
Czesław Adamiak

PhD

Researcher

University of Eastern Finland, Centre for Tourism Studies

Segmenting second home tourists in Finland to better explain their mobility and behaviour

The study presents the segmentation of second home users in Finland based on the values they link with their second home use. Four major segments are identified: passive cottagers, active cottagers, family cottagers and consumer cottagers. Segments are consequently compared in terms of socio-demographic background, characteristics and use of second homes, and plans for their future use. All categories of second home users except from passive cottagers should be attracted as economically beneficial for local communities. The number of passive and consumer cottagers is expected to increase in fastest pace during the next years.

Keywords: second homes, segmentation, Finland

Czesław Adamiak

PhD

Researcher

University of Eastern Finland

Centre for Tourism Studies

Department of Spatial Management and Tourism, Nicolaus Copernicus University

ul. Lwowska 1, 87-100 Toruń, Poland

Email: czeslaw.adamiak@umk.pl

Czesław Adamiak is a teaching assistant at the Department of Spatial Management and Tourism, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń (Poland). Before that, he worked as a researcher in the Centre of Tourism Research, University of Eastern Finland. His research interests focus on various impacts of second home tourism, as well as the application of statistical and GIS research methods.

Introduction

Visits to second homes form an important part of tourism mobility in many European countries and second home users constitute a significant seasonal population of rural areas. They use local services, interact with local communities, consume and influence landscape and environment (Hall & Müller, 2004; Roca, 2013). Managing second homes to use them as a development tool and mitigate their negative impacts is therefore a significant challenge for local governance (Hall, 2015). An important requirement for effective second homes governance is good knowledge of the motives and practices of second home users.

Many researchers focus on second home users' motives and values associated with second home use (Jaakson, 1986; Kaltenborn, 1998; Hall & Müller, 2004). Yet, they usually view second home users as a single group, not acknowledging its internal variety. In tourism research market segmentation procedures are often employed in order to distinguish homogenous subgroups of tourist/customers and hence target them with better tailored marketing instruments (Dolnicar, 2002; Pesonen, 2012). The use of segmentation technique for second home users can help to better understand different impacts that second homes produce and adjust management tools in local policy.

The study is based in Finland, a country where second homes form a particularly important part of national leisure culture, mobility patterns and rural landscape. Most of them are purpose-built cottages (*mökki*) located in natural environments. There were over 500,000 second homes in Finland in 2014 (Statistics Finland, 2015) and they belonged to the most popular forms of tourist accommodation (Adamiak et al., 2015). Although second homes are a long established phenomenon in Finland, they are also subject to dynamic processes induced by demographic, economic, political and technological transformations. Geographical location, social composition of owners, patterns of use, and cultural significance of second homes are constantly evolving and diversifying (Pitkänen & Vepsäläinen, 2008; Hiltunen, Pitkänen, Vepsäläinen, & Hall, 2013). It is therefore increasingly important to understand this diversity and segmentation approach may provide better insight into these changes, and help to predict future dynamics.

The study presents the segmentation of second home users in Finland based on the values they link with their second home use. Segments are consequently compared in terms of socio-demographic background, characteristics of use of second homes, and plans for their future use. The empirical analysis will be presented after a review of previous literature on values and motives of second home use, and segmentation of second home users.

Literature review

Motives of second home use

Second homes are valued as a place for leisure, investment, and satisfying a range of psychological needs related to nature consumption, continuity, identity, creativity and family life (Jaakson, 1986; Kaltenborn, 1998; Chaplin, 1999; Quinn, 2004). In general the motives and values of second home use can be systematized into three groups: leisure, identity-family, and pragmatic.

Second homes provide a place of leisure and detachment from work-related duties, urban environment and everyday rush, stress and ubiquity of technology (Kaltenborn, 1998; Quinn, 2004). Owning a second home facilitates performing nature-based recreational activities, of which appreciative activities like walking, cycling or swimming are usually more important than consumptive ones, such as hunting, off-road motorcycling or motorboating (Pitkänen, Adamiak, & Halseth, 2014). Passive relaxation in and around house is equally important as nature-based activities, and the value of stay at second home is not

only related to the change of place, but also time pattern into a more relaxed one (Jaakson, 1986). Also work at second home: renovation and maintenance of the house or garden work, is appreciated as leisure due to its contrast from professional work (Jaakson, 1986; Chaplin, 1999).

Second homes are also appreciated for their role in building self-identity and maintaining family and other social relationships. In contrast to other tourists, second homes owners are not only looking for novelty, but also continuity (Cohen, 1974). Equally to the change from everyday environment, they appreciate the feel of security and attachment to second home environment. In many cases, a stronger emotional relation links the owners with second homes than with their permanent residences (Kaltenborn, 1998).

