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Abstract: This study analyzed tourists’ activity preferences and motivations that drive them to visit farm tourism destinations and examined the relationship between them. It employed a quantitative following a descriptive-correlational research design with a total of 304 respondents who completed the researcher-administered and online survey questionnaires and were analyzed through canonical correlations. The study revealed that the pull motives of visitors are stronger drivers than push motives in visiting farm tourism sites. Moreover, the study found a linear relationship between the preferred activities and the motivations of local tourists. It suggests that farm tourism operators should continue to enhance their farm’s physical attributes while retaining the element of rurality, local cultures, and ways of life.
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1. Introduction

Rural tourism is increasingly being recognized as a valuable source of revenue for local communities and a tool for the countryside’s revitalization (Dinis et al., 2019; Fang, 2020; Khartishvili et al., 2019; Su et al., 2019; Wijijayanti et al., 2020). Aside from assisting these communities in
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Farm tourism is regarded as a vital tool for rural revitalization. As a result, farm tourism operators must understand the motivations and activity preferences of tourists. This study looked at the extrinsic forces (pull) or destination attributes, as well as the intrinsic forces (push), or the tourist’s inherent motivation to visit a destination. The findings revealed that extrinsic forces are stronger drivers than intrinsic forces, implying that tourists’ visits are strongly motivated by the destination’s features and activities. The farm’s natural and relaxing atmosphere is the top motivation for tourists, and the top activities are enjoying the scenery and taking a farm tour. The study also found a linear relationship between motivations and activity preferences, suggesting that farm tourism operators should develop their farms and create packages based on the tourists’ motivations.
maintaining their traditional activities, it is also critical in the promotion and conservation of local cultures, as well as the deterrence of rural-urban migration (Haldar, 2007). Although tourism is flourishing rapidly in many parts of the world, rural tourism remains underdeveloped in comparison to urban tourism (Aylward & Kelliher, 2009; Yang et al., 2021). However, it can be noted that one of the growing forms of rural tourism is agritourism, or farm tourism. According to the Department of Tourism (DOT; 2014), farm tourism is an activity carried out in the countryside that combines various stages of farming.

Farm tourism is not a new phenomenon (Król, 2019). Traditionally, people from Western countries move from the cities to rural areas for recreation and vacations. However, due to globalization, farm tourism faces an increased demand for a variety of services, professionalism, flexibility, quality, and competence (Blekesaune et al., 2008). In the Philippines, rural based farm tourism, as a relatively new tourism product, is becoming an emerging trend. However, this form of tourism has paid little attention from academic research (Ingram, 2002).

The study of local tourists’ motivations is one of the research gaps for farm tourism studies in the Philippines. There is a considered limitation in the availability of studies that explore the motivations for travel to farm tourism destinations, and some research has been conducted with the goal of developing tourism products and services, marketing plans, and other tourism development and promotion strategies (Hennessey et al., 2009). The majority of these are geared toward rural tourism rather than farm tourism. For example, Molera and Albaladejo (2007) explain that tourists are driven to visit the countryside to reconnect with nature, gain space, and freedom, to find peace, to seek authenticity and customs, to interact with the locals, and have fun on vacation. Furthermore, there the need to conduct more studies on tourists’ motives in general (Pesonen et al., 2011).

Tsephe and Obono (2013) examined five travel motivation theories in an attempt to understand tourists’ motivations: “the sunlust and wanderlust theory, the push and pull theory, the personal and interpersonal theory, the physical, status and prestige, cultural, and impersonal motivation theory, and the inner-directed and outer-directed values theory” (p. 274). Correspondingly, the push and pull theory was applied in this study. Scholars agreed that this theory can explain why people are motivated to visit certain places (Albayrak & Caber, 2018; Dann, 1997; Suhartanto et al., 2020). Push motives are factors that explain why people travel to satisfy needs, whereas pull factors are external factors that attract travelers, such as natural features. Scholars have recognized this model for exploring tourists’ motivations (Pestana et al., 2020; Yi et al., 2018).

In addition to motives, the preferences of local tourists in the Philippines for farm tourism are rarely studied. Pearce (2012) claimed that preference is more precise than motivation, and preferences are discovered through the places visited and the activities of tourists. An analysis of the motivations and preferences of local tourists aid in the sustainable development of the tourism industry (Nok et al., 2017; Seyidov & Adomaitienë, 2016). In order to yield sustainable rural destination development and developing successful and competitive rural tourism products, a better understanding of the market is required (Kastenholz, 2004). Thus, the present study is designed to investigate the relationship between motivational factors and activity preferences that drive locals to farm tourism destinations in Camarines Sur, the Philippines. The study will benefit farm tourism operators by serving input to improve the attractiveness and activities of their farm and develop effective promotional strategies.

