Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development
ISSN: 2152-0801 online
https://foodsystemsjournal.org

Visitors and values: A qualitative analysis of agritourism operator motivations across the U.S.

Lindsay Quella,[a] * Lisa Chase,[b] David Conner,[c] Travis Reynolds,[d] Weiwei Wang [e]
University of Vermont

Doolarie Singh-Knights [f]
West Virginia University

Submitted October 6, 2020 / Revised December 8, 2020, and January 22 and February 1, 2021 / Accepted February 3, 2021 / Published online June 4, 2021 / Correction published August 21, 2021

Citation: Quella, L., Chase, L., Conner, D., Reynolds, T., Wang, W., & Singh-Knights, D. (2021). Visitors and values: A qualitative analysis of agritourism operator motivations across the U.S.. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development, 10*(3), 287–301.
https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2021.103.010

Abstract

Owners of small- and medium-sized farms are increasingly interested in engaging in agritourism and direct sales in order to increase income, provide family employment, and educate the public about agriculture, among other reasons. Prior research on agritourism operator motivations largely focuses on economic goals and benefits, while acknowledging the strong influence of non-economic factors. However, more research is needed to better understand the nuances and breadth of non-economic motivations underlying agritourism operator decisions. In addition, research on U.S. agritourism tends to be at the state level, which raises questions about overall national trends and interstudy comparability. To address these gaps, we analyzed transcripts from semistructured interviews with small- and medium-sized farm owners engaged in agritourism from five states across the U.S. We examined the results through the theoretical lens

[a] * *Corresponding author:* Lindsay Quella, Department of Community Development and Applied Economics; 002 Morrill Hall; University of Vermont; Burlington VT 05405 USA; lquella@uvm.edu

[b] Lisa Chase, University of Vermont, Extension; 130 Austine Drive, Suite 300; Brattleboro, Vermont 05301 USA; +1-802-257-7967; lisa.chase@uvm.edu

[c] David Conner, Department of Community Development and Applied Economics; 205H Morrill Hall; University of Vermont; Burlington VT 05405 USA; david.conner@uvm.edu

[d] Travis Reynolds, Department of Community Development and Applied Economics; 204B Morrill Hall; University of Vermont; Burlington VT 05405 USA; +1-802-656-8115; twreynol@uvm.edu

[e] Weiwei Wang, Center for Rural Studies, 149 University Place, Room 206; University of Vermont; Burlington, VT 05405 USA; +1-802-656-0892; Weiwei.wang@uvm.edu

[f] Doolarie Singh-Knights, West Virginia University; G211 North Agricultural Sciences Building, 1194 Evansdale Way; Morgantown, WV 26506 USA; +1-304-293-7606; Dosingh-knights@mail.wvu.edu

Funding Disclosure

This work is supported by Critical Agriculture Research and Extension (CARE) grant no. VTN32556 from the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture.

Correction

Correction published to replace references to Allport's *conflict* hypothesis to the correct *contact* hypothesis.

of Allport's "contact hypothesis" in order to further understand how agritourism helps operators meet stated goals. Our results suggest that consistent with previous literature, nonmonetary motivations are high priorities for farmers engaged in agritourism. In particular, motivations related to community engagement/ leadership and quality-of-life emerged as forceful and reoccurring themes. We found that although Allport's contact hypothesis holds some important explanatory power for understanding agritourism operators' community-related goals—including reducing prejudice and increasing understanding between farmers and consumers in relation to agriculture—increased intergroup contact also has potential to create new conflicts between farmers and neighbors related to tourism. These findings have important implications for future research as well as for policies and programs aimed at supporting agritourism.

Keywords
Agritourism, Direct-to-Consumer Sales, Farm Tourism, Farmer Goals, Motivations, Qualitative Analysis, Semistructured Interview, Contact Hypothesis

Introduction and Literature Review

As small- and medium-sized farms worldwide struggle to remain viable, many farmers look for alternative revenue sources to sustain their enterprises and support their communities. Agritourism, including direct-to-consumer sales on farms, has a rich history across the globe. Though not formally defined or recognized by policy in the U.S., agritourism is an increasingly popular diversification strategy and a growing income source for many farmers and ranchers (Busby & Rendle, 2000; Schilling et al., 2012; Whitt et al., 2019).

U.S. rural communities have long been moving away from natural resource extraction-based economies to tourism- and service-based economies (Ashley et al., 2007; Laville-Wilson, 2017; Yonk, 2020). Farm communities thus face a range of new or intensifying economic pressures. Many farms have sought to introduce additional revenue streams to their operations via diversification into direct-to-consumer sales, vacation rentals, farm tours, and other forms of agritourism (Kloppenburg et al., 2000). A study found that small farms with an income diversification strategies, on average, report higher household incomes than those without (Khanal & Mishra, 2014). In addition, renewed interest in food systems and local food has provided the opportunity for farmers to invite the general public to their farms, creating both educational and economic value (Chase & Gubinger, 2014; Martinez, 2010). More recent research suggests that agritourism supports local food systems and enhances direct-to-consumer sales not only by directly influencing tourists' purchasing behavior but also by more generally promoting a broader interest in agriculture (Brune et al., 2020).

While increasingly popular, not all farmers are engaging in agritourism. Past research has shown that variation in comfort with risk and uncertainty, family context, styles of farming, management styles, and stewardship priorities all play into decision-making in farm diversification (Darnhofer & Walder, 2013). The most recent agricultural census data reports that agritourism operators are more likely to be women and to be older (U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service [USDA NASS], 2019). In addition, farms that already process or sell food for human consumption are more likely to participate in agritourism, as are farms and ranches with cattle and horses (Whitt et al., 2019).

