



WWJMRD 2023; 9(09): 25-31  
www.wwjmr.com  
International Journal  
Peer Reviewed Journal  
Refereed Journal  
Indexed Journal  
Impact Factor SJIF 2017:  
5.182 2018: 5.51, (ISI) 2020-  
2021: 1.361  
E-ISSN: 2454-6615

**Bissessar Persaud**

Division for Agriculture  
Science, University of Guyana  
Berbice Campus, Tain,  
Guyana.

**Ravinder K. Dhaliwal**

Department of Extension  
Education, Punjab  
Agricultural University,  
Ludhiana, Punjab (India).

**Gomathinayagam Subramanian**

Division for Agriculture  
Science, University of Guyana  
Berbice Campus, Tain,  
Guyana.

**Lacram Kokil**

Division for Agriculture  
Science, University of Guyana  
Berbice Campus, Tain,  
Guyana.

**Narita Singh**

Faculty of Natural Science,  
University of Guyana  
Turkeyen Campus,  
Georgetown, Guyana.

**Correspondence:**

**Gomathinayagam Subramanian**

Division for Agriculture  
Science, University of Guyana  
Berbice Campus, Tain,  
Guyana.

## Prospects of agri-tourism in Ludhiana district Punjab and strategies for its promotion

**Bissessar Persaud, Ravinder K. Dhaliwal, Gomathinayagam Subramanian, Lacram Kokil, Narita Singh**

### Abstract

The present paper studies the prospects of agri-tourism and strategies for its promotion. The study was conducted in Ludhiana district of Punjab state and 210 were selected for the study. The respondents selected were mainly teachers/principals, students and urban consumers. The findings revealed that although a little more than half of the total respondents were not aware of agri-tourism, three fourth of them were willing to visit an agri-tourism farm. More than (80%) of all the categories of respondents were willing to participate in agricultural activities on an agri-tourism farm, while more than three fourth of were willing to interact with the rural people. Nature viewing for a fact can enhance the promotion of agri-tourism as such most of the respondents from all the categories suggested that the increase of awareness through various media, capacity building by holding educational programmes and working closely with state Government along with other stake holders will aid in the promotion of agri-tourism.

**Keywords:** Agri-tourism; prospects; strategies; urban consumers; students; teachers/principals.

### Introduction

Agri-tourism is designed to involve visitors in agricultural activity to recreate in an agricultural environment and offers tourist an opportunity to live a rural life (Raghuandan 2010). It involves the practice of attracting visitors to an area or areas used primarily for agricultural purposes. However, agri-tourism is small-scale, low-impact, and, in most cases, education focused and has shown great prospects. Many agri-tourism activities require only a small farm crew in order to be successful. For instance, farm tours, bed and breakfasts, tractor bullock cart rides, grapes, mangoes, and other horticultural farms, by-product farms, birds, animal zoos, and many other activities may be operated with little additional investment in labor (Anonymous 2004). Nickerson *et al* (2001) in his study cited different motivational factors, such as following primary fluctuations in income, desire for additional income, employment for family members, loss of government programs such as subsidies, for tax reasons or incentives, success of other farms ranches in diversifying, a desire to educate the consumer, to meet a need in the industry, an interest or hobby, and better use of farm resources as a means to diversify farm into agri-tourism. Moshabaki and Malek (2004) in a study identified economic motives as important drivers of agri-tourism development. These economic motives may include increasing income generation from existing farm resources, diversifying farm revenue streams, expanding marketing and farm brand awareness, and smoothing seasonal fluctuations in farm revenue that are customary in many forms of agriculture. Wicks and Merrett (2003) further added that other motivations behind agri-tourism adoption include familial goals, social objectives, and personal entrepreneurial goals. Sharp and Smith (2003) reported that improving farm financial performance is generally a primary motive behind the development of agri-tourism enterprises. Langworthy *et al* (2006) reported that many urban tourists have curiosity regarding various rural festivals. They want to participate in these festivals but there are no such arrangements for them. Hence, when they visit rural areas they expect to participate in rural festivals and are interested to know more about the ways of lives of the rural people which can be provided

