



The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.



**Leveraging Japanese Sado Island Farmers' GIAHS
Inclusivity by Understanding Their Perceived
Involvement**

by Keshav Lall Maharjan, Clarisse M. Gonzalvo, and
Wilson F. Aala, Jr.

Copyright 2021 by Keshav Lall Maharjan, Clarisse M. Gonzalvo, and Wilson F. Aala, Jr. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

1 **Title: Leveraging Japanese Sado Island Farmers' GIAHS Inclusivity by**
2 **Understanding Their Perceived Involvement**
3

4 **Authors: Keshav Lall Maharjan ^{1*}, Clarisse M. Gonzalvo¹ and Wilson F. Aala, Jr.²**
5

6 **Abstract:** Sado island in Niigata prefecture is among the first GIAHS designated sites in Japan
7 and among developed countries worldwide. Recent studies have pointed out the need to
8 incorporate culture and farmer opinions to further strengthen GIAHS inclusivity in rural
9 farming. In connection to this, the study explored whether farmer visibility, which is
10 highlighted by GIAHS designation, actually translate to farmers' actual perception of GIAHS
11 involvement. A survey was conducted among Sado island farmers to determine their
12 knowledge and perception of their GIAHS involvement, in connection to their perspectives on
13 youth involvement, Sado island branding, and tourism management. Results showed that
14 56.3% of Sado island farmers feel uninvolved or unsure towards GIAHS, which is in stark
15 contrast with the prevalent farming method in the area which is special farming (complies with
16 GIAHS regulations). Further analyses revealed that farmers who feel that GIAHS does not
17 promote youth involvement, Sado island branding, and tourism management have higher
18 predisposition to perceive themselves as uninvolved towards GIAHS. This study highlights the
19 need for careful reevaluation and integration of farmer insights and needs to the current GIAHS
20 implementation in Sado island and in other GIAHS as well.

21 **Keywords:** GIAHS, farmer involvement, youth inclusivity, tourism management, *Tokimai*
22 branding

23 **JEL Codes:** Q57, O13, P25

24 *Corresponding author

25 ¹ Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Hiroshima University, Japan

26 ² Institute of Clinical Medicine, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan

Title: Leveraging Japanese Sado Island Farmers' GIAHS Inclusivity by Understanding Their Perceived Involvement

I. Introduction

In 2002, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) first launched the Globally Important Agriculture Heritage Systems (GIAHS) during the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, South Africa. This is part of the Global Partnership Initiative which aims to tackle issues such as sustainable development, agriculture, and traditional farming practices. In 2015, it became a corporate program of FAO which was further developed to protect traditional agricultural systems of global importance and enhance the harmonious relationship between people and nature. Specifically, FAO defines GIAHS in 2002 as “remarkable land use systems and landscapes which are rich in globally significant biological diversity evolving from the co-adaptation of a community with its environment and its needs and aspirations for sustainable development”. The selection criteria to be designated as a GIAHS are: 1) food and livelihood security; 2) agro-biodiversity; 3) traditional knowledge; 4) cultures and social values; and 5) landscape features. Overall, the object of designation is an agricultural system composed of traditional knowledge and practices, landscapes, culture, and biodiversity (FAO, 2020). Since 2005, FAO has designated 62 systems in 22 countries and is currently reviewing 15 new proposals from nine new countries. These selected sites worldwide provide food and livelihood security for millions of small-scale farmers as well as sustainably produced goods and services.

The overall objective of designating a GIAHS site is to highlight unique knowledge, practices, and landscapes as well as dynamic conservation of a site. The conservation of GIAHS sites is also highly advocated, which entail a number of development interventions such as agritourism activities, adding value to GIAHS food products, technology transfer

measures, awareness-raising campaigns, and supportive national policies (FAO, 2020). It is important to note that designating different sites as GIAHS can also increase awareness and visibility for farmers who are working in these areas and emphasize the critical role they play in global issues. This is essential most especially in this modern era when the field of agriculture faces issues on youth's declining interest, outmigration from rural to urban areas, farmland abandonment, transfer of indigenous and traditional knowledge, prioritization of modernization movements in conflict with agricultural land decline and environmental degradation, among others. These issues can be addressed by improving the image of agriculture and highlighting the visibility of farmers in traditional agricultural systems, which in turn can boost the status of agriculture worldwide. While increasing farmer visibility is important, it is also crucial to know if the importance of GIAHS principles actually translate to the ground level, particularly the farmers' perceptions on their GIAHS involvement. This paper will focus on this aspect by analyzing Japanese farmers' GIAHS inclusivity and how this may affect the GIAHS development in Sado Island. This paper particularly aims to answer the question: Does farmer visibility, which is highlighted by GIAHS designation, actually translate to farmers' actual perception of GIAHS involvement?

Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS) in Japan

In Japan, sustainable agriculture has been promoted for several years and high importance is given in preserving traditional farming, agro-culture, and biodiversity. This led to the application and acceptance of different sites in Japan as GIAHS. Aside from FAO's initial five selection criteria, Japan added three additional criteria in 2015 to have a more holistic and comprehensive assessment of GIAHS, which are: 1) enhanced resilience (ecological); 2) establishing the new commons (social); and 3) creating new business models (economic) (Yiu *et al.*, 2016). At present, there are 11 sites designated as GIAHS in Japan.

These are located in *Shizuoka* (terraced *wasabi* [Japanese horseradish: *Wasabia japonica*] fields), *Nisi-Awa* (cultivation of multiple crops in steep slopes), *Osaki* (utilization of various coping mechanisms to protect rice paddies), *Takachihogo-Shiibayama* (establishment of a composite management system of agriculture and forestry), *Minabe-Tanabe* (preservation of forest and Trees of *ume* [Japanese apricot: *Prunus mume*]), *Nagara River* (active inland water fisheries and fishing of *ayu* [Japanese sweetfish: *Plecoglossus altivelis altivelis*]), *Usa* (linkage of small irrigation ponds that stabilizes agricultural water supply), *Aso* (vast grasslands used to raise cows and horses), *Kakegawa* (tea production and cultivation), *Noto peninsula* (terraced rice-fields that represent the farming, fishing, and mountain villages indigenous to Japan), and *Sado island* (biodiversity conservation in paddy fields, particularly *toki* [Japanese crested ibises: *Nipponia nippon*] birds (MAFF, 2019). All of these sites have demonstrated remarkable use of land systems and landscapes, a good interplay between nature and its surrounding communities, rich biological diversities, which all contribute to sustainable development.

This paper particularly focused on Sado island in Niigata prefecture, which is one of the first GIAHS sites designated in a developed country. It is widely known as a natural habitat of endangered Japanese crested ibises (i.e., *Nipponia nippon*, locally called *Toki* in Japanese) because of its *satoyama* and *satoumi* landscapes. The Japan *Satoyama Satoumi* Assessment (JASS) defines the former term as “landscapes that comprise a mosaic of different ecosystem types including secondary forests, agricultural lands, irrigation ponds and grasslands, along with human settlements” and the latter as “Japan’s coastal areas where human interaction over time has resulted in a high degree of productivity and biodiversity” (Duraiappah *et al.*, 2010). Sado island is also famous for its rice produce with *Toki* branding, which supports the revival of the *Toki* birds. Other agricultural crops are also grown such as persimmons, apples, pears, cherries, oranges, strawberries, watermelons, shiitake mushrooms, among others. Since the island provides suitable habitats for the endangered *Toki* birds, public and private sectors

poured in efforts to support Sado island's biodiversity preservation through environmental conservation agriculture, which is a huge factor in its designation as a GIAHS.

Understanding Agricultural Heritage Systems and its Impacts on Farmer Involvement

FAO's initiative to designate GIAHS sites worldwide is essential to address various issues in the field of agriculture. Ever since it was launched in 2002, various studies have been done to analyze its sustainability, characterization, vulnerability of sites, tourism management, biodiversity conservation, among others (Reyes *et al.*, 2020; Santoro *et al.*, 2020; Garcia *et al.*, 2020; Ducusin *et al.*, 2019; Kohsaka *et al.*, 2019). Most studies focused more on the macro perspectives of GIAHS and its potential environmental impacts, which thereby established a wide-ranging knowledge on GIAHS, in supplement to what FAO annually provides. With an expansive bank of research findings, it is ideal to think that this knowledge can actually be absorbed by one of the main caretakers of GIAHS sites (i.e., the farmers); however, there are limited studies that can support this. There is still limited literature focusing on micro perspectives, such as farmer participation and perceived GIAHS involvement.

