

Erika Quendler*, Carla Barbieri, Kumar Bhatta, Lisa Chase, Allison Clark, Keleigh Cormier, Jean D'Amour Maniragaba, Shpresim Domi, Marisa Eslao-Pamo, Claudia Gil Arroyo, Chadley R. Hollas, Chih Yu (Bill) Hsiao, Viktoriia Kiptenko, Magdalena Kubal-Czerwińska, Vince Magnini, Tim Parsons, Adityavardhan Pathak, Jossie Romero, Nino Sachaleli, Thomas Streifeneder, Joseph Taremwa and Tsung-Chiung (Emily) Wu

A Wor(l)d of Agritourism? A Cross-national Validation of the Global Agritourism Network's definition.

Eine Welt oder ein Begriff des Agritourismus?
Internationale Validierung der Definition des
Global Agritourismus Network.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/tw-2025-0035>

Abstract: The growing popularity of agritourism highlights the need for a unified, global definition to ensure clarity and consistency. Until recently, the lack of such a definition hindered marketing, outreach and international collaboration. To address this, the Global Agritourism Network (GAN) formed a working group to conceptualize agritourism. A clear, shared definition is important to tell agritour-

***Corresponding author: Erika Quendler, Ph.D.,** Senior researcher at the Federal Institute of Agricultural Economics, Rural and Mountain Research in Vienna, Austria, E-Mail: erika.quendler@bab.gv.at

Carla Barbieri, Ph.D., Professor and Extension Specialist, and Lead Researcher at North Carolina State University (USA), E-Mail: carla_barbieri@ncsu.edu

Kumar Bhatta, Ph.D., Visiting Scholar, North Carolina State University, USA, E-Mail: kumar2bhatta@gmail.com

Lisa Chase, Ph.D., Extension Professor at the University of Vermont and Director of the Vermont Tourism Research Center in the USA, E-Mail: Lisa.Chase@uvm.edu

Allison Clark, Lead Innovator at Agritourism Tasmania, Email: aclark@agritourismtas.com.au

Keleigh J. Cormier, FCMC, BCom, ClearThink™ Group, Alberta, Canada, E-Mail: keleigh@clearthinkinc.com, www.clearthinkinc.com

Shpresim Domi, E-Mail: shdomi@ubt.edu.al

Marisa P. Eslao-Pamo, Assistant Professor at the Asian Institute of Tourism, University of the Philippines, E-Mail: mpeslao@up.edu.ph

Claudia Gil Arroyo, Agriculture & Natural Resources County Agent III, Rutgers Cooperative Extension of Cape May County, NJAES, Rutgers University, E-Mail: claudia.gilarroyo@rutgers.edu

Chadley R. Hollas, M.Sc., Principal of Cultivating Tourism in the USA, E-Mail: crhollas@gmail.com

ism apart from other types of rural tourism and to identify what ‘real’ agritourism is, particularly as some activities may be purely commercial or diverting from the main goals of this agricultural enterprise. GAN’s definition includes four key components: agriculture diversification activity, agriculture-tourism intersection, authentic experiences, and showcasing resources. This paper presents 17 national examples from across Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe and Oceania to illustrate how they fit within GAN’s agritourism definition. These national examples highlight diversities in agritourism and its regional adaptations, offering in-depth insights into agriculture and tourism worldwide. The cross-national approach enhances global understanding of agritourism and supports comparative insights across dis-

Brief overview: This paper evaluates the ‘Global Agritourism Definitional Components,’ enabling a better understanding of its four key components by: (i) detailing how these components are practiced in different countries, and (ii) how national references align with the framework.

Origin: Expanded written version of the presentation the authors delivered at the 18th World Agritourism Day (India) in May 2025, titled: Agritourism around the world: The global definition and regional perspectives (Quendler et al. 2025).

Chih Yu Hsiao, Ph.D., Adjunct assistant professor at Department of Tropical Agriculture and International Cooperation, National Pingtung University of Science and Technology in Taiwan, E-Mail: skyblueseas2004@hotmail.com

Viktoriia Kiptenko, Ph.D., Associate Professor at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, E-Mail: viktoriia_kiptenko@knu.ua

Magdalena Kubal-Czerwińska, Ph.D., Assistant Professor in the Institute of Geography and Spatial Management, Faculty of Geography and Geology at the Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland, E-Mail: magdalena.kubal@uj.edu.pl

Vincent P. Magnini, Ph.D, Chair of Management and Marketing at the College of Business and Economics, Longwood University in the USA, E-Mail: vince@isrteam.com

Jean D’Amour Maniragaba, BSc, Fndr. & MD, Founder & Social entrepreneur, Agro-Tourism Park – Eco Terra Vista Tours Co. Ltd., E-Mail: jeandamourmani@gmail.com, info@ecoterravista.com

Tim Parsons, Agritourism operator on a working family farm with accommodation and farm tours, Hamilton, Tasmania, Australia, E-Mail: tim@curringafarm.com.au

Adityavardhan Pathak, Aditya Agro Farm, Maharashtra, India, E-Mail: pathak.adityavardhan@gmail.com

Jossie B. Romero, College Dean of the College of Hospitality and Tourism Management of Partido State University, Camarines Sur, Philippines, E-Mail: jossiebromero.parsu@gmail.com

Joseph Taremwa Ruhakana, M.Sc., Founder & CEO, Agro-Tourism Association, Uganda, E-Mail: joseph.taremwa@gmail.com

Nino Sachaleli, Ph.D., Researcher and lecturer at Grigol Robakidze University in Tbilisi, Georgia, E-Mail: sachalelinino@yahoo.com

Dr. habil Thomas Streifeneder, Head of the Institute for Regional Development of Eurac Research in Bolzano (Italy), E-Mail: Thomas.Streifeneder@eurac.edu

Emily Wu, Professor in the Department of Tourism, Recreation & Leisure Studies, National Dong-Hwa University (Taiwan), E-Mail: tcwu@gms.ndhu.edu.tw

ciplines and policy contexts. Broader impacts on rural development and education may emerge over time, however, the primary focus of this study lies in validating and contextualizing the GAN agritourism definition across national settings. As the GAN's definition has gained social legitimacy, further case studies are needed to develop an impact assessment framework that strengthens agritourism's role in marketing, rural development, and sustainable tourism efforts worldwide.

