

DELINEATING AGRITOURISM: INSIGHTS FROM GUJARAT, INDIA

Yash Padhiyar¹, Yupal Shukla² and Rajen Purohit³

¹*College of Agribusiness Management, Sardarkrushinagar Dantiwada Agricultural University, Gujarat, India*

²*V. M. Patel Institute of Management, Ganpat University, Gujarat, India*

³*Centre for Continuing Education (GNU-CCE), Ganpat University, India.*

¹*yash.edu.sg@gmail.com;* ²*yss01@ganpatuniversity.ac.in;*

³*rajen.purohit@ganpatuniversity.ac.in*

Received: 1 Nov 2016 Accepted: 3 May 2017 Published: 30 June 2017

ABSTRACT

The present research identifies and proposes a delineation that defines agritourism by rectifying the key characteristics presently used to define agritourism in the literature. Efforts are put towards organizing them into a visible and constructed framework. The study highlights a proper understanding of agritourism as an economic tool which can help to support and satisfy both tourists, and farming fraternity. The cadre-1 officers of a renowned agricultural university from Gujarat were interviewed and data was evaluated to consolidate validity. Local culture and traditional ways of learning are drawn upon to explain knowledge sharing and practical learning which can be derived through empirical research to know the viability of the proposed delineation about agritourism. The key finding in the paper is the classification pertaining to delineation of agritourism through different labels and interview processes in the Gujarat context. The unique feature of the concept implication of agritourism is in its ability to fulfill the space between the practice and theory.. It also helps to support framework to underpin academic research of the phenomenon and has the capacity to harness more practical study on the difference between agritourism kinds. The research serves as an illustration of viable development that could be replicated through agritourism in rural settings as an economic empowerment tool.

Keywords: Agritourism; Delineating; Agriculture; Vacation farms

INTRODUCTION

Study of any phenomenon requires clarification on fundamental issues, its basic defining traits, and understanding it through basic conceptual tools. The present study was conducted in the Gujarat state of India, which is considered as doing well in the tourism sector. In the past couple of decades, the growth has been remarkable and this can be observed from Figure 1. The state with its rich culture and heritage, arts, festivals, tourism policy, and successful campaigns like

“*Khusbhoo Gujarat Ki*” (*Fragrance of Gujarat State*), has added many jewels of success for the state in the tourism sector. Gujarat also accomplished distinguished National Tourism Awards by the Government of India such as Best State in Comprehensive Development of Tourism, Best Film Promotion Friendly State, Best Rural Tourism Project: *Rann Utsav (Desert Festival)*, and Best Tourism Promotion & Publicity Material in the form of a Coffee Table Book titled “Gujarat's 50 Golden Destinations”.



Figure 1: Tourist Footfall (in Millions)
 (Source: Adopted from Tourism Sector Profile, Government of Gujarat)

Gujarat (Indian State) Agriculture

The agricultural dimension of Gujarat is one of the best examples of its trajectory success in this domain. Being second in ‘Green Revolution,’ the state has achieved an agricultural growth at 9.6% and has carved a niche in the field of agricultural development in India. The total geographical area of the state is about 196 lakhs hectares. Out of the total geographical area, 99.66 hundred thousand hectares are under net cultivable area which is 50 percent of the total geographical area. Major Agricultural produce include cotton, groundnut (peanuts), dates, and sugar cane, milk & milk products. Gujarat is the main producer of tobacco, cotton, and groundnuts in India. The State produced 84 percent of the total castor production of the country with an area of 6.83 lakh ha and 12.98 lakh MT production. The state has a 30 percent share in the country for production of groundnut with 20.37 lakh MT production covering an area of 14.02 lakh ha. Gujarat is the main producer of cumin, fennel and date palms, and the second producer of banana, papaya and lime. It is the highest producer Production of onion and potato as well as the second highest producer of banana, pomegranate and sapodilla. The state enjoys monopoly in processing of Isabgol

(Agri commodity). Gujarat is also a leader in milk production. Between the years 2014-15, Gujarat stood as the third in India with milk production of 116.91 hundred thousand metric tons. Gujarat has attained a notable 7.33 percent average growth rate in milk production during the last decade (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar November 2015). This justifies the state's prosperity, over the years, for agricultural development. This contributed to the overall national growth.

Agritourism being a novel and emerging field, demands this focus. The phenomenon of agritourism is growing in popularity and has reached a consistent level of diffusion as a proficient tool for rural reformation and diversification for both developed and developing economies (Barbieri, 2010; Ollenburg & Buckley, 2007; Nickerson, Black & McCool, 2001). The terms "rural tourism" and "agritourism" are generally practised interchangeably (Phillip, Hunter & Blackstock, 2010). A comprehensive scrutinizing of the literature unveils plentiful definitions and labels regarding agritourism depending on the diversity of features (Table 1).

