



WP New Series

No 1/2016

The Impact of Typical Products on the Decision to (Re)Visit a Tourist Destination: Market- Expanding or Business-Stealing?

by Marco Alderighi, Carluccio Bianchi and Eleonora Lorenzini



**Università Commerciale
Luigi Bocconi**

The Impact of Typical Products on the Decision to (Re)Visit a Tourist Destination: Market-Expanding or Business-Stealing?

by Marco Alderighi, Carluccio Bianchi and Eleonora Lorenzini

MARCO ALDERIGHI is full Professor of Applied Economics, Department of Economic e Political Sciences, Università della Valle d'Aosta, and CERTeT, Bocconi University, Milan. m.alderighi@univda.it

CARLUCCIO BIANCHI is Full Professor of Economic Policy, Department of Economics and Management, Università degli Studi di Pavia, Pavia. carluccio.bianchi@unipv.it

ELEONORA LORENZINI, Department of Economics and Management, Università degli Studi di Pavia, Pavia. eleonora.lorenzini@unipv.it

ABSTRACT

This paper studies how typical products affect the attractiveness of tourist destinations, distinguishing between market-expanding and business-stealing effects. We surveyed 1,100 Italians at their home on their intention to visit or revisit three popular mountain destinations in Northern Italy (Valtellina, Valle d'Aosta, Trentino), and on their experience, knowledge, and appreciation of five well-known typical products of these places (Pizzoccheri pasta, Bresaola dried beef, Fontina cheese, Melinda apple, Speck smoked ham).

We find that product experience positively affects the likelihood of (re)visiting both a product's place of origin and the other mountain destinations (market-expanding effect). Conversely, the correct identification of the product's place of origin may reduce the intention to (re)visit the other destinations (business-stealing effect). Finally, strong appreciation for a typical product has a positive effect only on the intention to (re)visit the place of origin.

Keywords: TYPICAL PRODUCTS; MOUNTAIN REGIONS; TOURISM; MARKET-EXPANDING EFFECT; BUSINESS-STEALING EFFECT; MULTIVARIATE PROBIT MODEL.

JEL classification: L83, M31, M37, Q13

1 Introduction

Tourism literature has broadly documented that typical products and local *cuisine* significantly affect the holiday destination choice (HALL AND MITCHELL, 2001; HJALAGER AND RICHARDS, 2002; LONG, 2004; QUAN AND WANG, 2004), and greatly influence the enjoyment of the stay (DU RAND AND HEATH, 2006; FOX, 2007; NIELD ET AL., 2000; YUKSEL AND YUKSEL, 2002).¹ The food literature has indeed widely emphasized the importance of typical products and gastronomy as a driving force of economic growth (HANDSZUH, 2000; TELFER AND WALL, 1996). In mountain resorts, for example, agricultural activities help to preserve environmental equilibrium and soil conservation, which are necessary premises for tourism development. Having said that, agriculture, the food industry, and tourism are therefore complementary, and characterized by upstream and downstream linkages and strong inter-sectoral multiplier effects (LORENZINI, 2011).

In many mountain resorts, the development and the promotion of typical products have grown in parallel with the acknowledgement of the importance of food for customer fidelization (SPARKS ET AL., 2003) and the attraction of new visitors (SIMS, 2009). At the place of vacation, typical products help to convey a sense of authenticity and uniqueness (SIMS, 2009), and to reinforce the external image of the area (BOYNE AND HALL, 2004). Outside the strict tourist locations, they play the role of an additional promotional channel. Because of the important role played by typical products in local tourism economies, in recent years typical products have increasingly become marketing and branding tools for tourism promotion (DU RAND AND HEATH, 2006; FOX, 2007; FROCHOT, 2003; HASHIMOTO AND TELFER, 2006; TELLSTROM ET AL., 2006). Since typical products evoke the identity, culture, and sustainability of the place of origin, many authors suggest that they should be considered explicitly and implicitly when the marketing strategies of local and regional destinations are designed. Moreover, protected designations of origin and quality labels are frequently recognized as capable of promoting tourism and conveying a feeling of quality and typicality (BESSIÈRE, 1998; SANTAGATA ET AL., 2007; HARRIS AND DEACON, 2011; BERG AND SEVÉN, 2014).

Contrary to local *cuisine* that is not really marketable outside the charming restaurants of a tourist region, typical products are also sold outside the place of origin. The availability of these products in food stores near their homes allows prospective visitors to get some idea of

¹According to ZAGO AND PICK (2004), typical products are “agricultural commodities or finished products with specific organoleptic characteristics related to a production area or technology (p. 150)”. Pacciani et al. (2001) noted that “typical products are strictly tied to their area of origin, as they derive their characteristics from the paedoclimatic, technical and organizational peculiarities of the ‘terroir’ they come from”. Typical products are often protected by designations of origin and quality labels, which strengthen their geographic connection to the place of origin (Giovannucci et al., 2010).

local traditions, and to increase their perception of the authenticity and attractiveness of the supposed place of origin. Moreover, for those travelers who have already spent a vacation in a tourist destination, the consumption of its typical products (far from the place of origin) may help to keep an interest in that destination alive. In both cases, typical products should make it more likely for customers to visit (or revisit) a tourist location.

Although there are plenty of works highlighting the benefits of local food on tourism, less attention has been devoted to verify the existence of a statistically significant effect of typical products on the intention to visit or revisit a tourist destination. Some exceptions are [BARROS AND ASSAF \(2012\)](#), [KIVELA AND CROTTTS \(2006\)](#) and [SPARKS ET AL. \(2003\)](#), who find a positive correlation between food quality perception and the intention to revisit. Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, the existing literature on the subject has not yet analyzed what effect typical products exert on competing tourist destinations.

This paper aims to fill this empirical gap by analyzing the impact of typical products on the decision to visit (and revisit) a destination, by means of an ad hoc survey. We select three popular mountain tourist areas in Northern Italy (Valtellina, Valle d'Aosta, Trentino), and five well-known typical products of these places sold in food stores all over the country (Pizzoccheri pasta, Bresaola dried beef, Fontina cheese, Melinda apple, Speck smoked ham). The need to have a sufficient number of respondents acquainted with these products suggested that we should limit our survey to Italians. Moreover, the choice of selecting only Italian people helps to satisfy the requirement that interviewees predominantly share the same food culture and the same opportunity to buy typical products in a supermarket in their place of residence.

Using computer-assisted telephone interviews, we surveyed 1,100 people at their home. The interview contains questions on the experience, appreciation, and presumed place of origin for a selection of typical products; the interviewee's intention to visit or revisit the three mountain destinations; the satisfaction with the visited places and the interviewee's sociodemographics. The peculiar structure of the collected data allows us to investigate the different roles played by typical products and their market-expanding and/or business-stealing impact. A Multivariate Probit methodology is employed to exploit the features of the data structure.

We find that the experience of a typical product positively and significantly affects the likelihood of (re)visiting both the place of origin and the other mountain destinations, suggesting that typical products have a market-expanding effect. Moreover, it also emerges that the correct identification of the product's place of origin in some cases reduces the intention to (re)visit the other competing mountain destinations, suggesting the existence of a business-stealing effect. Finally, strong appreciation for a typical product has a positive effect on the intention to (re)visit the place of origin, but no significant effects on the intention to (re)visit

other destinations.

These results can help policy makers to better develop their place branding strategies in mountain destinations. For instance, some possible joint territorial actions could be undertaken in order to strengthen the distribution channels of typical products in the whole national territory. Other sale channels such as product-specific e-marketplaces could be enhanced, and product packaging could be designed in order to contain images capable of evoking the link between local food and mountain resorts. In addition to this, some possible measures could be activated at the various stages of the supply chain in order to amplify the promotional role of typical products for specific mountain destinations. In particular, attention should be paid to improve the quality content, guarantee and recognizability of typical products and to increase the awareness about their use among local operators, such as restaurants, inns and wine bars.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 explores the literature background for the study of the market-expanding and business-stealing effects of typical products on tourist destinations. Section 3 sets out the hypotheses to be tested. Section 4 describes the data and the econometric model employed in the analysis. Section 5 discusses the results. The main implications for tourism policies and practices are outlined in the concluding section of the paper.

