



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

Use and Benefits Associated with State Marketing Programs

Anwasha Chakrabarti
Graduate Research Assistant
Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics
University of Connecticut

Ben Campbell
Assistant Professor
Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics
University of Georgia

Adam N. Rabinowitz
Assistant Professor
Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics
University of Georgia

Brady Brewer
Assistant Professor
Department of Agricultural Economics
Purdue University

**Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the Southern Agricultural Economics
Association 2019 Annual Meeting
Birmingham, Alabama**

Copyright 2019 by Anwasha Chakrabarti, Ben Campbell, Adam N. Rabinowitz, and Brady Brewer. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

Acknowledgments:

This research was funded by Farm Credit East. We appreciate input from multiple producers and industry stakeholders throughout the northeastern U.S.

Introduction

Government programs at the state and federal level play an important role in the profitability of agricultural producers throughout the U.S. As local food sales topped \$6 billion in 2012 (Low et al. 2015), states have devoted more efforts toward increasing local food sales by offering a variety of mechanisms for producers to access consumers. Notably, all states offer some type of state level marketing program that attempts to increase consumer access to “local” products (Onken and Bernard 2010), thereby, attempting to increase profitability at the farm level. Programs include buy local campaigns, operating or licensing farmers’ markets, farm/wine trails, and a plethora of quality labeling programs.

In order to evaluate these efforts and better understand how consumers perceive local food, there is extensive literature on consumer purchasing, perception and willingness-to-pay. For instance, high income consumers have been shown to be more likely to purchase local, though gender and educational effects vary (Jekanowski, Williams, and Schiek 2000, Brown 2003, Fernández-Ferrín et al. 2017). Furthermore, better quality, supporting the local community, and environmental benefits are frequently cited reasons for purchasing local (Seyfang 2006, Darby et al. 2008, Durham, King and Roheim 2009, Hand and Martinez 2010, Onozaka, Nurse and McFadden 2010, Sharp et al. 2011). With respect to willingness-to-pay, price premiums for local have been shown to exist for a variety of local foods (Darby et al. 2008, Yue and Tong 2009, Onozaka, Nurse and McFadden 2010, Campbell et al. 2015). However, price, inconvenience, lack of product choices and limited accessibility have been shown to be barriers to purchasing local food (Chambers et al. 2007, Hardesty 2008).

As noted above, the literature around local food on the demand side is extensive, yet there is little work that has examined the supply side of how and why producers participate in state level programs devoted to increasing producer sales of local food. Low et al. (2015) have

examined policies associated with supporting local and regional foods and the farm characteristics associated with direct-to-consumer marketing. However, no research has looked at how farm characteristics impact awareness and use of these state level programs or the barriers to/benefits from using the state level programs. This paper looks to fill this gap by utilizing a regional dataset (northeastern agricultural producers) to examine which farm characteristics impact awareness and use of state level buy local campaigns, farmers' markets, farm/wine trails, state seal of quality, and designated small farm status. Further, we examine and discuss the barriers associated with using these campaigns as well as the benefits gained by producers using the campaigns.

Materials and Methods

During September through November 2014 an online survey was administered to agricultural producers throughout the northeastern U.S. The survey focused on the state level regulatory climate, use of various state programs and costs of regulatory compliance. Since there is no definitive list of agricultural producers to use for distributing the survey, we utilized lists and distribution capabilities of state level Farm Bureaus, university extension agents, regional agricultural associations as well as contact information from online databases. No financial incentive was provided for participation. A total of 701 surveys were attempted (not all were complete) though there is no way to calculate a response rate as the total number of surveys distributed could not be attained. For this paper there were 382 complete and usable responses.

With respect to the sample, 36% of producers had their main operation in New York with only 3% from New Jersey (Table 1). Most producers (49%) in the sample were a sole proprietorship with limited liability corporation the second most used form of business organization (25%). Fruit and vegetable production represented the majority of agricultural

production for 31% of producers in the sample, followed by other (such as timber, bee keeping, etc.) at 16%, and dairy at 11%. Most of the surveyed farms had farm sales less than \$50,000 in 2013-2014 with 56% having less than \$100,000 in sales.

