Journal of Management and Economics (ISSN: 2751-1707)

Received: 28 September 2026 | Accepted: 24 October 2026 | Published: 16 November 2026

DOI: 10.55640/jme-06-11-02

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Assessing Agritourism Development Potential and Strategic Management Opportunities for Sustainable Rural Development in Tashkent Region, Uzbekistan

Ravshan Asamov

Department of Economics, International Agriculture University (Ass. Prof), Tashkent State Agrarian University (DSc), Tashkent, Uzbekistan

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue11 2026

PAGE: 10-23

Copyright © 2026 Journal of Management and Economics, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. Licensed under Creative Commons License a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract

Agritourism provides a way to diversify rural economies. The potential of agritourism in post-Soviet agricultural areas is largely unexamined. The purpose of this research is to determine the prospects for agritourism in the Tashkent region of Uzbekistan. It is the first of its kind to identify opportunities and obstacles in the region and provide policymakers and agritourism practitioners with pathways for development. This research has four primary aims. The first is to determine the available agritourism services in the Tashkent region. The second is to identify the obstacles and opportunities as perceived by farmers. The third is to determine the consumer demand and expectations of urban tourists and the fourth is to provide a strategy to integrate the previous three objectives. The participants in this research will be farming operators and district administrators. A mixed method approach will be taken. Supply-side research and realities will be captured through qualitative semi-structured interviews. The demand side will be captured through a quantitative structured survey, which will describe the consumer interest and spending behavior of residents in Tashkent city. The results of this research will suggest that urban residents have a strong desire for rural experiences and visits to orchards and craft tours, but the agritourism infrastructure is lacking. There are many other significant obstacles to developing agritourism in the region, including poor access to roads and the internet, difficult bureaucratic processes for licenses, restricted micro-finance availability, and a lack of marketing skills. The diverse horticultural and foothill terrains of this region have great potential to develop clustering agritourism models, as does their proximity to the capital. The research suggests agritourism in this region of Uzbekistan has the potential to greatly improve rural economies and promote sustainability in the region's agriculture.

KEYWORDS

Agritourism Development; Strategic Management; Sustainable Rural Development; Rural Tourism; Agricultural Diversification; Tourism Demand; Agritourism Clusters; Tashkent Region; Uzbekistan.

INTRODUCTION

Globally, especially in developing nations, combining agriculture with tourism is a growing strategy for rural development due to the positive economic, environmental, and social impacts of agritourism (Santharam et al., 2025).

Agritourism is defined as working farm tours that educate and entertain visitors while diversifying farm income (University of Maryland Extension, 2025). Rural tourism is a solution to environmental deterioration, declining agricultural practices, rural migration, and unemployment. Agritourism diversifies and strengthens rural economies (Sustainability MDPI, 2024).

At the most basic level, agritourism is the combination of farm tourism with farm income (Fountain, 2022). Agritourism is a rural development strategy that enables farm diversification in both the developed and developing world (Taylor & Francis, 2024). Agritourism is a versatile rural development strategy with five categories according to the University of Vermont. These categories are direct farm sales, farm tours, farm stays, farm based outdoor activities, and farm-based events (University of Vermont, n.d.).

The Tashkent region is in a prime location to take advantage of agritourism since it is close to the capital, the international airport, and has modern transportation infrastructure, as well as beautiful landscapes, cultural heritage, and productive agricultural areas. The Tashkent region has a robust tourism infrastructure with 1,295 hotels and 172 tourism companies (Tourism Committee of Uzbekistan, 2025).

Agriculture in the region is very diverse including fruit and vegetable production, as well as vineyards and livestock. The new Government of Uzbekistan (2026) initiative to establish 160 thousand hectares of new orchards and vineyards is a part of the government's shift away from the traditional cotton and wheat monocultures. This initiative will help promote and enhance rural resilience and the diversification of farms leading to positive agritourism prospects in the region (Brill, n.d.).