2 Typical products and their promotional role

In this section we introduce our background analysis concerning the market-expanding and business-stealing effects of advertising. MARSHALL (1919) was the first to identify two broad types of advertising: ‘constructive’ as opposed to ‘combative’ advertising. The former type corresponds to the case in which advertising has positive effects on the whole industry, i.e. a firm’s advertising campaign attracts new customers into the market, increasing all firms’ sales, revenues and profits. The latter type corresponds to the case where an advertising campaign generates a positive effect for the promoting firm, but a negative one for the others, i.e. the number of market consumers does not grow, and there is a reallocation of sales towards the advertising firm. In accordance with this explanation, ‘constructive’ advertising has therefore a market-expanding effect, while ‘combative’ advertising is business-stealing.²

²Marshall’s seminal classification of the effects of advertising expenditure has been reprised many times in the literature, even though different denominations have been used for the two categories of effects, such as competitive vs. non-competitive (BRAITHWAITE, 1928), cooperative vs. predatory (FRIEDMAN, 1983), within-category brand switching vs. category-expansion (GUPTA, 1988; CHINTAGUNTA, 1993; VAN HEERDE, 1999), category-building vs. share-stealing (DUBÉ AND MANCHANDA, 2005), market-expanding vs. business-stealing

Although the classifications described above are widely employed in theoretical and empirical studies (BAGWELL, 2007), there is no consensus on which effect prevails. Indeed the results reported in the literature differ according to the industry analyzed and the methodology used, as the following few examples clearly show. GARTHWAITE (2014), in his study of the economic effects of endorsement in the publishing sector, finds that endorsement is a business-stealing form of advertising that raises printed work sales without expanding the overall market. SELDON AND DOROODIAN (1989), instead, in their work on cigarette advertising, examine the response of aggregate cigarette demand to advertising, and the reaction of consumers and the tobacco industry to government health warnings and media policy during the period 1952-84. Their results indicate that advertising is market-expanding. Similarly, in their study on the frozen meal industry, DUBÉ AND MANCHANDA (2005) notice that advertising has a market-expanding impact especially in larger markets. In their analysis of the drug sector, NARAYANAN ET AL. (2004) and ARCIDIACONO ET AL. (2013) find both a market-expanding and a business-stealing impact of advertising. On the contrary, IZUKA'S (2004) and LIU AND GUPTA'S (2011) results mainly show a market-expanding effect.

In addition to Marshall's view, it is worth mentioning other advertising categories which are related, in certain respects, to our analysis. First, advertising may have an informative, a persuasive, and/or a complementary role. Advertising is informative when it increases the information that customers have about the existence and/or the characteristics of the product (STIGLER, 1961; KIHLMSTROM AND RIORDAN, 1984; MILGROM AND ROBERTS, 1986). It is persuasive when it alters customers' perception of the product and creates loyalty, prestige, image and goodwill (KALDOR, 1950; COMANOR AND WILSON, 1967, 1974). It has a complementary role, when advertising and the advertised product are complements: the consumer's utility of one good increases when there is a larger consumption of the other good (BECKER AND MURPHY, 1993). Therefore, the larger the *advertising consumption*, the larger the demand for the advertised product. Persuasive and complementary advertising are similar. The difference rests on the fact that the former implies a modification of the preference of the consumer, while the other does not (PEPALL ET AL., 2002).

Second, VAKRATSAS AND AMBLER (1999) provide a taxonomy of advertising models reviewing more than 250 articles in the field. They summarize the results of the empirical literature in 25 empirical findings (Table 2, p. 31) and classify different theories in five main groups based on three elements (cognition, affect and experience). In particular, they report empirical evidence (finding 15) that advertising likability is highly correlated with brand preference (BIEL, 1990; HALEY AND BALDINGER, 1991; DRÖGE, 1989). This finding suggests that strong appreciation for advertising may reinforce the intention to buy a product.

(Iizuka, 2004).

Finally, dynamic advertising models are usually classified into two groups (GOU ET AL., 2014). In the first one, advertising immediately affects consumer's awareness of the product and has a direct impact on sales (VIDALE AND WOLFE, 1957; SORGER, 1989; ERIKSON, 2009). In the second one, instead, advertising generates an accumulation of goodwill, which has a positive effect on sales (Nerlove and Arrow, 1962; Friedman, 1983; Chintagunta and Jain, 1992). Thus, in the latter case only long-term advertising has a positive effect on sales, while short-term advertising plays a negligible role (BASS ET AL., 2005).

As far as typical products and the choice of tourist destinations are concerned, the prevailing interpretation assigns a business-stealing role to typical products. OKUMUS ET AL. (2007), for instance, state that: "Food can play an important role in differentiating destinations in a meaningful way". Similarly, other authors highlight the role of food and local *cuisine* for the "differentiation and promotion of a specific tourist destination" (HORNG AND TSAI, 2010) "in an increasingly competitive global marketplace" (LEE AND ARCORDIA, 2011). The emphasis on the terms 'differentiation' and 'specific' in many papers (see also Boyne and Hall, 2004 and Lin et al., 2011, to cite but two of them) can be interpreted as a tendency for tourists to attribute typical products a combative nature in tourists' perception. Nevertheless, this interpretation is not supported by any empirical quantitative analysis.

As already mentioned in the previous section, only a few empirical studies have provided a quantitative analysis of the effects of typical products and local *cuisine* on the intention to (re)visit a tourist destination. BARROS AND ASSAF (2012) employed a mixed logit to point out the main factors affecting the tourists' intention to revisit the city of Lisbon. They found a positive and statistically significant role played by food quality and other destination attributes such as events, nightlife, weather and safety.

KIVELA AND CROTTS (2006) analyzed the effects of gastronomy on the returning preferences of tourists visiting the city of Hong Kong, reporting that "gastronomy is an integral part of the visitor's experience (p. 373)". In their study, they used a factor analysis to identify six different factors related to gastronomy. Afterwards, they regressed the intention to revisit the destination ("would you return to Hong Kong to sample the local cuisine some time in the future?") on these six factors. The most significant factors for explaining the decision to revisit were Factor 1 (*Expectations of Gastronomy*), followed by Factor 3 (*Gastronomy Experienced at Destination*).³ Thus, in terms of our analysis, their findings suggest that typical products sold outside a tourist destination may be an effective tool of promotion, provided that they can affect the prospective tourist's expectations on gastronomy.

Sparks et al. (2003) applied the theory of planned behavior (AJZEN, 1991) to investigate

³The other factors were: Factor 2 (*Importance of Gastronomy*), Factor 4 (*Gastronomy as Reason for Travel*), Factor 5 (*Evaluation of Gastronomy Experiences at Destination*), and Factor 6 (*Culture and Gastronomy*).

the factors affecting the intention to visit a wine tourist region for recreational purposes. They collected data by means of a survey on the Australian population and estimated a structural equation model. They found that attitude toward past experiences (individual's positive or negative evaluation of own performance in the previous experiences) and perceived behavioral control (difficulty or ease of performing a particular behavior) have a direct effect on the intention to visit.

To sum up, it is worth mentioning the following considerations. On the one hand, it may be argued that typical products, by strengthening the destination image and its perceived quality, increase the attractiveness of the place of origin, and simultaneously reduce that of competing destinations (business-stealing effect). On the other hand, it can also be argued that typical products, by evoking an association between a given food consumption ambience and places with corresponding characteristics, increase the attractiveness of all mountain tourist destinations in a given area (market-expanding effect). A thorough understanding of the existence and nature of these effects is of paramount importance, for example, in devising appropriate destination and promotional tourist strategies. Hence in the following sections we propose a method to address this issue.

