1   **Abstract**

2   A well-established destination personality facilitates differentiation of destinations and

3   helps to create emotional loyalty and increase repeat visitors. Although destination personality

4   and brand marketing have become increasingly important, there is still a lack of applied research

5   that simplifies the salient dimensions of destination personality. This study applies parsimony

6   analysis to help establish the simplest possible determination of destination personality to

7   identify the top destination personality traits of Kansas. Participants (*N*=209) were recruited by

8   an online marketing company, and descriptive statistics, Garrett ranking analysis, and Mann-

9   Whitney U-tests were conducted. The top brand personalities of Kansas identified amongst all

10 visitors included hardworking and reliable. Compared to first-time visitors, repeat visitors

11 perceived Kansas as contemporary, outdoorsy, and less sincere.

12

13 Keywords: Garrett Ranking, Rural Tourism, Emotional Loyalty, Non-Parametric Tests,

14 Destination, Personality

15

16   **Destination personality: how to make the metaphor simpler?**

17 **Introduction**

18   Destination personality is a projection of human traits onto a destination, through which

19 tourists can determine, establish, and maintain a relationship with that destination (Franzen &

20 Moriatry, 2008). It is an application of branding theories to tourism destinations (Ekinci &

21 Hosany, 2006). These human-like branding traits can prompt positive destination images and

22 strong emotional bonds between tourists and destinations (Usakli & Baloglu, 2011).

23   Despite the understanding that destination personality effectively assists a destination to

24 compete with its competitors (Ekinci & Hosany, 2006) and influence tourists' choices (Chen &

25 Phou, 2013), research applying destination personality to a rural destination or agricultural state

26 is rare. Applying a brand-based concept to rural tourism is important, given that rural tourism

27 helps to support agricultural regions in the form of agritourism, preserving cultural heritage,

28 improving the ecological state of territories, increasing sales of farming products, and preserving

29 natural beauty (Lowry, 2017; Widawski & Wyrzykowski, 2017).

30   Kansas is an agricultural state and encompasses a wealth of opportunities related to rural

31 tourism. However, there is a dearth of marketing research related to Kansas. While agricultural

32 visits continue to be popular in recent years, Kansas has the sixth-lowest visitors' spending rate

33 in the nation (Tourism Economics, 2015) and tourism only represents 1.7% of the total Kansas

34 gross state product and 4.9% of all employment (Economic Report, 2015). In contrast, visitors

35 in California spent $122 billion, the highest in the nation (Anderson, 2016; Tourism Economics,

36 2015), representing 4% of gross state product and 13.6% of the total workforce (Downie, 2016).

37 It is important to recognise that Kansas, as an important agricultural state, has its unique

38 opportunities and challenges. Furthermore, the process of identifying destination personality and

39   applying these results on an operational level is still perplexing due to the considerable length of

40   the measurement scale, baffling multi-dimensional concept, and difficulty in theorizing multi-

41   attributes for general use (Horner & Swarbrooke, 2016; Kozak & Baloglu, 2010; Low & Lamb

42   2000).

43   In contrast to Aaker's (1997) original brand personality scale, which contains five

44   dimensions and 42 items, the application of a destination personality scale usually requires a

45   scale validation process to a specific destination location (Ekinci & Hosany, 2006), thus it poses

46   considerable limitations for application and operationalization (Kumar & Nayak, 2018; Yoo &

47   Donthu, 2001). Therefore, the purpose of this research is to understand the top destination

48   personality attributes that define Kansas, identify which attributes are ranked as most important,

49   and determine key differences in the perception of these attributes between first-time and repeat

50   visitors.

51   **Literature review**

52   **Destination personality and dimensions**

53   Destination personality can be defined as the set of human characteristics associated with

54   a destination as perceived from a tourist's perspective (Ekinci & Hosany, 2006). Adapted from

55   the brand personality theory (Aaker, 1997), destination personality has achieved considerable

56   success. A well-established destination personality facilitates differentiation of a brand from that

57   of its competitors (Aaker, 1997), improves the brand equity (Keller et al., 2011), increases brand

58   preference and usage (Freling & Forbes, 2005), and develops strong emotional ties between

59   consumers and brands, resulting in greater brand attachment and emotional loyalty (Malar et al.,

60   2011). Although product/brand personality research in the consumer goods domain began in the

61   early-1960s, the research related with tourism destinations are considerably new (Lowry, 2017).

62   The attributes of destination personality consider five dimensions: sincerity, excitement,

63   competence, sophistication, and ruggedness, which are measured utilizing five-point Likert

64   scales with 42 specific personality items. Destination personality traits help stereotype a

65   destination's characteristics into several symbolic vocabularies. According to previous brand

66   marketing theories, the symbolic function of vocabularies is important for communication as it

67   helps provide an expressive, impressive, and social-adaptive function (Keller et al., 2011).

68   Through these distinguished variants, the functionality of the destination becomes clear, thus

69   helping customers establish mental memories and personifying destinations (Beverland, 2018;

70   Keller et al., 2011).

71   The destination personification process accumulates from physical and cognitive

72   destination attributes. The destination's attributes, or destination image, has to be consistent with

73   a visitor/tourist's cognitive perception of the destination, thus allowing a consistent and reliable

74   perception that results in motivated behaviors (Usakli & Baloglu, 2011). Destination marketers

75   who provide tourists with information that is inconsistent with those images and beliefs cause

76   consumer cognitive dissonance. Providing a consistent destination image is important, and

77   effective destination management often requires a long-term commitment based on consistent

78   tourism imaging through years of advertising (Lowry, 2017; Sharpley & Stone, 2010). Thus, this

79   study applies parsimony analysis to identify and understand top destination personality attributes

80   which define Kansas, enabling the destination to deliver a consistent image and attract repeat

81   visitors as a stable source of opportunity and revenue.

