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INTRODUCTION

Tourism is a rapidly expanding business in the United States. The recreation industry is the third most important industry following manufacturing and agriculture (17, p.1). A number of factors have contributed to this phenomenal growth. Perhaps the prime factor is the increase in personal income during the past twenty years, coupled with the marked increase in paid vacations in most sectors of the economy. With more leisure and with more money than before, Americans are on the move in ever increasing numbers (17, p.1).

Many states have recognized the potential benefits from a strong vacation industry. Out-of-state travelers can contribute to the income of any particular region or state. States are also recognizing that they need not be generously endowed with many traditional tourist attractions, such as 10,000 lakes, to reap benefits from the traveling American. For example, a North Dakota EDC Research Associate has estimated that automobile tourists added $25,567,000 to North Dakota’s income in 1963 (22, p.20).

With the betterment of highway and travel facilities, people have been expanding the scope of their vacations, driving many miles seeking recreation and oftentimes not returning home for several weeks or more. In order to arrive at their destination they travel across many states which do not have the interest and tourist drawing powers that the traveler’s destination region might have. But tourists do traverse these states and significantly, spend as they travel. As a result any "bridge" state can enter the race for the tourists dollar. A "bridge" state is a
state which must be crossed by tourists in order to get to the major
tourist attractions.

Florida, offering much in the way of natural recreation, has been a
traditional leader in tourist pursuit. The Florida Development Commission
employs a research division, gathering and analyzing tourist statistics.
Full-time trained personnel interview tourists or hand them questionnaires
as they enter or leave the state. Estimates of the total number of
tourists are continually being made with help of Florida Highway Depart-
ment surveys and Public Carrier passenger counts. The Development
Commission is able to make fairly accurate statements concerning travel
habits and expenditure patterns of Florida-bound tourists. These tourist
statistics not only are designed to serve as guide-lines for state origi-
nated Florida promotion and business development, but have proven extreme-
ly useful in annual comparisons. The Development Commission has deter-
mined that their increased advertising has paid off with increased
tourism. This means increased Florida income (12, p.2).

Florida is a major destination for many travelers. Because of its
unique geographical location and natural recreation facilities it does
not have a cross traffic pattern typical of travel in many other states.

North Dakota is towards the other end of the spectrum. The state
witnesses a much larger percentage of tourist cross traffic, as opposed
to North Dakota destined tourist traffic. This can be attributed to its
smaller natural tourist resource base and its central geographical loca-
tion. As in Florida, the State Economic Development Commission has
surveyed the vacation and recreation industry. The Commission's purpose
was to survey existing facilities, and determine certain tourist characteristics. Then, based on these figures, expand the tourist industry and state facilities to better accommodate travelers, encouraging them to stay longer. The results of their study also helped determine the economic impact of tourists. The impact was large enough to extend promotional activities and to merit efforts toward development of the tourist industry (23). The Commission recognizes North Dakota as a bridge state and promotes it as such. Both North Dakota and Florida realize how important it is to have accurate and meaningful statistics describing the nature of the potential customers for their product, the state itself.

In 1961 the Research and Statistics Division of the Iowa Development Commission compiled statistics on Iowa vacation travel, using the Iowa Highway Commission's 1960-1961 Origin and Destination Survey data (14). These data included a division of automobile travelers by groups according to accommodations sought, if any, in Iowa, and the traveler's respective origin and destination. Aside from this information, Iowa has virtually no statistics on the many tourists that travel in the state each year. Iowa has never been considered a natural tourist attraction center, and as a result little interest in tourism has been generated. But Iowa is one of the nation's tourist crossroads, with travelers passing through the state on their way to many other destinations. For example, many travelers pass through Iowa on their way to Minnesota's lakes. Tourists from east and south of Iowa pass through enroute to South Dakota's Black Hills and Mount Rushmore, Wyoming's Yellowstone National Park, and the West Coast's California, Washington, and Oregon. Travelers
from California cross Iowa headed for destinations north and east. Travelers who come many miles to stay in Iowa are in the minority.

With the increasing amount of money spent every year by traveling Americans there is concern that Iowa is allowing income opportunities to pass through the state. How much do the travelers spend while in Iowa? How is their spending distributed over the various services and commodities Iowa has to offer? Who is spending the most? How many tourists stop in Iowa? In general, what is the impact of travelers on the economy of Iowa?

According to the Iowa Development Commission, Iowa has done very little tourist promotion on a national, or on a regional non-local scale. Should the Development Commission actively promote tourism in Iowa? If so, what should be the nature of the promotion? It is necessary to know where the travelers live in order to direct promotion. It is necessary to understand what the travelers know about Iowa in order to advertise effectively with limited resources.

What do the current travelers like and dislike about Iowa? This is important if Iowa is interested in attracting travelers to the state. What attracts visitors to a state like Iowa? Why do tourists travel through Iowa rather than through Missouri, Minnesota, or other states? Research can offer insights into travel patterns and habits of tourists. Research will enable the promotion and public facility arms of the state to make more efficient use of the tax dollar. There also exists the possibility that increased tourism would allow the state to improve public facilities at a lower per person per visit rate, giving Iowans more recreation facilities for their money.
Several of Iowa's neighboring states, namely Minnesota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin, have been allocating as much as a quarter of a million dollars per year for the sole purpose of attracting tourists to their state. Michigan's annual expenditures approach the half-million dollar figure (9, p.30). North Dakota has more than quadrupled its annual tourist promotion expenditures in the last five years (23, p.58). These rough estimates are for promotional expenditures by state agencies. Private concerns have contributed much more.

As other states expand and increase their promotional activities while Iowa does little to attract tourists, Iowa could lose its relative tourist position. This could be especially true if the other states are adjacent to and compete with Iowa for tourist cross-traffic trade.

An accurate breakdown of the magnitude of traveler's complaints about Iowa facilities can be used to identify problem areas. The loudest complaints often are mistaken for the most prevalent, which may or may not be the case. Determining the relative importance of these complaints offers an opportunity to improve the tourist industry. With increasing tourism in the U.S., Iowa should learn more about the needs, habits, and characteristics of its tourists.

The purpose of this study then, is to extend knowledge in the area of Iowa tourism, add to the available statistics, and make purposeful recommendations.
SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Population

All types of travelers have some impact on the state. The ideal or complete population of out-of-state travelers would have included all tourists traveling by auto and using commercial lodging, camp grounds, trailer parks, homes of friends and relatives, or just passing through without stopping. But under the given survey conditions (i.e., limited funds, and time period surveyed) it would have been impossible to include all types of out-of-state travelers in Iowa.

The population for this survey can be defined as all August, 1964 out-of-state travelers staying at least one night in a motel within the sampled area. The sampled area included all motels located in the cities and towns along U. S. Highway 20 in Iowa.

Choosing this segment of the total traveler population facilitated the collection and isolation of data. The choice of August was two-fold. The concensus of available tourist surveys was that August was traditionally the most vacationed month, and on this basis merited research. In addition, by choosing the month of heaviest travel, an upper bound on the total monthly expenditures and activities could be determined. August is the third and last summer vacation month. Travelers questioned after the tourist season should be more likely to recall events from their most recent trip.

A few comments concerning the location of the sampled motels are in order. U. S. Highway 20 runs east and west through Iowa, entering on the west at Sioux City and leaving on the east at Dubuque. The three main
metropolitan areas of Sioux City, Cedar Falls-Waterloo, and Dubuque accounted for about three-fourths of the motel units in the survey.

There are many points of interest in the portion of Iowa traversed by U. S. Highway 20. A few of the more frequented tourist attractions are the scenic Mississippi River, Old Shot Tower, and Eagle Point Park near Dubuque; the Little Brown Church in the Vale at Nashua, located north of Cedar Falls and Waterloo; the fort in Fort Dodge; and numerous lakes within twenty-five miles of U. S. Highway 20.

Review of Questionnaire

A five page mail questionnaire consisting of an introductory letter, a map, and fourteen questions was used to elicit information from travelers in the survey. The questionnaire is entered as Appendix A. In this section the questionnaire will be reviewed and reasons for including the most important questions will be outlined:

Map

A map of Iowa and the surrounding areas was included in an attempt to accurately determine the routes followed by travelers. But many people did not bother to fill in the map, or had detached the map and returned only the questions. The travelers had either not remembered their route and did not care to check the map, or simply had not realized the map was printed on the reverse side of the introductory letter. More than one-third of the maps were unusable.

A secondary purpose for including the map was to provide the travelers with a visual reminder of Iowa and stimulate further recollection.
Questions

Q.1. Purpose of trip in Iowa  
There was no straightforward method to separate the business persons from the other travelers before mailing the questionnaire. The last part of question 1, Iowa is my Business Territory, etc., was intended not to discourage businessmen who otherwise might think the questionnaire pertained only to tourists.

Q.2. Total number in party

Q.3. Number of nights in Iowa  
What was the composition of travel parties? What was the size of the average travel party in Iowa? How many parties included children? How long did the travel parties remain in Iowa? This information is necessary in order to tie expenditures to traffic counts and make comparisons with other data.