2. Methodology
The study employed quantitative methods using a descriptive-correlational research design in analyzing the relationship between activity preference and tourist motivation. The study was conducted in Camarines Sur, where farm tourism has gradually emerged as a new nature-based and rural tourism. Using a non-probability sampling technique, particularly the convenience sampling, the respondents were recruited following the criteria that include male or female, at least
**Table 1. Reference of the motives used in the study**

| Motives                                           | References                                      | Cronbach Alpha |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| (1) Rediscovering self (pull)                     | Crompton (1979);                               | .715            |
| (2) Health problem or concern which requires farm ambiance (push) | Pyo et al. (1989); Uysal and Jurowski (1994) | .689            |
| (3) Exploring local food (pull)                   | Pyo et al. (1989); Echtner & Ritchie (1993)    | .707            |
| (4) Family or personal problem (push)             | Conceptualized                                  | .688            |
| (5) Escaping the hustle of city life (push)       | Yuan & McDonald (1990); Crompton (1990)         | .733            |
| (6) Quest to organic farming education (pull)     | Echtner & Ritchie (1993)                        | .724            |
| (7) Break from routine (push)                     | Crompton (1979); Echtner & Ritchie (1993)      | .726            |
| (8) Restful and relaxing place to visit (pull)    | Chen (2000); Pyo et al. (1979)                  | .743            |
| (9) Observing natural beauty, pastoral settings, and scenic vistas (pull) | Echtner & Ritchie (1993); Chen (2000) | .738            |
| (10) Experiencing and gaining knowledge of different cultures, and ways of life (pull) | Echtner & Ritchie (1993); Kozak (2002) | .740            |
| (11) Traveling to places where I feel safe and secure (push) | Pyo et al. (1989) | .749            |
| (12) Spending time with someone special (pull)    | Kozak (2002)                                    | .750            |
| (13) Change from a busy job (push)                | Pyo et al. (1989)                               | .689            |
| (14) Getting away from pressures and responsibilities (push) | Pyo et al. (1989) | .737            |

18 years old, and an individual who had visited at least one of the registered farm tourism destinations in Camarines Sur based on the Philippines’ Department of Tourism (DOT) Catalogue. A total of 304 local tourists, ranging in age from 18–60 years old ($M = 25$ years old, $SD = 8.05$), took part in the study via a survey administered by the researcher and an online survey form. The cover letter and informed consent were attached to the beginning of the survey forms to inform the participants about the nature of the study and ensure ethical compliance. Only when the respondent met the study's criteria was the survey administered.

The data collected was analyzed using two constructs: activity preferences and motivations of the locals to farm tourism destinations. Factors related to motivation and preference for farm tourism sites were derived and modified from previous tourism studies to align with the local context. Reliability for the entire construct using Cronbach’s alpha was 0.89. Table 1 displays the Cronbach’s alpha score for each statement and its sources.

Descriptive statistics were used to determine the push and pull motivation and preferences of tourists, while canonical correlation was applied to determine the relationship between tourists’ motivations and activity preferences. Two hypotheses were tested in this study: (1) the canonical
correlations of all canonical functions, taken collectively, are statistically significant; and (2) the canonical correlations of each of the canonical functions are all statistically significant. The data collected was encoded and analyzed using SPSS version 23.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Activity preferences of visitors

Farm tourism includes a wide range of products and services. According to Lane and Kastenholz (2015), tourists seek a variety of experiences in visiting rural based tourism destinations. Davies and Gilbert (1992) classified them into three types: accommodation-based, activity-based, and day-visitor-based. In the Philippines, the Department of Tourism (DOT) provides two categories of farm tourism: day farm and farm resort (DOT, Department of Tourism (DOT), 2014). The distinction between the two classifications is based on the farm's ability to provide tourists with lodging and dining services.

Understanding tourist activity preferences is crucial in providing the farm tourism industry with input for policy formulation and determining the best activities and attractions that best meet the demands of the customers. According to Burr (2011), one of the most important aspects for farm tourism operators is to provide support services and infrastructure. Table 2 shows the activity preferences of the local tourists for farm tourism sites in Camarines Sur.

This study revealed that “enjoying beautiful scenery” (4.65) is the top and most important activity in farm tourism sites. This finding is consistent with the findings of other studies on the activity preference for nature-based and agritourism sites. Blekesaune et al. (2008) pointed out that images, scenery, and tranquility are the reasons why tourists choose to visit farms. Sotomayor (2011), in his study on farms in Missouri, revealed that tourists are typically attracted to locations with scenic beauty because they enjoy the scents and sounds of nature while learning more about it. Moreover, it is argued that the visual is central to tourism as tourists travel to collect images and consume them with their eyes (Chalfen, 1979; MacCannell, 1976; Park & Kim, 2018). This finding suggests that the farm operators should enhance their farm so that tourists can enjoy it and take selfies (4.01). Dinhopf and Gretzel (2016, p. 126) proposed that the practice of taking selfies in the tourism industry consists of “othering, stylized performing, and producing or consuming visual culture of the self”. Through this process, tourists are able to attribute themselves to the characteristics that they originally associated with tourism attractions.

“Experiencing farm tour” (4.27) is an equally important farm tourism activity. Farm tour is designed to be educational, with a focus on cropping systems and patterns and livestock as the main attraction. The primary goal of this activity is to raise a visitor awareness of various types of crops, cultivation and harvesting practices, various types of farm animals and animal husbandry methods, as well the plight of the family farmer, and to instill a positive image of agriculture to the visitors (Mahaliyalanarachchi, 2015). According to Muhar and Siegrist (2017), a good connection between tourism and the local agricultural chain is one of the principles of sustainable tourism. Sonrisa Farm, for example, emphasizes organic farming systems as one of the attractions in farm tour packages. This finding suggests that the farm operators should offer a variety of farm tour packages to attract the target market. Some equally important activities included in the tour packages are experiencing adventure activities (4.19); observing wildlife (4.11); experiencing agricultural activities such as planting, harvesting, visiting farms/orchards, watching a harvest, visiting road stands, etc. (4.00); sampling and eating local foods, cuisine, and drink (3.86); experiencing local culture and lifestyles (3.83); feeding animals (3.73) and pick-and-pay experience of farm products (3.73).

