NAMES USED FOR CREATING THE IMAGE OF RURAL TOURIST ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

Jolanta Cichowska
University of Technology and Life Sciences in Bydgoszcz

Summary

Studies conducted among 1417 rural tourist accommodation facilities in Poland have shown that 966 of them have names for their service. Created names most often correspond to the profile of the business. A total of 130 objects specifically suggested that their product is the agritourism, using less sophisticated terms: agritourism, agritourism farm, gite, or expanding it by an additional element, usually referring to the owner's name or surname, plants (clover) or the location of the facility (e.g. in a valley or on a peninsula). There were also names of rural tourism facilities which suggested surroundings of the homestead („Kraina trzech stawów") or accentuated its regional affiliation („Czar Roztocza"). Owners often used their names to promote the tourism product for example: „U Basi", U Zochy", „U Kazika" or „U Kowalskich". They were not innovative, as in the case of the names created of parts of owners' names or surnames for example: „Czester". 451 services on the web portal did not have any names, which may cause that their offer will not remain for long in the minds of the potential customers, or will not be noticed at all. It must be emphasized that giving proper, attractive and easy to remember name is an important marketing move that could bring success to tourism activit**es**.

Key words: rural tourism**,** agritourism, service name

INTRODUCTION

Once a product has been created, it must reach a customer. One of the most efficient tools to make it exist in customer mind is giving it a name and accompanying logo. The name should be associated either with the enterprise or the product, or the region. Sometimes it is enough for it to be just catchy and easy to pronounce. It cannot be common or too long (Majewski, Lane 2003). Regarding the above mentioned facts, present article aims at presenting a survey of the names of Polish rural accommodation facilities and an attempt to answer the question „Can an appropriately applied terminology help to create a positive image of service provided in rural areas?" Due to the fact that nowadays the Internet is the commonly accessible web providing the main source of information and knowledge, as well as significant tool of communication (Pawłowska-Mielech, Bocek 2006), it was determined to follow the offers posted by the service providers on a commonly known web portal.

METHODS

In order to realize the assumed objective, analysed were 1417 entities providing tourist services, registered on the „agroturystyka.pl" web portal. The portal is administered by the Lublin Union of Agritourism Associations", supervised by „Gospodarstwa Gościnne" – Polish Federation of Rural Tourism (PFTW"GG"). The names of conducted activities were analysed for individual voivodships. In Tables compiled were first the number of offers, among which indicated were these, which introduced any names for their activities and further those which used only the names, such as: agritourism farm (independent or with an additional element), guest room or agritourism accommodation. It allowed for a better selection of the names, which in result led to identify the number of more interesting and original names, which could be far more attractive for a potential tourist.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Currently tourism business is nonexistent without the Internet. The latest data show that already 3 out of 4 Polish internet uses who plan their holidays looks for offers on the web, whereas a half of them make their booking on the web. According to the forecasts, the sale of tours and tourism services by means of mobile devices will grow even to 60%. It turns out that customers often do not have to look for the offers, because a personalized offer of leisure services can easily find them. (http://www.polskieradio.pl,...). From the marketing point of view, a crucial element suggesting the character of the offer in which we are

interested is its name. As emphasized by Malewicz-Pełczyńska (2007) the name is a basis of the identification system and a part of so called basic elements. It aims to distinguish the enterprise and its offer but also fixes its desired image in the environment. The name, like the price may be a factor which attracts a potential tourist for holidays or will make the offer highly attractive on the market (Cichowska 2014). Generally, it was noted that among 1417 facilities, 451 (31.8%) did not have any names. The other service providers (966) used various terms to describe their services (Table1). These were usually easy to remember, pronounce and associate, therefore they could translate into a better embedding of the service in receiver's mind, and cause that he would be willing to follow it more thoroughly.

Table 1. List of rural tourism accommodation facilities in Poland with attributed names

No.	Voivodship	Total number of rural tourist accommodations	Number of facilities possessing names for their services	In which these using only the name „agritourism farm" (**I**) and „agritourism farm with additional element (**II**)	
				I	**II**
1.	Dolnośląskie	80	63	1	3
2.	Kujawsko-pomorskie	27	17	1	3
3.	Lubelskie	237	166	18	21
4.	Lubuskie	33	25	5	3
5.	Łódzkie	4	3	0	0
6.	Mazowieckie	66	41	0	5
7.	Małopolskie	291	143	3	6
8.	Opolskie	8	8	0	0
9.	Podkarpackie	63	34	3	4
10.	Podlaskie	111	62	3	2
11.	Pomorskie	224	175	2	15
12.	Śląskie	0	0	0	0
13.	Świętokrzyskie	10	9	0	2
14.	Warmińsko-Mazurskie	121	94	3	8
15.	Wielkopolskie	93	82	11	2
16.	Zachodniopomorskie	49	44	0	2
Total		**1417**	**966**	**50**	**76**

*promoting their services at www.agroturystyka.pl

Source: Author's own studies on the basis of data collected from : www.agroturystyka.pl (on 13.09.2014, at 18.30).