Keywords: Agriculture, case countries, global framework, national variations, niche tourism

Zusammenfassung: Die wachsende Bedeutung des Agritourismus zeigt, wie wichtig eine globale Definition für mehr Klarheit und Einheitlichkeit ist. Bis vor Kurzem erschwerte das Fehlen einer solchen Definition das Marketing, die Öffentlichkeitsarbeit sowie die internationale Zusammenarbeit. Um dem entgegenzuwirken, initiierte das Global Agritourism Network (GAN) eine Arbeitsgruppe zur Konzeptualisierung des Begriffs und zur Erarbeitung einer globalen Definition. Diese GAN-Definition ist unerlässlich, um Agritourismus von anderen Formen des ländlichen Tourismus abzugrenzen. Sie hilft, klarzustellen, was als ‚echter‘ Agrotourismus definiert ist – insbesondere, da einige Aktivitäten rein kommerziell ausgerichtet sein oder von den ursprünglichen Zielen landwirtschaftlicher Betriebe abweichen können. Die GAN-Definition hat vier zentrale Elemente, nämlich: landwirtschaftliche Diversifizierung, Zusammenspiel von Landwirtschaft und Tourismus, authentische Erlebnisse sowie zur Schau stellen von Ressourcen. Dieser Beitrag zeigt anhand von 17 nationalen Fallbeispielen aus Afrika, Amerika, Asien, Europa und Ozeanien, wie diese in die GAN-Definition des Agritourismus eingeordnet werden können. Die Fallsbeispiele veranschaulichen die Vielfalt und regionalen Anpassungen des Agritourismus und bieten wertvolle Einblicke in die Landwirtschaft und den Tourismus weltweit. Diese länderübergreifende Betrachtung stärkt das globale Verständnis und erleichtert disziplin- und kontextübergreifende Vergleiche. Langfristig können sich daraus bedeutende Impulse für die ländliche Entwicklung und Bildung ergeben. Der Fokus dieses Beitrages liegt jedoch auf der empirischen Überprüfung und praxisnahen Veranschaulichung der GAN-Definition anhand der nationalen Gegebenheiten. Angesichts der zunehmenden gesellschaftlichen Anerkennung der GAN-Definition ist ein Bewertungsmodell zu entwickeln, das im Marketing, in der ländlichen Entwicklung und in den globalen Nachhaltigkeitsstrategien eingesetzt werden kann.

Schlüsselwörter: Landwirtschaft, Länderbeispiele, globaler Rahmen, nationale Unterschiede, Nischantourismus

1 The Quest for a Common Ground – Toward a Global Definition of Agritourism

Agritourism connects farming and tourism, helping rural areas diversify their revenue streams while giving visitors authentic insights into agricultural life. Yet, despite its rapid global expansion, the concept remains inconsistently defined across countries, disciplines and policy frameworks. This definitional fragmentation has generated conceptual and practical challenges. It complicates the distinction between agritourism and broader forms of rural tourism, hinders comparative research and limits the development of coherent policies and marketing strategies (Barbieri and Streifeneder 2019; Lamie et al. 2021). Without a shared understanding, it becomes difficult to identify what constitutes ‘real’ agritourism—activities that genuinely derive from and contribute to agriculture—versus those that are primarily commercial or disconnected from farming contexts (Streifeneder 2016; Domi and Belletti 2022).

This lack of conceptual clarity also obstructs reliable data collection, cross-regional benchmarking, and the integration of agritourism into broader sustainable development agendas. Countries vary widely in how they legally recognize or promote agritourism. This highlights the need for a globally coherent yet contextually adaptable definition that can guide research, support governance and strengthen the credibility of agritourism as both an agricultural and a tourism activity.

To fill this gap, the Global Agritourism Network (GAN) formed the Definitions and Standards Committee, an ad-hoc working group to craft a global definition of agritourism that is both globally relevant and adaptable to local contexts (GAN, undated). After developing the definition through a participatory, multi-country process, the GAN validated its relevance through a global online survey conducted in 2025. While the survey confirmed conceptual acceptance, it also raised the need to examine how the definition functions in practice within different national settings.

To address this, a comparative case study approach was adopted to explore how agritourism is understood, regulated and implemented across 17 countries on five continents. Experts from each country applied a standardized assessment template based on the four key components of the GAN definition. This approach allowed for identifying common patterns and contextual variations in the application of the GAN definition worldwide.

2 From Postulation to Practice – Operationalizing the GAN Agritourism Definition

GAN's definition of agritourism¹, adopted in November 2024 and validated through a global survey in May 2025 states: *“Agritourism is an agricultural diversification activity that results from the synergistic intersection of agriculture and tourism. Agritourism offers authentic experiences related to agricultural production that showcase the tangible and intangible resources of the region or locality”* (GAN, undated). Of 244 respondents from diverse affiliations, knowledge levels, professions, and continents, 84.8 % rated this definition as describing agritourism well (43.4 %) or extremely well (41.4 %) in their national contexts, with mean endorsement indices of 80–91 across subgroups (e. g., 89.2 % positive among farmers; 91.9 % in Europe). Consensus was consistent regardless of GAN membership, expertise, or region, confirming broad international resonance. (Barbieri et al. 2025).

Survey results confirmed the GAN definition's broad acceptance and relevance across regions. They also validated its conceptual clarity and practical usefulness. Building on this foundation, the next step was to examine how the definition translates into practice. Expert case studies from 17 countries demonstrate its applicability and adaptability within diverse national contexts. One primary expert per country, mostly GAN members, completed a standardized template assessing how national agritourism practices reflect the four GAN components—agricultural diversification activity, synergistic agriculture-tourism intersection, authentic agricultural experiences, and the showcasing of tangible and intangible resources. Additional input from local practitioners and networks enriched each case. Overarching conclusions were drawn by identifying patterns of alignment, variation, and common ground across countries, with particular attention to legal recognition, terminology use, and practical implementation.

¹ This definition resulted from a collaborative, multi-year dialectic process by approximately 30 members from 14 countries across the Americas, Africa, Asia, Europe and Oceania initiated who held monthly meetings that spanned from April 2023 to 2025. The group started identifying and discussing the core values of agritourism to set the foundation for a global definition (Chase et al. in review).

To increase transparency, broaden participation and achieve social legitimacy, the committee constantly requested feedback and approval of its advances from the broader agritourism community at events, such as the 2nd World Agritourism Congress in Italy (Barbieri et al. 2024) and the 18th International Conference on Agri Tourism in India (Quendler et al. 2025). These initiatives supported the recognition of both global commonalities and regional diversities inherent to agritourism practices.

