

# Visiting a farm based tourist enterprise – who are the visitors and what is the future potential?

Arild Blekesaune, Berit Brandth & Marit S. Haugen Paper no 1/08, ISSN 1503-2735

Paper to the 17th Nordic Symposium in Tourism and Hospitality Research, 25-27 September 2008

Arild Blekesune Department of Sociology and Political Science Norwegian University of Science and Technology 7491 Trondheim, Norway Email: <u>Arild.Blekesaune@svt.ntnu.no</u>

Berit Brandth Department of Sociology and Political Science Norwegian University of Science and Technology 7491 Trondheim, Norway Email: <u>Berit.Brandth@svt.ntnu.no</u>

Marit S. Haugen Centre for Rural Research 7491 Trondheim, Norway Email: Marit.Haugen@rural.no

# Visiting a farm based tourist enterprise - who are the visitors and what is the future potential? <sup>1</sup>

Arild Blekesaune, Berit Brandth and Marit S. Haugen<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the visitors to Norwegian farms which offer various tourism activities and services. It is based on data from ten representative national Norwegian surveys, carried out by Synovate Norway between 1991 and 2007. In Norway, as in many regions and countries, rural- and farm tourism is becoming an important activity for promoting the vitality and sustainability of rural communities. The countryside has increasingly become a place of consumption and recreation. As such, farm tourism is part of the shift in the economic base of rural societies. Moreover, in making the distinctive features of the local places and people more appreciated, farm tourism represents a counter-trend to homogenisation and mass tourism. In this paper we focus on the domestic market. Our analysis shows significant increases in the portion of the population visiting farm-tourism enterprises since the 1991. In addition to describing who the visitors are, the paper also characterizes potential visitors within the domestic tourist market.

# Visiting a farm based tourist enterprise - who are the visitors and what is the future potential?

# Introduction

Farm tourism has received much attention in agricultural politics and economics. It is expected to promote employment, vitality and sustainability of rural communities (Innovasjon Norge, 2006). Farm based accommodation is an important and exotic part of the accommodation supply in many rural areas. Farm tourism is also known as agricultural tourism, or agritourism. "Agritourism" has been defined as the opportunities for tourists to "reside and sometimes participate in the work activities of farms and ranches" (Smith & Long, 2000: 222). In this paper we use the term farm tourism to denote all kinds of farm-based activities offered to visitors. In addition to accommodation services, working farms might offer a unique niche where visitors can experience the farm ambiance and participate in activities like feeding animals, harvesting and milking, while other farms might offer various types of outdoor and wildlife activities.

Farm tourism operations might provide a bridge between the farming community and others; between urban and rural dwellers, but also rural residents may enjoy the experience of visiting farm ventures. Since the majority of the general population have little or no contact with agriculture, on–farm tourism is one way by which nonfarmers can learn about agriculture. Norwegian farming is different from farming in many other European countries, as the farms are not located in rural villages but are scattered and dispersed throughout the landscape and are therefore distant from each other. This gives many farm operations a unique opportunity to offer their guests nature based activities, peace and quietness.

Farm-based tourism is not a new phenomenon, either in Norway or in other western countries (Busby & Rendle, 2000). Historically, people from the cities have turned to the countryside for recreation and holidays. What is new is the scope and variety of activities and the increased demands for market-orientation, professionalism and flexibility of the services offered, along with increased demands for quality and competence. Today, approximately 10 percent of all working farms in Norway are involved in farm tourism (Forbord & Stræte, 2008). While farm accommodation has a long tradition, the most recent activities are serving meals and providing adventure activities, reflecting a stronger focus on culture and experiences (Haugen & Vik, 2008).

Diversification has always been an important aspect of Norwegian farming (Almås, 2004). Since the 1990's farm diversification has been supported by community

development grants (BU-funds) and encouraged by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. Marketing of farm tourism has been facilitated by the establishment of the organisation Norwegian Rural Tourism and Traditional Food (NBG) in 2004. It has professionalized the marketing and made it easier for visitors to access information about farm holidays and other farm-based tourism activities throughout the country (www.nbg-nett.no).