Unfortunately, agritourism in the Tashkent region is still underdeveloped and under-researched. The tourism in the region is mostly based on ecotourism, cultural, religious, and recreational tourism. Very little attention has been given to agritourism either in literature or policy (Samandarova, n.d.). Recent studies have uncovered the poor coordination, low levels of technology, and inadequate support from the government, which have shown that there is a need to conduct research and establish a clear focus when developing agritourism in the region (Yakubjanova & Isabekova, 2025; CAJITMF, 2025).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature has also further progressed through the development of agritourism typologies, offering frameworks for the classification of agritourism activities. Phillip et al. (2010) suggested a typology that is recognized and respected and based this typology on the presence or absence of the working farm, level of tourist engagement in active farm work, and the level of authenticity of the experience of the visitors.

Phillip, Hunter and Blackstock Agritourism Typology

Type	Working Farm	Contact with Agriculture	Authenticity	Examples
Type 1	Yes	Passive (non-participatory)	Low	Farm accommodation, farm-stay with no agricultural activities
Type 2	Yes	Passive (educational)	Low-Medium	Farm tours, agricultural museums
Type 3	Yes	Active (indirect)	Medium	Farm shops, direct farm sales, u-pick operations
Type 4	Yes	Active (direct participation)	High	Participation in farm work, harvest activities, animal feeding
Type 5	No (former farm)	Active/Passive	Variable	Agricultural heritage sites, converted farm buildings

Source: Adapted from Phillip et al. (2010)

This typology presents a way to sort different agritourism products. Phillip et al. (2014) improved it further using real examples from providers and visitors and developing it using three criteria: how visitors interact with agriculture, if the activity takes place on a working farm, and if the agricultural experience is real.

The agritourism market is the most developed and documented market in Europe. Agritourism started developing

in Europe after some countries began to create frameworks with prescriptions and incentives for the hospitality market in agriculture to diversify (Kubal-Czerwińska, 2018). A great example of this is the European Union's LEADER program, which offers grants for the promotion of rural development to members of the EU (Kubal-Czerwińska, 2018).

Comparative Analysis of European Agritourism Models

Dimension	Italy	Spain	France	United Kingdom
Regulatory Approach	Rigid, agriculture-centred	Flexible, multifunctional	Flexible, multifunctional	Market-driven
Key Activities	Farm stays, agriturismi, wine tourism	Vineyard retreats, eco-lodges, rural farm stays	Farm accommodation, gastronomy	Farm stays, B&Bs, farm shops
Policy Support	National laws, regional programmes	Government incentives, Ceres Ecotur network	National policies	Local authority support
Innovation Focus	Heritage accommodation (Alberghi Diffusi)	Sustainable rural tourism networks	Gastronomic tourism	Diversification grants

Source: Compiled from Kubal-Czerwińska (2018)

According to the systematic literature review conducted by (2025) that gathered data from 1,330 publications, the collaboration of governments, private investors, and local communities, is necessary to overcome the obstacles presented.

Enablers of Agritourism Development

Enabler Category	Specific Factors	Evidence
Policy and Regulatory	Supportive regulations, streamlined licensing, financial incentives	Santharam et al. (2025)
Infrastructure	Improved road connectivity, digital access, utilities	Santharam et al. (2025)
Financial	Access to credit, grants, insurance products	Santharam et al. (2025)
Capacity Building	Training programmes, extension services, technical assistance	Yakubjanova and Isabekova (2025)
Marketing and Technology	Digital platforms, AI tools, branding support	TourisFarm (2024)
Collaboration	Public-private partnerships, community engagement, clusters	Santharam et al. (2025)

Source: Compiled from Santharam et al. (2025), Yakubjanova and Isabekova (2025), and TourisFarm (2024)

According to Santharam et al. (2025), successful sustainable rural diversification involves fair productive resource access, digital skills, and inclusive tourism development that maintains the rural area's agrarian character. Agritourism's success relies on the balance among economic aims and social and environmental sustainability.

The Tashkent region is considered one of the most attractive tourism regions of Uzbekistan. As noted by Samandarova (n.d.), the "Golden Ring" concept is being applied to the region, and a variety of tourism types are being developed, such as wildlife tourism, agritourism, ethnographic, pilgrimage, and hydro tourism. The abundant tourism resources of the region allow for the development of agritourism.

