

# Journal of Rural and Community Development

## A Demand-driven Success Factor Analysis for Agritourism in Switzerland

**Authors:** Mario Huber, Pius Hofstetter, & Andreas Hochuli

**Citation:**

Huber, M., Hofstetter, P., & Hochuli, A. (2020). A demand-driven success factor analysis for agritourism in Switzerland. *The Journal of Rural and Community Development*, 15(1), 1–16.

**Publisher:**

Rural Development Institute, Brandon University.

**Editor:**

Dr. Doug Ramsey

**Open Access Policy:**

This journal provides open access to all of its content on the principle that making research freely available to the public supports a greater global exchange of knowledge. Such access is associated with increased readership and increased citation of an author's work.



# **A Demand-driven Success Factor Analysis for Agritourism in Switzerland**

**Mario Huber**

Bern University of Applied Sciences  
Bern, Switzerland  
[mario.huber@bfh.ch](mailto:mario.huber@bfh.ch)

**Pius Hofstetter**

Agricultural Education and Extension Center for Nature and Nutrition BBZN  
Schüpfheim, Switzerland  
[pius.hofstetter@edulu.ch](mailto:pius.hofstetter@edulu.ch)

**Andreas Hochuli**

Bern University of Applied Sciences  
Bern, Switzerland  
[andreas.hochuli@bfh.ch](mailto:andreas.hochuli@bfh.ch)

## **Abstract**

This article aims to define categories of tourists' motivations for visiting an agritourism farm. It also analyses the difference in motivation between potential customers and actual customers who have already been on an agritourism farm. Survey data from a total of 780 respondents (647 potential customers and 133 actual customers of agritourism facilities) were collected using a standardized questionnaire. The data was factor analysed (using PCA), and seven factors were identified: (1) comfort and consumption, (2) rural life, (3) accessibility to nature, (3) fun and relaxation on the farm, (4) regional products, (5) simple accommodation, and (6) culinary offers. The factors with most importance relate to the accessibility to nature as well as the possibility to buy regional food. The means of the factors were calculated for both respondent groups and compared using the Mann-Whitney U test. This test shows that the two groups "potential customers" and "effective customers on the farm" differ significantly only in the two characteristics of consumer behavior and comfort of accommodation. All other factors were either significantly less important or showed no differences for customers of agritourism farms. The results have implications for the communication process of agritourism farms or destination marketing organizations (DMOs), namely that the focus on comfort and consumption should be increased as a customer's decision comes closer to definitive booking.

**Keywords:** agritourism, success factors, factor analysis, consumer choice, accommodation facilities

---

## **1.0 Introduction**

Swiss agriculture has been undergoing structural change for more than 30 years, reducing the number of farms by 50% at an average rate of about 2% per annum (Ferjani, Zimmermann, & Roesch, 2015). For farmers, the three most common responses to this structural change, as identified by Ferjani et al. (2015), have been farm growth, farm exit or the search for a secondary source of income. On-farm activities are seen as a common secondary source of income as well as a possibility to maintain the farm as a family business (Mann, 2009).

Agritourism—or farm tourism<sup>1</sup>—is a popular possibility for on-farm diversification. Although there are no precise data about the number of farms with agritourism activity in Switzerland, it is estimated that in 2010 about 3300 farms offered activities and/or catering for tourists (Landwirtschaftliche Betriebszählung [BFS], 2010).

From the tourist point of view, over 30% of all tourism activities in Switzerland are undertaken in the countryside. The landscape is vitally important for tourism in Switzerland, with an estimated value of approximately CHF 70 billion (von Hunnius, 2015). Agritourism is seen as part of the concept of rural tourism (Hegarty & Przezborska 2005; Bojnec, 2004) and plays a significant role in it (Fleischer & Tchetchik, 2005).

Few studies on agritourism have been conducted in Switzerland (e.g., Vogt, 2010; Hochuli, Huber, & Hofstetter, 2016b; Markstein, 2009) and little is known about agritourism customers' needs<sup>2</sup>, expectations, or motivations. In the international literature, these topics are more present and better analysed. However, no literature about the evolution of agritourists' motivation from the tourists' decision-making process was found in either national or international literature. The present paper aims to close this gap by analysing tourist motivations for agritourism in Switzerland at two distinct moments of the decision-making process.

Exploratory research was carried out using a sample of 133 customers of agritourism facilities in central Switzerland ('actual' customers) and 647 respondents who had not necessarily been farm tourists ('potential' customers). The answers from the two questionnaires were analysed, aggregated, and evaluated using factor analysis.

The study aims to define categories of tourist motivations for choosing agritourism facilities in Switzerland and to analyse the difference in motivations between actual and potential customers. The factors identified need to be validated by other studies in this area.