Table 1: Related Literature on Agritourism

Term Used	Lables/Descriptions	Acknowledgment
Agritourism	Any activity evolved on a functioning (working) farm with the intention of tempting visitors. It is a strategic access implemented for beating economic decline in rural segments and for applicable use of land-based resources with the intention of perpetuating edging domain and having a constructive socio-economic influence in terms of achieving substitute income, creating supplementary employment opportunities and alleviating depopulation caused by migration to urban areas.	Sommino, 2004; Marques, 2006; Barbieri & Mshenga, 2008; Carpio, Wohlgenant, & Boonsaeng, 2008; Arroyo, Barbieri & Rich, 2013
Vacation Farms	Services and distinguished activities made available to the mercantile clients in a functioning farm for education, partaking of education.	Ollenburg, 2006
Agrotourism	As a matter of verity agritourism extends distinguished prospects for the visitors to visit into straight contact with the rural segments with those customs which are meaningful of nature and of farming traditions. Tourism actions are those experienced in rural areas by individuals who are associated with employment is in the secondary and primary sectors of the economy.	Laufenberg, Kunz & Nystroem, 2003
Rural-tourism	A portion of tourism serves, that utilizes countryside as the resource and is linked with the hunt by urban dwellers for tranquility and space for the external recreation other than being particularly associated to nature. Rural tourism at a very basic level can be seen as tourism that occurs in rural areas. Commonly these activities are classified as eco-tourism and agritourism.	Sibila Lebe & Milfelner, 2006

(Source: Adapted from Phillip, Hunter & Blackstock, 2010)

Different labels like agrotourism, vacation farms, rural tourism, are vice-versa with agritourism and among one another (Zehrer, 2009; Phillip, Hunter & Blackstock, 2010; Roberts & Hall, 2001) but it has been continuously used unambiguously to indicate the same but as a diverse theory (McGehee & Kim, 2004; Spreng, MacKenzie & Olshavsky, 1996). Many times the outcomes are intricate and paints a puzzling vision. Often the usage of the terminology fails to clarify and the need of the term such as why it is taken into consideration, rather than other options is hard to justify. Thus, for precision and evenness, the term “Agritourism” will be adopted for this study to cite the variety of the concept and labels conferred in literature.

The main aim of this research is to serve a well-gained insight pertaining to agritourism through contemplated structure of distinguished agritourism aspects. Previous studies (Horn & Simmons, 2002; Choi & Sirakaya, 2005; Dyer, Gursoy, Sharma & Carter, 2007) suggested that the communication linkage, travellers’ experience and cooperation of the residents of host communities are essential components of tourism development initiatives. Thus the proposed delineation is constructed on the basis of three major domains of the discussion in the documentation to support classification pertaining to the varied scope of activities and products recognised for the study into significant types depending on a comprehensive deck of traits. The arguments are as follow:-

- The nature of communication linking the customer (tourists) and farm (agricultural) activity
- Extent of realism in the traveller’s experience
- Is the product/service based on the working farm

Through steady consideration of agritourism products/services in accordance to the above classification, delineation provides three significant functions i.e. it extends a primary structure to further refine the perception pertaining to agritourism in line with wider rural debates which further elucidates and categorises meaning of agritourism which presently exists in literature. Also, it serves as a basis for potential empirical study to be conducted in the future.

The definition of the concepts and terminologies which strengthen the delineation will be given before examples, and description of the classification itself. In fact, very little is known about the Indian tourism Sector from agritourism point of view. The industry (tourism and agriculture) can seek, or the nature of the relationships, or approach which can be employed to access the resources for developing agritourism, has yet to get shaped in the study area.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Tourism and hospitality is an important service sector which can be considered as one of the most remarkable socio-economic phenomena of the present time (Minger, 1991; Nelson, 1999; Payne, 1999; Lindberg, Andersson & Dellaert, 2001; Hunter, 2002; Fanariotu & Skuras, 2004). The action was enjoyed by only a tiny group of relatively well-off people during the first half of the previous century; gradually it became a mass phenomenon (Jurowski & Gursoy, 2004; Kim & Jogaratnam, 2003). It now extends to an increasingly sizeable number of people throughout the globe and can be considered as an imperative element of worldwide integration (Gartner, 2004; Beshiri, 2005; Ollenburg, 2006; Koster & Lemelin, 2009). Mature tourism economies need to regain competitiveness as a new source of growth, thus imparting new dimension of tourism is of utmost importance for a more sustainable growth for Gujarat.

The tourism service industry in Gujarat has, in the past, developed largely apart from other sectors such as agriculture.. Presently, Gujarat is focusing on the distinguished sustainable development of tourism by introducing various methodologies in order to increase tourism by supporting them through different amenities and exciting destination, as well as implementing attractive promotions and marketing strategies (Padhiyar & Mody, 2013). As per the conjecture of benefiting through innovation (Teece, 1986, Teece, 2006; Hurst & Niehm, 2012), the capability of an organisation or business model to attain returns on innovation depends on the potency of the appropriate regime and the character of ownership of harmonising assets i.e. agritourism here. Agritourism is an innovative phenomenal for both the industry viz. agriculture and tourism for Gujarat. According to Ganeshasundaram and Henley (2007), focusing on market needs is important as it is a prerequisite for business success (Barabba, 1995) and seeing to the needs of the customers is a distinguishing characteristic of successful business (Stevens, Wrenn, Ruddick & Sherwood, 1997). The innovative service is portrayed either by very close visitors' contacts or by the amalgamation of external aspects in the service process (Vaughan, Farr & Slee, 2000; Hipp & Grupp 2005).

Tourism and Hospitality Overview

Different scholars have conceptualised tourism in different mode of understanding (Law, Buhalis & Cobanoglu, 2014; Koo, Gretzel, Hunter & Chung, 2015; Lamsfus, Wang, Alzua-Sorzabal & Xiang, 2015) nevertheless the most common sum up for the definition of tourism study as a field of research is its preoccupation with mobility (non-permanent movement) of people beyond their common space (area) which fringe their routine activities to a non common space (area) (Baker, & Crompton, 2000; Hall, 2005; Verhoef, et al., 2009). Research in the tourism domain covers many disciplines including social-

psychology, geography, organisational and strategy research, marketing, anthropology and consumer study (Echtner & Jamal, 1997). Nevertheless, many scholars tend to argue and believe that the multidimensional nature of the tourism and hospitality industry might discourage a more lucid approach towards tourism research (Dann, Nash & Pearce, 1988; Koh & Hatten, 2002). Many scholars and researchers in this field of tourism and hospitality agree that there is an immense potential for the integrity of multidisciplinary direction. The multiplicity of disciplines influencing the tourism research has led to tourism behaviour being approached from distinguished aspect (Gao, Huang & Huang, 2009; Yang, 2012).