3 Cross-country Insights – How it Fits

This section evaluates the breadth and adaptability of the GAN agritourism definition. It shows how national practices in 17 countries align with its four components. It also highlights differences in terminology and legal recognition to identify areas of common ground.

3.1 Use and Recognition of the Term ‘Agritourism’

Laying the ground for global understanding calls for an examination of the formal use of the term agritourism while accepting its variations across countries due to diverse policy and legal frameworks and cultural interpretations (Table 1). There is ongoing debate about the scope of agritourism, especially concerning its location, the authenticity of activities and the link between agriculture and tourism. This debate is further complicated by government interventions. (Domi and Belletti 2022; Streifeneder 2016). In countries such as Australia, Italy, Albania, Georgia and the Philippines, agritourism is formally recognized and defined within national or regional legislation, providing clear regulatory frameworks for its development and implementation. This institutional recognition highlights how agritourism activities can offer supplemental income to help preserve small and mid-scale farms, ranches and rural communities (Sachaleli 2022).

In countries within federal systems such as Canada and the United States of America (USA), definitions and policies (ranging from none to detailed) vary by province or state and municipality, demonstrating decentralized governance. The same applies to India, where, while there is no formal national policy, agritourism is increasingly promoted through government programs and grassroots initiatives, with pioneering efforts at the state level, such as in Maharashtra.

Some countries actively engage in agritourism-like activities, but these are formally recognized and regulated under other brand names, such as ‘Holidays on the Farm’ (Austria) or ‘Leisure Agriculture’ (Taiwan). Other countries, including Uganda, Rwanda and Vietnam, exhibit a widespread use of the term agritourism on the ground or for marketing, without any corresponding formal legal definitions. Several countries, such as Nepal, Perú, Poland and Ukraine, often embed the term agritourism within broader frameworks like rural or community-based tourism, highlighting overlaps in terminology and policy domains. The varied use of the term agritourism and the differences in its legal recognition highlight the need for a contextual understanding when examining agritourism development and its regulations worldwide.

Table 1: Formal recognition and usage of the term ‘Agritourism’ across study countries (@ authors’ elaboration)

Country	Formal Recognition and Use of the Term ‘Agritourism’
Albania	Agroturizëm (agritourism) is formally recognized and defined under Law 93/2015, and further detailed through the Ministerial Council Decision No. 22 (12.1.2018).
Australia	The National Agritourism Strategy Framework defines agritourism; Agritourism is widely recognized.
Austria	Urlaub am Bauernhof (Holidays on the Farm) is the prevalent term. Agritourism is not officially used, but the concept is widely practiced.
Canada	Agritourism is widely used although definitions vary by province, territory and even municipalities.
Georgia	The agritourism industry is legally defined and recognized (Resolution No. 501, 2023, paragraph “u”); The Law on Tourism (2023) defines agritourism (definition “a”); Resolution of the Government of Georgia No. 465 – gives detailed information about taxes and other regulations.
India	Agritourism overlaps with rural/eco-tourism. While there is no formal national policy, government programs and grassroots initiatives are increasingly being used, with the State of Maharashtra pioneering agritourism policy in 2005.
Italy	Agriturismo (Agritourism) is formally defined, legally protected and regulated by national and regional laws.
Nepal	Agritourism is recognized but often referred to as rural tourism, homestay, or village tourism.
Perú	Agroturismo (agritourism) is rarely used. Rural community tourism and Community-based rural tourism are the primary terms used.
Philippines	Agritourism, also referred to as Farm Tourism, is legally recognized (Farm Tourism Development Act, 2016).
Poland	Agroturystyka (agritourism), as a form of rural tourism, lacks a clear formal legal definition.
Rwanda	Agritourism lacks a formal legal definition. It is depicted as eco-farming tourism and community-based farm experiences.
Taiwan	“Leisure Agriculture” is the official term. “Agritourism” is also used, especially in marketing.
Uganda	Agritourism is widely recognized but not formally defined in national legislation; farm-stay is also used.
Ukraine	Agritourism lacks an official (regulatory) definition. It is generally categorized under rural and green (ecological) tourism, both of which are legally defined separately in the Ukrainian Law on Tourism.
USA	Agritourism is widely used and recognized in policy/marketing. Definitions and practices vary by state, county and municipality.
Vietnam	Agritourism, Rural Tourism and Homestays are used interchangeably with no formal legal definition.

3.2 National Practices in View of GAN's Definitional Components

This comparative analysis shows a general alignment of national practices with the GAN's agritourism definition, though the extent and details vary across countries.



Figure 1. Tourists participation in farming activities in Africa (Rwanda and Uganda). (© authors)

In Africa, countries like Uganda and Rwanda (Table 2) are increasingly promoting agritourism as a diversification strategy grounded in authentic experiences and local cultural assets (Figure 1). However, their institutional structures are still emerging. Rwanda, for example, has begun establishing national policies and community-based models, such as the Agro-Tourism Park initiative. Both countries show an emerging overlap of agriculture and tourism, through various initiatives like Agro-Tourism Association and COBATI's networks and agro-zoning in Uganda.

Table 2: Extent to which National Practices fit the GAN’s Agritourism Definitional Components in Rwanda and Uganda (Africa) (@ authors’ elaboration)

Country	Agricultural Diversification	Agriculture & Tourism Intersection	Authentic Agricultural Experiences	Showcase of Resources
Rwanda	Agritourism is an emerging agricultural diversification strategy supported by national policies and community-based models.	Tourism and agriculture work together, with activities like tea plantation tours and coffee experiences boosting rural-urban connections.	Coffee and tea farm tours, local crafts, hands-on activities.	Rural culture and tradition, farmscapes (e. g., tea plantations), agricultural practices and community stories.
Uganda	Agritourism is viewed as a strategic diversification tool.	There is some integration, particularly in rural areas, allowing farms to gain new income while visitors experience agriculture.	Farm tours, hands-on activities like organic farming, coffee experiences, and gorilla tracking, along with cultural storytelling, showcase local traditions and cuisine.	Rural landscapes (e. g., tea plantations, crop fields), local practices and agricultural heritage are showcased.