Q.4. Decision to travel in Iowa  
Why do people travel in Iowa? Is it because Iowa happens to be a bridge between their origin and destination, or are there other factors to consider? Question 4 also included a section to determine whether or not the tourists had been influenced by tourist promotion. Any response could be attributed to private advertising.

Q.5. What travelers did while in Iowa  
This question was included to give some indication as to what types of recreation activities interest travelers, thus laying groundwork for tourist promotion and facilities improvement.

The question is straightforward but it allowed respondents to generalize their answers. Additional space allowed the travelers to elaborate on the happenings of their trip, detailing activities and places visited in Iowa.
9.6. **What travelers enjoyed while in Iowa**  
To what extent do travelers think Iowa is "scenic"? Do travelers view Iowa farmland with disdain, or do they enjoy farmland countryside as much as other scenery? Are travelers enjoying the available rest areas? Are travelers enjoying their meals in Iowa restaurants? Question nine allowed additional space for traveler's comments. To make recommendations concerning Iowa's facilities we need to know what tourists have enjoyed and would enjoy.

9.7. **What travelers did not enjoy**  
Question seven was included as an open question in order not to influence the respondents in any manner.

9.8. **Iowa could improve its facilities**  
Question eight was intended to categorize many of the complaints concerning facilities in Iowa. In order to evaluate Iowa's tourist facilities, it is necessary to determine the relative magnitudes of traveler's complaints.

9.9. **Influences to remain in Iowa longer than expected**

9.10. **Influences to leave Iowa sooner than intended**  
These two open-end questions were included in an attempt to gain insight which would prove valuable in promotional material. Also, if any significant aspect of the questionnaire had been overlooked, these questions would be general enough to catch useful comments.

9.11. **Plan to travel in Iowa at some future time**  
Do the majority of the travelers, once they have been in Iowa, plan to return at some time? A large number of travelers indicating a planned return would be encouraging.
Q.12. Knowledge of Iowa attractions  In order to properly aim promotional material, it is necessary to be aware of information the travelers possess concerning the state and its attractions. This question was designed to determine the percentage of travelers who had visited different attractions in Iowa, and those who hadn't visited but would like to visit sometime in the future.

Attraction c. (Spirit Lake Massacre Area) and attraction g. (Iowa Great Lakes) are within a single recreation complex and knowledge of one should indicate knowledge of the other.

Q.13. August expenditures  How much do travelers spend while in Iowa? Do they spend more per day if they remain in Iowa for several days? How is the traveler's dollar distributed over the various goods and services available in Iowa? These data are necessary to determine the impact of tourism in Iowa.

Q.14. Annual income  Among the travelers in Iowa, which income class was the most heavily represented? Does income have any influence on the expenditures or travel habits of visitors? Do visitors with different incomes have different opinions about Iowa and its facilities?

Grouping data by income classifications should yield information valuable to agencies responsible for placing promotional materials in the proper media.

Rate of Return

The first mailing consisted of 1,257 questionnaires. Of these 85, or 6.8% were returned imprinted with "no such street", "person unknown", 
"no such address", etc. Five hundred sixty questionnaires were checked and returned, 44% of the total sent. Of these 521, or 41.1% were judged useful and included in the study. Questionnaires were judged unusable if respondents had answered only one or two questions. A partial second mailing yielded an additional 37 usable questionnaires.

The rate of return compares favorably with several other state's efforts. For example, North Dakota mailed questionnaires to past visitors, requesting them to make ten random phone calls in their local vicinity and ask questions designed to investigate the image of North Dakota. They realized a 44.68% return. But they offered an incentive, a small gift (23, p. 67).

Wisconsin also mailed questionnaires to travelers. Their usable rate of return, which they considered very good, was 40.5% (9, p. 2).

Test for State Bias of Questionnaire Returns

Did the returns have a geographical bias? Were individuals from some states more willing to return the questionnaire than residents of other states? This question was put to a statistical test.

The first step was to reject all state addresses of questionnaires which were returned unclaimed by the postal authorities. The remaining addresses in the sample were arranged according to the state of origin. Alongside was entered the actual number of returns from each state and the expected number of returns from each state. The deviations from the expected were noted. The $\chi^2$ goodness of fit test as outlined by Snedecor (21, ch. 1) was used to test the hypothesis that the returns did not
feature geographical bias. The calculated $\chi^2$ was 10.21. Tabular $\chi^2$ at
the 5% level of significance, 17 d.f., was 27.59. The hypothesis that no
geographical bias exists was not rejected.

The areas contributing the most to the $\chi^2$ measure of deviation were
the adjacent states, California, and Canada. The adjacent states' and
Canada's residents replied in less numbers than expected and California's
residents replied in greater numbers than expected.

Sampling Technique

The sample universe consisted of all out-of-state occupants during
August, 1964, of all motels located in cities and towns along U. S. High-
way 20 in Iowa. A stratified, systematic, self-weighting sample of motel
rooms was drawn with all out-of-state occupants of these rooms during
August, 1964, being included in the sample.\footnote{The systematic sample used in this survey was suggested by Professor N. V. Strand of the Iowa State University Statistics Department.}

Four geographic strata were formed. These strata were approximately
equal-sized in terms of number of motel rooms. Within each stratum the
motels were ordered by size according to the number of rooms. A systematic
sample of seven motels was selected with probability proportional to size
(again, in terms of number of rooms). Within each sample motel, four
rooms were selected in a random manner (several motels were large enough
to enter the sample twice, allowing selection of eight rooms within the
motel). All August, 1964, out-of-state occupants of these selected rooms
were mailed questionnaires.
A minimum of 300 usable replies (i.e. replies that were sufficiently complete and consistent to require, at most, only minor editing) was desired. The determination of the sample size necessary to yield this number of replies was based on preliminary estimates of the number of motels and motel rooms, the number of August out-of-state occupancies per room, and the expected return rate of usable replies. The over-all sampling rate was .013. The sample was self-weighting in terms of motel rooms and occupancies (i.e. each room and each August occupancy had an equal chance of being drawn in the sample); however, since an individual could have occupied more than one room in the universe sampled during August, 1964, the sample was not self-weighting in terms of occupants. The probability of an individual being selected in the sample was proportional to the number of different rooms he occupied during the month.

A total of 1,257 questionnaires were mailed which yielded 558 usable replies. The minimum of 300 replies was exceeded because more travelers responded than had been anticipated.
DATA AND ANALYSIS

Travel Party

Trip purpose

Any out-of-state persons traveling together are considered a group. For the purpose of tabulation "group" is synonymous with "travel party", "party", or "carload". Included within this definition are such diverse combinations as a family of five vacationing, three women traveling together, four college students crossing the state, or one businessman making his calls.

All groups in the sample were separated into subdivisions, hereafter abbreviated SD, according to the purpose of their trip in Iowa. Many of the survey tabulations were carried out using the following classifications:

(SD I) Business only All groups who were in Iowa only for the purpose of conducting business affairs were included in this subdivision. These groups might have visited friends and relatives, included children, or picnicked in our state parks; but they did not include these things in the purpose for their trip in Iowa. Of the 558 usable returns, 158 or 28.3% were classified SD I.

(SD II) Tourists passing through Groups in this subdivision were passing through Iowa. They could have visited friends or relatives, vacationed in Iowa, or even attended a convention or engaged in any other business activities. But these groups indicated that business was not their only reason for being in Iowa. Three hundred five groups (54.7%) were tourists passing through.
Tourists, Iowa destination

The groups in this subdivision identified Iowa as their final destination. Their purpose could have been vacationing in Iowa, visiting friends or relatives, or even conducting business affairs, if business was not their only purpose. SD III was the smallest of the subdivisions, including 95 groups, 17.0% of the total usable returns.

Tourists

SD IV is the sum of SD II and SD III, including all visitors not having business as their sole reason for being in Iowa. Visitors in this subdivision could have checked business as one of their reasons, but it could not be their only reason.

For the purpose of this thesis SD IV provides the narrow definition of "tourist" as an out-of-state person whose reason for traveling in Iowa is not singularly business. Four hundred \((305 + 95)\) groups (71.7% of the total usable returns) were tourists.

Figure 1 shows the distribution of travelers by purpose of their trip.

Composition of travel party

Table 1 shows the composition and average size of surveyed travel groups in Iowa during August, 1964.

A group has been previously defined as a party or as a carload of travelers. Mentioned in a previous section was the Highway Commission Origin and Destination survey compiled by the Iowa Development Commission (14). Based on their data, the estimated figure for travelers per automobile for out-of-state travelers planning to stay in a motel during the
Figure 1. Distribution of travelers by purpose of trip
summer months was 3.00. At the .05 level of significance the over-all estimate of 2.98 per car in table 2 is not significantly different from 3.00.