Other important activities include experiencing local culture and lifestyles (3.83), buying local food products, crafts, or souvenirs (3.72), and visiting farmers markets (3.69). According to Blekesaune et al. (2008), the top motivations for Norwegian farm consumers’ visit included purchasing fresh and homemade products as well as purchasing directly from farmers.
According to Lago (2017), farm-to-table or agri-gastronomy is the most prevalent type of agritourism activity in the province of Quezon. These activities are also available on some farms in the study area. The food served is fresh from their organic farm and they sell fresh-picked vegetables, as well as sell crafts, and souvenirs.

Scheduled gatherings are the least important farm tourism activities for local tourists, such as attending farm-related training (3.61) which is common in farm schools; camping (3.52); and organizing gatherings such as birthdays, reunions, retreats, and weddings (3.38). This implies that farm tourism operators should offer appealing packages for camping, parties, weddings, and other events.

Table 2. Tourists’ activity preference to farm tourism sites

| Farm Tourism Activity                                                                 | Weighted Mean (n = 304) | Verbal Interpretation | Rank |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|------|
| (1) Enjoying beautiful scenery                                                      | 4.65                    | Very Important        | 1    |
| (2) Experiencing farm tour                                                          | 4.27                    | Very Important        | 2    |
| (3) Experiencing adventure activities                                               | 4.19                    | Important             | 3    |
| (4) Observing wildlife (including bird watching)                                     | 4.11                    | Important             | 4    |
| (5) Taking selfie with the attractions                                             | 4.09                    | Important             | 5    |
| (6) Experiencing agricultural activities (e.g., planting, harvesting, visiting farms/orchards, watching a harvest, visiting a road stand, etc.) | 4.00                    | Important             | 6    |
| (7) Sampling and eating local foods, cuisine and/or drink                            | 3.86                    | Important             | 7    |
| (8) Experiencing local culture and lifestyles                                        | 3.83                    | Important             | 8    |
| (9) Feeding animals                                                                  | 3.73                    | Important             | 9.5  |
| (10) Picking and paying experience of farm products                                  | 3.73                    | Important             | 9.5  |
| (11) Buying of local food products, crafts or souvenirs                               | 3.72                    | Important             | 11   |
| (12) Visiting farmers markets                                                        | 3.69                    | Important             | 12   |
| (13) Attending training/s related to farm activities                                 | 3.61                    | Important             | 13   |
| (14) Camping                                                                         | 3.52                    | Important             | 14   |
| (15) Conduct gatherings (e.g., birthdays, reunions, retreat, weddings)               | 3.38                    | Moderately Important  | 15   |

Legend: 4.20–5.00-Very Important; 3.40–4.19-Important; 2.60–3.39-Moderately important; 1.80–2.59-Slightly important; 1.00–1.79-Not at all important
3.2. The motivation of the locals in visiting farm tourism sites

Tourists have a variety of reasons for visiting rural tourism destinations. When visiting a rural tourism site, these individuals or group of individuals have different motives or combinations of motivations and engage in various activities (Camilleri, 2018). Similarly, local tourists have a variety of reasons for visiting farm tourism. In this study, motivation is grouped into two types—pull and push. The concept of push refers to the idea that a person intends to visit a destination to satisfy a need whereas the concept of pull focuses on what the destination can offer in order to attract visitors (Tsephe & Obono, 2013).

Six (6) pull motives and eight (8) push motives were identified in the study. Table 3 shows that local tourists are more motivated by “pull factors”, or the attributes that attract visitors, than “push factors” or personal satisfaction. This demonstrates that local tourists have visited farm tourism sites due to the attractions and activities available. Two pull motives topped the motivations: “observe the natural beauty, pastoral settings, and scenic vistas of the farm tourism destinations” (4.65); and “the place is restful and relaxing” (4.27). It is clear that the top motivation is identical with the top preferred activity—enjoying beautiful scenery. In addition to attractions, local tourists are motivated by a desire for rest and relaxation. This finding implies that the farm tourism operators should provide their visitors the silence, peace, and an active form of rest in the natural environment, as well as maintain close contact with the residents in a pleasant atmosphere (Mahaliyanaarachchi, 2015).

The desire to escape the hustle and bustle of city life is the primary motivation of local tourists. Hence, more emphasis is being placed on a variety tourist motives and activities, such as harvesting, relaxing, and other recreational experiences (Kastenholz & Figueiredo, 2014). Other inherent attractions or activities of the farm that appeal to local tourists include “experiencing and gaining knowledge from different cultures, and ways of life of the locals or farm hosts” (4.14); “safety and security of the place” (4.04); “exploring local foods and delicacies” (3.84); and “the quest for organic farming” (3.37). The findings suggest that the farm tourism operators should put together the package of local cultures, ways of life, organic farming, and local foods and delicacies to entice the tourists. Local tourists are also concerned about their safety and security. The guidelines for accreditation of farm tourism sites established by the Department of Tourism (DOT) consider safety and security to be a basic prerequisite for certification. To protect the guests and operators, the DOT requires 24-hour security personnel, appropriate safety signs, restricted areas, firefighting facilities, first aid kits, and appropriate parking facility equipment.

