



Research Note

The transition from tourism on farms to farm tourism

Graham Busby^{a,*}, Samantha Rendle^b^a*Department of Land Use & Rural Management, Seale-Hayne Faculty, University of Plymouth, Newton Abbot, Devon TQ12 6NQ, UK*^b*BDO Hospitality Consulting, London, W1M 1DL, UK*

Received 1 December 1998; accepted 1 February 1999

1. Introduction

Farm tourism is not a new phenomenon. Frater (1983) recognized that in certain parts of Europe, it existed as a recognizable activity for over a hundred years; Frater (1982) also identified a number of changes in British agriculture over the last 50 years: a declining labour force, changing farm structure, increased intensification and specialization of farming activities, together with a decline in farm income. The inability to generate sufficient revenue has, in many cases, led farmers to diversify from the agricultural base (Rickard, 1983; Fleischer & Pizam, 1997) and undertake pluriactivity; to this end, Bowler, Clark, Crockett, Ilbery and Shaw (1996) describe a decision-making model for paths of farm business development. Farm tourism has been primarily developed for its economic benefits and represents a symbiotic relationship for areas where neither farming or tourism could be independently justified (Inskeep, 1991); Elson, Steenberg and Wilkinson (1995) add that the two primary concerns of the farmer have been to: generate additional income and provide economic benefits to the local economy.

There has been a continuity in farm tourism research since the early 1960s, with key studies by Bull and Wibberley (1976) and Clarke (1996a) who argued that agriculturalists view tourism as a category of farm diversification whereas tourism researchers consider it to be a sector of rural tourism in its own right. Farm tourism research has been described as of “spasmodic interest” (Pigram, 1993) and studies have tended to focus on “Bed and Breakfast” operations (Warnick & Klar, 1991; Lanier & Berman, 1993; Emerick & Emerick, 1994) while Maude and van Rest (1985) and Blaine, Golam and Var (1993) examined the wider context of farm tourism.

Oppermann (1995) argued that farm tourism still lacks a comprehensive body of knowledge and a theoretical framework largely due to problems with definition; indeed, it is sometimes used interchangeably with rural tourism (Deegan & Dineen, 1997). The contemporary literature suggests several reasons for this: first, it is difficult to precisely define farm tourism because it comprises a range of activities. Secondly, there is a lack of data sources for small, rural tourism enterprises with many businesses not wishing to participate in official tourism research. Consequently, it is difficult to quantify the size and development of the sector with data sources inconsistent and unrepresentative of the total population. Table 1 illustrates the development of definitions for farm tourism to date. The term farm-based tourism (FBT) is used in recent research by Ilbery, Bowler, Clark, Crockett and Shaw (1998), being conceptualized as an alternative farm enterprise (AFE) and viewed as one of seven possible pathways of farm business development.

This article reviews the nature of farm tourism according to the literature, drawing on international examples, and illustrates some of the ways in which the “product” has been categorized. The transition from tourism on the farm to farm tourism is discussed with reference to the sources of funding and advice available before a commentary on pluriactivity and gender issues. Farm tourism needs to be seen in the wider context of rural tourism given that it forms a key component of both the accommodation supply and many of the day attractions available.

2. The farm tourism industry*2.1. Europe*

Given that no studies discuss the entire continent of Europe, a review of farm tourism in a number of countries is offered. England, France, Germany and Austria, currently dominate the global vacation farm industry with 20,000–30,000 enterprises in each (Weaver &

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +44-1626-325646; fax: +44-1626-325657.

E-mail address: gbusby@plymouth.ac.uk (G. Busby).

Table 1
Farm tourism: A chronology of definitions

DART (1974): any tourist or recreation enterprise on a working farm
Hoyland (1982): the provision of temporary accommodation and/or indirect recreational facilities on a working farm
Frater (1983): tourism enterprises that are present on working farms and yet are largely supplementary to existing farm activities
Murphy (1985): working farms that supplement their primary function with some form of tourism business
Wales Tourist Board (1986): working farms, irrespective of type or size, where the primary activity is agriculture and where tourism is a supplementary activity
Denman and Denman (1990): active provision of facilities for tourists within a working farm
Davies and Gilbert (1992): a form of rural tourism whereby paying guests can share in farming life either as staying guests or day visitors on working farms
Pearce (1990): farm tourism represents continuing ownership and active participation by the farmer in, typically, small-scale tourism ventures
Roberts (1992): farm tourism is about people who are away from the place where they normally live and work, and about the things they do on a working farm, whether they visit for the day or for a longer holiday
Denman (1994a, b): a term which covers the provision of facilities for tourists on a working farm
Clarke (1996): tourism products in which the consumer is aware of the farming environment, at a minimum
Weaver and Fennell (1997): rural enterprises which incorporate both a working farm environment and a commercial tourism component
Ilbery et al. (1998): farm tourism is conceptualized as an alternative farm enterprise (AFE) comprising one of seven possible “pathways of farm business development”.

Fennell, 1997a); Frater (1982) estimated that 51 per cent of all the accommodation in Austria was farm based and in France there were 22,000 sites. In fact, in Austria, “approximately 25 per cent of farms have been receiving tourists for nearly 100 years” (Hummelbrunner & Miglbauer, 1994, p. 42) and an estimated “7.5 per cent of all Austrian farmers offer tourist accommodation” (Embacher, 1994, p. 64). However, in recent years, farm tourism in Austria has “experienced a structural change. (In the late 1990s) ... tourists expect farms to offer high standards of accommodation and a high quality of stay in terms of their experience” (Taguchi & Iwai, 1998, p. 537).