3 The hypotheses

A first preliminary hypothesis to be tested concerns the effect of typical product experience on the intention to visit or revisit a mountain destination (BARROS AND ASSAF, 2012; KIVELA AND CROTTTS, 2006; and SPARKS ET AL., 2003). Contrary to local *cuisine* that is an almost exclusive experience at the tourist location, typical products can be easily found in any food store or supermarket and, therefore, can also be consumed outside the place of origin. This implies that typical products may also influence the food image and reputation of a tourist place and the desire of newcomers to visit a mountain destination (RYU AND JANG, 2006). In addition, especially for this category of potential visitors, typical product experience may contribute to increase their familiarity with local *cuisine* and their evaluation of the tourist destination (MAK ET AL., 2012).

Hypothesis 1 *Previous experience with typical products is positively related to the intention to visit or revisit their place of origin.*

In order to test Hypothesis 1, we consider the following model:

$$(1) \quad V_{id} = \alpha + \sum_{p \in P^d} \beta_p E_{ip} + \zeta Z_{id} + \varepsilon_{id},$$

where i refers to the interviewee, p to the product, and d to the destination; V_{id} is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the interviewee intends to visit the destination; P^d is the basket of typical products belonging to destination d ; and E_{ip} is a dummy variable equal to 1 when the interviewee has actually experienced product p . Moreover, Z_{id} is a vector of control variables including whether the interviewee has already visited destination d ; her/his lifestyle customs (habit of buying typical products when shopping, type of vacation chosen in the last two years, presence of children), and her/his sociodemographic features (gender, age, education, distance from the tourist destination). Positive and significant values of β_p support the stated hypothesis, while null and non-significant values imply no promotional role of typical products.

The rest of the analysis is devoted to identify whether typical products have a market-expanding or a business-stealing effect.

Hypothesis 2 *Previous experience of typical products from other (similar) mountain locations is positively/negatively related to the intention to visit or revisit the place of origin of a typical product.*

In order to test Hypothesis 2, we consider the following model:

$$(2) \quad V_{id} = \alpha + \sum_{p \in P^a} \beta_p E_{ip} + \zeta Z_{id} + \varepsilon_{id},$$

where P^a is the basket of typical products belonging to all tourist destinations considered in the analysis, i.e. products belonging to d and other similar mountain destinations, $d' \neq d$. If $\beta_p > 0$ for $p \notin P^d$, we have a market-expanding effect of typical product p on destination d . Otherwise, if $\beta_p < 0$ for $p \notin P^d$, there is a business-stealing effect.

The literature offers different arguments for interpreting the market-expanding and business-stealing effects of typical products. A market-expanding effect of typical products may be due to confusion (Mitchell et al., 2005).⁴ According to [LOKEN ET AL. \(1986\)](#), physical similarities between products (or places) may induce a wrong assignment of a typical product to its place of origin (p. 196). Thus, a traveler assigns a positive food image (and evaluation) to a tourist location which is not the place of origin of a typical product and is more interested to visit or revisit the place because she/he wrongly assigns that product to that place. Thus, in this case, information on the place of origin plays a role. Lack of correct identification of the place of origin generates a market-expanding effect, while the correct identification of the place of origin may have a business-stealing effect on other competing destinations. Indeed, a correct

⁴Confusion may be defined as a state of mind which affects information processing and decision making ([MITCHELL AND PAPAVALASSIOU, 1999](#), p. 327).

identification of the place of origin reinforces the intention to visit that place and because of substitutability of destinations, should have a negative effect on the intention to visit the others.

According to BECKER AND MURPHY (1993), a market-expanding effect can also emerge when there is a complementarity in consumption between a typical product and a tourist resort (not necessarily the place of origin) which is evoked by the product. Under complementarity theory, information about the actual place of origin of a typical product, per se, does not play any role, and therefore it is neither market-expanding nor business-stealing. Vice versa, a market-expanding effect emerges because there is a positive interdependence in consumption between the typical product and the visit of a tourist destination.

Hypothesis 3 *The correct identification of the place of origin of a typical product:*

- a) *has no effect on/strengthens the intention to visit or revisit the place of origin;*
- b) *has no effect on/weakens/nullifies the intention to visit or revisit other similar competing places.*

In order to test Hypotheses 3a and 3b, we consider the following model:

$$(3) \quad V_{id} = \alpha + \sum_{p \in P^a} \beta_p E_{ip} + \sum_{p \in P^a} \gamma_p A_{ip} + \zeta Z_{id} + \varepsilon_{id},$$

where A_{ip} is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the interviewee has already experienced the product, and correctly assigned the product p to its place of origin, i.e. $A_{ip} = 1$ if $E_{ip} = 1$, $p \in P^d$, and the interviewee has correctly answered d .

The results should be interpreted in the following way. Our line of reasoning is developed under the assumption that $\beta_p > 0$ for $p \in P^a$ (the experience of typical products is market-expanding). For $p \in P^d$, if $\gamma_p > 0$, a correct identification of the product's place of origin reinforces the intention to visit that particular destination, while if $\gamma_p = 0$, a correct attribution does not influence the result. For $p \notin P^d$, if $-\beta_p < \gamma_p < 0$, a correct assignment of the product to another place of origin reduces the intention to visit that destination, while, if $\gamma_p = 0$, a correct assignment to another place does not influence the result. Moreover, if $\gamma_p = -\beta_p$, the intention to visit d is not affected by the product $p \notin P^d$ when interviewees are informed about the place of origin of typical products. Thus, when $\gamma_p \neq 0$, there is an informative role of typical products. On the contrary, when $\gamma_p = 0$, typical products play a complementary role with respect to the intention to visit similar destinations.

Finally, if we assume that typical products have an informative role on the image, reputation, and local *cuisine* appeal of a tourist destination, we expect that those interviewees who are both informed about the place of origin of typical products and strongly appreciate them

will be more interested in visiting that location.⁵ Thus, food appreciation may play an additional role in the intention to visit the place of origin. Moreover, we expect that it also plays a business-stealing effect on (similar) alternative destinations because consumer preferences are strongly channeled in the direction of that specific product and its territorial area (BIEL, 1990; HALEY AND BALDINGER, 1991; DRÖGE, 1989). In the case where a typical product plays a complementary effect, we expect no additional impact on the destination choice.

Hypothesis 4 *The strong appreciation of a product and the correct identification of its place of origin:*

- a) *has no effect on/strengthens the intention to visit or revisit a place of origin;*
- b) *has no effect on/weakens/nullifies the intention to visit or revisit other similar competing places.*

In order to test Hypotheses 4a and 4b, we consider the following model:

$$(4) \quad V_{id} = \alpha + \sum_{p \in P^a} \beta_p E_{ip} + \sum_{p \in P^a} \gamma_p A_{ip} + \sum_{p \in P^a} \delta_p L_{ip} + \zeta Z_{id} + \varepsilon_{id},$$

where L_{ip} is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the interviewee appreciates (strongly likes) a typical product and she/he correctly identifies its place of origin. Test results can be interpreted as in the previous case. When $p \in P^d$, if $\delta_p > 0$, typical product appreciation reinforces the intention to visit the destination; while, if $\delta_p = 0$, product appreciation does not influence the choice. When $p \notin P^d$, if $\delta_p < 0$, product appreciation induces a business-stealing effect, while, if $\gamma_p = 0$, product appreciation does not affect the result. Thus, when $\delta \neq 0$, we observe an informative role of typical products. On the contrary, when $\delta = 0$, typical products play a complementary role in the choice to visit similar tourist destinations.

4 Data and research methodology

Three homogeneous mountain regions have been chosen as the territorial focus of the analysis: Valtellina, Valle d'Aosta, and Trentino Alto Adige (from here on Trentino). All three destinations are located in the Italian Alps. Valle d'Aosta is the westernmost of the three, and is bordered to the West by France and to the North by Switzerland. Valtellina is part of the Lombardy Region, is located in the central part of the Alps, and is bordered to the North by Switzerland. Trentino is the most easterly of the three, and is bordered to the West

⁵Food appreciation or liking refers to “the palatability or pleasure obtained from tasting a given food” (GIESEN ET AL., 2010, p. 966).

by Switzerland and to the North by Austria. Apart from their topographic affinity, the three locations share significant similarities in their economic structure. In the three cases, tourism is a major source of income and employment for the local population. Moreover, their typical products are widely diffused and well-known all over the country.

