

Entry

Rural Tourism from a Comparative Perspective: Trends in Europe and Oceania

Michele Filippo Fontefrancesco ^{1,2,3,*} and Martina Pili ¹

¹ Department of Sociology, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, 20123 Milan, Italy

² School of Department of Anthropology, Durham University, Durham DH1 3HP, UK

³ School of Education and Social Sciences, University of Embu, Embu 60100, Kenya

* Correspondence: michele.fontefrancesco@unicatt.it

Definition

Rural tourism is defined as a tourism activity in which the visitor's experience is linked to agricultural activities, rural lifestyles, and traditional cultures. In many geographical contexts, especially in Europe, because the rural economy is so deeply tied to family farming, this form of tourism is referred to as "agritourism", even though agrotourism is a specific subset of rural tourism defined by the integration of tourism with a working farm or agricultural operation. The entry delineates the transformative dynamics of rural tourism in the context of global shifts towards personalized, experiential travel. It examines how contemporary tourists increasingly seek authentic and immersive experiences as a response to the superficiality of mass tourism. This trend leads travellers to engage deeply with local cultures, thereby fostering connections with community life and prioritizing sustainability. Amidst challenges such as environmental degradation and overtourism, rural tourism emerges as a viable alternative, offering unique, less-congested destinations that cater to travellers' desire for exclusivity and genuine discovery. The paper traces the historical evolution of rural tourism from its European origins in mid-20th-century agricultural practices to its current status as a vital component of rural development strategies. Through a comparative analysis of two distinct regional scenarios, Europe and Oceania, this article elucidates how local contexts shape tourism practices. The analysis highlights the pivotal role of gastronomy in enriching tourist experiences and emphasizes the need for digital literacy and eco-effectiveness in rural tourism operations. Although the entry does not provide a comprehensive global perspective on rural tourism or a quantitative environmental account of the sector's impact, it ultimately conveys that rural tourism is a critical engine of regional vitality and sustainability, illustrating the juxtaposition of historical roots and contemporary trends that define this evolving sector.

Keywords: rural tourism; authenticity; experiential travel; community engagement

Academic Editor: Elena-Mădălina Vătămănescu

Received: 21 December 2025

Revised: 7 February 2026

Accepted: 10 February 2026

Published: 13 February 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY\) license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

As recently pointed out by the World Tourism Organization, consumption in contemporary tourism is undergoing a structural transformation driven by emotional and experiential imperatives [1]. Contemporary tourists are no longer satisfied with standardized, "off-the-shelf" packages. Instead, there is a marked preference for the "flex" approach: personalized, adaptable itineraries that allow for spontaneity [2]. A critical trend shaping this new market space is the transition in engagement modalities. Using a

widespread metaphor [3], travellers are moving from a “surfing” modality characterized by superficial observation and rapid consumption of places, to a “diving” modality. In this deeper approach, travellers seek immersive experiences that allow them to integrate with local cultures and communities [4] rather than remaining external spectators and, faced with issues such as environmental degradation, over-tourism, and the erosion of cultural identities [5], they appear increasingly attracted by smaller-scale solutions, intrinsically focused on local communities. This creates a specific demand for destinations located “off the beaten path”, resulting in a conscious rejection of the homogenization inherent in mass tourism in favour of unique, less crowded locations that offer a sense of genuine discovery [6]. This contemporary traveller’s pursuit of authenticity is sustained by ethical awareness, a need for direct interaction with host communities [7], and the rising “wellness wave”: a trend prioritizing mental and physical health through relaxation and disconnection from urban stress, but at the same time, the desire for “instagrammable” moments and an aesthetic authenticity for their social narratives in the picturesque and unspoiled nature of settings [8].

These trends have created space for rural tourism to grow. Accordingly, the United Nations World Tourism Organization has defined rural tourism as “a type of tourism activity in which the visitor’s experience is related to a wide range of products generally linked to nature-based activities, agriculture, rural lifestyle/culture, angling and sightseeing.” In the context of the transformation of global tourism, rural environments are positioned as ideal destinations for “constructive tourism.” [2], where they are an active element of the therapeutic experience, satisfying the growing demand for nature-based activities and isolation from mass gatherings, a preference that has notably intensified in the post-pandemic era [9]. Thus, rural tourism offers a counterbalance to the extractive nature of high-density tourism models [10] and aligns with tourists’ inclination toward issues such as ecological sustainability [11].

Overall, despite the operational challenges associated with limited local governance capacity, the need for specialized entrepreneurial expertise, and the establishment of appropriate physical and digital infrastructure [12], rural tourism represents a structural alternative to the mass tourism model, in which the visitor experience is designed to be immersive, fostering a connection between the tourist and the rural reality through an active participation in local life that includes staying in farmhouses, participating in agricultural activities, engaging with local lifestyles, partaking in traditional practices, enjoying local gastronomic specialities, and exploring natural environments [13].

Historically, the sector emerged in Europe in the mid-20th century, gaining significant traction in the 1960s and 1970s as a specific response to industrialization and rural economic decline [14]. Initially, it served as a purely economic survival strategy to generate supplementary income for agricultural sectors that were stagnating due to rapid urbanization and the exodus of rural populations. However, the model has evolved significantly from a niche economic alternative into an integral component of rural development strategies that encompass social and environmental dimensions, so that it is increasingly framed as a fundamental expression of regenerative tourism—a model that seeks not just to minimize harm, but to actively restore local ecosystems and social fabric through visitor engagement [15].