The results of this study should impact and inform farmers, destination marketing organisations (DMOs), local and regional administrations, and other actors in tourism about which topics to focus on in communication during the customers' decision-making process.

## 2.0 Literature Review

In the international literature, tourist motivations and success factors in agritourism are both important topics. These issues have either been analysed from the management (supply-side) perspective (e.g., Nuntsu, Tassiopoulos, & Haydam, 2004; Benzing, Chu, & Kara, 2009; Westerbeek, Turner, & Ingerson, 2002) or from the customers' (demand-side) perspective (e.g., Getz & Brown 2006; Kozak, 2002; Crompton, 1979; Hanqin & Lam, 1999). On the supply side, researchers concentrate mostly on a managerial view, whereas on the demand side, the focus is often placed on customers' motivations. Some findings of both approaches are reported in the following paragraphs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Agritourism and farm tourism are used synonymously for the present study. Agritourism is defined as spending activities of visitors outside their usual working or living environment (demand side) as well as investments and production activities (supply side) on the farm (Hochuli, Huber, & Hofstetter, 2016a).

<sup>2</sup> In this study, agritourism customers are defined as paying visitors who use agritourism services.

From the managerial point of view, Sidali, Schulze, & Spiller (2007) questioned 103 farm vacation entrepreneurs in Germany and concluded that the most important factors for success are personal skills and the possibility to benefit from economy of scale on the farm. Wilson, Fesenmaier, Fesenmaier, and van Es (2001) adopted a focus group methodology with “community leaders” (including members of local governments, non-profit organizations or other institutions) and “businesspersons” (including entrepreneurs in the tourism sector) in several regions in Illinois, USA. The main finding is the importance of the community approach in the development of rural tourism. On the basis of the analysis of 40 organic agritourism enterprises, Privitera (2009) identified factors that helped rural communities develop agritourism in Sicily, Italy. Park, Doh, and Kim (2014) suggest that innovations resulting from the development of new products and services are a central element for improving the business performance of the farm.

From a demand-side, Devesa, Laguna, and Palacios (2009) studied the role of motivation in tourist satisfaction for rural tourism in Spain. The authors found that there are elements affecting all tourists (such as gastronomy quality or opening hours) and other factors which are evaluated differently depending on the motivation for the trip. Eagles (1992), when investigating the travel motives of Canadian ecotourists, found that ecotourists are more interested in destinations with nature-related factors than general travellers. Srikatanyoo and Campiranon (2010) defined the needs and motivations for Thailand’s agritourism industry by analysing 767 questionnaires and found three factors each for needs and motivations. Artuğer and Kendir (2013) worked on a sample of 196 Turkish agritourists and determined the motivations for choosing farm tourism.

Various studies have analysed customer segments of rural tourism offers, but only a few had a focus on Agritourism. Sidali and Schulze (2010) were among the first to apply a clustering approach to the definition of customer segments in rural tourism/agritourism. The authors defined six clusters for farm tourism in Germany. These vary from the “wild west supporters” to the “pure organic seekers” to the “rural idyll and wellness seekers.”

Kidd, King, & Whitelaw (2014) defined customer segments for farm tourism in Victoria, Australia. The authors were able to define three groups: (1) the group “Passive Recreation” with interest in more passive activities such as watching animals or farm tours, (2) the “Farm-Related Activities” with interest in activities such as bush walking or bird watching, and (3) the “Active Recreation” with activities such as fishing, hunting or horse riding.

Fernández-Hernandez, León, Araña, and Díaz-Pérez (2016) have defined customer segments in rural tourism in La Palma (Spain) in their study, with agritourism playing only a marginal role in the whole context. Nonetheless, nine clusters were defined which differ more from each other, ranging from more urban clusters (such as the “Museum Lovers”) to active tourism (such as the “Trekkers Lovers”) to more rural activity based clusters (such as the “Rural-environment Lovers”).

Dong, Wang, Morais, and Brooks (2013) have also defined various clusters for rural tourism in Potter County, Pennsylvania, USA. These were the “Experimental Travellers,” the “Rural Explorers,” and the “Indifferent Travellers.” An important finding from the study was that non-typical rural activities are the drivers of rural tourism. More important are other activities such as dining or shopping. Thus, tourism in the analysed region cannot simply be defined as “rural tourism” but much more as “tourism in a rural area.”

The customer segments defined in the analysed studies vary strongly depending on the analysis region and can, therefore, not be transferred one to one in another context.