4.1 The data

The data employed in the analysis come from a private survey carried out by means of a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) distribution method over a random sample of 1,100 Italian citizens stratified by age, gender and place of residence. The need to have a sufficient number of respondents acquainted with these products suggested that we should limit our survey to Italians. Moreover, the choice of selecting only Italian people helps to satisfy the requirement that interviewees predominantly share the same food culture and the same opportunity to buy typical products in a supermarket in their place of residence.⁶

4.2 The dependent variable

The intention to visit or revisit a tourist destination is the dependent variable of our estimates. Table 1 summarizes the mean values for the three destinations, as well as the Spearman correlation index. The number of respondents wishing to visit or revisit the three destinations ranges between 60.45% and 66.82%. The highest value corresponds to Trentino, which is the more extensive and popular destination of the three. Note that, although Valtellina is located in the center of the Alps, and is therefore located between the other two mountain destinations, a higher correlation occurs between Valle d’Aosta and Trentino. This result probably depends on the fact that the two places share more similar Winter and Summer tourism offers.

Table 1: Intention to (re)visit a destination

	Yes (%)	Spearman correlation		
		Valtellina	Valle d’Aosta	Trentino
Valtellina	60.45	1.0000		
Valle d’Aosta	61.27	0.5250	1.0000	
Trentino	66.82	0.5436	0.6367	1.0000

⁶We thank an anonymous referee for suggesting that even if the choice to interview only Italian people can be understood in practical terms, there is the risk of underestimating the effects of typical products. Indeed, it is reasonable to expect that the influence of typical products on foreign travelers should be larger and therefore it could induce even a higher curiosity to experience.

4.3 The independent variables of theoretical interest

A set of questions investigates the respondents' experience with a basket of 16 typical products belonging to the three destinations, i.e. the correct identification of the products' place of origin; whether they have tasted the products; and, if the answer is positive, their appreciation and willingness to pay for them. Hence, the variables of main theoretical interest are: experience of the products; correct identification of their place of origin; and strong appreciation of them.⁷ Although the collected answers concerned 16 typical products, the econometric analysis performed is based on a selection of only five items, using as a choice criterion the rule that at least 50% of interviewees had tried the product.

The use of this criterion is meant to reduce multicollinearity issues and to simultaneously focus on the most popular and diffused products, i.e. those which are more easily found in food stores all over the country.⁸

The selected products are Melinda apple and Speck smoked ham for Trentino, Pizzoccheri pasta and Bresaola dried meat for Valtellina, and Fontina cheese for Valle d'Aosta. Table 2 provides the descriptive statistics of the three variables of interest for each product.

Table 2: Experience, correct identification of the region of origin, and appreciation

	Experience	Identification	Appreciation (5=strong)				
	(%)	(%)	1	2	3	4	5
Speck smoked ham	78.6	61.9	10	13	81	239	520
Bresaola dried beef	76.6	42.5	15	31	104	254	438
Melinda apple	76.0	60.9	3	11	91	272	457
Fontina cheese	71.2	30.9	9	31	165	247	329
Pizzoccheri pasta	51.4	41.9	10	18	81	175	278

All five typical products are realized with high quality standards: two of them (Fontina cheese and Melinda apple) have been recognized by the EU as a protected designation of origin (PDO); the other three have been (Bresaola dried meat and Speck smoked ham) or are going

⁷The correct identification of the place of origin has been computed by comparing the answers to an open question about the supposed place of origin of the products with the true one.

⁸The excluded goods are: Bitto cheese, Arnad lard, Casera cheese, Fumin wine, Melavì apple, Arnad Montjovet wine, Mocetta dried beef meat, Teroldego wine, Grumello wine, Sforzato wine, Müller-Thurgau wine. Asiago cheese has been excluded because the territory of production belongs to both the Trentino and the Veneto Region. Moreover, we do not use a principal component analysis or a principal coordinate analysis (JOLIFFE, 2002) to reduce the variable dimensionality, because in the case of binary variables the interpretation of the resulting variables is strongly limited, and because of the poor results of these methods when applied to these specific data.

to be (Pizzoccheri pasta) recognized as a protected geographical indication (PGI).⁹

They have very distinctive characteristics and production processes, which differentiate them from other EU protected agricultural products and foodstuffs. The only (partial) exception comes from product names from Trentino - Alto Adige. First of all, in the EU Database Of Origin and Registration (DOOR) there are three PGI names referring to Speck: one in Italy (Speck Alto Adige) and two in Austria (Tiroler Speck and Gailtaler Speck). The reason for the multiplicity of labels comes from the fact that since the Medieval age, Speck smoked ham has been produced in the historical region of Tyrol, which is now split between Italy (approximately the administrative province of Alto Adige, called South Tirol) and Austria (the Tirol state in Western Austria). Italian and Austrian populations mainly buy the domestic products; some competition emerges for the German market, which is the main foreign outlet for the three PGI products. Indeed, according to the Italian speck consortium (Consorzio Tutela Speck Alto Adige), in 2014 about 84 per cent of their exports go to Germany and only 6 per cent to Austria. Second of all, the distinctiveness of the Melinda apple comes from the way in which it is produced, but not from the variety employed. Indeed, it is based on three highly diffused apple varieties: Golden Delicious, Renetta Canada, Red Delicious. Consequently, Melinda apple faces competition from many countries producing the same or similar varieties on the domestic and international markets. In Europe there are 10 different PGIs for apples produced in Italy, France, Spain and Portugal.

Table 2 shows that these products are well known in Italy, but we have no data on their knowledge abroad. Nevertheless, we can conjecture on how much they are familiar abroad. A first source of knowledge for foreign people comes from visiting the tourist destinations of the typical products. We, therefore, expect that proximity and therefore cultural affinity is a main driver. For example, knowledge about Pizzoccheri pasta or Bresaola dried meat is expected to be larger in Switzerland than in other countries, since Switzerland and Valtellina border one another. Melinda apple or Speck smoked ham are more likely to be known in Germany since German is one of the two official languages of Trentino - Alto Adige. For similar reasons Fontina cheese should be known in Switzerland and France. A second source of knowledge can

⁹PDO and PGI are two European quality labels. The Protected Designation of Origin (PDO) is granted to products which are produced, processed, and prepared in a given geographical area using recognized know-how, while in the case of the Protected Geographical Indication (PGI) it is sufficient that some stages of production, processing or preparation take place in the area (EU regulation 1151/2012). In particular, the selected products have the following protected names, dossier numbers and dates of registration (or of application in the case of Pizzoccheri pasta): Fontina cheese ('Fontina', IT/PDO/0017/0008, 6/21/1996); Melinda apple ('Mela Val di Non', IT/PDO/0005/0197, 9/23/2003); Speck smoked ham ('Speck Alto Adige / Sudtiroler Markenspeck / Sudtiroler Speck', IT/PGI/0117/0327, 6/13/1997); Bresaola dried meat ('Bresaola della Valtellina', IT/PGI/0017/1525, 02/07/1996); Pizzoccheri pasta ('Pizzoccheri della Valtellina', IT/PGI/0005/01349, 6/24/2015).

come from word-of-mouth and food mania. A final source of knowledge comes from marketing activities. In this case typical products whose promotional activities are more centralized (e.g. thanks to a consortium) or have invested in the creation of a label for a long time are more likely to be known.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the five typical products analyzed in this study are quite important for the local economy. For example, according to the Bresaola Consortium (Consortio di tutela del nome della Bresaola della Valtellina), formed by 16 firms, in 2011 the overall sale volumes for the Bresaola dried meat was about 377 million euros (2012), more than 16 per cent of GDP of the administrative province of Sondrio (approximately the Valtellina area). No reliable data are available on the production of Pizzoccheri pasta, but their relevance emerges as it is the traditional food of Valtellina. According to the GPI speck consortium, in 2014 its 29 members produced approximately 31,700 tons of GPI speck. Since the wholesale price of speck is about 8-9 euros/kg and the gross domestic product of Trentino - Alto Adige is 35.7 billion euros (2012), we can estimate that the GPI speck production accounts for about 1 per cent of the GDP of Trentino - Alto Adige. About 15,000 workers in Trentino - Alto Adige (1.5 per cent of the population) are involved in the apple supply chain. Personal calculations suggest that Fontina cheese turnover is about 60 million euros, which is more than 1 per cent of the GDP of Valle d'Aosta.