Farmers engage in diversification strategies, including agritourism, for a variety of reasons. Much of the existing literature on agritourism operators' motivations focuses primarily on economic benefits (McGehee & Kim, 2004; McGehee et al., 2007; Nickerson et al., 2001; Ollenburg & Buckley, 2007; Schilling et al., 2012). Recent U.S. census data show increasing revenue opportunities from agritourism: from 2012 to 2017, despite a small drop in the number of farms participating in agritourism, the income from agritourism and recreational services increased from US$704 million to US$949 million (USDA NASS, 2019). But past studies also reference other social and personal motives which lead farms to engage in agritourism, from personal interest to goals around consumer education, supporting family members on the farm, and enjoying companionship with visitors. Although these non-economic motivations have

received some attention in past research, further study is needed to better understand myriad motivations for engagement in agritourism and how agritourism operators balance competing priorities (McGehee & Kim, 2004; Nickerson et al., 2001). This level of analysis can help to better meet farmer needs, given operators' economic and non-economic motives, through adapting extension programming and also guide further academic investigation into agritourism constraints and opportunities in light of these motives.

In addition, more research is needed to understand why agritourism operators engage in agritourism, in particular, to meet their business and personal goals and how agritourism helps further non-economic farm agendas. As the number of U.S. farmers decreases, consumers are increasingly disconnected from their food and the people who grow it—i.e., the "food from nowhere," a concept coined by farmer-activist José Bové (Bové et al., 2002). The divide between urban and rural community priorities is a well-documented obstacle to rural development, and farmers face conflicts over land use, environmental concerns, and food safety (Sharp & Smith, 2004; Smith, 1969). As Sharp and Smith suggested, "social capital among farmers and nonfarmers at the rural-urban interface is likely to have several benefits for the farmer and the larger community, including increased awareness and appreciation of diverse stakeholder interests and increased trust and confidence that the actions of a community member (such as the farmer) respect the interests of other community members" (2003, p. 926). Indeed, Schilling et al. (2006) reported agritourism operators' interest in improving community relationships and reducing farmer/nonfarmer conflict. In a subsequent paper, they call for further research into the link between agritourism operator motivations and Allport's "contact hypothesis" (1954) for increasing tolerance between majority and minority groups, suggesting that farmers may engage in agritourism in order to preempt or mitigate right-to-farm issues and build positive community relations (Schilling et al., 2012).

This study uses qualitative research methods to respond to the following questions: What are the motivations and goals of agritourism operators across different U.S. states and types of agritourism operations? Do agritourism operators engage in agritourism in order to attempt to decrease conflict and increase cooperation with nonfarmers? In addition to explicitly focusing on non-economic benefits under-studied in previous research, this study also fills a gap a there has been little research on agritourism motivations at a national level, raising questions regarding interstudy comparisons of agritourism in diverse food system contexts across the U.S.

Defining Agritourism

Though it is generally agreed that agritourism in the U.S. was growing steadily until the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic, the word "agritourism" in the U.S. is not formally defined—neither by terminology (other words such as "farm tourism," "agritainment," and "farm-based tourism" are sometimes used instead) nor by activities associated with the term (Philip et al., 2010). The lack of consistent definition, which has been well-documented in the literature, has considerable consequences for operators, visitors, researchers, and policymakers (Arroyo et al., 2013). For example, while most definitions of agritourism set a "working farm" as the primary locus of agritourism activities, there is a broad range of activities that can be considered agritourism, primarily as it relates to the authenticity or legitimacy of a working farm and close connection to agricultural production (Carpio et al., 2008; McGehee, 2007; Ollenburg & Buckley, 2007; Phillip et al., 2010; Tew & Barbieri, 2012). In addition to creating a marketing challenge for producers and confusion among consumers, the lack of a consistent definition of agritourism creates discrepancies among academic studies attempting to quantify and qualify the impact of agritourism activities, hindering the ability of policymakers to prioritize support for agritourism sector development (Arroyo et al., 2013; Chase et al., 2018).

In 2002, the U.S. Department of Agriculture began to include "recreational services" in the National Agriculture Statistics Service's (USDA NASS) Census of Agriculture and since 2007 expanded their terminology to "agri-tourism and recreational services," which includes "income from recreational services such as hunting, fishing,

farm or winery tours, hayrides, etc." (USDA NASS, 2019). Though the Census definition of agritourism is more constrained than definitions typically seen in academic literature, it still encompasses the largest and most widely-used data set associated with agritourism in the U.S. and represents a significant step forward in formalizing the term.

Building on previous scholarship, Chase et al. (2018) created a more comprehensive conceptual framework that organizes agritourism activities into core and peripheral activities based on where they take place (on- or off-farm) or the degree to which they are directly related to agricultural activities: "core activities take place on a working farm or ranch and have deep connections to agricultural production," while "peripheral activities lack a deep connection to agricultural production, even though they may take place on a working farm or ranch" (p. 17). For example, core activities might include product sales and experiences such as farmstands, u-pick, farm tours, overnight stays, or farm-to-table meals. Peripheral activities might include off-farm farmers markets, weddings, music events, or outdoor recreation. The framework also organizes activities into five main categories: education, direct sales, entertainment, outdoor recreation, and hospitality. For the purposes of this study, agritourism includes but is not limited to all core and peripheral agritourism activities taking place on-farm, in all categories.

Motivations and Goals for Agritourism Operators

There is a wealth of literature examining motives for diversifying into different types of agritourism offerings across many different locations (recent studies summarized in Table 1). In one of the earliest studies concerning motives for agritourism, Nickerson et al. (2001) examined motives for diversification of Montana ranchers based on eleven categories and clustered them into social reasons, economic reasons, and external influences, concluding that operators were primarily motivated for economic reasons, although social reasons were a strong second. Other studies have since found support for this general conclusion, suggesting that income generation is a primary motivator for agritourism development (Barbieri & Mahoney, 2009; Brelik, 2011; Khanal & Mishra, 2014; McGehee & Kim, 2004; Tew & Barbieri, 2012). In a more recent assessment of the current state of agritourism research in the U.S., Rich et al. (2016) concluded, "Four of the [nine definitions of agritourism used by researchers] incorporated an income component either as a means of income generation and/or as an economic activity. This is worth noting because it is often assumed farmers engage in agritourism endeavors as a means to supplement farm income" (p. 4). Thus, for small farms which feel increasing financial pressure and "struggle to remain economically viable in the face of changing global markets, urbanization pressures, structural changes in the food retailing system, and

Table 1. Recent Literature on Agritourism Operator Motivations and Goals in the U.S.