Push motives also drive the locals to visit farm tourism. Among the push motives, experiencing some changes from a busy job or schooling (4.04) ranked first. This motive is nearly identical to other identified push motives such as “to break from my daily or weekly routine” (4.00), get away from the pressures and responsibilities (3.80), and “to escape the hustle of a city or urban life” (3.50). The findings supported the study of Hanai (2009), which found that most tourists visit natural areas to relax, find peace, combat stress, and get away from daily activities. It contributes to the trend of tourists from all over the world seeking to escape the city’s hustle and bustle (Kastenholz et al., 2012; Molera & Albaladejo, 2007; Sidali & Schulze, 2010). Encountering health problems (3.20) and family and personal problems (2.96), on the other hand, do not constitute motivation for tourists to visit farm tourism sites.

3.3. The relationship of the visitors’ activity preference and motivation

The study also analyzed the relationship between activity preferences and motivations through canonical correlations. Tables 4, 5, and 6 show the canonical correlation results from SPSS v.23 output. First, a multivariate test of all functions was performed simultaneously. The test statistics employed were Wilks’ Lambda, Pillai’s Trace, Hotelling-Lawley Trace, and Roy’s Greatest Root.
# Table 3. Pull and push motivation of the locals in visiting farm tourism sites

| Motivation                                                                 | Push or Pull | Weighted Mean (n = 304) | VI   | Rank |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------|------|
| (1) I visit to observe the natural beauty, pastoral settings, and scenic vistas of the farm tourism destination(s) | Pull         | 4.65                    | SA   | 1    |
| (2) I visit because the place is restful and relaxing                      | Pull         | 4.27                    | SA   | 2    |
| (3) I visit to experience some changes from a busy job or schooling       | Push         | 4.16                    | A    | 3    |
| (4) I visit to experience and gain knowledge from different cultures, and ways of life of the locals or farm hosts | Pull         | 4.14                    | A    | 4    |
| (5) I visit because the place is safe and secure                           | Pull         | 4.04                    | A    | 5    |
| (6) I visit to rediscover myself                                           | Push         | 3.91                    | A    | 6    |
| (7) I visit to break from my daily or weekly routine                       | Push         | 4.00                    | A    | 7    |
| (8) I visit because I want to spend time with someone special             | Push         | 3.86                    | A    | 8    |
| (9) I visit to explore local foods and delicacies                          | Pull         | 3.84                    | A    | 9    |
| (10) I visit to get away from pressures and responsibilities               | Push         | 3.80                    | A    | 10   |
| (11) I visit because I want to escape the hustle of city or urban life    | Push         | 3.50                    | A    | 11   |

(Continued)
| Motivation                                                                 | Push or Pull | Weighted Mean (n = 304) | VI  | Rank |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-----|------|
| (12) I visit for my quest to organic farming                             | Push         | 3.37                    | A   | 12   |
| (13) I visit due to health problem or concern which requires farm ambiance| Push         | 3.20                    | NAD | 13   |
| (14) I visit because I am experiencing family or personal problem        | Push         | 2.96                    | NAD | 14   |
| PULL Factors Grand Mean                                                   |              | 4.05                    | A   | 1    |
| PULL Factors Grand Mean                                                   |              | 3.67                    | A   | 2    |

Legend: 4.20–5.00-Strongly Agree (SA); 3.40–4.19-Agree (A); 2.60–3.39-Neither agree nor disagree (NAD); 1.80–2.59-Disagree (D); 1.00–1.79-Strongly Disagree (SD); VI-Verbal Interpretation
### Table 4. Standardized canonical correlation coefficients of the variables

| Variable                                                                 | Standardized Canonical Correlation Coefficients |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
|                                                                          | Canonical Function 1 | Canonical Function 2 | Canonical Function 3 | Canonical Function 4 |
| (1) Taking selfie with the attractions                                   | -.148               | .176                | -.451               | .412               |
| (2) Enjoying beautiful scenery                                           | -.038               | .338                | .007                | -.298              |
| (3) Feeding animals                                                      | -.121               | -.158               | .402                | .388               |
| (4) Experiencing farm tour                                               | -.103               | .293                | .101                | .393               |
| (5) Sampling and eating local foods, cuisine and/or drink                | -.064               | -.180               | -.409               | -.576              |
| (6) Experiencing agricultural activities (e.g., planting, harvesting, visiting farms/ orchards, watching a harvest, visiting a roadside stand, etc.) | -.280               | -.061               | .183                | .361               |
| (7) Picking and paying experience of farm products                       | .042                | .139                | .009                | .477               |
| (8) Attending trainings related to farm activities                       | -.015               | -.537               | -.221               | -.196              |
| (9) Buying of local food products, crafts or souvenirs                   | -.245               | .078                | -.093               | -.154              |
| (10) Experiencing local culture and lifestyles (e.g., mingling with locals) | -.144               | .102                | .720                | -.252              |
| (11) Conduct gatherings (e.g., birthdays, reunions, retreats, weddings)  | -.009               | -.340               | .074                | -.004              |