4.4 The control variables

In order to take into account some factors that can possibly affect the intention to (re)visit a destination, the four models include a set of control variables belonging to two main groups.

First, there is a set of lifestyle variables including: customary purchase of typical products (*Love of typical products*); mountain resorts chosen as a place of vacation in the last two years (*Love of mountains*), presence of children of 10 years old or less in the family (*Having children*); the interviewees' past traveling experience to the three destinations, e.g. whether they have already visited the places (*Previous visit*). Second, there is a set of sociodemographic variables, including: the distance between the place of residence and the tourist destination, age, and gender. Tables 3 and 4 provide the descriptive statistics of the selected sociodemographic and lifestyle variables. Other variables have been excluded from the analysis because they are either statistically insignificant (frequency of internet use, type of job), or highly correlated with other variables already included in the estimates (overall satisfaction with the holiday, and satisfaction with their hotels and restaurants), or because of poor data quality (income).

Table 3: Descriptive statistics of sociodemographic and lifestyle variables

	Frequency (%)
Lifestyle variables	
Love of mountains	25.0
Love of typical products	59.4
Previous visit to Trentino	41.8
Previous visit to Valle d'Aosta	28.7
Previous visit to Valtellina	25.4
Sociodemographic variables	
Age 18-25	14.9
Age 26-39	22.2
Age 40-49	20.4
Age 50-65	20.4
Age > 65	22.2
Primary education	9.5
Secondary education	26.6
High school education	42.5
University education	12.0
Male gender	50.0
Having children	34.5
Living in Northern Italy	60.0
Living in Central/Southern Italy	40.0

4.5 The econometric methodology

The four models described by equations (1)-(4) in Section 3 have been estimated using a Multivariate Probit (MP) model, a generalization of the probit model which allows the simultaneous estimation of more than one equation with correlated disturbances (GREENE, 2003, pp. 710-19). The general specification for a D -equation MP model is as follows:

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} V_{id}^* &= \sum_d \lambda_{id} + \varepsilon_{id} \\ V_{id} &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } V_{id}^* > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $d = 1, \dots, D$, V_{id}^* is a latent variable; V_{id} is the observed binary choice of the respondent; λ_{id} and Σ_d are, respectively, the set of independent regressors and the unknown parameters; ε_{id} is the error term distributed as a zero-mean multivariate normal, with variance-covariance

Table 4: Distance from tourist destination

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Valtellina	440.6664	340.261	139	1291
Valle d'Aosta	481.8591	347.9677	0	1335
Trentino	389.2182	310.5433	0	1177

matrix Ω having 1 on the leading diagonal, and $\rho_{jk} = \rho_{kj}$ off the principal diagonal.¹⁰

In our case, $D = 3$ and $V_{id} = 1$ if the interviewee i intends to visit or revisit the destination d , and zero otherwise; and X_{id} is the set of regressors varying in accordance with the selected model presented in equations (1)-(4), the set including: the constant term, the variables of interest, and the controls.

This method allows the unique nature of our data set to be exploited and provides many advantages in terms of econometric estimation. First, it is very flexible. No restriction on the tourist vacation decision is imposed. Interviewees may declare their intention to visit from zero to three of the suggested destinations. Second, the MP model has the same cross-equation correlation matrix of the seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) model, i.e. the residuals of the various equations may be correlated.¹¹ Thus, with respect to the case of the zero off-diagonal correlation assumption of the standard Probit models, the simultaneous estimation of our equations leads to more efficient estimates (provided that some regression variables differ across estimates). Third, and relatedly, the joint estimation of the parameters allows us to evaluate the strength of the cross-equation correlations of the alternatives. In particular, therefore, it helps to control for unobserved factors that simultaneously affect the decision to visit the three destinations. Finally, when cross-equation correlations are statistically significant, the separate estimation of the three equations leads to biased estimates of the coefficients of interest, while the use of the MP model produces unbiased results.

5 Results

This section presents the estimated results of the four models introduced in Section 3 to test Hypotheses 1-4. In Hypothesis 1, we claim that typical products experience is positively related to the intention to (re)visit the place of origin. Table 5 (Model 1) shows that Hypothesis 1 is

¹⁰The analysis has been performed using the *mvpobit* procedure for Stata 13.1, which implements the Geweke-Hajivassiliou-Keane (GHK) algorithm to estimate the multivariate probit model (see CAPPELLARI AND JENKINS, 2003).

¹¹Differently from the MP model, in the SUR model the dependent variable is continuous.

verified for each product and destination. In fact, experience with Bresaola and Pizzoccheri is found to have a positive and strongly significant correlation with the intention to (re)visit Valtellina; experience with Fontina is positively and significantly correlated with the intention to (re)visit Valle d’Aosta, and the same result holds for experience with Melinda and Speck with respect to Trentino.

Once the existence of a positive link between typical products experience and the intention to (re)visit their place of origin has been established, the analysis moves on to test Hypothesis 2, i.e. whether previous experience with typical products from other similar places of origin is positively or negatively related to the intention to (re)visit the place of origin of a typical product. The results are shown in Table 5 (Model 2). Generally, the estimates confirm that typical products have a market-expanding effect. In fact, Fontina and Melinda are positively correlated with the decision to (re)visit Valtellina even though they originate from competing tourist locations. The same result holds for Bresaola, Pizzoccheri and Speck with respect to the decision to (re)visit Valle d’Aosta and for Bresaola with respect to the intention to (re)visit Trentino.

The market-expanding effect of typical products may have two different explanations. On the one hand, there is complementarity between a typical product and all destinations, which have similar characteristics to the place of origin (mountain areas). On the other hand, there is complementarity between a typical product and only its place of origin, but there is confusion, i.e. similarities between mountain products may induce the wrong assignment of a product to a place of origin different from its own. In order to verify which explanation is more plausible, we move on to test Hypothesis 3.

In particular, we extend our previous analysis by introducing a dummy variable indicating whether the respondents correctly assigned a product to its place of origin. The results are shown in Table 6 (Model 3). Since the coefficients for almost all products and destinations are not significantly different from zero, we can conclude that typical products and similar tourist destinations are complementary, and confusion does not play any significant role. The only exceptions are Pizzoccheri for Trentino and Speck for Valtellina, for which we observe negative coefficients, meaning that a correct identification of a product’s place of origin weakens the intention to (re)visit other competing destinations (business-stealing effect).

In addition to this, we test whether a strong appreciation for a typical product plays an additional role on the intention to (re)visit its place of origin (Hypothesis 4). Table 6 (Model 4) shows that appreciation for typical products reinforces the decision to (re)visit the tourist destination for four out of five products. The only exception is Speck whose coefficient is not statistically different from zero.