In terms of socio-economics aspects, it was observed that livelihood endowments and strategies directly affect GIAHS farmers' participation in eco-compensation policies (Moucheng *et al.*, 2018). Particularly, the study found that comprehensiveness of eco-compensation programs, land capital, and material capital are positive factors towards farmers' initiatives to participate in GIAHS conservation and agricultural production, whereas human capital was seen as a negative factor. With regards to socio-cultural aspects, Kajihara *et al.* (2018) discussed the importance of understanding the relationship of culture and agriculture and highlighted the need for GIAHS to incorporate culture for more effective management strategies. It is important to note the interplay between farmers' cultural perspectives and their interaction towards their immediate environment, which thereby affects their involvement and

mindset towards GIAHS initiatives. This, in turn, contributes in honing the overall cultural development of GIAHS sites and its sustainability. When magnified in a global scale, Sun *et al.* (2019) concludes that more efforts are needed to understand agricultural heritage systems by combining traditional practices and international experiences.

Farmer involvement and decision making can be influenced by a lot of internal and external factors. The perception of being involved towards a bigger cause is being shaped by farmers' individual differences and environmental influences. In order to gauge the perceived involvement of farmers, it would be vital to know their opinions towards important issues related to GIAHS. Opinions have the capacity to shape perceptions, whether in an individual or community scale. In this study, three main factors were specifically studied, and they revolved on farmers' opinions towards GIAHS' effects to youth involvement, capability to enhance agricultural products, and tourism management.

II. Methods

The study was conducted in Sado island which is located west of the Niigata prefecture shoreline (Figure 1). It is the sixth largest island of Japan which has a complex ecosystem, with interdependent *satoyama* and *satoumi* landscapes. Survey method was employed to collect data from environmental conservation agriculture (ECA) farmers in Sado island. After prior discussion about the survey with key persons, the research objectives and questionnaire were explained in the annual meeting of the Board of Directors of the Council for Promotion of “*Toki-to-kurasu-satozukuri suishin kyogikai*” (Council for Promotion of Community Development Living with Toki), in cooperation with the Sado Municipality Agriculture Policy Division, in February 2020. The questionnaire was constructed by the research members of the joint research project, “Moving Towards Climate Change Resilient Agriculture: Understanding the Factors Influencing Adoption in India and Japan” in accordance with the rules of the

Research Ethics Committee of Hiroshima University's Graduate School for International Development and Cooperation. The survey was conducted with informed consent and specifically, it assured the respondents that their identity will not be revealed and any information they will share will be kept private, securely stored, and will be used for research purposes only. The board made the resolution to allow the survey and the questionnaires were distributed to the *Toki-to-kurasu-satozukuri suishin kyogikai* council members. A total of 279 (67%) responses were received by the end of April 2020.

GIAHS-related factors were incorporated in the questionnaire using a three-point ordinal scale (1-strongly yes, 2-unsure, 3-strongly no). Socio-demographic factors were also gathered from the questionnaire to obtain baseline data for the farmers. Data was analyzed using ordinal logistic regression and general linear model in SPSS v.27. Test of parallel lines and model fit were conducted to determine whether statistical assumptions were met. Lastly, qualitative questions were also gathered about the farmers' opinions regarding the impact of GIAHS to youth involvement, Sado island branding, and tourism management. The narratives in local Japanese were translated to English by the authors.



Figure 1. Sado island map. (Source: adopted from www.travel-around-japan.com, 2010)

III. Results and Discussion

To understand the current situation of farmer involvement towards GIAHS in Sado island, their perceived level of involvement was determined using a three-point scale, which revealed that only 43.7% (122 of 279) of the sampled farmers feel that they are involved in GIAHS, while 56.3% (157 of 279) feel uninvolved or unsure towards GIAHS (Table 1). Similarly, only 38.7%, 59.1%, and 49.8% of the farmers feel that GIAHS gives pride and confidence to youths, enhance agricultural products/brand, and promote tourism, respectively. When viewed at the perspective of their current farming method which is predominantly special farming (77.3%) (complies with GIAHS regulations) and organic farming (10.8%), the farming method and high frequency of farmers who feel unsure or uninvolved towards GIAHS do not appear to agree with each other.

Table 1. Frequency distribution table for GIAHS-related and socio-demographic factors among Sado Island farmers.