A difficulty with data collection in Germany exists since accommodation does not need to be registered unless nine or more beds are offered (Oppermann, 1997) but, not surprisingly perhaps, Schöppner (1988) discovered that a high density of farm accommodation is found in mountainous and coastal areas including the wine area of the Mosel. Out of 268 rural tourism operators interviewed by Oppermann (1996), 119 offered “holidays on the farm”, which had been in business for an average of 15 years, and tourist income represented 17 per cent of total net income. In Poland, farms register for “agri-tourism” but do not state what activities they offer; for example, in Wielkopolska — western Poland around Poznan — there are 15 farms registered out of several thousand (Sznajder, 1999).

In England, an estimated 85 per cent of farm attractions have opened since 1980 (ETB, 1996) with over 23 per cent of farms, in the UK, involved in tourism (Denman, 1994a, b). In terms of value, the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food estimate that farm accommodation in England and Wales generates an estimated £70 million per annum (MAFF, 1995a). Lavery (1996) suggests 10,000 farms offer serviced accommodation, in the UK, with a further 10,000 providing self-catering facilities; Miller (1993), however, believes the

number offering accommodation to be nearer 14,000. In England’s West Country, alone, Aubrey (1998) states that farm houses form 12 per cent of the region’s accommodation stock with self-catering farms comprising 23 per cent of the supply for that sub-sector; farms in this region offering accommodation obtained some 36 per cent of their total income from tourism in 1990 (MAFF, 1995a). Nonetheless, Denman (1994b) believes there is still potential growth in the farm tourism market; Hjalager (1996) identifies that financial incentives will have a distinct bearing on the development of this sector although the Farm Diversification Grant Scheme, in the UK, which contributed up to 25 per cent of the capital cost, was withdrawn in 1993 (Gladstone & Morris, 1998). The pattern which emerges is one of, generally, small family-run enterprises in terms of the accommodation supply with much of this in scenic areas which, almost axiomatically, tend to be marginalized in economic terms. Insufficient data exists to compare the farm attractions market.

2.2. *New Zealand*

Given a landscape that acts as a primary attraction in terms of its rural and scenic attributes, little empirical research exists on farm tourism in New Zealand. Pearce’s (1990, p. 343) research involved 13 farms throughout North and South Island, ranging in size from 5 to 100,000 acres, and with the interviewer deliberately taking the part of guest-participant; whilst money was, allegedly, not the main reason for offering farm stays, “the importance of money was subtly revealed when 90 per cent of all interviewees showed a detailed awareness of their costs and returns”. Referring to a rather more representative sample of 619 farms, Ryan (1997, p. 166) notes that about 75 per cent “relied, in varying degrees, on off-farm income”. New Zealand Tourist Board data “indicates that in 1993, 3 per cent of all overseas visitor nights were spent

in farm-stays, home-stays and historic homes (i.e. about 600,000 nights) (Ryan, 1997, p. 163) although “this accommodation type accounted for 7 per cent of all nights spent in New Zealand” (Oppermann, 1998, p. 226). From a non-accommodation perspective, New Zealand Tourist Board (1994) data reveals that 300,000 overseas visitors went to a “farm show”. The pattern, therefore, is somewhat similar to the UK with farms playing a more integral role in tourist activities than just as a source of accommodation; a comparative case study between New Zealand and the UK has been conducted by Clarke (1995).

2.3. North America

In the United States, Pizam and Pokela (1980, p. 203) have developed the concept of the “vacation farm”; unlike a dude ranch, however, they insist that this term applies to “an active working farm on which extra rooms in the home or extra houses on the farm are rented to guests”. Their research across 50 states resulted in a list of 419 farms, generating 286 respondents, which reduced to a sample of 119 after the elimination of those not classified as working and having a guest capacity of under 40. The regional breakdown was as follows: East (35), Northwest (32), Midwest (28), South (13) and Southwest (11); 56 per cent were located in areas in which tourism is a significant industry. What was interesting was the scale of landholding: ranging from 3 to over 10,000 acres with the mean being 1287. One of the conclusions was that the business “can accommodate a variety of farms... the goals the farmers have can be very different” (Pizam & Pokela, 1980, p. 213). In terms of overall numbers, Vogeler (1977) estimated that there were approximately 2000 vacation farms in 1969.

Like the United States, Canada appears to have a low participation rate with 70 per cent of an “estimated 1000 rural hosts” being farmers (Shaw & Williams, 1994, p. 237). The paucity of vacation farm research has led Weaver and Fennell (1997a,b) and Fennell and Weaver (1997) to undertake studies in Saskatchewan because of the importance of agriculture to the province: 3 per cent of the labour force are employed in agriculture for Canada as a whole but for Saskatchewan the figure is 16 per cent. There were 76 vacation farm operators accounting for approximately 6500 visitor nights in 1993 although it should be noted that the first farm did not start until 1971 (Weaver & Fennell, 1997a, b). Despite suggesting a period of consolidation, Weaver and Fennell (1997b, p. 81) refer to the growth potential through eco-tourism, citing bird-watching as “the fastest growing pursuit” in one study. Given that vacation farm operators currently represent 0.1 per cent of all farms in Saskatchewan, “the attainment of a 1–2 per cent participation rate by 2005 should not be considered unreasonable” (Weaver & Fennell, 1997b, p. 81).