Across the Americas, the alignment of national practices with the four-component framework also varies (Figure 2; Table 3). In North America, specifically Canada and the USA, agritourism is viewed as a supplementary farm income strategy, although the degree of authenticity and cultural immersion varies regionally. In South America, Perú shows partial alignment with the GAN framework through community-based tourism models that connect agrarian livelihoods and traditional agriculture, though core agritourism features are less consistently integrated.



Figure 2: Agritourism experiences from the Americas (Canada, Perú, USA), such as leisure activities, educational tours, U-pick and food tasting. (@ authors)

Table 3: Extent to which National Practices fit the GAN's Agritourism Definitional Components in Canada, Perú and the USA (the Americas) (@ authors' elaboration)

Country	Agricultural Diversification	Agriculture & Tourism Inter-section	Authentic Agricultural Experiences	Showcase of Resources
Canada	Agritourism is a recognized strategy for farm income diversification.	Provincial programs integrate tourism within agriculture (e. g., farm tours, festivals/events).	Activities like U-pick, educational tours, food experience, farm festivals connect visitors with agriculture.	Local/regional products, landscapes and rural culture are central.
Perú	Rural community tourism and community-based rural tourism are viewed as strategies for rural development that generate new income and support traditional agriculture.	Some overlap of tourism and agriculture, particularly in the Andes, with local programs fostering community-based tourism.	Engagement in Andean farming, culinary tourism and traditional crafts.	Local landscapes, food heritage and indigenous culture, through storytelling and community rituals.
USA	Agritourism is established as a strategy to supplement farm income, supported by state-level policies.	A mutually beneficial relationship is supported by policy but varies by state.	Farm stays, educational tours, festivals, and hands-on activities like U-pick offer family-friendly ways to connect with farming roots and rural traditions.	Local food, landscapes, rural heritage; sustainable practices protect environment and culture.

Asian countries demonstrate a strong integration of tourism within agriculture through hands-on farm-based activities, cultural immersion and government-supported programs, aligning very well with all the key components of the GAN agritourism definitional framework (Figure 3; Table 4).



Figure 3: Visitors in Asia (Taiwan, Nepal, India and the Philippines) engaging in agricultural practices and ways of living. (© authors)

In India, the agriculture-tourism overlap as an agricultural diversification strategy is especially strong in the states of Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Punjab, Kerala, Goa and Assam, while in the Philippines, the provinces of Camarines Sur, Cavite and Batangas rely on community-managed initiatives to offer immersive experiences focused on traditional ways of living. Asian countries also integrate their tangible and intangible resources into the agritourism offerings. For example, Nepal showcases the integration of its unique natural and cultural resources into its agricultural lifestyles (e. g., terraced rice fields on rural landscapes, thread crafts) while Vietnam emphasizes traditional cooking and village life through different initiatives (e. g., Ba Vi Farmstay, Mekong Rustic, Ecohost Nam Định). Taiwan prioritizes the strategic integration of primary (agricultural production), secondary (agricultural processing), and tertiary (tourism services) industries.

Table 4: Extent to which National Practices fit the GAN's Agritourism Definitional Components in India, Nepal, Philippines, Taiwan and Vietnam (Asia) (@ authors' elaboration)

Country	Agricultural Diversification	Agriculture & Tourism Intersection	Authentic Agricultural Experiences	Showcase of Resources
India	Agritourism is promoted for rural development and boosting farmers' income.	Agriculture and tourism intersect through immersive experiences, with implementation and policy support differing by region.	Farm stays, local traditional cuisine, cultural performances, educational tours and hands-on agricultural and other activities.	Activities highlight rural landscapes, local food, crafts and cultural traditions (e. g., Festivals at Aditya Agro Farm, Shahapur, Maharashtra).
Nepal	Agritourism is recognized as a diversification tool, especially in rural and mountain areas.	Tourism and agriculture intersect, mainly through homestays and farm-based activities.	Farm-stays at cow, sheep and apple farms; traditional foods; cultural shows and agricultural festivals (e. g., Roapain).	Focus on mountain landscapes (e. g., terraced rice fields), traditional practices and local products (e. g., local alcoholic beverages, pottery, thread crafts).
Philippines	Agritourism is promoted as a rural development strategy (farm stays, tours, product sales).	Local policies and community involvement support community-managed agritourism sites.	Emphasis on farm visits and tours, hands-on activities, local food, crafts and agricultural festivals.	Combining agricultural landscapes with cultural practices and local cuisine.
Taiwan	Recognized strategy for rural development, supported by government programs (e. g., Leisure Agriculture Zones).	Strategic integration of agricultural production, agricultural processing and tourism services.	Rice paddy experience, tea tourism and rural festivals. The Special Agro-tourism Spot Certified (SAS) program ensures genuine experiences.	Showcases tangible and intangible assets, particularly in rural villages and agritourism clusters, anchored in: rural living, agricultural production and environmental ecology.
Vietnam	Agritourism emerges as a strategy for rural economic development.	Initiatives (e. g., community-based models, national programs) foster this collaboration	Hands-on experiences (e. g., rice farming, tea picking), cultural immersion (e. g., local foods, village life, wine tourism).	Rural landscapes, local crafts, agricultural rituals and ethnic heritage are integrated into experiences.

In *Europe*, agritourism is a well-established form of on-farm diversification supported by policies and community models that preserve agricultural identity and cultural heritage (Figure 4). It strengthens local identity by promoting traditional products, cuisine, ethnography, music and more, offering authentic experiences tied to agriculture and cultural resources. This strongly aligns with the components of the GAN framework (Table 5).

Table 5: Extent to which National Practices fit the GAN’s Agritourism Definitional Components in Albania, Austria, Georgia, Italy, Poland and Ukraine (Europe) (@ authors’ elaboration)

Country	Agricultural Diversification	Agriculture & Tourism Intersection	Authentic Agricultural Experiences	Showcase of Resources
Albania	Agritourism is considered a diversification activity, offering farmers additional income while preserving agricultural traditions.	Tourism is complementary to agriculture. Comprehensive regional development models have been implemented in areas such as Fishtë, Dibra and Përmet.	Only active farms can offer agritourism, ensuring real farm experiences such as harvesting, traditional cooking and storytelling.	Highlights landscapes (e. g., Vjosa Valley), local products (e. g., cheese, olives, wine) and intangible assets like rural lifestyle and hospitality.
Austria	Agritourism is promoted to diversify rural incomes. It is supported by public-private partnerships and policy.	Experiences combine farm stays, food, outdoor activities and local events, often coordinated by regional organizations.	Visitors participate in farm work, taste local products and engage in traditional rural life through hands-on activities.	Showcases tangible (landscapes, local food) and intangible (cultural traditions) natural and cultural heritage.
Georgia	Agritourism is a diversification activity to increase farmers income while preserving agricultural traditions.	Regional initiatives foster synergies between agricultural production and cultural and recreational tourism.	Only active farms can offer real farm experiences like grape harvesting (Rtveli), traditional winemaking (Qvevri), sheep farming and culinary workshops.	Highlights agricultural landscapes and products with an emphasis on incorporating local culture, cuisine and crafts (folk songs).
Italy	Agritourism is legally typified as a diversification activity.	Synergistic intersection is through farm-based experiences like wine tasting.	Traditional farming methods showcased.	Emphasis on rural heritage and landscapes.