Study	Date	Methods	Subject Focus	Key Findings
Halim et al.	2020	Mixed qualitative methods	Female agritourism entrepreneurs in North Carolina	Themes constituting women's self-definition of success: being constantly on the move, ensuring customer satisfaction, having family support, creating broad impact, gaining recognition and respect, securing financial sustainability, pursuing happiness, debating work-life balance, and perpetuating the family farm
Chiodo et al.	2019	Case studies	Agritourism operators in mountainous regions in the U.S., Brazil, Italy, and France	Top motivations: creativity & innovativeness, social interaction, awareness about farm operations, support local producers, income generation, autonomy, contribute to the local economy, environmental conservation
Khanal & Mishra	2014	Analysis of NASS census data	U.S. farmers	Income influences diversification strategies among small farms

perpetual vagaries of weather, diseases, and pests," agritourism is a valuable coping strategy (Schilling et al., 2012, p. 200).

Other studies have indicated other motives beyond income, several finding agritourism income to be small in comparison to total farm income, highlighting the importance of nonmonetary goals of agritourism such as personal goals, employment opportunities for family members, social interaction with guests, and educating the public about agriculture (Busby & Rendle, 2000; Schilling et al., 2012; Tew & Barbieri, 2012). Hansson et al. (2013) examined motives for starting ventures outside of conventional agriculture among farmers in Sweden and assessed family farm roles in influencing these motivations. They found operators have two underlying motives: business development to reduce risk and use idle resources, and business development for social and lifestyle reasons, noting that their findings differed from previous studies "both in respect to the number of underlying motives and the nature of these motives" (p. 247). The authors concluded that considering disaggregated motives outside of a broader family or firm context may fail to capture operator goals fully. Diversification, they argued, can be better understood by considering "more overarching motives related to the management and development of the business and the situation of the farmer and his/her family" (p. 248). Ainley and Kline (2014) similarly advocated for more exploratory research methods that "fully appreciate the complex intertwining of multiple factors underlying the phenomenon [of agritourism]" (p. 405). In addition, Telfer (2002) examined agritourism in an Indonesian community using principles of sustainable community development. He found that while agritourism does not always meet the goal of economic self-reliance, it is a powerful tool for community control and building community culture, while others find that agritourism can serve as a tool for farmers to resist urban stereotypes and regain control over their own representation among nonfarmers (Nazariadli et al., 2019).

In addition, the scope of most U.S. agritourism research is limited by geography. While there are several national agritourism studies of Europe, Canada, and South America, very little agritourism data exists on a national or multistate level in the U.S. Rich et al. (2016) note: "While three national surveys exist which provide insight into agritourism or farm visits…the focus of these studies was not agritourism; rather agritourism was a small component. In order for valid comparisons and generalizations to be made agritourism-focused survey data at a national scale is greatly needed" (p. 4). This multistate research project builds on previous research at the state level while also providing much-needed insights into what common themes emerge when considering the multitude of other factors that influence farm decision-making based on geographic region.

A review of the existing literature thus suggests that while quantitative research has been instrumental in creating a blueprint for understanding why U.S. farmers are embracing agritourism, there is an opportunity to probe deeper and "add flesh to the bones of what is currently understood [about agritourism motivations]" (Ainley & Kline, 2014, p. 405) using more interpretive, qualitative methods.

Theoretical Framework

In his 1954 work, *The Nature of Prejudice*, social psychologist Gordon Allport hypothesized that face-to-face encounters between people of different groups would reduce intergroup hostility: "[Prejudice] may be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the pursuit of common goals. The effect is greatly enhanced if this contact is sanctioned by institutional supports (i.e., by law, custom, or local atmosphere), and provided it is of a sort that leads to the perception of common interests and common humanity between members of the two groups" (p. 281). Under these four conditions—equal status, institutional support, common goals, and common humanity (or intergroup cooperation)—Allport argued that bringing together majority and minority groups could reduce prejudice and increase intergroup cooperation.

Further study has provided support for Allport's hypothesis. Most notably, Pettigrew and Tropp's 2006 meta-analysis of intergroup contact theory found that intergroup contact typically reduces intergroup prejudice. They also asserted that the theory holds true in addition to racial and

ethnic encounters, as originally hypothesized, and can be extended to other groups, including people of different ages, gender identity, sexual orientation, and physical and mental ability.

Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) concluded that Allport's optimal contact conditions typically lead to a greater reduction in prejudice, but are not essential for reducing prejudice. More recent literature has since focused on *when* and *how* contact is most likely to reduce prejudice, as well as the impact of indirect contact, such as extended contact (knowing or observing an in-group contact who has an out-group friend) and imagined contact (Hewstone & Swart, 2011). This research suggests the effects of contact are greatest when contact involves intergroup and interpersonal factors, such as cross-group friendships, and that contact works to reduce prejudice by reducing intergroup anxiety and increasing empathy. Allport and others defined contact as "face-to-face interaction between members of clearly defined groups" (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006, p. 754). In the context of agritourism, this could include many offerings, such as farm tours, on-farm direct sales, classes, and tastings.

To date, no research has applied Allport's contact hypothesis to the study of farmer motivations, and yet there is reason to suspect that farmers engaging in agritourism might be motivated at least in part by a desire to increase contact in order to improve relations with customers and other non-farmers. In an early study, Johnston and Bryant (1987) examined farmer adaptation to the changing rural-urban interface and identified three types of farmer adaptations: positive, such as adding an enterprise; neutral, such as adopting agricultural technology; and negative, such as leaving farming. A more recent study by Smith and Sharp (2003) proposes an additional adaptation focused on improving neighborly relations, including building social capital with both local neighbors and more distant farm clientele. Agritourism reflects several of these adaptations simultaneously, as a potential new enterprise that also increases social capital.