Agritourism

The concept of agritourism has its positive impact on the rural territories (Holland, Burian, & Dixey, 2003; Rathore, 2012) through triggering substitute source of revenue, diversifying households course of action and reinforcing economic activities of the population residing in rural areas (Carpio, Wohlgenant, & Boonsaeng, 2008). In addition to that, Katz and Boland (2000) believe value adding actions are those which can add consumers' value. The blend of agriculture and tourism together can most probably produce outstanding results in terms of economic benefits for rural community and urban community as well (Hritz & Ross, 2010; Apostolakis & Clark, 2011). The concept of agritourism is a prominent economic driver against the development of rustic segments which also helps in overcoming issues of depopulation that is used as a significant factor of local development approach (Sonnino, 2004; Niedziolka & Brzozowska, 2009; Malkanthi & Routry, 2011; Hurst & Niehm, 2012).

Studies have unveiled that alternative farming systems are becoming more customary in some agricultural spheres (Brock & Barham, 2009). Agricultural background and various actions allied which is accelerating in most part of Gujarat as the entire farming guild is aggressively adopting its resourcefulness and commitment to match up the burden of shifting market place. Of these distinguished activities, if diversified into tourism can be one of the most ubiquitous because of the perceived gains of functioning (working) from home while being able to look after the responsibility of family and the opportunity of achieving additional source of revenue (Cottrell, Van der Duim, Ankersmid, & Kelder, 2004; Choi & Sirakaya, 2005; Sharpley & Vass, 2006; Brida, Osti & Barque., 2010; Huayhuaca, Cottrell, Raadik & Gradl, 2010). Farmers have now become entrepreneurs in many developed nations, achieving additional income from second jobs known as "Off-farms activities" which have been predicted to comprise about 75% of farm revenue (Kim & Han, 2008). Researchers have tried to integrate a few types of off-farm services (e.g., farmers' markets), where farmers grow their farm products which are then taken away from the agricultural production setting to be sold (Wicks & Merrett, 2003; Wilson,

Thilmany & Sullins, 2006). The present study is focused on agritourism which comprises various concepts such as vacation farm and rural tourism, which revolves around the concept of agritourism (Wang, Zhen, Zhang & Wu, 2013).

METHODOLOGY

The data was gathered through semi-structured interviews because of non availability of standard literature support to carry research on agritourism in Gujarat's condition. Generally qualitative research is much needed when development of a particular area is at an infant stage, and it is very true in the case of agritourism research in India.

As part of gathering insights about the development and opportunities related to agritourism, professors affiliated to agricultural universities are believed to be good sampling units for the research. Raw data was collected through one to one interview with higher authorities/Professor (Class-1 cadre) from a renowned Agricultural Universities in Gujarat, India. Each personal interview lasted approximately one and half hour, was recorded in audio mode, typed in MS word and reviewed by the interviewee. The evaluation of interviewees consolidates in making the construction valid and reliable. The inaccuracies were debated with the interviewees, and amendments were imparted consequently. Data obtained from eight interviews were analysed accordingly and the findings were discussed in order to provide interesting and useful insights about the agritourism in Gujarat.

DEFINITION OF VARIOUS TERMINOLOGY RELATED TO AGRITOURISM (BASED ON INTERVIEW CONDUCTED)

Vacation Farm

This is debatably an often quoted necessity affiliated with agritourism (as shown in Table 1). Nevertheless the meaning that comprises a vacation farm itself has been basically unnoticed in the agritourism literature. Thus, in regard to wider rural debates, this generates an important dilemma as the farm cannot be recognised only as an economic set-up but also its cultural and social importance (Fiore, Lee & Kunz, 2002; Burton, 2004). The key elements such as proportion of agricultural revenue, physical area of land, drivers for motivations were discovered to be of utmost importance. The present definition in context to agritourism reveals that it can be presumed that vacation farm is used to indicate a farm where the farming activities are presently being performed (Sonnio, 2004).

Agriculture can be defined as a group of action of nurturing production of crop plants, rearing animals etc along cultivation of the soil utilisation and for sale as food and other commodities (Robinson & Gammon, 2004). The definition quoted here is valuable as it helps to ascertain periphery among actions which are conventionally found on farms which are non-agricultural (wine-processing, food processing, cycling, horse riding etc) from those that are agricultural (sowing, harvesting, seed treatment, irrigation activities etc). Furthermore it plays a significant role as it addresses the main aspects fundamentally by identifying agriculture as a physical rather than economic course of action; which is mainly significant in regard to integrating the huge number of agricultural smallholdings which may be framed out on a part-time basis and those which are assisted by other streams of revenue. A vacation farm is the place where the agricultural courses of activities are carried out.

Respondent 1: *A great deal of endeavour is needed to justify vacation farm at a broader perspective. The respondent also agrees on vacation farm not only being an economic variable as far as culture and social aspects are concerned in Gujarat's context. Additionally, he throws light on highlighting the concept to those educated professionals to roll the concept into the limelight and for more debate to get better understanding through mass thinking of the concept.*

Correspondence with Agricultural Course of Activities

The tendency of customers (tourists) involving with the agriculture is also often debated in the agritourism literature (Busby & Rendle 2000; Getz & Carlsen 2000; Nickerson et al., 2001). Arguments are heightened in concern whether active appreciation of agriculturally produced landscapes as a platform for tourism can be considered as agritourism (Clarke, 1999) and there are such benchmarks where agritourism has slightly more in common with the farm other than the growers (farmers) manage the land on which agritourism exercise is performed (Roberts & Hall, 2001). Additional illustrations suggest that there must be a direct linkage among agricultural and tourism activities for it to be identified as agritourism (Sharpley & Sharpley, 1997). The relationship is often articulated in terms of the two being knotted (Gladstone & Morris, 2000), but frequently the nature of correspondence among tourism and agriculture is not defined (Sonnino, 2004).