TABLE 1. Group composition of surveyed travel groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Children under 16</th>
<th>People per group</th>
<th>Standard error people per group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD I</td>
<td>Business only</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD II</td>
<td>Tourists, passing through</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD III</td>
<td>Tourists, Iowa destination</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD IV</td>
<td>All tourists</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>All travelers</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Iowa estimates can be compared with several nearby states. Michigan, for example, compiled persons per group averages from tourist information centers located on various incoming Michigan highways (18). Very few, if any, businessmen would stop at such information centers. Their tourist statistics should be comparable with SD IV or tourists. Iowa's 3.53 tourists per group is not significantly different (.05 level of significance) from Michigan's 3.48 (18, p.95) people per group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of individuals per group</th>
<th>SD I Business only</th>
<th>SD II Tourists, passing through</th>
<th>SD III Tourists, Iowa destination</th>
<th>SD IV All tourists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total groups (% Base)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 gives a more detailed breakdown of group composition, indicating the distribution of groups by number of individuals and purpose of trip. For example, table 2 shows that 202 tourist groups (51%) did not include children and 105 business groups (68.1%) consisted of only one person.

The modal number of persons per group for SD I, business only, is one person. One hundred five business groups consisted of only one person. The modal number tourists is two. Three hundred ninety seven tourist groups consisted of two persons.

Income of travel party

Table three classifies groups by income and main purpose in Iowa. Very few respondents (3.3%) failed to indicate their income.

The modal income of business groups is slightly higher than the modal income of tourists. The business incomes are concentrated in $10,000 and up brackets, whereas the tourist incomes are evenly spread throughout the $5,000 and up brackets.

These figures can be compared with available national statistics. The advance report of the 1963 census of Transportation Passenger Survey, National Travel Summary (26, p.21), has data which, with appropriate interpolation, can be compared with the estimates presented in table 3. The interpolation was carried out according to a method outlined by Kahn (15, p.161). Although the national figures are for 1963 and our information was gathered in 1964, the differences between consecutive years should be negligible.
TABLE 3. Annual income of family or individual receiving questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Business only SD I</th>
<th>Tourist, passing through SD II</th>
<th>Tourist, Iowa destination SD III</th>
<th>All tourists SD IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4,999</td>
<td>7 (4.4%)</td>
<td>35 (11.5%)</td>
<td>8 (8.4%)</td>
<td>43 (10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-7,489</td>
<td>20 (12.7%)</td>
<td>59 (19.4%)</td>
<td>26 (27.4%)</td>
<td>85 (21.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500-9,999</td>
<td>29 (18.4%)</td>
<td>72 (23.6%)</td>
<td>20 (21.1%)</td>
<td>92 (23.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,010-14,999</td>
<td>56 (35.5%)</td>
<td>61 (20.0%)</td>
<td>28 (29.5%)</td>
<td>89 (22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-up</td>
<td>39 (24.7%)</td>
<td>65 (21.3%)</td>
<td>12 (12.6%)</td>
<td>77 (19.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>7 (4.4%)</td>
<td>13 (4.3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>14 (3.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Base)</td>
<td>158 (100%)</td>
<td>305 (100%)</td>
<td>95 (100%)</td>
<td>400 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 compares the national survey with the Iowa survey. The Iowa survey supposedly included only motel patrons. But because travelers mixed their modes of lodging, the Iowa survey also included individuals who had spent nights in the homes of friends and relatives or in other lodging. The national survey included all travelers using commercial lodging. The diverse definitions of the populations preclude statistical tests determining relationships between the two sets of data.

Time in Iowa during August, 1964

Table 4 indicates the number of nights groups spent in Iowa. The groups in each category are expressed as a percentage of respondents in order to facilitate comparison:

SD I Business groups About 60% of the 'business only' groups
Figure 2. Income distribution: Iowa survey compared with national survey
### TABLE 4. Distribution of groups by purpose and number of nights in Iowa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nights in Iowa</th>
<th>SD I Business only</th>
<th>SD II Tourist, passing through</th>
<th>SD III Tourist, Iowa destination</th>
<th>SD IV All tourists</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(14.6%)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>(59.1%)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(16.0%)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>(28.2%)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(13.2%)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(6.0%)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(16.0%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1.7%)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(9.0%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(4.9%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(3.5%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(20.1%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondents (Base)**
- Total: 158
- Respondents: 144
- Non-Respondents: 14

**Total Respondents:** 538
stayed 4 nights or less, with the modal number of nights being 2 and 4. The average number of nights spent in Iowa was 5.7. The businessmen on long sales trips in their Iowa territory and the businessmen who made frequent trips during August helped boost the mean well over the mode.

**SD II Tourists, passing through** 95% of the tourists who indicated they were passing through Iowa stayed four nights or less. The modal number of nights was one. Fifty nine per cent indicated they had remained only one night. Eighty five, 28.2%, stayed in Iowa two nights during August. This is about half the number of groups staying one night. Groups without an Iowa destination did not spend additional days at one place, but remained for the night and passed through. Upon closely checking the questionnaires of groups staying two nights it was found that the majority of them did not spend both nights at a single location. If they did, it was generally because they had returned through the same city.

**SD III Tourists, Iowa destination** Tourists with an Iowa destination presented a significantly different pattern. Thirty four, 36.6%, stayed two nights in Iowa. This is double the number that remained one night.

Sixty nine, 74.2%, of the tourists with an Iowa destination remained in the state four nights or less. The average length of stay or mean stay was 3.7 days and the modal stay was two days.

**SD IV All tourists** Combining the last two purpose classifications, SD II and SD III, the average for all tourists was determined.

Four hundred forty one, 82%, of the tourists in the survey remained in Iowa four days or less, with 215, 40%, staying one night. The average
length of stay for all tourists was 2.2 nights. The modal length of stay was one night. The average length of stay for all tourists in another bridge state, North Dakota, was also 2.2 nights (22, p.20).

Expenditures

An American Automobile Association survey showed that vacation expenditures remained unchanged from two years ago. "While enroute by passenger car, two people can travel comfortably on a daily budget of $31 for necessity spending." AAA broke down the budget as follows: $10.50 for meals and snacks; $11.00 for lodging; $7.00 for gas and oil, and $2.50 for tips and miscellaneous (28, p.7).

How much money do travelers spend in Iowa? Do they spend more per day if they stay longer? How is the traveler’s dollar split among available activities? How do their expenditures in Iowa compare with their expenditures in other states? These questions are answered in this section.

Total expenditures were split into five categories: lodging, food, automobile, retail stores and recreation. Lodging and food expenditures were small for several groups because they didn’t spend every night in commercial lodging, but rather in private homes and/or camping facilities. Automobile expenditures included all costs associated with the car, even tires and repairs. The recreation expenditures category left quite a wide range for interpretation. Retail stores expenditures was more explicit.

Respondents indicated the number of nights they stayed in Iowa. It has been assumed that staying one night in Iowa required staying one day
in Iowa. Expenditures in this thesis are reported on a per day basis.

**Average daily per person expenditures**

Figure 3 displays the daily per person expenditures. The average expenditure figures were rounded off to the nearest quarter dollar. Any attempt to make finer estimates is unnecessary. Most travelers did not report costs to the nearest cent.

Figure 3a shows average daily per-person expenditures by business groups. Average outlay per day was $20. Eighty four per cent of their spending was for lodging, food, and auto, with only 16% for recreation and retail store items. The business people spent three times more on recreation than they spent in retail stores.

Figure 3b shows the daily per-person expenditures by tourists passing through. These tourists spent $9.50 daily per person. Ninety per cent of their daily expenditures were for lodging, food, and auto. Ten per cent of their daily outlay was for recreation and retail store items. The split between recreation and retail store items was even, 5% for each.

Figure 3c shows the daily per-person expenditures for the tourists with an Iowa destination. The average daily outlay per person was $8.75. Seventy five per cent of this, $6.50 per person, was spent for lodging, food and auto. Twenty five per cent of their expenditures were for recreation and retail store items. The split between recreation and retail stores was almost even, with 11% spent for recreation and 14% spent in retail stores.

Figure 3d shows the daily per person expenditures by all tourists. The average daily outlay was $9.50. Eight dollars, 84%, was spent for
Figure 3. Average expenditures per person per day

**SD I - BUSINESS ONLY**

$20.00

- **food**: $6.00 (30%)
- **auto**: $3.75 (19%)
- **recreation**: $2.50 (12.5%)
- **lodging**: $7.00 (35%)

**SD II - TOURISTS PASSING THROUGH**

$9.50

- **food**: $3.00 (32%)
- **auto**: $2.00 (21%)
- **lodging**: $3.50 (37%)
- **recreation**: $0.50 (5%)

**SD III - TOURISTS, IOWA DESTINATION**

$8.75

- **food**: $2.50 (29%)
- **auto**: $1.50 (17%)
- **recreation**: $1.00 (11%)
- **lodging**: $2.50 (29%)
- **retail stores**: $1.25 (14%)

**SD IV - ALL TOURISTS**

$9.50

- **food**: $3.00 (32%)
- **auto**: $1.75 (18%)
- **recreation**: $0.75 (8%)
- **lodging**: $3.25 (34%)
- **retail stores**: $0.75 (8%)
lodging, food, and auto. Sixteen per cent or $1.50, was spent in retail stores or for recreation. Spending in retail stores matched spending for recreation, 8% each of total daily expenditures.

