

## How Agritourism Operators Make Marketing and Promotion Decisions

Katelyn Miller

Quisto Settle

Audrey E. H. King

Bree Kisling

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/jhse>



Part of the [Communication Technology and New Media Commons](#), [Public Relations and Advertising Commons](#), and the [Social Media Commons](#)

---

# How Agritourism Operators Make Marketing and Promotion Decisions

**Katelyn Miller**

*Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation*

**Quisto Settle**

**Audrey E. H. King**

**Bree Kisling**

*Oklahoma State University*

*Agritourism operators in Oklahoma were interviewed to determine how they make promotional decisions. Three themes were found from the interviews. The first was Educated Guessing. Participants were not formally trained in promoting agritourism operations, but they used their past experiences and the resources available to them to make decisions. The second theme was Facebook First. All 10 operations in this interview used Facebook as their primary marketing method based on positive experiences with the site as a promotional tool, followed by other options, such as websites. The third theme was More of the Same. The participants mostly intended to keep doing what they were already doing and were hesitant to make changes. Even those who wanted to make changes often just wanted to improve what they were already doing. It is recommended that new agritourism operations focus their initial marketing approach on Facebook due to low cost and high reach, while other options can be considered later to meet the operation's needs. Organizations that help agritourism operators should be mindful of differing needs, so a one-size-fits-all approach is not appropriate.*

*Keywords: agritourism, interviews, innovation-decision process, promotion, marketing*

## Introduction

### Agritourism

Agritourism is a first-hand experience for the public to engage with a working farm or agricultural operation (Phillip et al., 2010). Popular agritourism ventures include activities like pick-your-own local fruits and vegetables, as well as interacting with animals (Murphy et al., 2017). Agriculturists choose to participate in agritourism for many reasons, including economic gain, providing recreation, supplementing education, and preserving history (Rich et al., 2010).

Economic gain is particularly important because agritourism allows operations to diversify revenue streams (Amanor-Boadu, 2013; Dickinson, 2001; Tew & Barbieri, 2012). As of 2017,

Oklahoma's roughly 400 agritourism operations had about a \$64 million collective impact on the state's economy (Murphy et al., 2017). Agritourism businesses are generally similar, providing a short-term visit experience, but they are diverse in the services and experiences they may offer. There is also a limited amount of direct competition between operations because most agritourism visitors in Oklahoma travel within 50 miles of home, which limits visitors' options and, therefore, competition between operations (Murphy & Melstrom, 2017). This balance creates an environment of *coopetition*, a term to describe the relationship of cooperation and competition between different businesses competing for similar resources or customers (Walley, 2007).

In addition to opportunities for economic gain for producers, agritourism provides consumers with an opportunity for educational entertainment (Schilling & Sullivan, 2014). Agritourism is particularly popular in areas where other types of tourism are uncommon or nonexistent (Tweeten et al., 2008). Barbieri (2013) found agritourism to be the soundest business diversification for producers when considering potential profit, environmental sustainability, and social benefit. In addition to the economic impact, agritourism has the potential to affect public policy, environmental, and social decisions by providing education and perspectives of production agriculture that are not common in the general population (Broccardo et al., 2017). A positive experience at an agritourism venue is applied by visitors to their perceptions of the agricultural industry as a whole (Stebner et al., 2015). Agritourism is particularly crucial for farm retention of small and intermediate-scale agricultural production businesses (Schilling et al., 2014). Successful agritourism businesses are unlikely to showcase the prominent crops of a region but instead focus on specialty or seasonal agriculture that provides a unique experience in an area (Tew & Barbieri, 2012).

### **Agritourism Marketing & Promotion**

Effective marketing is fundamental to successful agritourism, and promotional materials must meet the needs of a diverse possible audience (Joyner et al., 2018). Although information about agritourism is most often spread through word-of-mouth communication, the second most common method is some form of paid advertisement (Amaral et al., 2012). Vakratsas and Ambler (1999) found effective marketing strikes a balance between cognitive needs, emotional effect, and experience. Operators should provide the public with a clear and accurate image or expectation of the experience for potential visitors to be comfortable (Schilling & Sullivan, 2014). If customers feel their experiences closely match their expectations based on advertisements or communication, they are more likely to enjoy their visits because they feel leisurely and assured (Liang et al., 2020).

Social media sites are important to note for promotion because they are free to use and can provide access to billions of users. Facebook is one of the top 10 most visited websites in the world, consistently ranked as one of the top five in the United States (Alexa, 2020), and has more

than 2 billion active users each month (Facebook, 2020). In the United States, 69% of adults use Facebook (Perrin & Anderson, 2019). In line with being the most used social media site overall, Facebook is also the most used social media site by agriculturalists for business (Wilson, 2016).