The studies revealed that the owners of tourist facilities in the country very often named them suggesting in which surroundings their guests will spend their free time. For example: "Leśna Zagroda", "Leśna kwatera", "Sosnowy młodnik", "Chata w lesie", "Domek w lesie", "Leśniczówka Paryż", "Dom wśród lasów", "Agro SPA pod laskiem", "Na skraju lasu", "Leśniczówka", "Leśniczówka pod akacją", "Leśny Dworek" or "Pod lasem" (all showing the facility location in or close to the forest) originated from the surrounding countryside. They immediately suggest that the guest will spend their holidays either in the forest or in its immediate vicinity. Other names, which capture the imagination and give some idea about the place where one may relax were among others: "Stokrotka", "Dom pod różą", "Świat Ogrodów", "Dom tulipanów", "Azalia", "W Aroniach", "Jarzębinka", "Kalinka", "Jabłonka", "Dom pod gruszą", "Złote brzozy", "Pokoje pod świerkami", "Dębina", "Dwa dęby", "Pod dębem", "Pod lipami", "Pod kasztanami", "Pod Bukiem", "Agroturystyka pod Jesionami", "Pod cisem", "Jodełka", "Akacja", "Srebrny klon" "Malinowy dworek", "Pod pachnącym groszkiem" (using names of flowers or trees). Frequently the names refer to animals and birds, such as ("Dolina Bobrów", "Myszogród", "Koziołek", "Owieczka", "Pod bocianem", Pod bocianim gniazdem", "Ptasie sioło", "Pustułka", "Uroczysko Dolina Sarenek", "Jelonek", "Trzy jaskółki na Siarce", "Żabi Raj", "Koziarnia") or provide a subjective feeling that the holidaymakers could spend their time of leisure in peace and quiet ("Agrozacisze", "Oaza", "Ostoja", "Eden", "Zacisze", "Zakątek", "Przyjemność", "Jutrzenka", "Oaza zdrowia", "Agro-Raj", "Boska Dolina", "Swojska chata", "Dolina Marzeń", "Szczęśliwa siódemka", "Zacisz u Beatki", "Dolina zapomnienia", "Z dala od zgiełku"). However, the most frequently the names of facilities were created of proper names ("U Basi", "U Kazika"), there were 57 of these registered. Offers were also presented using the name itself (27 of the surveyed). Definitely the most numerous names bearing the name of the service were registered in the Malopolskie and Pomorskie voivodships (respectively 20 and 19: considering the total number of persons who called their services with their names and those who used the term "At.."). Also new names were created out of two first elements of the owners' names (e.g. "Czester" from Czeslaw and Teresa) or using the name or surname of the owner and added "-ówka" ending ("Jaroszówka", "Ściborówka", "Zofiówka", "Błażejówka"), or even elements of both surname and first name were used ("Lubomir"). A simple way to give a name to one's business was also a surname used to call a tourist accommodation service, such as "At the Sawicki". The analysis of names of rural tourist accommodations allowed to identify a group of entities suggesting location of the facilities by a water reservoir or river ("Nad Sanem", "Gościniec nad Wkrą", "Nad Bugiem", "Raj nad Zalewem", "Kraina trzech stawów", "Agroturystyka nad jeziorem", "Za potokiem", "Za wodą").

More innovative or creative service providers invented interesting names, such as: "Trzy gwiazdy", "Dźwigajówka pod lipami", "Złota Przystań", "Podlipie", "Chata u brata", "Apisołtysówka", "U Rumcajsa", "Chatka Cyborga", "Chatka Morgana", "Dom w Kotle", "Dworek Św. Antoniego", "Ranczo Anders", "Czarny Młyn", "Chata Gburska Dom Kaszubski", "Gościnny domek", "The Green House", "Miodowy Dwór", "Bajkowy Zakątek", "Stręgielek", "Za piecem", "Kraina trzech stawów", "Cyganówka", "Wichrowe pola", "Ogród Bajek Sowa czy "Chata Wuja Toma". Usually also the prefix "agro" was added to owner's surname ("Agrosulek") or first name ("Agroela"). Some owners suggested by their names that the holidays would involve e.g. ecological elements ("PUK PUK EKO", "Ekofarm", "Ekoturist farm", "Ekowczasy", "Natura", "Końskie zdrowie", "EJKOLOGUS", "Gospodarstwo Ekoturystyczne", Eko-sen", Ekologiczne Gospodarstwo Rolne"). The others indicated that a tourist would spend his time at a working farm ("Pod pługiem") or at some household pursuing some profession (Agroturytyka "U Drwala", "U Ogrodnika") or on a farm greatly attached to its land ("Ojcowizna"). Still others suggested by the names they used that their services target a special group of tourists (e.g. families with children, fans of angling or horse riding: "Kids farm", "Pod brzozami dla rodzin z dziećmi", "Raj Wędkarza", "Łowisko Ryb", "AGRO-SZCZUPAK", "Hubertus").