82   **2.2. The multidimensional concept and parsimonious analysis**

83   Studying destination personality perceptions are paramount for effective destination

84   management, as the consistency with a person's actual or ideal self-image often influences pre-

4

85   visit preferences (Usakli & Baloglu, 2011) and post-visit satisfaction (Hosany & Martin, 2012;

86   Kastenholz et al., 2012). However, adaptation of the destination personality is often complicated

87   due to its multi-dimensional functionality (Ekinci & Hosany, 2006; Kumar & Nayak, 2018; Yoo

88   & Donthu, 2001) and considerable definition and scale (Low & Lamb, 2000), which increases

89   the sample size needed for statistical power and increases the risk of multicollinearity (Salkind,

90   2007).

91   Although some brands provide more functional advantages and value, others help

92   consumers construct their self-identity, and can therefore be viewed as an extension of the self

93   (Aaker, 1996; Belk, 1976; Escalas, 2004). Considerable limitations in the application of

94   destination personality led to increased attention in tourism literature (Ekinci & Hosany, 2006;

95   Heere, 2010; Hultman et al., 2015) even as the importance of destination branding and

96   generalizability can be heightened by developing a more rigorous method to help reduce the

97   salient dimensionality of this multi-dimensional concept.

98   Parsimony analysis (also referred to as maximum parsimony analysis) is a principle

99   borrowed from phylogenetics, which denotes the simplest possible explanation is the best, and

100   most likely to be correct explanation (Augoustinos & Innes, 1990; Farris, 2008; Panaccio, 2017).

101   This principle is part of a universal approach to science, especially when dealing with systems

102   that are overwhelmingly complex and defy simple modeling or explanations. Therefore,

103   developing a rigorous method and utilizing the existing understanding of the destination

104   personality concept can help researchers generalise a basic schematic description in different

105   tourism contexts (Freling & Forbes, 2005; Hultman et al., 2015; Lee et al., 2009; Liu et al., 2016;

106   Sahin & Baloglu, 2011).

107   When applying for a multi-dimensional destination personality, which affects destination

108   selection, the generalizability of the scale remains limited due to lack of protocols for

109   parsimonious adaption (Hosany et al., 2007; Low & Lamb 2000). Therefore, with the rapid

110   growth of the tourism segment (Airey et al., 2015), overall low-profit margins (Hays et al.,

111   2013), and plethora of brands and offerings within the tourism sector (Horner & Swarbrooke,

112   2016), it is important to understand the top destination personality attributes that define Kansas

113   and which attributes are ranked as the most important.

114   *RQ1. What are the top personality attributes that describe Kansas amongst US visitors?*

115   **2.3. The application on first-time and repeat visitors and their differences**

116   The differences between first-time and repeat visitors have achieved continuous interest

117   amongst tourism researchers and destination management organizations (Chang et al., 2013; Chi,

118   2012; Fuchs & Reichel, 2011). Empirical studies suggest that a closer match between

119   destination personalities and self-personalities of tourists would increase the likelihood of

120   visitation and create repeat visitors (Matzler et al., 2016).

121   The observable differences between first-time and repeat visitors are noteworthy.

122   Previous literature suggests that first-time visitors tend to have shorter stays at a destination (Del

123   et al., 2014; Lau & McKercher, 2004) and have more complex and discerned experiences than

124   repeat visitors (Schroeder et al., 2013). Therefore, compared with repeat visitors, marketing

125   strategies aimed at attracting potential first-time tourists can be challenging to develop.

126   Additionally, first-time visitors typically explore a destination widely and participate in a variety

127   of activities, such as landmark attractions and notable events (Lee et al., 2009), with significant

128   differences in considering the various dimensions of destination perceptions (Del et al., 2014;

129   Kruger et al., 2012).

130   Conversely, repeat visitors are more predictable but less likely to be satisfied (Tsang et

131   al., 2012; Wong et al., 2015). However, destination personality has been found to directly and

132   indirectly influence repeat visit intention via brand self-congruity (Matzler et al., 2016).

133   Therefore, determining key differences in attributes are critical, and comparing destination

134   personality between first-time and repeat visitors can help to disseminate tourist's revisit

135   behavior and identify the most influential brand image components. Kiliccedil and Sop (2012)

136   surveyed 252 domestic tourists of Bodrum, Turkey and discovered destination personality

137   directly impacted both first-time and repeat visitors' behavioral intention and destination loyalty.

138   Baloglu et al. (2014) surveyed 312 tourists of Ocho Rios, Jamaica, and found that destination

139   personality has varying influences on behaviors, which were significant on first-time visitors'

140   behavioral intention, but non-significant on repeat visitors. Specifically, their study results

141   indicated that repeat visitors rely more on their cognitive impression of the island than affective

142   and overall image of the destination.