An important aspect of using social media for promotion is the ability for members of the public to interact directly with a business. Park and Kim (2014) explored the relationship between a business's social media marketing and consumer behavior, and they found that customers who perceive an effortful relationship from a business's social media will be more likely to interact positively with that business in the future. This effect is increased when consumers feel a human connection in a business's social media presence (Hudson et al., 2016).

Abrams and Sackman (2014) found that the online business presence of alternative farms, an umbrella term that includes agritourism, is often blurred with the operator's personal online presence. This overlap occurs in small agricultural businesses that focus on direct-to-consumer marketing because social media marketing is often run entirely by the operation owners. The more time operators spend online, the higher their influence is with their current and potential customers through the development of online relationships (Abrams & Sackman, 2014). However, if these social media channels or websites are basic and not interactive, people looking online for places to visit will form a negative perception of those businesses (Platania, 2014). Outdated information and dead links on a business's online presence can become deterrents to potential customers (Król, 2019). King and Settle's (2020) research indicated agricultural operations were underutilizing Facebook. In Oklahoma, agritourism operations with original posts about the business have more likes than pages with business information alone, and pages with active, paid Facebook marketing have more likes than those with no promoted posts (Bowman et al., 2020).

Operators do not have a reliable, feasible method of understanding their customers' perceptions of their businesses (Zavattaro et al., 2015). Part of this difficulty comes with the relative newness and constant change in social media marketing (Harrigan et al., 2016). Norby and Retallick (2012) noted that agritourism visitors' marketing preferences were changing, which have likely continued to change over the past decade. While there is a correlation between the number of page likes and agritourism revenue, this is not an indication of consumers' feelings at any given time (Abrams & Sackman, 2014). There is also a relationship between the number of original posts by an operation and overall page likes, but there is a stronger relationship with the number of community member posts on an organization's page, indicating the importance of public engagement (Bowman et al., 2020).

While research has assessed trends of success for how agricultural organizations promote themselves, another area that needs to be explored is how operators make promotional decisions. Ultimately, having the right options for operators is not enough if one is unable to convince them to adopt those options.

## Theoretical Framework

The innovation-decision process is a series of belief or action stages that occur when an individual is introduced to a new idea (Rogers, 2003). An aspect of the larger diffusion of innovation theory, the innovation-decision process outlines the steps taken from the moment an individual encounters an innovation to consider knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation, and confirmation (Rogers, 2003). Knowledge describes the discovery of the innovation. In this study, that would be operators discovering marketing opportunities. Persuasion is the positive or negative opinion formed in the early period after knowledge. Decision comes with the individual chooses to adopt or reject the innovation. Implementation is the series of actions applying the innovation to their situation. Confirmation is the evaluation of the effect of the action and is the point at which a decision maker is most likely to discontinue a choice, but an innovation can be rejected at other stages in the process (Rogers, 2003). A portion of the timing and introduction frequency of the knowledge stage is determined by the decision maker's social network (Iffländer & Fretschner, 2019). People are more likely to adopt practices used by their peers through imitation or deeper influence (Iffländer & Fretschner, 2019).

Social media as a technology is so commonly adopted that it is considered a ubiquitous innovation (Yen et al., 2019). However, users' likelihood to continue usage is continuously reevaluated at the confirmation stage of the innovation-decision process. It depends on them receiving purposeful benefit, self-discovery, interconnectivity, social enhancement, and entertainment (Yen et al., 2019). Agricultural operators who primarily use social media for marketing purposes have determined online marketing has an advantage over other forms of marketing for their operation (White et al., 2014). Shaw et al. (2015) asserted the innovation-decision process has the greatest potential benefit when the operator regularly engages with the considered marketing innovation.

## Research Question

Agritourism provides a variety of benefits for the agricultural industry by increasing revenue, improving public education, and helping to preserve the history of the industry (Rich et al., 2010), but promotion is an area common challenge for agritourism operations (McGhee, 2007; Miller et al., 2012; Schilling et al., 2006). The following research question guided the study: How do agritourism operators in Oklahoma decide how to promote their operations?

## Methods

This research used a qualitative approach to explore the experiences of agritourism operators promoting their businesses. In contrast to quantitative research, qualitative research treats reality as pluralistic and grounded in individual experiences (Flick, 2006), as opposed to seeking a single reality (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). Qualitative interviews were chosen as the

specific method to allow each participant the freedom to comfortably share their experiences in their own words (Creswell, 2012).