through agri-tourism. Che (2005) observed that although the traditional orientation of farmers toward commodity production may serve as a barrier to farm diversification into tourism enterprises both the US and Wisconsin have seen large increases in agri-tourism enterprises and agri-tourism income on farms with annual receipts of \$10,000 or more but declines in numbers of farms and income on farms grossing under \$10,000 annually, this indicates that agri-tourism, and agri-tourism profitability, is growing particularly on larger scale farming operations. Schilling *et al* (2012) suggested that agri-tourism is an important adaptation strategy for small family farms that lack scale efficiencies and face constrained wholesale market access. Martha (2008) suggested that staff needs training for various activities such as drivers for hayrides, cashiers in a gift shop, activities which require personnel for safety reasons, lookout stations in a corn maze, help with parking, greeters at the entrance, staff to conduct orientation or educational classes, etc. Anonymous (2008) reported that Governments should recognized the importance of rural tourism as a priority and help in creating healthy competitive business environment. Government should try to generate data for decision-making bodies investing for developing the human resources, create adequate facilities and suitable infrastructure like accommodation, roads, airport facilities, rail facilities, local transport,

communication links and other essential amenities become essential for development of rural tourism.

**Methodology**

The present study was planned on the basis of suitable research methods and appropriate tools to measure the outcome. It was conducted in the district of Ludhiana, Punjab and is comprised of three kinds of respondents viz. teachers and principals, final year students of under graduate programme and urban consumers. From the procured list of senior secondary schools of Ludhiana district, five Government and five private schools were selected, ten teachers were selected randomly from each school and the principals of all selected schools were also included, thus having a total of one hundred and ten respondents from the selected schools. Two Government Colleges i.e. one for boys and one for girls were also selected for this study. Out of these, sixty final year students of under graduate programmes were selected on the basis of probability proportional to the total number of final year students in under graduate programmes in each college. From the locality of Sarbha Nagar Ludhiana district, forty urban consumers were selected using the incidental sampling technique. Thus, the total sample comprised of 210 respondents for the present study.

Category	Secondary school		Government College		Locality	Total
Study area	Public	Private	Boys	Girls	Urban consumers	
Sample size	55	55	30	30	40	210

**Results and discussion**

**Table 1:** Distribution of respondents according to their willingness for agri-tourism.

Sr. No	Willingness for	Teachers (n <sub>1</sub> =110)		Students (n <sub>2</sub> =60)		Urban Consumers (n <sub>3</sub> =40)	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
1	An agri-tourism farm.	103	93.6	53	88.3	32	80.0
2	Agri-tourism farm with various agricultural resources.	85	77.3	47	78.3	24	60.0
3	Agri-tourism farm that organizes educational tour.	87	79.0	46	76.6	29	72.5
4	Opportunity to Interact with rural people.	90	81.8	48	80.0	31	77.5
5	Taking school children to an agri-tourism farm.	92	83.6	-	-	-	-

Majority of teachers 93.6 per cent, students 88.3 per cent and urban consumers 80 per cent were willing to visit an agri-tourism farm. It was also noted that on an average of 77.8 per cent of both teachers and students were willing to go for agri-tourism farm with various agricultural resources, whereas 60 per cent of the urban consumers were willing to go. More than 70 per cent of the total respondents were willing to go to an agri-tourism farm

which organizes educational tour. The data further stated that 81.8 per cent of teachers, 80.0 per cent of students and 77.5 per cent of urban consumers were willing to interact with the rural people. The data further revealed that 83.6 per cent of the teachers were willing to take school children to visit an agri-tourism farm. It can be concluded that majority of the teachers, students and urban consumers were attracted to visit an agri-tourism farm.