Applied Research Methods

Qualitative methodologies were chosen for this study to better capture the nuances, depth, and breadth of producer experiences in agritourism.

Recruitment and Sampling Strategy

The sample used for this study was obtained from a larger selection of farmers and ranchers engaged in agritourism and direct sales. The U.S. project collaborators collected information about the sample subjects from five states: Vermont, Minnesota, California, West Virginia, and Oregon. These states were chosen due to the growing or ongoing interest in agritourism and direct sales by farmers in those states, and based on the expertise of the key informants working in agricultural extension and tourism.

From a list of 80 farmers and ranchers compiled via the criterion sampling method, six were selected from each state using a maximum variation sampling method (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). This sampling method was chosen because criterion selection yields information-rich data from which researchers can learn deeply about farmer and rancher experiences, while maximum variation sampling ensures that a wide variety of experiences is explored and represented (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011; Polkinghorne, 2005). Farmers and ranchers were organized by geographic location within their state, agritourism and direct sales activities, farm size, number of years in business, agricultural products, race, and gender. Based on the literature on firm characteristics and business performance, geographic region diversity was prioritized for selection, then race and gender, then agritourism and agricultural offerings (Barbieri & Mshenga, 2008).

We used email communication to recruit farmers and ranchers within their assigned state. To participate, a person had to be 18 or older and identify as an agritourism operator. Participants were offered a US$50 incentive for their time and participation. Potential participants were sent three invitations to participate. Recruitment continued for four months until we obtained at least three interviews per sampled state and at least 20 interviews total.

Sample Information

Of the 23 interviewees included in this study, six are operators in Vermont, five in Oregon, five in California, four in Minnesota, and three in West Virginia. The discrepancy in the number of interviewees per state is due to the relative ease or difficulty with recruitment in each state due to time

constraints during agricultural growing seasons.

Given our study's focus, all the farms or ranches were classified as small or medium by USDA standards; 57% of farms and ranches were small, and 43% were medium-sized. Sixty percent of the interviewees were women, although the majority of participants operated in a family context. One study that compared diversified farms to agritourism farms reported that diversified farms, in general, had more women principal operators compared to all U.S. farms—33% versus 11% (Barbieri, 2009). However, this was reported before the most recent changes to the agricultural census determining how women are counted as decision-makers on farms and ranches, and therefore most likely underrepresents the number of women farmers in the U.S. (USDA NASS, 2019). Ninety-one percent of interviewees were white, and 9% were Asian. We attempted to interview Black, Latinx, Hispanic, and indigenous American operators; however, we could not do so due to time and sampling constraints. Many different farm products were represented, from diversified livestock to dairy to diversified crops to value-added products.

Interviewee responses were categorized based on the conceptual framework developed by Chase et al. (2018). Eighty-seven percent of farms and ranches offered direct sales, 83% offered education, 48% offered hospitality, 26% offered outdoor recreation, and 87% offered entertainment. All farms and ranches offered at least two agritourism activities, 78% offered more than two activities, and 39% offered four or more agritourism activities. This is consistent with the literature on diversified farms and ranches as a whole, which have been reported to have, on average, 3.8 diversification categories per farm (Barbieri et al., 2008).

Interview Strategy

The interview protocol was co-constructed with project collaborators. The first author prescheduled and conducted semistructured interviews over the phone, which lasted approximately 60-90 minutes. All interviewees were emailed a consent form and the interview protocol to review in advance. The interviews contained 16 open-ended questions (Appendix); semistructured interviews follow a preconceived interview script but also gave the interviewer or interviewee "freedom to digress" to explore emergent themes (Berg & Lune, 2004, p. 61).

Interviews were transcribed verbatim using speechpad.com, an online transcription service, resulting in 500 single-spaced pages. Transcripts were reviewed for accuracy. All farmer and farm names were changed to protect and maintain confidentiality.

Analytics Strategy

Two team members (the first author and a second team member and author) initially conducted a thematic analysis of the first three interviews. These interviews were chosen to capture a diverse set of perspectives. We used constant comparative analysis, a cyclical and continuous method of processing, reducing, and explaining (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011), to identify themes in the data inductively. We used Braun and Clarke's (2006) hallmark thematic analysis method to code themes within and across interviews. The six-step framework includes: (a) familiarizing ourselves with the data by reading transcripts and listening to audio recordings; (b) generating initial codes; (c) searching for themes; (d) reviewing themes; (e) defining and naming themes; and (f) analyzing the resulting coded data (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 87).

We used Owen's (1984) criteria of recurrence, repetition, and forcefulness to generate initial codes. Owen defines recurrence as when "at least two parts of a report had the same thread of meaning, even though different wording indicated such a meaning" (p. 275). Repetition refers to the explicit repetition of certain words, not just implicit meaning, and forcefulness refers to "vocal inflection, volume or other dramatic pause which serve to stress and subordinate some utterances from other locutions" (p. 275). Our transcriptions were verbatim and included pauses and other vocal inflections. We coded for recurring, repetitive, and forceful themes within interviews, as well as across interviews.

After coding the first three interviews separately, we met to discuss, refine and collapse codes. Codes were entered into NVIVO software and analyzed for intercoder reliability using a Kappa coefficient. Codes with a Kappa coefficient of less than 80% were reviewed and re-coded until con-

sensus was met. Then the first author coded the rest of the interviews independently, continuing the process by adding new codes where needed, re-coding previous interviews with new codes, and refining codes as the process continued.

Based on the emergent themes, we focused on five specific questions related to decision-making in agritourism and then specifically on one question focused on defining and measuring success in agritourism. The answers to this question served to illuminate participant motivations and goals for agritourism.