143   *RQ2. What are the primary destination personality associations amongst first-time*

144   *travellers and repeat travellers within all five dimensions?*

145   *RQ3. Are there significant differences between first-time and repeat visitors' destination*

146   *personality traits?*

147   **Methodology**

148   *Measurement*

149   The survey instrument for this study was based on Aaker's (1997) Brand Personality

150   Scale (Appendix Table 1), combined with single-item measures of travel satisfaction (Horner &

151   Swarbrooke, 2016) and demographic questions (gender, age, income, and employment status).

152 The authors chose to use a forced ranking questionnaire which asked travellers to rank the

153 representativeness of the adjective/traits by the personality of Kansas.

154 *Procedures*

155 A pilot study (*n*=25) was first conducted online with U.S. tourists to ensure questionnaire

156 clarity. After the pilot study, two screening questions and some instructions were reworded to

157 improve flow.

158 The main study (*N*=599) was distributed through an online marketing company using

159 three waves of data collection in both the spring and fall to control for the seasonal effect of

160 tourism preferences (Fernandez-Morales et al., 2016). The population of interest was U.S.

161 tourists living within the continental U.S., but excluded the residents of Kansas. Additional

162 screening questions at the start of the questionnaire ensured only participants who had visited

163 Kansas completed the survey. After purging incomplete responses, a total of 209 (34.9%) records

164 were used for analysis.

165 A post hoc statistical power analysis was conducted to ensure the sample's statistical

166 power (Faul et al., 2007). Based on five personality latent variables, and travel satisfaction as a

167 dependent variable, the sample satisfied an alpha set at $p < 0.001$, effect size at $d > 0.5$ with

168 sufficient power $1-\beta > 0.90$.

169 *Statistical analysis*

170 *Maximum parsimony analysis: Henry Garrett ranking method*

171 Henry Garrett ranking analysis was used as the parsimony analysis for this study to

172 determine the most significant personality factors perceived by Kansas visitors (Garg, 2015;

173 Garrett, 1924). The ranking analysis allowed us to apply a 95th percentile rule, which can be

174 justified using the Schematic Theory to identify primary associations between recognition and

175   personal satisfaction (Augoustinos & Innes, 1990). If travellers ranked the association above or

176   near the 95th percentile, it was deemed to be a primary association. All other associations were

177   deemed secondary (Heere, 2010).

178   *Statistical procedure*

179   A two-stage non-parametric analytical procedure was conducted. First, a ranking

180   analysis was performed in Microsoft Excel (Version 365) to calculate the respective rank

181   positions and total Garrett Values for each adjective using the following equation (1) (Garg,

182   2015; Motulsky, 2013):

$$\text{Percent position} = \frac{100\ (R_{ij}\text{-}0.5\ )}{N_j} \tag{1}$$

Where R_{ij}=Rank given for the i_{th} item by the j_{th} individual and N_j=Number of items ranked
by the j_{th} individual.

183

184   The percentage position of each rank item was converted into scores using the Garrett

185   Table and added together to sum up the total Garrett Value. The total Garrett Value divided by

186   the total number of respondents was calculated to draw a mean percentage sum for each

187   destination personality adjective. The percentage scores for each item were then ranked and

188   arranged in descending order.

189   The second stage of the analysis utilised the Mann-Whitney U-tests with the Wilcoxon

190   Signed-Rank analysis between first and repeated visitors. The analyses were conducted in IBM-

191   SPSS Statistics (21.0). Additionally, a one-way analysis of variance test was used on overall

192   travel satisfaction.

193   **Results**

194   *Profile of the respondents*

195   Participants (*N*=209) were equal in male and female distribution with an approximate

196   mean age of 40.4 years. The detailed profile of the participants is presented in Table 1.

197 || Insert Table 1 Here ||

198   *Common methods of bias*

199   Both procedural control, pilot study, and statistical remedies were used to control for

200   common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2012). A fixed, one-factor unrotated factor analysis

201   suggested low indication of bias (8.11% of the total variance). Non-parametric analyses were

202   employed and control variables were used to adapt estimation for accuracy (Podsakoff et al.,

203   2012).

204   *The overall ranking of destination personality items*

205   The overall ranking positions with Garrett Values of items are listed in descending order

206   in Table 2. Using the 95th percentile rule, two of the primary personality traits—hardworking

207   and reliable—ranked highest using the percentage score. The descriptive frequencies of each

208   destination personality items from the 1st to 11th percentiles are categorised into five dimensions

209   and listed in Appendix Table 2.

210 || Insert Table 2 Here ||

211   *Personalities within first-time and repeat visitors' groups*

212   The participants in this study were split into two groups, first-time tourists (*n*=67) and

213   repeat visitors (*n*=132). The relative rank position was then tabulated again for comparison

214   (Table 3). Personality trait "real" drastically increased from rank eight amongst first-time

215   visitors to rank six amongst repeat visitors, and "up-to-date" dropped from rank three amongst

216   first-time visitors to rank six amongst repeat visitors.

217 || Insert Table 3 Here ||

218

219   *Post hoc comparison tests between first and repeat visitors*

220   Mann-Whitney U-tests with two independent samples were conducted on all 42

221   destination personality items between first-time travellers and repeat travellers. Post hoc

222   analysis with Wilcoxon Signed-Rank tests (Table 4) show there are significant differences

223   between first time and repeat visitors among three of the personality traits: sincere (Z=-

224   2.22, $p<0.05$), contemporary (Z=-2.16, $p<0.05$), and outdoorsy (Z=-1.98, $p<0.05$). A one-way

225   ANOVA showed no significant differences in overall travel satisfaction scores between the two

226   groups.