3. The farm tourism product

The farm tourism comprises two principal forms: non-accommodation and accommodation-related activities; some farms participate in both (Shaw & Williams, 1994). A simplistic list of farm tourism elements is provided by Clarke (1996a) (see Table 2), many are specifically used for tourism purposes. Dartington Amenity Research Trust (1974) and Davies and Gilbert (1992) identified similar components, segmenting farm tourism into three distinct categories, viz. accommodation-based, activity-based, and day-visitor-based whereas Ilbery et al. (1998) distinguish between accommodation and recreation enterprises.

As Table 1 highlights, the definitions for farm tourism have narrowed to a demand-led basis where there is no doubt that the consumer recognizes the farming environment as part of the overall tourism product. Clarke (1996b) believes this transition has changed the emphasis from “tourism on a farm” to “farm tourism” where the tourist component is a main-stay of many farm businesses. In fact, the literature contains a range of comments on the value of farm tourism: Worth (1997) reports that one farmer who established a tourism business in 1989 considers it is now more reliable and better than their traditional farming activities. Roberts (1992, p. 5) refers to West Country farmers who have “found that the tourism side of the business developed to such an extent that income from tourism now outweighs that from agriculture”.

Farm tourism has evolved to the point where it is recognized as a product in its own right; as Hoyland (1982) observes, although tourist facilities

Table 2
Farm tourism elements — according to Clarke (1996a, b)

Attractions — permanent	Attractions — events
Farm visitor centres	Farm open days
Self-guided farm trails	Guided walks
Farm museums	Educational visits
Farm centres	Demonstrations
Conservation areas	
Country parks	
Access (rural)	Activities
Stile/gate maintenance	Horse-riding/trekking
Footpaths/bridleways/tracks	Fishing
	Shooting/clay
	Boating
Accommodation	Amenities
Bed and breakfast	Restaurants
Self-catering	Cafes/cream teas
Camping and caravanning	Farm shops/roadside stalls
Bunkhouse barns	Pick your own
	Pinic sites

have been available on farms in England for many decades, it is only in the last 10–15 years that they have justified the description of farm tourism. Stewart (1995) drew particular attention to the increasing professionalization of farm tourism, moving away from a “pin money” activity (Miller, 1993) to one with a multi million pound turnover.

4. The transition

There is little evidence in the literature to suggest when and how the transition from tourism on farms to farm tourism is made; Page and Getz (1997) are critical of the existing literature, noting that there is a problem with the absence of accurate national studies concerning the growth and development of the sector and the need to understand the dynamics and operation of such businesses, particularly the role of entrepreneurship. Jacobs (1973, p. 6) has previously commented on this, observing that “the recent history of tourism on the farm is poorly documented”. It is important to note that there is also confusion over those tourism enterprises located on farmland and activities developed by the farmer divorced from the agricultural business. These differences could have a bearing on whether the activity is defined as tourism on a farm — or farm tourism. Bowen, Cox and Fox (1991) argue that a tourism activity will be considered agriculture based if the landscape is maintained by the farmer.

Managing the transition is not always straightforward; Wild (1989) believes that many small tourism businesses have suffered from the negative effects of fragmentation; farm accommodation is typecast as fragmented and isolated (Clarke, 1996b). Many farmers are isolated with a lack of knowledge, expertise, and training in the tourism field. Whilst it may appear that management of a farm tourism enterprise requires different skills to that of agriculture, Gilling (1995) reports “... farmers think that because they know how to look after animals, they know how to look after people”. Williams (1994) states that “the management skills required to run an efficient farm are the perfect groundwork for operating a successful tourism venture”. It is argued that the extent to which a farm will change depends on how professional an approach the business adopts.

Elson et al. (1995) and Youell (1998) note that there are many organizations available to assist the farmer in providing guidance; for example, the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) (1995b) discusses business plans and Roberts (1992, p. 1) comments that given the many English Tourist Board publications which “provide a full and detailed insight into the development of specific types of tourism product ... our guide is different. Its for those West Country farmers... now considering whether to diversify or further develop their existing

tourism enterprises”. In the northern Pennines area, 19 of the 27 organizations interviewed by Ilbery et al. (1998, p. 361) “had been set up after 1970 and six since 1990 (the latter particularly featuring tourism) — the functions ranging from finance and advice, through marketing and promotion, to regulation, representation and policy making”. National organizations involved in the study area include ADAS, the Agricultural Training Board (Landbase), the Rural Development Commission and the Farm Holiday Bureau; on a regional scale, are the Northumbria Tourist Board and the North Pennines Tourism Partnership, followed at a local level, by the district planning departments and Northumberland Training and Enterprise Council.

The supra-national scale also needs to be considered; some farm enterprises have benefited from EU funding including initiatives such as LEADER I (1991–1994) and LEADER II (1994–1999) for those located in Objective 1 or 5b areas. Ray (1996, p. 11) observes that, in LEADER I, local proposals were required to conform to certain categories of measures, viz. technical support (in particular, action to discover and assess local potential); vocational training (enabling local people to participate in the local economy); rural tourism (raising standards of quality, area-level booking agencies, etc.); local agricultural products; and, small firms, craft enterprises and local services (pluriactivity, SMEs, and information technology projects).