With regard to the control variables, lifestyle features such as *Love of mountains*, *Love of*

Table 5: Multivariate probit. Decision to (re)visit a tourist destination

	Model 1			Model 2		
	Valtellina	Valle d'Aosta	Trentino	Valtellina	Valle d'Aosta	Trentino
Bresaola experience	0.210** (0.082)			0.383*** (0.130)	0.527*** (0.136)	0.460*** (0.140)
Pizzoccheri experience	0.178** (0.078)			0.234*** (0.089)	0.242*** (0.089)	0.084 (0.088)
Fontina experience		0.445*** (0.073)		0.217** (0.100)	0.230* (0.140)	-0.001 (0.148)
Melinda experience			0.368*** (0.107)	0.373*** (0.113)	0.102 (0.122)	0.467*** (0.122)
Speck experience			0.268*** (0.100)	-0.233 (0.158)	0.361*** (0.128)	0.257* (0.155)
Love of mountains	0.434*** (0.089)	0.406*** (0.071)	0.371*** (0.113)	0.440*** (0.089)	0.398*** (0.075)	0.372*** (0.117)
Love of typical products	0.479*** (0.125)	0.338*** (0.109)	0.398*** (0.134)	0.358*** (0.111)	0.107 (0.097)	0.237** (0.114)
Previous visit to Valtellina	0.897*** (0.151)	0.031 (0.087)	-0.057 (0.106)	0.893*** (0.165)	-0.060 (0.101)	-0.090 (0.123)
Previous visit to Valle d'Aosta	0.102 (0.102)	0.958*** (0.148)	0.417*** (0.102)	0.062 (0.102)	0.963*** (0.145)	0.386*** (0.102)
Previous visit to Trentino	0.243*** (0.076)	0.082 (0.094)	0.867*** (0.153)	0.207** (0.082)	0.023 (0.080)	0.851*** (0.147)
Distance from Valtellina	0.014 (0.057)			0.025 (0.054)		
Distance from Valle d'Aosta		-0.053 (0.059)			0.004 (0.058)	
Distance from Trentino			-0.172*** (0.056)			-0.145*** (0.055)
Age 18-25	0.126 (0.152)	0.130 (0.137)	0.168 (0.140)	0.123 (0.150)	0.088 (0.148)	0.164 (0.143)
Age 26-39	0.229* (0.133)	0.169 (0.175)	0.130 (0.193)	0.251* (0.133)	0.141 (0.166)	0.137 (0.191)
Age 50-65	-0.062 (0.124)	-0.004 (0.112)	0.164 (0.141)	-0.075 (0.118)	0.004 (0.117)	0.164 (0.141)
Age > 65	-0.251** (0.109)	0.002 (0.150)	-0.017 (0.136)	-0.263** (0.106)	0.017 (0.162)	-0.006 (0.137)

<i>cont'd</i>	Model 1			Model 2		
	Valtellina	Valle d'Aosta	Trentino	Valtellina	Valle d'Aosta	Trentino
Secondary education	0.002 (0.103)	0.286*** (0.094)	0.133 (0.095)	-0.077 (0.104)	0.202** (0.097)	0.055 (0.099)
High school education	-0.109 (0.135)	0.130 (0.169)	-0.046 (0.191)	-0.214 (0.140)	0.035 (0.165)	-0.141 (0.187)
Male gender	-0.129 (0.100)	-0.010 (0.082)	0.006 (0.073)	-0.108 (0.096)	0.040 (0.081)	0.026 (0.071)
Having children	0.273*** (0.095)	0.238** (0.101)	0.466*** (0.106)	0.260*** (0.097)	0.185* (0.101)	0.439*** (0.107)
Cross-equation corr.						
Valtellina	1.000			1.000		
Valle d'Aosta	0.633	1.000		0.643	1.000	
Trentino	0.676	0.792	1.000	0.675	0.791	1.000
Log pseudolikelihood		-1,409.439			-1,369.815	
LL ratio test χ^2		464.111			465.029	
LL ratio test χ^2 (p-value)		0.000			0.000	
N		1,100			1,100	

Robust standard errors in parentheses, clustered by 89 Italian Provinces. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

typical products and *Previous visit* have the expected sign, and are strongly significant for all tourist destinations. The variable *Distance from* the destination place is only significant in the case of Trentino. Sociodemographic variables are generally insignificant, apart from *Having children*, which is strongly and positively correlated with the intention to (re)visit the three destinations in all four estimates.

As far as the use of the MP model is concerned, cross-equation correlation and the Likelihood ratio test ($H_0: \rho_{12} = \rho_{13} = \rho_{23} = 0$) in the four estimates show that the residuals of the three equations are strongly correlated, so that the use of a simultaneous estimation procedure is preferable to single-equation estimates. As a robustness check, however, we performed single-equation estimates, which generally confirmed our previous findings.

Finally, as an additional robustness check, we estimated the effect of typical product experience, identification and appreciation on the different binary dependent variable *Visiting a seaside destination*. This variable is 1 if a seaside resort has been chosen by the interviewee as place of vacation in the last two years, and zero otherwise. As expected, this test showed that the variables of interest were not statistically significant in explaining the decision to visit, thus confirming the validity of our main results.

Table 6: Multivariate probit. Decision to (re)visit a tourist destination

	Model 3			Model 4		
	Valtellina	Valle d'Aosta	Trentino	Valtellina	Valle d'Aosta	Trentino
Pizzoccheri experience	0.234** (0.110)	0.295* (0.157)	0.251** (0.125)	0.227** (0.108)	0.273* (0.162)	0.256** (0.125)
Bresaola experience	0.376*** (0.144)	0.507*** (0.129)	0.532*** (0.161)	0.381*** (0.146)	0.513*** (0.133)	0.524*** (0.165)
Fontina experience	0.213* (0.109)	0.188 (0.151)	-0.043 (0.147)	0.186* (0.110)	0.178 (0.155)	-0.071 (0.147)
Melinda experience	0.289** (0.136)	-0.013 (0.147)	0.473*** (0.117)	0.314** (0.132)	-0.019 (0.145)	0.498*** (0.114)
Speck experience	-0.074 (0.178)	0.430*** (0.162)	0.304* (0.161)	-0.090 (0.175)	0.452*** (0.164)	0.315** (0.159)
Pizzoccheri identification	0.015 (0.156)	-0.105 (0.184)	-0.231* (0.133)	-0.107 (0.151)	-0.090 (0.232)	-0.401** (0.157)
Bresaola identification	0.017 (0.143)	0.005 (0.110)	-0.138 (0.126)	-0.170 (0.170)	0.040 (0.144)	-0.187 (0.135)
Fontina identification	0.067 (0.110)	0.137 (0.111)	0.129 (0.107)	0.030 (0.143)	-0.013 (0.168)	0.149 (0.147)
Melinda identification	0.121 (0.103)	0.174 (0.116)	-0.013 (0.109)	0.055 (0.129)	0.116 (0.119)	-0.132 (0.121)
Speck identification	-0.278** (0.137)	-0.117 (0.111)	-0.091 (0.117)	-0.264* (0.150)	-0.134 (0.122)	-0.050 (0.128)
Pizzoccheri appreciation				0.249** (0.120)	0.019 (0.155)	0.375** (0.151)
Bresaola appreciation				0.327** (0.151)	-0.134 (0.144)	0.046 (0.137)
Fontina appreciation				0.078 (0.181)	0.316* (0.163)	0.038 (0.141)
Melinda appreciation				0.145 (0.124)	0.103 (0.120)	0.205* (0.114)
Speck appreciation				-0.021 (0.162)	0.043 (0.102)	-0.077 (0.118)
Love of mountains	0.448*** (0.089)	0.410*** (0.079)	0.375*** (0.108)	0.435*** (0.090)	0.414*** (0.079)	0.356*** (0.102)
Love of typical products	0.361*** (0.114)	0.108 (0.100)	0.256** (0.115)	0.331*** (0.110)	0.096 (0.102)	0.229** (0.110)