In what has been called "the experience economy" Pine and Gilmore (1999) predict that businesses may be compelled to wrap experiences around their traditional products and services in order to stay in the market. That this happens at a time when businesses are putting increased emphasis on individual customer care makes it all the more interesting. These general market trends are also felt in Norwegian small-scale tourist businesses, and place greater demands on the hosting role as a vital part of the quality of the tourist product. A national campaign for rural tourism in Norway in 2006 concluded that those who supply tourist packages (accommodation, meal and activities) rather than a single product are the winners (Innovasjon Norge, 2006).

Farm tourism represents a variety of services and products. Davies and Gilbert (1992) for instance divide farm tourism products into three distinct categories; accommodation-based, activity-based and day-visitor-based. In Norway studies indicate that putting on seminars and meetings, weddings and anniversaries, and cultural events like concerts and festivals seem to be of growing importance for the farm enterprises (Brandth & Haugen, 2005; Kramvig, 2006), and this indicates that the services and products and hence the visitors (customers) are even more diverse. Common to all the categories of products is that adventures and memorable experiences can be added in order to increase the value. Tourism products are often intangible and cannot be experience for the visitor, tourism work is interactive and process focussed, and the quality of the product depends on the quality of the interaction between hosts and guests. Another characteristic of tourism products is that the visitors are present in the production process (Crang, 1997:139).

When tourists choose to visit a farm site, it might be for its image, scenery and tranquillity. As pointed out, adventures and individual experiences have become increasingly important. It is authentic people which are the focus of the tourists' concerns, and the visitors expect the hosts to be knowledgeable when it comes to nature and local culture (Pearce & Moscardo, 1986). Much tourism does occur around nature, local culture and takes place in rural areas, and research has been concerned with use, preservation and market possibilities (Viken, 2001; Jacobsen & Viken, 1997; Jacobsen & Viken, 1999; Wollan, 2002; Forbord & Stræte, 2008). Norwegian research on rural tourism has not dealt specifically with *farm* tourism at

the household level. Internationally, rural- and farm tourism research have been more varied in focus (Page & Getz, 1997; Sharpley & Sharpley, 1997; Hall, Roberts, & Mitchell, 2003).

Nevertheless, there is only a small body of research literature on farm tourism visitors, who they are and what their motivations and expectations are. In a US study from two counties in California results showed high participation and interest in agricultural tourism (Jolly & Reynolds, 2005). The top-ranking motivations for consumers' visits were purchasing fresh and homemade products, purchasing directly from farmers, experiencing nature, and vacation and relaxation. Differences were found between rural and urban visitors. Urban and suburban visitors were more likely to place value on open space than were rural or small town respondents (Jolly & Reynolds, 2005:4). Farmsteads were more important for the small town and rural respondents. Word of mouth advertising is found to be the most effective for agritourism marketing, with newspaper and magazine articles as the second and third most important marketing source (Reynolds, 2007). Foreign tourists visiting Norwegian fjords were asked in a survey whether they would be interested in visiting a farm (Rusten, Hem, & Iversen, 2007; Mehmetoglu, 2007). One third of the foreign tourists said they would be interested in visiting a farm during their holiday in Norway. Women are slightly more positive than men (58% versus 42%), the majority of those interested have higher education and are less than 50 years old (Mehmetoglou, 2007:256). Farm tourism appeals to the tourists who state that experiencing something new and being physically active are the most important motives for travelling to the fjords of Norway (p. 257).

An increasing body of tourism research has dealt with economic issues of small businesses in rural development, but little attention has been paid to the visitors. In Norway this research has been particularly absent. Visitors to farm tourism operations are not necessarily 'tourists' in a narrow sense. In this paper a broader term of 'visitor' will be used to embrace tourist-facility users from the local region and hometown as well as those visiting a farm for overnight stays.