To better understand this evolving sector, this entry, written in form of a narrative review [16] (see Supplementary Materials), aims to fulfill the following specific objectives:

- To trace the historical evolution of rural tourism from a survival strategy to a sophisticated lifestyle expression.
- To analyze the role of gastronomy as a primary cultural anchor in rural destinations.
- To compare the institutionalized, policy-driven model of Europe with the market-driven, “New Frontier” model of Oceania.

- To identify the specific digital and ecological competencies required for future operational success.

In the following paragraph, this entry further explores how rural tourism has changed. It then examines and compares the specific trajectories that characterize the two distinct continental scenarios: Europe and Oceania. Comparing these two places can help us clarify the sector's emerging outlook and anticipate future opportunities and challenges.

2. Global Developments in Rural Tourism (1950s–2020s)

The contemporary trajectory of rural tourism presents a compelling narrative of socio-economic adaptation, evolving demand, and an increasing sophistication in the management of natural and cultural resources [17]. Analyzing the period from the end of World War II to the present day reveals a distinct shift from rural tourism as merely an alternative to mass tourism towards a complex, highly professionalized sector driven by the “experience economy” [18]. While the fundamental desire for a connection with nature remains a historical constant, the mechanisms of engagement, the role of technology, and the depth of sustainability practices have undergone radical transformations [19].

The genesis of modern rural tourism is best understood in the context of the post-World War II era. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, the global tourism landscape was dominated by traditional beach holidays: a model of mass consumption that prioritized sun and sea [20]. It was not until the 1970s that the concept of rural tourism began to gain significant traction, particularly within Europe. This emergence was not accidental but a direct response to saturation at coastal destinations. A societal shift began to manifest, characterized by a growing valuation of tranquillity, nature, and local culture over the frenetic pace of urban life and the industrialized characteristics of mass-tourism resorts. This period marked the initial deflection of tourism toward the countryside, a movement designed to leverage local agricultural practices, natural landscapes, and cultural heritage.

Throughout these decades, the function of rural tourism was primarily reactive, counteracting the adverse effects of urbanization. For rural communities, it became a vehicle for economic promotion and community development [21]. However, as the timeline progressed into the 1980s and 1990s, the drivers of this sector became deeply entwined with the macroeconomic forces of globalization. During this era, migration patterns and economic instability significantly influenced the supply side of rural tourism. Migration was often adopted as a survival strategy by rural populations facing economic hardship; interestingly, this dynamic enabled some migrants to reinvest remittances in their local economies through tourism initiatives [22]. Consequently, the growth of rural tourism in the late 20th century was not merely a leisure trend but a strategy for economic resilience, allowing communities to integrate new revenue streams with traditional agricultural practices [23].

Tangible socio-economic factors shaped the entrepreneurial landscape of this historical period. Research indicates that activities in rural tourism were heavily driven by land ownership, the proportion of income derived from farming, and the perceived attractiveness of such a form of tourism [24]. The performance of these early tourism enterprises correlated positively with the specific characteristics and resources of local entrepreneurs, thereby improving the overall economic viability of struggling rural areas [21] as well as allowing local stakeholders to take control of the tourism development process and ensure that economic benefits were equitably distributed [25].

As the millennium approached, a significant shift in consumer preferences occurred, bridging historical contexts with contemporary trends. By the late 1990s and entering the 2000s, visitors began to demand more than just visual proximity to nature; they sought immersive experiences [26]. The passive tourist of the 1970s evolved into an active

participant. This shift meant that tourists engaged directly in farming activities, in preserving local cultures, and in cross-cultural exchanges [27]. The rising desire for stress relief and outdoor recreational activities, fuelled by increasing urban pressures, has led to a marked preference for rural over urban holiday experiences [28]. This period also saw the crystallization of environmental awareness. The recognition of the negative impacts of mass tourism on fragile environments prompted operators to focus on sustainable practices that maximize local resources while promoting conservation. This created a strong link between rural tourism and ecotourism, which is a form of tourism defined by its ethical and environmental purpose rather than just its location [29].

As global trends in the 2010s and 2020s have shifted, the sector has undergone a metamorphosis defined by the imperatives of the “experience economy” [2]. If the historical trend was about seeking an alternative location, the current trend is about seeking a transformed self through immersion. A pivotal element distinguishing the current era from the historical context is the central role of gastronomy. While food was always a component of hospitality, it has now transcended its role as sustenance to become a primary cultural anchor and a core motivation for travel [30]. There is a strict relationship between the growth of food and wine tourism and the rediscovery of rurality by urbanized societies [31]. Tourists now seek to engage with the “terroir”—the profound, intrinsic connection between food, culture, and place [32], and this emphasis given to food productions transforms the rural landscape into a “gastronomic deposit” to be explored, involving visits to producers, participation in food festivals, and the tasting of quality products [33].

Overall, contemporary rural tourists’ expectations have shifted toward a multidimensional pursuit of authenticity and status, diverging from the simpler motivations of previous decades. Current motivations are physical (pleasure of food), cultural (understanding through flavours), interpersonal (social eating), and status-related (distinction through high-quality local products) [34]. Consequently, rural tourism has become a sophisticated expression of lifestyle. Ultimately, this synergy positions rural tourism as a “constructive” form of tourism that enhances residents’ quality of life while satisfying the postmodern traveller’s quest for genuine experiences [35].