Results and Discussion

As expected, based on previous literature, financial goals were a forceful and recurring theme. However, they were closely intertwined with two other types of goals: community-related goals and personal/family goals. These themes were fairly consistent throughout different parts of the country and different types of agritourism operations. (Because of the study design, emergent themes are not necessarily representative but are meant to help inform further study at the national level.) That results echo previous studies suggests that, in the area of motivations and goals, location is not a strong influence. In this section, findings involving general themes of motivation expressed through interviews with agritourism operators are described, then these themes are analyzed through the lens of Allport's contact hypothesis.

Financial Goals

All participants discussed the importance of financial profit; however, the importance of agritourism enterprise financial solvency varies on a wide spectrum. For some, agritourism is not the main income source for the farm but occupies another vital role. For others, agritourism and direct sales are the sole sources of income. Regardless of an enterprise's overall financial contribution, almost all participants agreed that it was crucial for their enterprises to at least pay for themselves. One farmer from California stated, "I think that measure of success, it can come in different forms, but if somebody is losing money, they're not going to be able to sustain it." Another rancher in Oregon confirmed, "Obviously, money, it has to pay its way. Everything we did in value-added could never threaten the resources base. It had to enhance it." Participants acknowledged that while money was not always the top priority, losing money on a venture is not tenable.

Even among those farmers for whom agritourism is considered very important financially, agritourism decisions do not always match professed goals. For example, one flower farmer in Oregon said, "I think if it's sustainable for us, it's gotta be economically sustainable." She explained how they run a tour train through their fields for people who have difficulty walking:

> And it costs us money to run. But the personal touch for those…you know, it costs them five bucks to ride it and it's a half-hour tour. But it's that personal touch and being able to talk to them; it's not economically sustainable [on its own as an offering]. But I always insist that we keep doing it because of that personal touch, and you know, talking to people.

Thus, for some participants, exceptions are made and financial goals are de-prioritized in favor of other community or family-related goals.

Personal and Family Goals

The second significant thematic category that emerged centered around personal or family goals. For all participants, quality of life is important, which is consistent with past research (Chase et al., 2013). Participants talked about minimizing burnout, spending time with and finding employment for family members, and getting to enjoy what they do. They emphasized making strategic decisions about what enterprises to engage in and trying to enter into partnerships wherever possible to share responsibility. On family farms, minimizing stress and interfamily conflict is important. For some, agritourism facilitates these goals by allowing them to remain on-farm to live and work. A maple sugar-maker in Vermont explained how agritourism allowed him and his wife to homeschool their children: "My wife, she's like 'When my kids were sick I got to take my hand on his forehead, and check on him every hour, and give him a kiss on the forehead. I got to see all that instead of hearing

it from daycare.'" A livestock farmer with small children explained how, despite initial challenges, having visitors to a cabin on their farm allows them to remain working on-farm. Their Airbnb felt time-consuming and the farmer was resentful: "But then I keep reminding myself, 'Well, it's either this or find a job off-farm.' So this is my job." For this farmer, remaining on her farm while her children were young facilitated easier management of competing family and economic priorities.

Another theme related to quality of life involves customer interaction and feedback. For many operators, having visitors to their farms breaks up rural isolation and provides positive encouragement. A dairy farmer aid, "You know, you can laugh, but one form of measurement [of success] is the hundreds of Christmas cards that we get here every year." Similarly, a grower in West Virginia explained:

> It's rewarding to just have people come and see the farm. And it is both, of course, fiscally rewarding because they give you money for it, but to see the way they interact and hear positive things that they say about the farm is nice because it just kind of reinvigorates your purpose. It's affirming, and it's an ego boost.

While not all participants live in rural areas, agricultural work often demands long hours without much financial compensation or cultural prestige. For many agritourism operators, feeling appreciated and valued is a considerable benefit of opening their land and businesses to visitors.

Community-Related Goals

A third emergent theme concerns goals focused on education and community leadership. Participants told us that a major way they define success is through their roles as educators. They see themselves as intermediaries between the general public and the "private" world of agriculture. As public figures, they consider themselves advocates for and teachers of their version of agriculture and a direct connection between consumers and food sources. Participants also found that the connection between their farm and consumers differs among generations. A West Virginia farmer explained, "The older population, it brings back memories from their childhood of, you know, doing something with their grandparents. And then you have the younger population or millennials that might not have been familiar with that, but they're really trying to get connected to their food source." A California farmer described how their farm connected with school groups over time: "Success for us was in the return of schools. We have many schools that have been coming for ten years." They worried that the school groups, which were charged a fee, would not have funding to return during an economic downturn. "Most of the schools, they cut all the other field trips, but they kept coming to our farm. So, our school business remained the same…To me, the success is that people found us and came back to us, I think. That makes us feel good."

They also observed a U.S. population increasingly disconnected from its food sources, fewer farmers integrated with the nonfarming community, fewer farmers in general, and increased public concerns about food safety and agricultural practices. A rancher in Oregon told us:

> It's more than profits. It's really important today if you have the attitude to do it, it's really important to open your door to people who aren't in farming and ranching, to help them see the truth about the good work that farmers and ranchers do. You need to school yourself about GMO conversations, predator conversations, pesticide conversations, all the issues that people that don't know about ag, they're frightened by. It's really important that the voice of the ranchers and farmers, real people that do the work, be heard by the majority of people who aren't. We're less than 2% of the population. We don't even count on the census statistics, you know, so how are people gonna know if they don't come out and see you?

This sentiment of visibility also emerged in the theme of community leadership. Participants discussed seeing themselves as community leaders both for the public and for other farmers. They described being models for other farmers in their

region and the benefits of building relationships in their community. A diversified vegetable grower in Minnesota told us about the advocacy role that comes with being a public-facing business:

> The path we're taking is very public. It's not like we're hiding in the corner and growing vegetables…which I think is good because you can advocate then for farms and say 'Well, come up.' And you can see how much work it is, and just bring farms and farming to the front of people's minds. Because honestly, there are people in this area that do not believe you can even grow anything up here, which is absurd.

In this leadership capacity, participants find value and meaning in engaging with visitors, and agritourism becomes more than a financial diversification mechanism.