By being ground on a working farm, tourism utterly drives in some form of correspondence with agriculture in regards to shared physical milieu. Nevertheless the intensity which the correspondence tourists (customers) have with the agricultural course of action in a working farm set-up can differ significantly. The tourist correspondence with agrarian activities can be divided into the following three types:-

- Passive correspondence
- Direct correspondence
- Indirect correspondence

Passive correspondence in regards with agrarian activities designate that agriculture and tourism are performed autonomously and merely the farm location is held in general (recreational activities). Direct correspondence in concern with the agrarian activities indicates that agricultural activities are a tangible attribute from the tourists' point of view i.e. tourist personal experience such as U-pick vegetables or fruits, tasting a wine etc (Lobo et al., 1999; Nickerson et al., 2001; McGehee & Kim, 2004; Hegarty & Przeborska, 2005). Visit of winery tasting room, or wine tourism, is a recognized agritourism activity (Wicks & Merrett, 2003; Gold & Thompson, 2011) and allows consumers to enjoy a farm-produced product and further understand the farming experience (Dodd, 1995; Peters, 1997; Skinner, 2000). Indirect correspondence in regards with agritourism indicates a secondary link to the agrarian activities surrounded within the tourists' experience, may be with correspondence of agrarian produce (value-added food processing, selling the same or consumption of the same). By elucidating these, the nature of the customers (tourists) correspondence with the agrarian activities, and therefore the role of agricultural activities in the tourism product becomes clearer.

***Respondent 2:** Conventional awareness and culture are very important aspects of life in the rural segment and have vast differences in comparison to those in the urban settings. It is hard to engage urban (white-collar, professional, corporate personnel) in such a course of action where agricultural activities are directly or indirectly connected.*

Genuineness of Tourists' Agrarian Experience

The clarification of genuineness in regards to tourist wisdoms are more often linked to MacCannell (1973), who offers a range of genuineness depending upon the perception of back and front regions. Through the belief of front region on the platform; where the performers (musicians, actors etc) offer their talent to the viewers, and back regions as the preparation area which is restricted for those ordinary public, similarly it is a matter of debate that for the tourists to encounter genuine agrarian activities they must embark to the back stage (regions or platform). Otherwise, visitors can experience stage genuineness. Moving forward there are distinguish approaches through which genuineness can be staged, through replicating the situation that emerges to be genuine, for example, farm model which can be planned to let tourists have a glance back stage (platform) for instance tours at farm. Tourist and farmer perceptions can possibly be possibly varied through the implication of this; the reason is because their

original understanding of agricultural and what it encompasses is possibly different. On the other hand, tourists can experience staged uniqueness.

Nevertheless, genuine experience of the agrarian activities may only be enjoyed by the tourists where the concerned activities are practiced as they generally would be. The visions of the tourists experiencing genuine farming activities are very rare and generally harness physical involvement on agrarian task.

Respondent 3: *Tourism brings people together to share aspects of culture, heritage, ideas-thoughts and resources. We all belong to the same profession; just as a matter of fact that the human being has its own needs and wants, we are engaged in different professions. It is always a curiosity for those urban professionals to learn and know their roots (where we all belong), thus answers to their questions are engaging and blending one in such an agrarian activity.*

Non-operational Farm Agritourism

Traditionally, there has been a degree of resistance among rural communities to tourism as farming is traditionally the main source of income, in this context (operational/working farm) it is the main ingredient when it comes to defining agritourism (Jauhari, 2010). Thus, by many definitions non-operational farm agritourism could be in fact rectified as generic rural tourism, creating the most debatable sort of agritourism in the proposed delineation. Nevertheless, majority of the literature eliminate tourism which is not established on an operational farm. Indeed, there are illustrations revealing that tourists can involve themselves in agritourism in which the linkage is established to farming in some other regards.

Many researches including Fleischer and Techetchik (2005) conveyed that an operational farm is not essential from the tourism point of view whereas Jaworski and Lawson (2005) argued that clean-hygienic depiction of agricultural activities are progressively being presented more by fresh groups of agritourism enterprises. Majority of the non-operational farms agritourism is conceived due to agricultural imagery or agricultural heritage; for instance, lodging in a converted farmhouse, or cow rearing (where agricultural related activities were performed or are performing is concluded as a part of tourist product). Tourism activities dependent on the converted farms like horse riding, milking a cow, cultural and heritage spots etc incorporate examples of the same. Significantly, the aspect differentiating between the rural tourism and non operational farm is the linkage made to the agricultural heritage and agriculture in some other than an operating/ working farm location.

Respondent 4: *The respondent believes that the linkage between the agriculture and tourism can be justified by visible activities carried out or experienced or*

being a part of such a course of action. It is actually a win-win situation for both; the provider and the visitors.