An interview guide was developed to facilitate the interviews and ensure consistency between interviews (Creswell, 2012). Participants were first asked if they consented to participating in the research and having the conversation recorded. Then to address the research question of how operators make promotional decisions, participants were asked about their operation, the history of agritourism at their operation, goals of the agritourism operation, how they promoted their agritourism operations, where they learned about marketing and promotion, and how they would promote their operations if resources were not a constraint. There were two to four follow-up questions for each of those key questions. The interviewer provided a summary of the key points at the end of the interview, which each participant was asked to confirm for accuracy and provide any necessary clarification, which served as a member check to help ensure confirmability of the results (Ary et al., 2010; Creswell, 2012).

The population for this study consisted of agritourism operators in Oklahoma. Purposive sampling, which involves selecting participants based on certain criteria, was used to ensure a variety of agritourism operator experiences were represented in the sample (Miles & Huberman, 1994). To ensure this variety, personnel at the agritourism marketing office in the state's department of agriculture provided a list of recommended operations that included representation from different regions of the state and categories of agritourism. These categories are taken from the state department of agriculture's agritourism promotion office (Oklahoma Agritourism, n.d.). Prospective participants were sent an email explaining the project and soliciting their participation. Interviews were conducted until data saturation occurred, which is when no new information was gained from the interviews (Creswell, 2012). The final sample consisted of 10 operations (Table 1). Two of the operation interviews were conducted with two of the operators participating in the interview.

***Table 1. List of Participant Pseudonyms and their Respective Types of Agritourism Operations***

| <b>Operator Pseudonyms</b> | <b>Agritourism Type</b>    |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Grace                      | Pumpkin patch              |
| Jacob                      | Pick-your-own berries      |
| Hannah & Henry             | Pick-your-own berries      |
| Allison                    | Petting farm & guest ranch |
| Michael                    | Hunting outfitter          |
| Sarah                      | Pumpkin patch              |
| Charlotte                  | Bed and breakfast          |
| Lauren                     | Pick-your-own berries      |
| Kayla                      | Pick-your-own flowers      |
| Emma & Earl                | Christmas tree farm        |

Interviews were conducted over the phone and recorded to ensure accuracy. The interviews were then transcribed using the online service Temi. The transcripts were then compared to the recording to ensure the accuracy of the information being used to make interpretations and justify findings (Flick, 2006). The transcripts include the words as spoken, including filler words. There is no consensus approach to the treatment of quotes with filler words (Corden & Sainsbury, 2006; Neufeld et al., 2006), so we erred on the side of caution to avoid any undue researcher influence accidentally altering the participants' words. The interviewer's handwritten field notes from the interviews were used to aid internal consistency in the research.

The transcripts were analyzed using Glaser's (1965) constant comparative method in MAXQDA. Each incident is coded into a category and compared to any existing categories. As analysis occurs, categories from the transcript are compared to categories developed from other transcripts, with categories merging and boundaries being delineated to improve their focus. Describing the themes serves as the final step of analysis (Glaser, 1965). MAXQDA allows notes to be taken during analysis. These notes, combined with the transcripts and field notes, act as an audit trail that maintains a record of the research process (Flick, 2006). This audit trail is used to help ensure the dependability and confirmability of the results so that they can be confirmed through a review of the research process (Ary et al., 2010; Creswell & Miller, 2000; Flick, 2006; McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The study was approved by Oklahoma State University's Institutional Review Board (IRB-20-47).

## Findings

When reflecting on the way they have chosen to market their agritourism operations, participants in this study provided responses that fit into three themes. Each theme represents a strategy used in different stages of the innovation-decision process. The first major theme is Educated Guessing, which is the way operators use previous experience combined with targeted resources to make promotional decisions. The second theme is a Facebook First strategy, with operators primarily relying on Facebook for their marketing with a secondary interest in other digital platforms. The third theme is a More of the Same strategy, wherein operators plan to continue current methods with minor adjustments or increased resources for future marketing.

### Educated Guessing

The first theme that emerged from the interviews was the strategy of using educated guesses to make marketing decisions based on different work and life experiences. Most operators in this study create and broadcast their marketing without hiring outside services, working through trial and error to find the best fit for promoting their business. "We just tried, just started trying stuff. Really, I don't think anybody taught us anything," said Earl, co-operator of a Christmas tree farm with Emma. Participants did not mention partaking in formal marketing education related to their agritourism operations. "I mean, we really haven't taken any courses," said Sarah, operator of a fall agritourism destination during the month of October. However, agritourism owners in this

study did name other sources of education or inspiration for their marketing choices. “There is a site called Farmers Inspired, and it’s NAFDMA [National Association of Farm Direct Marketing & Agritourism],” Sarah said. “So it is actually a site for people that have agritourism, um, venues that are throughout the whole United States and Canada. And so that has been so helpful seeing what other farms do.”