It is apparent from figure 3 that daily lodging expenditures by tourists with an Iowa destination were lower than lodging outlays by tourists passing through. This can be easily explained. Tourists with an Iowa destination often stayed in the homes of friends and relatives for a few nights, thereby reducing their average daily lodging costs. This same reason also accounts for their relatively lower food expenditures. Not all of their meals were served in restaurants, but rather many were served in the homes of these same friends and relatives. Many of the Iowa destined groups picnicked, a much higher percentage than those passing through. Picnicking also tended to decrease their food expenditures. Another section of this thesis offers statistical evidence substantiating an inverse relationship between tourists average daily expenditures and length of stay.

Tourist per-person automobile costs cannot adequately be contrasted with business individuals' automobile costs because of the large differences in group size. Comparisons are valid when discussing group expenditures. But daily auto expense comparisons between classes of tourists are valid at this level.

Tourists with an Iowa destination spent less per day for automobile costs, although the difference was not significant at the .05 level. There was a tendency on their part to stay longer in one place than those passing through, running their cars less than 300 miles per day. This difference is borne out in the travel party comparisons in a following section.
The major differences between expenditures occurred in the two remaining cost categories, recreation and retail store items. Business individuals' recreation expenditures were more than triple their outlay in retail stores.

This contrasts sharply with the rest of the travelers in Iowa. The tourists reported their spending was evenly divided between the two items. The cash outlay by tourists just passing through was about half the outlay by tourists with an Iowa destination.

**Average daily group expenditures**

Figure 4 shows daily expenditures for SD I - business only, SD II - all tourists, passing through, SD III - tourists, Iowa destination and SD IV - all tourists. To facilitate comparison between classes of travelers, the individual expense figures are expressed as a percentage of total daily expenditures.

It is possible to compare automobile costs at the group level because group has been assumed to be synonymous with carload. It was found that business groups and tourist groups with an Iowa destination had similar daily automobile costs. This could have been due to the similarities in their travel routes as depicted on the questionnaire map. In other words they did not travel as many miles per day as travelers passing through Iowa. There was no significant difference (.05 level) between the auto expenditures of business groups and tourist groups with an Iowa destination.

The average daily group automobile expenditures of travelers passing through Iowa was $7.00. This is identical to the American Automobile
Figure 4. Average daily group expenditures
Fig. 4a

SD I - BUSINESS ONLY
($31.75)

Fig. 4b

SD II - TOURIST, PASSING THROUGH
($34.00)

Fig. 4c

SD III - TOURIST, IOWA DESTINATION
($32.00)

Fig. 4d

SD IV - ALL TOURISTS
($33.00)
Association's gas and oil estimate of $7.00 per day for the typical traveling vacationer (28, p.7).

Average total group and individual expenditures in Iowa during August, 1964

Figure 5 shows how much money the groups spent in Iowa during August, 1964. Figure 6 shows how much money the individuals spent in Iowa during August, 1964. Those traveling in Iowa for business reasons spent the most, per person and per group, during August, 1964. The average was $115 per person for the month. Tourists with an Iowa destination averaged $33.25 per person and $121.00 per group in Iowa during the surveyed month. Tourists passing through spent on the average $20.25 per person and $71.50 per group in Iowa during the surveyed month.

It is apparent from figures 5 and 6 that the business groups spent much more during August than any other set of groups. It is also apparent that the Iowa-destined tourists spent more in Iowa's retail stores than the other two sets of groups. These estimates could be regarded as an indication of the additional revenue Iowa could expect from encouraging different types of travelers.

Percentage of Iowa expenditures by class of traveler

Figure 7 shows the percentage of expenditures in Iowa during August, 1964, attributable to the classes of travelers.¹ For example, figure 7 shows that tourists passing through Iowa (72% of the travelers) accounted for only 16% of all money spent for recreation by travelers in the survey.

¹To facilitate comparisons, figure 7a repeats the distribution of travelers shown in figure 2.
Figure 5. Total group expenditures in Iowa during August, 1964
Fig. 5a
SD I - BUSINESS ONLY
($179.00)

Fig. 5b
SD II - TOURISTS, PASSING THROUGH
($57.25)

Fig. 5c
SD III - TOURISTS, IOWA DESTINATION
($121.00)

Fig. 5d
SD IV - TOURISTS
($71.50)
Figure 6. Total per person expenditures in Iowa during August, 1964
Fig. 6a
SD I - BUSINESS ONLY
($115.50)

Fig. 6b
SD II - TOURISTS, PASSING THROUGH
($16.25)

Fig. 6c
SD III - TOURISTS, IOWA DESTINATION
($33.25)

Fig. 6d
SD IV - ALL TOURISTS
($20.25)
Figure 7. Percentage of expenditures by class of traveler

SD I  = Business only
SD II = Tourists, passing through
SD III = Tourists, Iowa destination
SD IV = All tourists
recreation
SD III (23%)
SD I (61%)
SD IV (16%)

Fig. 7b

food
SD III (18%)
SD I (50%)
SD II (32%)

Fig. 7e

lodging
SD III (17%)
SD I (50%)
SD II (33%)

Fig. 7d

retail stores
SD III (43%)
SD I (30%)
SD II (27%)
SD IV (20%)

Fig. 7c

distribution of travelers
SD III (17%)
SD I (28%)
SD II (55%)

Fig. 7a

automobile
SD III (19%)
SD I (47%)
SD II (34%)

Fig. 7f

total expenditures
SD III (20%)
SD I (49%)
SD II (31%)

Fig. 7g
Half of the August lodging expenditures were made by business groups. One-third of the lodging expenses were attributable to tourists who were passing through. The remainder of lodging expenses, 17 per cent, were attributable to tourists with an Iowa destination. Total expenditures for lodging, food, and automobile were split evenly between the business groups and tourist groups.

It has been demonstrated in a previous section that business groups spent more for recreation than other groups. This figure shows that 61% of the total recreation expenses reported in this survey were by business groups.

Forty-three per cent of the expenditures in retail stores by the sampled out-of-state travelers were made by tourists with an Iowa destination. These tourists represented only 17% of the total sample.

Relationship between expenditures and income, time in Iowa, and people per group

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to investigate the significance of relationships between average daily group expenditures and certain characteristics of the travel groups.

The five different classes of expenditures (lodging, food, auto, recreation, and retail stores) and total expenditures are expressed as linear functions of group length of stay in Iowa, income, and number of persons per group. The general sample regression equation is

\[ Y_{i,j,k} = a_{jk} + b_{jk1}X_{1k1} + b_{jk2}X_{1k2} + b_{jk3}X_{1k3} \]

where \( i = 1, \ldots, n \) ... groups
\( j = 1, \ldots, 6 \) ... Expenditures
The $Y_{1jk}$'s denote expenditures as dependent variables and the $X_{1kl}$'s denote independent variables. The first subscript, $i$, represents the $i$th group in the sample. The second subscript, $j$, indicates the type of expenditures. $k$ assigns the equation to one of the three group purpose classifications where 1 is business only, 2 is tourist passing through, and 3 is tourist with an Iowa destination. $l$ identifies the independent variables described below. The $a_{jk}$ and $b_{jkl}$ values are the parameters to be estimated.

**Dependent variables:**

- $Y_{11k}$ = daily group lodging expenditure
- $Y_{12k}$ = daily group food expenditure
- $Y_{13k}$ = daily group auto expenditure
- $Y_{14k}$ = daily group recreation expenditure
- $Y_{15k}$ = daily group retail stores expenditure
- $Y_{16k}$ = total daily group expenditure

**Independent variables:**

- $X_{1kl}$ = income
- $X_{1k2}$ = nights in Iowa
- $X_{1k3}$ = people per group

For example, $Y_{112}$ represents the daily amount spent for lodging by the 1th tourist group passing through Iowa, and $X_{113}$ represents the number of persons in the 1th business group.

**Hypotheses**

The hypotheses tested were that daily group expenditures ($Y_{1jk}$) changed with length of stay, changed as income increased, and changed as the number of people per group increased.

\[^1X_{1kl} is a coded value.\]
Data and tests  Table 5 shows the over-all significance of each regression equation, the multiple $R^2$ for each equation, the $b$ values for the independent variables, and the calculated $t$ for each $b$ value.

The F-ratio tests whether or not there is a significant linear relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. The multiple $R^2$ shows the percentage of variation in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent variables. The $b$ values indicate the dollar change in expenditures per unit change in the independent variable. The sign of $b$ indicates the direction of change in expenditures with an increase in the independent variables.

The $t$ value discloses whether or not $b$ is significantly different from zero. If the $t$ test indicates the $b$ value is significantly different from zero, then with a high probability a relationship exists between the particular independent variable and the expenditure.