Table 5: (continued)

Country	Agricultural Diversification	Agriculture & Tourism Intersection	Authentic Agricultural Experiences	Showcase of Resources
Poland	Agritourism is well-established as a diversification strategy, such as in Kościerski County.	Policy supports the agriculture-tourism intersection within the rural tourism umbrella.	Visitors engage in farm stays, farm work, sale of home-made products, local cuisine, crafts workshops.	Combines natural landscapes, traditional architecture, folklore and crafts, offering an immersive cultural experience.
Ukraine	Agritourism is a diversification strategy supported to foster rural development (e. g., job creation, recovery efforts).	Agriculture and tourism are closely linked through policy-backed partnerships and networks.	Farm stays (e. g., Brynzarnia), local food tasting, traditional crafts and authentic heritage (e. g., the Smart Village Museum in Semisotka)	Integrates rural landscapes, cultural heritage and community initiatives (e. g., Geographical Indications Project 2017).

Agritourism in Europe often develops through integrated regional models, such as those in Fishtë, Dibra, and Përmet in Albania; the Cluster Frumushika Nova and information and consultation farms like Zelenyi Hay in Ukraine; and Tusheti, Adjarian mountains and Svaneti in Georgia. In Kościerski County and Staszów County, Poland, although not formally organized as integrated regional models, these areas are increasingly recognizing the potential of their many agritourism farms and are actively working to establish themselves as agritourism regions. In the case of Austria, the public-private partnerships have resulted in the ‘Holidays on the Farm Association’ that ensures the quality for authentic farm experiences. Some European countries, notably Italy, have consolidated agritourism policies sanctioning it as a diversification strategy and imposing strict regulations, such as limits on touristic infrastructure (e. g., number of beds) and a mandatory proportion of hosts’ time dedicated to farming activities— In contrast, other countries (e. g., Georgia) are just showing emerging government support, indicating institutionalization is underway.



Figure 4: Authentic agritourism across Europe (Georgia, Italy, Albania, Austria and Ukraine), showcasing farm life and recreation, local cuisine and traditional cultural experiences. (© authors)

Australia, representing *Oceania*, has a highly coordinated agritourism sector. Regional models and national strategies highlight the strong connection between agriculture and tourism while ensuring authenticity and showcasing local resources. Regional initiatives, such as Agritourism Queensland and Agritourism Tasmania, support and advocate for agritourism as a strategy for agricultural diversification. Likewise, the Agritourism 2030 Action Plan encourages collaboration between agriculture and tourism and promoting regional models that integrate both sectors to foster whole-region visits. This approach supports hands-on farm experiences rooted in real operations and local identity, including a mix of experiences focused on dairy, meat, vegetable production, food and fiber processing, (agri) cultural demonstrations and farm stays. Through these experiences, agritourism providers combine tangible (local production, landscapes, crops) with intangible (community spirit, traditions and local stories) heritages. (Figure 5; Table 6)



Figure 5: Authentic agritourism in Australia, including farm sightseeing tours of grazing animals and sheep shearing demonstrations. (© authors)

Table 6: Extent to which National Practices fit the GAN's Agritourism Definitional Components in Australia (Oceania)

Country	Agricultural Diversification	Agriculture & Tourism Intersection	Authentic Agricultural Experiences	Showcase of Resources
Australia	Agritourism is widely supported as a diversification strategy, with farm stays, tastings, and workshops supplementing farm income from primary production. Regional initiatives (e. g., Queensland and Western Australia Associations, and Tasmania's reference group.)	Agritourism 2030 Action Plan encourages collaboration between agriculture and tourism. Strong integration of tourism and agriculture through collaborative regional models and operator networks. Clusters and branding initiatives promote local food systems and whole-region experiences,	Hands-on farm activities grounded in real operations and local identity, e. g., beef and sheep production, dairy, fruit and vegetable production and processing, native & local food culture, & immersive farm stays.	Combines local produce, landscapes and farming systems (tangible) with community spirit, traditions and local stories (intangible).

Table 6: (continued)

Country	Agricultural Diversification	Agriculture & Tourism Intersection	Authentic Agricul- tural Experiences	Showcase of Resources
	support interested farmers to add tourism to their operations.	increasing visitor engagement and spend.		

In summary, countries around the world apply the GAN agritourism definition to varying degrees, with many moving toward models that fully integrate agriculture and tourism to offer authentic experiences. Each case demonstrates that combining tourism with agriculture supports diversification and promotes genuine visitor experiences by sharing both tangible resources (land, crops, architecture, products) and intangible ones (knowledge, customs, celebrations, foodways). This approach preserves local identity while creating memorable experiences for guests and sustainable benefits for rural communities.

3.3 Common Ground – National Variations within the Global Vision

Despite the diversity in legal frameworks, applied terminology, and on-the-ground practices across countries, a unifying global consensus on agritourism is emerging. The GAN’s agritourism definition serves as a common reference point, bridging diverse interpretations and providing a foundation for understanding and advancing the sector globally. While not being prescriptive, national alignment to the GAN definition tends to be stronger where agritouristic activities are formalized and/or supported by a legal or institutional framework. Conversely, the opposite also held true.

The GAN agritourism definition contributes to the ongoing development process by providing a clear and consistent global vision. It unites diverse practices under a common understanding and enhances communication and outreach, policy-making, and cross-regional learning. By celebrating authenticity and emphasizing the synergistic agriculture-tourism intersection, agritourism is fundamental to valuing both tangible and intangible natural and (agri)cultural resources.

Moreover, recognizing national diversity within a shared global vision allows for both flexibility and coherence. The GAN agritourism definition framework thus serves not only as a practical tool for policy harmonization but also as a catalyst for inclusive, sustainable growth in agritourism – and, in turn, for the sustainable revitalization of rural areas.