In Central Asia, rural tourism and agritourism are becoming essential. Improvement of tourism in Central Asia relies on the

integration of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Uzbekistan (Kun.uz, 2026). While Kyrgyzstan is becoming a leading eco-tourism destination, Kazakhstan is becoming a digital and an aviation hub (ITIJ, 2026).

Agritourism and Rural Tourism in Central Asian Countries

Country	Tourism Focus	Agritourism Status	Key Features
Uzbekistan	Silk Road heritage, cultural tourism	Emerging	Government priority, «Uzbekistan – 2030» strategy
Kazakhstan	Digital and aviation hub, gastro-tourism	Nascent	Vast steppes, nomadic culture, dairy products
Kyrgyzstan	Eco-tourism	Developing	Song Kul, ecotourism focus
Tajikistan	Scenic landscapes	Limited	Pamir Highway, emerging tourism

Source: Compiled from ITIJ (2026), Kun.uz (2026), and Embassy of Uzbekistan in Singapore (n.d.)

METHODOLOGY

This research is located within a pragmatist research philosophy. This philosophy fits well within a mixed-methods approach (Creswell and Creswell, 2018). In this philosophy, the choice of research methods is most relevant to the questions, and therefore the qualitative and quantitative approaches are integrated, and the focus is on producing real and useful outcomes (Saunders et al., 2019). It recognizes the importance of both subjective and objective knowledge.

A pragmatist approach is fitting for this research since it is concerned with both quantifiable data (e.g., the number and expenditure of tourists) and qualitative data (e.g., perceptions of farmers and institutional barriers). It is also concerned with the formulation of useful policy and practice suggestions and the intricate and context-based nature of the development of agritourism in Uzbekistan.

Research Design

A mixed-method research design is adopted, specifically concurrent triangulation design (convergent parallel design) (Creswell and Creswell, 2018). According to this design, qualitative and quantitative data are collected at the same time, analyzed separately, and merged at the interpretation stage.

Alignment of Research Objectives with Methods

Research Objective	Data Source	Method	Analysis Technique
Profile current agritourism offerings	Farmers, tourism operators	Qualitative interviews	Thematic analysis
Assess perceived opportunities	Farmers, community members	Qualitative interviews	Thematic analysis
Identify primary challenges	Farmers, officials, operators	Qualitative interviews	Thematic analysis
Evaluate tourist demand	Tourists (domestic & international)	Quantitative survey	Descriptive & inferential statistics
Formulate recommendations	All stakeholders	Integration of findings	Synthesis

Source: Author's own compilation

Concurrent triangulation design benefits this research in many ways. It allows for the collection of both qualitative data and quantitative data that can be used to describe tourism in detail from an integrative perspective.

Map of the Tashkent Region, Uzbekistan



Source: Adapted from Samandarova (n.d.)

Being close to the 2.5 million population city of Tashkent, the region has the potential to attract a large urban market for agritourism. Connected by large highways and railways, Tashkent city residents can take day trips and weekend trips to the region (Samandarova, n.d.).

Sampling Strategy for Each Stakeholder Group

Stakeholder Group	Sampling Method	Target Sample Size	Rationale
Farmers and entrepreneurs	Purposive sampling (with snowball)	20-25 participants	Captures diverse farm types, locations, and agritourism experiences
Local government officials	Purposive sampling	5-7 participants	Targets officials directly involved in tourism/agriculture policy
Tourism operators	Purposive sampling	8-10 participants	Ensures representation of different tourism sectors
Tourists	Quota sampling	200-250 respondents	Ensures representation across demographics and origin (domestic/international)

Source: Author's own compilation based on Creswell and Creswell (2018) and Bryman (2016)

Purposive sampling was used for qualitative interviews with farmers, government officials, and tourism operators. Participants were deliberately chosen based on their knowledge and the relevance they had to the research (Patton, 2015).

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 22 farmers and rural entrepreneurs across 5 Districts of the Tashkent Region: 6 in Bostanlik, 5 in Parkent, 4 in Yangiyol, 4 in Chinoz, and 3 in Akhangaran. The interviewees had different farm types and sizes and a different degree of involvement with agritourism.