(Continued)
Table 4. (Continued)

| Variable                                                                 | Standardized Canonical Correlation Coefficients |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                          | Canonical Function 1  | Canonical Function 2  | Canonical Function 3  | Canonical Function 4  |
| (12) Observing wildlife (including bird watching)                        | −.107                | .232                 | .272                 | −.208                |
| (13) Camping                                                             | −.021                | −.217                | −.227                | .204                 |
| (14) Experiencing adventure activities                                  | −.022                | .388                 | −.424                | .021                 |
| (15) Visiting farmers markets                                           | −.297                | −.091                | −.164                | −.248                |
| (16) I visit to rediscover myself                                       | .020                 | .220                 | −.619                | −.190                |
| (17) I visit due to health problem or concern which requires farm ambiance | −.126                | −.346                | .188                 | .210                 |
| (18) I visit to explore local foods and delicacies                      | −.408                | .017                 | −.178                | −.732                |
| (19) I visit because I am experiencing family or personal problem       | −.135                | −.104                | .388                 | .571                 |
| (20) I visit because I want to escape the hustle of city or urban life   | −.102                | .208                 | −.209                | −.332                |
| (21) I visit for my quest to organic farming education                  | −.143                | −.679                | −.455                | −.013                |
| (22) I visit to break from my daily or weekly routine                    | −.015                | .028                 | .572                 | −.337                |
| (23) I visit because the place is restful and relaxing                   | −.077                | .434                 | −.401                | .242                 |
| Variable                                                                 | Canonical Function 1 | Canonical Function 2 | Canonical Function 3 | Canonical Function 4 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| (24) I visit to observe the natural beauty, pastoral settings, and scenic vistas of the farm tourism destination(s) | -.217                | .268                 | .164                 | -.113                |
| (25) I visit to experience and gain knowledge from different cultures, and ways of life of the locals or farm hosts | -.267                | -.008                | .833                 | -.094                |
| (26) I visit because the place is safe and secure                       | -.210                | -.135                | -.149                | .462                 |
| (27) I visit because I want to spend time with someone special          | .083                 | .118                 | .058                 | -.178                |
| (28) I visit to experience some changes from a busy job or schooling    | -.009                | .045                 | .048                 | .409                 |
| (29) I visit to get away from pressures and responsibilities             | .086                 | .066                 | -.377                | .234                 |
| Canonical Statistics                                                    |                      |                      |                      |                      |
| Canonical Correlation (Cc)                                              | .725                 | .546                 | .422                 | .419                 |
| Squared Canonical Correlation (Cc2)                                     | 0.525                | 0.295                | 0.180                | 0.175                |
| Eigenvalue                                                              | 1.106                | .424                 | .217                 | .213                 |
| Proportion                                                              |                      |                      |                      |                      |
| p-value                                                                 | 0.000                | 0.000                | 0.000                | .001                 |
| Multivariate Statistics                                                 |                      |                      |                      |                      |
| Value                                                                   |                      |                      |                      |                      |
| F-value                                                                 |                      |                      |                      |                      |
| p-value                                                                 |                      |                      |                      |                      |
| Wilks' Lambda                                                           | 0.14327              | 2.82985              | <.0001               |                      |
| Variable                  | Standardized Canonical Correlation Coefficients |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
|                           | CanonicalFunction 1 | Canonical Function 2 | Canonical Function 3 | Canonical Function 4 |
| Pillai’s Trace            | 1.61597             | 2.50537             | <.0001               |
| Hotelling-Lawley Trace    | 2.43151             | 3.16262             | <.0001               |
| Ray’s Greatest Root       | 0.52471             |                     |                     |
Table 5. Correlations between preferred activities/motivation and their canonical variables

| Variables                                                                 | Canonical Loadings |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
|                                                                           | Canonical Function 1 | Canonical Function 2 | Canonical Function 3 | Canonical Function 4 |
| Correlation between Preferred Activities and their canonical variables    |                    |                    |                    |                    |
| 1. Taking selfie with the attractions                                    | -.331              | .163               | -.372              | .474               |
| 2. Enjoying beautiful scenery                                            | -.444              | .465               | -.037              | -.215              |
| 3. Feeding animals                                                        | -.469              | -.198              | .295               | .414               |
| 4. Experiencing farm tour                                                | -.564              | .346               | .072               | .117               |
| 5. Sampling and eating local foods, cuisine and/or drink                 | -.666              | -.099              | -.263              | -.321              |
| 6. Experiencing agricultural activities (e.g., planting, harvesting,     | -.750              | -.029              | .059               | .173               |
|    visiting farms/orchards, watching a harvest, visiting a roadside stand,|                    |                    |                    |                    |
|    etc.)                                                                  |                    |                    |                    |                    |
| 7. Picking and paying experience of farm products                         | -.598              | -.232              | -.065              | .242               |
| 8. Attending trainings related to farm activities                         | -.609              | -.531              | -.067              | -.035              |
| 9. Buying of local food products, crafts or souvenirs                     | -.747              | .057               | .005               | -.128              |
| 10. Experiencing local culture and lifestyles (e.g., mingling with locals)| -.709              | -.011              | .384               | -.213              |
| 11. Conduct gatherings (e.g., birthdays, reunions, retreats, weddings)   | -.516              | -.421              | .025               | .003               |
| 12. Observing wildlife (including bird watching)                          | -.573              | .237               | .257               | -.159              |
| 13. Camping                                                               | -.569              | -.224              | -.236              | .037               | (Continued)
### Table 5. (Continued)

| Variables | Canonical Loadings |
|-----------|--------------------|
|           | Canonical Function 1 | Canonical Function 2 | Canonical Function 3 | Canonical Function 4 |
| 14. Experiencing adventure activities | -.535 | .350 | -.328 | -.052 |
| 15. Visiting farmers markets | -.693 | -.259 | -.203 | -.208 |

