As Table 2 depicts, there was quite a bit of variance in demographic characteristics of visitors to HGHM sites. The sample was not evenly split between male and female visitors, with more than twice as many females than males. Other variables were dominated by certain categories of responses. The average age of the HGHM visitors was 45 years old, and there were very few (less than 3%) visitors under the age of 23. The majority of visitors attended the sites in groups of 2-4 people and reported that they were repeat visitors. Almost 90% of the visitors were residents of North Carolina who traveled an average of 62 miles to attend the site where they were surveyed.

Another important component of the study involved trip purpose. This was determined by asking respondents if the actual visit to the HGHM site where they were

surveyed was the primary purpose for their trips. Table 3 provides a breakdown of the results of this question for all three HGHM sites.

Table 3. Was HGHM Site Primary Purpose of Trip

Visit to PFS Site was Primary Purpose	Mike's Strawberry Farm		Rocky Mount Imperial Center		NC Arts Incubator		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	53	96.4	25	80.6	11	64.7	89	86.4
No	2	3.6	5	16.1	6	35.3	13	12.6
Total	63	100	237	100	31	100	331	100

Overall, the majority (86%) of respondents indicated that their visit to the HGHM site was the primary purpose of their visit. This indicates that the HGHM sites are acting as true visitor destinations rather than just stopovers or ancillary targets for people who happen to be in the area or are just passing through. However, significant differences were found between the three sites in relation to how respondents answered the question. For example, although 96% of visitors to Mike's Strawberry Farm indicated that their visit to the site was the primary purpose for their trip, fewer than two-thirds (64.7%) of NC Arts Incubator visitors reported that their visit to the site was the primary reason for their trip. Thus, a great deal of variance occurred between the three sites when considering their usefulness in as acting as a true destination.

A list of questions regarding visitor spending characteristics was developed based on a review of relevant literature and incorporated into the survey instrument. These questions were designed to determine the amount of money visitors to HGHM sites spent in the region during their trip (direct impacts) in different expenditure categories such as food, accommodations, gas, souvenirs, etc. Keep in mind that the questions asked visitors to estimate the spending of their entire traveling party for both expenses that were directly related to the site where they were interviewed as well as for expenses that they

incurred on their trip to the region, but were not directly related to the interview site.

Tables 4 and 5 respectively summarize the average spending of visitor parties to all three sites by the expenditure categories that visitors reported spending money in.

Table 4. Visitor Expenditures Directly Related to Site Where Interviewed

Types of Expenditures	Average Expenditures
Food and Beverage (includes restaurants, taverns, groceries, etc)	\$37.04
Shopping (includes clothing, personal items, souvenirs, etc)	\$11.77
Lodging (includes hotels, motels, B&Bs, etc)	\$1.44
Transportation (includes parking fees, gasoline, etc)	\$5.69
Entertainment and Recreation	\$2.40
All other expenses related to your visit	\$.30
Total	\$58.64

Table 5. Visitor Expenditures Not Directly Related to Site but Incurred During Trip

Types of Expenditures	Average Expenditures
Food and Beverage (includes restaurants, taverns, groceries, etc)	\$54.95
Shopping (includes clothing, personal items, souvenirs, etc)	\$20.29
Lodging (includes hotels, motels, B&Bs, etc)	\$313.03
Transportation (includes parking fees, gasoline, etc)	\$ 11.40
Entertainment and Recreation	\$ 5.38
All other expenses related to your visit	\$.40
Total	\$405.45

As Table 4 indicates, travel parties spent an average of \$58.64 directly associated with their HGHM site visit. As expected, the highest amount spent was within the food and drinks category (\$37.04), followed by Shopping at \$11.77, and Transportation at \$5.69. The expenditures in Table 5, those incurred on the trip to the region, but not directly related to the HGHM site visit were also impressive. In addition to the directly related

expenditures discussed above, visitors reported that their travel parties spent an additional \$405.45 on average for their trip to the region. The spending category with the highest expense was lodging at \$313.03. While these additional expenditures can not be totally attributed to the presence of the HGHM site in the region, the fact that many of the visitors cited the HGHM site as their primary purpose for being in the region suggests that the presence of the sites are greatly contributing to the local economy.

It is important to realize that the expenditures summarized in the preceding Tables are not for individuals, but are for travel parties. To convert them to individual visitors, the total amount spent was divided by the party size. Summaries of these conversions are located in Tables 6 and 7. These calculations conclude that on average, each visitor to HGHM sites accounted for \$10.79 of expenditures directly related to the HGHM site and an additional \$37.35 of expenditures not directly related to their site visit but incurred as a result of their trip to the region.