Also various pragmatic motives affect the ownership of second homes. Second homes can be treated as an investment. They are sometimes rented out as an additional form of use, which is most common in tourist resorts (Komppula, Reijonen, & Timonen, 2008). Second homes may also become a permanent residence after a time, usually after the retirement of their owners, if the second home is located in a suitable suburban location (Müller & Marjavaara, 2012).

In tourism motivations research, the reasons for travels are often measured as push (internal motivations) and pull (the attractiveness of destination) forces (Chen & Chen, 2015; Pesonen, 2012). However, second home users' relationship with their second homes and their locations is usually more complex, as they are often bound by their property ownership, inheritance or family relations.

Segmenting second home users

Market segmentation is a procedure of dividing a heterogeneous population of customers (tourists) into smaller and more homogenous groups in order to better adjust marketing and management tools to the market. It is widely used in tourist research and management (Dolnicar, 2002; Park & Yoon, 2009; Pesonen, 2012; Chen & Chen, 2015). Segmentation is usually performed based on demographic, geographic, psychographic or behavioral criteria, or a combination of these groups (Tkaczynski, Rundle-Thiele, & Beaumont, 2009). Two basic approaches to the procedure of segmentation are: conceptual (*a priori*), where grouping criteria expected to differentiate the market are decided in advance, and data-driven (*a posteriori*), where segments are identified based on patterns of responses obtained from the customers (Dolnicar, 2002). In data-driven segmentation usually psychographic criteria – travel motivations – are used (Park & Yoon, 2009; Pesonen, 2012). They are typically measured by series of questions with scaled responses (e.g. Likert scale) and the resulting statistical datasets are processed with dimension reduction and clustering statistical techniques.

The internal diversity of second home groups in terms of their psychographic and behavioral features has been noted in second home studies, but usually only described qualitatively. For example, Svenson (2004) defined four “ideal types” of cottagers based on interviews with second home owners from Toronto: “the cottagers”, “the suburbanites”, “the wanderers”, and “the homecomers”. In Denmark, Haldrup (2004) distinguished three styles of vacationing in second home: “inhabiting”, “navigating” and “drifting”. Huijbens (2012) identified two types of second home owners in Iceland based on their relation to the local community: “homesick locals” and “lifestyle locals”.

Quantitative studies rarely divide second home users into subgroups to analyse differences in attitudes and behaviours. More often second home users, as a whole, are compared with permanent residents (McIntyre & Pavlovich, 2006; Stedman, 2006) or with tourists which use commercial accommodation (Mottiar, 2006). Infrequent quantitative studies looking at internal variability of second home users group, usually employ *a priori*

division based on intensity of its use (amount of time spent at second home): Sievänen, Pouta, & Neuvonen (2007), and Pitkänen et al. (2014), showed that second home owners' groups divided in such way differ between each other in terms of socio-demographic background, leisure activities performed in second home area, and therefore potential use of local services.

Data and methods

The study segments second home users in Finland in a data-driven way, based on psychographic characteristics. Instead of travel motives, which are usually used in tourist segmentation (Park & Yoon, 2009; Pesonen, 2012), the segmentation procedure is based on values ascribed to second homes. Such broader approach helps to acknowledge that the use of second homes is not only a result of preferences of the users, but also other factors such as property ownership, inheritance or family relations. After defining segments, they are characterized and compared in terms of socio-demographic composition, and characteristics of the second home (location, technical standard) and their use (time patterns, use of services, and plans for future use).

The analysis is based on the data from a mail survey targeted to a random sample of 4000 Finnish inhabitants aged 15–85 in 2012. A total of 1189 questionnaires was returned (response rate 29.7%), and 565 cases of those respondents who used second homes and provided full answers to essential questions were included in the analysis. 62% of these respondents owned a second home, the remaining part were those who had access to a second home owned by members of their family, or, less frequently, used a long-term rented second home. Also, 30% of the effective sample had access to at least two second homes. In their case, the questions used in the analysis regarded the most frequently used second home.

To measure the values that second home users assign to their second homes, respondents were asked to evaluate the importance of thirty value items referring to various aspects of second home, its environment (including physical environment, features of the house and its location), social and family relations, recreation opportunities and possibility to engage in leisure activities (Table 1). Respondents evaluated the importance of each item on a 5-item Likert scale from 1 – “not at all important” to 5 – “very important”. In order to extract only the effect of structures of values assigned to second homes by their users (indicated by differences within sets of answers of individual respondents), and to eliminate the effect of overall personal importance of second home ownership and use (indicated by differences in individual respondents' average answers to all 30 value questions asked), as well as bias of different points of reference to answer the questions, the data matrix was transposed and item values were standardized among answers to 30 questions within each case (respondent).