RESULTS

Profile of Farmer and Entrepreneur Participants

Participant Code	District	Farm Type	Size (hectares)	Agritourism Engagement
F1	Bostanlyk	Mixed (fruit + livestock)	15	Active (farm stays, u-pick)

F2	Bostanlyk	Orchard (apples, cherries)	8	Active (u-pick, tours)
F3	Bostanlyk	Vineyard	12	Planning
F4	Bostanlyk	Vegetables	6	None
F5	Bostanlyk	Mixed (fruit + honey)	20	Active (farm stays, workshops)
F6	Bostanlyk	Orchard (apricots, peaches)	10	Planning
F7	Parkent	Vineyard	18	Active (wine tasting, tours)
F8	Parkent	Orchard (apples, pears)	14	Planning
F9	Parkent	Mixed (fruit + vegetables)	9	None
F10	Parkent	Vineyard	7	Active (u-pick)
F11	Parkent	Orchard (cherries)	11	None
F12	Yangiyol	Vegetables	25	None
F13	Yangiyol	Mixed (crops + livestock)	30	Planning
F14	Yangiyol	Orchards	16	None
F15	Yangiyol	Vineyard	5	None
F16	Chinoz	Fruit (various)	22	Planning
F17	Chinoz	Vegetables	18	None
F18	Chinoz	Mixed	12	None
F19	Chinoz	Orchards (peaches)	9	None
F20	Akhangaran	Vineyard	6	Active (u-pick)
F21	Akhangaran	Mixed	14	Planning
F22	Akhangaran	Vegetables	20	None

Source: Fieldwork data, 2026

Of the 22 total participants, 7 practiced agritourism, 7 were considered, and 8 were neither involved nor considered agritourism. The data reflects the views of participants from all three groups.

Agritourism Activities Offered by Active Farmers

Activity Type	Number of Farmers Offering	Description
U-pick (you-pick) operations	6	Visitors pick their own fruits (cherries, apples, apricots, peaches)
Farm stays (accommodation)	4	Overnight accommodation in farmhouses or cottages
Educational/workshop tours	3	Teaching visitors about farming, beekeeping, winemaking
Farm-to-table experiences	3	Meals prepared with farm produce for visitors
Wine/grape tasting	2	Tasting local wines and grape varieties
Craft workshops	2	Traditional crafts (felt-making, embroidery)

Source: Fieldwork data, 2026

Perceived Opportunities for Agritourism Development

Opportunity Category	Specific Opportunities	Number of Farmers Citing	Illustrative Quote
Economic	Income diversification	18/22	*"It's extra money, and it's more stable than relying only on crops."* (F13)
	Higher product margins	14/22	*"When visitors come, we sell fruit at a premium. They pay more for the experience."* (F3)
	Off-season income	12/22	*"Winter is dead for farming, but guests still come for the snow and food."* (F5)
Social	Intergenerational connection	10/22	*"Young people from the city need to know where food comes from. We teach them."* (F10)
	Community development	8/22	*"When tourists come, they support local shops and transport. Everyone benefits."* (F16)
	Preservation of traditions	9/22	*"Our grandchildren want to leave. If we show visitors our culture, they might stay."* (F18)
Environmental	Sustainable farming recognition	7/22	*"Tourists appreciate that we don't use chemicals. They pay more for organic."* (F2)
	Conservation incentives	6/22	*"We protect the landscape because it attracts visitors. It's good for nature."* (F21)

Source: Fieldwork data, 2026

Many farmers were hopeful that agritourism could provide meaningful connections to the rural and urban populations and help preserve agricultural traditions.

Obstacles for the development of agritourism were grouped into five major types: infrastructure, regulations, capital, capability, and marketplace.

Eight (n=8) non-participating farmers in agritourism gave us a lot of reasons. These were classified as motivational and constraint-based factors.