Table 6. Per Person Visitor Expenditures Directly Related to Site Where Interviewed

Types of Expenditures	Average Expenditures
Food and Beverage (includes restaurants, taverns, groceries, etc)	\$6.34
Shopping (includes clothing, personal items, souvenirs, etc)	\$2.02
Lodging (includes hotels, motels, B&Bs, etc)	\$.36
Transportation (includes parking fees, gasoline, etc)	\$1.53
Entertainment and Recreation	\$.53
All other expenses related to your visit	\$.01
Total	\$10.79

Table 7. Per Person Visitor Expenditures Not Directly Related to Site but Incurred During Trip

Types of Expenditures	Average Expenditures
Food and Beverage (includes restaurants, taverns, groceries, etc)	\$7.03
Shopping (includes clothing, personal items, souvenirs, etc)	\$5.25
Lodging (includes hotels, motels, B&Bs, etc)	\$20.98
Transportation (includes parking fees, gasoline, etc)	\$2.89
Entertainment and Recreation	\$1.07
All other expenses related to your visit	\$.13
Total	\$37.35

The primary purpose of this project was to determine the increase in economic impacts resulting from the Web site promotion, rather than total economic impact of HGHM sites.

Therefore, the data derived from the online survey is now required to generate the marginal increase in the number of visitors due to the web sites presence.

Two series of questions were asked of online survey respondents in order to determine the influence that the Web site had on their travel behavior. The first of these, as summarized in Table 8, asked respondents whether or not the HGHM Web site influenced their travel plans. As Table 8 indicates, 55.8% of respondents reported that the Web site did influence their travel plans. Respondents who indicated that the Web site influenced their travel behavior were asked a series of follow-up questions designed to ascertain how the Web site influenced their plans. The responses to these questions are provided in Table 9. The most important potential response of this series was *The Web site influenced me to visit a region that I otherwise would not have visited*. Of the respondents who indicated that the Web site influenced their travel plans, 53.6%

answered affirmatively that the Web site had indeed influenced them to visit a region that they would otherwise not have traveled to.

Table 8. Influence of Visit to the HomegrownHandmade.com on travel plans

<i>Did Visit influence Travel Plans</i>	<i>Number</i>	Percentage
Yes	29	55.8
No	23	44.2
Total	52	100

Table 9. Type of influence on Travel

<i>How Did the Web site Influence Your Travel Plans?</i>	<i>Yes</i>		<i>No</i>		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
The Web site introduced sites/activities to me that I was previously unaware of	28	93.3	2	6.7	30	100
I used the Web site to find out more information about sites/activities that I was already interested in	26	89.7	3	10.3	29	100
I used the Web site to help me choose between two or more regions that I was already thinking about visiting	15	53.6	13	46.4	28	100
The Web site influenced me to visit a region that I otherwise would not have visited	15	53.6	13	46.4	28	100
The Web site influenced me to visit an individual site/business that I otherwise would not have visited	24	82.8	5	17.2	29	100

Data from the Web site administrators indicates that the HGHM Web site averages hits from 273 visitors each day or 99,645 visitors per year. Since 55.8% of respondents indicated that the Web site influenced their behavior, 55,602 people had their travel plans influenced by the Web site. Of these, our data indicates that 53.6% or 29,803, are annually influenced by the Web site to visit a region that they otherwise would not have visited. The expenditure data discussed earlier can then be extrapolated by this number

(Tables 10 & 11) to derive the total increase in direct expenditures resulting from the HGHM Web site. While this method is consistent with accepted practices (Dillman, 2000) for estimating population parameters from a sample, the sample size really ought to be much larger (sample of 350) than it is to accurately reflect the behavior of all HGHM Web site visitors. Considering the fact that this was a pilot project designed to test a methodology, rather than a full study to determine economic impact, the sample size is adequate for pilot testing.