Motivations for Agritourism Engagement in Relation to the Contact Hypothesis

As described above, among community-related goals, agritourism operators emphasized that consumer education is a crucial aspect of agritourism engagement. Interviewees discussed the importance of visitors seeing what they do for myriad reasons, including promoting awareness of the importance of food production, educating consumers on product value (this was particularly emphasized by farmers engaged in alternative agriculture, whose price points tend to be higher, as well as those participating in direct sales), and providing transparency around consumer concerns regarding land management, pesticides, GMOs, and animal welfare. In this respect, the contact hypothesis helps us understand agritourism operator motivations, as they are in many cases engaging in agritourism at least in part to build positive relationships with consumers and their communities.

Nevertheless, in some ways agritourism may exacerbate community conflict related to tourism while reducing community conflict related to farming. Three main challenges expressed by interviewees about their agritourism enterprises were friction with authorities over regulations for hosting visitors, concerns about liability for visitor injury or accidents, and disputes with neighbors over increased local traffic and noise. A dairy farmer in West Virginia advised, "You may even want to talk to your neighbors. Make sure they're OK with hundreds of cars coming past their property onto your property." Increased visibility also comes with the potential for increased public scrutiny. A diversified fruit and vegetable grower in Oregon described the trade-off in this way:

> I guess if a person is into [agritourism], there's the notoriety, you get to be known in the community. There's some drawbacks to that also because it does increase your public profile. . . . All of a sudden instead of, you know, I'm not anonymous anymore, you know, when I'm in my local community. I have to be careful, sometimes I'd better not, you know, have that drink or I better not do this, I better not do that.

Thus, the contact hypothesis is a valuable framework for understanding why agritourism operators prioritize non-economic goals, and further research is needed to ascertain whether face-to-face interactions between farmers and visitors do actually improve intergroup relationships.

Conclusions

Much of the existing literature on the motivations of producers engaged in agritourism in the U.S. focuses on potential economic benefits, with the underlying assumption that farmers and ranchers in the U.S. are primarily concerned with making money. Our results show that, at first glance, financial considerations are indeed a key motivator for considering diversification into agritourism, consistent with some previous findings. However, when probed deeper, participants suggested that ongoing participation in agritourism provides many other nonfinancial benefits, some of which are equal to or even take priority over financial goals. Through this lens, for many operators an agritourism enterprise's profitability is a necessary but not sufficient condition for engaging in agritourism.

Our findings mirror and build upon the results of work by McGehee and Kim (2004), who reported the top three motivations for agritourism as

gaining additional income, fully utilizing resources, and educating the consumer. Our findings are also consistent with Nickerson et al. (2001), who found income and resource utilization as the primary motivators, followed by coping with the variability of agricultural livelihoods. The nonfinancial themes related to running an agritourism business that most clearly emerged from this study centered around community building and engagement, consistent with recent literature on agritourism and motivations (Chiodo et al., 2019; Halim et al., 2020).

Even in the realm of personal goals, many of the goals circled back to some form of community interaction. As Telfer (2002) and Nazariadli et al. (2019) observed, our results suggest that, for our study participants, agritourism provides a level of transparency that allows them to better control the narratives regarding their businesses and allows community members to participate in the agricultural process, thereby gaining further community control. Agritourism also aids in building community culture around food, the natural environment, and cultural heritage. Understanding agritourism operator motivations through the lens of Allport's contact hypothesis helps build upon these findings. Community building is not only important for its own sake, but also for improving relationships and increasing understanding between majority (nonfarmers) and minority (farmer) groups.

With this framing in mind, our results are broadly applicable and add to a growing body of work that can be used to help agritourism operators succeed. Accurately identifying farmer motivations and goals can help provide better programming and support for producers at the outreach level and more accurately steer the focus of future academic research. Although a recent study suggests that there are areas in which agricultural extension agents are failing to fully meet farmer needs (Ferreira et al., 2020), research shows that when agricultural educators have a greater understanding of the diversity of farmers' perceptions, beliefs, and actions, they are "more likely to succeed in supporting farmers' application of knowledge and skills, resulting in improvements to farming practices and production" (Eckert & Bell, 2005, p. 8). This study sought to better capture the depth and breadth of these farmer motivations, and critically highlights the role of community engagement and leadership of agritourism operators alongside financial viability goals. Thus, for those working to support farms that might benefit from engagement in agritourism, using a broader community development lens or toolkit may more likely engender success for both producers and consumers.

Limitations and Future Research

The time-intensive nature of the interviews necessarily limited the number of responses, so although theoretical saturation was reached, associations cannot be drawn between agritourism operator motivations and other characteristics. Further research would benefit from a larger sampling of agritourism operators from all 50 states in order to draw broader conclusions. Additionally, the scope of this project was focused on small- and medium-sized farms in the U.S., and thus does not represent the whole of U.S. agriculture. While 90% of farms in the U.S. are small, 44% of the value of production comes from large farms, which thus represent a significant, but distinct, category of farm type (Economic Research Service, 2020).

Nevertheless, this study has added nuance to the discussion of farmer motivations for agritourism and has opened up avenues for future research, such as survey-based work informed by these findings and further testing of Allport's theory.

Finally, as emphasized in this study, at a policy level agritourism operator goals—and subsequent benefits—can be conferred from producers to consumers and the community at large. Schilling et al. (2012) emphasize "the economic multiplier effects of agritourism, namely the impact on other local businesses, local employment, and tax revenues" and that "the preservation of rural amenities, as well as historic and cultural values, also contributes to the desirability of a community to potential residents and businesses by creating a sense of place. … Through its contribution to farm retention, agritourism similarly helps communities manage or limit dis-amenities that may be associated with uncontrolled development (e.g., congestion, pollution, loss of scenic viewscapes)" (p. 204). Thus, the success of meeting agritourism operator goals may not only benefit the operators them-

selves, but also their surrounding communities—making the interaction between producer goals, community goals, and local and regional policy frameworks an important area for further agritourism research. 