While the GAN definition offers a unifying framework, its adoption across countries is not without challenges. In highly commercialized contexts (e. g., parts of North America and Oceania), the emphasis on ‘authentic agricultural experiences’ may conflict with diversified business models that extend beyond core farming, potentially leading to debates over what constitutes ‘real’ agritourism. In emerging markets (e. g., Africa, parts of Asia), the definition could be strategically leveraged by governments and NGOs to formalize and upscale local practices, but risks cultural dilution if applied without sensitivity to indigenous knowledge systems. Countries with alternative terminology (e. g., Austria’s ‘Holidays on the Farm’) may resist rebranding, while others could misuse the term for purely touristic ventures disconnected from agriculture. These tensions highlight the need for context-specific implementation guidelines to preserve the definition’s integrity while maximizing its utility in policy, marketing and rural development.

The findings underpin to the following proposition, *“The GAN definitional framework serves as a global reference for agritourism practices worldwide, uniting diverse interpretations and implementations. National realities, however, are also influenced by factors such as legal frameworks, policy engagement, cultural attitudes towards tourism and the balance between government and private sector involvement”* (Quendler et al. 2025). The Global Agritourism Network’s definition can therefore serve as a practical tool to support cross-national research, inform policy design, and foster sustainable agritourism development around the world.

4 Conclusions

By bringing together a collection of experts from 17 countries across five continents, this study shows how national agritourism practices align with the four components of the GAN definition. The findings confirm the definition’s validity and flexibility across diverse legal, cultural, policy, and institutional contexts—from formalized systems in Italy and Australia to emerging practices in Uganda and Rwanda. Moreover, it also strengthens the definition’s social legitimacy by validating it through international experts. It demonstrates that the concept resonates beyond its original development group and is gaining recognition worldwide.

Despite differences in legal systems, terminology and cultural approaches, the GAN’s definition demonstrates that coherence and common understanding are achievable across borders. This cross-national evidence establishes the GAN defini-

tion as a practical reference point for research, policy development and agritourism implementation worldwide.

At the same time, this approach has limitations. The selection of case countries is not exhaustive. It relies primarily on expert inputs that do not account for all agritourism stakeholders, particularly agritourists, and does not fully capture intra-country variations. Future research should consider, therefore, (i) broadening the geographical and methodological scope, (ii) incorporating participatory methods with practitioners and communities, (iii) developing practical tools for farm-level application, and (iv) establishing an impact assessment framework to evaluate the definition's role in marketing, policy, advocacy efforts and sustainable rural development.

References

- Barbieri, Carla, Keleigh Cormier, Erika Quendler, Tim Parsons, and Adityavardhan Pathak. 2025. A Wor(l)d of Agritourism: Definitions and Values Identified by the Global Agritourism Network. Global Agritourism Network Gatherings (global, virtual), November 18. Recording available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2eXZ5jZ9b8c>.
- Barbieri, Carla, Keleigh Cormier, Shpresim Domi, Maria Rosa García Sanchez, Chih Yu Hsiao, Romeo Illie, Magdalena Kubal-Czerwińska, Long Nguyen, Tim Parsons, Adityavardhan Pathak, Erika Quendler, Satyajit Sinha, and Jacquie Taylor. 2024. "Global values of agritourism: Towards a unified definition." 2nd World Congress on Agritourism, Bolzano.
- Barbieri, Carla, and Thomas Streifeneder. 2019. "Agritourism advances around the globe: A commentary from the editors." *Open Agriculture*, 4, 712–714. DOI: 10.1515/opag-2019-0068.
- Chase, Lisa, Chadley Hollas, and Carla Barbieri (*in review*). Building networks to strengthen agritourism around the globe. CABI Tourism Cases, Special Issue on the Evolution of Agritourism – Past and Present.
- Domi, Shpresim, and Giovanni Belletti. 2022. "The role of origin products and networking on agritourism performance: The case of Tuscany." *Journal of Rural Studies*, 90, 113–123. DOI:10.1016/j.jrurstud.2022.01.013
- Global Agritourism Network undated. "Agritourism." <https://globalagritourismnetwork.org/definition-and-values/> (accessed on June 16, 2025)
- Lamie, Dave, Lisa Chase, Emilio Chiodo, Lori Dickes, Sharon Flanigan, Claudia Schmidt, and Thomas Streifeneder. 2021. "Agritourism around the globe: definitions, authenticity, and potential controversy." *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 10(2), 573–577. DOI: 10.5304/jafscd.2021.102.002
- Quendler, Erika, Carla Barbieri, Kumar Bhatta, Lisa Chase, Keleigh Cormier, Shpresim Domi, Marisa Eslao-Pamo, Tzu-Wei Fang, Claudia Gil Arroyo, Enkeleda Golemi Lacej, Chadley Hollas, Magdalena Kubal-Czerwińska, Chih Yu Hsiao, Viktoriia Kiptenko, Vince Magnini, Jean D'Amour Maniragaba, Bobby Nguyen, Tim Parson, Adityavardhan Pathak, Jossie Romero, Nino Sachaleli, Thomas Streifeneder, Joseph Taremwa Ruhakana and Emily Wu. 2025. "Agritourism around the world: The global definition and regional perspectives." Online presentation. World Agritourism Day India, 15 May, 2025.

- Quendler, Erika, Hans Embacher, Vince Magnini, Alexander Plaikner, and Rike Stotten. 2024. "Austria under the auspices of global agritourism values: a narrative literature review." *Frontiers in Sustainable Tourism*, 3, 1513292. DOI: 10.3389/frsut.2024.1513292.
- Sachaleli, Nino. 2022. "Sustainability of agritourism as a rural development factor." *Agricultural Economics and Rural Development*, 19(1), 77–87. https://www.eadr.ro/RePEc/iag/iag_pdf/AERD2201_77-87.pdf
- Streifeneder, Thomas. 2016. "Agriculture first: assessing European policies and scientific typologies to define authentic agritourism and differentiate it from countryside tourism." *Tourism Manag. Perspect*, 20, 251–264. DOI: 10.1016/j.tmp.2016.10.003

Author information

Erika Quendler, Ph.D.

Senior researcher at the Federal Institute of Agricultural Economics, Rural and Mountain Research in Vienna (Austria).