In the Operational Farm: The Active Correspondence

In agritourism, operational farm serves as the context for the tourism. Nevertheless, the affiliation between agriculture and tourism goes no deeper than that. Distinguished activities such as outdoor recreation, traditional food and others are previously being acknowledged as predominantly taking place in agritourism by Roberts and Hall (2001). The characteristics of the activities including services and products in operational farm and active correspondence let farmers to benefit on the existing resources as a means of augmented income devoid of the agriculture as a diverse activity. To be more precise, it can be debatable that this is the utmost frequently researched kind of distinguished definition demanding that agritourism should be based on a operational/working farm base though does not require much of prerequisite for connecting with agriculture ahead of that (Barbieri & Mshenga, 2008). Moreover, it can be recommended that researchers considering agritourism from the view point of farm diversification, as contrasting to the enhancement of tourism, focus on operational farm and active correspondence agritourism as it is nearly among all the logical alternatives available to the growers (Walford, 2001).

Respondent 5: *'Seeing is believing' as one can understand better by observing the operations (agricultural activities) carried out at the farm. It helps the visitors to participate in those activities and feel a psychological affiliation with the agriculture and allied functions.*

Operating Farm, Indirect Correspondence Agritourism

Agritourism starts to integrate agriculture on the farm with the tourism product in operating farm, indirect correspondence. The kind of correspondence in this regards is not direct in the sense that agricultural commodities, as contrasting to the agricultural activities themselves, feature as a tourism product. Many researchers entailed this indirect linkage between tourism and agrarian components in their theories. For instance, Gladstone and Morris (2000) concluded that it should be intimately harnessed with agriculture. Nevertheless the scholars do not eliminate direct interface with the operating farms, their thrust is on the various tourism management aspects such as accommodation, hospitality etc. This helps to harness the idea that there is significant space where distinguished agricultural products such as fresh local food can make its way to the tourists market. This is possible through the utilisation of the agricultural/farm produce in the tourist food/meals served in restaurants or at the accommodation or even sold to the tourists at operating farm shops. For instance, vineyards produce wines and sell it to the tourist who comes to visit them.

Respondent 6: *Operating farms actually provide practical insights and transparency. This enables trust and loyalty from customers' end. Supplementary source of income can be generated through such practices.*

Operating Farm, Direct Correspondence: Platform for Agritourism

Agritourism communicates with the transitional phases of distinguished varieties of genuineness, in which tourists can experience farming activities that have been put on willingly for tourism at operating farms (MacCannell, 1973). The greater amount of escalation pertaining the health and safety can matter in many aspects where the tourists get associated directly with the agriculture staging which is required to overcome hazards implicit to an otherwise genuine working farm environment. Many researchers including Di Domenico and Millar (2007) argued that the distinguished methods of the agriculture can be staged for tourism, which may offer from basic temporal variations that let tourism and agriculture components to be operated at harmonized gaps; for instance feeding or milking a cow, and visiting times, to the execution of purpose-built agricultural attractions.

Respondent 7: *Operating a farm is the best channel for marketing products and this is an ultimate benefit to both the parties (producer and customers). It is a standard platform for both parties (visitors and agritourism provider) where both can gain benefits (i.e. customers can get direct and fresh goods and agritourism providers can get better price and no intermediate parties or commission agents are involved).*

Operating Farm, Direct Correspondence: Factual Agritourism

Activities such as U-pick, horse riding, associating one with irrigation activities on the working farm can be a kind of experience and motivation for the tourists under the above heading. This is barely a kind of agritourism that undergoes afar normal tourist settings when it comes to agriculture back regions (MacCannell, 1973). Activities and the products which can be categorised under the above heading i.e. operating farm, direct correspondence: agritourism factual is argued not as much in the literature than other kinds. For example visitors contribute to the economy of farm in regards to the toil in the returns for accommodation and many times food (McIntosh & Bonnemann, 2006). It is debatable that the concept of organic agriculture serves an important chance for operating farm, direct correspondence: factual agritourism concept owing to the toil focused nature of the production proficiency employed. Distinguished activities such as U-pick where it has to be handpicked may be apple, strawberry, blueberry and so on also gives an appropriate chance (Marques, 2006). Nevertheless the opportunities to experience operating farm, direct correspondence: factual agritourism is restricted; it symbolised a significant niche that should be removed and must be divided from staged agritourism experiences.

Respondent 8: *The operating or functioning farm is the only way for one to learn and contribute as far as agriculture, tourism or both are concerned. The visitors participating in the farming activities carried out at an operating farm can get benefits in various aspects such as, theoretical plus practical knowledge and also it is value for money to have such an experience at the present time.*

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATION

The efforts in the paper are put towards the delineation of Agritourism for researchers, industrial stakeholders and visitors. The practical implications of the study carried out have been discussed with various personnel (higher cadre i.e. class one officers) in the agricultural university of Gujarat and the commentary received on the practical relevance and the value of the study has also been discussed for unbiased conclusion. The tourism sector is one of the largest economic activities worldwide and the findings of the paper serve as important implications for agritourism concept in India and more precisely in Gujarat's context, where tourism is showing positive statistics in terms of both the inflow of visitors and revenue.

It is argued that modern consumers tend to emphasize memorable experiences (buying a holiday) rather than common products, thus taking tourism to the next level of experience for visitors who seek something new makes; agritourism a perfect match. Agritourism service providers are doing or planning to start entrepreneurial activities in the rural segment, marketing researchers are encompassing on existing product advancement, and policy makers are working out regional development strategies through the implementation of tourism stimulation projects. It is of utmost necessity to understand the variety of visitor's preference for agritourism enterprises or rural households, since it is a kind of support to them to improve tourism offerings to those urban people, enhancing their experience if the understanding of the concept of "Agritourism" is clearly understood by one.