To distinguish the homogenous groups in terms of structures of values, a non-hierarchical k-means clustering method was used, based on the matrix of 30 answers standardized within cases. The choice of segmentation procedure was based on previous tourism segmentation studies conducted on large samples (Dolnicar, 2002). After testing various solutions with different numbers of clusters, a four-cluster solution was selected in a subjective way, based on the interpretability of the results. After assigning cases to clusters, the socio-demographic structure of each cluster was described using contingency tables and chi-square tests (Table 2). Consequently, the characteristics of second homes and their uses by members of each cluster were compared with the use of contingency tables and analysis of variance (Table 3). In the latter part of analysis, not all cases were always taken into account, due to missing answers. IBM SPSS 21 software was employed in the statistical analysis.

Results

Values of second home use

Thirty values of second home use enumerated in the questionnaire include those related to the area where second home is located, a second home itself, ways of spending time at second home, activities, social and family contacts performed there (Table 1). The most important values for all respondents are these related to the stay at the second home as a contrast to everyday life (“I can let go of my everyday routines”, “I can enjoy slower pace of life”) and stay in the natural and relaxed environment (“I can spend time in the wild”, “I can enjoy the silence”). Among specific activities that can be undertaken in the second home environment, the most important are these with no serious impact on the natural environment (exercising and refreshing oneself outdoors, picking berries and mushrooms, fishing, growing food). Social values of second homes as the possibility to spend time with family, relatives and friends, are moderately important to respondents, and their significance varies between cases of different demographic situations. In the middle range of overall importance, there is also a group of values that refer to the contact with nature and simplicity of life at the second home (“I can enjoy the modest way of life”, “Living takes place on nature’s terms”, “There is valuable natural environment or species in the area”), while lower importance is assigned to the values that refer to the high standard, utility of the second home and its suitable location.

Segmentation

Four clusters of second home users were distinguished, based on differences in structure of importance of various values ascribed to second homes: (I) consumer cottagers, (II) passive cottagers, (III) family cottagers and (IV) active cottagers (Table 1).

Table 1. Mean answers for value questions and cluster centres

Item	Mean	I	II	III	IV
		Passive cottagers	Active cottagers	Family cottagers	Consumer cottagers
I can let go of my everyday routines	4.52	4.72	4.56	4.20	4.34
I feel safe	4.52	4.44	4.63	4.50	4.58
I can spend time in the wild	4.52	4.64	4.72	4.18	4.19
I can enjoy the silence	4.49	4.73	4.52	4.10	4.31
I can spend time with relatives	4.35	4.41	4.28	4.53	4.00
I can enjoy slower pace of life	4.35	4.60	4.33	4.06	4.03
Living doesn’t burden the environment	3.97	4.11	4.28	3.44	3.72
There are good opportunities to exercise and refresh oneself outdoors in the area	3.89	3.63	4.12	3.89	4.30
I can pick berries or mushrooms	3.89	3.90	4.45	3.68	2.96
The area is child friendly	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.25	3.54
I can enjoy modest way of life	3.79	4.38	3.92	2.83	3.12
Buildings and yards are well taken care of	3.74	3.36	4.02	4.05	3.90
Living takes place on nature's terms	3.66	3.87	4.10	2.82	3.38
The area has a good image	3.66	3.16	4.12	3.92	3.85
I can spend time with my friends	3.40	3.33	3.50	3.50	3.22
I can fish and hunt	3.34	3.20	4.34	3.07	1.99
I can spend time with my family	3.30	3.44	3.17	3.76	2.36
I can get disengaged from machines and devices	3.26	3.90	3.38	2.21	2.57

Pets enjoy being there	3.23	3.13	3.62	3.26	2.62
I can spend time/be alone	3.01	3.42	2.68	2.57	3.15
The location is connected to my descent	2.75	3.27	1.60	3.72	2.05
Standard of equipment is high	2.75	2.00	2.74	3.53	3.99
There is a valuable natural environment or species in the area	2.72	2.68	3.01	2.36	2.78
The transport connections are good	2.69	2.37	2.82	2.67	3.49
I can grow food by myself (e.g. vegetable garden berry bushes)	2.67	2.69	2.98	2.84	1.58
Big size of the dwelling	2.43	2.04	2.39	2.86	3.12
Services and leisure facilities are close	2.42	1.79	2.81	2.30	3.85
I can meet neighbours	2.35	2.22	2.42	2.75	1.95
Workplace or study place is close	1.55	1.39	1.70	1.62	1.61
I can use paid upkeep services (e.g. cleaning, maintenance)	1.46	1.27	1.44	1.46	2.16
N	565	228	155	115	67

In bold: values more than 0.15 higher than means.