Operators make day-to-day promotional decisions based on a variety of experiences, including some combination of collegiate marketing education, experience in industries other than agritourism, or continuing education through promotional organizations. Three operators said they draw on their college education to inform their marketing decisions. “My degree was hotel and restaurant administration, so of course it had a little bit of marketing classes,” Sarah said. Operators also draw from their experience as professionals in other fields either before or simultaneously with running their agritourism enterprises. Jacob, operator of a pick-your-own-produce farm, reflected on his previous career’s impact on marketing. “We would advertise and, you know, do all everything that we needed to do to bring in business.” Five participants spoke about their experiences in hospitality, sales, and customer service as applicable experiences to their current marketing decisions. In addition to her college education and seeking out continuing education through online classes and podcasts, pick-your-own operator Lauren said,

I also have worked for ... a big international company for 20 years. And not directly in marketing communication but in customer engagement and brand loyalty. So I would say that I have, you know, a strong background in mass, in marketing in that standpoint, how to reach customers.

Half of the interviewees spoke of support they received from organizations that share marketing and operations information between agritourism businesses. Hannah, co-operator of a pick-your-own-produce farm with Henry, named several organizations that have provided resources and education to help them better promote their business:

Well, we’ve gone to the Small Business Administration, the Oklahoma Farmers [Market] and Agritourism Conference, which is happening today, was very helpful for us. We belong to ... the strawberry growers association and the blackberry association, and we learned through that method as well.

### **Facebook First**

The second theme is a Facebook First strategy for marketing, with other digital platforms being used as a supplement. Operators of all 10 agritourism businesses in this study said Facebook was the primary marketing method for their business. Grace, a pumpkin patch operator, named her most effective and beneficial marketing: “Facebook ... I’m going to keep saying Facebook.” Hannah said, “Facebook has by far been the most successful means of marketing.” Most operators noted their website, other social media sites, email newsletters, and TV spots as the



most beneficial secondary marketing methods. Kayla, a pick-your-own-flowers business operator, said the following:

We have a website, and I collect email addresses, ... but I'm working on our first newsletter, um, that will be coming out for the folks that have signed up either through our website or, um, have requested more information. They'll be getting a newsletter that I'll send out just with updates on the farm and future events.

Four participants mentioned Instagram as a marketing option in conjunction with Facebook. Lauren said, "We have a very active Facebook and Instagram page. So I use both of those." Michael said he uses Instagram for its connectivity with Facebook and for its ease and resonance with a younger audience:

We use Instagram for mostly for our day-to day-posts with the stories. And now that there's the Instagram, we do our video to that format. Uh, but in the sense you can, you can post, you know, simultaneously from Instagram to Facebook. So some of my older demographic, older clients I guess really like Facebook, I would say the younger demographic likes the Instagram a little better.

Contrasting the use of digital methods by all participants, analog marketing methods, including print advertisements in magazines and newspapers, were most often named as failures that operators would not replicate or attempt in the future. Charlotte, who runs a bed-and-breakfast, said: "I've taken ... little ads out in a couple of regional magazines, and I always ask people how they hear about us, and no one said those magazines. So I don't do that anymore." Michael, manager of the agritourism branch of a ranch, noted print advertising, in newspapers and brochures, was once a staple for their marketing efforts:

We don't spend a lot of money on brochures or business cards or anything like that anymore. Uh, so that stuff kind of worked in the beginning, but as technology's changed and years have gone by, it's not really worked to spend that kind of money on an actual physical brochure if you don't really have anybody to hand it out to, you just point somebody to your Instagram page now and that seems to work a lot easier.

However, Hannah said she has remained open to other possible marketing options, "We do newsletters, we do, um, any opportunities that come up. This year we were featured on the December issue of Edible OKC, and that, that was very beneficial for us." Emma mentioned the addition of in-person events to kick off their season for selling Christmas trees:

We've added movie nights, um, where we show a movie outside on a huge screen. Um, we added a, like a vendor fair where we have local crafters and artists come in, um, they each have their own booth and, um, and they sell, you know, their stuff.

Emma also mentioned hosting an event with the local animal rescue shelter.

However, a notable distinction to this theme is that two operators, when asked what they would do with unlimited marketing resources, said they would like to try more analog marketing methods that have previously not been an option due to cost. Kayla said,

I would love to do maybe some sort of print. Having something that they can give to someone physical. I still think print is very important. Um, instead of just saying, “Oh, well, like us on Facebook or like us on Instagram.”