The purpose of this paper is to explore domestic visitors to farms in Norway. Specifically, the paper examines the domestic market for farm tourism, and three specific questions are addressed: First whether there are any changes in the popularity of visits to farms offering tourism activities, second who are the visitors and third who are the potential visitors expressing an interest in farm based tourism. Based on recent developments on the supply side, for instance increased diversification of farm tourism services and improved marketing combined with an international trend among tourists to search for unique experiences, we expect that more people will be attracted to farm tourism and that this might influence the composition of visitors.

#### Methods

In order to assess the level of domestic participation in farm-based tourism, and to identify the consumers and potential visitors to agritourism operations, we use data from ten national surveys *Norsk Monitor*, carried out by the Synovate Norway. We have data from 1991 and all the following surveys conducted every second year with the most recent data from 2007. The data is collected in a two-stage process. First, a random sample of people are contacted by telephone and asked to participate in a comprehensive survey of values. Then, those who agree to participate receive a self-completion questionnaire by post. The total sample from the ten surveys is nearly 36 000 people, and all these surveys are weighted by population weights developed by Synovate Norway (Hellevik, 2008).

#### Explanatory Variables

For the first part of this analysis, we have operationalised a set of dummies which will be used as explanatory variables. The gender variable is recoded into a dummy variable where men are coded 1 and women are coded 0. The age variable is recoded into four dummies, with age 60 years or older used as a reference category. The variable *single* is coded 1 for respondents living in one person households, and 0 for multi households. The variable children living in household is a dummy which is coded 1 if the respondent has children living in his or her household and 0 if not. The variable *urban* is a dummy coded 1 if the respondent is living in one of the 22 most populated municipalities in Norway, and 0 if not. Social class is measured by seven dummies based on the question "What kind of work do you have?". The first class dummy consists of skilled workers and operators, and is named skilled workers. The second class dummy consists of top executives and general managers, and is named top executives. The third dummy consists of employees with other executive positions within the service sector, and is named service class with other executive positions. The other employees in service sectors are identified in the fourth dummy called service class other. The fifth dummy consists of all selfemployed persons. The sixth consists of pupils, students and apprentices, and is named students. The last dummy is named other outside the labour market, and includes people who have answered unemployed, retired, social security, homeworkers, and 'other'. All these dummies are measured according to the group unskilled workers, which constitutes the reference category that all classes are compared to. The variable grandparents who lived on farm is code 1 if one or more of the respondent's grandparents were living on a farm, and 0 if none of them lived on a farm. The education variable is based on self-reported data concerning 'level of education', and as many as 48 percent have classified their own education level as high, and these are defined into one group which is coded 1, while the others are coded 0. In addition to these dummies, we have operationalised the independent continuous variable year which identifies the changes between the different surveys,

and is coded with the value 0 for the first survey in 1991, and each new survey is coded with number of years after the first one. The last survey, completed in 2007, is by this system coded with value 16. The descriptive statistics of all these variables are presented in Table 1.

	Min	Max	% with value 1
Gender (men=1/women=0)	0	1	49.08 %
Age dummies			
Age 15-25 (reference)	0	1	17.91 %
Age 26-39	0	1	25.99 %
Age 40-59	0	1	31.40 %
Age 60+	0	1	24.70 %
Single (yes=1/no=0)	0	1	20.33 %
Children living in household (yes=1/no=0)	0	1	48.01 %
Urban district (yes=1/no=0)	0	1	41.68 %
Social class dummies			
Skilled workers (reference)	0	1	9.34 %
Unskilled workers	0	1	14.89 %
Top executives	0	1	2.46 %
Service class with other executive positions	0	1	9.89 %
Service class other	0	1	10.26 %
Self-employed	0	1	5.24 %
Students	0	1	10.97 %
Other	0	1	36.95 %
Grandparents who lived on farm (yes=1/no=0)	0	1	10.3 %
Higher education (yes=1/no=0)	0	1	33.48 %
Year (1991=0 – 2007=16)	0	16	Mean 7.84 SD 5.00

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the explanatory variables in the total sample. Minimum, maximum, and percent with value 1 for dummy variables (N=35746).