Passive cottagers are the most numerous category (228 cases, 40% of all). Members of this segment are characterised by the structure of values similar to that of the total sample. They put however much more pressure on aspects of second homes related to the contrast to everyday environment and lifestyle: silence, solitude and presence of nature (“I can spend time/be alone”, “I can enjoy modest way of life”, “I can get disengaged from machines and devices”, “I can enjoy the silence”, “Living takes place on nature’s term”). They prefer to spend time passively in nature than to use the natural environment for active leisure. They are often related to the location of the second home by their descent. They pay little attention to the technical standard of second home, its location and equipment with services (“Standard of equipment is high”, “Big size of the dwelling”, “Services and leisure facilities are close”).

The second group, active cottagers, is less numerous (155 cases, 27% of the total). The members of this group do not pay so much attention to the contrast to everyday life and environment. They ascribe relatively high values to the possibility to perform productive nature-based activities: fishing and hunting, picking berries and mushrooms, and growing food by oneself. They also value the good image of the area, the availability of services and leisure facilities, and the good environment for pets. On the other hand, compared with other groups, they see the family-related values as relatively unimportant.

The third group, family cottagers, comprises 115 cases (20% of the total). They are more distinctive from the whole sample than the two previous segments. They assign much importance to values related to family and other social contacts, experience and suitability for children (“The location is connected to my descent”, “I can spend time with my family”, “I can meet neighbours”, “The area is child friendly”). They ascribe high values to the standard

of second home (size, standard of equipment, technical shape), and low values to the contrast from urbanised environment (enjoying modest life, disengagement from machines and devices, living on nature's terms), which situates the family cottagers in opposition to the passive users.

The last group of consumer cottagers is the least numerous one (67 cases, 12% of the total), and the most distinct one with regards to the characteristics of the whole sample. Consumer cottagers pay high attention to commodity and high standard of the second home ("Standard of equipment is high", "Big size of the dwelling", "I can use paid upkeep services"), to a suitable location and the environment in terms of leisure opportunities ("The transport connections are good", "Services and leisure facilities are close", "There are good opportunities to exercise and refresh oneself outdoors in the area"). They ascribe relatively low importance to the qualities characteristic for all other groups: family-related values (important for the family cottagers), the simplicity of second home life in natural environment (passive cottagers), and particularly the opportunity to perform productive nature-based activities (typical for the active cottagers).

Socio-demographic characteristics of the segments

Four segments of second home users differ from each other in their socio-demographic backgrounds (age, gender, education, socioeconomic position and place of residence) and ownership of second home (non-owner, owner who inherited a second home and other owner). Household size and income do not differ significantly between segments (Table 2).

Compared to the average of all respondents, passive cottagers are predominantly female, relatively young and well educated, often living in the Helsinki urban area. They frequently do not own second homes by themselves, but use ones belonging e.g. to their parents (47.4% non-owners among passive cottagers compared with 37.5% in the whole sample). If they own second homes, they are frequently inherited properties, which explains the high proportion of those who have used second homes for a long time.