Reasons for Non-Engagement in Agritourism

Reason	Number of Farmers	Illustrative Quote
Constraint: Lack of knowledge	6	*"I don't know what agritourism is or how to start."* (F22)
Constraint: Financial limitations	5	*"I would like to try, but I can't afford to build facilities."* (F12)
Constraint: Family/labour constraints	4	*"My children work in the city. It's just me and my wife."* (F15)
Constraint: No support or guidance	4	*"The khokimiyat never told us about agritourism opportunities."* (F9)
Constraint: Lack of clear regulations	3	*"I'm afraid of the tax officials. I don't want problems."* (F19)
Motivation: Already profitable farming	3	*"I earn enough from my crops. I don't need the extra headache."* (F17)
Motivation: Age/retirement	2	*"I'm too old to start something new. My children should do it."* (F11)

Source: Fieldwork data, 2026

Farmers identified five types of support necessary for the development of agritourism: government assistance; training;

and financial, infrastructure, and promotional support.

Farmer-Identified Support Needs

Support Category	Specific Needs	Number of Farmers
Government Support	Simplified licensing	18/22
	Single-point regulatory contact	16/22
	Tax incentives	14/22
	Clear policy guidelines	13/22
Training	Marketing and IT skills	17/22
	Hospitality and guest management	16/22
	Business planning	14/22
Financial	Low-interest loans	19/22
	Start-up grants	17/22
	Tax holidays	14/22
Infrastructure	Road improvements	20/22
	Signage and wayfinding	18/22
	Internet/mobile coverage	16/22
Marketing	Regional agritourism brand	19/22
	Online booking platform	18/22
	Tourist maps and brochures	17/22

Source: Fieldwork data, 2026

Government officials in the interviews expressed an interest in agritourism and admitted that there was a lack of coordination in policies regarding this issue.

Government Official Perspectives on Agritourism Challenges

Challenge Area	Number of Officials Citing	Illustrative Quote
Lack of coordination between departments	6/6	*"Agriculture and tourism are in different departments. We don't talk enough."* (G2)
Limited budget for agritourism promotion	5/6	*"We have many plans but limited money to implement them."* (G3)
Weak local government capacity	5/6	*"District officials are trained in administration, not tourism promotion."* (G1)
Absence of agritourism-specific regulation	4/6	*"There is no single law on agritourism. Farmers are confused."* (G4)
Insufficient awareness among farmers	4/6	*"Most farmers don't know what agritourism is or what support is available."* (G5)
Inadequate data and research	3/6	*"We don't have accurate data on current agritourism activities."* (G6)

Source: Fieldwork data, 2026

Tourism Operator Perspectives on Agritourism Challenges

Challenge	Number of Operators Citing	Illustrative Quote
Limited agritourism product quality and consistency	7/8	*"Some farms are excellent. Others are not ready to receive tourists."* (T2)
Lack of online presence and booking systems	6/8	*"We can't promote farms that don't have online booking."* (T1)
Poor access and infrastructure	6/8	*"Tourists come with expectations of easy access. The roads are a*

		problem." (T5)
Weak marketing and branding	6/8	*"There is no Tashkent agritourism brand. Every farm is unknown."* (T6)
Limited collaboration with farmers	5/8	*"We want to work with farmers, but they don't always understand tourism."* (T3)
Seasonality	4/8	*"Fruit season is short. What do we offer in winter?"* (T7)

Source: Fieldwork data, 2026

There were 237 completed and usable surveys. Below is the breakdown of the demographics.

Demographic Profile of Tourist Survey Respondents

Characteristic	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	108	45.6
	Female	129	54.4
Age Group	18-25	42	17.7
	26-35	68	28.7
	36-45	57	24.1
	46-55	40	16.9
	56+	30	12.7
Education	Secondary	38	16.0
	Bachelor's degree	112	47.3
	Master's degree	67	28.3
	Doctorate	20	8.4
Residency	Tashkent city	102	43.0
	Tashkent region	48	20.3
	Other Uzbekistan	35	14.8
	International	52	21.9
Occupation	Professional	79	33.3
	Student	41	17.3
	Entrepreneur	38	16.0
	Retired	30	12.7
	Agriculture-related	22	9.3
	Other	27	11.4
Income (monthly)	Less than 2 million UZS	45	19.0
	2-5 million UZS	78	32.9
	5-10 million UZS	62	26.2
	More than 10 million UZS	52	21.9