### Estimation Methods

In our empirical analysis, we estimate regression models with two different dependent variables. The first dependent variable is based on the question "Which of these activities did you do last summer holiday?", and one of twelve alternatives was "Visited a farm that took in tourists". The respondent could give more than one answer, and we assume that those who ticked this alternative are all those who have visited such farms, and those who have not given this answer have not visited such farms. This measure is used as a dependent variable in Figure 2 and Table 2, and is coded 1 for those who have visited tourist farms last summer and 0 for those who have not. This dummy coded dependent variable is analysed with a logistic regression model. In such models, the coefficients from each independent variable represent the natural log of the odds of the dependent variable being in category 1 when the value of the independent variables increases by one step. When these coefficients are 0, the independent variables have no effect, positive coefficients imply positive relationships, and negative coefficients imply negative relationships. In order to decide whether the coefficient is statistically significant or not, we show both the exact p-value and use an asterisk (\*) to mark significant coefficients. Additionally, we also present the t-values, which are the coefficients divided by their standard errors, to give an idea of the strength of the coefficients.

The second dependent variable, used in Table 3 and Table 4, is based on the question "How interested are you in a farmhouse holiday?", where the respondents could decide whether they are not interested (coded 1), a little interested (2), quite interested (3), or very interested (4). This variable appears to be skewed, because a large proportion of the sample is not interested (value 1), and it is doubtful whether any linear model can describe this distribution well. Therefore, we have estimated the model in Table 4 as an ordinal regression model, which is designed explicitly for ordinal outcomes (Long, 1997), but the coefficients, t-values, and p-values in this model can be interpreted in nearly the same way as the measures used in the logistic regression model in Table 2.

### Results

In this section we present the results of the empirical analysis. Before describing those who visited farm tourist enterprises last year, we will show a more general picture of main summer holiday activities reported in the different surveys since 1995.

Figure 1 shows a composite picture of the respondents' travel activities last summer and the changes over the years. It shows that visiting second homes/cottages is the most common activity during the summer holiday, closely followed by domestic holiday motoring, and air travel abroad. All these activities have been more frequently undertaken since 1995. This might partly be a result of an increase in statutory rights to paid annual vacation during this period from 21 to 25 days<sup>3</sup>, and a growth in the domestic economy among Norwegian households.



Figure 1. Percentages that show main (travel) activities last summer 1995-2007.

The relatively high percentage of domestic holiday motoring indicates the potential of Norwegian rural tourism and agrotourism.

The next step in the empirical analysis is to examine the visitors to farm-tourism enterprises by comparing them with those who have not visited a farm-tourism enterprise, and then describing the potential visitors ie. people who answer that they are interested in visiting a farm-tourism enterprise next summer.

Figure 2 shows that seven percent of the sample answered that they had visited a farm-tourism operation in 2007, and this share has increased steadily since the first survey in 1991. In particular, there has been a steady increase in popularity since 1999.



Figure 2. The percentages in each survey who have visited farm tourism enterprises last summer.

Table 2 gives a description of who these visitors are. The negative coefficient of gender shows that women are more likely to have visited a farm tourist enterprise than men. Interestingly, this coincides with the findings that women among foreign visitors in Norway are more interested than men in visiting farm-tourist enterprises (Mehmetoglu, 2007). The age pattern is more complicated. People between 25 and 39 and people over 60 have much higher probability of having visited a tourist farm last summer than people younger than 25 years. On the other hand, there are no differences between people between 40 and 59, and the reference group who consist of people younger than 25. This indicates a pattern where farm tourism is most attractive for people between 25 and 39 and above 60 years old. The positive coefficient for children shows that respondents with children in their household have higher probability of visiting farms than those without children. There is no difference in visits between respondents from urban and rural areas. There are significant differences between the class dummies, which underlines the idea that farm tourism reflects a class pattern. Skilled workers, service class with other executive positions, self-employed, and others outside the labour market have higher visiting frequency than unskilled workers. On the other hand, top executives, service class other, and students have about the same visiting proportions as unskilled workers. There is no significant tendency for respondents with grandparents who live/lived on farms have a higher probability of visiting farm tourist enterprises than respondents without such connection to agriculture. Table 2 also shows a steady and statistically significant yearly increase in such visits since 1991. The variables single