However, to remain competitive in this shifting landscape, the supply side of rural tourism faces challenges that are vastly more complex than those of the 20th century. First of all, the success of the rural model brings the risk of ‘rural overtourism’ and gentrification, where the commodification of local lifestyles can lead to the displacement of residents and the ‘museumification’ of the countryside, necessitating a focus on social equity within governance frameworks [36]. Moreover, a crucial hurdle of the current decade is the “digital imperative.” Unlike the 1990s, when word of mouth or brochures might have sufficed, modern operators must master digital literacy to bypass intermediaries [37]. The integration of digital technologies is no longer optional but essential for visibility, and digital marketing is now a decisive factor for the agro-industrial complex, enabling producers to communicate directly with a hyper-connected consumer base [38]. This involves accommodating the emerging needs linked with the, so called, ‘Workation’ trend, where the rural tourist is no longer a transient visitor but a ‘digital nomad’ seeking long-term integration [39]. Furthermore, rural geosystems must adapt to a “smartphone world,” where the quality of digital interfaces directly correlates with tourist satisfaction and destination selection [40].

Paralleling this digital shift is the evolution of sustainability from a general philosophy to a technical competency. While the historical period recognized the need for conservation, the current trend demands “eco-effectiveness”, asking operators to move beyond vague green claims to demonstrable ecological stewardship [41]. Moreover, globalization has intensified the link between tourism and carbon emissions [42], necessitating rural operators to adopt specific green strategies to maintain legitimacy in a market

increasingly sensitive to ecological footprints [43,44]. Overall, this trend indicates that the sector is currently pivoting toward forms of regenerative tourism; a paradigm that shifts the focus from merely ‘minimizing impact’ to actively ‘giving back’ to the land, where the tourist’s presence directly contributes to the restoration of local biodiversity and soil health [15].

Furthermore, the quality of service in the 2020s hinges on “experience design.” Operators must curate authentic narratives that promote local heritage. Recent studies confirm that perceived authenticity is a primary driver of loyalty [45]. This requires a sophisticated understanding of how to blend atmosphere, service, and flavour, particularly in agritourism contexts where farm-raised foods are central [46].

Finally, current trends highlight that competitiveness relies on collective action and collaborative governance, which is a step beyond the individual entrepreneurship of the 1980s. Governance is critical to development, particularly in navigating the relationships between media, policy, and local development [47]. Participation in bottom-up initiatives is essential to integrate local community perspectives into strategies, thereby securing the social licence to operate and promote equitable economic distribution [48].

3. A Comparative Analysis

While the global trajectory towards an experiential and sustainable economy provides a unifying framework, the manifestation of rural tourism remains deeply rooted in local specificities. Continental scenarios exhibit unique dynamics shaped by their specific geographical constraints, social fabrics, and the historical stratification of tourism. Consequently, to fully grasp the versatility of this phenomenon, it is essential to analyze two ideal extremes that define the sector’s boundaries. The following analysis contrasts the European context, the historical cradle and mature example of modern rural tourism development, with the emerging scenario of Oceania, where, in recent years, rural tourism is actively reshaping visitor flows, modifying established forms of leisure even in island states that historically bore the brunt of twentieth-century mass tourism.

3.1. Europe

The European tourism landscape is currently undergoing a profound structural transformation, moving away from standardized mass tourism models that defined the late 20th century, toward an experience-driven approach in which rural tourism has emerged as a strategic pillar of regional resilience and economic vitality [49]. Europe remains the mature epicentre of global tourism, recently marking a robust post-pandemic recovery with arrivals nearing pre-crisis levels [34]. However, the internal dynamics of this flow are shifting profoundly towards the “experience economy”. In this context, rural tourism is no longer a niche alternative for budget travellers but a sophisticated response to tourists’ changing preferences for immersive experiences that allow them to engage directly with the local environment and communities rather than remaining passive spectators [50].

To understand the depth of this sector, one must look to its historical roots, which are deeply embedded in the European social fabric. Rural tourism dates to the 19th century, particularly in the Alpine regions, where the expansion of railway networks first enabled urban residents to escape the industrial city and access nature, thereby establishing the early “guest–host” dynamics that still define the sector today. However, the modern, organized form of rural tourism gained significant momentum from the 1930s onwards, particularly in countries like Italy, France, and Spain, where initiatives emerged to organize tourism around agriculture and local farming [51]. By the 1960s, this practice had been formally institutionalized as a policy tool to combat rural depopulation and to diversify farm incomes amid industrialization. This historical function remains critical

today, as the sector supports local economies grappling with agricultural decline and demographic stagnation, proving its value as a pillar of rural resilience [52].

The contemporary European model is characterized by “multifunctionality,” a concept that views farms not just as production units for commodities but also as custodians of culture, landscape, and biodiversity. This model is heavily supported by institutional frameworks, most notably the European Union’s Rural Development Programs and the LEADER program, which emphasize bottom-up, community-led initiatives to foster local development [53]. European rural tourism is characterized by its integration into dense cultural landscapes in which history, agriculture, and community life are inextricably linked. A central pillar of this model is the strict promotion of gastronomy, where rural culinary experiences have surged, particularly in Southern Europe [54]. This connection is far from incidental; it is a strategic asset where Protected Geographical Indication designations are used to differentiate destinations in a competitive global market, transforming local foods into cultural ambassadors that drive international demand [55].

The economic significance of this sector is substantial, with farm-based tourism alone estimated to contribute approximately 12 billion euros to European rural economies, and the broader rural tourism sector, potentially exceeding 65 billion euros annually [56]. This revenue is essential for revitalizing peripheral areas, providing alternative sources of income for communities that might otherwise face economic obsolescence [57]. Furthermore, it promotes sustainable practices that help maintain rural ecosystems and mitigate the carbon footprint associated with global travel [58].