In addition to agritourism or rural tourism research, many studies have been conducted in more general tourism contexts. Kozak (2002) defined differences in tourism motives (reduced with factor analysis) on the basis of tourists' nationality and destinations by sampling 1872 British and German tourists visiting Turkey and Majorca. Hanqin and Lam (1999) utilised factor analysis to examine 26 “pull” motivations of 105 mainland Chinese visiting Hong Kong. Rid, Ezeuduji, and Pröbstel-Haider (2014) surveyed 430 foreign tourists in Gambia and measured their motivations based on 22 items and found inter-alia potentials in event-driven rural tourism.

Table 1 shows an overview of selected factors characterizing tourism motivations (for both agritourism and conventional tourism) from the analysed literature with a similar methodological approach to the present study.

Table 1. *Factors Characterizing Tourism Motivation (demand) in the Analysed Literature with a Similar Methodological Approach to the Present Work*

<b>Parent Topic</b>	<b>Factors</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>
Relaxation	Relaxation	Artuğer & Kendir, 2013
	Relaxation	Kozak, 2002
Sport	Physical	Kozak, 2002
	Sport and wellness	Sidali & Schulze, 2010
Nature and environment	Attractions and environment	Srikatanyoo & Campiranon, 2010
	Sun & beach	Rid et al., 2014
Comfort and safety	Comfort and safety	Sidali & Schulze, 2010
	Facilities, services, and location	Srikatanyoo & Campiranon, 2010
	Service attitude and quality	Hanqin & Lam, 1999
	Accessibility	Hanqin & Lam, 1999
Consume	Expenditure	Hanqin & Lam, 1999
	Fun and flirt	Sidali & Schulze, 2010
	Activities and shopping	Srikatanyoo & Campiranon, 2010
	Pleasure-seeking/ Fantasy	Kozak, 2002
Rural experience	Culture and rural life	Sidali & Schulze, 2010
	Authentic rural experience	Rid et al., 2014
	Agricultural experiences	Artuğer & Kendir, 2013
Relationships	Quality of life, relationships, and adventure	Artuğer & Kendir, 2013
Culture	Culture	Kozak, 2002
	Sightseeing variety	Hanqin & Lam, 1999
	Cultural links	Hanqin & Lam, 1999
	Learning	Rid et al., 2014
	Heritage & nature	Rid et al., 2014
Adventure	High-tech image	Hanqin & Lam, 1999

### 3.0 Methods

The findings of this study were drawn from two separate paper-based surveys conducted between 2014 and 2015. The first questionnaire was designed to investigate the wants of “potential” customers of agritourism facilities (i.e., customers who had not necessarily stayed on an agritourism farm before). The data collection took place at a fair (Central Switzerland Spring Fair ‘LUGA’) during a 10-day period in 2014. The LUGA fair was chosen because of the rather rural-interested public, which is, therefore, more likely to be interested in agritourism. However, the more urban population was less involved, which is a limiting factor of the study. The questionnaire asked about the importance of 38 items when choosing an agritourism facility. A four-point Likert-type scale from very important (1) to not important at all (4) was used. The four-point Likert-type scale was chosen to make the questionnaire as simple and compact as possible in order to address a maximum number of passers-by.

The second questionnaire (actual customer questionnaire) was filled out by customers of 50 agritourism farms at the end of their stay. The survey was undertaken during a period of ten months in order to include both summer and winter tourists. The questionnaire asked about the importance of 40 items when choosing an agritourism facility (the questions’ formulation was explicitly kept general and not specific to the farm visited). The answers were given on a seven-point Likert-type scale from not important at all (0) to very important (7). Since this survey was not aimed at passers-by, but at customers of agritourism, the hurdle of convincing people to take part in the survey was lower than at the LUGA fair. Accordingly, a broader Likert-type scale was chosen.

A total of 780 questionnaires were completed. Six hundred forty-seven respondents were classified as “potential” agritourists, whereas 133 were actual customers of agritourism facilities. Although the aim was to achieve a balanced sample of current and potential customers, the resulting sample is to be considered as a convenience sample. In order to consider the largest number of cases for factor analysis, missing data were replaced using the expectation-maximization (EM) imputation method (see Dempster, Laird, & Rubin, 1977; Bernaards & Sijtsma, 2000).

The list with the items in both questionnaires was created on the basis of an extensive literature review. Because of the two different target groups, some variables diverged between the questionnaires. For the comparison of the two surveys in the present study, only 30 identical variables were considered. The problem of combining two surveys with different Likert scales was solved by reducing the scale of both questionnaires to a range from 0-1 (where 0 stands for “not important at all” and 1 stands for “very important”). The answers in-between were scaled linearly depending on the number of possible answers.