and education have no significant effect on the probability of visiting farm tourism enterprises. The constant in Table 2 is mainly technical information, and has minor interest in our analysis.

	Log.	t-value	p-value
	coeff.		
Gender (men=1/women=0)	-0.171**)	-3.385	0.001
Age (dummies with Age 15-25 as reference)			
Age 26-39	0.491**)	5.128	0.000
Age 40-59	0.122	1.214	0.225
Age 60+	$0.499^{(*)}$	4.476	0.000
Single (yes=1/no=0)	-0.016	-0.210	0.834
Children living in household (yes=1/no=0)	$0.565^{**)}$	8.417	0.000
Urban district (yes=1/no=0)	0.045	0.891	0.373
Social class (dummies with unskilled workers reference)			
Skilled workers	0.223*)	2.046	0.041
Top executives	0.218	1.230	0.219
Service class with other executive positions	0.254*)	2.071	0.038
Service class other	-0.046	-0.369	0.712
Self-employed	0.369**)	2.718	0.007
Students	0.078	0.590	0.555
Other	0.306**)	2.976	0.003
Grandparents who lived on farm (yes=1/no=0)	0.137	1.671	0.095
Higher education (yes=1/no=0)	-0.019	-0.339	0.735
Year (1991=0 – 2007=16)	0.035**)	6.106	0.000
Constant	-4.007**)	-29.424	0.000
(N=)	35746		
Model Chi-Square (df=17)	268.310**)		

Table 2. Visitors of farm tourism enterprises last summer by different demographic characteristics. Logistic regression model.

\*) significant on 5%-level, \*\*) significant on 1%-level

Table 2 presents data from all nine surveys between 1991 and 2007, but if we take a closer look at each survey separately, we will see that the market potential for farm tourism has become more open and diverse since 1991. In the 1990's there was a more distinct segment of visitors than in recent years. This change is most clear if we look at the differences between the age dummies. In figure 3, we present a figure with predictions of the different age groups' probability of having visited a farm last

summer. This figure is based on predictions from the model presented in Table 3, but this prediction model is extended with interaction terms between the age dummies and the variable year.



Figure 3. Prediction of different age group's probabilities of having visited a tourist farm last summer from 1991 to 2007. Model predictions when all other independent variables are set to their means.

Figure 3 shows that the probability of visiting a tourist farm has increased in all age groups, but the most interesting and promising growth is the increased interest among the youngest age group (15-25 years). A more general change is from a situation where we could identify two main age groups of visitors, towards a situation where farm tourism is interesting all age groups.

The surveys from 2005 and 2007 have an additional question about the respondents' interest in visiting a farm tourism enterprise next summer, where the respondents could grade their interest into four ranked categories. The distribution of these answers is presented in Table 3.

	2005	2007
1 Not interested	72	69
2 A little interested	19	21
3 Quite interested	7	7
4 Very interested	2	3
Total	100	100
(n=)	(3332)	(3465)

Table 3. *How interested are you in visiting a farm-tourism enterprise, by year. Percentages.* 

Kendall's tau-c = 0.029;  $p_{(approx.)} = 0.010$ 

Table 3 shows an increased interest in farm tourism between 2005 and 2007, but this increase is so weak that we have to estimate this relation with statistical model controlling for other differences in these two surveys. Because the question about interest in farm tourism was only included in the two last surveys, we can extend this analysis by more independent variables which were not included in the former surveys.