227 || Insert Table 4 Here ||

228   **Conclusion and implications**

229   Destination perception accumulates from destination attributes, both physical and

230   cognitive, and may influence tourists' visiting decisions. Destination personality carries positive

231   characteristics which create a positive attitude toward the destination amongst tourists and helps

232   serve as an important cognitive fulfillment regarding the destination's success. However,

233   effective destination management requires a long-term commitment based on a narrow set of

234   destination visioning and consistent tourism advertising through years of imaging. Using

235   maximum parsimony analysis, this study aimed to identify and understand the top destination

236   personality attributes that define Kansas, which would enable destinations in Kansas to deliver a

237   consistent image and attract repeat visitors with a stable source of state revenue.

238   Following the Schematic Theory (Augoustinos & Innes, 1990), two prominent

239   personality traits above 95% of the total personality rankings were identified as most important

240   destination traits among Kansas visitors: "hardworking" and "reliable". "Hardworking" is

241   defined as a person tending to work with energy and commitment (Merriam-Webster, 2013),

242   which is often related to industrious and family values. Meanwhile, "reliable" is defined as

243   consistently good in quality or performance, which is often related to accuracy and honesty

244   (Merriam-Webster, 2013). Tourists expect Kansas destinations to reflect hardworking ethics and

245   maintain accuracy and honesty in relation to the marketing information.

246   Compared with some of the current advertisements of Kansas (e.g., *The Wizard of Oz* in

247   Kansas City), which portray Kansas as imaginary and magical (rank #23 on Table 2), it is

248   important to recognise Kansas as an important agricultural state (ranking 7th nationwide), and

249   historically a mining state, with many cultural heritage attractions and various historical sites.

250   Visiting historical or industrial sites often include, for example, viewing old canals, railways, and

251   production sites, which relate strongly to Kansas's personality traits of being industrious,

252   productive, and hardworking. While destination management and branding often requires a

253   long-time commitment and generous investment in terms of advertisement, these results indicate

254   it is important to design tourism products with the core Kansas personality attributes of

255   "hardworking" and "reliable," which can help connect tourists and create return visitors.

256   One example for future Kansas tourism can be factory tours and manufacturing museums

257   (Hollenbeck et al., 2008). A successful related example includes wine tourism in California,

258   which helps create both loyal customers and repeat visitors. As modern production has become

259   highly complicated and distant to consumers, factory tours and visitor centers offer proximity to

260   the process of product creation, which fosters credibility for the organization and trust in the

261   product.

262   Another important finding of this study involved a comparison between first-time and

263   repeat visitors. The initial tabulation of the results noted the destination personality trait "up-to-

264 date" has dropped from rank three amongst first-time visitors to rank six amongst repeat visitors.

265 The post hoc, non-parametric tests confirmed significant decrease with first-time visitors

266 amongst "sincere," "contemporary," and "outdoorsy" when compared to repeat visitors. The

267 results provide important information that can be interpreted in two ways.

268   First, Kansas feels less up-to-date and less contemporary among repeat visitors. Media

269 outlets often have ranked Kansas at the bottom (50th) compared to California (1st) for the worst

270 state to visit (CheatSheet, 2017; Thrillist Travel, 2016). It is important to note that tourism

271 requires a considerable amount of investment in terms of transportation and destination

272 infrastructures, and Kansas lacks both. For example, the state of California spent about $50

273 million on tourism development in 2013 compared to $4.8 million in Kansas (Tourism

274 Economics, 2015). Considering California is first amongst the best states to visit and first in

275 tourism investment, this study identified important areas for future improvements.

276   Second, repeat visitors often rate Kansas tourism sites as having less "sincerity".

277 Marketers should carefully review marketing materials to ensure the message accurately portrays

278 the reality that Kansas has established. Future marketing campaigns should focus on the

279 genuineness and reliableness of Kansas to help attract repeat visitors. Marketing campaigns that

280 build upon clearly defined tourism objectives and assurances, while accurately describing the

281 end-product, will be most likely to be successful.

282 *Theoretical contributions*

283   Destination personality is a multi-dimensional construct which contains 42 items and five

284 latent facets which affect destination selection. The theorization and testing of this

285 multidimensional construct remain a daunting task and prone to errors due to sophisticated

286 measurement procedures and large sample sizes neccssary for data analysis. This study helped

287 simplify scale dimensions according to specific tourism contexts. As Aaker (1996) noted,

288 marketing management is the implicit assumption that all brands fulfill a symbolic function for

289 communication. In this case, "hardworking" and "reliable" play important roles in the form of a

290 symbolic vocabulary, which helps communicate to tourists and contributes to the functional

291 advertising benefits for marketers.

292   This study developed an adaptive protocol which helps to fulfill the existing literature

293 gap about parsimonious analysis within destination personality literature. Future research could

294 adapt the procedures of this study and apply to other destinations. Also, a simplified scale

295 measurement allowed the ability to develop complex models (e.g., multigroup model or latent

296 growth model) without overstretching statistical power and sample size. With more statistical

297 precision, destination marketing and self-expressive variants became more expressive,

298 impressive, and contained more social-adaptive functions.