The data were analysed using factor analysis with a varimax rotation using SPSS 23. Both Bartlett’s test of sphericity (approx. chi-square of 8091.21, df. of 435 and sig. of .000) and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin’s measure of sampling adequacy (meritorious: .85) were positive. The analysis of the measures of sampling adequacy (MSA) for each variable was also positive. The lowest MSA result was .72, which is still considered as “middling” by Kaiser (1974). The factor analysis resulted in seven factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.00. 58.24% of the variance in the data is explained with the seven factors defined. For the factor analysis, only variables with a factor loading greater than 0.5 were considered. From the 30 factor-analysed variables, five did not reach a factor loading of 0.5 and were therefore excluded from further analysis.

After the factor analysis, the means of the defined factors were analysed separately for the two datasets (potential customers and actual customers). The Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare the means of the two groups.

### **3.1 Results of the Factor Analysis**

The detailed results of the factor analysis are reported in Table 2. Factor 1, which was defined as *comfort and consumption*, includes variables such as a comfortable room or the accessibility to bars and restaurants. This factor includes six variables, explains 12.70 % of the variance, and has a mean over all variables of 0.36 of a maximum of 1.00 (meaning that the overall importance of this factor for the selection of an agritourism facility is quite low). Factor 2 (*rural life*) includes variables that give an insight into rural/farm life and work on the farm. The variance explained by the four included variables in this factor is 9.49%, with a grand mean of 0.55. The third factor (*accessibility to nature*) represents variables that are strongly related to activities in nature, such as the accessibility to hiking trails or lakes. The four variables in factor 3 explain 8.56% of the variance with a mean of 0.63. Factor 4 (*fun and relaxation on the farm*) describes activities on the farm like swimming or visiting an adventure park. The three variables included explain 7.41 of the variance with quite a low mean of 0.39.

The fifth factor (*regional products*) is about the sale of regional or farm products. The only two variables included in this factor (explaining 7.14 % of the variance) are very similar and important for the choice of an agritourism facility (mean of 0.74). Factor 6 (*simple accommodation*) implies basic (dormitories) or adventurous (e.g., tents or yurts) lodging options. It should be noted that the variable “room with private bathroom” has a negative factor loading, representing a negative association with the factor; because of the negative factor loading, this variable will not be considered for further steps. The grand mean of factor 6 is 0.51, and the variance explained is 6.59%. The last defined factor 7 (*culinary offers*) includes variables about meals (breakfast or set menus) on the farm. The three variables described in this factor explain 6.35% of the variance and have a grand mean of 0.53.

### **3.2 Comparison of Potential Customers with Actual Customers of Agritourism Facilities**

The analysis of the differences between the importance of each factor and between potential and actual customers reveals clear differences in some factors, whereas others do not differ significantly). Factor 1, *comfort and consumption*, tends to be significantly more important for actual customers than for potential customers and is mostly influenced by “room with high degree of comfort” and “free Wi-Fi access.” Although factors 2 (*rural life*) and 3 (*accessibility to nature*) are quite important when choosing an agritourism facility, no significant differences between the customer groups can be identified for these factors.

*Fun and relaxation* is significantly less important for customers who had actually stayed at an agritourism facility than for “potential” customers. In particular, the mean of the “adventure park on the farm” variable for potential customers is significantly lower. Factor 5 (*regional products*) is also significantly less important for the actual customer of agritourism facilities than potential customers. *Simple accommodation* (factor 6) is significantly less important for actual customers of agritourism facilities than for potential customers, with the “lodging in dormitories” variable seeming to have little importance for customers who had actually visited an agritourism facility. Factor 7 (*culinary offers*) also has less importance for actual customers than potential customers, with the “big breakfast” and “offer of one or more menus on the farm” variables showing significant differences.

Table 2. *Results of the Factor Analysis*

	<b>Factors' Loading<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Eigenvalue<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>% of Variance<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Grand Mean<sup>b</sup></b>
<b><i>Factor 1: Comfort and consumption</i></b>		3.81	12.70	.36
Room with a high degree of comfort	.58			
Free Wi-Fi access	.64			
Accessibility to cultural offerings	.64			
Accessibility to bars, restaurants, etc.	.74			
Accessibility to shops	.79			
Availability of sports amenities in the region	.61			
<b><i>Factor 2: Rural life</i></b>		2.85	9.49	.55
Availability to children's playground (on the farm)	.77			
Availability to petting zoo (on the farm)	.85			
Possibility of work on the farm	.65			
Possibility of horseback riding	.64			
<b><i>Factor 3: Accessibility to nature</i></b>		2.57	8.56	.63
Accessibility to hiking trails	.78			
Accessibility to cable cars	.75			
Accessibility to lakes	.61			
Good public transport	.57			
<b><i>Factor 4: Fun and relaxation on the farm</i></b>		2.22	7.41	.39
Swimming facilities on the farm	.68			
Adventure park on the farm	.53			
Spa facilities on the farm	.55			