### **More of the Same**

The third theme in this study is a More of the Same strategy for the future marketing decisions of these operators. Participants in this study were generally confident in their current marketing strategies and were hesitant to make considerable changes. “I plan to continue what I’m doing right now,” Charlotte said. When asked what they might do with unlimited resources, several participants said they would continue running their marketing as they have been. “Right now, I wouldn’t change anything,” Jacob said. Charlotte said she would not change anything about their marketing practice because they have found the balance that works for their business: “I’m as busy as I want to be.” Henry did mention they were prepared to change as needed: “Which direction that goes, you know, somewhat will depend on the more people go online. You know, I mean, if there’s this epic shift to Twitter, we may do more there.”

The participants who did mention altering their marketing strategy said they would consider doing more according to their current plan. “Honestly, I think we would just increase what we’re doing right now. Um, it’s really working,” Michael said. As suggested by the Facebook First strategy, operators said a future increase in marketing efforts would first mean paying for more exposure through boosted Facebook advertisements. “Right now, I do everything free, and whatever I can do for free, I do it. Um, I would do more paid social media and then I would also do video, media, TV, radio, stuff like that,” Allison said. Some operators said higher quality content on hand would improve their marketing efforts. “I think the key is to have better quality photos and better quality videos, so more live videos, things like that.” Earl said, “Um, more personal stuff, which I hate doing.”

Operators are quick to recognize marketing methods that are not producing the desired results relative to the costs of implementation. “We used GoDaddy’s social media like white glove service and got out of it quickly. It was too expensive,” Earl said. This process of elimination is based on the operations’ resources and needs. Michael said,

We used to go to, um, outdoor shows quite a bit. We’d do three, four, five a year. Um, we quit going to those. They just weren’t, uh, there wasn’t really any return.

We were spending money and not really getting any return from those types of, uh, shows and outdoor places.

### **Discussion**

The agritourism operators in this study were intimately aware of the impact of effective marketing on their businesses' success, and they worked diligently to make increasingly productive promotional choices. That said, they were largely navigating the innovation-decision process on their own. In line with Abrams and Sackman's (2014) results, the agritourism operation owners in this study were running their own social media marketing activities instead of having other employees or third-party firms making marketing decisions for them. Although there was little formal structure in how the participants were learning best practices (Rich et al., 2010), they combined educational and non-agritourism professional experiences with their experiences promoting their agritourism operations to make marketing decisions. They were implementing new strategies but also abandoning strategies that either no longer worked or never worked to begin with when they reached the confirmation stage of the process. The participants' trial and error process was indicative of them cycling through Rogers' (2003) innovation-decision process as they sought to make the best decisions for their operations. There were also some participants who indicated they were learning from peers in the state and from examples across the country through various associations and organizations that provided training and education. This is important because people are more likely to adopt practices when they see their peers engaged in those practices (Iffländer & Fretschner, 2019).

While there were a variety of promotional options used by participants, Facebook was overwhelmingly the primary tool used by participants (Wilson, 2016), which is logical given Facebook's place as the most-used social media site in the U.S. (Perrin & Anderson, 2019). Social media marketing has been identified for years as an effective form of marketing for agritourism businesses (Amaral et al., 2012), but it is still underutilized by many agritourism operations (Bowman et al., 2020). No operator in this study shared a negative experience stemming from their efforts at Facebook marketing, which helps confirm their decision to continue using Facebook as a promotional tool.

Even though paid traditional advertising options were considered by some of the participants who did not have the resources to implement them yet, those who had engaged in traditional advertising efforts had reported discontinuance because they did not believe there was a good return on investment. These results contrast with the Amaral et al. (2012) finding that paid advertisement is one of the dominant means of sharing information about agritourism, though the change could be accounted for by increased use of social media over the past decade. It is also worth noting that some participants were considering or already engaging in marketing and promotional activities beyond Facebook and paid traditional advertisements. Websites and newsletters were commonly used, and one participant mentioned doing in-person promotional

events that bring potential customers on-site. The on-site promotional events could potentially be very useful given that word-of-mouth communication was found to be how information about agritourism was most commonly spread in a past study (Amaral et al., 2012). Participants considering other options indicate they are continually engaging in the innovation-decision process, as noted by Yen et al. (2019), even if those considerations do not always reach the implementation stage.