LEADER II “operates within Objective 1, 5b and 6 regions... (although) the more formalised approach ... has watered down the original bottom up approach” (EC, 1997, p. 44). Research conducted for the China Clay LEADER II project, in Cornwall, involved 358 farms being contacted, eliciting a 62 per cent response rate ($n = 223$). Of these, 7.5 per cent were involved in Bed and Breakfast, 11.8 per cent in providing self-catering accommodation, 4.3 per cent camping sites, and 1.6 per cent (i.e. three) running a tourist attraction (Jefferys, 1997). When asked to rate the importance of tourism to their business, 26.7 per cent considered it was “fairly important” and 12.8 per cent “very important”; interestingly, this represents 71 farms although those providing the facilities mentioned above number only 47 — this would suggest that “farm shops”, “fishing” and “horses” as activities also benefit from tourists.

With respect to Ireland, Deegan and Dineen (1997, p. 111) observe that the LEADER I programme “was notable for its qualitative rather than quantitative outputs”; 17 LEADER I areas covered 61 per cent of the Republic. In Ballyhoura, County Limerick, the existing Failte Society (a local tourism co-operative) received funding to further develop tourism products; this included increasing the Bed and Breakfast facilities providing “independence for farm wives hitherto dependent on their husband’s farm earnings” (O’Connor, 1995, 1996 cited in Deegan & Dineen, 1997, p. 108). Further

reflections on the LEADER programme can be found in Barke and Newton (1997), Ray (1998) and Slee (1998, p. 483); the latter, however, argues that as “development objectives are not simply economic, it is difficult to reduce the assessment of performance to economic criteria alone”. Finally, with regard to a structural fund, Nix (1997, p. 180) observes that projects “which benefit groups of farms are more likely to be successful” under the European Agricultural Guidance Fund (EAGGF) than individual ones.

A continuum best describes the transition from tourism on farms to farm tourism; various factors, such as the level of marketing, competition, entrepreneurship and investment, will dictate where each farm lies on this continuum. It can be assumed that, as enterprises move, substantial capital investment is required. Clough (1997) suggests that when a farm only caters for six guests or less, the owner is exempt from business rates, does not need a fire certificate or to register with their local authority; this is “tourism on a farm”.

Improved marketing is an obvious route to additional income and yet, historically, farmers have not shown great interest. Remoteness from the consumer, homogeneous products and atomistic competition have all contributed to this lack of concern (Slee & Yells, 1984). Evans and Ilbery (1992b) highlighted the difficulty that individual farm businesses have in distributing promotional literature.

As the tourist element has become more important to farmers, many have become members of the national Farm Holiday Bureau (FHB) and, by definition, their regional tourist board; this farmer-owned co-operative body has over 1000 members, within a network of 88 local groups, comprising 8500 bed spaces (MAFF, 1995a; Miller, 1993). Smith (1998) states that the membership costs for the FHB are £180 per annum and each farm must be inspected by their regional tourist board, be accepted by the local farm holiday marketing group and be a working farm. In practice, the FHB is creating a “local rural tourism brand through the linkages that they create... with the locally based self-help groups (bringing) out the unique character of the area” (Clarke, 1998, p. 139–140). Other distribution channels used by farm enterprises include tourist information centres (TICs), marketing consortia, commercial letting agencies, and trade magazines/journals. Rimes’ (1984) study into the promotional methods used by farm tourism businesses in England’s West Country revealed that all respondents thought repeat or recommendation was their best tool, followed by 62 per cent who stated that accommodation guides were most effective.

5. Pluriactivity and gender issues

Bateman and Ray (1994, p. 2) define pluriactivity “as the participation by any member of the farm household

in income-earning activities that contribute to maintaining the viability of the household” whereas Evans and Ilbery (1992a, p. 86) clearly distinguish farm diversification as the pluriactive strategy “where ‘unconventional’ use is made of on-farm resources”. Given that much of this pluriactivity is undertaken by women, some consideration of their role is needed; it should be noted that, in some areas, the type of agriculture “coincides with some of the busiest parts of the farming year, so minimising male involvement in tourism” (Neate, 1987, p. 18) and this forms part of the explanation for the preponderance of women in farm accommodation.