299 *Practical contributions*

300   Kansas is in the centre of America and the southern half of the Great Plains region,

301 giving it both geographic and natural advantages. However, compared to California, Kansas

302 often ranks bottom amongst media and travel magazines, and the results of this study further

303 confirmed considerable drawbacks. It is important to note that tourists tend to downplay certain

304 information that is inconsistent with prior images and beliefs, thus creating negative images and

305 beliefs that are increasingly difficult to refute. The results of this study imply a considerable

306 amount of investment might be needed to ensure consistent suppliers of destination imaging and

307 services. Additionally, Kansas has not taken advantage of its strength as an agricultural state by

308 offering more opportunities for farm tours and cultural heritage products. Kansas tourism

309 marketers could embrace a long-term strategy centered around its core value as "industrious" and

310   "reliable" with a narrowly focused, individualised tourism experience with long-term benefits for

311   the state and local communities.

312   One example for future Kansas tourism can be agricultural tourism and farm visits. As

313   an agricultural state, Kansas has many tourism opportunities in food processing, which includes

314   flour-milling, animal feeding, and meat processing. Farmer's markets and healthy, organic food

315   have become popular in recent years, and farm visits and local produce can open lots of venues

316   for tourism products. Various food production sites not only attract savvy eaters and doubtful

317   consumers, but farm and production visits also provide educational benefits for kids and

318   families. More importantly, the functional value provided by these tourism products also

319   coincide with Kansas's core destination personality as being industrious, hardworking, and

320   trustworthy. These study results focus on one state, thus providing functional benefits by making

321   the destination personality widely applicable.

322   *Limitations and future studies*

323   This study has several limitations. First, the data were collected via a convenience

324   sampling method which targeted domestic visitors, which may not fully reflect the demographic

325   and sociographic population of international visitors. Future studies should conduct replication

326   studies with international visitors to understand Kansas's marketing position internationally.

327   Second, the online survey offers anonymity, thus reduced bias, but introduces other biases such

328   as computer literacy; also, online surveys are less controllable than a paper-and-pen survey.

329   Third, the findings of this research are specific only to Kansas tourism destinations. Finally, in

330   regard to future studies, scholars could use the proposed procedures in this study to continue to

331   refine and develop a longitudinal scale that better serves generalizability and further improves

332   validity and reliability.

333   **References**

334   Aaker, D.A. (1996) Measuring brand equity across products and markets. *California*
335   *Management Review, 38*: 102-120. https://doi.org/10.2307/41165845
336
337   Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research, 32*(3),
338   347-356. https://doi.org/10.2307/3151897
339
340   Airey, D., Tribe, J., Benckendorff, P., & Xiao, H. (2015). The managerial gaze: The long tail of
341   tourism education and research. *Journal of Travel Research, 54*(2), 139-151.
342   https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287514522877
343
344   Anderson, M. (2016, May) Every day is a holiday: California's tourism economy kept growing
345   last year. The Business Journal. Retrieved from:
346   http://www.bizjournals.com/sacramento/news/2016/05/02/
347
348   Augoustinos, M., & Innes, J. M. (1990). Towards an integration of social representations and
349   social schema theory. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 29*(3), 213-231.
350   https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1990.tb00901.x
351
352   Baloglu, S., Henthorne, T. L., & Sahin, S. (2014). Destination image and brand personality of
353   Jamaica: A model of tourist behavior. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 31*(8),
354   1057-1070.
355
356   Belk, R. W. (1976). It's the thought that counts: A signed digraph analysis of gift-giving. *Journal*
357   *of Consumer Research, 3*(3), 155-162. https://doi.org/10.1086/208662
358
359   Beverland, M. (2018). *Brand Management: Co-creating Meaningful Brands.* Thousand Oaks,
360   CA: SAGE Publications.
361
362   Chang, K. L., Chen, C. M., & Meyer, T. J. (2013). A comparison study of travel expenditure and
363   consumption choices between first-time and repeat visitors. *Tourism Management, 35*,
364   275-277. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.06.006
365
366   CheatSheet (2017, December). *These Are the Worst States to Visit on Your Next Vacation.*
367   Asheville, NC: CheatSheet.com. Retrieved from:
368   https://www.cheatsheet.com/culture/travel/worst-states-visit-vacation.html
369
370   Chen, C. F., & Phou, S. (2013). A closer look at destination: Image, personality, relationship and
371   loyalty. *Tourism Management, 36*, 269-278.
372   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.11.015
373
374   Chi, C. G. Q. (2012). An examination of destination loyalty: Differences between first-time and
375   repeat visitors. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 36*(1), 3-24.
376   https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348010382235
377

Del, C. G., Tinaz, C., & Michele, T. D. (2014). Driving first-time and repeat spectators to a
motor sport event. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research,
8*(4), 388-400. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCTHR-03-2014-0023

Downie, R. (2016, January). *California's economy: The 9 industries driving GDP growth.
investopedia.* Retrieved from: http://www.investopedia.com/articles/investing/011416/

Economic Report. (2015, Oct). *2015 Kansas Economic Report.* Topeka, KS: Kansas Department
of Labor. Retrieved from: https://www.doleta.gov/Performance/Results/AnnualReports/

Ekinci, Y., & Hosany, S. (2006). Destination personality: An application of brand personality to
tourism destinations. *Journal of Travel Research, 45*(2), 127-139.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287506291603

Escalas, J. E. (2004). Narrative Processing: Building Consumer Connections to Brands. *Journal
of Consumer Psychology, 1*(14), 168-180.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp1401&2_19

Farris, J. S. (2008). Parsimony and explanatory power. *Cladistics, 24*(5), 825-847.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1096-0031.2008.00214.x

Fernández-Morales, A., Cisneros-Martínez, J. D., & McCabe, S. (2016). Seasonal concentration
of tourism demand: Decomposition analysis and marketing implications. *Tourism
Management, 56*, 172-190. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.04.004

Franzen, G., & Moriarty, S. (2008). *The science and art of branding.* Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.