A noteworthy aspect of this study is that the participants in this study were largely confident in their current marketing practices even though marketing and promotion have been identified as areas that needed improvement in past agritourism research (McGhee, 2007; Miller et al., 2012; Schilling et al., 2006). There appear to be mixed results in terms of how agritourism operators are implementing social media use (Bowman et al., 2020). One reason this could have occurred is that social media use has become more prevalent over time, so agritourism operators may be more comfortable now than they were when past research occurred. Another possibility is that the participants were not aware of areas where they could improve, which could indicate a potential need for external guidance.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the stated experiences of the participants in this study, new agritourism operators or those new to promoting their operations should focus their marketing approach on social media, specifically Facebook, first before spending time and money on traditional forms of marketing. Because there is no required cost to use Facebook and it has a broad user base, it appears to be a good option. As the agritourism operation continues over time, the operators can consider branching out to other opportunities depending on demographic goals. Operators should remain consistent and clear in their marketing to maintain the positive reputation gained by their online presence (Abrams & Sackman, 2014). It is possible that a poor social media presence can do more harm than good because potential customers will see it as a lack of care and attention (Król, 2019). Operators who begin adopting social media for promotion and marketing should ensure they are willing and able to engage in that process properly (Abrams & Sackman, 2014; Park & Kim, 2014), especially because customers have more positive perceptions if they feel there is a human connection in a business's social media presence (Hudson et al., 2016).

Some participants mentioned using educational information from organizations like commodity associations and chambers of commerce, but operators were largely navigating the innovation-decision process on their own. Because agritourism operators are doing this without outside support, intentional efforts should be made by Extension to support them, even if that is pointing operators to existing resources. This support would give operators access to resources and knowledge they might otherwise overlook and would help operators navigate the innovation-decision process more efficiently.

Adoption of any further promotional tactics should be made based on the needs of the operation. In this study, some participants were satisfied with how their operations were doing and did not feel the need to increase promotions, while others were hoping to expand their practices beyond unpaid Facebook marketing. While Facebook is a good starting point because of its broad user base and the ability to interact with customers directly (Hudson et al., 2016; Park & Kim, 2014), 30% of adults in the U.S. are not Facebook users, and younger people use a more diverse number of social media sites than older people (Perrin & Anderson, 2019).

Ultimately, there is no one-size-fits-all approach for agritourism marketing and promotion. Agritourism operators need to make marketing decisions that meet their business's needs and capabilities based on available resources. For communication personnel in organizations seeking to help agritourism operators, a key aspect of the results is that aside from using Facebook, operators had differing needs and goals. Some were looking into expanding their promotional practices, and others were content with what they were doing. Trainings and resources should be tailored to specific operations, or a bank of resources can be provided that allows operators to choose what is most appropriate for their needs at any given time. It would also be advantageous to show agritourism operators other operators engaged in those practices to increase the likelihood of adoption (Iffländer & Fretschner, 2019).

Because of the limited scope of this study, there are a variety of future research opportunities that could help shed light on the topic. First, this research could be expanded to other states to determine how promotional decision processes vary across the country. Second, a quantitative survey of agritourism operations would allow for more generalizability of results than interviews. Third, the participants in this study were largely satisfied, but promotion and marketing have been considered a common challenge for agritourism operations, and social media is often underutilized by agricultural operations (Bowman et al., 2020; King & Settle, 2020; McGhee, 2007; Miller et al., 2012; Schilling et al., 2006). As such, it would be advantageous to seek out operators who are dissatisfied with their current practices to understand their experiences and contrast them with the participants of this study. Finally, research needs to be conducted with potential customers to determine if the marketing and promotional decisions are actually well received by audience members.

## References

- Abrams, K. M., & Sackman, A. (2014). Are alternative farmers yielding success with online marketing communication tools for their social capital and business viability? *Journal of Applied Communications*, 98(3). <https://doi.org/10.4148/1051-0834.1085>
- Alexa. (2020). The top 500 sites on the web. *Amazon*.
- Amanor-Boadu, V. (2013). Diversification decisions in agriculture: The case of agritourism in Kansas. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review*, 16(2). <https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.148583>