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank colleagues who provided vital support in the research and writing of this article, including Penny Leff from the University of California, Mary Stewart from Oregon State University, Gail Feenstra of the University of California Davis, Michelle Walk of Mackinac State Historic Parks, Cynthia Messer of the University of Minnesota, Claudia Schmidt of Pennsylvania State University, Dan Tobin of the University of Vermont, and Sarah Heiss of the University of Vermont.

References

Ainley, S., & Kline, C. (2014). Moving beyond positivism: Reflexive collaboration in understanding agritourism across North American boundaries. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *17*(5), 404–413. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2012.750281

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Perseus.

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.12.007

Ashley, C., De Brine, P., Lehr, A., & Wilde, H. (2007). *The role of the tourism sector in expanding economic opportunity* (Report, Economic Opportunity Series). John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. https://www.hks.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/centers/mrcbg/programs/cri/files/report_23_EO%2BTourism%2BFinal.pdf

Barbieri, C. (2009). A comparison of agritourism and other farm entrepreneurs: Implications for future tourism and sociological research on agritourism (Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS-P-42). In D. B. Klenosky & C. L. Fisher (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2008 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium*; 2008 March 30–April 1, Bolton Landing, NY. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station 343–349. https://www.fs.usda.gov/treesearch/pubs/17158

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2008.06.001

Barbieri, C., Mahoney, E., & Butler, L. (2008). Understanding the nature and extent of farm and ranch diversification in North America. *Rural Sociology*, *73*(2), 205–229. https://doi.org/10.1526/003601108784514543

Barbieri, C., & Mshenga, P. (2008). The role of the firm and owner characteristics on the performance of agritourism farms. *Sociologia Ruralis*, *48*(2), 166–183. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9523.2008.00450.x

Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2004). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (5th ed.). Pearson.

Bové, J., & Dufour, F. (2001). *The world is not for sale: Farmers against junk food* (Trans. A. de Casparis). Verso.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brelik, A. (2011). Agritourism activity as an example of diversification of agriculture. *Acta Scientiarum Polonorum. Oeconomia*, *10*(2), 19–27. https://aspe.sggw.pl//article/view/4007

Brune, S., Knollenberg, W., Stevenson, K. T., Barbieri, C., & Schroeder-Moreno, M. (2020). The influence of agritourism experiences on consumer behavior toward local food. *Journal of Travel Research*, 0047287520938869. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287520938869

Busby, G., & Rendle, S. (2000). The transition from tourism on farms to farm tourism. *Tourism Management*, *21*(6), 635–642. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(00)00011-X

Carpio, C. E., Wohlgenant, M. K., & Boonsaeng, T. (2008). The demand for agritourism in the United States. *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, *33*(2), 254–269. https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.42465

Chase, L., & Grubinger, V. (2014). *Food, farms, and community: Exploring food systems.* University of New Hampshire Press.

Chase, L., Kuehn, D., & Amsden, B. (2013). Measuring quality of life: a case study of agritourism in the Northeast. *Journal of Extension*, *51*(1), 1FEA3. https://archives.joe.org/joe/2013february/a3.php

Chase, L. C., Stewart, M., Schilling, B., Smith, B., & Walk, M. (2018). Agritourism: Toward a conceptual framework for industry analysis. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, *8*(1), 13–19. https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2018.081.016

Chiodo, E., Fantini, A., Dickes, L., Arogundade, T., Lamie, R. D., Assing, L., Stewart, C., & Salvatore, R. (2019). Agritourism in mountainous regions—Insights from an international perspective. *Sustainability*, *11*(13), 3715. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11133715

Darnhofer, I., & Walder, P. (2013). Farmer types and motivation. In P. B. Thompson & D. M. Kaplan (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of food and environmental ethics*. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0929-4_86

Eckert, E., & Bell, A. (2005). Invisible force: Farmers' mental models and how they influence learning and actions. *Journal of Extension*, *43*(3), 3FEA2. https://extension.unh.edu/adultlearning/invisibleforce.pdf

Economic Research Service. (2020, December 2). *Farming and farm income*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/ag-and-food-statistics-charting-the-essentials/farming-and-farm-income/

Ferreira, B., Morais, D., Szabo, A., Bowen, B., & Jakes, S. (2020). A gap analysis of farm tourism microentrepreneurial mentoring needs in North Carolina, USA. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, *10*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2020.101.025

Halim, M. F., Barbieri, C., Morais, D. B., Jakes, S., & Seekamp, E. (2020). Beyond economic earnings: The holistic meaning of success for women in agritourism. *Sustainability*, *12*(12), 4907. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12124907

Hansson, H., Ferguson, R., Olofsson, C., & Rantamäki-Lahtinen, L. (2013). Farmers' motives for diversifying their farm business—The influence of family. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *32*, 240–250. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2013.07.002

Hewstone, M., & Swart, H. (2011). Fifty-odd years of inter-group contact: From hypothesis to integrated theory. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *50*(3), 374–386. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02047.x

Johnston, T. R., & Bryant, C. R. (1987). Agricultural adaptation: The prospects for sustaining agriculture near cities. In W. Lockeretz (Ed.), *Sustaining agriculture near cities* (pp. 9–21). Soil & Water Conservation Society.

Khanal, A. R., & Mishra, A. K. (2014). Agritourism and off-farm work: Survival strategies for small farms. *Agricultural Economics*, *45*(S1), 65–76. https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12130

Kloppenburg, Jr, J., Lezberg, S., De Master, K., Stevenson, G., & Hendrickson, J. (2000). Tasting food, tasting sustainability: Defining the attributes of an alternative food system with competent, ordinary people. *Human Organization*, *59*(2), 177–186. https://doi.org/10.17730/humo.59.2.8681677127123543

Laville-Wilson, D. P. (2017). The transformation of an agriculture-based economy to a tourism-based economy: Citizens' perceived impacts of sustainable tourism development (No. 2262). [Doctoral dissertation, South Dakota State University]. OpenPrairie Electronic Theses and Dissertations. https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd/2262/

Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2011). *Qualitative communication research methods* (3rd ed.). SAGE.