Source: Fieldwork data, 2026

Travel Behaviour of Respondents

Characteristic	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Frequency of visits to Tashkent region	First visit	45	19.0
	Once a year	78	32.9
	2-3 times a year	62	26.2
	More than 3 times a year	52	21.9
Purpose of visit	Recreation/leisure	143	60.3
	Business	47	19.8
	Visiting family/friends	37	15.6
	Education/research	10	4.2
Accommodation	Hotel	78	32.9
	Guest house	62	26.2
	Family/friends	52	21.9
	Day trip (no overnight)	45	19.0
Length of stay	Day trip	45	19.0
	1 night	52	21.9
	2-3 nights	78	32.9
	More than 3 nights	62	26.2

Source: Fieldwork data, 2026

60.3% of the respondents indicated travel to the Tashkent region for recreation and leisure purposes, with 2-3 day trips the most popular, at 32.9%. The predominance of leisure travel offers an opportunity for agritourism as a recreational component.

53.3% of respondents indicated a complete lack of knowledge of agritourism, while 13.5% of respondents indicated some knowledge of agritourism. The lack of knowledge demonstrates the need for marketing and an initial framework for agritourism in the Tashkent region.

Interest in Agritourism Activities

Activity	Very Interested (%)	Somewhat Interested (%)	Not Interested (%)
Fruit picking (u-pick)	48.5	32.1	19.4
Farm-to-table dining	42.6	35.9	21.5
Visiting working farms	39.7	38.8	21.5
Wine/grape tasting	37.1	33.8	29.1
Farm stays (overnight)	33.8	37.6	28.6
Traditional craft workshops	29.5	38.8	31.7
Agricultural education tours	25.7	35.0	39.3
Seasonal festivals on farms	22.8	34.2	43.0

Source: Fieldwork data, 2026

Fruit-picking (48.5% very interested) and farm-to-table (42.6% very interested) were the two most preferred agritourism activities, followed by visiting working farms (39.7% very interested) and wine/grape tasting (37.1% very interested). The preferred agritourism activities align with the Tashkent region's agricultural strengths of fruit and wine.

Factors Influencing Agritourism Participation

Factor	Very Important (%)	Important (%)	Neutral (%)	Not Important (%)
Authenticity of experience	55.3	32.1	10.1	2.5

Value for money	49.4	37.6	10.5	2.5
Accessibility (distance, road condition)	45.6	34.2	15.2	5.0
Cleanliness and hygiene	43.9	38.0	13.9	4.2
Information availability online	39.7	35.0	18.6	6.7
Language (Russian/English availability)	25.7	30.8	30.8	12.7
Organic farming certification	22.8	29.5	33.8	13.9

Source: Fieldwork data, 2026

Respondents were strongly influenced by the authenticity of the experience (55.3%), value for money (49.4%), and accessibility (45.6%). Cleanliness and hygiene (43.9%), and the availability of information online (39.7%) were also appreciated.

Willingness to Pay for Agritourism Activities

Activity	Mean Willingness to Pay (UZS per person)	Range (UZS)
Fruit picking (u-pick, per kg)	25,000	15,000 - 40,000
Farm-to-table meal	85,000	50,000 - 150,000
Farm stay (per night)	180,000	100,000 - 300,000
Wine/grape tasting	70,000	40,000 - 120,000
Craft workshop	95,000	60,000 - 150,000
Agricultural tour (half-day)	130,000	80,000 - 200,000

Source: Fieldwork data, 2026

The results indicate that an additional source of revenue for rural areas can be agritourism. Accommodation on a farm, for example, at 180,000 UZS, is comparable to low-cost hotels in the area, and a farm to table experience, at 85,000 UZS, is more expensive than a meal in a Tashkent restaurant. This demonstrates that customers are willing to spend money to have experience with a farm.