The role of women in farm tourism has, obviously, been significant for many decades although it is only in the recent post-productivist era (Garcia-Roman, Canoves & Valdovinos, 1995) that research has started to consider gender issues. Berlan-Darque and Gasson (1991) identify descriptive, Marxist and feminist phases in the agriculture and gender literature. It is not the remit of this paper to discuss the possible outcomes for women engaged in tourist provision as an AFE, except to note that Evans and Ilbery (1996) identify two “positive” and one “negative” outcomes. Pluriactivity “has the potential to alter the distribution of power between farm husbands and wives, but it is the direction of this change that is unclear from the scant empirical evidence” (Evans & Ilbery, 1996, p. 78). Annual research conducted by Brunt, at the University of Plymouth, for the Devon Farm Accommodation marketing consortium (affiliated to the Farm Holiday Bureau) suggests that nearly all of the 100 plus properties are run by the wife and, in a small number of cases, by both partners; this can be compared to Evans and Ilbery’s (1996) survey of 212 farms covering Staffordshire, Lincolnshire and Dorset, in 1989, which indicated 58 per cent were controlled by women. The critical issues to be borne in mind are that farm data may not have been collected in relation to theoretical constructs on gender relations proposed by Whatmore (1991, cited in Evans & Ilbery, 1996) and, secondly, that the business is engaged in pluriactivity. To illustrate the latter point, Evans and Ilbery (1996, p. 77) refer to Gasson and Winter’s (1992, cited in Evans & Ilbery, 1996) data set “in which only 32 per cent of farms had wives engaged in pluriactivity ... and only 17 per cent in ventures based on the farm”. Nilsson (1998, p. 378), however, is emphatic — “within farm tourism, one thing is constant: the wife is in charge of the tourism business”.

6. The future for farm tourism

It is argued that as farms move along the continuum from minor to major importance in revenue terms, the uniqueness of the farm tourism product may be distorted. Peebles (1995) suggests “farm tourism” is just tourism in a farm setting. The farm business may need to maintain

a level of “real” agricultural activity to safeguard the traditional ambience. Morris and Romeril (1986) suggest agriculture cannot be completely subordinated to the tourism component whereas Iwai and Taguchi (1998) provide examples which conflict with this.

As farms make the transition to farm tourism, they increasingly do not require a working farm as their traditional activities are forced to change or adapt to meet visitor demand. This could result in a mismatch between the efficient farm business and an efficient tourism business. Does the visitor need to be aware of the commercial farming environment? Clough (1997) notes that a large part of the public are quite happy not to see the farm but choose one for its image, scenery and tranquillity. Paynter (1991) concurs that a working farm is not necessarily required. An interesting adjunct to this is raised by Hoyland (1982, p. 384) who observes that “perhaps those who do not get on with animals are less likely to succeed with people; or, more likely, livestock farms have a greater visual appeal”.

These issues lead one to a consideration of MacCannell’s (1976) notions of authenticity: are farm-based tourists seeking a backstage experience? The enterprise could “stage” the real, traditional authenticity of the farm instead of relying on a commercial working enterprise. Pearce and Moscardo (1986) argue that it is authentic people, rather than authentic places, which are the focus of the tourist’s concern — as Nilsson (1998, p. 375) comments “the old idealised picture of the farmer has not totally disappeared”.

7. Conclusion

It is apparent that in recent years, the focus on farm tourism has changed; from being a supplementary commercial activity, tourism has developed into a sector in its own right. It is growing and various authors (Denman, 1994a; Clarke, 1996a; Hjalager, 1996) forecast a further growth in demand. Thus “Staying in a farmhouse bed-and-breakfast and enjoying family-style hospitality, is a form of tourist game which is psychologically the opposite of the city break” (Voase, 1995, p. 160); moreover, it is a post-industrial tourist experience “regarded as visitable” simply because it is not a purpose-built resort according to Voase (1995, p. 160). On this basis, farm tourism is a classic example of “new tourism” (Poon, 1993). However, this issue requires more detailed theoretical research to assess the extent to which this analogy is a valid assumption.

The transition from “tourism on a farm” to “farm tourism” is a complex process involving a range of factors. The authors believe, that to some extent, the threshold for transition is a state of mind for both the farmer and consumer; for example, Roberts (1992, p. 5) cites one farmer’s wife who cautions that “farmhouse Bed

and Breakfast only works if the family is 100 per cent behind you ... Without backup from my husband and children it just won’t work”. From another perspective, Ilbery et al. (1998, p. 363) comment that the dominance of small-scale bed and breakfast businesses — in the northern Pennines — is due to a shortage of family labour but where the “female partner can employ her labour to raise the income from the farm”. Nonetheless, the personal interaction is of great importance; Alletorp’s (1997) survey found that “the relationship between the host and guest” is the main strength of farm tourism.

The transition from tourism on farms to farm tourism could be said to occur when tourism revenue exceeds that for agriculture, or once a farmer has adopted a tourism business plan, or when the enterprise is regarded as farm tourism by the consumer. For most farms, tourism does not bring a large revenue stream; rather it is about providing income which can make the difference between viability or not. Oppermann (1995) believes the early research (e.g. Ager, 1958, cited in Oppermann, 1998) indicated “euphoric” results for farm tourism and contributed to the persistence of this opinion. In the final analysis, the transitional process is difficult as many farmers lack the experience of running a tourism business but guidance, as noted in a variety of forms, is available from a number of supra-national, national, regional and local sources. Therefore, this research note has identified both the developing literature on farm tourism and a number of useful avenues for further research. These can be summarized in terms of barriers to entry, gender relations, the proportion of non-farm accommodation activities to accommodation activities in a given area, and warrants detailed comparative case studies. The latter would certainly help to explain why participation in some countries has grown at a faster rate than others; for example, 54 vacation farms in Namibia by the early 1990s (Shackley, 1993) compares very favourably with the United States on a per capita basis.

In a wider context, with changes in supranational policy and the framework of EU member states, there is also considerable scope for research to examine the impact of agricultural policy (e.g. CAP) on diversification. If this diversification leads to a development of additional tourism businesses, then the weakness of EU tourism policy may be influenced by the complementary effects of non-tourism policy at EU and state level in developing farm tourism businesses.