In Table 4 we have expanded the model from Table 3 with one dummy which measures differences in interest between those who have visited a tourist farm last year (value 1) and those who have not (value 0). This is the variable used as the dependent variable in Table 3. In Table 4, we have also included a variable measuring family income into nine ranked income groups, and a variable named *cultural background* based on the question "I grew up in a home with many books, music, art, and other cultural interests". Here, the respondents could answer 1 "completely disagree", 2 "partly disagree", 3 "impossible to answer", 4 "partly agree", or 5 "completely agree".

The most impressive finding in Table 4 is the huge effect of visiting a farm tourism enterprise last year. Respondents who visited a farm tourism enterprise last year, have a significantly higher interest in such a visit next summer than respondents without such an experience. The negative coefficient of gender means that men are significantly less interested than women.

	Log.	t-value	p-value
	coeff.		
Gender (men=1/women=0)	-0.433**)	-7.633	0.000
Age (dummies with Age 15-25 as reference)			
Age 26-39	0.046	0.440	0.660
Age 40-59	-0.367**)	-3.424	0.001
Age 60+	-0.648**)	-5.050	0.000
Single (yes=1/no=0)	-0.054	-0.585	0.558
Children living in household (yes=1/no=0)	0.489**)	6.758	0.000
Urban district (yes=1/no=0)	0.139*)	2.397	0.017
Social class (dummies with skilled workers reference)			
Unskilled workers	-0.013	-0.106	0.916
Top executives	-0.146	-0.820	0.412
Service class with other executive positions	-0.012	-0.088	0.930
Service class other	-0.112	-0.823	0.411
Self-employed	0.254	1.609	0.108
Students	-0.056	-0.415	0.678
Other	-0.034	-0.297	0.766
Grandparents who lived on farm (yes=1/no=0)	0.141*)	2.490	0.013
Higher education (yes=1/no=0)	-0.105	-1.633	0.102
Family income (in nine ranked income groups)	-0.121***)	-7.083	0.000
Cultural background (low=1 – high=5)	0.063**)	3.283	0.001
Farm visitor last year (yes=1/no=0)	1.392**)	14.463	0.000
Year (1991=0 - 2007=16)	0.098**)	3.492	0.000
Threshold [interest=1]	$1.849^{(*)}$	4.148	0.000
Threshold [interest=2]	3.334**)	7.449	0.000
Threshold [interest=3]	4.768**)	10.532	0.000
(N=)	6731		
Model Chi-Square (df=17)	268.310**)		

Table 4. Interest in farmhouse holidays, by different demographic characteristics and whether they visited a farm last summer. Ordinal regression model with data from 2005 and 2007.

<sup>\*)</sup> significant on 5%-level, <sup>\*\*)</sup> significant on 1%-level

The pattern between the age dummies shows that younger respondents are more interested than older respondents. This is in contrast to the finding from Table 2 that

implies that people of 60 years and over and people between 26 and 39 were more likely than younger respondents to have visited a farm enterprise last summer. On the other hand, the pattern shown in Table 4 that people less than 40 are more interested than over-40s is in accordance with the pattern shown in Figure 3 indicating that the two youngest age groups have the highest increase in interest. Children in household also increases the interest. Family income has a negative effect, but cultural background has a positive effect on the interest in visiting a farm tourism enterprise. The class dummies have no influence on the interest, but there is a tendency for respondents with grandparents who lived on a farm to be more interested than those without such connection to agriculture. The urban dummy also has an influence on interest to visit a farm, and this coefficient shows that urban people are more interested than rural people. The year variable shows an increased interest in farm visits between 2005 and 2007. The threshold terms in Table 4 are only technical information, and will not be annotated more explicitly.

#### **Discussion and conclusions**

This paper has focused on the domestic visitors to farm based tourism enterprises in Norway. The analysis is based on a representative nationwide data base and gives us a unique opportunity to study changes in Norwegians holiday choices and preferences. As the data base contains much background information about the respondents, it enables us to investigate whether the visitors have certain characteristics.