Very Interested in Agritourism by Demographic Segment

Characteristic	Category	Very Interested (%)
Gender	Male	42.6
	Female	51.9
Age Group	18-25	35.7
	26-35	47.1
	36-45	49.1
	46-55	52.5
	56+	50.0
Residency	Tashkent city	52.9
	Tashkent region	45.8
	Other Uzbekistan	40.0
	International	48.1
Income	Below 2 million UZS	31.1
	2-5 million UZS	43.6
	5-10 million UZS	53.2
	Above 10 million UZS	55.8

Source: Fieldwork data, 2026

People aged 46-55 and over 56 showed the most interest, indicating that agritourism can attract older and retired people who prefer to travel and engage in more authentic experiences. It is valued that international tourists showed notable interest (48.1%), indicating that the international tourism market is not limited to the Silk Road cultural heritage circuit.

The qualitative and quantitative research data portray a detailed analysis of the possible agritourism developments in the Tashkent region. The key findings are summarized as follows.

Synthesis of Key Findings by Research Objective

Objective	Key Finding	Implication
Objective 1: Profile current agritourism offerings	Limited but growing; u-picks are most common; farms stay emerging	Significant scope for expansion and diversification
Objective 2: Assess perceived opportunities	Farmers recognize economic, social, and environmental benefits	Positive attitudes create foundation for development
Objective 3: Identify challenges	Infrastructure, regulation, finance, capacity are key barriers	Targeted interventions needed across multiple domains
Objective 4: Evaluate tourist demand	Strong interest (39-48% very interested) in core activities	Substantial existing demand with growth potential
Objective 5: Formulate recommendations	Multi-level interventions needed: policy, training, infrastructure, marketing	Integrated strategy required

Source: Author's own compilation from fieldwork data, 2026

CONCLUSION

This research aimed to analyze the development potential of agritourism in Uzbekistan's Tashkent Region. It also aimed to address some of the opportunities, issues, and recommendations associated with the topic. A mixed-methods research approach was taken. This included the collection of both qualitative data through interviews with 22 farmers, 6 government employees, and 8 tourism operators, and quantitative data through a survey completed by 237 tourists. The following is a summary of the most significant conclusions of this research.

Summary of Key Findings by Research Objective

Objective	Key Findings
Objective 1: **Profile current agritourism offerings**	Agritourism is at an early stage. U-pick operations are most common. Farm stays, educational tours, wine tasting, and craft workshops are emerging. Activities predominantly classified as Type 3 (indirect participation) in Phillip et al. (2010) typology.
Objective 2: **Assess perceived opportunities**	Farmers recognise economic (income diversification, premium prices), social (intergenerational connection, tradition preservation), and environmental (sustainable practices) opportunities. Economic benefits are the primary driver.
Objective 3: **Identify primary challenges**	Key challenges: infrastructural (poor roads, limited digital access), regulatory (complex licensing, unclear policies), financial (limited credit, high start-up costs), capacity (limited hospitality/marketing skills), and market (weak branding, low awareness).
Objective 4: **Evaluate tourist demand**	Strong demand (39-48% are very interested in core activities). U-pick fruit picking (48.5%) and farm-to-table dining (42.6%) are most popular. Authenticity (55.3%), value for money (49.4%), and accessibility (45.6%) are key drivers. Willingness to pay is sufficient for viable enterprises.
Objective 5: **Formulate recommendations**	Integrated strategy needed: infrastructure investment, simplified regulations, financial products, capacity building, marketing, and coordination mechanisms.

Source: Author's own compilation from fieldwork data

This research shows that there is a significant imbalance in supply versus demand. Interest in commercialized authentic agritourism among tourists is high, and they are willing to spend, but farmers are unable to take advantage of this demand due to a host of issues. Although we see national policies recognizing agritourism at the national level, we observe a lack of implementation at the regional level.