<i>cont'd</i>	Model 3			Model 4		
	Valtellina	Valle d'Aosta	Trentino	Valtellina	Valle d'Aosta	Trentino
Previous visit to Valtellina	0.913*** (0.169)	-0.029 (0.089)	-0.007 (0.124)	0.901*** (0.174)	-0.016 (0.090)	-0.039 (0.124)
Previous visit to Valle d'Aosta	0.058 (0.111)	0.958*** (0.150)	0.355*** (0.107)	0.038 (0.106)	0.966*** (0.151)	0.357*** (0.106)
Previous visit to Trentino	0.239*** (0.080)	0.013 (0.085)	0.871*** (0.157)	0.242*** (0.087)	0.001 (0.083)	0.884*** (0.162)
Distance from Valtellina	0.032 (0.056)			0.029 (0.055)		
Distance from Valle d'Aosta		0.009 (0.056)			0.003 (0.055)	
Distance from Trentino			-0.153*** (0.053)			-0.155*** (0.053)
Age 18-25	0.095 (0.144)	0.085 (0.151)	0.167 (0.145)	0.100 (0.149)	0.121 (0.149)	0.200 (0.150)
Age 26-39	0.242* (0.134)	0.146 (0.167)	0.149 (0.191)	0.236* (0.132)	0.165 (0.163)	0.149 (0.191)
Age 50-65	-0.082 (0.122)	0.006 (0.117)	0.203 (0.139)	-0.086 (0.126)	0.013 (0.115)	0.219 (0.139)
Age > 65	-0.275*** (0.104)	0.017 (0.162)	0.019 (0.134)	-0.286*** (0.107)	0.025 (0.161)	0.027 (0.136)
Secondary education	-0.074 (0.105)	0.205** (0.094)	0.058 (0.101)	-0.045 (0.107)	0.205** (0.098)	0.071 (0.101)
High school education	-0.216 (0.139)	0.029 (0.164)	-0.120 (0.191)	-0.179 (0.140)	0.046 (0.161)	-0.099 (0.190)
Male gender	-0.101 (0.098)	0.040 (0.081)	0.035 (0.075)	-0.077 (0.100)	0.056 (0.079)	0.059 (0.077)
Having children	0.275*** (0.100)	0.183* (0.100)	0.461*** (0.112)	0.267*** (0.098)	0.198** (0.100)	0.475*** (0.117)
Cross-equation corr.						
Valtellina	1.000			1.000		
Valle d'Aosta	0.640	1.000		0.645	1.000	
Trentino	0.676	0.796	1.000	0.666	0.805	1.000
Log pseudolikelihood		-1,361.559			-1,348.037	
LL ratio test χ^2		465.312			460.880	
LL ratio test χ^2 (p-value)		0.000			0.000	
N		1,100			1,100	

Robust standard errors in parentheses, clustered by 89 Italian Provinces. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

6 Conclusions

Our analysis offers two important contributions to the literature on the promotional role of typical products for mountain destinations. First, it confirms the existence of a strong and statistically significant link between typical products and the intention to (re)visit a mountain destination. Second, it clarifies whether typical products have a market-expanding and/or a business-stealing effect. Our results indicate that experience of typical products plays a significant role in promoting both the places of origin and other similar tourist destinations. Thus, typical products have a market-expanding role. These results do not significantly change if we control for the knowledge of the place of origin, with the exception of some cases where the correct identification of a product's place of origin has a business-stealing effect. Instead, the strong appreciation for a typical product combined with the correct identification of its place of origin has a positive effect on the intention to (re)visit only the product's place of origin, and no significant effects on the intention to (re)visit other destinations.

Thus, our study identifies three main components related to the promotional role of a typical product (tourist's experience, knowledge and appreciation of that product), and it shows that a typical product may be either market-expanding or business-stealing depending on the message that the typical product conveys to prospective tourists. If the typical product evokes positive characteristics of mountain destinations such as historic, romantic and kid-friendly locations, culture, typical *cuisine*, fresh air, beautiful scenery, sport and other outdoor activities, the typical product and the intention to (re)visit a destination are complementary goods. Then, the larger the consumption of typical products, the larger the willingness to visit or to revisit a mountain destination. And, similarly, the stronger the appreciation of a typical product, the stronger the intention to (re)visit a mountain place.

On the contrary, if a typical product conveys a message that the positive characteristics mentioned above refer to the place of origin of that product, but not (necessarily) to others, then it will have a business-stealing effect. A prospective tourist, who wants to go to a very typical mountain place, will visit only that specific mountain destination. In order to convey such a message, a typical product must have an informative content, i.e. tourists must be able to identify the place of origin of the typical product. Otherwise, when prospective tourists are confused, a typical product continues to be market-expanding. Thus, a business-stealing effect only occurs when prospective tourists know the place of origin of the product so that the typical product is complementary only to the intention to (re)visit its place of origin.

Our results have straightforward policy implications. First, since experience of typical products has a market-expanding effect, mountain destinations may take advantage from engaging in joint promotional actions, using their typical products as promotional tools. Some

possible joint territorial actions to be undertaken are the strengthening of the distribution channels of typical products in the whole national territory. Other sale channels such as product-specific e-marketplaces could be enhanced. Moreover, product packaging could be designed in order to contain images capable of evoking the link between local food and mountain resorts. Second, in order to maximize the promotional role of a typical product for a single mountain destination, strong appreciation and correct identification of the place of origin are required. To this end, some possible measures can be activated at the various stages of the supply chain. From the producers' side, attention should be paid to improve the quality and palatability of products, for goods sold both at their place of origin and elsewhere. Producers should guarantee the quality content of their products, and their recognizability as well. A campaign could be launched with the aim of raising the awareness about the use of typical products among local operators, such as restaurants, inns and wine bars. Finally, attention should be paid to reinforcing territorial brands and quality labels.

References

- AJZEN I (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.
- ARCIDIACONO P, ELLICKSON PB, LANDRY P, RIDLEY DB (2013). Pharmaceutical followers, *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 31, 538-553.
- BAGWELL K (2007). The economic analysis of advertising. In: Armstrong, M. and Porter, R. (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial Organization*, vol. III. North-Holland, pp. 1701-1844.
- BARROS CP AND ASSAF AG (2012). Analyzing tourism return intention to an urban destination. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research* 36(2): 216-231.
- BASS FM, KRISHNAMOORTHY A, PRASAD A, SETHI SP (2005) Generic and Brand Advertising Strategies in a Dynamic Duopoly. *Marketing Science* 24 (4): 556-568.
- BECKER GS AND KM MURPHY (1993). A simple theory of advertising as a good or bad. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 108(4): 941-964.
- BERG PO, SEVIN G (2014). Food - branding places - A sensory perspective, *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* 10: 289-304.
- BESSIÈRE J (1998). Local development and heritage: traditional food and cuisine as tourist attractions in rural areas. *Sociologia Ruralis* 38(1): 21-34.

- BIEL A (1990) Love the Ad, buy the product? Why liking the advertisement and preferring the brand aren't strange bedfellows after all, *Admap*, 26: 21-25.
- BOYNE S AND HALL D (2004). Place promotion through food and tourism: Rural branding and the role of websites. *Place Branding* 1(1): 80-92.
- BRAITHWAITE D (1928). The economic effects of advertisement. *Economic Journal*, 38: 16-37.
- CAPPELLARI L, JENKINS SP (2003). Multivariate Probit Regression using simulated maximum likelihood. *The Stata Journal* 3(3): 278-294.
- CHINTAGUNTA PK (1993). Investigating purchase incidence, brand choice and purchase quantity decisions of households. *Marketing Science* 12(2): 184-208.
- CHINTAGUNTA PK, JAIN D (1992). A Dynamic Model of Channel Member Strategies for Marketing Expenditures. *Marketing Science* 11 (2): 168-188.
- COMANOR WS, WILSON TA (1967). Advertising, Market Structure and Performance. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 49: 423-40.
- DRÖGE C (1989). Shaping the route to attitude change: central versus peripheral processing through comparative versus noncooperative advertising. *Journal of Marketing Research* 26: 193-204.
- DU RAND GE, HEATH E (2006). Towards a framework for food tourism as an element of destination marketing. *Current Issues in Tourism* 9(3): 206-234.
- DUBÉ J-P AND MANCHANDA P (2005). Differences in dynamic brand competition across markets: An empirical analysis. *Marketing Science* 24(1): 81-95.
- ERICKSON GM (2009). Advertising Competition in a Dynamic Oligopoly with Multiple Brands. *Operations Research* 57 (5): 1106-1113.
- FOX R (2007). Reinventing the gastronomic identity of Croatian tourist destinations. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 26(3): 546-559.
- FRIEDMAN JW (1983). Advertising and Oligopolistic Equilibrium. *The Bell Journal of Economics*, 14(2): 464-473.
- FROCHOT I (2003). An analysis of regional positioning and its associated food images in French tourism regional brochures. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing* 14 (3/4): 77-96.