- Amaral, K., Edgar, L. D., & Johnson, D. M. (2012). Agricultural communication students' perceptions, knowledge, and identified sources of information about agritourism. *Journal of Applied Communications*, 96(3). <https://doi.org/10.4148/1051-0834.1154>
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorenson, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). Wadsworth.
- Barbieri, C. (2013). Assessing the sustainability of agritourism in the US: A comparison between agritourism and other farm entrepreneurial ventures. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22(2), 252–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2012.685174>
- Bowman, B., Settle, Q., Tomas, S., and Riggs, A. (2020). Facebook activity of Oklahoma agritourism Facebook pages. *Journal of Applied Communications*, 104(2). <https://doi.org/10.4148/1051-0834.2296>
- Broccardo, L., Culasso, F., & Truant, E. (2017). Unlocking value creation using an agritourism business model. *Sustainability*, 9(9), 1618. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9091618>
- Corden, A., & Sainsbury, R. (2006). *Using verbatim quotations in reporting qualitative social research: Researchers' views* (ESRC 2136). University of York.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, 39(3), 124–130. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3903\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3903_2)
- Dickinson, K. (2001). *Deciding to diversify: A case study of seven Virginia farm businesses* [Master's Thesis]. Virginia Tech Electronic Theses and Dissertations. <http://hdl.handle.net/10919/30877>
- Facebook. (2020). Facebook reports first quarter 2020 results. *PR Newswire*. <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/facebook-to-announce-first-quarter-2020-results-301038559.html#:~:text=Facebook%20Apr%2009%2C%202020%2C%2016%3A05%20ET%20MENLO%20PARK%2C,PT%20%2F%205%20p.m.%20ET%20the%20same%20day>
- Flick, U. (2006). *An introduction to qualitative research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Glaser, B. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Social Problems*, 12(4), 436–445. <https://doi.org/10.2307/798843>
- Harrigan, P., Evers, U., Miles, M., & Daly, T. (2017). Customer engagement with tourism social media brands. *Tourism Management*, 59, 597–609. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.09.015>
- Hudson, S., Huang, L., Roth, M. S., & Madden, T. J. (2016). The influence of social media interactions on consumer-brand relationships: A three-country study of brand perceptions and marketing behaviors. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 33(1), 27–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2015.06.004>
- Iffländer, K., & Fretschner, M. (2019). Social connectedness and product exposure in the innovation decision process. *Nordblick*, 10, 6–23.

- Joyner, L., Kline, C., Oliver, J., & Kariko, D. (2018). Exploring emotional response to images used in agritourism destination marketing. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 9, 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2017.10.004>
- King, A. E. H., & Settle, Q. (2020). Examining the social properties of Oklahoma agricultural Facebook pages: A quantitative content analysis. *Journal of Applied Communications*, 104(4). <https://doi.org/10.4148/1051-0834.2347>
- Król, K. (2019). Forgotten agritourism: Abandoned websites in the promotion of rural tourism in Poland. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, 10(2), 431–442. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTT-09-2018-0092>
- Kubickova, M., & Campbell, J. M. (2020). The role of government in agro-tourism development: A top-down bottom-up approach. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 23(5), 587–604. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1551338>
- Liang, A. R. D., Nie, Y. Y., Chen, D. J., & Chen P. (2020). Case studies on co-branding and farm tourism: Best match between farm image and experience activities. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 42, 107–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2019.11.009>
- McGhee, N. (2007). An agritourism systems model: A Weberian perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(2), 111–124. <https://doi.org/10.2167/jost634.0>
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry*. Pearson Education, Inc.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. SAGE Publications.
- Miller, J., McCullough, S., Rainer, D., & Das, B. (2012). Communication training needs in Arkansas' agritourism industry. *Journal of Applied Communication*, 96(1), 68–81. <https://doi.org/10.4148/1051-0834.1153>
- Murphy, C., & Melstrom, R. T. (2017). *Know your customers: Oklahoma agritourism visitor characteristics and opinions about a new liability law* (AGEC-1053). OSU Extension. <https://extension.okstate.edu/fact-sheets/know-your-customers-oklahoma-agritourism-visitor-characteristics-and-opinions-about-a-new-liability-law.html>
- Murphy, C., Melstrom, R., Shideler, D., & Cummings, J. (2017). *Agritourism in Oklahoma* (AGEC-1058). OSU Extension. <https://extension.okstate.edu/fact-sheets/agritourism-in-oklahoma.html>
- Neufeld, H. T., Marchessault, G., & Dean, H. J. (2006). From talk to text: Balancing ethical and aesthetic considerations in editing. *Canadian Journal of Diabetes*, 30(4), 379–380. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1499-2671\(06\)04003-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1499-2671(06)04003-2)
- Norby, M. S., & Retallick, M. S. (2012). Iowa consumer trends and participation in agritourism activities. *Journal of Extension*, 50(5). <https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/joe/vol50/iss5/8>
- Oklahoma Agritourism. (n.d.). <https://www.oklahomaagritourism.com/>
- Park, H., & Kim, Y. K. (2014). The role of social network websites in the consumer-brand relationship. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 21(4), 460–467. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2014.03.011>