The main question of interest was “What state organized marketing programs are you aware of and do you participate in?”. Producers could answer “yes aware – participate,” “yes aware – do not participate,” or “not aware.” Based on their answer to the initial question, producers were asked a follow up question. Producers that were aware and participated were asked “What benefits have you received from participating in the state organized marketing program?” and were given the following choices “increased sales,” “a price premium over usual prices,” “access to new markets,” “no benefits,” or “other.” Producers that were aware but did not participate were asked “Why do you not participate in the state organized marketing program?” with answer choices being “not enough information about the program,” “lack of time to sign up,” “production is too small to participate,” “do not believe the program provides any benefits,” “the fee to participate is too high,” or “other.”

Given the question of interest was categorical in nature, we utilized a multinomial logit (MNL) model. The MNL model is based on random utility theory whereby each choice has a utility ascribed to it and the producer’s choice is the choice with the highest utility. As noted by Greene (2003 p. 721), the probability of choosing choice j by producer i is modeled as:

$$Prob(Y_i = j | x_i) = \frac{e^{\beta' j x_i}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^3 e^{\beta' k x_i}} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, 3. \quad [1]$$

where x_{ij} includes the farm characteristics and producer’s demographics. The marginal effects are the partial derivatives with respect to each explanatory variable.

Results and Discussion

The buy local program had the largest percentage of producers participating followed by farmers' markets at 42% and 31%, respectively (Table 2). As expected, given the size and scope of the buy local and farmers' market programs, these programs had few producers that were not aware of them. The farm/wine trails, state seal of quality, and small farm designation had few participants with a large percentage aware but not participating.

Marginal Effects Associated with Buy Local

The MNL marginal effects provide some interesting results (Table 3). Notably, corporations were 31% more likely to participate in the buy local program compared to a sole proprietorship. Furthermore, greenhouse/nursery operations were 38% less likely to participate in buy local compared to fruit/vegetable operations. This is not surprising as most local programs tend to be geared toward foods and not plants. Of key interest is that firms that are seeing decreased profitability over time are 17% less likely to participate in buy local programs. We might anticipate that firms that are seeing decreased profitability would be looking for various programs to help increase profitability, but this is not the case when looking at buy local program usage.

When examining those firms that are aware but do not participate we see that general proprietorship/limited partnerships are more likely to know about but not participate in buy local programs, while corporations are less likely. Furthermore, greenhouse/nursery and field crop producers are more likely to not participate. With respect to not being aware, field crop and farms having \$50,000-\$99,999 producers are 11% and 3%, respectively, less likely to be aware

of buy local programs compared to fruit/vegetable producers and farms making less than \$50,000.

Marginal Effects Associated with Farmers' Markets

With respect to farmers' market participation, producers located in Maine were 8% less likely to participate in farmers' markets than producers from New York (Table 3). However, New Hampshire producers were 13% more likely than New York producers to sell at farmers' markets. Farm operations set up as limited liability corporations (LLC) were 10% more likely than sole proprietorships to sell at a farmers' market. This could be the result of LLCs having limited liability at the personal level for producers, thereby, lowering the risk of selling direct-to-consumer. Furthermore, we find that dairies, greenhouse/nursery, field crops, and other agricultural production are less likely to sell at a farmers' market than fruit/vegetable producers. On the other hand, LLCs, dairies, greenhouse/nursery, and field crop producers are less likely to sell at farmers' market even though they are aware of them.

Marginal Effects Associated with Other State Programs

In comparison to the buy local and farmers' market results, the other program results (farm/wine trail, state seal of quality, and designated small farm) have a lot of state variation around awareness (Table 4). For instance, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey and Vermont producers are less likely to be aware of but not participating in a farm/wine trail than New York producers, while being more likely to not be aware of this program. In comparison, Maine, New Jersey, and Vermont producers are less likely to be aware and participate in state

seal of quality programs than New York producers, with Massachusetts producers being more likely to be aware and not participate.

Focusing on agricultural production, the farm/wine trail has the most significant differences as the other programs are generally similar to fruit/vegetable producers. Greenhouse/nursery, field crops, beef, and other agricultural product producers are less likely to participate in farm/wine trails than fruit/vegetable producers, but non-beef livestock producers are more likely. Further, we see that as total full time employees increases the probability of participating in farm/wine trails increases.