References

- Ager, T. (1958). Der Fremdenverkehr in seiner Bedeutung für die Gebirgsbevölkerung und für die Bergbauernbetriebe. *Agrarpolitische Revue*, 14, 455–468.

- Alletorp, L. (1997). An investigation and comparison of the farm accommodation product in the United Kingdom and Denmark. Unpublished BSc Honours Project, University of Plymouth.
- Aubrey, P. (1998). Economic Development, West Country Tourist Board, Personal Communication, 25 February.
- Bateman, D., & Ray, C. (1994). Farm pluriactivity and rural policy: Some evidence from Wales. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 10(1), 1–13.
- Barke, M., & Newton, M. (1997). The EU LEADER Initiative and endogenous rural development: The application of the programme in two rural areas of Andalusia, Spain. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 13(3), 319–341.
- Berlan-Darque, M., & Gasson, R. (1991). Editorial — Changing gender relations in agriculture: an international perspective, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 7(1/2), (1–2).
- Blaine, T. W., Golam, M., & Var, T. (1993). Demand for rural tourism: an exploratory study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20, 770–773.
- Bowler, I., Clark, G., Crockett, A., Ilbery, B., & Shaw, A. (1996). The development of alternative farm enterprises: A study of family labour farms in the northern Pennines of England. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 12(3), 285–295.
- Bowen, R. L., Cox, L. J., & Fox, M. (1991). The interface between tourism and agriculture. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 2(2), 43–54.
- Bull, C., & Wibberley, G. P. (1976). Farm based recreation in south east England. Studies in Rural Land Use Report 12, Wye College, Wye, Ashford: University of London.
- Clarke, J. (1995). The effective marketing of small-scale tourism enterprises through national structures: lessons from a two-way comparative study of farm tourist accommodation in the United Kingdom and New Zealand. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 1(2), 137–153.
- Clarke, J. (1996a). Farm tourism. *Insights*, January D19–24.
- Clarke, J. (1996b). Farm accommodation and the communication max. *Tourism Management*, 17(8), 611–616.
- Clarke, J. (1998). Marketing rural tourism: Problems, practice and branding in the context of sustainability. *Rural Tourism Management: Sustainable options*, Conference Proceedings, 9–12 September, Scottish Agriculture College, Auchincruive, Ayr.
- Clough, M. (1997). Profiting from farm tourism. *Western Morning News*, 11 June.
- Dartington Amenity Research Trust (1974). Farm recreation and tourism in England and Wales. Countryside Commission Publications 83, London.
- Davies, E. T., & Gilbert, D. C. (1992). A case study of the development of farm tourism in Wales. *Tourism Management*, 13(1), 56–63.
- Deegan, J., & Dineen, D. A. (1997). *Tourism policy and performance – the Irish experience*. London: International Thomson Business Press.
- Denman, R. (1994a). Green tourism and farming. In J. M. Fladmark, *Cultural tourism* (pp. 215–222). London: Donhead Publishing.
- Denman, R. (1994b). The farm tourism market. *Insights*, March, B49–64.
- Denman, R., & Denman, J. (1990). A study of farm tourism in the West Country. West Country Tourist Board, Exeter.
- Elson, M., Steenberg, C., & Wilkinson, J. (1995). *Planning for rural diversification: A good practice guide*. London: Oxford Brookes University and Department of the Environment.
- Embacher, H. (1994). Marketing for Agri-tourism in Austria: Strategy and realisation in a highly developed tourist destination. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 2(1 and 2), 61–76.
- Emerick, R. E., & Emerick, C. A. (1994). Profiling American Bed and Breakfast Accommodations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(4), 20–25.
- English Tourist Board (1996). Sight-seeing in the UK 1995. English Tourist Board, Northern Ireland Tourist Board, Scottish Tourist Board and Wales Tourist Board, London.
- European Commission (1997). CAP 2000 working document. Rural Development, Directorate General for Agriculture (DG VI), European Commission, Brussels.