**Correlation between Tourists' Motivations and their canonical variables**

1. I visit to rediscover myself | -.497 | .032 | -.382 | .178 |
2. I visit due to health problem or concern which requires farm ambiance | -.515 | -.381 | -.024 | .255 |
3. I visit to explore local foods and delicacies | -.764 | .001 | -.175 | -.405 |
4. I visit because I am experiencing family or personal problem | -.505 | -.226 | .039 | .342 |
5. I visit because I want to escape the hustle of city or urban life | -.491 | .073 | -.166 | -.183 |
6. I visit for my quest to organic farming education | -.526 | -.622 | -.211 | -.069 |
7. I visit to break from my daily or weekly routine | -.287 | .115 | .188 | -.195 |
8. I visit because the place is restful and relaxing | -.527 | .559 | -.161 | .198 |
9. I visit to observe the natural beauty, pastoral settings, and scenic vistas of the farm tourism destination(s) | -.508 | .459 | .165 | .079 |

(Continued)
| Variables                                                                 | Canonical Function 1 | Canonical Function 2 | Canonical Function 3 | Canonical Function 4 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 10. I visit to experience and gain knowledge from different cultures, and ways of life of the locals or farm hosts | -.756                | .097                 | .310                 | .103                 |
| 11. I visit because the place is safe and secure                         | -.621                | .082                 | -.133                | .397                 |
| 12. I visit because I want to spend time with someone special             | -.297                | .110                 | -.017                | .073                 |
| 13. I visit to experience some changes from a busy job or schooling       | -.523                | .294                 | .010                 | .277                 |
| 14. I visit to get away from pressures and responsibilities               | -.325                | .248                 | -.303                | .208                 |
| Variables                                                                 | Canonical Function 1 | Canonical Function 2 | Canonical Function 3 | Canonical Function 4 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| **Correlation between the Preferred Activities and the Canonical Variables of the Tourists' Motivations**          |                      |                      |                      |                      |
| 1. Taking selfie with the attractions                                    | -.240                | .089                 | -.157                | .199                 |
| 2. Enjoying beautiful scenery                                             | -.322                | .254                 | -.016                | -.090                |
| 3. Feeding animals                                                        | -.340                | -.108                | .125                 | .174                 |
| 4. Experiencing farm tour                                                | -.409                | .189                 | .030                 | .049                 |
| 5. Sampling and eating local foods, cuisine and/or drink                  | -.483                | -.054                | -.111                | -.135                |
| 6. Experiencing agricultural activities (e.g., planting, harvesting, visiting farms/ orchards, watching a harvest, visiting a roadside stand, etc.) | -.544                | -.016                | .025                 | .072                 |
| 7. Picking and paying experience of farm products                         | -.433                | -.127                | -.027                | .101                 |
| 8. Attending trainings related to farm activities                         | -.441                | -.290                | -.028                | -.015                |
| 9. Buying of local food products, crafts or souvenirs                     | -.542                | .031                 | .002                 | -.054                |
| 10 Experiencing local culture and lifestyles (e.g., mingling with locals) | -.514                | -.006                | .162                 | -.089                |
| 11. Conduct gatherings (e.g., birthdays, reunions, retreats, weddings)    | -.374                | -.230                | .010                 | .001                 |
| 12. Observing wildlife (including bird watching)                         | -.415                | .129                 | .109                 | -.066                |
| 13. Camping                                                              | -.412                | -.122                | -.100                | .015                 |
| Variables                                                                 | Canonical Function 1 | Canonical Function 2 | Canonical Function 3 | Canonical Function 4 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 14. Experiencing adventure activities                                    | -.388               | .191                 | -.138                | -.022                |
| 15. Visiting farmers markets                                             | -.502               | -.141                | -.086                | -.087                |
| **Correlation between the Tourists' Motivation and the Canonical Variables of the Preferred Activities** |                      |                      |                      |                      |
| 1. I visit to rediscover myself                                          | -.360               | .018                 | -.161                | .074                 |
| 2. I visit due to health problem or concern which requires farm ambiance | -.373               | -.208                | -.010                | .107                 |
| 3. I visit to explore local foods and delicacies                         | -.553               | .000                 | -.074                | -.170                |
| 4. I visit because I am experiencing family or personal problem          | -.366               | -.123                | .016                 | .143                 |
| 5. I visit because I want to escape the hustle of city or urban life      | -.355               | .040                 | -.070                | -.077                |
| 6. I visit for my quest to organic farming education                      | -.381               | -.339                | -.089                | -.029                |
| 7. I visit to break from my daily or weekly routine                       | -.208               | .063                 | .079                 | -.082                |
| 8. I visit because the place is restful and relaxing                      | -.382               | .305                 | -.068                | .083                 |
| 9. I visit to observe the natural beauty, pastoral settings, and scenic vistas of the farm tourism destination(s) | -.368               | .251                 | .070                 | .033                 |