Variable	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)
GIAHS involvement		
Strongly yes	122	43.7
Strongly no	28	10.0
Not sure	129	46.2
TOTAL:	279	100.0
Opinion on GIAHS giving pride and confidence to youths		
Strongly yes	108	38.7
Strongly no	33	11.8
Not sure	138	49.5
TOTAL:	279	100.0
Opinion on GIAHS enhancing agricultural products/brand		
Strongly yes	165	59.1
Strongly no	24	8.6
Not sure	90	32.3
TOTAL:	279	100.0
Opinion on GIAHS promoting tourism		
Strongly yes	139	49.8
Strongly no	42	15.1
Not sure	98	35.1
TOTAL:	279	100.0
Farming method		
Special farming ^a	215	77.3
Organic farming ^b	30	10.8
Eco-farming or related ^c	26	9.4
Conventional farming ^d	7	2.5
TOTAL:	279	100.0
Environmental conservation agriculture (ECA) effect on climate change		
As an adaptation	121	43.5
Reducing the effect	71	25.5
No effect	64	23.0
Others	9	3.2
TOTAL:	279	100.0
Selling place for products*		
Agricultural cooperatives	260	93.5
Direct to consumers	60	21.6
<i>Michi-no-eki</i> (roadside farmers market)	11	4.0
Supermarket	4	1.4
Restaurant	2	0.7
Internet	2	0.7
Central market	1	0.4
Food processors	1	0.4

*multiple answer

^aSpecial farming: uses 50%-80% less fertilizers and pesticides from the conventional farming practice of the locality; complies with GIAHS regulations

^bOrganic farming: certified as organic by Japanese Agricultural Standards (JAS), or no JAS certification but do not use chemical fertilizers and synthetic pesticides

^cEco-farming or related: environment-friendly methods based on other standards

^dConventional farming: uses chemical fertilizers and pesticides prescribed and practiced in the region

Relationship of GIAHS involvement with youth involvement, tourism, and branding

In order to provide an explanation for this observation, various socio-demographic and GIAHS-related factors of Sado island farmers were used as predictors against their level of perceived involvement towards GIAHS. The three GIAHS factors evaluated in this study were the common themes of Japanese rural farming, namely: youth involvement, brand promotion, and tourism enhancement (Ohe, 2008; Ohe and Kurihara, 2013; Uchiyama *et al.*, 2008). All three variables were found to be positively related with GIAHS involvement score such that farmers who feel that GIAHS does not promote youth involvement, promote Sado island brand, and enhance tourism are 17.4%, 38.8%, and 49.4%, respectively more likely to feel uninvolved towards GIAHS (Table 2).

Table 2. Relationship of various GIAHS variables with the farmers' perceived level of GIAHS involvement using ordinal logistic regression^a.

Predictor ^b	Estimate	Odds Ratio	Significance
GIAHS giving pride and confidence to youth in Sado Island	1.747	17.43%	0.000**
GIAHS enhancing agricultural products and brand of Sado Island	0.946	38.83%	0.005**
GIAHS promoting tourism in Sado Island	0.706	49.36%	0.004**

^aLink function: Cauchit: $\tan(\pi(F_k(x_i)-0.5))$

^bTest of parallel lines: Chi-square=1.750, df=3, sig=0.626

Model fit: Chi-square=117.612, df=3, sig=<0.001

**significant at p<0.01

GIAHS involvement and youth inclusivity

Eight socio-demographic factors were used as predictors of the Sado island farmers' perceived level of GIAHS involvement (Table 3). The effect of age, farming experience, farm/paddy area, yield, climate change effect perception, and farming method were found to have no significant effect towards perceived GIAHS involvement. On the other hand, farmers who reported to be participating in exchange programs either voluntarily or with subsidy are more likely to feel involved towards GIAHS.

Table 3. Relationship of various socio-demographic variables with the farmers' perceived level of GIAHS involvement using general linear model^b.

Response variable: GIAHS involvement		
Predictor	Estimate	Significance
Age	3.519	0.111
Farming experience	-0.077	0.119
Farmland size	0.058	0.110
Paddy land size	0.119	0.057
Paddy yield	-0.143	0.371
Perceived intensity of climate change effect	-0.042	0.499
Farming method	0.045	0.749
1) Organic farming	-0.012	0.393
2) Special farming	-1.03	0.322
3) Eco-farming or related	-1.166	0.984
4) Traditional farming	0.019	.
Exchange program(s) participation/promotion	-	0.238
1) Not participating	-1.514	0.167
2) Participating with subsidy	-1.838	0.036*
3) Participating voluntarily	-2.199	0.028*
4) Participating with pay	-2.311	0.617
5) Others	-0.238	.