**Table 2:** Distribution of respondents according to the duration preferred on an agri-tourism farm.

Sr. No	Respondents	Category	Duration					
			One day		Overnight		Weekend	
			f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Teachers (n <sub>1</sub> =110)	Alone	25	22.8	23	21.0	22	20.0
		Family	37	33.6	49	44.5	54	49.0
		Students	48	43.6	38	34.5	34	31.0
2	Students (n <sub>2</sub> =60)	Alone	15	25.0	12	20.0	10	16.7
		Family	20	33.3	20	33.3	26	43.3
		Friends	25	41.7	28	46.7	24	40.0
3	Urban consumers (n <sub>3</sub> =40)	Alone	14	35.0	10	25.0	10	25.0
		Family	16	40.0	18	45.0	18	45.0

		<b>Friends</b>	10	25.0	12	30.0	12	30.0
--	--	----------------	----	------	----	------	----	------

It is evident from Table 2 that majority of the teachers 43.6 per cent were willing to go for one day with students, whereas 41.7 per cent of the students were willing to go with friends and 40 per cent of the urban consumers were willing to go with their family. Regarding overnight stay, majority of the teachers 44.5 per cent and urban consumers 45 per cent were willing to go with their families, whereas 46.7 per cent of the students were willing to go with their

friends. In case of weekend stay, most of the teachers 49 per cent, students 43.3 per cent and urban consumers 45 per cent were willing to go with their families. It can be concluded that teachers get an opportunity to visit different places, while students were influenced by peer groups and majority of the urban consumers were married and belong to the age group of 36-48 that's why they preferred to go with their family.

**Table 3:** Willingness of the respondents regarding accommodation on an agri-tourism farm.

Sr. No	Accommodation requirement	Teachers (n <sub>1</sub> =110)		Rank	Students (n <sub>2</sub> =60)		Rank	Urban Consumers (n <sub>3</sub> =40)		Rank
		f	%		f	%		f	%	
1	Accommodation required on the farm	82	74.5	-	45	75.0	-	31	77.5	-
2	Accommodation away from the farm	28	25.5	-	15	25.0	-	9	22.5	-
3	<b>Kinds of accommodation n<sub>1</sub>=(82); n<sub>2</sub>=(45); n<sub>3</sub>=(31)</b>									
a.	Cottage	22	26.8	2	10	22.3	3	8	25.8	2.5
b.	Farm house	25	30.5	1	13	28.8	2	10	32.3	1
c.	Resort hotels	19	23.2	3	15	33.3	1	8	25.8	2.5
d.	Farm tents	16	19.5	4	7	15.6	4	5	16.1	4

More than 74 per cent of the total respondents were willing to be accommodated on an agri-tourism farm i.e., urban consumers accounted for 77.5 per cent followed by students 75 per cent then teachers that of 74.5 per cent. Regarding the kind of accommodation preferred by the respondents, it can be clearly seen from the data in Table 7

that teacher preferred farm house and was ranked first followed by cottage, resort hotels then farm tents. For students, resort/hotel was ranked first followed by farm house, cottage and farm tents. In the case of urban consumers farm house ranked first followed by cottage and resort/hotel and the last farm tents.

**Table 4:** Preference of respondents regarding type of transportation on an agri-tourism farm.

Sr. No	Res-pondents	Category	Type of transportation											
			Bullock cart		Tractor and Trailor		Jeep		Car		Tonga		Bus	
			f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Teachers (n <sub>1</sub> =110)	Alone	25	22.8	23	21.0	22	20.0	38	34.5	35	31.8	12	10.9
		Family	37	33.6	38	34.5	54	49.0	52	47.3	28	25.5	47	42.9
		Students	48	43.6	49	44.5	34	31.0	20	18.2	47	42.7	51	46.2
2	Students (n <sub>2</sub> =60)	Alone	15	25.0	11	18.3	10	16.7	18	30.0	17	28.3	11	18.3
		Family	20	33.3	22	36.7	23	38.3	20	33.3	21	35	23	38.3
		Friends	25	41.7	27	45.0	27	45.0	22	36.7	22	36.7	26	43.4
3	Urban consumers (n <sub>3</sub> =40)	Alone	14	35.0	10	25.0	10	25.0	13	32.5	14	35.0	5	12.5
		Family	16	40.0	18	45.0	18	45.0	16	40.0	15	37.5	16	47.5
		Friends	10	25.0	12	30.0	12	30.0	11	27.5	11	27.5	19	40.0