The asterisk(s) after certain numbers in table 5 indicate the degree of significance. One asterisk signifies 95% assurance that a definite relationship exists, and two asterisks signify 99% assurance that a definite relationship exists.

Conclusions  Interpretation of the data and conclusions are presented in three sections, each section consisting of the results from six equations as shown in table 5.

SD I Business only  None of the $b_{jk1}$ or $b_{jk2}$ values were significantly different from zero, indicating income and number of nights in Iowa of business groups did not affect their expenditures.
TABLE 5. Expenditures: Results of regression analysis and tests of significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Multiple R-Square</th>
<th>(Xik1) Income (Xik1)</th>
<th>(Xik2) Nights in Iowa</th>
<th>(Xik3) People per group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bjk1</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>bjk2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD I - Business only (112 df)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y111) Lodging</td>
<td>25.492**</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>-031</td>
<td>-115</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y121) Food</td>
<td>19.294**</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>1.353</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y131) Auto</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>1.252</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y141) Recreation</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y151) Retail stores</td>
<td>1.852</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>1.581</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y161) Total</td>
<td>13.416**</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>1.379</td>
<td>-.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD II - Tourists, passing through (256 df)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y112) Lodging</td>
<td>45.479**</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>1.212</td>
<td>5.847**</td>
<td>-1.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y122) Food</td>
<td>32.684**</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>6.218**</td>
<td>-.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y132) Auto</td>
<td>11.045**</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>-.1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y142) Recreation</td>
<td>6.817**</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y152) Retail stores</td>
<td>1.382</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>-.385</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y162) Total</td>
<td>31.023**</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>2.687</td>
<td>5.075**</td>
<td>-2.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD III - Tourists, Iowa destination (64 df)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y113) Lodging</td>
<td>8.523**</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>1.259</td>
<td>1.847</td>
<td>-1.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y123) Food</td>
<td>4.591*</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>1.821</td>
<td>-.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y133) Auto</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>-.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y143) Recreation</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>-.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y153) Retail Stores</td>
<td>1.553</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.455</td>
<td>-.604</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y163) Total</td>
<td>5.643*</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>2.464</td>
<td>1.442</td>
<td>-2.167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level
A significant linear relationship (.01 level) exists between the number of people per group and average daily group lodging and food expenditures. The more people per group, the higher the food and lodging expenditures.

Note that the number of people per group had no significant effect on spending in retail stores and expenditures for recreation.

SD II Tourists, passing through The income of tourists passing through Iowa had a significant influence on the amount of money they spent for lodging and food. Tourists with a higher income tended to spend more for these items. Group expenditures for food and lodging increased significantly as the size of the group increased.

The length of stay, nights in Iowa, had a significant influence on all expenditures. The expenditures for lodging, food, and auto decreased with an increase of time in Iowa. This could indicate that these groups traveling through did not occupy a motel room each night, but rather, stayed in the homes of friends or relatives, decreasing their average daily expenditures for lodging and food.

The significant decrease in average daily automobile expenditures would seem to indicate that the tourists who were passing through but chose to remain in Iowa longer than one night did not extensively tour the state.

Also significant was the increase in daily recreation and retail store expenditures relative to an increase in time spent in Iowa.

SD III Tourists, Iowa destination Income of tourists with an Iowa destination did not have a significant effect on their expenditures. But at the .01 level of significance, the length of time in Iowa was
related inversely to lodging and food expenditures. As nights in Iowa increased, expenditures on these two items decreased. Many of these groups could have stayed in the homes of friends or relatives. A few could have been camping and had decided to spend a few rainy nights in a motel.

Automobile expenditures of these groups did not significantly decrease with an increase in time in Iowa. Coupling this with the average daily auto expenditure by groups, $5.50, it can be concluded that these groups did not confine their visit to one location but moved about the state.

All travelers    Automobile expenditures were not significantly affected by income or persons per group. The size of the group did not significantly influence recreation or retail store expenditures. Generally, the longer the tourists remained in Iowa, the lower their average daily expenditures for lodging, food, and auto, and the higher their daily expenditures for recreation and retail store items.

Averaging methods

The average daily expenditures used in this section are weighed means, the weight for each group or person being the number of nights spent in Iowa. For example, a group staying 15 nights and spending $10.00 per night for lodging would be the same in averaging as 15 groups each staying one night and spending $10.00. The advantage of this method becomes apparent in the following section where expenditures are extrapolated to include the entire state. Group days were determined and the total expenditures were found by multiplying group-days by average expenditures.
Extrapolation of tourist expenditures

In the past various attempts have been made to assess the economic impact of tourists in a given region. "Tourist", "tourist industry", and "vacation travel" are rather ambiguous terms. Because they are difficult to pin down, there are many methods of measuring the impact of tourists. One method often used as a starting point is the measurement of tourist expenditures. There are many approaches to these measurements once a 'tourist expenditure' and 'tourist' have been defined.

One of the most common methods has been to sample 'tourists', obtaining estimates of their expenditures. Then these averages have been expanded to an entire state or region, based on an estimate of the number of cars entering or leaving.

But as stated above, the expenditures are merely a starting point in determining the impact. As pointed out in a government publication (24, p.16), "approximately 80% of direct tourist expenditures has gone into what are sometimes called the "primary travel-serving business". These businesses included commercial lodging, gasoline service stations, etc.

The income generated by the original tourist expenditures goes beyond the obvious moneys spent in these primary travel-serving businesses. These businesses spend their tourist income money for supplies, labor, and other expenses, bringing about a second round of income. So the income ultimately generated by the initial tourist expenditure is more than the expenditure itself; and through the chain of expenditures, the tourist's spending will ultimately affect most businesses to some degree.

One factor to consider in the over-all economic impact would be the change in employment which would result from the change in the state or
regional income. Another factor to consider would be the change in tax revenues resulting from the change in income.

No attempt will be made to assess the last three factors. An attempt will be made to determine the total-state wide expenditures of tourists who remained at least one night in a motel in Iowa during August 1964.

**Assumptions** Extrapolating expenditures figures to the state level required several assumptions. It was assumed $33 per day was the actual average. It was assumed the sample was not biased and the respondents were representative of the population. The crucial assumption allowing extrapolation of the survey data to the entire state was based on the high correlation between the origin of tourists in the Highway Commission-Iowa Development Commission survey (14) (encompassed the entire state) and the origin of tourists in this survey (included only tourists who stayed in motels along U. S. Highway 20 in Iowa). Page 46 of this thesis reviews the legitimacy of this assumption.

**Data** In the second section of this thesis it was stated that 112 units or rooms were surveyed, and 1,257 out-of-state names were obtained; of which, based on the return, 71.7% or 901 were tourists. It follows, then, that 901/112 or 8 was the number of groups of tourists per unit during August. The total expenditures per unit for August is the number of groups of tourists per unit for August, 8, times the average expenditure per day, $33, or $264. According to the author's tabulation of the Iowa Department of Agriculture motel licensing records, there were approximately 13,870 available motel rooms or units. The estimate of August, 1964, expenditures in Iowa by the group of tourists as previously defined
(those who stayed at least one August night in an Iowa motel) is $3,661,680.

**Comments** Although the 3 2/3 million figure is small when compared with other states, one must remember the restrictions which limited the definition of tourist. The figure for August would be much larger if we could have included tourists who did not stay in motels. Also, the figure would have been much larger if all out-of-state travelers had been included and not just the tourists.

To put 3 2/3 million dollars in perspective, Iowa's personal income for 1964 was 6,548 million dollars (25, p.10), which when divided by 12 to arrive at a comparable August figure, is 546 million dollars.

Considering the restrictive assumptions, the total figure of $3,661,680 should not be regarded as a final estimate, but rather, an estimate which will suffice until a more exhaustive survey can be completed.

**State Origin and Destination of Out-of-State Travelers**

**State origin of tourist groups**

Figure 8 shows the percentage distribution of the sampled tourists according to their home state.

Almost one-half of the tourists resided in an adjacent state. It was quite likely that Illinois, Missouri, Wisconsin, or Minnesota residents crossed portions of Iowa on their way to the Black Hills, Yellowstone Park, California, or other points west. It was possible that Nebraska and South Dakota residents traveling east and Illinois, Missouri, and Nebraska residents destined to the lake country of the north, crossed the state.
Figure 8. State origin of tourists
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Other states contributing 4.5% or more were Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan. Iowa and U. S. Highway 20 form a natural bridge to the west from these three states.

California contributed 7.2% of the tourists in the sample. Only 10% of these tourists considered Iowa their destination. California does not fit into the logical geographical pattern as do the adjacent states. Several reasons are offered to justify this. First, California is the most populous state in the union. So regardless of its geographical position, when compared with less populous states, one could expect proportionally more travelers crossing Iowa. Secondly, it has been humorously stated that there is no such thing as a native Californian. Of course this isn't true, but it reflects the fact that many people have left their respective home states and moved to California, more so than to many other areas. Many of these people return to visit their former homes and, Iowa being a bridge state, many of them traveled across Iowa.