Despite its maturity and economic success, the European sector faces pressing challenges that threaten its long-term viability. A primary concern is the risk of “over-tourism” in specific high-demand rural areas, where traffic congestion and resource strain can degrade the very landscapes and quietude that tourists come to seek. Balancing high visitor numbers with environmental carrying capacity is a critical necessity to prevent the “commodification” of rural life and ensure that tourism remains a regenerative force rather than an extractive one [41]. Moreover, the human capital driving this sector is facing a crisis of continuity; the ageing rural operator population demands urgent generational renewal and upskilling [50]. Consequently, the future of European rural tourism depends on its ability to innovate within tradition—leveraging digital tools and sustainable management practices while maintaining the authentic, human-scale connection that constitutes its unique value proposition in the global marketplace [59].

3.2. Oceania

The tourism landscape in Oceania is currently undergoing a significant paradigm shift. Historically viewed through the lens of distance and isolation, this region has transformed into a “New Frontier” for global tourism, characterized by a steady rise in international arrivals driven by improved air connectivity and strategic economic partnerships [60]. In this context, rural tourism has emerged as a core economic driver that leverages the region’s most abundant assets: its colossal scale, rugged wilderness, and rich indigenous heritage.

Unlike the European model, which is often village-centric and heavily subsidized by public policy to preserve cultural landscapes, rural tourism in Oceania is fundamentally market-driven, born from the necessity of economic diversification in the face of volatile global commodity markets. This sector effectively meets the demands of the post-modern tourist by offering “station stays” and wilderness encounters that are structurally distinct from the manicured, high-density experiences found in the Northern Hemisphere. Here, the visitor experience is defined by isolation and vastness; tourists often engage with massive agricultural operations, such as high-country sheep stations in New Zealand or cattle

stations in the Australian outback, which are frequently accessible only by light aircraft or extended overland journeys [61].

The historical trajectory of this sector reveals a resilience-based evolution rather than a policy-based one. As shown by Hamish Bremner (2013 #10936), the roots of rural tourism in the region can be traced back to the early 20th century, particularly in New Zealand, where “farm holidays” emerged as early as the 1930s. This was essentially a pragmatic response by farmers to supplement dwindling incomes during periods of economic depression, establishing a commercial precedent for hosting urban visitors on working farms. By the 1970s, this informal practice began to institutionalize, notably through the global adoption of the WWOOF (Willing Workers on Organic Farms) movement, which formalized the exchange between eco-conscious travellers and rural hosts. Parallel to this agricultural evolution, indigenous tourism developed. Indigenous communities have long histories of engaging with visitors and adapting traditional narratives to educate tourists while maintaining cultural integrity [62].

Today, the specific characteristics of the Oceanian rural tourism sector are defined by a unique synthesis of agriculture, adventure, and luxury. The “New Frontier” model uses the region’s “wild” landscapes to create a product in which high-adrenaline adventure tourism overlaps significantly with traditional agricultural settings [34]. Furthermore, there is a strategic shift toward high-value, low-volume tourism to mitigate the costs associated with the region’s remoteness. “Glamping” (glamorous camping) on vineyards and remote farms is booming, catering to a demographic that seeks connection with nature without sacrificing comfort. Simultaneously, the region has developed sophisticated “food and wine trails” (e.g., the Barossa Valley in Australia or Marlborough in New Zealand) that mimic European routes but operate with a more aggressive, export-oriented branding strategy designed to compete globally [63]. However, the continued success of this model depends on addressing critical operational challenges. The most pressing need is for digital literacy training to enable local entrepreneurs to bypass intermediaries, maintain visibility, and retain a larger share of tourism revenue. Furthermore, the sector, which operates within strict environmental limits [64], should equip operators with sustainable resource management skills to ensure that the development of high-value tourism products does not compromise the land’s ecological carrying capacity and to foster environmental and cultural stewardship, thereby ensuring that the sector remains a sustainable buffer against economic volatility rather than a driver of resource depletion. Overall, the sector is developing new countermeasures to address issues arising from potential over-tourism. They include implementing stakeholder-driven management plans that respect carrying capacities, utilizing real-time data analytics for crowd control, and adopting community-based models of entrepreneurship [65]. However, many of the challenges appear to still be open.

3.3. *The Emerging Outline*

A comparative analysis between the two regions reveals two distinct developmental trajectories (see Table 1): Europe represents the “First Comer,” a mature model shaped by deep institutional support and heritage preservation, while Oceania stands as the “Late Comer” or “New Frontier,” where development is fuelled by market-driven resilience and the management of vast wilderness. Despite these structural divergences, both regions are converging on a shared imperative of sustainability and authenticity, positioning rural tourism as a critical engine for regional resilience in a globalized world.

Table 1. A synthetic comparison between the characteristics of rural tourism in Europe and Oceania.

Features	Europe (The First Comer)	Oceania (The New Frontier)
Historical Root	Policy-driven; response to 1960s rural decline.	Market-driven; entrepreneurial response to commodity risks.
Model Type	Village-centric: focuses on maintaining community viability.	Wilderness-centric: focuses on isolation and vast scale.
Key Assets	High-density cultural landscapes and “terroir”.	Station stays, rugged wilderness, and indigenous heritage.
Governance	Heavily institutionalized (e.g., EU CAP and LEADER)	Market-driven; resilience-based with low public subsidy.
Sustainability Challenge	Mitigating over-tourism and cultural commodification.	Managing resource scarcity and climatic variability.
Primary Driver	Gastronomy and heritage preservation.	Adventure, luxury glamping, and economic diversification.