(Continued)
| Variables                                                                 | Canonical Function 1 | Canonical Function 2 | Canonical Function 3 | Canonical Function 4 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 10. I visit to experience and gain knowledge from different cultures, and ways of life of the locals or farm hosts | -0.548               | 0.053                | 0.131                | 0.043                |
| 11. I visit because the place is safe and secure                        | -0.450               | 0.045                | -0.056               | 0.167                |
| 12. I visit because I want to spend time with someone special            | -0.215               | 0.060                | -0.007               | 0.031                |
| 13. I visit to experience some changes from a busy job or schooling      | -0.379               | 0.161                | 0.004                | 0.116                |
| 14. I visit to get away from pressures and responsibilities              | -0.236               | 0.135                | -0.128               | 0.087                |
Significance tests show that the full canonical correlation analysis model is statistically significant at 0.1 level. Hence, the study failed to reject the alternative hypothesis that all canonical functions, taken collectively, are statistically significant. This only means that there is a linear relationship between the “preferred activities variables” and the “motivation variables”. In addition, the proportion of variance shared between the variable sets across all functions was 85.67%, so the full model was both statistically significant and had a large effect size.

Second, the statistical significance test for the canonical correlations of each of the canonical functions was employed. Initially, there were 14 pairs of variates (i.e., functions) generated from the data. A dimension reduction analysis showed that only the first 4 canonical functions are statistically significant, with Wilk’s Lambda of 0.14327 (p < .01), .30144 (p < .01), .42769 (p < .01), .52135 (p < .01), respectively. Hence, the study failed to accept the alternative hypothesis that the canonical correlations of each of the canonical functions are all statistically significant. Looking at the canonical statistics, the canonical correlation for four functions is .724, .543, .424 and .418 with corresponding squared canonical correlations of .525, .295, .180 and .175, respectively. This finding indicates that the proportion of variance in the canonical variate of one set of variables (Preferred Activities) explained by the canonical variate of the other set of variables (Tourists’ Motivations) is 52.5% for Function 1, 29.5% for Function 2, 18% for Function 3 and 17.5% for Function 4.

Also, based on the standard canonical correlation coefficients, only “Experiencing agricultural activities (e.g., planting, harvesting, visiting farms/orchards, watching a harvest, visiting a roadside stand, etc.),” “Buying of local food products, crafts or souvenirs” and “Visiting farmers markets” are the relevant criterion variables in the first variate of the preferred activities. Whereas 4 out of 14 predictor variables, namely, “I visit to explore local foods and delicacies”, “I visit to observe the natural beauty, pastoral settings, and scenic vistas of the farm tourism destination(s)”, “I visit to experience and gain knowledge from different cultures and ways of life of the locals or farm hosts” and “I visit because the place is safe and secure” are primarily contributing to the first variate of tourists’ motivations. Although it can be gleaned from function 1, that the influence of both criterion and predictor variables on the first dimension is very low, except for predictor 3, “I visit to explore local foods and delicacies,” having a coefficient of .408.

Furthermore, for the preferred activities, the second canonical function is most influenced by “Attending trainings related to farm activities (−.537)” followed by “Experiencing adventure activities,” while for the third function, “Experiencing local culture and lifestyles (e.g., mingling with locals)” is the strong relevant criterion variable, and “Taking selfies with the attractions,” “Experiencing adventure activities,” “Sampling and eating local foods, cuisine and/or drink” and “Feeding animals” having made secondary contributions. For the fourth function of the preferred activities, six relevant criterion variables, namely “Sampling and eating local foods, cuisine and/or drink,” “Picking and paying experience of farm products,” “Taking selfie with the attractions,” “Experiencing farm tour,” “Feeding animals,” and “Experiencing agricultural activities (e.g., planting, harvesting, visiting farms/orchards, watching a harvest, visiting a roadside stand, etc.)” are dominating variables.

On the other hand, the second function of tourists’ motivations is comprised of “I visit for my quest for organic farming education” and “I visit because the place is restful and relaxing,” while the third canonical function is most strongly influenced by “I visit to experience and gain knowledge from different cultures, and ways of life of the locals or farm hosts,” “I visit to rediscover myself,” and “I visit to break from my daily or weekly routine,” and moderately influenced by “I visit for my quest to organic farming education,” “I visit because the place is restful and relaxing,” “I visit because I am experiencing family or personal problem,” and “I visit to get away from the pressures and responsibilities.” For the fourth canonical function, the influence of tourists’ motivation variables such as “I visit to explore local foods and delicacies,” “I visit because I am experiencing family or personal problem,” “I visit because the place is safe and secure,” and “I visit to experience some changes from a busy job or schooling” ranges from a moderate to strong contribution to its canonical dimensions.
Table 5 presents the correlation between preferred activities and motivation measurements and their canonical variables (canonical loadings). The first variate for the preferred activities (i.e., Canonical Function 1) has a moderate to strong but negative correlation with most of the preferred activity variables, except for “Taking selfies with the attractions”, which has a weak negative correlation with the first canonical function. Furthermore, the 2nd variate for preferred activities is moderately correlated with “Enjoying the beautiful scenery” and negatively correlated with “Attending trainings related to farm activities”, “Conduct gatherings (e.g., birthdays, reunions, retreats, weddings)”, and “Experiencing adventure activities”. For the canonical function 3 of preferred activities are positively correlated with “Experiencing local culture and lifestyles (e.g., mingling with locals)”, with “Taking selfie with the attractions” showing a negative correlation. On the other hand, the fourth variate of preferred activities is positively correlated with “Taking selfie with the attractions” and “Feeding animals” while the other criterion variables have weak and negative correlation with the fourth variate or no correlation at all.