Over 20% of the tourists in the sample were from Illinois, almost three times the number from any other state: Two-thirds of the tourists from Illinois were passing through and one-third listed Iowa as their destination.

**State origin of business groups**

Figure 9 shows the percentage of total business groups from each of the states. Approximately seventy-eight per cent of all business groups in the sample were from adjacent states and an additional 15.9% were Ohio, Indiana, Colorado, Kansas, and North Dakota; all states within a 325 mile radius of Iowa.
Figure 9. State origin of business groups
Illinois was the leader in supplying business groups with 30.4% of the total, over one and one-half as many groups as any other state.

**Comparison of motel survey with traffic data**

In 1961 and 1962 the Research and Statistics Division of the Iowa Development Commission analyzed the 1960-1961 Iowa State Highway Commission Origin and Destination survey data. They have listed the number of out-of-state vehicles from each state on an average summer weekday, the occupants of which were on vacation and planning to stay overnight in Iowa. The state figures were expressed as a percentage of all out-of-state groups in Iowa on vacation (14).

The definition of group in the context of this motel survey is synonymous with carload or vehicle. It is reasonable to assume that the origin pattern of Iowa's out-of-state visitors would not change significantly over a few years. With these two assumptions in mind, the motor vehicle data was compared with the data from the motel survey, using simple correlation as outlined by Snedecor (21, ch.7). Table 6 shows the comparison between the two sets of data.

The correlation between the two sets of data is .97, which is highly significant. To further test, a simple regression model was used:

\[ M_1 = \alpha + BH_1 + E \]

where \( M_1 \) is the state origin percentage from the motel survey and \( H_1 \) is the state origin percentage from the Highway survey. The hypotheses tested were \( \alpha = 0 \) and \( B = 1 \) vs. \( \alpha \neq 0 \) and \( B \neq 1 \). The hypotheses were not rejected at the .05 level of significance. This, coupled with the highly significant correlation coefficient indicates the motel sample does not feature a significant state bias and can be considered as
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Motel %</th>
<th>Hwy %</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Motel %</th>
<th>Hwy %</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Motel %</th>
<th>Hwy %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 6. Comparison of motel and highway origin surveys
representative of the state. The acceptance of these hypotheses justified
the assumption which allowed the sampled area to be considered representa-
tive of the state and further, allowed expenditures to be extrapolated
to the state level.

Tourist destinations

Figure 10 shows the destinations of all tourists by states expressed
as a percentage of 400, the total number of tourists in the sample. Al-
most one-fourth of the tourists in the sample considered Iowa their desti-
nation. The remaining 75% of the tourists were passing through. Fifteen
of the tourists in the sample specifically indicated the Black Hills or
Yellowstone National Park as their destination and an additional 7.5%
listed South Dakota or Wyoming, as their destination; for a total of
23.5% for South Dakota and Wyoming. The only other area which stands out
from the rest as a major tourist destination is Minnesota. 11.25% of the
tourists in the sample indicated Minnesota as their destination.

One must remember that the sample consisted only of tourists who
remained at least one night in motels in Iowa during August, 1964. Accord-
ing to the previously mentioned Iowa Development Commission's statistical
analysis, only about 16% of the tourists crossing the state remained over-
night (14).

The high percentage for South Dakota and Wyoming could be expected;
not only because of the tremendous drawing power of these states' major
tourist attractions, but because of the location of Iowa and sample motels.
U. S. Highway 20 is a favorite route for tourists east of Iowa traveling
to these natural attractions. Highway 20 also leads directly to and
through Yellowstone National Park in Wyoming.

There is a difference between Minnesota and Wisconsin (3.75%), both states richly endowed with natural tourist attractions of a similar nature. This difference can be partially explained by Iowa’s geographical position directly below Minnesota.

The reader is cautioned to reserve conclusions from this map due to the nature of possibly equivocal returns. The question in the questionnaire could have been answered in many ways. For example, a tourist party from Ohio traveling through the Black Hills of South Dakota, Yellowstone Park, and California, and traveling across Iowa twice in the process, had several alternative destinations to enter on their questionnaire. This particular group could have reported any of the areas visited, or in a probable instance, could have reported their destination as home, Ohio. Others could have traveled through Iowa only on their trip home but listed 'Black Hills' or 'Fisheye, Minnesota' as their destination.

Knowledge of Selected Iowa Attractions

Seven Iowa attractions were included in the questionnaire (see Appendix A) with provisions for the respondents to indicate whether or not they had heard of the attraction, whether or not they had visited the attraction in the past, and whether or not they would like to visit the attraction some time in the future.

A major assumption was necessary in the compilation of the data. Many respondents checked all but one or two of the attractions. It was assumed that a person who skipped one, or several, but answered the rest had not heard of the attraction.
In order to arrive at more representable estimates, it was decided to base the various percentages on the number of respondents. A respondent is defined as one who had answered one of the possibilities for at least one of the attractions.

Figure 11 shows the number of tourists and number of business groups who had previous knowledge, who had visited, and who would like to visit the listed attraction, expressed as a percentage of respondents.

"An Iowa Vacation Farm" was included to give some indication or feeling for possibilities of expansion into the vacation farm field. In the United States there are very few vacation farms or farms which are open to the public. There are only several in Iowa.

The tabulations for Iowa Vacation Farm showed that 31.2% of the tourists had heard of it, but only 27.3% of the business groups had heard of it. This contrasts with the other 'have heard' tabulations, where business groups dominated. Many respondents skipped this attraction while answering others. A few people had entered "I was born on a farm" or "My father was a farmer." It is possible that respondents confused commercial vacation farms with farms in general.

Hoover's birthplace was the most familiar attraction listed. Almost 80% of the tourists indicated they had heard of Hoover's Birthplace, although a few volunteered that they didn't realize it was in Iowa. The Amana Colonies proved to be almost as well known as Hoover's Birthplace. In view of the fact that several admitted they didn't know Hoover's Birthplace was in Iowa, the Amana Colonies might well be the best known of the listed attractions.
Figure 11. Attractions
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Figure 11. Attractions

Fig. 11b. Percentage having visited attraction

Fig. 11c. Percentage who would like to visit attraction
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The Amana Colonies were by far the most frequented of the seven attractions. Almost half of the business groups and about one-fourth of the tourists had visited there at one time or another.

Figure 11b shows that a greater proportion of the business individuals have visited the various attractions.

Figure 11c shows the percentage of respondents indicating a desire to visit the selected attractions at some time in the future. The returns indicated the tourists were more interested in seeing the attractions than were the business groups. Over one-fourth of the tourists expressed an interest in visiting the two most popular attractions, Hoover's Birthplace and the Amana Colonies.

Factors Motivating Tourists to Visit Iowa

The tourists in the sample were asked to indicate those things which helped them make the decision to travel in Iowa. Sixty-six per cent indicated they traveled in Iowa because it was their 'best route'. This could mean almost anything, depending on the individual's definition of 'best route'. Twenty-nine per cent of the tourists stated they were in Iowa to visit friends. This seemed to be the largest single factor, aside from 'best route', influencing tourists to visit Iowa.

Eight and one-half per cent of the tourists indicated business was one of their reasons for visiting Iowa, but that business was not their only reason. Two per cent of the tourists were attending a meeting or convention in Iowa.

The second part of the question four on the questionnaire (see Appendix A), "I was influenced by tourist promotion," etc., was devised
in order to find out what affect, if any, different types of promotion or state advertising have had on the public.

It was stated in the introduction that at the time of this survey Iowa as a state unit had been doing virtually no out-of-state tourist advertising. As a result, it is understandable that only 2.5% of the tourists were influenced by a magazine advertisement or story, and none of the tourists were influenced by a radio or television advertisement or story. This indicates the effectiveness or quantity of private Iowa promotion.

Friends and relatives have promotional effect. Ten per cent of the tourists maintained they were influenced by tourist promotion originating from friends or relatives. With the available data it was not possible to separate the extent to which the tourists were influenced by friends and relatives saying "Iowa is a great place!", "You should visit Iowa!", and the same suggesting "why not spend part of your vacation with us?" In the case of the latter, Iowa might not have been the attraction.

Twelve per cent of the tourists indicated that the American Automobile Association influenced their decision to travel in Iowa. The one in eight tourists replying on AAA information were tabulated by income. The percentage of groups using AAA information was the lowest (4.7%) for income groups under $5,000 per year and the highest (15.6%) for income groups over $15,000 per year.

The listed items on the questionnaire did not allow full expression of factors which influenced travelers to visit Iowa. Several dozen tourists added special comments concerning factors influencing them to travel in Iowa.
"We wish our children to see as many states as possible to be familiar with the country", "Want children to see Iowa", and "Wanted to see Iowa" were typical comments. Many tourists were interested because they had never seen Iowa; it was something different.

Several groups indicated they had been in Iowa at some previous time, liked the state and were on a return visit. Several others indicated they were previous residents and had returned for a visit. Additional statistics are needed to further investigate tourists' motivations and reasons for returning to Iowa. Approximately three-fourths of the tourists in the survey indicated some possibility of returning to Iowa at some time in the future.