The analyses showed also that the service providers often referred in their names to the region from which they come. An example may be accommodation providers from the eastern part of Poland, i.e. Podlaskie voivodship ("Dom na Krańcu Świata", "Tatarska Jurta", "Stanica Kresowa"), Lubelskie ("Czar Roztocza") or Warmińsko-Mazurskie ("Siedlisko na półwyspie"). Nice sounding names were such as "Pokój babuni", "Tęczowa Zagroda", "Domek na Zielonej", but also less fortunate examples were noticed, such as "Traktorek 4 koła – usługi ogrodnicze" (*Four-wheel tractor – gardening services*). There were also very interesting names which encouraged to have a closer look at the offer, since the name had no indication which product one may expect (e.g. "Jest takie miejsce na ziemi "-*There is such place on earth*).

Summing up the above presented contemplations on the names referring to rural tourism products it should be emphasized that the attractiveness or uniqueness are not enough for the service to be immediately successful. However, in the first place it may attract a potential guest and make him study the offer more thoroughly. The investigations have demonstrated that 207 service providers (14.6% of the total number of investigated) did not create any more sophisticated names. Of this group 21.4% used only the term "agri-tourist farm" while promoting their services, whereas 36.7 added another element, such as a name of plant, owner's name or locality, e.g.: Gospodarstwo agroturystyczne *Koniczynka*, Gospodarstwo agroturystyczne *Barbara*, Gospodarstwo agroturystyczne

Dolina Zapomnienia or some less interesting element. Respectively 6.3% and 1.9% of accommodation providers offered their services under the name of "guest room" or "agritourism accommodation". A big group was composed of persons using only their names for offered accommodation ("Marlena") (13%) or term, such as "U Baśki, "U Kazika" (27.5%) or "U Kowalskich" (3.4%).

The name, which is an element of a tourist offer image, is not easy to invent, as it should call attention and remain in the customer's mind. Enterprises which care for their market position treat the whole process of creating and promoting the name as an investment. Non-material added value created by the name often generates far greater benefits than investments. While creating a name one should not disregard single elements, such as its vibrancy, catchiness or emphasis (http://www.codes.pl/...). It is difficult to determine whether the choice of names by accommodation providers is right or not, whether while placing their service offer on the portal they were not influenced by the names of other service providers. It was noticed that words, such as forest or valley, or first and last names of the owners appeared frequently. In many cases identical terms were encountered, which may indicate that their author did not follow similar offers in the web. However, an important aspect is an attempt made by persons conducting tourist activities to create new terminology, which would allow to distinguish their product on the competitive market.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The names for rural tourist accommodation facilities should be treated critically. To potential guests a simple name may be the element which would attract their attention, whereas too complicated may discourage and cause a lack of interest in the offer.
2. Analysis of the terminology used by service providers who want to set certain tone for their services revealed that the most common expressions referred to the surrounding nature, conducted agritourist activities or emphasizing in the first place their first and last names in various approaches.
3. Total of 68.1% of the owners who used a name for the product they offered obviously did not use the professional services of firms engaged in creating a marketing image. However, must be emphasized that a large group of persons took the challenge to promote and create their services on the market more efficiently.

REFERENCES

Cichowska J. (2014). Wstępna analiza potencjału agroturystycznego w województwie kujawsko – pomorskim, Infrastruktura i Ekologia Terenów Wiejskich Nr1/2014, Polska Akademia Nauk, Oddział w Krakowie, s.11-12.

Majewski J., Lane B. (2003). Turystka wiejska i rozwój lokalny, Fundacja Edukacja dla Demokracji, Warszawa, s. 200.

Malewicz – Pełczyńska A. (2007). System identyfikacji wizualnej jako element komunikacji marketingowej [w:] Metody i narzędzia komunikacji marketingowej, Zeszyty Naukowe Gnieźnieńskiej Wyższej Szkoły Humanistyczno-Menadżerskiej "Milenium", Zarządzanie i Marketing Nr 1, s. 23, 26.

Pawłowska – Mielech J., Bocek D. (2006). Rola i znaczenie Internetu w komunikacji społecznej, Zeszyty Naukowe 2, Świętokrzyskie Centrum Edukacji na Odległość, s. 53.

http://www.codes.pl/jak-wymyslic-dobra-nazwe/ (11.10.2014, godz. 14.00).

http://www.polskieradio.pl/42/3146/Artykul/1222727,Biznes-turystyczny-nie-istnieje-bez-Internetu (11.10.2014, godz. 14.00).

Dr Jolanta Cichowska
University of Technology and Life Sciences in Bydgoszcz
Department of Development and Protection of the Environmnet
Ul. Sucha 9, 85-798 Bydgoszcz, tel. 52-340 8440
Jolanta.cichowska@utp.edu.pl