CONCLUSION

The proposed delineation in the research is inspired due to the need of the constancy and lack of mutual understanding regarding the literature of agritourism in Gujarat, India. Till this date, there has been hardly an attempt to investigate or to merge the diverse definition and approach of understanding agritourism. Efforts emphasised in the presented delineation carves the space through rectifying the major traits used to identify agritourism in the literature and structuring it in a visible and organized framework, that is in the beginning of the three significant functions of this study. Furthermore, delineation justifies

the concept of agritourism and also concerned labels, letting an additional concrete base for potential research. Secondly, the delineation serves as an ample framework that homogenizes the wide array of the activities and products rectified as a component of agritourism in the literature, from active admiration of the vacation to farm tours; to agricultural produced scenery and so on.

Furthermore; the competencies that underpin the studies with a logical and straightforward conceptual structure can avoid constant variation in literature and support future research position itself relatively to the diversity in the field. Hence, the framework allows scholars to distil the idea of agritourism in regard to the rural arguments. The framework that is flexible lets the different agritourism types to be identified independently, moderately or as single underlying phenomenon.

Parallel to this, the distinguished kinds discussed in the context to the interview (pilot research) represents the delineation, genuinely a kind of agritourism. The delineation is not ranked and none of its kind is better compared to others discussed. Additional pioneering attributes pertaining agritourism delineation is its competence to link the space between practice and theory. It also serves as a reliable structure to harness academic learning of the phenomenon, and also has the prospectus to strengthen much of the practical market investigation by stressing the difference among agritourism kinds to perform more alert study of the wants of tourists. The authors are presently constructing on the agritourism delineation to seek this support of building their data collection with tourists in the near future. This delineation will be helpful in data analysis once collected to increase the knowledge of the expectations and motivations which may drive agritourism both from the demand and supply perspective. The clarification in the research pertaining to the agritourism can be a matter of support for the industry (especially tourism) to strengthen them and serve the need of visitors.

REFERENCES

- Apostolakis, A., & Clark, D. (2011). Tourism activity and economic conditions in Britain. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, 6(2), 83-102.
- Arroyo, C. G., Barbieri, C., & Rich, S. R. (2013). Defining agritourism: A comparative study of stakeholders' perceptions in Missouri and North Carolina. *Tourism Management*, 37, 39-47.
- Baker, D. A., & Crompton, J. L. (2000). Quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Annals of tourism research*, 27(3), 785-804.
- Barabba, P. (1995). *Meeting of the Minds-Creating the market-based Enterprise*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.

- Barbieri, C. (2010). An importance-performance analysis of the motivations behind agritourism and other farm enterprise developments. *Canada. Journal of Rural and Community Development*, 5(1), 1–20.
- Barbieri, C., & Mahoney, E. (2009). Why is diversification an attractive farm adjustment strategy? Insights from Texas farmers and ranchers. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 25(1), 58–66.
- Barbieri, C., & Mshenga, P. M. (2008). The role of the firm and owner characteristics on the performance of agritourism farms. *Sociologia ruralis*, 48(2), 166-183.
- Beshiri, R. (2005). A visit to Canada's countryside: Rural tourism. *Rural and Small Town Canada Analysis Bulletin*, 6(5), 1-22.
- Brida, J. G., Osti, L., & Barquet, A. (2010). Segmenting resident perceptions towards tourism—a cluster analysis with a multinomial logit model of a mountain community. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 12(5), 591-602.
- Brock, C., & Barham, B. (2009). Farm structural change of a different kind: Alternative dairy farms in Wisconsin—graziers, organic and Amish. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, 24(01), 25-37.
- Burton, R. J. (2004). Seeing through the 'good farmer's' eyes: towards developing an understanding of the social symbolic value of 'productivist' behaviour. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 44(2), 195-215.
- Busby, G., & Rendle, S. (2000). The transition from tourism on farms to farm tourism. *Tourism management*, 21(6), 635-642.
- Carpio, C.E., Wohlgenant, M.K., & Boonsaeng, T. (2008). The demand for agritourism in United States. *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, 33(2), 254-269.
- Choi, H. S. C., & Sirakaya, E. (2005). Measuring residents' attitude toward sustainable tourism: Development of sustainable tourism attitude scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(4), 380-394.
- Clarke, J. (1999). Marketing structures for farm tourism: beyond the individual provider of rural tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 7(1), 26-47.
- Cottrell, S., Van der Duim, R., Ankersmid, P., & Kelder, L. (2004). Measuring the sustainability of tourism in Manuel Antonio and Texel: A tourist perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 12(5), 409-431.
- Dann, G., Nash, D., & Pearce, P. (1988). Methodology in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(1), 1-28.
- Di Domenico, M., & Miller, G. (2007). Are plastic cows the future for farming? Implications of an alternative diversification model. *Developments in tourism research*, 21-32.
- Dodd, T. H. (1995). Opportunities and pitfalls of tourism in a developing wine industry. *International Journal of wine marketing*, 7(1), 5-16.
- Dyer, P., Gursoy, D., Sharma, B., & Carter, J. (2007). Structural modelling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Tourism Management*, 28(2), 409-422.