The results show that farm tourism has increased in popularity and that there has been a steady increase of people visiting farm tourist enterprises. In 2007 nearly 7 percent of the representative sample of Norwegians above age 15 visited a farm tourist enterprise and this represents a doubling since 1991.

Women, families with children in the household, and people 60 years and above were most likely to have visited a farm tourism enterprise last summer. Among the visitors there were no significant differences between rural and urban dwellers, showing that farm tourism attracts both groups. We could not find any clear class pattern, but there is a tendency for unskilled and low skilled workers and employees to be less likely to visit farm tourist enterprises.

By looking into the respondents' interest in a farmhouse holiday next summer we have some indication of the popularity and future potential on the domestic market for farm tourism enterprises. Most importantly, those who visited a farm tourist enterprise last year, are more interested in visiting a farm enterprise next year. This shows that positive experiences among visitors, which stimulate the domestic re-sale

and increase repeated bookings, are important for the business. There has also been an increased interest in farmhouse holidays from 2005 to 2007. Again, women and families with children are more interested in farmhouse holidays. Another interesting finding is the increase in interest among the younger age group. While high income has a negative effect on the interest, growing up in a home with cultural interests has a positive effect. This indicates that a farmhouse holiday is perceived as a proper way to spend one's holidays among the cultural rather than the economic elite. Further, having grandparents with roots in farming, increases the interest. This might indicate a wish among some people to strengthen their links back to their cultural roots. Unlike the actual visiting pattern, people from urban areas express higher interest than rural residents.

Our analysis has shown that the market potential for farm tourism has become more open and diverse. In the 1990's there was a more distinct segment of visitors than in recent years; ie families with children and elderly people were most likely to visit a farm tourism business. The analysis of the most recent years shows a more compound picture of the visitors. There is no longer any distinct group or groups of visitors but a variety of people who are attracted to farm tourism. One of the most interesting and promising growth trends is the increased interest among the youngest age group (15-25 years). One explanation of a growing market segment is that farm tourism represents a varied supply of services and activities that may suit different interests and thus a wide spectrum of visitors. This is positive for the industry, which may develop in different directions and cultivate various niches, and thus attract a range of visitors. This means that the analysis confirms the main hypothesis that increased diversification of farm tourism services has led to an increased interest among different groups of potential visitors.

This study has focused solely on the domestic (holiday) market, and can therefore not tell anything about the international market and foreign visitors. For the majority of farm tourism enterprises, the domestic market is, however, very important. Bearing in mind that another segment of visitors, like participants in meetings and seminars, private parties and other kinds of arrangements, are not included in the study, the potential for visitors is even higher than the results of this study indicate. Further studies about visitors' motivations, expectations and experiences will give more information about the future perspectives for the farm tourism industry in Norway.

# Notes

1) This paper is part of the project "Nature-based farm tourism – the importance of hosting in the experience economy" and is financed by The Research Council of Norway, Agricultural Agreement Research Fund (Forskningsmidler over jordbruksavtalen) Foundation for Research Levy on Agricultural Products (Fondet for forskningsavgift på landbruksprodukter), SpareBank1-SMN and Norwegian Rural Tourism and Traditional Food (Norsk Bygdeturisme og Gardsmat - NBG)

2) The authors in alphabetical order

3) In comparison the entitlement to paid holiday in other European countries are Spain 22 days, France 30 days, Switzerland 20 days, Austria 22 days, United Kingdom 24 days, and in Canada 10 days, while in USA there are no statutory right to paid holiday.