**Table 2 continued**

<b>Factor 5: Regional products</b>		2.14	7.14	.74
Direct sale of farm products	.85			
Direct sale of products from the region	.81			
<b>Factor 6: Simple accommodation</b>		1.98	6.59	.51
Room with private bathroom	-.51			
Lodging in tents, tipis, yurts etc.	.71			
Lodging in dormitories	.77			
<b>Factor 7: Culinary offers</b>		1.91	6.35	.53
Big breakfast	.53			
Offer one or more menus on the farm	.65			
Wide gastronomic range with a diversified menu	.60			
<i>Not classified variables (factor loading below 0.50)</i>				
Availability of thematic trails in the region				.48
Availability of adventure offerings in the region (river-rafting, climbing etc.)				.42
Bike or e-bike rental on the farm				.51
Guided tour of the farm				.66
Small breakfast				.50

Notes:

<sup>a</sup>Extraction method: principal component analysis. Rotation method: varimax with Kaiser normalization. Rotation converged in 18 iterations.

<sup>b</sup>Based on a Likert-type scale from 0 (not important at all) to 1 (very important).

#### 4.0 Discussion and Practical Implications

Most of the seven factors identified within the present study are in line with other studies that used similar methods. Factor 1 (*comfort and consumption*) has many similarities with the “comfort and safety” and “fun and flirt” factors identified by Sidali and Schulze (2010) or the “expenditure” factor described by Hanquin and Lam (1999). Factor 2 (*rural life*) is similar to the factors of “authentic rural experience” in the work of Rid et al. (2014) and the factor “agricultural experiences” described by Artuğer and Kendir (2013). Factor 3 (*accessibility to nature*) shares some features with the “physical” factor identified by Kozak (2002), whereas Factor 4 (*fun and relaxation on the farm*) is quite similar to the “sun and beach” factor described by Rid et al. (2014). Factors related to food (factor 5 - *regional products*, and factor 7 - *culinary offers*) have no comparable factors in the analysed literature with similar study approaches. Nevertheless, many authors focus on food as an important component for the development of rural tourism (see Renko, Renko, & Polonijo, 2010; Bessièrè, 1998; Skuras, Dimara, & Petrou, 2006; Torres, 2002). The described importance of food has been confirmed in the present study considering the relatively high grand means of factors 5 and 7. *Simple accommodation* (factor 6), which has quite a low grand mean, is hardly considered in the literature. This could be explained by the fact that—especially in Europe—rural tourism accommodation has evolved from simple accommodation to more specialized infrastructures (Cánoves, Villarino, Priestley, & Blanco, 2004).

One of the quite surprising results of the factor analysis was the fact that the most important factor when choosing an agritourism facility is not directly related to the farm infrastructure but to the accessibility to the rural area (hiking trails, lakes, or cable-cars) and the direct sale of regional food products. The importance of the direct sale of regional products from the farm is probably due to the fact that the direct sale of farm products is generally in vogue among the population, but also to the fact that the agricultural tourism offer in Switzerland is still strongly linked to the traditional image of agriculture as a producer of high-quality regional products.

Also, the importance of the surroundings compared to other factors requires explanation. Many studies on factors affecting the choice of hotels have been done and mostly stated the importance of the infrastructure over locational factors (e.g., Yavas & Babakus, 2005; Dolnicar & Otter, 2003). These studies refer mostly to city hotels and should therefore not be used to explain the demand for rural-oriented agritourism operations. Kim Lian Chan and Baum (2007) explain that for the rural region they analysed, natural attractions were important motivating factors for choosing a destination and accommodation.

The analysis of differences between the two surveys gives quite a clear image of the evolution of the importance of the factors from potential agritourists to actual agritourists who stayed at an agritourism facility (see Table 3). Only factor 1 (*comfort and consumption*) became more important for the agritourists. Factor 2 (*rural life*) and factor 3 (*accessibility to nature*) do not show significant differences between the two groups. All other factors were significantly less important for customers who had actually stayed on a farm. The increased importance of comfort compared to other factors (especially for simple accommodation or regional food) for customers actually staying on an agritourism farm could be explained by considering the difference between the imagery of rural tourism and the actual needs when booking a service. The socially constructed image of rural areas, including stunning landscapes, simple and rustic lifestyles, basic recreational activities (Figueiredo & Raschi 2012)

affect the imagery of rural tourism. However, tourism is also a phenomenon related to consumption and leisure that can be interpreted on the one hand as a desire for quality during tourism activities (Cánoves et al., 2004), and on the other hand as the desire for experience in the rural tourism activity. Therefore, a combination of authenticity and quality/experience in rural tourism could be quite important (Cánoves et al., 2004).