- Evans, N. J., & Ilbery, B. W. (1992a). Farm-based accommodation and the restructuring of agriculture: Evidence from three English Countries. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 8(1), 85–96.
- Evans, N. J., & Ilbery, B. W. (1992b). Advertising and farm-based accommodation: A British case study. *Tourism Management*, 13(4), 415–422.
- Evans, N. J., & Ilbery, B. W. (1996). Exploring the influence of farm based pluriactivity on gender relations in capitalist agriculture. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 36(1), 74–92.
- Fennell, D. A., & Weaver, D. B. (1997). Vacation farms and ecotourism in Saskatchewan, Canada. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 13(4), 467–475.
- Fleischer, A., & Pizam, A. (1997). Rural tourism in Israel. *Tourism Management*, 18(6), 367–372.
- Frater, J. (1982). Farm tourism in England and overseas. Center for Urban and Regional Studies, University of Birmingham.
- Frater, J. M. (1983). Farm tourism in England: Planning, funding, promotion and some lessons from Europe. *Tourism Management*, 4(3), 167–179.
- Garcia-Ramon, M. D., Canoves, G., & Valdovinos, N. (1995). Farm tourism, gender and the environment in Spain. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(2), 267–282.
- Gasson, R., & Winter, D. M. (1992). Gender relations and farm household pluriactivity. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 8, 387–397.
- Gilling, J. (1995). Farm attractions: Harvesting profits. *Leisure Opportunities*, 22 February.
- Gladstone, J., & Morris, A. (1998). The role of farm tourism in the regeneration of rural Scotland. *Rural tourism management: Sustainable options*, Conference Proceedings, 9–12 September, Scottish Agricultural College, Auchincruive, Ayr.
- Hjalager, A.-M. (1996). Agricultural diversification into tourism. *Tourism Management*, 17(2), 103–111.
- Hoyland, I. (1982). The development of farm tourism in the UK and Europe: Some management and economic aspects. *Farm Management*, 4(10), 383–389.
- Hummelbrunner, R., & Miglbauer, E. (1994). Tourism promotion and potential in peripheral areas: The Austrian case. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 2(1 and 2), 41–50.
- Ilbery, B., Bowler, I., Clark, G., Crockett, A., & Shaw, A. (1998). Farm-based tourism as an alternative farm enterprise: A case study from the Northern Pennines, England. *Regional Studies*, 32(4), 355–364.
- Inskeep, E. (1991). *Tourism planning: An integrated and sustainable development approach*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Iwai, Y., & Taguchi, K. (1998). Rural tourism in Japan: A case study of Hokkaido farm-inns. *Rural Tourism Management: Sustainable Options*. Conference Proceedings, 9–12 September, Scottish Agricultural College, Auchincruive, Ayr.
- Jacobs, C. (1973). *Farms and Tourism in Upland Denbighshire*. Tourism and Recreation Research Report No. 4, Denbighshire County Council, Ruthin.
- Jefferys Chartered Surveyors (1997). *China clay area LEADER II project*. Report on the Agriculture & Horticulture Sector Appraisal, St. Austell, Cornwall.
- Lanier, P., & Berman, J. (1993). Bed and breakfast inns come of age. *Cornell Hotel Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 34(2), 15–23.
- Lavery, P. (1996). *Travel and tourism* (3rd ed.). King's Ripton: ELM.
- MacCannell, D. (1976). The Tourist, Schocken, New York cited in Pearce, P. L. (1990) Farm tourism in New Zealand: A social situation analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(3), 337–352.
- Maude, A. J. S., & van Rest, D. J. (1985). The social and economic effects of farm tourism in the United Kingdom. *Agricultural Administration*, 20, 85–98.
- Miller, B. (1993). Farm tourism — sustaining employment in rural areas. *Agricultural Manpower*, 1(24), 8–11.
- Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (1995a). Success with farm-based tourist accommodation. London: MAFF Publications.
- Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (1995b). Success with farm diversification. London: MAFF Publications.
- Morris, H., & Romeril, M. (1986). Farm tourism in England's peak National park. *The Environmentalist*, 6(2), 105–110.