Table 2. Socio-demographic characteristics of second home users segments

Item	Mean	I Passive cottagers	II Active cottagers	III Family cottagers	IV Consumer cottagers
Age of respondent					
15–44 years	32.1%	39.9%	17.5%	34.8%	34.3%
45–64 years	42.6%	40.8%	48.1%	40.9%	38.8%
65–85 years	25.4%	19.3%	34.4%	24.3%	26.9%
Dif. sig.	0.000				
Gender of respondent					
male	44.6%	38.2%	52.9%	46.1%	44.8%
female	55.4%	61.8%	47.1%	53.9%	55.2%
Dif. sig.	0.041				
Number of household members					
one or two	71.3%	73.2%	74.8%	62.6%	71.6%
three or more	28.7%	26.8%	25.2%	37.4%	28.4%
Dif. sig.	0.132				
Level of education of respondent					
elementary or vocational	35.0%	30.7%	49.0%	34.8%	17.9%
secondary	32.2%	28.1%	33.5%	33.0%	41.8%
university	32.7%	41.2%	17.4%	32.2%	40.3%
Dif. sig.	0.000				
Socioeconomic position of respondent					
entrepreneur or upper level employee	23.9%	24.6%	18.7%	27.0%	28.4%
lower level employee or manual worker	32.4%	34.6%	36.1%	29.6%	20.9%
pensioner	30.4%	25.0%	38.7%	29.6%	31.3%
student, unemployed, stay at home, other	13.3%	15.8%	6.5%	13.9%	19.4%
Dif. sig.	0.012				
Annual household income					
less than 40 000 €	33.5%	35.5%	34.8%	31.3%	26.9%
40 000–69 999 €	38.9%	38.6%	41.9%	38.3%	34.3%
70 000 € and more	27.6%	25.9%	23.2%	30.4%	38.8%
Dif. sig.	0.335				
Place of residence					
outside Helsinki urban area	74.3%	68.4%	83.9%	76.5%	68.7%
Helsinki urban area	25.7%	31.6%	16.1%	23.5%	31.3%
Dif. sig.	0.005				
Ownership of second home					
non-owner	37.5%	47.4%	25.8%	34.8%	35.8%
owner of not inherited second home	45.3%	32.0%	66.5%	39.1%	52.2%
owner of inherited second home	17.2%	20.6%	7.7%	26.1%	11.1%
Dif. sig.	0.000				
Length of use of second home					
4th quarter (31–67 years)	23.9%	25.9%	23.2%	27.8%	11.9%
3rd quarter (20–30 years)	25.7%	33.3%	16.8%	25.2%	20.9%
2nd quarter (9–19 years)	24.6%	20.6%	29.0%	27.0%	23.9%
1st quarter (0–8 years)	25.8%	20.2%	31.0%	20.0%	43.3%
Dif. sig.	0.000				

In bold: values higher than means.

The characteristics of active cottagers are in many regards opposite to that of passive cottagers. They are relatively old, and therefore there is the highest proportion of pensioners among them (38.7%), and the lowest average education level. They are also more frequently males, and relatively rarely live in Helsinki. They are most commonly first owners of their second homes, which they acquired by themselves (66.5% compared with 45.3% in total), and because of that, they have been using their second homes for relatively short time.

Family cottagers differ from other groups by high average household size (37.4% are families with three or more members, compared with 28.7% in total) and they are relatively often owners of inherited second homes (26.1% compared with 17.2% in total).

Consumer cottagers are well educated, have relatively high incomes, and often live in Helsinki. Their most distinctive characteristic is the history of second home ownership. They have usually acquired a second home (52.2%), rarely inherited it (11.1%), and they have used it for a short time: 43.3% for not more than 8 years (the lowest quartile of the total sample), and only 11.9% for more than 30 years (the highest quartile of the total sample).

Second home characteristics and use

Table 3 presents the characteristics of second homes and their use by members of the four segments. Most Finnish second homes are located at coasts and island, and in scattered rural settlements. Second homes used by consumer cottagers are relatively frequently located in resorts or vacation cottage areas, or in towns or villages. There is a clear difference in size and level of equipment of second homes between the segments. Passive and active cottagers have smaller (less than 60 m² on average) and more austere properties (a quarter of them is not connected to the electricity grid), while family and consumer cottagers' second homes are bigger (more than 80 m² on average), better equipped and in their majority adjusted for year-round use.

Table 3. Characteristics and use of second homes by second home users segments

Item	Mean	I Passive cottagers	II Active cottagers	III Family cottagers	IV Consumer cottagers
Location of second home in natural environment:					
island	20.0%	25.2%	17.8%	17.0%	12.5%
shore (not island)	55.4%	50.0%	63.8%	54.5%	56.3%
forest (not island or shore)	19.1%	20.4%	15.1%	22.3%	18.8%
other	5.4%	4.4%	3.3%	6.3%	12.5%
Dif. sig.	0.028				
N	554				
Location of second home in built environment:					
town or village	18.6%	12.9%	17.8%	25.0%	29.2%
resort or vacation cottage area	16.1%	12.0%	17.1%	10.7%	36.9%
scattered rural settlement	65.3%	75.1%	65.1%	64.3%	33.8%
Dif. sig.	0.000				
N	554				
Level of equipment of second home:					
no grid electricity	20.0%	27.9%	21.1%	12.5%	3.1%
grid electricity, no dishwasher	60.7%	65.0%	67.8%	50.0%	47.7%
dishwasher	19.3%	7.1%	11.2%	37.5%	49.2%
Dif. sig.	0.000				
N	555				
Winterisation of second home:					
yes	54.9%	40.7%	50.0%	72.6%	84.6%
no	45.1%	59.3%	50.0%	27.4%	15.4%
Dif. sig.	0.000				
N	556				
Size of living area of second home (m ²)	65.9	58.7	54.2	87.0	83.2
Dif. sig.	0.000				
N	528				
Distance to second home (km)	154	164	103	137	278
Dif. sig.	0.000				
N	537				
Number of visits per year	25.2	20.7	34.3	28.5	15.2
Dif. sig.	0.000				
N	509				
Number of nights per year	43.2	31.2	55.9	50.9	44.0
Dif. sig.	0.000				
N	509				
Percent of visits in summer (VI –VIII)	54.4	62.4	49.5	52.9	40.0
Dif. sig.	0.000				
N	509				
Importance of services (scale of 15 items)	2.30	2.13	2.21	2.39	2.91
Dif. sig.	0.000				
N	516				
Plans to use second home in 5–10 years:					
move permanently	2.6%	2.3%	4.0%	1.8%	1.6%
use more often	20.4%	20.5%	22.1%	18.2%	19.7%
use the same as now	60.7%	64.1%	53.0%	65.5%	59.0%
use less often	7.4%	8.2%	6.7%	10.0%	1.6%
give up	1.7%	0.5%	2.7%	0.9%	4.9%
don't know	7.2%	4.5%	11.4%	3.6%	13.1%
Dif. sig.	0.034				
N	540				