Based on the data analysed, it seems that potential customers of agritourism farms in Switzerland give significantly more importance to a more traditional image of rural tourism (including regional food, simple accommodation or insight into rural life), whereas comfort and consumption become significantly more important for customers who have actually stayed on such a farm. This could imply that potential customers who are not immediately interested in booking a service on a farm have a more ‘romantic’ view of agritourism. When that interest is more concrete, factors closer to consumption-based tourism become equally as important. This fact could be important for the communication process of a rural tourism destination or an agritourism farm. Researchers have proven that different factors influence the various stages of the tourism decision-making process (Decrop & Snelders 2005; Gretzel & Yoo 2008; Gitelson & Kerstetter 1995). Choi, Lehto, & O’Leary (2007) analysed inter alia the change of online information sources in the different pre-trip planning stages and observed a change from the initial phase (airline sites or search sites) to the final and more concrete phase of the booking process (map sites or weather sites). Transposed to the present study, it could be concluded that when the decision-making process approaches a more concrete phase, the communication focus should be on comfort and consumption behaviour.

## **5.0 Conclusions and Limitations of the Study**

The study has, for the first time in Switzerland, given an insight into the factors farm tourists in Switzerland consider important when choosing an agritourism facility. Overall, it has been shown that accessibility to nature as well as the possibility to buy regional products are quite important. Furthermore, the study showed how the importance of factors changed between potential customers and customers who had actually stayed on a farm. These differences could have implications in the communication along the decision-making process: when the process comes closer to the definitive booking of a service, the focus may increasingly be put on comfort and consumption and less on food or on simple accommodations.

Factor analysis is a proven method to reduce the number of variables. Splitting the sample after the factor analysis and comparing the means of the two groups separately is an approach that does not often appear in the literature (although Kozak 2002 adopted a similar approach). From the author’s point of view, the adopted methodology was appropriate to the declared aim of the study. The results of the current work are, however, subject to some limitations. The difference between the sizes of the two samples may lead to a major influence of the bigger sample in the factor analysis. Moreover, the adopted methodology excluded some variables with quite high means, such as “guided tour of the farm” or “room with a private bathroom,” both of which could be quite important for the communication of services on the farm.

Table 3: *Differences between the Two Surveys*

	Potential customers	Actual customers	Mann-Whitney U	Asymp. Sig. (2 Tailed)
<b><i>Factor 1: Comfort and consumption</i></b>	.35	.41	1403665	.000
Room with high degree of comfort	.46	.58	32541	.000
Free Wi-Fi access	.32	.55	27678	.000
Accessibility to cultural offerings	.31	.41	33980	.000
Accessibility to bars, restaurants, etc.	.37	.30	37981	.020
Accessibility to shops	.30	.34	39687	.112
Availability of sports amenities in the region	.35	.28	36734	.004
<b><i>Factor 2: Rural life</i></b>	.56	.53	678636	.449
Availability of children’s playground (on the farm)	.54	.53	41894	.546
Availability of petting zoo (on the farm)	.55	.52	41747	.504
Possibility of work on the farm	.63	.61	42847	.847
Possibility of horseback riding	.50	.45	39936	.145
<b><i>Factor 3: Accessibility to nature</i></b>	.63	.62	681033	.524
Accessibility to hiking trails	.73	.77	37309	.007
Accessibility to cable cars	.58	.56	42045	.584
Accessibility to lakes	.63	.60	41043	.318
Good public transport	.60	.54	38459	.033
<b><i>Factor 4: Fun and relaxation on the farm</i></b>	.40	.32	327225	.000
Swimming facilities on the farm	.43	.36	38534	.038
Adventure park on the farm	.44	.33	31076	.000
Spa facilities on the farm	.35	.30	39516	.097

---

**Table 3 continued**

---

<b>Factor 5: Regional products</b>	.76	.61	125056	.000
Direct sale of farm products	.78	.65	32807	.000
Direct sale of products from the region	.74	.57	29423	.000
<b>Factor 6: Simple accommodation</b>	.40	.32	145864	.000
Lodging in tents, tipis, yurts etc.	.41	.37	39756	.124
Lodging in dormitories	.39	.27	33244	.000
<b>Factor 7: Culinary offers</b>	.56	.39	284356	.000
Big breakfast	.76	.55	28128	.000
Offers of one or more menus on the farm	.55	.36	35032	.000
Wide gastronomic range with a diversified menu	.36	.27	39516	.097

---

Data collection at a trade fair and on agritourism enterprises excluded certain population groups. People from other parts of the country or more urban parts of the population are likely to be underrepresented in this study. A broader survey taking into account a more homogeneous socio-cultural sample would have given the results additional significance.

In Switzerland, scientific literature on agritourism is still in its infancy. There are many possibilities for further analyses of the demand for agritourism services. Among other things, the analysis of the socio-cultural backgrounds of tourists should provide important additional insights to this study and thus enable more accurate recommendations for the marketing process of agritourism offers.