Activities of Travelers and Their Reaction to Iowa

Activities by group purpose in Iowa

Figure 12 shows the percentage of travelers who participated in the specified activities.

For example, figure 12 indicates 32% of the 'business only' groups participated in at least one of the activities, 46% of the tourists passing through participated in at least one of the activities, and 93.7% of the tourists with an Iowa destination participated in at least one of the listed activities.

Graphing the activities in this manner facilitates comparison between the various types of travelers. It is apparent that the tourists with an Iowa destination were more apt to participate in activities than were the other travelers. It is also significant that business people participated in the selected activities; but they did not participate as much as the
Figure 12. Percentage of travelers participating in the selected activities—by purpose in Iowa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Business only SD I</th>
<th>Tourists, passing through SD II</th>
<th>Tourists, Iowa destination SD III</th>
<th>All tourists SD IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Participated in at least one of the listed activities
(2) Visited friends or relatives
(3) Visited historic sites
(4) Visited lakes
(5) Picnicked
(6) Visited state parks
(7) Hunted or fished
(8) Visited commercial attractions
(9) Played golf, etc.
tourists.

All of the activities indicated the same trend, except one. Playing golf was the exception. More businessmen played golf, 10.8% of all sampled, than any other set of groups shown on graph 9. Golf, it would seem, was a popular diversion among businessmen.

The percentages in figure 12 are not true averages. They should be viewed as lower limits of participation. Because there was no provision for "we did nothing while in Iowa", it could not be determined how many respondents skipped this section of the questionnaire but actually participated in the activities. It would be more suitable to say "at least 10% of the tourists visited lakes while in Iowa", and so on.

**Activities by income**

Figure 13 shows the same activities as figure 12, but the tourists are classified by income.

The tourists were separated into the five following annual income classifications for analysis:

- $ 0-$ 4,999  
- Lower bracket
- $ 5,000-$ 7,499  
- Lower middle bracket
- $ 5,500-$ 9,999  
- Middle bracket
- $ 10,000-$ 14,999  
- Upper middle bracket
- $ 15,000-$ up  
- Upper bracket

A general pattern of participation in activities emerged. The increasing with income trend cannot be pursued to the upper income bracket, as even a casual glance at figure 13 would indicate.

Over seventy people added their own activities to the questionnaire
Figure 13. Percentage of tourists participating in the selected activities—by income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line</th>
<th>under $5,000</th>
<th>$5,000-$7,499</th>
<th>$7,500-$9,999</th>
<th>$10,000-$14,999</th>
<th>$15,000-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Participated in at least one of the listed activities
(2) Visited friends or relatives
(3) Visited historical sites
(4) Visited lakes
(5) Picnicked
(6) Golfed, etc. and/or fished, etc.
(7) Visited commercial attractions
(8) Visited state parks
list. Many added that they had visited various Iowa attractions. The most frequently mentioned were the Amana Colonies and the Little Brown Church in the Vale at Nashua. Several interesting points were brought to view by the tourist’s own list. Iowa’s college and university campuses attracted many out-of-state visitors. A few families returned to show the children where their parents had attended school; several were interested in looking over the campuses for future prospects, while others were just interested.

Other unlisted but frequented attractions were various town and city parks which were used by the tourists for picnicking and other purposes.

**Activities travelers enjoyed in Iowa**

Table 7 shows the specified items travelers enjoyed, expressed as a percentage of respondents who did not skip question 6 on the questionnaire.

The number of respondents who skipped question 6 was assumed to be the number of respondents who skipped the entire fourth page of the questionnaire (see Appendix A) or who skipped all but the last question on the page.

The selected items were also tabulated by tourist’s income, as shown in figure 14. No over-all income trend is evident. Only the use of rest areas shows a definite decrease with higher incomes.

**Farmland scenery vs. natural scenery** Farmland scenery and natural scenery were by far the two most popular items on the list. These two items were included as a deliberate contrast. To what extent was natural
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enjoyed</th>
<th>Business only</th>
<th>Tourist, Iowa through</th>
<th>Tourist, Iowa destination</th>
<th>All tourists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>(140)</td>
<td>(270)</td>
<td>(85)</td>
<td>(355)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm visit</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland scenery</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural scenery</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and quiet</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly people</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining out</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest areas</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 14. Selected activities tourists enjoyed in Iowa--by income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enjoyed by Tourists</th>
<th>under $5,000</th>
<th>$5,000-$7,499</th>
<th>$7,500-$9,999</th>
<th>$10,000-$14,999</th>
<th>$15,000-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Nothing</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Farm visit</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Farmland scenery</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Natural scenery</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Peace and quiet</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Friendly people</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Dining out</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Rest areas</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Nothing
(2) Farm visit
(3) Farmland scenery
(4) Natural scenery
(5) Peace and quiet
(6) Friendly people
(7) Dining out
(8) Rest areas
scenery preferred to farmland scenery or vice versa? The effectiveness of state promotional material could be severely dampened if Iowa farms were promoted, but travelers were not interested in farmland scenery. The hypothesis that no difference exists between farmland and natural scenery preference was tested for each of the classifications in table 7 and for each of the income classifications in figure 14.

The testing procedure, difference in proportions, is outlined by Dixon and Massey (8, p.232). Confidence intervals for the difference between the two proportions were established at .05 level. If the confidence interval covered zero, there would not be sufficient reason to reject the hypothesis.

Although several differences were above 13%, only the business groups' difference between farmland scenery and natural scenery as indicated in table 7 was significant at the .05 level.

The business groups were not expected to react favorably to all of the items listed in the questionnaire. Question six was designed primarily for the purpose of examining the tourists' reactions to Iowa. But it is interesting to note that the business groups did enjoy farm visits, friendly people, and to some degree, dining out, as much as tourists.

Tourists within the $5,000-$7,499 income range enjoyed more of the listed items than tourists within any other income range. Tourists with an annual income above $15,000 indicated fewer favorable reactions than tourists within any other income range.

Over one-fourth of the tourists used and enjoyed the rest areas in Iowa. This percentage is high enough to merit an additional look at
Iowa's rest areas and facilities.

More than eighty people added their own comments, supplementing the suggested items. About a half dozen commented on the beautiful city parks and other small parks in Iowa. Twenty-four of the more than eighty people adding remarks declared they thoroughly enjoyed the motel accommodations in Iowa, and several of these maintained the accommodations were the 'best anywhere'. A few travelers commented on the wonderful roads in Iowa, but these people formed a very small minority.

Travelers' Complaints and Their Recommendations for Improvement

In the past, grievances concerning Iowa have been heard from different directions with different magnitudes. But until now there have been no attempts to quantify these complaints. Table 8 shows how the three most frequently registered complaints were distributed over the travelers. Table 8 also displays responses to the questionnaire list of suggested possible improvements.

The most common complaint was Iowa's highways. About one-fourth of the travelers included written comments on the poor condition of Iowa's highways, the curb along the edge of some highways, or the long and sometimes needless detours. Over one-half of the travelers checked 'highways' as an Iowa facility needing improvement. Several individuals also indicated they would go out of their way rather than travel Iowa's roads again. It is evident that Iowa's highways project an unfavorable image to many.

Four and one-half per cent of the tourists indicated they had insufficient information about Iowa. This written complaint was more frequently registered than any other, except highways. Most of the other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written complaints</th>
<th>All travelers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business only</td>
<td>Tourists, passing through</td>
<td>Tourists, Iowa destination</td>
<td>All tourists</td>
<td>$0-4,999</td>
<td>$5,000-7,499</td>
<td>$7,500-9,999</td>
<td>$10,000-14,999</td>
<td>$15,000-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written complaints</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No written complaints</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to improve</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway signs</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider highways</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of rest areas</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rest areas</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of park signs</td>
<td>(140)</td>
<td>(270)</td>
<td>(85)</td>
<td>(355)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td>(86)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)The base is the number of respondents, i.e., the number who did not skip questions seven and eight on the questionnaire.
complaints, monotony of scenery, poor service, poor food, etc., were in the minority, not one being greater than three per cent. The only exceptions were business groups complaining about farm vehicles on the highways (4.3%), discourtesy of Iowa drivers (4.3%), and poor quality of food (5.7%).

It appears as if travel groups in the upper income brackets actually found less fault with the rest areas, park signs, and historical markers than groups in the lower income brackets. But perhaps as figure 13 and figure 14 might suggest, the groups in the upper income bracket did not participate in as many activities. They did not use the state's facilities as much as other groups and therefore were in no position to suggest improvement.
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Tourism is a rapidly expanding business. People have more money available and more leisure time to enjoy it. States richly endowed with natural resources are actively promoting them, encouraging travelers to visit and spend, thus adding to the income, welfare, and further development of the area.

But other states, not richly endowed with natural attractions, are beginning to realize that tourists can appreciably add to the income of certain areas. Notable among these are tourist 'bridge' states, states which are not destinations in themselves, but are crossed extensively by tourists who spend as they cross.