Table 10. Total Direct Impacts Directly Related to Visits to HGHM Sites

Types of Expenditures	Average Expenditures
Food and Beverage (includes restaurants, taverns, groceries, etc)	\$188,951.02
Shopping (includes clothing, personal items, souvenirs, etc)	\$60,202.06
Lodging (includes hotels, motels, B&Bs, etc)	\$10,729.08
Transportation (includes parking fees, gasoline, etc)	\$45,598.59
Entertainment and Recreation	\$15,795.59
All other expenses related to your visit	\$298.03
Total	\$321,574.37

Table 11. Total Direct Impacts Not Directly Related to Site but Incurred During Visit

Types of Expenditures	Average Expenditures
Food and Beverage (includes restaurants, taverns, groceries, etc)	\$209,515.09
Shopping (includes clothing, personal items, souvenirs, etc)	\$156,465.75
Lodging (includes hotels, motels, B&Bs, etc)	\$625,266.94
Transportation (includes parking fees, gasoline, etc)	\$86,130.67
Entertainment and Recreation	\$31,889.21
All other expenses related to your visit	\$3,874.39
Total	\$1,113,142.05

Based on the data displayed in Tables 10 and eleven, it appears as if the HGHM Web site has had a considerable direct economic impact on the State of North Carolina. Visitors to sites who went there due to the presence of the HGHM Web site are estimated to spend \$321,574.37 per year directly associated with their site visits and an additional \$1,113,142.05 not directly related to the site visits, but incurred during their trip to the sites. One must realize that these are the direct impacts resulting from visitor expenditures. There are also additional economic impacts as described below:

Indirect impacts: Result from the businesses that make purchases from other businesses as a result of the initial spending.

Induced impacts: Reflect the increases in household spending resulting from increases in compensation.

For example, the total money spent to eat in restaurants is the *direct* impact. The local expenditures made by the restaurant as a result of the increased customers such as additional groceries needed by the restaurant or additional laundry expenses represent the *indirect* impact. The additional compensation received by the employees of the restaurant also causes additional purchases in the local economy resulting in the *induced* impact.

For this project, the indirect and induced impacts, as well as the number of new jobs created through economic activity, were calculated through the Implan® software package. This software incorporates an input/output social matrix model that takes into account the types of industries within a region and estimates indirect, induced, and employment impacts due to increases in demand for locally produced products and

services. Tables 12 and 13 provide a summary of the total economic impacts resulting from the increase in visits due to the presence of the HGHM Web site.

Table 12. Total Economic Impacts Directly Related to Visits to HGHM Sites

<i>Impact Type</i>	<i>Economic</i>	Jobs Created
Direct	\$321,574.37	5.7
Indirect	\$87,796	.8
Induced	\$80,452	.9
Total	\$489,822.37	7.4

Table 13. Total Economic Impacts Not Directly Related to Site but Incurred During Visit

<i>Impact Type</i>	<i>Economic</i>	Jobs Created
Direct	\$1,113,142.05	17.9
Indirect	\$167,310	1.5
Induced	\$278,430	3.1
Total	\$1,558,882.05	22.5

As Tables 12 and 13 indicate, the HGHM Web site promotion had a substantial economic impact within the State of North Carolina. Total economic impacts directly related to HGHM site visits by Web site converted visitors are estimated at \$489,822.37 with the creation of 7.4 new jobs. An additional \$1,558,882.05 of impacts and 22.5 jobs were estimated to be created by converted visitors to HGHM sites, but not directly related to their site visits. While not 100% attributable to the Web site promotion, these latter numbers can be interpreted as being contributed by the Web site promotional effort.

Discussion

The purpose of this project was to test a model developed to measure the economic impact of a Web site promotion within North Carolina, as well as to provide some preliminary estimates of what these impacts may be. Since the majority of the preceding results focus on this secondary purpose, the discussion will focus on the utility

of the model that was tested, and how it can be improved and implemented in future uses. It appears as if the model worked in the way it was intended. However, it does have some limitations. First of all, nearly all economic impact studies produce inexact figures regarding expenditures. These figures need to be regarded as estimates based on the best possible data. However, the average spending figures that are extrapolated to the entire population of visitors are based on mean spending data provided by visitors, and nearly always have very high standard deviations (some visitors spend nothing, and others spend enormous sums). With this in mind, there is never any guarantee that the actual spending of all visitors will be accurately measured by this mean. Secondly, it is very difficult for any model of this type to capture an increase in spending at an individual venue that is attributable to a single event. Thus, while we stand behind the model as a measuring tool to estimate regional impacts attributed to the Web site, the model is unable to estimate impacts at a single site that result from Web site conversions. There are just too many extraneous variables that cannot be controlled for without a very large number of responses, data collected at all venues, and a significant increase in the number and complexity of questions that are asked of each respondent. While these changes may be possible, they would tend to reduce the advantages related to ease of use that the model currently enjoys.