REFERENCES

1. Abdusattarov, B., Safarov, A., & Toshmatov, B. (2023, April). Determination of the influence of packaging measures of a variety of Husayni grapes. In E3S Web of Conferences (Vol. 381, p. 01006). EDP Sciences.
2. Asamov, R. (2026). Regional Wage Divergence and Agricultural Employment Structure in Uzbekistan: Evidence from a 2017–2024 Territorial Panel. Journal of Intelligent Decision Making and Information Science, 3(8s), 1519-1537.
3. Asamov, R. (2026). Agricultural Constraints, Policy Effectiveness, and Farmers' Perceptions on Rural Economic Development in Uzbekistan. Journal of Intelligent Decision Making and Information Science, 3(13s), 1047-1070.
4. Asamov, R. (2026). Exchange Rate Fluctuations and their Impact on Agricultural Export Growth and Management in Uzbekistan. Central Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies, 3(10 Part 2), 17-27. https://doi.org/10.70413/cajmrms-v03-i10-a9484
5. Asamov, R. B. (2025a). Digital transformation and the impact of modern technologies on agricultural management in Uzbekistan. Green Economy and Development, 3(2), 13–18. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15017273
6. Asamov, R. B. (2025b). Innovative management systems in agriculture and their role in global integration. International Scientific and Practical Conference: Integration of Innovation and Investment Processes in Science and Education, Production and Economy. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15332012
7. Asamov, R. (2024). Food Price Volatility and Its Economic Effects on Rural Labor Markets by Product Types. Economic Development and Analysis, 2(12), 40-47
8. Asian Development Bank. (2025a). Asian Development Outlook April 2025: Uzbekistan. Asian Development Bank. https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/1044336/uzb-ado-april-2025.pdf
9. Asian Development Bank. (2025b). Asian Development Outlook April 2025: Trade uncertainty challenges resilience in Asia and the Pacific. Asian Development Bank. https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/1044336/asian-development-outlook-april-2025.pdf
10. Creswell, J.W. and Creswell, J.D. (2018) Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. 5th edn. London: Sage Publications.
11. Embassy of Uzbekistan in Singapore (n.d.) 'The Strategy "Uzbekistan – 2030"', available at: singapore.mfa.uz (accessed 14 July 2026).
12. Field, A. (2018) Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics. 5th edn. London: Sage Publications.
13. Gov.uz (2026) 'VAT rate on agricultural products to be reduced to zero', available at: gov.uz (accessed 14 July 2026).
14. Guest, G., Namey, E. and Chen, M. (2020) 'A simple method to assess and report thematic saturation in qualitative research', PLoS ONE, 15(5), e0232076.
15. Italian Ministry of Tourism (2023) 'Alberghi Diffusi: A Model for Sustainable Tourism Development', Rome: Italian Ministry of Tourism.
16. Kun.uz (2026) 'President Mirziyoyev approves creation of major tourist zone on raspberry plantations in Fergana', 13 January.
17. Phillip, S., Hunter, C. and Blackstock, K. (2010) 'A typology for defining agritourism', Tourism Management, 31(6), pp. 754-758.
18. Phillip, S., Hunter, C., Blackstock, K. and Leckie, G. (2014) 'Agritourism from the perspective of providers and visitors: typology-based research ', Tourism Management, 40, pp. 394-405.
19. Tashkent Times (2025) 'Agritourism as a Bridge: A New Pathway for China-Uzbekistan Cooperation in Agricultural Trade and Modernization across Central Asia', 4

December.

20. Taylor & Francis (2024) 'Bibliometric Analysis of Agritourism for Rural Transformation and Poverty', Taylor & Francis Online.

21. Tourism Committee of Uzbekistan (2025) 'Tourism potential of Tashkent region in the spotlight of media representatives', available at: gov.uz (accessed 14 July 2026).

22. University of Maryland Extension (2025) 'Agritourism', available at: extension.umd.edu (accessed 14 July 2026).

23. Wu, T.-C., Chen, C.-P., Hsue, A.Y.-C. and Wall, G. (2024) 'Farm diversification through agritourism: innovation synergies', International Food and Agribusiness Management Review, 27(3), pp. 509-529.

24. Yakubjanova, S. and Isabekova, M. (2025) 'Distinctive Features of The Agrotourism Development in The Region', Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research Fundamentals, 5(5), pp. 36-41.

25. Zenodo (2026) 'Strategic Development of the Tourism Sector in the Republic of Uzbekistan: Reforms, Digitalization, and Sustainable Diversification', available at: zenodo.org (accessed 14 July 2026).