Reasons for not Participating

The main reason for not participating in a buy local program is producer belief that production is too small (33%) followed by a belief the program does not offer any benefits (26%) (Table 5). Similar results are found for the other programs, though do not believe program provides benefits is the most cited reason for the other programs followed by small production. Based on these results it is clear that state agencies and other stakeholders wanting to increase producer use of these programs should focus on highlighting program benefits and finding ways to incorporate smaller producers into the programs.

Benefits of Participating

The primary reason for participating in the buy local, farmers' market, and farm/wine trail programs is increased sales (Table 6). Access to new markets was also a commonly cited benefit to these programs. Interestingly, 25% of producers that participate in the buy local program indicated there was no benefit. Similarly, 14% and 12% of farmers' market and farm/wine trail producer participants indicated they found no benefit in the programs they were participating in,

respectively. With respect to state seal of quality and designated small farm programs, almost 50% of producers that participate in these programs indicated there was no benefit to participation. So in essence, these producers are putting resources toward a program that they believe provides no benefit. The reason for this is not exactly known and is worth researching in more depth. A basic hypothesis is that the producers feel that they need to be a part of the program to say they are a part or to be seen participating. It is also possible there was an expected benefit when they first started to participate in the program but have been unable to subsequently achieve that benefit. Ultimately, this presents an interesting question for future research.

Conclusions

Many studies have focused on the demand side of state programs, such as buy local campaigns and farmers' markets. This study attempted to gain a better understanding of the supply side by examining producer awareness and usage of several state sponsored programs. Using a sample of agricultural producers from the northeastern U.S., we evaluate usage and reasons for usage of these programs.

Our results find that state, type of business organization, and main agricultural product produced played a role in usage of the programs. The effects of these characteristics varying by program. Further, we find that a large percentage of non-participants cite no benefits as one reason why they do not participate. Similarly, a large percentage of participants see no value in their participation but they still participate. Producers that do find a benefit indicate that increased sales is the primary benefit of their participation.

References

Brown, C. 2003. Consumers' Preferences for Locally Produced Food: A Study in Southeast Missouri. *American Journal of Alternative Agriculture* 18(4):213–224.

Campbell, B.L, H. Khachatryan, B.K. Behe, J. Dennis, and C. Hall. 2015. Consumer Perceptions and Misperceptions of Ecofriendly and Sustainable Terms. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review* 44(1):21–34.

Chambers, S., A. Lobb, L. Butler, K. Harvey, and W.B. Traill. 2007. Local, National and Imported Foods: A Qualitative Study. *Appetite* 49(1):208–213.

Darby, K., M.T. Batte, S. Ernst, and B. Roe. 2008. Decomposing local: A Conjoint Analysis of Locally Produced Foods. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 90(2):476–486.

Durham, C.A., R.P. King, and C.A. Roheim. 2009. Consumer Definitions of 'Locally Grown' for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables. *Journal of Food Distribution Research* 40(1):56–62.

Fernández-Ferrín, P., Bande, B., Calvo-Turrientes, A., and Galán-Ladero, M. M. 2017. The Choice of Local Food Products by Young Consumers: The Importance of Public and Private Attributes. *Agribusiness: An International Journal* (33)1:70-84.

Greene, W.H. 2003. *Econometric Analysis*, 5th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hand, M.S., and S. Martinez. 2010. Just What Does Local Mean? *Choices* 25(1):13–18.

Hardesty, S.D. 2008. The Growing Role of Local Food Markets. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 90(5):1289–1295.

Jekanowski, M.D., D.R. Williams, and W.A. Schiek. 2000. Consumers' Willingness to Purchase Locally Produced Agricultural Products: An Analysis of an Indiana Survey. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review* 29(1):43–53.

Low, S.A., A. Adalja, E. Beaulieu, N. Key, S. Martinez, A. Melton, A. Perez, K. Ralston, H. Stewart, S. Suttles, S. Vogel, and B. Jablonski. 2015. Trends in U.S. local and regional food systems. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, AP-068. 10 Jan. 2019. <<https://naldc.nal.usda.gov/download/60312/PDF> >.

Onken, K.A., and J.C. Bernard. 2010. Catching the 'Local' Bug: A Look at State Agricultural Marketing Programs. *Choices* 25(1).

Onozaka, Y., G. Nurse, and D.T. McFadden. 2010. Local Food Consumers: How Motivations and Perceptions Translate to Buying behavior. *Choices* (N.Y.) 25(1).