The largest problem that we encountered with the tested model was related to achieving data collection goals. The most frequent problem associated with the data collection was that in the rural areas where members of HGHM are located there were not very many visitors. This problem has two components, the first being that while surveyors were on site, there were often times few if any visitors. It was not uncommon

to spend two or more days at one site and only complete one or two surveys. The second component was related to having increased visitation when surveyors were not at the sites. Some sites would request that data collectors not be on-site during periodic influxes of visitation because they perceived that surveyors would interfere with visitors' shopping behavior. This two-pronged issue makes it virtually impossible to obtain an accurate portrayal of visitation at these sites. One possible solution to this problem is to have the HGHM site management distribute surveys to the visitors on a daily basis. Daily distribution of mail back surveys coupled with on-site surveys conducted by the project manager could lead to a more complete picture of visitation at these sites. However, this requires a strong commitment on the part of the site proprietors, and has oftentimes failed on other projects due to businesses not wanting to inconvenience their customers and not having well trained employees.

During the data collection, surveyors found varying degrees of awareness about the HomegrownHandmade Web site. Despite the fact that a tool kit for participating sites and materials for site visitors are available, these resources were not evident during the surveyor site visits. Employees and visitors at the various sites were very interested in learning more about HGHM. It is suggested that site proprietors be reminded to replenish the marketing materials and to train their employees in their distribution.

A suggestion related to data collection involves using a different method to obtain e-mail addresses of Web site visitors. While the current method of asking visitors to voluntarily submit their e-mail addresses provided ample numbers of respondents to pilot test the instrument, it did not produce enough addresses to adequately represent the entire population of Web site visitors. The voluntary submission of addresses also creates

questions about non-response bias that again speaks to representative issues of the sample.

Another suggestion involves some changes to the data collection instruments. In order to more accurately measure where expenditures are taking place, we suggest that respondents are asked to classify their trip expenditures as taking place either at home, en-route, or on-site. This will assist the allocation of expenditures regionally, rather than assign them all to a particular region.

In summary, the method developed and tested through this project can be used to estimate increases in economic impact resulting from specific internet based promotional efforts. However, the success of future implementation of the method depends on several issues. These are as follows:

- A much larger sample of both on-site and Web site visitors are needed. We suggest that a minimum of 1,000 individuals for each sample would greatly increase the accuracy of the method in estimating the economic impacts to North Carolina.
- The mail-back instrument should be adjusted to better allocate where expenditures are occurring.
- A larger number of HGHM venues should be chosen as data collection sites. We suggest at least 30 sites participate in any future evaluation.
- Participating sites should receive orientation about research requirements prior to the research team's visit in order to garner a larger sample size.

Appendix 1

Survey instruments

2006 HomegrownHandmade.com On-Site Survey

Survey Number _____ Interviewer _____ Time _____
Date: _____ Site _____ Gender M F

1. What is your Zip-Code? _____
 2. What state/county do you live? State _____ County _____
 3. Approximately how far did you travel today to visit this site? _____ Miles
 4. Is this your first visit to this site? Yes No
 5. Including yourself, how many people are in your group today? _____
 6. Are you here today primarily to visit this site? Yes No
 - 6a. If no, what is your primary purpose for being here?
-

7. How did you find out about this site?
- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| HomegrownHandmade.com website? | Yes | No |
| Friends/family? | Yes | No |
| Local chamber/convention & visitor's bureau | Yes | No |
| Our State Magazine ad | Yes | No |
| Other _____ | | |

How much money do you plan to spend today on meals? Shopping? \$ _____

What other activities will you do in the area?

Will you take part in a follow-up survey to help us better understand the impact of the HomegrownHandmade.com Web site and how it can be improved?

_____ Yes _____ No

Thank You

2006 HomegrownHandmade.com Mail-Back Survey

Dear Visitor,

We appreciate your willingness to be interviewed during your recent visit to a site featured in HomegrownHandmade.com (North Carolina Art Roads and Farm Trails in North Carolina.) We hope that your visit was rewarding and enjoyable.

Please complete the questionnaire on the following pages as soon as possible and return using the enclosed postage paid envelope. This survey should take no more than 10 minutes of your time. There are no right or wrong answers—we are only interested in your views and selected items of information. Although surveys that have been totally completed are the most beneficial to this project, you are under no obligation to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable.

When completing this survey, answer the questions based on the trip and location where you were interviewed. Please do not answer the questions based on visits prior to or after the visit where you were interviewed.

You were selected at random to participate in this survey. The information that you submit is completely confidential, and will only be used to help make rural North Carolina attractions better places to visit and more beneficial to all. Your name and contact information will be eliminated from our files as soon as we receive your completed survey. You will not be placed on any mailing lists or receive any advertisements due to your cooperation with this survey.