To understand the current state of rural tourism in these regions, one must examine their differing historical roots. The European model is heavily institutionalized, having emerged historically as a policy tool to combat rural depopulation caused by industrialization, and is underpinned by substantial public funding, most notably through the European Union’s Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and the LEADER program. Conversely, the Oceanian model is fundamentally an entrepreneurial response to fluctuations in commodity prices and climate risk. Consequently, while the European model is “village-centric” and focused on maintaining the demographic viability of rural settlements, the Pacific model is defined by “scale and wilderness,” with large-scale stations and remote landscapes attracting visitors seeking isolation and adventure.

Despite their differing origins, both regions are responding to the current need for immersive engagement among global tourists, and a commonality in meeting this demand is the strategic promotion of gastronomy. In Europe, this is manifested through the concept of “terroir” and is strictly regulated and marketed through Protected Geographical Indication designations. The Pacific region has mirrored this strategy but adapted it to its “New Frontier” context by focusing on innovation and “paddock-to-plate” experiences that mimic European routes but operate with a more aggressive, export-oriented branding strategy. In both contexts, gastronomy anchors the visitor experience in local biodiversity, transforming the rural landscape from a passive backdrop into an active “gastronomic deposit” to be explored.

While both models prioritize sustainability, the specific environmental challenges they face are dictated by their disparate geographies and population densities. Europe must navigate the risks of “over-tourism” and the potential commodification of its culture, shifting toward “eco-effectiveness”. In contrast, the Pacific model is constrained by “resource scarcity” rather than crowding. To mitigate this, the Pacific sector is increasingly adopting a high-value, low-volume strategy, such as luxury “glamping” on remote stations, which maximizes economic revenue while minimizing the physical footprint on fragile, water-scarce ecosystems.

Finally, the long-term viability of both models requires urgent upskilling in digital literacy to navigate the “smartphone world” and market directly to consumers, bypassing intermediaries and controlling narratives, thereby enabling them to create high-value, authentic experiences.

4. Conclusions and Prospect

In the contemporary global landscape, rural tourism has transcended its origins as a peripheral economic survival strategy to become a central pillar of regional resilience. The sector currently stands at a critical inflection point: a transition from passive preservation toward a model of regenerative tourism. This shift is not merely a cosmetic adjustment in marketing, but a structural evolution necessitated by a fundamental change in traveller behaviour—moving from a “surfing” modality of superficial observation to a “diving” modality of immersive, transformative engagement.

However, this paradigm shift is currently impeded by significant transversal gaps in human capital. Operators worldwide face a double imperative: a “digital mandate” to bypass global intermediaries and a requirement for “green competence” to move beyond “greenwashing” toward rigorous ecological accounting. Yet, as this analysis demonstrates, these challenges are not monolithic. The distinct contribution of this study lies in challenging the generalized narrative of rural development by dissecting how uniform global pressures manifest as divergent operational imperatives across continental contexts.

The digital divide, for instance, operates according to distinct logics across regions. In the mature, high-density European market, digital tools serve as mechanisms for differentiation and crowd management, which is essential for mitigating the risks of commodification and overtourism. Conversely, in the vast, remote expanses of Oceania, these tools are existential mechanisms for basic market visibility in a crowded global marketplace. Similarly, the application of “eco-effectiveness” varies significantly: Europe must prioritize cultural sustainability—ensuring that living heritage does not devolve into static “museumification”—while Oceania faces an imperative for physical resilience against acute climatic variability.

Institutional contrasts further highlight these divergent paths. The European experience suggests that while frameworks like the LEADER program are vital for maintaining demographic viability, they risk fostering a “static performance” of rurality. On the other hand, the Oceanian model illustrates potent market-driven resilience; by rebranding isolation and vastness as “luxury exclusivity,” this region has successfully transformed geographical constraints into a competitive advantage.

These divergent trajectories underscore the fact that the path forward cannot be universal. The diversity of these scenarios calls for three specific areas of future in-depth research to inform global policy:

- **Metrics for Regenerative Impact:** Quantitative studies are needed to measure the actual “net-positive” contribution of tourism to local soil health, biodiversity, and community wealth.
- **Digital Autonomy vs. Economic Leakage:** Research must assess the proficiency of operators in navigating a “smartphone world,” specifically quantifying how digital self-management prevents revenue leakage to global intermediaries.
- **Thresholds of cultural commodification:** Scholars must identify the sociological tipping points where tourism-led gentrification begins to erode the functional social fabric of rural communities.

Ultimately, the evolution of rural tourism reveals that this sector is no longer a passive backdrop for urban leisure, but an active participant in the survival of peripheral geosystems. Successful governance in this space cannot be standardized; it requires hybrid models that integrate gastronomy, agriculture, and tourism in ways that respect specific “terroir” constraints.

Whether navigating the dense cultural stratifications of former landscapes or the fragile, remote wilderness of the New Frontier, the future of this sector depends on

transforming the visitor from a consumer of places into a custodian of landscapes. By bridging the gap between historical roots and the digital future, rural tourism serves as more than an economic alternative; it remains a critical engine for global sustainability, ensuring that the countryside is not merely visited but truly understood and revitalized.