The data revealed that 49 per cent and 47.3 per cent of the teachers preferred jeep and car respectively with their family, followed by bus 46.2 per cent, tractor and trailor 44.5 per cent, bullock cart 43.6 per cent and tonga 42.7 per cent with students. In the case of students, 45 per cent preferred jeep and tractor and trailor followed by bus 43.4

per cent, bullock cart 41.7 per cent car and tonga 36.7 per cent. In case of urban consumers, 47.5 per cent preferred bus. Jeep and tractor and trailor were preferred by an equal percentage of respondents (45.0%). 40 per cent preferred bullock cart and car and 37.5 per cent tonga.

**Table 5:** Preference of respondents regarding medical facility on an agri-tourism farm.

Sr. No	Facilities required	Teachers (n <sub>1</sub> =110)		Rank	Students (n <sub>2</sub> =60)		Rank	Urban Consumers (n <sub>3</sub> =40)		Rank
		f	%		f	%		f	%	
1	<b>Medical facility on the farm</b>	87	79.1	-	42	70.0	-	29	72.5	-
3	<b>Type of medical facility n<sub>1</sub>=(87) n<sub>2</sub>=(42)n<sub>3</sub>=(29)</b>									
a.	<b>Clinic</b>	29	33.3	2	14	33.3	2	10	34.4	2
b.	<b>Health center</b>	25	28.7	3	11	27.5	3	8	27.6	3
c.	<b>First aid</b>	33	38.0	1	17	40.5	1	11	38.0	1

The findings showed that 79.1 per cent of the teachers, 72.5 per cent of the urban consumers and 70.0 per cent of the students preferred medical facility on an agri-tourism farm.

Regarding the preference for type of medical facility, it is clear from the figures in table 10 that all the respondents reported that first aid was required and it ranked first

followed by clinic then health center. It is due to the fact that first aid is important during emergency.

**Table 6:** Willingness of respondents regarding their participation in agricultural activities on an agri-tourism farm.

Sr. No	Agricultural activities	Teachers (n <sub>1</sub> =110)			Students (n <sub>2</sub> =60)			Urban Consumers (n <sub>3</sub> =40)		
		f	%		f	%		f	%	
1	Participate in agricultural activities	100	90.9		52	86.7		32	85	
2	Kind of activities	Teachers (n <sub>1</sub> =100)			Students (n <sub>2</sub> =52)			Urban Consumers (n <sub>3</sub> =32)		
a	Production activities	Alone f %	Family f %	Students f %	Alone f %	Family f %	Friends f %	Alone f %	Family f %	Friends f %
i	Milking of buffalos	22 (22.0)	36 (36.0)	42 (42.0)	13 (25.0)	17 (32.7)	22 (42.3)	11 (34.4)	14 (43.8)	7 (21.8)
ii	Feeding of animals	26 (26.0)	34 (34.0)	40 (40.0)	17 (32.7)	16 (30.8)	19 (36.5)	11 (34.4)	15 (46.8)	6 (18.8)
iii	Gardening	20 (20.0)	37 (37.0)	43 (43.0)	16 (30.8)	13 (23)	23 (44.2)	10 (31.3)	15 (46.9)	7 (21.8)
iv	Ploughing the fields	28 (28.0)	33 (33.0)	39 (39.0)	12 (23.0)	16 (30.8)	24 (46.2)	13 (40.6)	11 (34.4)	8 (25.0)
v	Harvesting of crops	20 (20.0)	36 (36.0)	44 (44.0)	16 (30.8)	15 (28.8)	21 (40.4)	11 (34.4)	13 (40.6)	8 (25.0)
vi	Picking of fruits and vegetables	28 (28.0)	32 (32.0)	40 (40.0)	17 (32.7)	15 (28.8)	20 (38.5)	10 (31.3)	14 (43.7)	8 (25.0)
b	Operate agri-machineries	30 (30.0)	33 (33.0)	37 (37.0)	16 (30.8)	17 (32.7)	19 (36.5)	13 (40.6)	11 (34.4)	8 (25.0)
c	Processing activities									
i	Processing of dairy products	21 (21.0)	38 (38.0)	41 (41.0)	14 (26.9)	16 (30.8)	22 (42.3)	11 (34.4)	13 (40.6)	8 (25.0)
ii	Fruit processing	23 (23.0)	37 (37.0)	40 (40.0)	13 (25.0)	17 (32.7)	22 (42.3)	11 (34.4)	12 (37.5)	9 (28.1)
iii	Vegetable processing	23 (23.0)	37 (37.0)	40 (40.0)	12 (23.0)	16 (30.8)	24 (46.2)	11 (34.4)	12 (37.5)	9 (28.1)
iv	Preserved fruits and vegetables	24 (24.0)	37 (37.0)	39 (39.0)	16 (30.8)	13 (25.0)	23 (44.2)	12 (37.6)	13 (40.6)	7 (21.8)