Many of these states realize the value of tourist promotion, and have been engaged in various advertising activities in order to encourage tourists. Other states in the 'bridge' category have not entered into any extensive promotional activities. Iowa is one of them.

Iowa needs to determine the impact of tourists on its economy in order to decide whether or not it is feasible to actively engage in state promotion. If the decision is made to encourage tourist travel, the state planners must make institutional decisions, such as which facilities need improvement and what additional facilities are desired; the state advertising committee must also decide on the form or nature of the promotional material and where to direct it.

The purpose of this thesis was to investigate and extend knowledge in the area of Iowa tourism. The primary surveying tool was a questionnaire (Appendix A) mailed to over 1,200 August, 1964, motel patrons. The
sample consisted of out-of-state travelers who spent at least one night in an Iowa motel along U. S. Highway 20 during August, 1964.

This survey has collected data which would be useful in the development of tourism in Iowa. Although the survey was concentrated in cities along U. S. Highway 20 (located in the upper third of the state), it is probable that the results can be considered as representative of the state. The percentage of total tourist traffic from each state in the survey corresponded closely with the Highway Department-Development Commission Survey.

All travelers were classified by the purpose of their trip in Iowa. The survey results were presented within the framework of these trip purpose classifications; business only, tourists passing through, and tourists with an Iowa destination.

It was found that tourists with an Iowa destination and tourists passing through spent about the same amount each day. But the Iowa-destined tourists spent more in retail stores and for recreation and less for lodging and food.

Relationships between expenditures and income, time in Iowa, and people per group were sought, using multiple regression analysis. Finally, tourist expenditures were extrapolated to form a statewide expenditures estimate for August, 1964.

Investigation of the travelers' knowledge of selected Iowa attractions showed that Hoover's Birthplace and the Amana Colonies were the best known and the most frequently visited of the seven selected Iowa attractions. Over one-fourth of the travelers also indicated a desire to visit these attractions in the future.
Traveler's complaints concerning Iowa's facilities and reception of travelers, and their suggestions for improvement were analyzed. Tourists found only two significant faults with Iowa, poor roads and lack of tourist information.

The state of Iowa did have tourist information available but did not extensively advertise out-of-state. As a result, many travelers did not know what Iowa had to offer. Complaints concerning the lack of Iowa information was second only to complaints concerning Iowa's roads.

Based on this survey it would seem reasonable to recommend expansion of tourist promotional activities at both the state and local level. Because of the many tourists passing through to Yellowstone National Park, the Black Hills, and Minnesota, it would seem reasonable to concentrate a portion of Iowa's promotional activities in the same geographical areas that these already deeply-entrenched recreation spots actively solicit.

Tourist Information Centers could be located at strategic points along main highways entering Iowa. These centers could disseminate information during the peak summer tourist months. In the trial stage, these centers could be portable, perhaps mounted on flat-bed trucks if necessary, and moved about to determine the best locations. Registers could be used to obtain tourist's names for further tourist surveys. Over the years an accurate group of comparable statistics could be compiled, measuring, among other things, the virtues of various promotional activities. These Tourist Information Centers would have to be well advertised, both in out-of-state advertising media, and on billboards along the highways.

How can the state attract tourists and convince them they should travel in Iowa, and then convince them they should remain additional
days? Certain improvements are in order. Almost one-fourth of the tourists added written comments regarding Iowa's highway system. Over half of the tourists checked 'improve Iowa's roads', and over five per cent made specific comments about the dangerous lip at the edge of several Iowa highways.

In order to keep travelers from whizzing through on the interstate, Iowa must improve the quality of certain substandard, narrow highways. One advantage of the interstate, though, is that it should take some pressure off the now heavily traveled throughways, allowing slower, sight-seeing tourists to enjoy a more leisurely drive through Iowa.

Analysis of tourists' suggestions for improvement yielded several important facts. Out-of-state travelers generally found Iowans courteous hosts. Iowa's friendly people certainly are an important asset to the state.

It was found that more than twice as many tourists desired an increase in rest areas than desired improvement of existing rest areas. Cities, and especially smaller cities, could be encouraged to develop parks near the highways. Several respondents indicated they had utilized existing small town parks. Tourists seeking local color and friendly people often found Iowa's small towns much to their liking. These parks could be a supplement to the highway rest area system, and due to the possibility of connections with local utilities, these parks could offer better facilities than many rest areas now in existence.

Camping is becoming an extremely popular vacation mode. Adequate, well-advertised camping facilities could attract tourists to Iowa. Iowa farmers could easily expand into this area.
Another new field of endeavor open to farmers is the increasing interest of city people in the functions of the farm. Fifteen per cent of the tourists indicated a desire to visit an Iowa Vacation Farm. Development, coupled with adequate promotion, of vacation farms in Iowa could prove beneficial to the state.

In final summary: It has been demonstrated that Iowa could advantageously solicit tourists and data have been assembled which could benefit those who seek to improve Iowa's tourist position.
1. Ashley, John W. Recreation in Missouri's future. Univ. of Missouri studies defining the problems and prospects for Missouri's economy. No. 2. 1964.


APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
Dear Iowa visitor:

The people of Iowa want to be pleasant, efficient hosts to all visitors. There is much we, and others, need to know about the expanding, exciting, important business of the traveling American.

In order that we might become better hosts and be able to offer you, our guests, the best we have, we are asking recent "visitors" for help. You, as an August 1964 visitor in Iowa, are asked to take a short 10 minutes, to complete and return the enclosed questionnaire.

Only a few of these are being sent, so your reply is important! Postal regulations permit your use of the enclosed envelope without stamp.

Thank you for your time!

Yours truly,

Eber Eldridge

Extension Economist
Trace your route with a pencil, using arrows to indicate your direction of travel and encircled numbers to show how many nights you stayed at that place. Show as much of the trip as possible on this map. Also trace any side trips you might have made. We have traced one family's trip as an example. If you passed through Iowa twice in August 1964 please give information on both trips.
QUESTIONNAIRE

Can be completed in 10 minutes.

1. Purpose of your trip in Iowa: (check as many as apply)
   ___ a vacation in Iowa
   ___ visit friends or relatives
   ___ business
   ___ passing through Iowa, enroute to ____________________ (give destination)
   ___ attend meeting or convention
   ___ Iowa is my business territory. I make numerous trips.
   (If the latter is the case, please return even though many of the
    questions are not applicable.)

2. The total number of people in my party was _______.
   (total)
   number of men ______
   number of women ______
   number of children under 16 ______

3. The total number of nights party stayed in Iowa during August 1964. ______

4. Check those of the following which apply and helped you make your decision to
   travel in Iowa:
   ___ best route to my destination
   ___ business commitment
   ___ visited friends or relatives in Iowa
   ___ attend meeting or convention
   ___ I was influenced by tourist promotion (which of the following)
     ___a. recommendation of friends or relatives
     ___b. newspaper story or advertisement
     ___c. magazine story or advertisement
     ___d. radio
     ___e. TV
     ___f. American Auto Association
     ___g. oil company maps and information
     ___h. other ____________________

     (please specify)

5. While in Iowa we: (check all that are applicable)
   ___ visited friends and relatives
   ___ visited historical sites and/or museums
   ___ visited lakes
   ___ picnicked
   ___ hunted and fished
   ___ played golf, tennis, etc.
   ___ visited commercial attractions
   ___ visited state parks
   ___ other ____________________

     (please specify)
6. While in Iowa we enjoyed:

- a farm visit
- farmland scenery
- natural scenery
- peace and quiet
- friendly nature of the people
- dining out
- rest areas
- other

(please specify)

7. While in Iowa we did not enjoy the following:

8. Iowa could improve its facilities or treatment of travelers in these ways:

- improve courtesy of service
- provide additional highway signs
- widen the highways
- improve the quality of the rest areas
- increase the number of rest areas
- increase number of signs announcing parks
- increase the number of historical markers
- other

9. Did anything about Iowa influence you to remain in Iowa longer than you expected? If so, what?

10. Did anything about Iowa cause you to leave Iowa sooner than you had intended? If so, what?

11. Do you plan to travel in Iowa at some future time?
12. Please check:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iowa attraction</th>
<th>Never heard of it</th>
<th>Have heard about it but never visited</th>
<th>Have visited</th>
<th>Would like to visit sometime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Amana Colonies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Herbert Hoover's birthplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Spirit Lake massacre area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. An Iowa vacation farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Grotto at West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Effigy Mounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Iowa Great Lakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. During our August visit to Iowa my party spent approximately: (your best estimate, please)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>$ _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto (gas, oil, etc.)</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and entertainment</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail stores (excluding food)</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Your name will not be used and you will not be identified with the results of the study in any manner. Therefore, we would appreciate your answer to the questions below.

Annual income of family, or of the individual receiving the questionnaire:

- [ ] under $3,000
- [ ] $3,000 to $4,999
- [ ] $5,000 to $7,499
- [ ] $7,500 to $9,999
- [ ] $10,000 to $14,999
- [ ] $15,000 to $20,000
- [ ] over $20,000