- Echtner, C. M., & Jamal, T. B. (1997). The disciplinary dilemma of tourism studies. *Annals of tourism research*, 24(4), 868-883.
- Fanariotu, I., & Skuras, D. (2004). The contribution of scenic beauty indicators in estimating environmental welfare measures: a case study. *Social Indicators Research*, 65(2), 145-165.
- Fiore, A. M., Lee, S. E., & Kunz, G. (2004). Individual differences, motivations, and willingness to use a mass customization option for fashion products. *European Journal of Marketing*, 38(7), 835-849.
- Fleischer, A., & Tchetchik, A. (2005). Does rural tourism benefit from agriculture?. *Tourism Management*, 26(4), 493-501.
- Ganeshasundaram, R., & Henley, N. (2007). "Decision research" correlates directly with better business performance. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 25(1), 45-65.
- Gao, S., Huang, S., & Huang, Y. (2009). Rural tourism development in China. *International journal of tourism research*, 11(5), 439-450.
- Gartner, W. C. (2004). Rural tourism development in the USA. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 6(3), 151-164.
- Getz, D., & Carlsen, J. (2000). Characteristics and goals of family and owner-operated businesses in the rural tourism and hospitality sectors. *Tourism management*, 21(6), 547-560.
- Gladstone, J., & Morris, A. (2000). *Farm accommodation and agricultural heritage in Orkney*. In F. Brown (Ed.), *Tourism in peripheral areas: Case studies* (pp. 91-100). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Limited.
- Gold, M., & Thompson, R.S. (2011). List of alternative crops and enterprises for small farm diversification. Alternative Farming Systems Information Center, available at: www.nal.usda.gov/afsic/pubs/altlist.pdf (accessed 26 May 2015).
- Hall, C. M. (2005). *Tourism: Rethinking the social science of mobility*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hegarty, C., & Przeborska, L. (2005). Rural and agri-tourism as a tool for reorganising rural areas in old and new member states—a comparison study of Ireland and Poland. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 7(2), 63-77.
- Hipp, C., & Grupp, H. (2005). Innovation in the service sector: The demand for service-specific innovation measurement concepts and typologies. *Research policy*, 34(4), 517-535.
- Holland, J., Burian, M., & Dixey, L. (2003). Tourism in poor rural areas. Diversifying the product and expanding the benefits in rural Uganda and the Czech Republic. PPT Working Paper No. 12.
- Hritz, N., & Ross, C. (2010). The perceived impacts of sport tourism: An urban host community perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 24(2), 119-138.

- Huayhuaca, C. A., Cottrell, S., Raadik, J., & Gradl, S. (2010). Resident perceptions of sustainable tourism development: Frankenwald Nature Park, Germany. *International Journal of Tourism Policy*, 3(2), 125-141.
- Hunter, C. (2002). Sustainable tourism and the touristic ecological footprint. *Environment, development and sustainability*, 4(1), 7-20.
- Hurst, J. L., & Niehm, L. S. (2012). Tourism shopping in rural markets: a case study in rural Iowa. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 6(3), 194-208.
- Horn, C., & Simmons, D. (2002). Community adaptation to tourism: comparisons between Rotorua and Kaikoura, New Zealand. *Tourism Management*, 23(2), 133-143.
- Iakovidou, O. (1997). Agro-tourism in Greece: the case of women agro-tourism co-operatives of Ambelakia. *Medit*, 8(1), 44-47.
- Jauhari, V. (2010). How can the visitor experience be enhanced for spiritual and cultural tourism in India? *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 2(5), 559-563.
- Jaworski, A., & Lawson, S. (2005). Discourse of Polish agritourism: global, local, pragmatic. In A. Jaworski, & A. Pritchard (Eds.), *Discourse, communication, and tourism* (pp. 123–149). Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Jurowski, C., & Gursoy, D. (2004). Distance Effects on Resident Attitudes Towards Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(2), 396-312.
- Katz, J. P., & Boland, M. (2000). A new value-added strategy for the US beef industry: the case of US Premium Beef Ltd. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 5(2), 99-110.
- Kim, W., & Han, H. (2008). Determinants of restaurant customers' loyalty intentions: A mediating effect of relationship quality. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 9(3), 219-239.
- Kim, K. Y., & Jogaratnam, G. (2003). Travel motivations: A comparative study of Asian international and domestic American college students. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 13(4), 61-82.
- Koh, K.Y., & Hatten, T.S. (2002). The tourism entrepreneur: The overlooked player in tourism development studies. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration*, 3(1), 21-48.
- Koo, C., Gretzel, U., Hunter, W. C., & Chung, N. (2015). The role of IT in tourism. *Asia Pacific Journal of Information Systems*, 25(1), 99–104.
- Koster, R. L., & Lemelin, R. H. (2009). Appreciative inquiry and rural tourism: a case study from Canada. *Tourism Geographies*, 11(2), 256-269.
- Lamsfus, C., Wang, D., Alzua-Sorzabal, A., & Xiang, Z. (2015). Going mobile: Defining context for on-the-go travelers. *Journal of Travel Research*, 54(6), 691-701.
- Laufenberg, G., Kunz, B., & Nystroem, M. (2003). Transformation of vegetable waste into value added products: (A) the upgrading concept; (B) practical implementations. *Bioresource Technology*, 87(2), 167-198.

