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Background

- Nature tourism is seen as an opportunity to revitalize rural, declining communities
- National parks as attractions for nature tourism
Aim of the study

• ’Protection areas as a generator of rural vitality’ – project
  • what kind of economic and social impacts the national park has on the surrounding rural community, and what kind of interaction the NP visitors and the rural community have?

• This sub-study aims to explain the intentions for future visits
  • place attachment, attitudes towards rural areas, and the satisfaction with the services in rural communities.
Theoretical background

• Place attachment: positive connection or bond between a person and a particular place
  • Place dependence
  • Place identity
    • (Williams et al. 1992, Williams and Patterson 1999 Kaltenborn & Williams 2002, Kyle et al. 2004, etc.)

• Consumer satisfaction and loyalty

• Attitudes towards countryside
  • (Ajzen and Fishbein 1980)
Theoretical framework

- Novelty seeking
- Attitudes towards countryside and nature protection
- Visiting history
- Social bounds/ local culture
- Satisfaction to services/as a whole
- Place attachment
- Intention to visit
- Interest to use countryside services

Background variable - socioeconomic variables
- Distance to destination
- Main activity
- Motives to visit

Experiences of the surrounding community

National Park and surrounding community
Data and methods

- Visitor survey data
  - questionnaire delivered at site together with a regular visitor survey conducted by Metsähallitus; shared data
  - questionnaire returned by mail

- Seitseminen NP, N=342
- Linnasaari NP, N=213
Measurement: visit intention

- Intention to visits in the region in future 5 years?
- Binary: Yes / No
- Descriptives: 1/3 intended to visit in five years
Measurement: Place dependence

• 4 scales (1-5) focusing on activities and place
  – This region provides best opportunities for my activities.
  – Visiting this area instead of any other area is more pleasant for me

• Alpha coefficient 0.73
  ➢ Sum variable
  ➢ Descriptives:
    – median score 2.5
    – 5 % highly dependent
Measurement: Place identity

• 4 scales (1-5) focusing on self/personality and place:
  – Visiting this area tells much about me and my personality
  – I feel that I can really be my self on visit to this area

• Alpha coefficient 0.74
  ➢ Sum variable
  ➢ Descriptives
    – median score 3
    – for 17 % identity strongly related to area
Measurement: rural area attitude

- Attitude toward the rural area around national park
- No references from previous literature
- 13 semantic differential scales
  - Sum variable using all scales
  - Descriptives: median score 3.8 (1-5)
Measurement: area satisfaction

- 16 items: transportation (3), shops, lodging, restaurants, program services, information, events, recreation opportunities, sceneries,
- Satisfaction scale (1-5)
  - Sum variable
  - 3 factors for satisfaction components
# Satisfaction components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants &amp; cafes</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program services</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas stations</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural events</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor recreation services</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness of staff</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness of staff to serve</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No litter</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Logistic regression for future visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Exp(b)</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Exp(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>1.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td><strong>0.142</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.152</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.144</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.155</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural area attitude</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-services sat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td><strong>0.023</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.031</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-landscape &amp; environment sat.</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-personnel sat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.447</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-3.995</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of correctly classified (%) cut point 0.50</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$- test p-value</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R²</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Path model for future visits, alternative 1

CORRELATIONS AMONG INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

- Dependence-Identity *
- E1-Dependence *
- E1-Identity *
- E2-Dependence *
- E2-Identity *

GOODNESS OF FIT SUMMARY FOR METHOD = ML (critical values)

- Chi$^2$=0.598, p=0.439 (p>0.05)
- NFI=0.999, CFI=1.000, GFI=0.999 (>0.950)
- 95% CL RMSEA=[0.000, 0.115] (<0.05)
Path model for future visits, alternative 2

* = Significant at p<0.05

CORRELATIONS AMONG INDEPENDENT VARIABLES
Dependence-Identity *
E1-Dependence *, E1-Identity *
E2-Dependence *, E2-Identity *
E2-E3 *, E3-E4 *

GOODNESS OF FIT SUMMARY FOR METHOD = ML (critical values)
Chi^2=4.031, p=0.545 (p>0.05)
NFI=0.995, CFI=1.000, GFI=0.997 (>0.950)
95% CL RMSEA=[0.000, 0.059] (<0.05)
Conclusion

• The path model shows the structure behind intention
• Place attachment and rural attitudes are important predictors of satisfaction and visit intention
• From the components of satisfaction only service satisfaction effects on visits intention
• Only small part of the variation of intention explained
How to continue

• SEM-modeling continues, including latent variables
• What is the role of economic variables (travel cost and income) in relation to psychological variables?
• Are re-Visitors heavy spenders?
• How do the areas differ, and what are the reasons behind possible differences?
Thank you!