Also, Table 5 shows the correlation between tourists’ motivations variables and their canonical variables. From the results, it can be gleaned that the first canonical function is strongly correlated with most of the predictor variables, though it is showing negative loadings. Looking at function 2 for tourists’ motivations, it can be seen that the 2nd variate is highly correlated with 2 motivation variables and shows positive loadings (“I visit because the place is restful and relaxing.” .559 and “I visit to observe the natural beauty, pastoral settings, and scenic vistas of farm tourism destinations(s).”) and another 2 variables yielded negative loadings (“I visit for my quest to organic farming education”, -.622 and “I visit due to a health problem or concern which requires farm ambiance” -.381). Table 5 also demonstrated that the 3rd variate of Tourists Motivations is inversely correlated with “I visit to rediscover myself” while the 4th variate is positively correlated with “I visit because the place is safe and secure” and negatively correlated with “I visit to explore local foods and delicacies”. The significance of loading was determined by using Hair et al.’s factor loading guidelines which considered the loadings to be significant if they exceeded 0.35.

Table 6 shows the results of canonical cross-loadings or the correlation between the Preferred Activities and the Canonical Variables of the Tourists’ Motivations and Correlation between the Tourists’ Motivation and the Canonical Variables of the Preferred Activities. The results show that activities 2, 4, 12, 14 are correlated with the canonical variables of Tourists’ Motivation while motivations 8, 9, 13, and 14 are correlated with the canonical variables of Preferred Activities for canonical function 2, activities 3, 10 and 12 are correlated with motivation 10 for canonical function 3 and activities 1, 3, 7 are correlated with motivations 2, 4, 11 and 13 for canonical function 4.

This only means that the local tourists who were highly motivated by “I visit because the place is restful and relaxing,” “I visit to observe the natural beauty, pastoral settings, and scenic vistas of the farm tourism destination(s),” “I visit to experience some changes from a busy job or schooling,” and “I visit to get away from the pressures and responsibilities” were also more likely to be interested in “Enjoying beautiful scenery,” “Experiencing farm tour,” “Observing wildlife (including bird watching),” and “Experiencing adventure activities”.

The results of the canonical function 3 indicated that strong interests in activities such as “Feeding animals,” “Experiencing local culture and lifestyles (e.g., mingling with locals)” and “Observing wildlife (including bird watching)” were more likely to be positively related to motivation “I visit to experience and gain knowledge from different cultures, and ways of life of the locals or farm hosts”. Furthermore, the results of canonical function 4 revealed that tourists who considered important activities at rural destinations to include “Taking selfie with the attractions,” “Feeding animals,” and “Picking and paying experience of farm products” were most likely to be motivated by “I visit due to a health problem or concern which requires farm ambiance,” “I visit because I am experiencing family or personal problem,” “I visit because the place is safe and secure,” and “I visit to experience some changes from a busy job or schooling”.
4. Conclusion

Tourists’ activity preferences and motivations for visiting farm tourism destinations in Camarines Sur are varied. It can be construed that the tourists pay visits mainly to enjoy the scenery and explore the farm through farm tours. Hence, it is recommended that the tourism operators come up with a picture-perfect, tranquil, and peaceful attraction that will entice the tourists. Furthermore, it should develop more tourism elements that highlight the identity of the rural community (Kim, 2018), local culture and traditions, and ordinary ways of life. In addition, farm tourism operators should create a variety of tour packages based on the activities that tourists prefer.

The study also reveals that the pull motives are stronger motivators for tourists to visit farm tourism. These motives are the farm’s attractions and characteristics that “pulls” tourists people to visit. Two of them are the “natural beauty, pastoral setting, and scenic vistas of the farm tourism destinations” and “restful and relaxing”. This suggests that the farm tourism operators must constantly improve or develop their farm to attract more visitors. The Department of Tourism (DoT) should provide training on farm improvement and packaging.

According to canonical correlations, activity preferences and motivations have significant relationships. This supports the study of Lago (2017) farm tourism in Quezon Province, which found a significant relationship between tourists’ motivations and their preferences. This means that the more motivated the tourists are, the more likely they are to travel and visit new places.

The results of the study also suggest that future researchers conduct a factorial analysis of the items related to motivations and activity preferences to address similar patterns of responses in which reduction of a set of observed data must be reduced to a small number of latent factors. Exploring the demographics of the respondents may be considered to see if activity preferences and motivations vary depending on gender, civil status, educational attainment, and occupation.

Furthermore, this study also suggests that more research on tourists’ activity preferences and their motivations to visit farm tourism destinations in the Philippines be conducted. Future investigations may focus on the relationship between demographic and motivation or activity preferences, comparing urban and rural tourists or domestic and foreign tourists. Other provinces in the Philippines with thriving farm tourism destinations may also be studied.
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