In bold: values higher than means.

The distance from the respective permanent residence to the second home is on average close to 150 km. Properties used by passive, and particularly consumer cottagers, are located further away from permanent dwellings than in the case of two other groups. This affects the frequency of their visits: active and family cottagers visit their second homes more often than others. Yet, consumer cottagers compensate infrequent visits with longer stays. In the end, passive cottagers use their second homes less intensively than any other group. In their case the seasonal variability of the use is also most noticeable.

Although the use of services and local expenditures of second home users was not measured directly in the survey, the consumption activity can be approximated based on the questions about the perception of the importance of 16 various services in the locality of second home (grocery stores; special stores; building, maintenance, and renovation services; health care; fire and rescue services; theatres, concerts, cinema, and exhibitions; local events; restaurants; wellness services; tourism services; sport facilities; libraries; public transport; services of the church; internet connection; buying food from local farmers). Answers to these questions created a highly reliable scale (Cronbach Alpha=0.873 after removing one item: internet connection). Respondents ascribed low values to most of the services (average 2.30 on 1–5 scale), yet the differences between four segments are noticeable: for consumer cottagers local services are most important (2.91), while passive and active cottagers expressed lowest interest in the availability of these services.

There are also differences between the segments concerning plans for the future use of second homes. In general, the majority of respondents is planning to use their second homes in the same way as now (61%), or more often (20%); 9% intend to use them less often or give it up, while 3% want to move to their second homes permanently. The intention of more frequent visits or a permanent move is most common among active cottagers, and plans of less frequent visits are most common among family and passive cottagers. Consumer and active cottagers were the most common not to have any decisive plans on how to use their second homes in the future (over 11% in each group).

Discussion and conclusions

The study has found four major segments of second home users in Finland based on the valuation of their second home use: passive cottagers, active cottagers, family cottagers and consumer cottagers. Passive cottagers are the most numerous group (40%), they appreciate second homes as a place to relax and spending time in natural environment. They

are typically young people who visit cottages owned by their parents, they do have a long experience with second homes, but nowadays use them relatively infrequently. For active cottagers (27%), second homes are important to them, enabling them to engage in nature-based activities such as fishing, berry picking and gardening. They are typically older males, pensioners or lower level workers, from outside Helsinki. Usually they have bought their second homes and use them frequently. Family cottagers (20%) appreciate their second home as a place to keep family together. They are typically families having inherited their second home. Compared with the first two groups, their second homes are bigger and better equipped. Consumer cottagers are the least numerous segment (12%). For them, the high technical standard, accessibility and availability of leisure services are relatively important aspects of a second home. They are usually affluent, well-educated, and have bought their second homes quite recently. Their cottages have high technical standard and are more often located in clustered settlements (resort, cottage area, town or village) than scattered ones, as in the case of second homes belonging to respondents from other segments. The consumer cottagers are also most willing to use local services.

The paper complements previous studies, which pointed at the key topics in contemporary transformations of Finnish second home culture: an improving technical standard of second homes and associated extended use evolving towards dual dwelling, changes in their distribution with new concentrations in amenity-rich areas, and internationalization (Pitkänen & Vepsäläinen, 2008, Hiltunen et al., 2013). Consumer cottagers can be most identified with the trend towards upscale well-equipped properties in amenity-rich tourist centres, which is in contrast to the traditional image of simple cottages in the natural environment (Tuulentie, 2007; Pitkänen & Vepsäläinen, 2008). The trend of improving the standard of second homes is noticeable in the case of family cottagers as well, while houses of passive and active cottagers have more traditional forms, though the two groups differ in how they use their second homes. Family and active cottagers extend their stays in second homes, thus reflecting the dual residence trend, though they rarely consider moving to their second homes permanently. The internationalization tendency has not been noticed in the current analysis, due to the small absolute scale of this phenomenon.