#### **References:**

- Almås, R. (2004). From state-driven modernization to green liberalism 1920-2000.
  In R. Almås, (ed.), *Norwegian Agricultural History* (pp. 296-351).
  Trondheim: Tapir Academic Press.
- Brandth, B., &. Haugen, M. S. (2005). *Farmers as tourist hosts. Consequences for work and identity.* Paper 2/05. Trondheim: Centre for Rural Research..
- Busby, G., & Rendle, S. (2000). The transition from tourism on farms to farm tourism. *Tourism Management*, 21(8):635-642.
- Crang, P. (1997). Performing the tourist product. In C. Rojek & J. Urry (Eds.), *Touring Cultures. Transformations of travel and theory*. London: Routledge.
- Davies, E. T., & Gilbert, D. C. (1992). A case study of the development of farm tourism in Wales. *Tourism Management* 13 (1):56-63.
- Forbord, M., &. Stræte, E. P. (2008). Hva betyr reiseliv, kultur og lokal mat for omsetning og sysselsetting i distriktene? Report 4/08. Trondheim: Centre for Rural Research.
- Hall, D., Roberts, L., & Mitchell, M. (2003). *New directions in rural tourism*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Haugen, M. S., & Vik, J.(2008). Farmers as entrepreneurs: The case of farm-based tourism. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 6(3):321-336.
- Hellevik, O. (2008) *Jakten på den norske lykken. Norsk monitor 1985-2007.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Innovasjon Norge (2006). Den *nasjonale kampanjen for bygdeturisme 2006*. Retrieved April 8, 2008, from <u>http://www.innovasjonnorge.no/Reiseliv\_fs/PDF/DM%20korrektur2.pdf</u>
- Jacobsen, J. K. S., & Viken, A. (eds.), (1997). *Turisme. Fenomen og næring*. Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Jacobsen, J. K. S., & Viken, A. (eds.), (1999). *Turisme. Stedet i en bevegelig verden*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Jolly, D. A., & Reynolds, K. A. (2005). Consumer demand for agricultural and on farm nature tourism. UC Small farm Centre Research Brief. Retrieved April 8, 2008, from www.sfc.ucdavis.edu/agritourism/agtoubrief0601.pdf.
- Kramvig, B. (2006) Fish, culture and rock'n roll. Paper 1/06, NORA-conference; Exploring Creative Solutions in Small Coastal Communities in the North Atlantic; Labrador: Newfoundland & Labrador.
- Long, J. S. (1997). *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- Mehmetoglu, M. (2007). Gårdsturisme i en bredere reiselivs- og turistkontekst. In G. Rusten, N.M. Iversen & L.E. Hem (eds.), Våronn med nye muligheter.
  Ressurs- og opplevelsesbasert verdiskaping på vestlandsbygdene (pp. 243-263). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Page, S., & Getz, D. (1997). *The business of rural tourism: International perspectives*. London: International Thomson Business Press.
- Pearce, P. L., & Moscardo, G. M. (1986). The concept of authenticity in tourists' experiences. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 22(1): 121-132.
- Pine, J. P. II, & Gilmore, J. H. (1999). *The Experience Economy: Work is Theatre and Every Business a Stage*. Cambridge MA: HBS Press Book.
- Reynolds, K. A. (2007). Information channels reaching agricultural and on-farm nature tourism visitors. UC Small farm Centre Research Brief. Retrieved April 8, 2008, from <u>www.sfc.ucdavis.edu/agritourism/agtoubrief0701.pdf</u>.
- Rusten, G., Hem, L. E., & Iversen, N. M. (2007). Våronn med nye muligheter.
  Verdiskaping på vestlandsbygdene basert på ressurser og opplevelser. In G.
  Rusten, L. E. Hem, & N. M. Iversen (eds.), Våronn med nye muligheter (pp. 13-30). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Sharpley, R., & Sharpley, J. (1997). *Rural tourism: An introduction*. London: International Business Press.
- Smith, V., & Long, V. (2000). Farm tourism. In J. Jafari (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Tourism* (pp. 222-223). New York: Routledge.
- Viken, A. (Ed.), (2001). *Turisme. Tradisjoner og trender*. Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.
- Wollan, G. (2002). Den moderne turismens næringsmessige konsekvenser. NTFrapport 1/02, Steinkjer: Nord-Trøndelagsforskning.