Supplementary Materials: The following supporting information can be downloaded at <https://www.mdpi.com/article/10.3390/encyclopedia6020048/s1>. References [16,34,35] are cited in the Supplementary Materials.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, M.F.F.; methodology, M.F.F.; formal analysis, M.F.F.; investigation, M.F.F. and M.P.; resources, M.F.F. and M.P.; data curation, M.F.F. and M.P.; writing—original draft preparation, M.F.F.; writing—review and editing, M.F.F. and M.P.; supervision, M.F.F.; project administration, M.F.F.; funding acquisition, M.F.F. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by the European Education and Culture Executive Agency through the project “The Agriculture-Tourism Alliance: From Farm to Fork Strategy applied in the Pacific Island Countries” (n. 101177322).

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Acknowledgments: Many thanks to Paolo Corvo, who provided the initial materials on which this entry was developed.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

1. WTO. *Fifty Years of Tourism*; World Tourism Organization: Madrid, Spain, 2026.
2. Siino, M. La scelta del viaggio: Come cambia il consumo di viaggi turistici. In *Sociologia dei Consumi Turistici*; Lo Verde, F.M., Corvo, P., Pepe, V., Eds.; Pearson: Milano, Italy, 2023; pp. 157–193.
3. Heinström, J. Fast surfing, broad scanning and deep diving: The influence of personality and study approach on students’ information-seeking behavior. *J. Doc.* **2005**, *61*, 228–247. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00220410510585205>.
4. Shah, C.; Shah, S.; Gibson, D. Demystifying agritourism development in Fiji: Inclusive growth for smallholders. *Tour. Hosp. Res.* **2022**, *22*, 131–148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14673584211005169>.
5. Nurjaya, I.N. Legal Policy of Sustainable Tourism Development: Toward Community-Based Tourism in Indonesia. *J. Tour. Econ. Policy* **2023**, *2*, 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.38142/jtep.v2i3.404>.
6. American Express, T. *2023 Global Travel Trends Report*; American Express Travel: New York, NY, USA, 2023.
7. Mulyaningsih, T. A Systematic Literature Review of Development Rural Tourism. *General Manag.* **2023**, *24*, 34–48. <https://doi.org/10.47750/qas/24.194.05>.
8. Skyscanner. *Travel Trends 2023: The Year of Price-Driven Decisions*; Skyscanner: Edinburgh, Scotland, 2022.
9. Gursoy, D.; Chi, C.G. Effects of COVID-19 pandemic on hospitality industry: Review of the current situations and a research agenda. *J. Hosp. Mark. Manag.* **2020**, *29*, 527–529. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2020.1788231>.
10. Rahman, A.Z.; Pradana, A.E.; Rakhma, N.A. Sustainable Tourism Development in Glawan Village: Balancing Infrastructure Growth and Environment Through Local Governance. *Iop Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci.* **2025**, *1537*, 012001. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1537/1/012001>.
11. Villanueva-Alvaro, J.-J.; Jiménez, J.M.; Saez-Martínez, F.J. Rural Tourism: Development, Management and Sustainability in Rural Establishments. *Sustainability* **2017**, *9*, 818. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9050818>.
12. Xue, C.; Tu, Y.T.; Ananzeh, M.; Aljumah, A.I.; Trung, L.M.; Ngo, T.Q. The Role of Economic Conditions and Sustainable Rural Development on the Sustainability of Tourism Development: Evidence from China. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* **2023**, *30*, 30588–30602. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-24062-w>.