**Figures in parentheses indicate percentage**

Certain agricultural activities are performed on the farm and the respondent's willingness to participate in these activities was taken and presented in Table 6. The data revealed that 90.9 per cent of the teachers, 86.7 per cent of the students and 85 per cent urban consumers were willing to participate in agricultural activities on an agri-tourism farm. The different kind of agricultural activities are divided into three categories, these are production activities, processing activities and operating agricultural machineries. The findings further revealed that 39 per cent to 44 per cent of the teachers were willing to participate in all the production activities with students followed by 3.0

per cent to 37.0 per cent with their family. Similar trend was noticed in the case of students whereby 36.5 per cent to 46.2 per cent were willing to participate in all the activities with their friends. However, in the case of urban consumers one can see that 40.6 per cent were willing to plough the fields and operate agricultural machineries alone, whereas 37.5 per cent to 46.9 per cent were willing to participate in the remaining activities with their family. Under processing activities 39 per cent to 41 per cent of the teachers were willing to participate with students followed by 37 per cent to 38 per cent with family. In the case of students 42.3 per cent to 46.2 per cent were willing to participate with friends.

**Table 7:** Distribution of respondents according to their interest of rural culture.

Sr. No	Rural culture	Teachers (n <sub>1</sub> =110)		Rank	Students (n <sub>2</sub> =60)		Rank	Urban consumer (n <sub>3</sub> =40)		Rank
		f	%		f	%		f	%	
a	Interest	87	79.1		49	81.6		31	77.5	
b	Type of rural culture n <sub>1</sub> =(87) n <sub>2</sub> =(49) n <sub>3</sub> =(31)									
I	Folk dance	19	21.8	2	10	20.4	2.5	5	16.2	4.5
II	Folk music	16	18.5	4	9	18.4	4.5	5	16.2	4.5
III	Traditional dress	20	23.0	1	11	22.4	1	7	22.6	2
IV	Traditional food	17	19.5	3	10	20.4	2.5	8	25.8	1
V	Traditional places	15	17.2	5	9	18.4	4.5	6	19.2	3

Rural culture can be preserved only if there is interest into it. Agri-tourism plays a vital role in its preservation. The respondents were further probed whether they have interest in rural culture or not and then what type of cultural activity interest them. The information so collected is placed in Table 13. A perusal of the data revealed that 81.6 per cent of the students, 79.1 per cent teachers and 77.5 per

cent urban consumers were interested in rural culture. The data further reveal that in the case of teachers 23 per cent were interested in traditional dress and alternative ranked first followed by folk dance 21.8 per cent, traditional food 19.5 per cent, and folk music 18.5 per cent then traditional places 17.2 per cent. In the case of students, traditional dress was also ranked first 22.4 per cent followed by

traditional food and folk dance that is of 20.4 per cent then folk music and traditional place that is of 18.4 per cent. In case of urban consumers, traditional food was ranked first

25.8 per cent followed by traditional dress 22.6 per cent, traditional places 19.2 per cent then folk dance and folk music that is of 16.2 per cent.