Seyfang, G. 2006. Ecological Citizenship and Sustainable Consumption: Examining Local Organic Food Networks. *Journal of Rural Studies* 22(4):383–395.

Sharp, J.S., J.K. Clark, G.A. Davis, M.B. Smith, and J.S. McCutcheon. 2011. Adapting Community and Economic Development Tools to the Study of Local Foods: The Case of Knox County, Ohio. *Journal of Extension* 49(2):1–12.

Yue, C. and C. Tong. 2009. Organic or Local? Investigating Consumer Preference for Fresh Produce using a Choice Experiment with Real Economic Incentives. *HortScience* 44:366–371.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the sample.

	Mean	SD
State of Main Farming Operation		
New York	36%	48%
Connecticut	15%	36%
Maine	5%	21%
Massachusetts	18%	39%
New Hampshire	17%	38%
New Jersey	3%	18%
Rhode Island	4%	19%
Vermont	5%	23%
Type of Business Organization		
Sole Proprietorship	49%	50%
General Proprietorship/Limited Partnership	8%	27%
Limited Liability Corporation	25%	43%
Corporation	15%	36%
Other	4%	19%
Main Agricultural Product Produced		
Dairy	11%	31%
Greenhouse/Nursery	7%	26%
Field Crops	9%	29%
Fruit/Vegetable	31%	46%
Beef	5%	23%
Non-Beef Livestock	8%	27%
Other	16%	37%
Farm Sales 2013-2014		
Less than \$50,000	46%	50%
\$50,000-\$99,999	10%	29%
\$100,000-\$349,999	19%	39%
\$350,000-\$1,000,000	10%	29%
Greater than \$1,000,000	16%	37%
Total Full Time Employees	5.0	10.1
Firm Profitability Trend since 2010		
Profit Decreased	21%	41%
Profit Unchanged	27%	45%
Profit Increased	48%	50%
Gender (male = 1)	67%	47%
Age	56.8	11.7
Race (Caucasian = 1)	92%	27%
Percentage of Household Income from Farming		
Farm Income less than 25%	38%	49%

Farm Income 25%-75%

27%

45%

Farm Income greater than 75%

35%

48%

Table 2. Awareness and participation in several state agricultural programs.

	Aware and Participate	Aware and do not Participate	Not Aware
Buy Local	42%	46%	12%
Farmers Markets	31%	62%	7%
Farm or Wine Trail	10%	60%	30%
State Seal of Quality	12%	41%	47%
Designated Small Farm	6%	32%	62%

Table 3. Marginal effects from the multinomial logit models for awareness and participation in buy local and farmers' market programs.

	Buy Local						Farmers Markets					
	Aware and Participate		Aware and do not Participate		Not Aware		Aware and Participate		Aware and do not Participate		Not Aware	
	M.E.	P-value	M.E.	P-value	M.E.	P-value	M.E.	P-value	M.E.	P-value	M.E.	P-value
<i>State of Main Farming Operation</i>												
Connecticut	0.0314	0.777	-0.0272	0.807	-0.0042	0.868	0.0277	0.588	-0.0278	0.587	0.0001	0.495
Maine	0.1359	0.475	-0.1204	0.526	-0.0155	0.559	-0.0805	0.011	0.0805	0.011	-0.0000	0.948
Massachusetts	0.0080	0.931	-0.0097	0.917	0.0017	0.936	0.0284	0.555	-0.0284	0.555	0.0000	0.636
New Hampshire	0.1376	0.183	-0.1462	0.159	0.0086	0.741	0.1271	0.071	-0.1270	0.071	-0.0000	0.248
New Jersey	-0.0654	0.764	0.0516	0.814	0.0138	0.749	0.0814	0.600	-0.0815	0.600	0.0002	0.462
Rhode Island	0.2990	0.087	-0.2934	0.075	-0.0056	0.901	-0.0090	0.930	0.0091	0.929	-0.0001	0.119
Vermont	-0.2268	0.107	0.1959	0.187	0.0310	0.531	0.0203	0.820	-0.0208	0.816	0.0005	0.379
<i>Type of Business Organization</i>												
General												
Proprietorship/ Limited												
Partnership	-0.1838	0.131	0.2088	0.090	-0.0249	0.259	-0.0438	0.443	0.0438	0.442	-0.0000	0.377
Limited Liability Corporation	0.0869	0.365	-0.0814	0.396	-0.0054	0.789	0.0991	0.063	-0.0991	0.064	-0.0000	0.747
Corporation	0.3134	0.002	-0.2850	0.004	-0.0285	0.118	0.1085	0.152	-0.1069	0.159	-0.0017	0.011
Other	-0.1513	0.421	0.1558	0.405	-0.0045	0.930	-0.0149	0.858	0.0150	0.857	-0.0001	0.116
<i>Main Agricultural Product Produced</i>												
Dairy	-0.0941	0.434	0.1170	0.344	-0.0228	0.386	-0.0662	0.051	0.0661	0.052	0.0001	0.556
Greenhouse/ Nursery	-0.3807	0.000	0.3784	0.000	0.0023	0.950	-0.0741	0.045	0.0737	0.047	0.0005	0.428
Field Crops	-0.1669	0.150	0.2749	0.018	-0.1080	0.000	-0.3035	0.000	0.3037	0.000	-0.0001	0.126
Beef	-0.0885	0.509	0.0483	0.730	0.0402	0.402	0.0086	0.887	-0.0088	0.884	0.0002	0.283
Non-Beef												
Livestock	0.0578	0.778	-0.0296	0.884	-0.0282	0.182	0.2042	0.367	-0.2042	0.367	-0.0000	0.727
Other	-0.1185	0.390	0.0986	0.479	0.0199	0.577	-0.1062	0.015	0.1062	0.015	-0.0000	0.972
<i>Farm Sales 2013-2014</i>												