Freling, T. H., & Forbes, L. P. (2005). An empirical analysis of the brand personality effect. The
Journal of Product and Brand Management, 14(7), 404-413.
https://doi.org/10.1108/10610420510633350

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G* Power 3: A flexible statistical
power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior
Research Methods, 39*(2), 175-191. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146

Fuchs, G., & Reichel, A. (2011). An exploratory inquiry into destination risk perceptions and
risk reduction strategies of first time vs. repeat visitors to a highly volatile destination.
Tourism Management, 32(2), 266-276. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.01.012

Garg, B. (2015). Analysis to select the appropriate test among general rank test and Garrett's
ranking method in management decision making. *Pranjana, 18*(1), 53.
https://doi.org/10.5958/0974-0945.2015.00006.0

Garrett, H. E. (1924). An empirical study of the various methods of combining incomplete order
of merit ratings. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 15*(3), 157.
https://doi.org/10.1037/h0070378

424

425   Hays, S., Page, S. J., & Buhalis, D. (2013). Social media as a destination marketing tool: its use
426   by national tourism organisations. *Current Issues in Tourism, 16*(3), 211-239.
427   https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2012.662215

428

429   Heere, B. (2010). A new approach to measure perceived brand personality associations among
430   consumers. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 19*(1), 17.

431

432   Hollenbeck, C. R., Peters, C., & Zinkhan, G. M. (2008). Retail spectacles and brand meaning:
433   Insights from a brand museum case study. *Journal of Retailing, 84*(3), 334-353.
434   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2008.05.003

435

436   Horner, S., & Swarbrooke, J. (2016). *Consumer behaviour in tourism.* New York, NY:
437   Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315795232

438

439   Hosany, S., Prayag, G., Van Der Veen, R., Huang, S., & Deesilatham, S. (2017). Mediating
440   effects of place attachment and satisfaction on the relationship between tourists' emotions
441   and intention to recommend. *Journal of Travel Research, 56*(8), 1079-1093.
442   https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287516678088

443

444   Hosany, S., & Martin, D. (2012). Self-image congruence in consumer behavior. *Journal of
445   Business Research, 65*(5), 685-691. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.03.015

446

447   Hultman, M., Skarmeas, D., Oghazi, P., & Beheshti, H. M. (2015). Achieving tourist loyalty
448   through destination personality, satisfaction, and identification. *Journal of Business
449   Research, 68*(11), 2227-2231. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.06.002

450

451   Kastenholz, E., Carneiro, M. J., Marques, C. P., & Lima, J. (2012). Understanding and managing
452   the rural tourism experience—The case of a historical village in Portugal. *Tourism
453   Management Perspectives, 4,* 207-214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2012.08.009

454

455   Keller, K. L., Parameswaran, M. G., & Jacob, I. (2011). *Strategic brand management: Building,
456   measuring, and managing brand equity.* London, UK: Pearson Education.

457

458   Kiliccedil, B., & Sop, S. A. (2012). Destination personality, self-congruity and loyalty. *Journal
459   of Hospitality Management and Tourism, 3*(5), 95-105.

460

461   Kozak, M., & Baloglu, S. (2010). *Managing and marketing tourist destinations: Strategies to
462   gain a competitive edge.* Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
463   https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203842300

464

465   Kruger, M., Botha, K., & Saayman, M. (2012). Information source preferences and associated
466   expenditure of first-time and repeat visitors at a South African wine festival. *Tourism
467   Analysis, 17*(3), 343-355. https://doi.org/10.3727/108354212X13412775927943

468

469 Kumar, V., & Nayak, J. K. (2018). Destination personality: Scale development and validation.
470   *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 42*(1), 3-25.
471   https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348014561027
472
473 Lau, A. L., & McKercher, B. (2004). Exploration versus acquisition: A comparison of first-time
474   and repeat visitors. *Journal of Travel Research, 42*(3), 279-285.
475   https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287503257502
476
477 Lee, J. S., Lee, C. K., & Yoon, Y. (2009). Investigating differences in antecedents to value
478   between first‑time and repeat festival‑goers. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing,*
479   *26*(7), 688-702. https://doi.org/10.1080/10548400903284511
480
481 Liu, Z., Huang, S. S., Hallak, R., & Liang, M. (2016). Chinese consumers' brand personality
482   perceptions of tourism real estate firms. *Tourism Management, 52*, 310-326.
483   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.06.022
484
485 Low, G. S., & Lamb Jr, C. W. (2000). The measurement and dimensionality of brand
486   associations. *Journal of Product & Brand Management, 9*(6), 350-370.
487   https://doi.org/10.1108/10610420010356966
488
489 Lowry, L. L. (Ed.). (2017). *The SAGE International Encyclopedia of Travel and Tourism.*
490   Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483368924
491
492 Malar, L., Krohmer, H., Hoyer, W. D., & Nyffenegger, B. (2011). Emotional brand attachment
493   and brand personality: The relative importance of the actual and the ideal self. *Journal of*
494   *Marketing, 75*(4), 35-52. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.75.4.35
495
496 Matzler, K., Strobl, A., Stokburger-Sauer, N., Bobovnicky, A., & Bauer, F. (2016). Brand
497   personality and culture: The role of cultural differences on the impact of brand
498   personality perceptions on tourists' visit intentions. *Tourism Management, 52*, 507-520.
499   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.07.017
500
501 Merriam, G. C. & Webster, N. (2013). *In Merriam Webster Online*. Springfield, MA: Merriam-
502   Webster . Retrieved from: http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/
503
504 Motulsky, H. (2013). *Intuitive biostatistics: a nonmathematical guide to statistical thinking.* New
505   York, NY: Oxford University Press.
506
507 Panaccio, C. (2017). *Ockham on concepts.* New York, NY: Routledge.
508   https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315247809
509
510 Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social
511   science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of*
512   *Psychology, 63*, 539-569. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452
513