**Table 8:** Willingness of the respondents to purchase agricultural products from an agri-tourism farm.

Sr. No	Agricultural products	Teachers (n <sub>1</sub> =110)		Rank	Students (n <sub>2</sub> =60)		Rank	Urban consumer (n <sub>3</sub> =40)		Rank
		f	%		f	%		f	%	
a	Ready to purchase	86	78.2	-	47	78.3	-	32	80	-
b	Kind of agri products n <sub>1</sub> =(86);n <sub>2</sub> =(47); n <sub>3</sub> =(32)									
I	Fresh vegetables	11	12.8	2	5	10.6	5.5	4	12.5	3
II	Fruits	10	11.6	3.5	7	14.9	1	3	9.4	7
III	Dairy products	9	10.5	6	5	10.6	5.5	4	12.5	3
IV	Honey	12	13.9	1	6	12.8	3	5	15.5	1
V	Meat and poultry products	8	9.3	8.5	4	8.5	8	3	9.4	7
VI	Organic products	10	11.6	3.5	6	12.8	3	3	9.4	7
VII	Medicinal herbs	9	10.5	6	4	8.5	8	4	12.5	3
VIII	Handicrafts	8	9.3	8.5	6	12.8	3	3	9.4	7
IX	Processed products	9	10.5	6	4	8.5	8	3	9.4	7

The data indicated that 80 per cent of the urban consumers, 78.3 per cent students and 78.2 per cent teachers were ready to purchase agricultural products from an agri-tourism farm. The data further indicated that 13.9 per cent of the teachers were ready to purchase honey followed by fresh vegetables 12.8 per cent, fruits and organic products of 11.6 per cent, medicinal herbs, dairy products and process products 10.5 per cent then followed by handicraft meat and poultry products 9.3 per cent. In case of students 14.9 per cent were ready to purchase fruits followed by

honey, organic products and handicraft that is of 12.8 per cent; fresh vegetables and dairy products that of 10.6 per cent then followed by processed products, meat and poultry products that of 8.5 per cent. In case of urban consumers, 15.5 per cent were ready to purchase honey followed by fresh vegetables, dairy products and medicinal herbs that is 12.5 per cent; then followed by fruits, meat and poultry products, organic products, handicraft and processed products that is 9.4 per cent.

**Table 9:** Preference of respondents regarding recreational activities on an agri-tourism farm.

Sr. No	Recreational facilities	Teachers (n <sub>1</sub> =110)			Students (n <sub>2</sub> =60)			Urban consumers (n <sub>3</sub> =40)		
		Alone	Family	Students	Alone	Family	Friends	Alone	Family	Friends
		f %	f %	f %	f %	f %	f %	f %	f %	f %
1	Bullock cart ride	38 (34.5)	26 (23.6)	46 (41.9)	20 (33.3)	17 (28.4)	23 (38.3)	14 (35)	11 (27.5)	15 (37.5)
2	Horse ride	39 (35.5)	27 (24.5)	44 (40.0)	16 (26.7)	21 (35)	23 (38.3)	15 (37.5)	11 (27.5)	14 (35.0)
3	Camping	24 (21.8)	39 (35.5)	47 (42.7)	12 (20.0)	23 (38.3)	25 (41.7)	9 (22.5)	18 (45)	13 (32.5)
4	Cart race	40 (36.4)	36 (32.7)	34 (30.9)	15 (25.0)	20 (33.3)	25 (41.7)	13 (32.5)	11 (27.5)	16 (40.0)
5	Tubewell bath	38 (34.5)	39 (35.5)	33 (30.0)	16 (26.6)	20 (33.3)	24 (40.0)	13 (32.5)	16 (40.0)	11 (27.5)
6	Picnic spot	26 (23.6)	40 (36.4)	44 (40.0)	12 (20.0)	23 (38.3)	25 (41.7)	9 (22.5)	17 (42.5)	14 (35.0)
7	Buffalo ride in water	42 (38.2)	30 (27.3)	38 (34.5)	19 (31.7)	17 (28.3)	24 (40.0)	14 (35.0)	10 (25.0)	16 (40.0)
8	Drive agri machinery	32 (29.1)	35 (31.8)	43 (39.1)	14 (23.3)	21 (35.0)	13 (32.5)	17 (42.5)	10 (25.5)	13 (32.5)
9	Historical sight seeing	27 (24.5)	37 (33.6)	46 (41.9)	13 (21.7)	22 (36.7)	10 (25.0)	10 (25.0)	17 (42.5)	13 (32.5)