The results of the study bring certain practical implications for predicting second homes future and targeting second home policy. The group of passive cottagers is the most numerous one and can be expected to grow in the future as a result of inheriting homes by children of current owners. Consumer cottagers should be another developing segment through purchases of new houses, while the two remaining groups will grow slower. The

composition and dynamics of segments vary spatially: in particular, consumer cottagers are most common in new second home developments, e.g. in ski resorts, while other groups are present in traditional cottage areas. Members of different segments exert different economic, social and environmental impacts on the host areas and therefore require to employ different policies regarding promotion of second homes and their management.

Consumer cottagers are the most active consumers of local services while passive cottagers are the least active ones. Consumer and family cottagers have the biggest, well equipped houses, so their expenditures on their maintenance and construction should be the highest. Hence, from the perspective of local economy, consumer cottagers are the best target, followed by family and active cottagers. However, attracting consumer cottagers requires satisfying their high expectations regarding the standard of houses, accessibility and availability of leisure facilities and services. On the other hand, consumer cottagers are likely to be less involved in local communities than family and passive cottagers (with longest experience of visiting the area) and active cottagers (who visits the area most frequently and have highest preference for extending stays in the area or moving there permanently). Long-term community involvement of second home users is important for local sustainable development. It is difficult to evaluate and compare the environmental impacts caused by members of different segments of second home users. Active cottagers should cause lowest overall environmental impacts due to the relatively small size of their houses and their modest technical equipment. Consumer cottagers are on the other extreme. Yet, clustered location of many of their houses in villages and resorts make it easier to manage the impacts.

The possible limitations of this study are related to the method of data acquisition, and the specifics of the Finnish case. In the present study, individuals were used as the unit of analysis, while in most cases families are the agents of decisions on second home ownership and use, and their internal structures and dynamics should be taken into account. Particularly with young people who use their parents' second homes, or have inherited them, the notions of values and motives of second home use should be carefully reconsidered, as instead of taking free decision on the ownership and use of second home they are often bound by ambivalently valued family heritage (Flemsæter, 2009). Also, the personal importance of second homes cannot be fully understood without referring to one's primary home, as two dwellings complement each other in satisfying one's leisure needs (Quinn, 2004; Perkins & Thorns, 2006). The possibilities of international generalization of the study results are limited by the specifics of second homes in Finland as a popular and egalitarian phenomenon rooted in national culture. Even the gathering of comparable data in other countries can be difficult

or impossible due to low frequency of second home use in population and lack of registries and statistical data about second home users.

Acknowledgements

The study was supported by the Academy of Finland (SA 255424).

References

- Adamiak, C., Vepsäläinen, M., Strandell, A., Hiltunen, M., Pitkänen, K., Hall, M., Rinne, J., Hannonen, O., Paloniemi, R., Åkerlund, U. (2015). *Second home tourism in Finland – Perceptions of citizens and municipalities on the state and development of second home tourism*. Reports of the Finnish Environment Institute 22en/2015. Helsinki: Finnish Environment Institute. Retrieved from <https://helda.helsinki.fi/handle/10138/155090>
- Chaplin, D. (1999). Consuming work/productive leisure: the consumption patterns of second home environments. *Leisure Studies*, 18(1), 41–55. doi:10.1080/026143699375041
- Chen, L., & Chen, W. (2015). Push-pull factors in international birders' travel. *Tourism Management*, 48, 416–425. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2014.12.011
- Cohen, E. (1974). Who is a tourist? A conceptual clarification. *Sociological Review*, 22(4), 527–555. doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.1974.tb00507.x
- Dolnicar, S. (2002). A Review of Data-Driven Market Segmentation in Tourism. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 12, 1–22. doi:10.1300/J073v12n01_01
- Flemsæter, F. (2009). From “Home” to “Second Home”: Emotional Dilemmas in Norwegian Smallholdings. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 9(4), 406–423. doi:10.1080/15022250903374455
- Haldrup, M. (2004). Laid-Back Mobilities: Second-Home Holidays in Time and Space. *Tourism Geographies*, 6(4), 434–454. doi:10.1080/1461668042000280228
- Hall, C. M. (2015). Second homes planning, policy and governance. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 7(1), 1–14. doi:10.1080/19407963.2014.964251
- Hall, C. M., & Müller, D. (Eds.). (2004). *Tourism, mobility and second homes: Between elite landscape and common ground*. Clevedon: Channel View.
- Hiltunen, M. J., Pitkänen, K., Vepsäläinen, M., & Hall, C. M. (2013). Second home tourism in Finland – current trends and ecosocial impacts. In Z. Roca (Ed.), *Second homes in Europe: Lifestyle issues to policy issues* (pp. 165–199). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Huijbens, E. H. (2012). Sustaining a Village's Social Fabric? *Sociologia Ruralis*, 52(3), 332–352. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9523.2012.00565.x
- Jaakson, R. (1986). Second-home domestic tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13(3), 367–391. doi:10.1016/0160-7383(86)90026-5