514 Sahin, S., & Baloglu, S. (2011). Brand personality and destination image of Istanbul. *Anatolia,*
515   *22*(01), 69-88. https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2011.556222
516
517 Salkind, N. J. (2007). *Encyclopedia of measurement and statistics (Vol. 1).* Thousand Oaks, CA:
518   SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412952644
519
520 Schroeder, A., Pennington-Gray, L., Kaplanidou, K., & Zhan, F. (2013). Destination risk
521   perceptions among US residents for London as the host city of the 2012 Summer
522   Olympic Games. *Tourism Management, 38,* 107-119.
523   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.03.001
524
525 Sharpley, R., & Stone, P. R. (Eds.). (2010). *Tourist experience: Contemporary perspectives.*
526   New York, NY: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203855942
527
528 Thrillist Travel (2016, September). *All 50 states ranked by their beauty.* New York, NY: Thrillist
529   Media Group. Retrieved from: https://www.thrillist.com/travel/nation/most-beautiful-
530   states-in-america
531
532 Tsang, N. K., Lee, L. Y., Wong, A., & Chong, R. (2012). Adapting the SERVQUAL scale to
533   theme park services: A case of Hong Kong Disneyland. *Journal of Travel & Tourism*
534   *Marketing, 29*(5), 416-429. https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2012.691391
535
536 Tourism Economics (2015). *The Economic Impact of Travel in Kansas* [PowerPoint slides].
537   Retrieved from http://www.kslegislature.org/
538
539 Usakli, A., & Baloglu, S. (2011). Brand personality of tourist destinations: An application of
540   self-congruity theory. *Tourism Management, 32*(1), 114-127.
541   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.06.006
542
543 Widawski, K., & Wyrzykowski, J. (Eds.). (2017). *The Geography of Tourism of Central and*
544   *Eastern European Countries.* New York, NY: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-
545   319-42205-3
546
547 Wong, J., Wu, H. C., & Cheng, C. C. (2015). An empirical analysis of synthesizing the effects of
548   festival quality, emotion, festival image and festival satisfaction on festival loyalty: A
549   case study of Macau Food Festival. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 17*(6),
550   521-536. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2011
551
552 Yoo, B., & Donthu. D. (2001). Developing and validating a multidimensional consumer-based
553   brand equity scale. *Journal of Business Research, 52*(1), 1–14.
554   https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(99)00098-3
555

Tables

557 **Table 1.**

558 Profile of respondents (*n*=172).

	n	*%*		*n*	*%*
Gender			*Education*		
Male	86	41.1	Some high school	2	1.0
Female	86	41.1	High school graduate	38	18.2
Age			Associate degree	30	14.4
18 - 24	0	0	Bachelor's degree	71	34.0
25 - 34	20	9.6	Master's degree	24	11.5
35 - 44	73	34.9	Doctorate degree	6	2.9
45 - 54	41	19.6	*Marital Status*		
55 - 64	21	10.0	Single	75	35.9
65 - 74	14	6.7	Married	85	40.7
75 or older	3	1.4	Widowed	2	1.0
Race			Divorced/ Separated	9	4.3
White	134	64.1	*Employment*		
Hispanic	13	6.2	Full time	111	53.1
Asian	13	6.2	Part time	24	11.5
Black	10	4.8	Unemployed	28	13.4
American Indian	1	0.5	Others (retired/self-employ)	9	4.3
Other	1	0.5			

559 Note: Responses may not equal 100% due to non-response to some of the demographic questions.

560

561

562 **Table 2.**
563 Combined Garrett value, averaged score, and rank position (*N*=209).

	Garrett Value	Percentage Score	Rank
hardworking	14540	69.57	1
reliable	14377	68.79	2
down-to-earth	14067	67.31	3
charming	13547	64.82	4
small town	13163	62.98	5
outdoorsy	13000	62.20	6
family oriented	12914	61.79	7
spirited	12875	61.60	8
daring	12181	58.28	9
secure	12046	57.64	10
good-looking	11788	56.40	11
exciting	11329	54.21	12
western	11285	54.00	13
honest	11086	53.04	14
cool	11027	52.76	15
trendy	10980	52.54	16
smooth	10922	52.26	17
independent	10721	51.30	18
real	10564	50.55	19
intelligent	10559	50.52	20
unique	10556	50.51	21
sincere	10392	49.72	22
imaginative	10294	49.25	23
wholesome	10199	48.80	24
young	9959	47.65	25
friendly	9932	47.52	26
masculine	9595	45.91	27
technical	9388	44.92	28
rugged	9225	44.14	29
tough	9145	43.76	30
successful	9074	43.42	31
upper-class	9055	43.33	32
glamorous	8786	42.04	33
feminine	8602	41.16	34
corporate	8455	40.45	35
confident	8409	40.23	36
up-to-date	8241	39.43	37
cheerful	7959	38.08	38
original	7946	38.02	39
leader	7411	35.46	40

564 **Table 2.** (Continue).