\$50,000-\$99,999	-0.0051	0.970	0.0314	0.817	-0.0263	0.096	0.0229	0.729	-0.0230	0.729	0.0000	0.773
\$100,000-\$349,999	0.1104	0.364	-0.0869	0.476	-0.0235	0.252	0.1144	0.128	-0.1143	0.128	-0.0001	0.295
\$350,000-\$1,000,000	-0.0106	0.944	-0.0014	0.993	0.0120	0.760	0.0120	0.870	-0.0116	0.874	-0.0004	0.112
Greater than \$1,000,000	-0.1895	0.216	0.1875	0.236	0.0020	0.956	-0.0310	0.613	0.0310	0.613	0.0000	0.784
<i>Firm Profitability Trend since 2010</i>												
Profit Decreased	-0.1733	0.066	0.1416	0.153	0.0317	0.331	-0.0071	0.890	0.0070	0.891	0.0001	0.284
Profit Increased	-0.0863	0.343	0.0863	0.347	0.0001	0.997	0.0584	0.126	-0.0584	0.126	0.0000	0.735
Gender (male=1)	-0.0085	0.925	0.0115	0.900	-0.0029	0.886	-0.0174	0.646	0.0175	0.645	-0.0001	0.382
Age	0.0046	0.134	-0.0048	0.129	0.0002	0.831	0.0001	0.958	-0.0001	0.959	-0.0000	0.522
Race (Caucasian = 1)	0.1491	0.238	-0.1741	0.168	0.0250	0.195	0.0013	0.985	-0.0013	0.985	-0.0000	0.907
<i>Percentage of Household Income from Farming</i>												
Farm Income 25%-75%	-0.0396	0.696	0.0242	0.811	0.0153	0.553	-0.0097	0.815	0.0097	0.814	-0.0000	0.686
Farm Income greater than 75%	-0.0598	0.620	0.0668	0.578	-0.0071	0.801	-0.0565	0.241	0.0565	0.241	-0.0000	0.859
Total Full Time Employees	0.0026	0.493	-0.0032	0.393	0.0006	0.284	-0.0014	0.543	0.0014	0.543	-0.0000	0.946
Wald chi2			1769.100							4250.190		
Prob > chi2			0.000							0.000		
Log pseudolikelihood			-222.753							-168.414		
Pseudo R2			0.117							0.207		

*Bold represents significance at alpha 0.1 level or less.