**Figures in parentheses indicate percentage**

Recreational activities on an agri-tourism farm play a vital role in it promotion. The data indicated that majority of the teachers 41.9 per cent preferred bullock cart ride with students, whereas 38.3 per cent of students and 37.5 per cent of urban consumers preferred bullock cart ride with their friends. In case of horse ride, 40 per cent of the teachers preferred it with students. While 38.3 per cent of students preferred horse ride with friends and 37.5 per cent of urban consumers preferred it alone. A further look at the

figures in Table 15 revealed that 42.7 per cent of teachers preferred camping with students, whereas 41.7 per cent of students preferred with their friends and 45 per cent urban consumers preferred with their family. Regarding cart race 36.4 per cent of the teachers preferred alone, whereas 41.7 per cent of the students and 40 per cent of urban consumers preferred with their friends. In the case of tube well bath, 35.5 per cent of the teachers and 40 per cent of the urban consumers preferred it with their family, while 40 per cent of students preferred with their friends. In case of picnic

spot, 40 per cent of the teachers preferred with students, whereas 41.7 per cent of students preferred with friends and 42.5 per cent of urban consumers preferred with family. Regarding buffalo ride in water, 38.2 per cent of the teachers preferred alone, while 40 per cent of both students and urban consumers preferred with friends. With regards to driving agricultural machineries, 39.1 per cent of

teachers preferred with students, whereas 35.5 per cent of students preferred with family and 42.5 per cent of urban consumers preferred alone. In the case of historical sightseeing, 41.9 per cent of teachers preferred with students, whereas 42.5 per cent of urban consumers and 36.7 per cent of students preferred with their family.

**Table 10:** Preference of respondents according to nature viewing.

Sr. No	Kind of nature viewing	Teachers (n <sub>1</sub> =110)			Students (n <sub>2</sub> =60)			Urban consumer (n <sub>3</sub> =40)	
		Alone	Family	Students	Alone	Family	Friends	f	%
		f %	f %	f %	f %	f %	f %		
1	Bird watching	32 (29.1)	35 (31.8)	43 (39.1)	14 (23.3)	22 (36.7)	24 (40.0)	26	65.0
2	Watching of animals	31 (28.2)	37 (33.6)	42 (38.2)	16 (26.7)	21 (35.0)	23 (38.3)	24	60.0
3	Flora and Fauna	35 (31.8)	29 (26.4)	46 (41.8)	16 (26.7)	21 (35.0)	23 (38.3)	18	45.0
4	Land scaping	32 (29.1)	38 (34.5)	40 (36.4)	15 (25.0)	21 (35.0)	24 (40.0)	25	62.5
5	Waterfall viewing	30 (27.3)	38 (34.5)	42 (38.2)	13 (21.7)	22 (36.7)	25 (41.6)	24	60.0

Nature viewing can enhance the promotion of agri-tourism; the data indicated that 36.4 per cent to 41.8 per cent of the teachers preferred nature viewing with students, whereas 38.3 per cent to 41.6 per cent of the students preferred them with their friends. However, it is clearly shown that majority of the urban consumers 65.0 per cent preferred bird watching followed by landscaping 62.5 per cent. an equal percentage of respondents (60.0%) preferred animal watching and water fall viewing followed by flora and fauna viewing 45 per cent.

**Suggestion and strategies for the promotion of Agri-tourism**

**1 Increase awareness**

- i. Enhance participant’s knowledge and appreciation of the concept of agri-tourism for the increasing farm productivity and creating economic opportunities in rural areas through press release and advertisement.
- ii. Broadcasting of agri-tourism programme through radio and television at least once a week.
- iii. Distribution of brochures with contact information to all other tourism centers, tourist sites, railway stations and bus stand.
- iv. Holding of seasonal events such as festivals.