- Kaltenborn, B. P. (1998). The alternate homes - motives of recreation home use. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift – Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 52(3), 121–134. doi:10.1080/00291959808552393
- Komppula, R., Reijonen, H., & Timonen, T. (2008). Vacation home owner's willingness to lease through an intermediary – A case study of two Finnish ski resorts. In P. Keller & T. Bieger (Eds.), *Real Estate and Destination Development in Tourism. Successful Strategies and Instruments* (Vol. 3, pp. 285–300). Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.
- McIntyre, N., Pavlovich, K. (2006). Changing Places: Amenity Coastal Communities in Transition. In N. McIntyre, D. Williams, & K. McHugh (Eds.), *Multiple Dwelling and Tourism: Negotiating Place, Home and Identity* (pp. 239–261). Wallingford: CABI.
- Mottiar, Z. (2006). Holiday Home Owners, a Route to Sustainable Tourism Development? An Economic Analysis of Tourist Expenditure Data. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14(6), 582–599. doi:10.2167/jost585.0
- Müller, D. K., & Marjavaara, R. (2012). From Second Home To Primary Residence: Migration Towards Recreational Properties in Sweden 1991-2005. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie*, 103(1), 53–68. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9663.2011.00674.x
- Park, D. B., & Yoon, Y. S. (2009). Segmentation by motivation in rural tourism: A Korean case study. *Tourism Management*, 30(1), 99–108. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2008.03.011
- Perkins, C. H., Thorns, D. C. (2006). Home Away from Home: the Primary/Second-home Relationship. In N. McIntyre, D. Williams, & K. McHugh (Eds.), *Multiple Dwelling and Tourism: Negotiating Place, Home and Identity* (pp. 67–81). Wallingford: CABI.
- Pesonen, J. A. (2012). Segmentation of rural tourists: combining push and pull motivations. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 18(1), 69–82.
- Pitkänen, K., Adamiak, C., & Halseth, G. (2014). Leisure Activities and Rural Community Change: Valuation and Use of Rural Space among Permanent Residents and Second Home Owners. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 54(2), 143–166. doi:10.1111/soru.12023
- Pitkänen, K., & Vepsäläinen, M. (2008). Foreseeing the Future of Second Home Tourism. The Case of Finnish Media and Policy Discourse. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 8(1), 1–24. doi:10.1080/15022250701880729
- Quinn, B. (2004). Dwelling Through Multiple Places: A Case Study of Second Home Ownership in Ireland. In C. M. Hall & D. K. Müller (Eds.), *Tourism, Mobility and Second Homes: between elite landscape and common ground* (pp. 113–130). Clevedon: Channel View.
- Roca, Z. (Ed.). (2013). *Second homes in Europe: Lifestyle issues to policy issues*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Sievänen, T., Pouta, E., & Neuvonen, M. (2007). Recreational Home Users - Potential Clients for Countryside Tourism? *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 7(3), 223–242. doi:10.1080/15022250701300207

Stedman, R. C. (2006). Places of Escape: Second-home Meanings in Northern Wisconsin, USA. In N. McIntyre, D. Williams, & K. McHugh (Eds.), *Multiple Dwelling and Tourism: Negotiating Place, Home and Identity* (pp. 129–144). Wallingford: CABI.

Statistics Finland. (2015). *Buildings and Free-time Residences 2014*. Helsinki: Statistics Finland. Retrieved from http://www.stat.fi/til/rakke/2014/rakke_2014_2015-05-28_en.pdf

Svenson, S. (2004). The Cottage and the City: An Interpretation of the Canadian Second Home Experience. In C. M. Hall & D. K. Müller (Eds.), *Tourism, Mobility and Second Homes: between elite landscape and common ground* (pp. 55–74). Clevedon: Channel View.

Tkaczynski, A., Rundle-Thiele, S. R., & Beaumont, N. (2009). Segmentation: A tourism stakeholder view. *Tourism Management*, 30(2), 169–175. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2008.05.010

Tuulentie, S. (2007). Settled Tourists: Second Homes as a Part of Tourist Life Stories. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 7(3), 281–300. doi:10.1080/15022250701300249