**M.E. = marginal effect from the multinomial logit model.

Table 4. Marginal effects from the multinomial logit models for awareness and participation in Farm/Wine trail, State Seal of Quality and Designated Small Farm programs

	Farm or Wine Trail						State Seal of Quality						Designated Small Farm						
	Aware and Participate		Aware and do not Participate		Not Aware		Aware and Participate		Aware and do not Participate		Not Aware		Aware and Participate		Aware and do not Participate		Not Aware		
	M.E.	P-value	M.E.	P-value	M.E.	P-value	M.E.	P-value	M.E.	P-value	M.E.	P-value	M.E.	P-value	M.E.	P-value	M.E.	P-value	
<i>State of Main Farming Operation</i>																			
Connecticut	-0.0001	0.408	0.0015	0.988	-0.0014	0.988	-0.0097	0.557	-0.3798	0.000	0.3895	0.000	-0.0000	0.478	-0.2242	0.001	0.2242	0.001	
Maine	0.0000	0.804	-0.3904	0.023	0.3904	0.023	-0.0623	0.000	-0.0819	0.639	0.1442	0.409	-0.0000	0.282	-0.1339	0.276	0.1339	0.276	
Massachusetts	0.0002	0.265	-0.1657	0.079	0.1656	0.080	-0.0211	0.135	0.1973	0.021	-0.1762	0.040	-0.0000	0.817	-0.0870	0.232	0.0870	0.232	
New Hampshire	0.0000	0.944	-0.2288	0.038	0.2288	0.038	0.0000	1.000	-0.0109	0.921	0.0109	0.921	-0.0000	0.097	0.1151	0.270	-0.1151	0.270	
New Jersey	0.0001	0.760	-0.4114	0.024	0.4113	0.024	-0.0244	0.068	-0.3459	0.002	0.3703	0.001	-0.0000	0.116	-0.1966	0.023	0.1966	0.023	
Rhode Island	-0.0003	0.007	-0.2845	0.116	0.2848	0.116	0.0023	0.946	-0.1509	0.498	0.1487	0.497	-0.0000	0.113	-0.1677	0.200	0.1677	0.200	
Vermont	-0.0003	0.008	-0.4088	0.011	0.4091	0.011	-0.0726	0.000	0.1190	0.464	-0.0464	0.775	0.0001	0.360	-0.1764	0.096	0.1763	0.097	
<i>Type of Business Organization</i>																			
General Proprietors																			
Partnership/Limited Liability Corporation	0.0000	0.893	-0.0516	0.692	0.0515	0.692	0.0295	0.441	0.1367	0.293	-0.1663	0.191	-0.0000	0.080	-0.0135	0.922	0.0135	0.922	
Corporation	0.0009	0.048	0.0746	0.328	-0.0755	0.321	0.0515	0.112	-0.0954	0.303	0.0438	0.638	-0.0000	0.721	0.0186	0.822	-0.0186	0.822	
Other	0.0005	0.213	0.1652	0.053	-0.1658	0.052	0.0554	0.182	-0.0402	0.745	-0.0152	0.903	0.0000	0.602	0.0057	0.958	-0.0057	0.958	
Main Agricultural Product Produced																			
Dairy	-0.0001	0.185	0.1377	0.158	-0.1376	0.158	-0.0269	0.025	-0.0697	0.582	0.0966	0.450	-0.0000	0.077	-0.0351	0.726	0.0351	0.726	
Greenhouse/Nursery	-0.0005	0.009	0.1343	0.189	-0.1338	0.191	-0.0219	0.078	-0.1296	0.424	0.1515	0.354	0.0000	0.950	-0.1076	0.368	0.1076	0.368	
Field Crops	-0.0005	0.009	-0.0546	0.662	0.0550	0.659	-0.0156	0.406	-0.1065	0.420	0.1221	0.367	0.0000	0.692	0.1571	0.232	-0.1571	0.232	
Beef	-0.0003	0.011	-0.0692	0.553	0.0696	0.551	0.0091	0.791	-0.0821	0.544	0.0729	0.595	-0.0000	0.065	-0.1618	0.139	0.1618	0.139	
Non-Beef Livestock	0.9917	0.000	-0.6951	0.000	-0.2965	0.000	0.0084	0.821	-0.0100	0.958	0.0017	0.993	-0.0000	0.069	-0.0786	0.587	0.0786	0.587	
Other	-0.0019	0.017	-0.1575	0.274	0.1594	0.268	0.0059	0.814	0.0355	0.814	-0.0413	0.787	0.0000	0.912	0.1279	0.368	-0.1279	0.368	
<i>Farm Sales 2013-2014</i>																			
\$50,000-\$99,999	0.0001	0.606	0.0036	0.977	-0.0037	0.976	-0.0133	0.525	0.1752	0.193	-0.1619	0.219	-0.0000	0.643	-0.0120	0.923	0.0120	0.923	
\$100,000-\$349,999	0.0005	0.207	0.0475	0.663	-0.0479	0.660	0.0068	0.783	0.1533	0.208	-0.1602	0.173	-0.0000	0.245	0.0138	0.897	-0.0138	0.897	
\$350,000-\$1,000,000	0.0005	0.333	-0.2172	0.217	0.2168	0.218	0.0196	0.639	0.0315	0.840	-0.0511	0.731	-0.0000	0.171	0.0140	0.917	-0.0140	0.917	
Greater than \$1,000,000	0.0004	0.316	-0.0561	0.741	0.0557	0.742	0.0275	0.516	0.0269	0.886	-0.0544	0.761	-0.0000	0.225	0.1244	0.475	-0.1244	0.475	
<i>Firm Profitability Trend since 2010</i>																			
Profit Decreased	0.0001	0.551	-0.2197	0.056	0.2197	0.056	-0.0142	0.324	-0.0126	0.919	0.0268	0.827	-0.0000	0.119	-0.0879	0.287	0.0879	0.287	
Profit Increased	0.0000	0.797	-0.1518	0.047	0.1517	0.047	-0.0141	0.417	-0.0313	0.736	0.0454	0.619	-0.0000	0.840	-0.1142	0.147	0.1142	0.147	