	Garrett Value	Percentage Score	Rank
contemporary	6787	32.47	41
sentimental	6728	32.19	42

565

566

567 **Table 3.**
568 Garrett value, percentage, and rank position with first-time and repeat visitors.

	First-Time Visitors (*n*=67)			Repeat Visitors (*n*=132)		
Rank	Percentage Score	Garrett Value	Traits	Garrett Value	Percentage Score	Rank
1	68.04	4559	down-to-earth	8909	67.49	1
2	63.96	4285	family oriented	8235	62.39	2
3	62.82	4209	small town	8056	61.03	3
4	51.99	3483	honest	7011	53.11	4
5	50.49	3383	sincere	6670	50.53	8
6	50.13	3359	wholesome	6688	50.67	5
7	49.64	3326	sentimental	6281	47.58	7
8	47.21	3163	real	6436	48.76	6
9	37.31	2500	cheerful	5038	38.17	10
10	35.66	2389	friendly	5113	38.73	9
11	32.99	2210	original	4163	31.54	11

Rank	Percentage Score	Garrett Value	Traits	Garrett Value	Percentage Score	Rank
1	62.52	4189	cool	8111	61.45	1
2	56.12	3760	spirited	7644	57.91	2
3	54.55	3655	up-to-date	6698	50.74	6
4	53.37	3576	trendy	6964	52.76	5
5	52.73	3533	exciting	7241	54.86	3
6	51.66	3461	imaginative	6695	50.72	7
7	48.88	3275	unique	6510	49.32	8
8	47.99	3215	daring	7120	53.94	4
9	46.40	3109	independent	6309	47.80	9
10	39.06	2617	young	5169	39.16	10
11	36.72	2460	contemporary	4139	31.36	11

569
570

571 **Table 3.** (Continue).

	First-Time Visitors (*n=67*)		Traits	Repeat Visitors (*n=132*)		
Rank	Percentage Score	Garrett Value	Traits	Garrett Value	Percentage Score	Rank
1	71.82	4812	reliable	9107	68.99	1
2	69.21	4637	hardworking	9005	68.22	2
3	59.10	3960	secure	7562	57.29	3
4	48.57	3254	intelligent	6768	51.27	4
5	43.46	2912	corporate	5720	43.33	6
6	43.16	2892	technical	6006	45.50	5
7	40.90	2740	successful	4386	33.23	9
8	39.90	2673	leader	5503	41.69	7
9	34.88	2337	confident	4601	34.86	8

Rank	Percentage Score	Garrett Value	Traits	Garrett Value	Percentage Score	Rank
1	64.37	4313	upper-class	8689	65.83	1
2	56.30	3772	smooth	7584	57.45	2
3	55.90	3745	feminine	6677	50.58	3
4	42.81	2868	good-looking	5429	41.13	5
5	41.15	2757	glamorous	5419	41.05	6
6	39.48	2645	charming	5802	43.95	4

Rank	Percentage Score	Garrett Value	Traits	Garrett Value	Percentage Score	Rank
1	65.15	4365	outdoorsy	8000	60.61	1
2	52.31	3505	masculine	7240	54.85	2
3	46.04	3085	western	6070	45.98	3
4	43.28	2900	tough	6030	45.68	4
5	43.21	2895	rugged	5660	42.88	5

572
573

574 **Table 4.**
575 Comparison of destination personality and travel satisfaction between first and repeat visitors of
576 Kansas (*n*=199).

Destination personality		*N*	Mean	*SD*	*U*	*W*	*Z*	*Sig.ᵃ*
Sincere	First-time	67	6.57	2.13	3579	12132	-2.22	.026*
	Repeat	132	5.86	2.26				
	Total	199						
Contemporary	First-time	67	8.13	3.32	3641	5919	-2.16	.030*
	Repeat	132	8.93	3.19				
	Total	199						
Outdoorsy	First-time	67	1.76	1.12	3714	5992	-1.98	.047*
	Repeat	132	2.12	1.30				
	Total	199						
Travel Satisfaction		*N*	Mean	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*F*	*Sig.ᵇ*
	First-time	67	5.48	1.20	.646	189	2.73	.100
	Repeat	124	5.35	1.40				
	Total	199						

577 *Note: SD* = Standard deviation; *U* = Mann-Whitney U-tests; *W* = Wilcoxon W; *t* = t-test; *df* = degree of freedom.
578 ᵃ *Sig.* = Asymptotic significance; ᵇ *Sig.* = Significance
579 **p* < .05 (two-tailed test).
580

581   **Note on contributors**

582   **Naiqing Lin, Ph.D.** is an Adjunct Instructor in the Department of Hospitality Management at

583   Kansas State University. His research interest focuses on food safety behavior and

584   organizational behavior. Dr. Lin has published two book chapter and many prestigious academic

585   journals across disciplines. He is a member of Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Sigma Xi.

586

587   **Kevin R Roberts, Ph.D.** is an Associate Professor and Undergraduate Hospitality Management

588   Program Director in the Department of Hospitality Management, Kansas State University. Dr.

589   Roberts has garnered over $8 million in funded research and has published in many academic

590   journals across disciplines. He serves as co-director of the Center of Excellence for Food Safety

591   Research in Child Nutrition Programs.

592
593

594   Copyright 2018

595

596   Published version available at DOI: 10.1080/13032917.2019.1588758.