- GARTHWAITE CL (2014). Demand spillovers, combative advertising, and celebrity endorsements. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 6(2): 76-104.
- GIESEN JCAH, HAVERMANS RC, DOUVEN A, TEKELENBURG M AND JANSEN A (2010). Will work for snack food: the Association of BMI and Snack Reinforcement. *Obesity* 18 (5): 966-970.
- GIOVANNUCCI D, BARHAM E, PIROG R (2010). Defining and marketing ‘local’ foods: Geographical indications for US products, *Journal of World Intellectual Property* 13(2): 94-120.
- GOU Q, ZHANG J, LIANG L, HUANG Z, ASHLEY A (2014) Horizontal cooperative programmes and cooperative advertising, *International Journal of Production Research*, 52(3): 691-712.
- GREENE WH (2003). *Econometric analysis*, fifth edition, Prentice-Hall.
- GUPTA S (1988). Impact of sales promotions on when, what, and how much to buy. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25(4): 342-355.
- HALEY RI, BALDINGER AL (1991) The ARF copy research validity project. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 31: 11-32.
- HALL CM AND MITCHELL R (2001). Wine and food tourism. In: N. Douglas, N. Douglas and R. Derrett (eds.) *Special interest tourism: Context and cases*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, 307-329.
- HANDSZUH H (2000). Local food in tourism policies. Paper presented at the International Conference on Local Food and Tourism, Larnaka, Cyprus.
- HARRIS J, DEACON J (2011) Marketing in context - the marketing authenticity of owner/entrepreneurs of small firms: Case evidence from Welsh (UK) SME food and drink producers and retailers, *Small Enterprise Research*, 18(1): 33-50.
- HASHIMOTO A AND TELFER DJ (2006). Selling Canadian culinary tourism: Branding the global and the regional product. *Tourism Geographies* 8 (1): 31-55.
- HJALAGER A-M AND RICHARDS G (Eds.) (2002). *Tourism and gastronomy*. London: Routledge.
- HORNG J-S AND TSAI C-T (2010). Government websites for promoting East Asian culinary tourism: A cross-national analysis. *Tourism Management* 31, 74-85.
- IIZUKA T (2004). What explains the use of direct-to-consumer advertising of prescription drugs? *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 52(3): 349-379.

- JOLIFFE IT (2002). *Principal Component Analysis*. New York: Springer, second edition.
- KALDOR N (1950). The Economic Aspect of Advertising. *Review of Economic Studies* 18: 1-27.
- KIHLSTROM R, RIORDAN M (1984). Advertising as a Signal. *Journal of Political Economy* 92: 427-50.
- KIVELA J AND CROTTTS JC (2006). Tourism and gastronomy: Gastronomy's influence on how tourists experience a destination. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research* 30(3): 354-377.
- LEE I AND ARCORDIA C (2011). The role of regional food festivals for destination branding. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 13: 355-367.
- LIN Y-C, PEARSON TE, CAI LA (2011). Food as a form of destination identity: A tourism destination brand perspective. *Tourism and Hospitality Research* 11(1): 30-48
- LIU Q, GUPTA S (2011). The impact of direct-to-consumer advertising of prescription drugs on physician visits and drug requests: Empirical findings and public policy implications, *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 28: 205-217.
- LOKEN B, ROSS I AND HINKLE RL (1986). Consumer confusion of origin and brand similarity perceptions. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing* 5: 195-211.
- LONG LM (2004). *Culinary tourism*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.
- LORENZINI E (2011). The extra-urban cultural district: an emerging local production system. Three Italian case studies. *European Planning Studies* 19(8): 1441-1457
- MAK AHN, LUMBERSA M, EVESA A, CHANG RCY (2012). Factors influencing tourist food consumption. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 31: 928-936.
- MARSHALL A (1919). *Industry and trade: A study of industrial technique and business organization; and of their influences on the conditions of various classes and nations*. London: MacMillan and Co.
- MILGROM P, ROBERTS J (1986). Price and Advertising Signals of Product Quality. *Journal of Political Economy* 94: 796-821.
- MITCHELL V-W AND PAPAVALASSIOU V (1999). Market causes and implications of consumer confusion. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* 8: 319-339.

MITCHELL V-W, WALSH G AND YAMIN M (2005). Towards a conceptual model of consumer confusion. *Advances in Consumer Research* 32: 143-150.

NARAYANAN S, DESIRAJU R AND CHINTAGUNTA PK (2004). Return on investment implications for pharmaceutical promotional expenditures: the role of marketing-mix interactions. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(4): 90-105.

NERLOVE M, ARROW KJ (1962). Optimal Advertising Policy under Dynamic Conditions. *Economica* 29: 129-142.

NIELD K, KOZAK M AND LEGRYS G (2000). The role of food service in tourist satisfaction. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 19(4): 375-384.

OKUMUS B, OKUMUS F AND MCKERCHER B (2007). Incorporating local and international cuisines in the marketing of tourism destinations: The cases of Hong Kong and Turkey. *Tourism Management* 28: 253-261.

PACCIANI A, BELLETTI G, MARESCOTTI A, SCARAMUZZI S (2001). The role of typical products in fostering rural development and the effects of regulation (EEC) 2081/92, 72rd seminar of the European Association of Agricultural Economics, Ancona 28-30 June.

PEPALL L, RICHARDS DH, NORMAN G (2002). *Industrial Organization: Contemporary Theory and Practice*, Second Edition, Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.

QUAN S AND WANG N (2004). Towards a structural model of the tourist experience: an illustration from food experiences in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 25(3), 297-305.

RYU K AND JANG S (2006). Intention to experience local cuisine in a travel destination: the modified theory of reasoned action. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research* 30(4): 507-516.

SANTAGATA W, RUSSO AP AND SEGRE G (2007). Tourism quality labels. An incentive for the sustainable development of creative clusters as tourist attractions? In: G. Richards and J. Wilson (eds.) *Tourism, Creativity and Development*. London: Routledge, 107-124.

SELDON BJ AND DOROODIAN K (1989). A simultaneous model of cigarette advertising: Effects on demand and industry response to public policy. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 71(4): 673-677.

SIMS R (2009). Food, place and authenticity: local food and the sustainable tourism experience. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 17(3): 321-336.

- SORGER G (1989). Competitive Dynamic Advertising a Modification of the Case Game. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 13 (1): 55-80.
- SPARKS B, BOWEN J AND KLAG S (2003). Restaurants and the tourist market. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 15(1): 6-13.
- STIGLER GJ (1961). The Economics of Information. *Journal of Political Economy*, 69: 213-25.
- TELFER DJ AND WALL G (1996). Linkages between tourism and food production. *Annals of Tourism Research* 23(3): 635-653.
- TELLSTROM R, GUSTAFSSON I AND MOSSBERG L (2006). Consuming heritage: the use of local food culture in branding. *Place Branding* 2(2): 130-143.
- VAKRATSAS D, AMBLER T (1999). how advertising works: what do we really know? *Journal of Marketing*, 63: 26-43.
- VIDALE ML, WOLFE HB (1957). An Operations Research Study of Sales Response to Advertising." *Operations Research* 5(3): 370-381.
- YUKSEL A AND YUKSEL F (2002). Measurement of tourist satisfaction with restaurant service: A segment-based approach. *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 9(1): 52-68.
- ZAGO AM, PICK D (2004). Labeling policies in food markets: private incentives, public intervention, and welfare effects, *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, 29(1): 150-165.

Nuova Serie | *New Series* – WP CERTeT

Anno | *Year* 2016

N. 01 «The Impact of Typical Products on the Decision to (Re)Visit
a Tourist Destination: Market-Expanding or Business-Stealing?
di Marco Alderighi, Carluccio Bianchi e Eleonora Lorenzini