Martinez, S. (2010, December 1). Varied interests drive growing popularity of local foods. *Amber Waves: The Economics of Food, Farming, Natural Resources, and Rural America.* https://www.ers.usda.gov/amber-waves/2010/december/varied-interests-drive-growing-popularity-of-local-foods/

McGehee, N. G. (2007). An agritourism systems model: A Weberian perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *15*(2), 111–124. https://doi.org/10.2167/jost634.0

McGehee, N. G., & Kim, K. (2004). Motivation for agri-tourism entrepreneurship. *Journal of Travel Research*, *43*(2), 161–170. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287504268245

McGehee, N. G., Kim, K., & Jennings, G. R. (2007). Gender and motivation for agri-tourism entrepreneurship. *Tourism Management*, *28*(1), 280–289. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.12.022

Nazariadli, S., Morais, D. B., Bunds, K., Baran, P., & Supak, S. (2019). Rural tourism microentrepreneurs' self-representation through photography: A counter-hegemonic approach. *Rural Society*, *28*(1), 29–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/10371656.2019.1576294

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. https://doi.org/10.1177/004728750104000104

Ollenburg, C., & Buckley, R. (2007). Stated economic and social motivations of farm tourism operators. *Journal of Travel Research*, *45*(4), 444–452. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287507299574

Owen, W. F. (1984). Interpretive themes in relational communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *70*(3), 274–287. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335638409383697

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 751–783. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751

Philip, S., Hunter, C. and Blackstock, K. (2010). A typology for defining agritourism. *Tourism Management*, *31*(6), 754–758. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.08.001

Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *52*(2), 137–145. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.137

Rich, S. R., Standish, K., Tomas, S., Barbieri, C., & Ainely, S. (2016). The current state of agritourism research in the United States. *Travel and Tourism Research Association: Advancing Tourism Research Globally*, 12. https://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1455&context=ttra

Schilling, B. J., Marxen, L. J., Heinrich, H. H., & Brooks, F. J. (2006). *The opportunity for agritourism development in New Jersey* (Food Policy Institute Publication No. RR-0706-010). Food Policy Institute, Rutgers. https://www.nj.gov/agriculture/pdf/ATReport.pdf

Schilling, B. J., Sullivan, K. P., & Komar, S. J. (2012). Examining the economic benefits of agritourism: The case of New Jersey. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, *3*(1), 199–214. https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2012.031.011

Sharp, J. S., & Smith, M. B. (2003). Social capital and farming at the rural-urban interface: The importance of nonfarmer and farmer relations. *Agricultural Systems*, *76*(3), 913–927. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-2927(02)00083-5

Sharp, J. S., & Smith, M. B. (2004). Farm operator adjustments and neighboring at the rural-urban interface. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture*, *23*(4), 111–131. https://doi.org/10.1300/J064v23n04_09

Smith, T. L. (1969). Agricultural-pastoral conflict: A major obstacle in the process of rural development. *Journal of Inter-American Studies, 11*(1), 16–43. https://doi.org/10.2307/165400

Telfer, D. J. (2002). Agritourism—a path to community development? The case of Bangunkerto, Indonesia. In D. Hall & G. Richards (Eds.), *Tourism and sustainable community development* (pp. 242-257). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203464915

Tew, C., & Barbieri, C. (2012). The perceived benefits of agritourism: The provider's perspective. *Tourism Management*, *33*(1), 215–224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.02.005

U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agriculture Statistical Service [USDA NASS]. (2019, April 11). *Census of Agriculture.* U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service. http://www.nass.usda.gov/AgCensus

Whitt, C., Low, S. A., & Van Sandt, A. (2019, November 4). Agritourism allows farms to diversify and has potential benefits for rural communities. *Amber Waves: The Economics of Food, Farming, Natural Resources, and Rural America.* https://www.ers.usda.gov/amber-waves/2019/november/agritourism-allows-farms-to-diversify-and-has-potential-benefits-for-rural-communities/

Yonk, R. M. (2020). Developing together? Understanding the interaction between amenity-based tourism, agriculture, and extractive industries in the Northern Rockies. In R. M. Yonk & V. Bobek (Eds.), *Perspectives on economic development—Public policy, culture, and economic development*. IntechOpen. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.92111

Appendix. Interview Protocol

1. Let's start with a little bit of history about your farm or ranch.

2. Our project is focused on 5 categories of agritourism:

    - Direct sales (e.g. on-farm sales, farmers markets, CSA, U-pick, etc.)
    - Education (e.g. classes, workshops, student visitors)
    - Hospitality (e.g. camping, airbnb/bnb, lodging/other rentals, retreats, farm-stay or guest ranch)
    - Outdoor recreation (e.g. hunting, fishing, horseback riding, biking, hiking, skiing)
    - Entertainment (e.g. music, events, weddings).

    Can you tell me about what kinds of visitors you have on your farm or ranch?

3. How has your use of those five categories of agritourism changed over time?

4. What key lessons have you learned about agritourism? When you first started in agritourism, what do you wish you knew then what you knew now?

5. How important is agritourism to your farm or ranch?

6. How do you define and measure "success" in agritourism?

7. In what ways does agritourism bring other benefits?

8. What are the key factors to success in agritourism that you have identified?

9. What are the risks associated with agritourism and how do you have adapted to those risks?

10. What infrastructure or resources are needed for success in agritourism? How does your management change with agritourism use?

11. What external resources contribute to or inhibit success in agritourism?

12. To what extent does agritourism contribute to your quality of life?

13. How does your farm connect with your local community? Tourists and visitors from other places?

14. To what extent are agritourism activities profitable?

15. What advice would you have for farmers or ranchers interested in bringing agritourism to their farm or ranch?

16. What role do you think agritourism plays in 'sustainable development'?