Gender (male = 1)	-0.0002	0.212	0.0337	0.678	-0.0335	0.680	-0.0148	0.414	0.0622	0.511	-0.0474	0.611	-0.0000	0.189	0.0337	0.681	-0.0337	0.681	
Age	0.0000	0.224	-0.0009	0.788	0.0009	0.787	-0.0001	0.884	0.0005	0.874	-0.0004	0.895	0.0000	0.944	0.0016	0.618	-0.0016	0.618	
Race (Caucasian = 1)	-0.0005	0.270	0.0021	0.988	-0.0016	0.991	-0.0017	0.946	0.1836	0.186	-0.1819	0.199	-0.0000	0.481	0.2820	0.000	-0.2820	0.000	
<i>Percentage of Household Income from</i>																			
<i>Farming</i>																			
Farm Income 25%-75%	-0.0001	0.184	0.0207	0.811	-0.0206	0.812	0.0242	0.322	0.0312	0.769	-0.0554	0.592	-0.0004	0.046	0.0123	0.895	-0.0119	0.898	
Farm Income greater than 75%	-0.0002	0.041	0.0079	0.946	-0.0076	0.947	0.0083	0.703	0.1721	0.181	-0.1804	0.148	0.0000	0.975	0.0834	0.458	-0.0834	0.458	
Total Full Time Employees	0.0000	0.032	0.0060	0.372	-0.0060	0.372	0.0003	0.551	0.0058	0.135	-0.0062	0.121	-0.0000	0.792	0.0025	0.526	-0.0025	0.526	
Wald chi2			3230.780						1836.940						2404.040				
Prob > chi2			0.000						0.000						0.000				
Log pseudolikelihood			-178.496						-222.200						-171.837				
Pseudo R2			0.233						0.146						0.185				

*Bold represents significance at alpha 0.1 level or less.

**M.E. = marginal effect from the multinomial logit model.

Table 5. Reasons for not participating in various state agricultural marketing programs.

	Reasons producers do not participate					
	Not enough time	Lack of time to sign up	Product too small to participate	Do not believe program provides benefits	Fee to participate too high	Other
Buy Local	21%	8%	33%	26%	2%	11%
Farmers Markets	6%	9%	32%	38%	4%	11%
Farm or Wine Trail	18%	4%	29%	34%	1%	14%
State Seal of Quality	20%	5%	26%	39%	2%	9%
Designated Small Farm	24%	4%	22%	39%	1%	11%

Table 6. Reasons for participating in various state agricultural marketing programs.

Benefits Received from Participating in State Organized Marketing Programs					
	Increased sales	Price premium	Access to new markets	No benefits	Other
Buy Local Farmers Markets Farm or Wine Trail State Seal of Quality Designated Small Farm	43%	7%	19%	25%	6%
	55%	5%	17%	14%	9%
	61%	2%	16%	12%	9%
	23%	4%	18%	49%	6%
	17%	0%	22%	48%	13%