**2 Capacity building**

- i. Educational programme for farmers entering into farm-based tourism through workshops held by agri-tourism board or state agriculture boards etc. Workshops should be recommended for anyone seeking a loan or grant from any government entity.
- ii. Equip participants with knowledge of the tools and techniques to enhance their skills in planning, management, promotion, and marketing of agri tourism projects and products.
- iii. Conduct outreach activities for agri-tourism operators to promote the tourism calendar of events.

- iv. Training courses should follow a modular approach and consist of lectures, hospitality training, case studies, seminars etc.

**3 Promotion of agri-tourism**

- i. Subsidy or grants should be given to agri-tourism owners for infrastructure facilities and agri-tourism development
- ii. Accessibility to agri-tourism farms through proper road ways, transportation facilities etc.
- iii. State government and other policy makers should play more emphasis on acquiring more markets and price regulation for agri products.
- iv. Extension personnel should involve in the promotion of agri-tourism in organizing field days.
- v. Punjab Agricultural University should incorporate agri-tourism as a course.

**Conclusion**

The study can be concluded that agri-tourism provides additional income for the rural people; it also creates employment and develops the social and cultural values of the people. Agri-tourism connects the rural and urban people in many ways thereby making beneficial linkages for both settings and reconciles the farming interests and environmental protection through integrated land management in which farmers continue to play a key role. Tourists, who choose farm accommodation rather than other kinds of accommodation facilities look for genuine rural atmosphere where they can share intimacy of the household they live in, learn traditional crafts and skills with their hosts make friends and above all enjoy homemade food and drinks. The study further concluded that majority of respondents from all the categories were attracted to visit an agri-tourism farm and were willing to visit one which has various agricultural resources. Most of the total respondents were willing to interact with the rural people from the local community and were willing to visit an agri-tourism farm which organizes educational tour.

Although most of the teachers had wanted to visit agri-tourism farm with their family during the weekend, majority of them were willing to go with school children for one day or overnight.

### References

1. Anonymous (2004 b) Hawaii Agri-tourism. Hawaii Agricultural Statistics Honolulu HI. Retrieved from <http://www.nass.usda.gov/hi/speccrop/agtour.htm> on 09-12-2013
2. Che D, Veeck A and Veeck G (2005) Sustaining production and strengthening the agri-tourism product. Linkages among Michigan agri-tourism destinations. *Agriculture and Human values* **22**: 225-34.
3. Langworthy A, Howard, J and Mawson F (2006) Building the relationship between agriculture and tourism, models and benefits of co-operation. Report for Agriculture and Business, Swinburne University of Technology Melbourne. CF Maria (2012) Marketing for agritourism in Mountain Pelion region in Greece. Retrieved from <https://emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm> on 15-06-2014
4. Martha G (2008) Suggestions for starting an agri-tourism venture North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. Rev. August 2008. Pp 48-55.
5. Moshabaki and Malek (2004). Designing the policy of tourism marketing in Iran, *Bimonthal Scientific Magazine*, CF Naser and Bakhshandea (2011) Effects of positive and negative rural tourism *J Geography and Regional Planning* **4**: 63-76
6. Nickerson NP, Black RJ and McCool SF (2001). Agritourism: Motivations behind farm/ranch business diversification. *J Travel Res.* **40**: 19-26.
7. Raghundandan A (2010) A critical analysis of developing and implementing the concept of agritourism in India. M.Sc. Thesis, Cesar Ritz College Switzerland. Retrieved from <http://www.tourism.gov.in> on 28-08-2013.
8. Schilling B, Sullivan K and Komar S (2012) Examining the economic benefits of agri-tourism, the case of New Jersey *J Agri* **3**: 199-214.
9. Sharp J and Smith M (2003) Social capital and farming at the rural-urban interface, the importance farmer relations. *J Agri Syst* **76**: 913-27.
10. Wicks E and Merrett C D (2003) Agritourism: An economic opportunity for Illinois. Retrieved from <http://www.iira.org/pubsnew/publication/IIRA-RRR-577.pdf>. on 23-02-2014.