Email: erika.quendler@bab.gv.at

She holds a PhD in Agricultural Economics from the University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna. Her research primarily focuses on agritourism, where she has made substantial contributions through scientific publications, participation in international conferences, and active involvement on global networks.

Carla Barbieri, Ph.D.

Professor and Extension Specialist, and Lead Researcher at North Carolina State University (USA).

Email: carla_barbieri@ncsu.edu

Barbieri is the Founder and Lead Investigator of the Agritourism & Societal Well-being Lab, which addresses the needs of farmers offering agritourism while promoting sustainable rural development. She has spearheaded agritourism-related projects at state, national, and international levels, resulting in over 100 publications and outreach materials. Barbieri's work has earned recognition as an Emerging Scholar by the International Academy for the Study of Tourism, a Fulbright Scholar, and as a Fellow of the Academy of Leisure Sciences.

Kumar Bhatta, Ph.D.

Visiting Scholar, North Carolina State University, USA.

Email: kumar2bhatta@gmail.com

He was born in Nepal, studied in Japan and currently works as a Visiting Scholar at NC State University. His research focuses on agritourism development in developing countries, particularly in agrarian villages where tourism activities are not yet common. He has proposed a series of steps to guide agritourism development in these ordinary rural destinations. In addition to tourism studies, he is also interested in agricultural economics and rural development economics.

Lisa Chase, Ph.D.

Extension Professor at the University of Vermont and Director of the Vermont Tourism Research Center in the USA.

Email: Lisa.Chase@uvm.edu

Her research and outreach focus on the intersection of tourism, community vitality, food systems, and working landscapes. For over 20 years, she has worked with entrepreneurs, communities, farmers, and tourism businesses throughout Vermont and around the globe. She co-authored the book *Food, Farms and Community: Exploring Food Systems* and is the founding president of the Global Agritourism Network, which fosters collaboration and provides education, research, and training for agritourism practitioners and scholars worldwide.

Allison Clark

Lead Innovator at Agritourism Tasmania.

Email: aclark@agritourismtas.com.au

She is the founder and lead innovator of Agritourism Tasmania, established to grow and elevate agritourism as a distinct industry sector in Tasmania, Australia. She has led major initiatives including the Agritourism Accelerator, supporting hundreds of farm businesses to develop and expand agritourism experiences. Recent focus includes regulatory reform to remove barriers and reduce red tape for farmers contemplating agritourism. Her work centres on collaboration, regional development, and strengthening connections between agriculture and tourism. Allison also serves as Co-Chair of the Australia/New Zealand regional committee of the Global Agritourism Network, contributing to knowledge exchange and sector development internationally.

Keleigh J. Cormier, FCMC, BCom

ClearThink™ Group, Alberta, Canada

Email: keleigh@clearthinkinc.com

www.clearthinkinc.com

Founder and co-owner of ClearThink™ Group, a management consulting firm in Alberta, Canada. A Fellow of the Institute of Certified Management Consultants of Alberta (FCMC), she is a national and global award-winning consultant whose work focuses on advising farm families, industry organizations, and government agencies on developing and advancing agritourism and the broader agrifood sectors in Canada and internationally. She volunteers with the Global Agritourism Network (GAN), contributing to the global exchange of knowledge and best practices.

Shpresim Domi

Email: shdomi@ubt.edu.al

He is a lecturer and scientific researcher at the Agricultural University of Tirana, specializing in rural tourism, agritourism development, and entrepreneurship. He holds a PhD in Entrepreneurship and SME Management, has published widely in scientific journals, and has contributed to rural development through both applied and fundamental projects – at national and international levels. His work also includes drafting national policies aligned with agriculture and rural development.

Marisa P. Eslao-Pamo

Assistant Professor at the Asian Institute of Tourism, University of the Philippines.
Email: mpeslao@up.edu.ph

She is an early-career researcher specializing in tourism planning and development and holds a Master's Degree in Tourism Development and Management. She promotes agritourism through partnerships with local farms, collaborations with agricultural colleges, and youth-oriented curriculum development. She also provides consultancy and extension services to local governments. Her work focuses on sustainable tourism strategies and integrating agritourism into local development plans.

Claudia Gil Arroyo

Agriculture & Natural Resources County Agent III, Rutgers Cooperative Extension of Cape May County, NJAES, Rutgers University
Email: claudia.gilarroyo@rutgers.edu

She serves as Agriculture & Natural Resources Agent III (equivalent to Assistant Professor) at Rutgers Cooperative Extension in Cape May County, New Jersey. Her research and extension work focus on agritourism, craft beverage tourism, sustainable community development, and rural empowerment. Her scholarship includes studies on women's empowerment through agritourism in Andean communities, exploring how tourism-related farming activities support agency and socio-economic advancement. She holds a Ph.D. and is an active contributor to sustainability and rural development literature.

Chadley R. Hollas, M.Sc.

Principal of Cultivating Tourism in the USA.
Email: crhollas@gmail.com

His work focuses on agritourism, rural tourism, and food systems, with an emphasis on community resilience and prosperity. He is the founding secretary of the Global Agritourism Network, an active collaborator in international agritourism research, and is PhD candidate in Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management at the University of Georgia, USA.

Chih Yu Hsiao, Ph.D.

Adjunct assistant professor at Department of Tropical Agriculture and International Cooperation, National Pingtung University of Science and Technology in Taiwan.
Email: skybluesea2004@hotmail.com

He is an expert in promoting agritourism in Taiwan. His research focuses on agritourism, sustainable farm management, agritourism policies and strategic innovation, and he actively participates in various international conferences and events. He is also committed to industry guidance and outreach, supporting the transformation of Taiwan's agritourism sector, facilitating its development, and helping it connect with the international community. He has made significant contributions to Taiwan's agritourism industry, academic research, and global agritourism networks through his active engagement.

Viktoriia Kiptenko, Ph.D.

Associate Professor at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv.

Email: viktoriia_kiptenko@knu.ua

She is a lecturer and leader of research on Indicator Analysis of Sustainable Development in Ukraine at the Geography Department of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine. She holds a PhD in Social and Economic Geography and the title of Associate Professor, Tourism and Country Studies Chair. Her teaching and research focus on sustainable tourism, including rural and agricultural practices, promoted by academic and public papers, articles, conference presentations, and teaching materials.

Magdalena Kubal-Czerwińska, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor in the Institute of Geography and Spatial Management, Faculty of Geography and Geology at the Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland.