- Law, R., Buhalis, D., & Cobanoglu, C. (2014). Progress on information and communication technologies in hospitality and tourism. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(5), 727-750.
- Sibila Lebe, S., & Milfelner, B. (2006). Innovative organisation approach to sustainable tourism development in rural areas. *Kybernetes*, 35(7/8), 1136-1146.
- Lindberg, K., Andersson, T., & Dellaert, B. (2001). Tourism Development: Assessing Social Gains and Losses. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(4), 1010-1030.
- Lobo, R. E., Goldman, G. E., Jolly, D. A., Wallace, B. D., Schrader, W. L., & Parker, S. A. (1999). Agritourism benefits agriculture in San Diego County. *California Agriculture*, 53(6), 20-24.
- MacCannell, D. (1973). Staged authenticity: Arrangements of social space in tourist settings. *American journal of Sociology*, 79(3), 589-603.
- Malkanathi, S. H. P., & Routry, J. K. (2011). Potential for agritourism development: evidence from Shri Lanka. *The Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 6(1), 45-58.
- Marques, H. (2006). Searching for complementarities between agriculture and tourism—the demarcated wine-producing regions of northern Portugal. *Tourism Economics*, 12(1), 147-160.
- McGehee, N. G., & Kim, K. (2004). Motivation for agri-tourism entrepreneurship. *Journal of travel research*, 43(2), 161-170.
- McIntosh, A. J., & Bonnemann, S. M. (2006). Willing workers on organic farms (WWOOF): The alternative farm stay experience?. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14(1), 82-99.
- Minger, T. (1991). The Green Resort: Environmental Stewardship and the Resort Community. In Gill, A. & Hartmann, R. (1991). *Mountain Resort Development: Proceedings of the Vail Conference April 1 \$ h- 2 r !*, 1991 (Eds). Vail, Colorado: Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data, pp. 66.
- Nelson, J. (1999). The Spread of Ecotourism: Some Planning Implications. In Nelson, J., Butler, R. & Wall, G, *Monitoring, Planning, Managing and Decision Making: Tourism and Sustainable Development* (Eds). Waterloo, Ontario: Department of Geography University of Waterloo.
- Nickerson, N. P., Black, R. J., & McCool, S. F. (2001). Agritourism: Motivations behind farm/ranch business diversification. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40(1), 19–26.
- Niedziolka, A., & Brzozowska, A. (2009). Aspects of agritourism management in Malopolska Voivodeship. *Annals of the University of Petros,ani, Economics*, 9(4), 105-112.
- Ollenburg, C. (2006). Farm tourism in Australia: a family Business and rural studies perspective. Doctor of Philosophy Christian-Albrechts University of Keil (Germany) and Griffith University (Australia).
- Ollenburg, C., & Buckley, R. (2007). Stated economic and social motivations of farm tourism operators. *Journal of Travel Research*, 45(4), 444–452.

- Ollenburg, C. (2006). Farm tourism in Australia: A family business and rural studies perspective. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Griffith University, Australia.
- Padhiyar, Y. J., & Mody, S. K. (2013). Agricultural Hospitality & Tourism: Destination Gujarat, Edition, March 2013, book serial no: 3:4:598 2012-2013.
- Payne, R. (1999). Desirable Attributes of Sustainability Indicators for Tourism Destinations. In Nelson, J., Butler, R. & Wall, G. *Monitoring, Planning, Managing and Decision Making: Tourism and Sustainable Development* (Eds). Waterloo, Ontario: Department of Geography University of Waterloo.
- Peters, G. (1997). *American Winescapes: The Cultural Landscapes of America's Wine Country*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO.
- Phillip, Sh., Hunter, C., & Blackstock, K. (2010). A typology for defining agritourism. *Tourism Management*, 31(6) 754-758.
- Rathore, N. (2012). Rural tourism impact: Challenges and opportunities. *International Journal of Business Economics and Management Research*, 2(2), 252–260.
- Roberts, L., & Hall, D. (2001). Rural tourism and recreation: Principles to practice. Wallingford: CABI.
- Robinson, T., & Gammon, S. (2004). A question of primary and secondary motives: revisiting and applying the sport tourism framework. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 9(3), 221-223.
- Sharpley, R., & Sharpley, J. (1997). *Rural tourism: An introduction*. Thomson Business Press.
- Sharpley, R., & Vass, A. (2006). Tourism, farming and diversification: An attitudinal study. *Tourism management*, 27(5), 1040-1052.
- Skinner, A. (2000). Napa Valley, CA: a model of wine region development. in Hall, M., Sharples, L., Cambourne, B. and Macionis, N. (Eds), *Wine Tourism Around the World*, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 283-296.
- Sonnino, R. (2004). For a 'piece of bread'? Interpreting sustainable development through agritourism in Southern Tuscany. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 44(3), 285-300.
- Spreng, R., MacKenzie, S., & Olshavsky, R. (1996). Re-examination of the determinants of consumer satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(3) 15-35.
- Stevens, R., Wrenn, B., Ruddick, M., & Sherwood, P. (1997). *The marketing research guide*. Haworth Press, New York, NY.
- Teece, D. J. (1986). Profiting from technological innovation: Implications for integration, collaboration, licensing and public policy. *Research policy*, 15(6), 285-305.
- Teece, D. J. (2006). Reflections on "profiting from innovation". *Research Policy*, 35(8), 1131-1146.

- Vaughan, D., Farr, H., & Slee, D. R. (2000). Estimating and interpreting the local economic benefits of visitor spending: an explanation. *Leisure studies*, 19(2), 95-118.
- Verhoef, P. C., Lemon, K. N., Parasuraman, A., Roggeveen, A., Tsiros, M., & Schlesinger, L. A. (2009). Customer experience creation: Determinants, dynamics and management strategies. *Journal of retailing*, 85(1), 31-41.
- Walford, N. (2001). Patterns of development in tourist accommodation enterprises on farms in England and Wales. *Applied Geography*, 21(4), 331-345.
- Wang, X., Zhen, F., Zhang, J., & Wu, X. (2014). Exploring factors influencing residents' satisfaction with tourism development in poverty-stricken areas: A case study of five poor villages in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 19(5), 517-537.
- Wicks, B. E., & Merrett, C. D. (2003). Agritourism: An economic opportunity for Illinois. *Rural Research Report*, 14(9), 1-8.
- Wilson, J., Thilmany, D., & Sullins, M. (2006). Agritourism: A potential economic driver in the rural west. Economic Development Report. Colorado State University.
- Yang, L. (2012). Impacts and challenges in agritourism development in Yunnan, China. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 9(4), 369–381.
- Zehrer, A. (2009). Service experience and service design: concepts and application in tourism SMEs. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 19(3), 332-349.