Thank you in advance for completing this survey. Your feedback will be extremely valuable to the small business owners participating in the program and the administrators of the HomegrownHandmade Web site in their promotional efforts.

Thank you,

Dr. Hans Vogelsong
Principal Researcher
East Carolina University

Including yourself, how many people were in your group when you visited the site where you were interviewed? _____

Section 1. Spending

In this section, for each category listed below, please estimate total expenses for your travel party while in the area where you were interviewed. Give your best estimate – try not to overestimate or underestimate.

Expenses directly related to the site where you were interviewed Round to nearest dollar

Food and Drinks (Includes restaurants, bars, groceries, etc)	\$ _____
Shopping (Includes clothing, personal items, souvenirs, etc)	\$ _____
Lodging (Includes, hotels, B&B's, campgrounds, etc)	\$ _____
Transportation (Includes parking fees, gasoline, etc)	\$ _____
Entertainment and Recreation (Includes guide services, entrance fees, equip rental, etc)	\$ _____
Other expenses	\$ _____

Expenses not directly related to interview site, but incurred during you trip to the region

Food and Drinks (Includes, restaurants, bars, groceries, etc)	\$ _____
Shopping (Includes clothing, personal items, souvenirs, etc)	\$ _____
Lodging (Includes, hotels, B&B's, campgrounds, etc)	\$ _____
Transportation (Includes parking fees, gasoline, etc)	\$ _____
Entertainment and Recreation (Includes guide services, entrance fees, equip rental, etc)	\$ _____
Other expenses	\$ _____

Section 2. Visit Information

When did you decide to visit the site where you were interviewed?

- _____ The day of the visit
- _____ During the week before the visit
- _____ Two to four weeks before the visit
- _____ Five to 12 weeks before the visit
- _____ More than 12 weeks before the visit

Have you been to the HomegrownHandmade Web site (www.homegrownhandmade.com)?

- No (skip to section 3)
- Yes (please continue)

Did you learn about the site where you were interviewed through the HomeGrownHandMade.com?

- No
- Yes

How did the information at HomegrownHandmade .com influence your visit?

- The Web site helped me choose sites/activities for a trip to the region I was already planning to visit..
- The Web site influenced me to take a trip to the region that I had not previously planned.
- The Web site had no influence on my trip.

Section 3. Visitor Information

Which of the following indicates your level of education (check one)?

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| _____ 11th grade or less | _____ college graduate |
| _____ 12th grade (high school graduate) | _____ post graduate work |
| _____ some college | |

Please tell us which of the following best indicates your race or ethnic group?

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| _____ American Indian or Alaskan Native | _____ Hispanic |
| _____ Asian or Pacific Islander | _____ White |
| _____ African American | _____ Other (specify _____) |

Which of the following best describes your household income before taxes?

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| _____ Less than \$10,000 | _____ \$40,000– \$49,999 |
| _____ \$10,000 –\$19,999 | _____ \$50,000-- \$75,000 |
| _____ \$20,000– \$29,999 | _____ More than \$75,000 |
| _____ \$30,000 - \$39,999 | |

What is your age? _____

Is there anything else you and your group would like to tell us about your visit to **the site where you were interviewed?**

Is there anything else you and your group would like to tell us about HomegrownHandmade.com (North Carolina Art Roads and Farm Trails)?

We appreciate your help with this survey. We have enclosed a postage paid return envelope for your convenience. If you have any questions about the survey or results, please contact Dr. Hans Vogelsong, East Carolina University, Belk Annex 1, Greenville, N.C. 27858

Appendix 2

List of venues visited on-site

Imperial Centre for Arts & Sciences

100 Imperial Plaza
Rocky Mount, NC 27802-1180
(252) 972-1154

Mike's Farm Strawberry Patch & Country Store

767 Luther Banks Road
Richlands, NC 28518
(910) 324-3422

NC Arts Incubator Gallery

138 North Chatham Avenue
Siler City, NC 27344-3032
(919) 663-2072

Appendix 3

List of research team members

Hans Vogel song, PhD – Principle Investigator

Associate Professor
East Carolina University
Department of Recreation & Leisure Studies
106 Belk Annex 1
Greenville, NC 27858
(252) 328-0020

Ms. April Evans – Project Manager

Masters Student
East Carolina University
Department of Recreation & Leisure Studies
5 Belk Annex 4
Greenville, NC 27858
(252) 328-2479

Mr. David Graefe – Data Collection

Masters Student
East Carolina University
Department of Recreation & Leisure Studies
5 Belk Annex 4
Greenville, NC 27858
(252) 328-2479