Email: magdalena.kubal@uj.edu.pl

Her background is solid in socio-economic geography and tourism. She is an active researcher with research interests revolving around such topics as entrepreneurial behaviour in hospitality on rural areas, sustainable development in tourism and hospitality, attitudes and behaviours towards the problem of reducing food waste. She was involved as a researcher in national and international projects, e. g., the Visegrad funds, Twinning (H2020), National Science Centre (Poland).

Vincent P. Magnini, Ph.D.

Chair of Management and Marketing at the College of Business and Economics, Longwood University in the USA.

Email: vince@isrteam.com

He conducts research on environmental sustainability with specific application to hospitality and tourism settings. He holds a number of editorial board appointments on well-regarded journals and has been ranked among the most prolific hospitality and tourism researchers in the world. He has published seven books and more than 250 articles and reports.

Jean D'Amour Maniragaba, BSc, Fndr. & MD

Founder & Social entrepreneur, Agro-Tourism Park – Eco Terra Vista Tours Co. Ltd.

Email: jeandamourmani@gmail.com info@ecoterravista.com

He is the founder and project manager of the Agro-Tourism Park by Eco Terra Vista Tours Co. Ltd. He holds a Bachelor's Degree in Crop Production from the University of Rwanda. His work focuses on agritourism and regenerative rural development, he has made meaningful contributions through community-based projects, research on agro-tourism models, and presentations at international tourism conferences. He also mentors eco-tourism students at the University of Rwanda and has received multiple recognitions, including three awards for the Best Agri-Tourism Initiative.

Tim Parsons, Hamilton, Tasmania, Australia.

Agritourism operator on a working family farm with accommodation and farm tours.

Email: tim@curringafarm.com.au

He has been extensively engaged in tourism across the local, state, and national levels and currently serves as Chair of the Australian Tourism Export Council (Tasmania). Together with his wife Jane, he developed a globally recognised agritourism product that received honours at the World Agritourism Awards 2024, and the pair were named Tasmania's Tourism Champions in 2024 in recognition of their significant contribution to the sector. Tim was also awarded in 2025 in recognition for his contribution to the National Tourism Export Council. Tim markets extensively throughout greater China to promote Tasmanian tourism.

Adityavardhan Pathak

Aditya Agro Farm, Maharashtra, India

Email: pathak.adityavardhan@gmail.com

Adityavardhan Pathak is a Military Vet who traded his Bullets for Bullocks and became a full-time farmer in Shahapur (near Mumbai), Maharashtra. Under his leadership, his family-owned Horticultural farm has expanded into agritourism through Pārijāt Boutique Farmstays & Agri-Tourism Centre, offering immersive farm experiences, educational visits, and nature-based hospitality – essentially trying to connect the cosmopolitan youth to their roots/culture through activities that are educational, relatable and more importantly, fun. His work, which promotes diversified farming, rural livelihoods, and community wellbeing, received international recognition with a World Agritourism Award in 2024 for sustainable agritourism entrepreneurship.

Jossie B. Romero

College Dean of the College of Hospitality and Tourism Management of Partido State University, Camarines Sur, Philippines.

Email: jossiebromero.parsu@gmail.com

She graduated with the degree of Doctor of Business Administration at Ateneo de Naga University. She is affiliated with Regional Quality Assessment Team, Commission on Higher Education Region V, Accrediting Agencies for Charter Colleges and Universities in the Philippines, and Global Agritourism Networks as Member. I promote community-managed agritourism and coastal tourism.

Joseph Taremwa Ruhakana, M.Sc.

Founder & CEO, Agro-Tourism Association, Uganda

Email: joseph.taremwa@gmail.com

He is a professional farmer and agritourism leader with an MSc in Agricultural Economics (University of Reading) and a BSc in Agriculture (Makerere University). He has been very engaged in advancing rural livelihoods through agritourism and agribusiness development. As Founder and CEO of the Agro-Tourism Association, he has supported more than 125,000 smallholder farmers—especially youth and women in Northern and Eastern Uganda—to increase their incomes through Farming as a Business. His work focuses on integrating agriculture with tourism to promote inclusive and sustainable economic opportunities in Uganda.

Nino Sachaleli, Ph.D.

Researcher and lecturer at Grigol Robakidze University in Tbilisi, Georgia.

Email: sachalelinino@yahoo.com

She holds a PhD and specializes in agritourism, rural development, and wine as a competitive regional product. Her academic work includes studies on agritourism business models, the sustainability of rural tourism, and Georgia's wine industry. Her research highlights how agriculture, culture, and tourism intersect to support regional economic growth. She actively contributes to academic development through teaching, coordination, and collaborative research projects. Dedicated to innovation and evidence-based practice, she continues advancing knowledge in agritourism and sustainable rural development.

Dr. habil Thomas Streifeneder

Head of the Institute for Regional Development of Eurac Research in Bolzano (Italy).

Email: Thomas.Streifeneder@eurac.edu

He studied economic geography at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University in Munich (LMU). His research activities cover agricultural and socio-economic transformation processes in rural areas, focusing especially on mountain and Alpine regions (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7588-8206>). In 2018, he organized the First World Congress on Agritourism (<https://agritourism.eurac.edu/>). He is particularly interested in literary geography and spatial literary studies (see www.rural-criticism.eu), with a focus on how rural lifestyles and economies are portrayed in prose.

Clean: He studied economic geography at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University in Munich (LMU). His research activities cover agricultural and socio-economic transformation processes in rural areas, focusing especially on mountain and Alpine regions (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7588-8206>). In 2018, he organized the First World Congress on Agritourism (<https://agritourism.eurac.edu/>). He is particularly interested in literary geography and spatial literary studies (see www.rural-criticism.eu), with a focus on how rural lifestyles and economies are portrayed in prose.

Emily Wu

Professor in the Department of Tourism, Recreation & Leisure Studies, National Dong-Hwa University (Taiwan).

Email: tcwu@gms.ndhu.edu.tw

She is a Professor in the Department of Tourism, Recreation, and Leisure Studies at National Dong Hwa University, Taiwan, where she teaches courses on rural tourism, tourism development, and eco-tourism. Her research interests include sustainable development, rural tourism, and indigenous tourism. Her agritourism extension services extend across national, county, NGO, and farm organization levels. She is also the founder of the Special Agro-tourism Spots Certification System, a national mechanism designed to ensure the quality and authenticity of agritourism offerings.