13. Ishak, F.A.C.; Muhammad, N.A.L.; Karim, S.A.; Abidin, U.F.U.Z.; Ismail, N.A.; Hanafiah, M.H. Staging Memorable Dining Experience in Food Tourism: A Narrative Literature Review of Ethnic Restaurants. *Int. J. Acad. Res. Bus. Social Sci.* **2023**, *13*, 282–304. <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbs/v13-i5/17021>.
14. Reid, D.G. Understanding rural tourism. In *Handbook on Tourism and Rural Community Development*; Mair, H., Ed.; Edward Elgar Publishing: Cheltenham, UK, 2023; pp. 29–40.
15. Bellato, L.; Pollock, A. Regenerative tourism: A state-of-the-art review. *Tour. Geogr.* **2025**, *27*, 558–567. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2023.2294366>.
16. Sukhera, J. Narrative Reviews: Flexible, Rigorous, and Practical. *J. Grad. Med. Educ.* **2022**, *14*, 414–417. <https://doi.org/10.4300/jgme-d-22-00480.1>.
17. Kumar, V.; Agarwala, T.; Kumar, S. Rural tourism as a driver of sustainable development: A systematic review and future research agenda. *Tour. Rev.* **2025**. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-03-2024-0172>.
18. Tagowa, W.N.; Hunohidoshi, M. From Mystification to ‘Cultural Openness’: Gearing Local Communities for ‘Tangible and Intangible’ Rural Tourism Development among the Bwatiye, North-Eastern Nigeria. In *Sustainable Development and Planning VII*; WIT Press: Southampton, UK, 2015; pp. 203–214.
19. Rosalina, P.D.; Dupre, K.; Wang, Y. Rural tourism: A systematic literature review on definitions and challenges. *J. Hosp. Tour. Manag.* **2021**, *47*, 134–149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2021.03.001>.
20. Bhatta, K.; Ohe, Y.; Ciani, A. Which Human Resources Are Important for Turning Agritourism Potential Into Reality? SWOT Analysis in Rural Nepal. *Agriculture* **2020**, *10*, 197. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture10060197>.
21. Barbieri, C.; Mshenga, P. The Role of the Firm and Owner Characteristics on the Performance of Agritourism Farms. *Sociol. Rural.* **2008**, *48*, 166–183. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9523.2008.00450.x>.
22. Haas, H.d. Migration and Development: A Theoretical Perspective. *Int. Migr. Rev.* **2010**, *44*, 227–264. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2009.00804.x>.
23. McGehee, N.G.; Kim, K. Motivation for Agri-Tourism Entrepreneurship. *J. Travel Res.* **2004**, *43*, 161–170. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287504268245>.
24. McGehee, N.G.; Kim, K.; Jennings, G. Gender and Motivation for Agri-Tourism Entrepreneurship. *Tour. Manag.* **2007**, *28*, 280–289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.12.022>.
25. Lapointe, D. “Salvaging” presence: Tourism as regional development strategies for rural communities. In *Handbook on Tourism and Rural Community Development*; Mair, H., Ed.; Edward Elgar Publishing: Cheltenham, UK, 2023; pp. 301–315.
26. Yanan, L.; Ismail, M.A.; Aminuddin, A. How has rural tourism influenced the sustainable development of traditional villages? A systematic literature review. *Heliyon* **2024**, *10*, e25627. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e25627>.
27. Kazmina, L.; Provotorina, V.; Makarenko, V.; Petrenko, A. Social and Financial Feasibility of the Development of Rural Tourism and the Hospitality Industry in the Rostov Region. *E3s Web Conf.* **2021**, *273*, 09002. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202127309002>.
28. Grimaldi, P. *Tempi Grassi, Tempi Magri*; Omega: Torino, Italy, 1996.
29. Ross, D. The history of ecotourism. In *International Handbook of Ecotourism*, Ballantyne, R., Packer, J., Eds.; Edward Elgar Publishing Limited: Cheltenham, UK, 2013; pp. 15–30.
30. Fusté-Forné, F. The Rural Food Tourist. *The Food Tourist*; Emerald Publishing Limited: Bingley, UK, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83549-085-320251005>.
31. Corvo, P.; Fontefrancesco, M.F. Sustainable Gastronomic Tourism. In *The Routledge Handbook of Gastronomic Tourism*; Dixit, S.K., Ed.; Routledge: London, UK, 2019; pp. 209–216.
32. Demossier, M. *The Europeanization of Terroir: Consuming Place, Tradition and Authenticity*; Friedman, R., Thiel, M., Eds.; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2016; pp. 119–137.
33. Fontefrancesco, M.F. *Food Festivals and Local Development in Italy : A Viewpoint from Economic Anthropology*; Palgrave: London, UK, 2020.
34. Lo Verde, F.M.; Corvo, P.; Pepe, V. *Sociologia dei Consumi Turistici*; Pearson: Milano, Italy, 2023.
35. Mair, H. Introduction: Understanding rural community development and tourism in challenging times. In *Handbook on Tourism and Rural Community Development*; Mair, H., Ed.; Edward Elgar Publishing: Cheltenham, UK, 2023; pp. 1–13.
36. Butler, R.W. Overtourism in Rural Areas. In *Overtourism: Causes, Implications and Solutions*, Séraphin, H., Gladkikh, T., Vo Thanh, T., Eds.; Springer International Publishing: Cham, Switzerland, 2020; pp. 27–43.
37. Pepe, V. Consumi turistici e pratiche tecnologiche nell’era digitale. In *Sociologia dei Consumi Turistici*; Lo Verde, F.M., Corvo, P., Pepe, V., Eds.; Pearson: Milano, Italy, 2023; pp. 87–109.