- Murphy, P. E. (1985). *Tourism: A community approach*. London: Methuen.
- Neate, S. (1987). The role of tourism in sustaining farm structures and communities on the Isles of Scilly. In M. Bouquet, & M. Winter (Eds.), *Who from their labours rest? Conflict and practice in rural tourism* (pp. 9–21). Aldershot: Avebury.
- New Zealand Tourist Board (1994). *New Zealand international visitors survey*. New Zealand Tourist Board, Wellington.
- Nilsson, P. A. (1998). Stay on a farm: A study of the ideological background to farm tourism. *Rural tourism management: Sustainable options, Conference Proceedings*, 9–12 September, Scottish Agricultural College, Auchincruive, Ayr.
- Nix, J. (1997). *Farm management pocketbook* (28th ed.). Wye, Ashford: Wye College, University of London.
- O'Connor, P. (1995). Tourism and development in Ballyhoura: Women's business? *Economic and Social Review*, 26 (4) 369–401 cited in Deegan, J., & Dineen, D. A. (1997) *Tourism policy and performance — the Irish experience*. London: International Thomson Business Press.
- O'Connor, P. (1996). Invisible players? Women, tourism and development in Ballyhoura. Women's Studies, Department of Government and Society, University of Limerick, Limerick cited in Deegan, J., & Dineen, D. A. (1997). *Tourism Policy and Performance — The Irish experience*. London: International Thomson Business Press.
- Oppermann, M. (1995). Holidays on the farm: A case study of German hosts and guests. *Journal of Travel Research*, 34(1), 63–67.
- Oppermann, M. (1996). Rural tourism in southern Germany. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23, 86–102.
- Oppermann, M. (1997). Rural tourism in Germany: Farm and rural tourism operators. In S. J. Page, & D. Getz, *The business of rural tourism: International perspectives* (pp. 108–119). London: International Thomson Business Press.
- Oppermann, M. (1998). Farm Tourism in New Zealand. In R. Butler, C. M. Hall, & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Tourism and recreation in rural areas* (pp. 225–233). Chichester: Wiley.
- Page, S. J., & Getz, D. (1997). *The business of rural tourism: International Perspectives*. London: International Thomson Business Press.
- Paynter, J. (1991). Down on the farm. *Leisure Management*, October.
- Pearce, P. L. (1990). Farm tourism in New Zealand: A social situation analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(3), 337–352.
- 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.
- Peebles, M. S. (1995). Cultivating the tourist/farm tourism. *Tourism — the Journal of the Tourism Society*, No. 86, Autumn.
- Pigram, J. J. (1993). Planning for tourism in rural area: Bridging the policy implementation gap. In D. Pearce, & R. W. Butler (Eds.), *Tourism research — critique and challenge* (pp. 156–174). London: Routledge.
- Pizam, A., & Pokela, J. (1980). The vacation farm: A new form of tourism destination. In D. E. Hawkins, E. L. Shafer, & J. M. Roelstad, *Tourism marketing and management issues* (pp. 203–216). Washington DC: George Washington University.
- Poon, A. (1993). *Tourism, technology and competitive strategies*. Wallingford: C.A.B.
- Ray, C. (1996). The dialectic of local development: The case of the EU LEADER I rural development programme. Centre for Rural Economy Working Paper 23, Department of Agricultural Economics and Food Marketing. Newcastle: University of Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Ray, C. (1998). Territory, structures and interpretation — two case studies of the European Union's LEADER I programme. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 14(1), 79–87.
- Rickard, R. C. (1983). *The role of farm tourism in the less favoured areas of England and Wales*. Exeter: University of Exeter Agricultural Economics unit.
- Rimes, R. (1984). *Farm holiday accommodation in Devon: Some aspects of marketing*. Unpublished dissertation supported by Glanely Agricultural Vacation Scholarship, University of Plymouth.
- Roberts, J. (1992). Harvesting the benefits from visitors to the countryside. West Country Tourist Board in association with Rural Development Commission, Agricultural Development and Advisory Service, Devon Country Council and The Big Sheep, Exeter.
- Ryan, C. (1997). Rural tourism in New Zealand: Rafting in the Rangitikei at river valley ventures. In S. J. Page, & D. Getz, *The business of rural tourism: International perspectives* (pp. 162–187). London: International Thomson Business Press.
- Schöppner, A. (1988). Urlaub auf dem Bauernhof. Eine fremdenverkehrs-geographische Untersuchung. Bochumer Materialien zur Raumordnung 36, University of Bochum, Bochum.
- Shaw, G., & Williams, A. M. (1994). *Critical issues in tourism: A geographical perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Shackley, M. (1993). Guest farms in Namibia: An emerging accommodation sector in Africa's hottest destination. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 12(3), 253–265.
- Slee, B. (1998). Soft tourism: Can the Western European model be transferred into Central and Eastern Europe? *Rural tourism management: Sustainable options, Conference Proceedings*, 9–12 September, Scottish Agricultural College, Auchincruive, Ayr.
- Slee, R. W., & Yells, R. (1984). Some aspects of marketing farm holiday accommodation. *Farm Management*, 5(8), 317–323.
- Smith, L. (1998). Front Office Manager, Farm Holiday Bureau, Personal Communication, 11 March.
- Stewart, R. (1995). A speaker at the Tourism Society meeting. Cultivating the tourist, cited in Peebles (1995).
- Sznajder, M. (1999). Professor in Agricultural Economics, Agricultural University, Poznan, Poland, Personal Communication, 15 February.
- Taguchi, K., & Iwai, Y. (1998). Agri-tourism in Austria and its implications for Japanese rural tourism. *Rural tourism management: Sustainable options, Conference Proceedings*, 9–12 September, Scottish Agricultural College, Auchincruive, Ayr.
- Voase, R. (1995). *Tourism: The human perspective*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Vogeler, I. (1977). Farm and ranch vacationing. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 9, 291–300, cited in D. Weaver, & D. Fennell, (1997). Rural tourism in Canada: The Saskatchewan vacation farm operator as entrepreneur. In S. J. Page, & D. Getz, *The business of rural tourism: International perspectives* (pp. 77–92). London: International Thomson Business Press.
- Wales Tourist Board (1986). More money from tourism — a practical guide for Welsh farmers. Wales Tourist Board, Cardiff.
- Warnick, R. B., & Klar, L. R. (1991). The bed and breakfast and small inn industry of the commonwealth of Massachusetts: An exploratory survey. *Journal of Travel Research*, 29, 17–25.
- Weaver, D. B., & Fennell, D. A. (1997a). The vacation farm sector in Saskatchewan: A profile of operations. *Tourism Management*, 18(6), 357–365.
- Weaver, D. B., & Fennell, D. A. (1997b). Rural Tourism in Canada: The Saskatchewan vacation farm operator as entrepreneur. In S. J. Page, & D. Getz, *The business of rural tourism: International perspectives* (pp. 77–92). London: International Thomson Business Press.
- Whatmore, S. (1991). Life cycle or patriarchy? Gender divisions in family. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 7, 71–76.
- Wild, C. N. (1989). Fragmentation in the tourism industry. In S. F. Witt, & L. Moutinho (Eds.), *Tourism marketing and management handbook* (2nd ed.) (pp. 82–85). London: Prentice-Hall.
- Williams, P. (1994). Farm based tourism and leisure: A step further. Uckfield, East Sussex: Nuffield Farming Scholarships Trust.
- Worth, V. (1997). Down on the farm. *Caterer and Hotelkeeper*, 8 May.
- Youell, R. (1998). *Tourism — an introduction*. Harlow: Addison-Wesley Longman.