- Perrin, A., & Anderson, M. (2019). *Share of U.S. adults using social media, including Facebook, is mostly unchanged since 2018*. Pew Research Center.  
<https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/04/10/share-of-u-s-adults-using-social-media-including-facebook-is-mostly-unchanged-since-2018/>
- Phillip, S., Hunter, C., & Blackstock, K. (2010). A typology for defining agritourism. *Tourism Management, 31*(6), 754–758. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.08.001>
- Platania, M. (2014). Agritourism farms and the web: An exploratory evaluation of their websites. *AGRIS Online Papers in Economics and Informatics, 6*(3), 51–58.  
<https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.188735>
- Rich, S. R., Standish, K., Tomas, S., Barbieri, C., & Ainely, S. (2010). The current state of agritourism research in the United States. *Tourism Travel and Research Association: Advancing Tourism Research Globally, 12*.  
<http://scholarworks.umass.edu/ttra/2010/Visual/12>
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations*. Free Press.
- Schilling, B. J., Attavanich, W., & Jin, Y. (2014). Does agritourism enhance farm profitability? *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics, 39*(1), 69–87.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/44131315>
- Schilling, B. J., Marxen, L. J., Heinrich, H. H., & Brooks, F. J. A. (2006). *The opportunity for agritourism development in New Jersey*.  
<https://www.nj.gov/agriculture/pdf/ATReport.pdf>
- Schilling, B. J., & Sullivan, K. P. (2014). Characteristics of New Jersey agritourism farms. *Journal of Food Distribution Research, 45*(2), 161–173.  
<https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.186930>
- Shaw, K., Meyers, C., Irlbeck, E., Doerfert, D., Abrams, K., & Morgan, C. (2015). Agriculturists personal and business use of online communication tools. *Journal of Applied Communications, 99*(2). <https://doi.org/10.4148/1051-0834.1045>
- Sharpley, R., & Vass, A. (2005). Tourism, farming and diversification: An attitudinal study. *Tourism Management, 27*(5), 1040–1052. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.10.025>
- Stebner, S., Ray, J., Becker, J., & Baker, L. M. (2015). Totally transparent: A qualitative study about the impact of farm tours on bloggers. *Journal of Applied Communications, 99*(4).  
<https://doi.org/10.4148/1051-0834.1059>
- Tew, C., & Barbieri, C. (2012). The perceived benefits of agritourism: The provider's perspective. *Tourism Management, 33*(1), 215–224.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.02.005>
- Tweeten, K., Leistritz, L., & Hodur, N. (2008). Growing rural tourism opportunities. *Journal of Extension, 46*(2), Article 4. <https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/joe/vol46/iss2/4/>
- Vakratsas, D., & Ambler, T. (1999). How advertising works: What do we really know? *Journal of Marketing, 63*(1), 26–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299906300103>



- Walley, K. (2007). Coopetition: An introduction to the subject and an agenda for research. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 37(2), 11–31. <https://doi.org/10.2753/IMO0020-8825370201>
- White, D., Meyers, C., Doerfert, D., & Irlbeck, E. (2014). Exploring agriculturalists' use of social media for agricultural marketing. *Journal of Applied Communications*, 98(4). <https://doi.org/10.4148/1051-0834.1094>
- Wilson, M. (2016). Survey: Facebook is social media king among farmers. *Farm Futures*. <https://www.farmprogress.com/commentary/survey-facebook-is-social-media-king-among-farmers>
- Yen, W. C., Lin, H. H., Wang, Y. S., Shih, Y. W., & Cheng, K. H. (2019). Factors affecting users' continuance intention of mobile social network service. *The Service Industries Journal*, 39(13-14), 983–1003. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2018.1454435>
- Zavattaro, S. M., Daspit, J. J., & Adams, F. G. (2015). Assessing managerial methods for evaluating place brand equity: A qualitative investigation. *Tourism Management*, 47, 11–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.08.018>

*Katelyn Miller* is a public affairs specialist at the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation.

*Quisto Settle* is an Assistant Professor of Agricultural Communications in the Department of Agricultural Education, Communications, and Leadership at Oklahoma State University. Please direct correspondence about this article to Quisto Settle at [gsettle@okstate.edu](mailto:gsettle@okstate.edu).

*Audrey King* is an Assistant Professor of Agricultural Communications in the Department of Agricultural Education, Communications, and Leadership at Oklahoma State University.

*Bree Kisling* is an undergraduate student in the Agricultural Communications major in the Department of Agricultural Education, Communications, and Leadership at Oklahoma State University.

### **Acknowledgments**

This work was supported by the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Hatch project OKL03072, and by the OAES/CASNR Undergraduate Research Scholars program at Oklahoma State University.