38. Kulikova, E.S.; Rushickaya, O.A.; Kruzhkova, T.I. Analysis of the Implementation of Digital Marketing in the Agro-Industrial Complex. *Agrar. Bull. Ural* **2024**, *24*, 1106–1114. <https://doi.org/10.32417/1997-4868-2024-24-08-1106-1114>.
39. Pearce, P.L. Smart Tourists and Intelligent Behavior. In *Handbook of e-Tourism*; Xiang, Z., Fuchs, M., Gretzel, U., Höpken, W., Eds.; Springer International Publishing: Cham, Switzerland, 2022; pp. 1067–1083.
40. Voda, M.; Dumitrache, N.D.; Negru, R.; Du, Q.; Gan, C. Rural Geosystems' Future in the Smartphone World: The Inception of Romanian Tourist Sites. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 9652. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14159652>.
41. Belliggiano, A.; Garcia, E.C.; Labianca, M.; Valverde, F.N.; De Rubertis, S. The “Eco-Effectiveness” of Agritourism Dynamics in Italy and Spain: A Tool for Evaluating Regional Sustainability. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 7080. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12177080>.
42. Ehigiamusoe, K.U.; Shahbaz, M.; Vo, X.V. How Does Globalization Influence the Impact of Tourism on Carbon Emissions and Ecological Footprint? Evidence from African Countries. *J. Travel. Res.* **2022**, *62*, 1010–1032. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875221113886>.
43. Adamov, T.; Ciolac, R.; Iancu, T.; Brad, I.; Peț, E.; Popescu, G.; Șmuleac, L. Sustainability of Agritourism Activity. Initiatives and Challenges in Romanian Mountain Rural Regions. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 2502. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12062502>.
44. Ciolac, R.; Iancu, T.; Brad, I.; Adamov, T.; Mateoc-Sîrb, N. Agritourism—A Business Reality of the Moment for Romanian Rural Area's Sustainability. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 6313. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13116313>.
45. Chi, X.; Lee, S.K.; Ahn, Y.j.; Kiatkawsin, K. Tourist-Perceived Quality and Loyalty Intentions towards Rural Tourism in China. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 3614. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12093614>.
46. Baby, J.; Kim, D.Y. Atmosphere, Service, and Flavor: Exploring Quality Dimensions of Farm-Raised Foods in Agritourism. *Tour. Hosp.* **2025**, *6*, 165. <https://doi.org/10.3390/tourhosp6040165>.
47. Lequeux-Dincă, A.I.; Teodorescu, C. Governance and Development of Tourism in Rural Areas through the Lens of Media in South Bukovina (Romania). *Agriculture* **2024**, *14*, 1462. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture14091462>.
48. Aulanni'am, A.; Hariati, A.M.; Sawitri, M.E.; Padaga, M.C.; Wuragil, D.K.; Hakim, L. Principles of Rural Tourism Development in Krisik Village, East Java: The Perspectives of Local Community. *J. Indones. Tour. Dev. Stud.* **2021**, *9*, 128–132. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jitode.2021.009.02.05>.
49. Joshi, S.; Panzer-Krause, S.; Zerbe, S.; Saurwein, M. Rural tourism in Europe from a landscape perspective: A systematic review. *Eur. J. Tour. Res.* **2024**, *36*, 3616. <https://doi.org/10.54055/ejtr.v36i.3328>.
50. Fontefrancesco, M.F.; Boscolo, A.; Zocchi, D.M. Rural Culinary Tourism in Southern Europe: Emerging Educational Needs of a Growing Sector. *Tour. Hosp.* **2023**, *4*, 293–306.
51. World Tourism Organization. *Rural Tourism in Europe: Experiences, Development and Perspectives*; World Tourism Organization: Madrid, Spain, 2004.
52. Cherep, A.; Voronkova, V.; Venherska, N. European Practices of Rural Green Tourism: Challenges and Prospects. *Balt. J. Econ. Stud.* **2023**, *9*, 275–282. <https://doi.org/10.30525/2256-0742/2023-9-5-275-282>.
53. Leslie, D. The European Union, sustainable tourism policy and rural Europe. In *Sustainable Tourism in Rural Europe*; Macleod, D., Gillespie, S., Eds.; Routledge: London, UK, 2010; pp. 43–60.
54. Garibaldi, R. *Rapporto sul Turismo Enogastronomico Italiano: Trend e Tendenze del Turismo Enogastronomico*; Associazione Italiana Turismo Enogastronomico: Bergamo, Italy, 2022.
55. Santeramo, F.G. Research Note: Promoting the International Demand for Agritourism: Empirical Evidence from a Dynamic Panel Data Model. *Tour. Econ.* **2015**, *21*, 907–916. <https://doi.org/10.5367/te.2014.0397>.
56. Still Tourism Around Yard. *Agritourism in Europe: Opportunities, Challenges, and Policy Implications*; Biotehniški Center Naklo: Naklo, Slovenia, 2024.
57. Klufová, R.; Šulista, M. Perceptions of Czech Rural Life by Its Inhabitants in Connection to Tourism. *Deturope-Cent. Eur. J. Tour. Reg. Dev.* **2018**, *10*, 5–32. <https://doi.org/10.32725/det.2018.001>.
58. Oleksenko, R.; Bilohur, S.; Rybalchenko, N.; Verkhovod, I.; Harbar, H. The Ecological Component of Agrotourism Development under the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Cuest. Políticas* **2021**, *39*, 870–881. <https://doi.org/10.46398/cuestpol.3969.53>.
59. Fontefrancesco, M.F. *Rural Affective Economies: An Ethnographic Approach to Local Development in Rural Italy*; Palgrave: London, UK, 2025.
60. Narayan, P.K.; Narayan, S.; Prasad, A.; Prasad, B.C. Tourism and Economic Growth: A Panel Data Analysis for Pacific Island Countries. *Tour. Econ.* **2010**, *16*, 169–183. <https://doi.org/10.5367/000000010790872006>.
61. Saverimuttu, V.; Varua, M. Promoting Sustainable Tourism in the Pacific Forum Island Countries. In *Sustainable Tourism VI*; WIT Press: Southampton, UK, 2014; Volume 1, pp. 27–38. <https://doi.org/10.2495/ST140031>.

62. Shah, C.; Gibson, D.; Shah, S.; Pratt, S. Exploring a market for agritourism in Fiji: Tourists' perspective. *Tour. Recreat. Res.* **2020**, *45*, 204–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2019.1685180>.
63. Stephenson, M.L.T.; Marcus, L. Future research trajectories: Pacific Island tourism. In *Routledge Handbook on Tourism and Small Island States in the Pacific*; Stephenson, M.L., Ed.; Routledge: London, UK, 2022; pp. 381–392.
64. Ka, D.; Chong, L.; Stephenson, M.L. Deciphering tourism's auspicious and inauspicious relationships with food and agriculture in Pacific Island states: Identifying problems and solutions. In *Routledge Handbook on Tourism and Small Island States in the Pacific*; Stephenson, M.L., Ed.; Routledge: London, UK, 2022; pp. 126–140.
65. Scheyvens, R.; Movono, A.; Auckram, S. The Future of Pacific Tourism: Strengthening sustainable tourism development by prioritising local people and places. *Pac. Dyn. Interdiscip. Res.* **2025**, *9*, 1358–1383.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.