## References

- Artuğer, S., & Kendir, H. (2013). Agritourist motivations: The case of Turkey. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(21), 63–69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v8n21p63>
- Benzing, C., Chu, H. M., & Kara, O. (2009). Entrepreneurs in Turkey: A factor analysis of motivations, success factors, and problems. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 47(1), 58–91. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-627X.2008.00262.x>
- Bernaards, C. A., & Sijtsma, K. (2000). Influence of imputation and EM methods on factor analysis when item nonresponse in questionnaire data is nonignorable. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 35(3), 321–364. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327906MBR3503\\_03](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327906MBR3503_03)
- Bessièrè. J. (1998). Local development and heritage: Traditional food and cuisine as tourist attractions in rural areas. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 38(1), 21–34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9523.00061>
- Bundesamt für Statistik [BFS]. (2010). *Landwirtschaftliche Betriebszählung*. Neuchâtel, Switzerland: Author.
- Bojnec, S. (2004). Farm tourism: Myth or reality? *Studies on the Agricultural and Food Sector in Central & Eastern Europe*, 25, 286–304.
- Cánoves, G., Villarino, M., Priestley, G., & Blanco, A. (2004). Rural tourism in Spain: An analysis of recent evolution. *Geoforum*, 35(6), 755–769. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2004.03.005>
- Choi, S., Lehto, X. Y., & O'leary, J. T. (2007). What does the consumer want from a DMO website? A study of US and Canadian tourists' perspectives. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 9(2), 59–72. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.594>
- Crompton, J. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 408–424.
- Decrop, A., & Snelders, D. (2005). A grounded typology of vacation decision-making. *Tourism Management*, 26(6), 121–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2003.11.011>
- Dempster, A. P., Laird, N. M., & Rubin, D. B. (1977). Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 39(1), 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1977.tb01600.x>
- Devesa, M., Laguna, M., & Palacios, A. (2009). The role of motivation in visitor satisfaction: Empirical evidence in rural tourism. *Tourism Management*, 31(4), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.06.006>

- Dolnicar, S., & Otter T. (2003). Which hotel attributes matter? A review of previous and a framework for future Research. In T. Griffin, & R. Harris (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th Annual Conference of the Asia Pacific Tourism Association [APTA]* (pp.176–188). Sydney, Australia: University of Technology.
- Dong E., Wang, Y., Morais, D., & Brooks, D. (2013). Segmenting the rural tourism market: The case of Potter County, Pennsylvania, USA. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 19(2), 181–193.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1356766712471231>
- Eagles, P. F. J. (1992). The travel motivations of Canadian ecotourists. *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(2), 3–7.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F004728759203100201>
- Ferjani, A., Zimmermann, A., & Roesch, A. (2015). Determining factors of farm exit in agriculture in Switzerland. *Agricultural Economics Review*, 16(1), 59–72. DOI: 10.22004/ag.econ.253691
- Fernández-Hernandez, C., León, C. J., Araña, J. E., & Díaz-Pérez, F. (2016). Market segmentation, activities and environmental behavior in rural tourism. *Tourism Economics*, 22(5), 1033–1054.  
<https://doi.org/10.5367%2Fte.2015.0476>
- Figueiredo, E., & Raschi, A. (2012). Immersed in green? Reconfiguring the Italian countryside through rural tourism promotional materials. *Advances in Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 6, 17–44.
- Fleischer, A., & Tchetchnik, A. (2005). Does rural tourism benefit from agriculture. *Tourism Management*, 26(4), 493–501.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2003.10.003>
- Getz, D., & Brown, G. (2006). Critical success factors for wine tourism regions: A demand analysis. *Tourism Management*, 27(1), 146–158.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.08.002>
- Gitelson, R., & Kerstetter, D. (1995). The influence of friends and relatives in travel decision-making. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 3(3), 59–68. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J073v03n03\\_04](https://doi.org/10.1300/J073v03n03_04)
- Gretzel, U., & Yoo, K. H. (2008). Use and impact of online travel reviews. In P. O'Connor, W. Höpken, & U. Gretzel (Eds.), *Information and communication technologies in tourism 2008* (pp. 35–46). Vienna, Austria: Springer.
- Hanqin, Z. Q., Lam, T. (1999). An analysis of Mainland Chinese visitors' motivations to visit Hong Kong. *Tourism Management*, 20(5), 587–594.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(99\)00028-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(99)00028-X)
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.513>
- Hochuli, A., Huber, M., & Hofstetter, P. (2016a). *Innovative Geschäftsmodelle für den Schweizer Agrotourismus*. Zollikofen and Schüpfheim, Switzerland: BFH-HAFL and BBZN.
- Hochuli, A., Huber, M., & Hofstetter, P. (2016b). Kundensegmente im Agrotourismus. *Agrarforschung Schweiz*, 7(7), 338–343.  
[https://www.agrarforschungschweiz.ch/archiv\\_11de.php?id\\_artikel=2199](https://www.agrarforschungschweiz.ch/archiv_11de.php?id_artikel=2199)

- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index for factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 31–36.
- Kidd, J. N., King, B. E. M., & Whitelaw, P. A. (2004). A profile of farmstay visitors in Victoria, Australia and preliminary activity-based segmentation. *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, 11(4), 45–64. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J150v11n04\\_04](https://doi.org/10.1300/J150v11n04_04)
- Kim Lian Chan, J., & Baum, T. (2007). Motivation factors of ecotourists in ecolodge accommodation: The push and pull factors. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 12(4), 349–364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941660701761027>
- Kozak, M. (2002). Comparative analysis of tourist motivation by nationality and destination. *Tourism Management*, 23(3), 221–232. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(01\)00090-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(01)00090-5)
- Mann, S. (2009). *The nature of the diversified farm household*. Working Paper Series No. 6. Reckenholz-Tänikon, Switzerland: Forschungsanstalt Agroscope Reckenholz Tänikon ART.
- Markstein, K. (2009). *Sind die raumplanerischen Rahmenbedingungen für den Agrotourismus in der Schweiz zu restriktiv? – Ein Vergleich zum benachbarten Alpenraum*. Zürich, Switzerland: Swiss Federal Institute of Technology ETH.
- Nuntsu, N., Tassiopoulos, D., & Haydam, N. (2004). The bed and breakfast market of Buffalo City (BC), South Africa: Present status, constraints and success factors. *Tourism Management*, 25(4), 515–522. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(03\)00125-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(03)00125-0)
- Park, D.-B., Doh, K.-R., & Kim, K.-H. (2014). Successful managerial behavior for farm-based tourism: A functional approach. *Tourism Management*, 45, 201–210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.04.007>
- Privitera, D. (2009). *Factors of development of competitiveness: The case of organic-agritourism*. Paper prepared for presentation at the 113th EAAE Seminar. Belgrade, Serbia: EAAE.
- Renko, S., Renko, N., & Polonijo, T. (2010). Understanding the role of food in rural tourism development in a recovering economy. *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, 16(3), 309–324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10454446.2010.485096>
- Rid, W., Ezeuduji, I. O., & Pröbstl-Haider, U. (2014). Segmentation by motivation for rural tourism activities in The Gambia. *Tourism Management*, 40, 102–116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.05.006>
- Sidali, K. L., & Schulze, B. (2010). Current and future trends in consumers' preference for farm tourism in Germany. *Leisure/Loisir*, 34(2), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14927713.2010.481116>
- Sidali, K. L., Schulze, H., & Spiller, A. (2007). *Success factors in the development of farm vacation tourism*. Paper presented at the 105th EAAE Seminar. Bologna, Italy: EAAE.
- Skuras, D., Dimara, E., & Petrou, A. (2006). Rural tourism and visitors' expenditures for local food products. *Regional Studies*, 40(7), 769–779. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343400600660771>



- Srikatanyoo, N., & Campiranon, K. (2010). Agritourist needs and motivations: The Chiang Mai Case. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 27(2), 166–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548400903579795>
- Torres, R. (2002). Toward a better understanding of tourism and agriculture linkages in the Yucatan: Tourist food consumption and preferences. *Tourism Geographies*, 4(3), 282–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616680210147436>
- Vogt, L. (2010). *Alp- und Agrotouristische Wertschöpfungspotentiale: Wettbewerbsfaktoren, Erfolgsfaktoren und Herausforderungen. Ein strategischer Leitfaden*. Birmensdorf, Switzerland: Eidgenössische Forschungsanstalt für Wald, Schnee und Landschaft WSL.
- Von Hunnius, Y. (2015). *Landschaft als Pluspunkt für Ferien in der Schweiz*. Bern, Switzerland: Bundesamt für Umwelt BAFU.
- Westerbeek, H. M., Turner, P., & Ingerson, L. (2002). Key success factors in bidding for hallmark sporting events. *International Marketing Review*, 19(2/3), 303–322. DOI: 10.1108/02651330210430712.
- Wilson, S., Fesenmaier, D. R., Fesenmaier, J., & van Es, J. C. (2001). Factors for success in rural tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40(2), 132–138. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F004728750104000203>
- Yavas, U., & Babakus, E. (2005). Dimensions of hotel choice criteria: Congruence between business and leisure travelers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 24(3), 359–367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2004.09.003>