*significant at $p < 0.05$

^b $y = B_0 + B_1X$

White test for heteroskedasticity: Chi-square=117.264, df=107, sig=0.234

Lack of fit test: F=1.051, sig=0.486

In terms of age, 80.3% (224/279) of the sampled Sado island farmers are 60 years old and above. Of the 15 farmers who are 49 years old or younger, only one third (5/15) reported being involved in GIAHS. This underrepresentation of youth in GIAHS activities appears to have contributed to the dilution of the effect of age on GIAHS involvement. Recent papers such as by Reyes *et al.* (2020) have indeed highlighted the negative effects of farmland abandonment and underuse of farming resources resulting from Japan's decreasing and aging rural population. This same sentiment has been observed among the submitted testimonials of the interviewed farmers, such as by Respondent 269 who mentioned the following:

“There are many abandoned lands due to lack of successors. Lands are overgrown by various weeds, such as Solidago canadensis var. Scabra, Ambrosia artemisiifolia which flowers yellow during autumn and winter, making it look ugly or

not cared for, which is far from the image of GIAHS. First, such land should be managed properly and brought under proper cultivation.”

Sado farmers also recognize the alarming issue of farmer shortage in the future because of the increasing trend of youth exodus; hence, they are also voicing their opinions on how to attract people to farm in Sado. The narrative of Respondent 131 clearly shows this:

“There will be a shortage of people who will continue farming in the near future. Attract the people who are fed up of city life and loves the countryside to create a natural living environment. People with allergies, retired life, and kids can come to live in Sado. This will create circulatory connectivity in different aspects between Sado and the cities, which will eventually attract the youths to Sado, increase their movements to and fro, making the livelihood more active and connected with the cities as well.”

This highly agrees with the findings of Usman *et al.* (2021) which highlights the desperate need of rural areas for agricultural workers in connection with Japan’s aging farmers’ population, in order to mitigate the increase in Japan’s dependency for international food products and high import expenses.

To this end, participation in exchange programs may thus play a key role in not only encouraging the younger generations of famers, but also enhance the transfer of intangible farming inputs such as techniques and managerial skills (Uchiyama *et al.*, 2008). This was also shared by Respondent 276 who stated that:

“There is a need to secure people to continue GIAHS. All the GIAHS sites in Japan should come together to promote and enhance it through PRs in universities and colleges and make it part of lectures to get the interest of students who would work on it in the future. First, orient them about GIAHS in general and different GIAHS in Japan, and let them participate in field studies and internships in a GIAHS of their choice for them to interact and learn the local culture, as well as experience the local livelihoods.

264 *Afterwards, let them reflect about it and how they can be involved in it in the future to*
265 *improve.”*

266 This theme was also explored by Yamashita (2021) which focused on how Japanese
267 traditions can be saved by analyzing urban university students’ participation in rural festivals.
268 Interestingly, the case site of the study is also a GIAHS in Japan, particularly the Noto region
269 in Ishikawa prefecture. The study recommended that better collaborations should be
270 established between urban youths and their participation in rural festivals, which means that
271 more focus should be given in the management of festivals and how outside support can further
272 increase. These can help alleviate the discontinuation of rural festivals and loss of cultural
273 values. This is also in connection with what Sado farmers are voicing out in this study, which
274 is the need to attract youths in Sado island, thereby implying that they are also well aware of
275 the negative consequences if common trends of youth exodus and rural disinterest will continue.

276 The narratives of Sado farmers and various literature that established the interlinked
277 issues of farmland abandonment, aging population, youth exodus, and farmer shortage clearly
278 show the need for more policies that would cater to the strengthening of Japan’s agriculture.
279 Based on this paper’s findings, participation in exchange programs may increase the chances
280 of attracting people, especially the youth, in exploring rural areas and be more involved in
281 addressing issues in the field of agriculture. With the increase in youth participation, modern
282 solutions can also be applied as rural areas struggle to adapt in the changing world.

283 ***GIAHS involvement in tourism and branding***

284 Sado island has become known for their *Tokimai* brand of rice. This integration of
285 conserving the local *Toki* bird population with local farming has contributed to the 0.6% growth
286 rate of tourism in Niigata Prefecture amounting to roughly 400,000 accumulated number of
287 guests at accommodations (Japan National Tourism Organization,
288 <https://statistics.jnto.go.jp/en>, accessed March 11, 2021). In this study, the effects of farmer

expectations on ECA and selling location on perceived GIAHS involvement were also tested. In terms of selling location, farmers who sell directly to consumers were more likely to perceive themselves to be involved towards GIAHS than those who sell at other locations (Table 4). Looking at the frequency distribution, selling to agricultural cooperatives was the most predominant choice among the farmers (93.5%). This inconsistency was elaborated in the testimonials of the farmers with many entries commenting on the poor uptake of the *Tokimai* brand across other industries/markets, such as restaurants and supermarkets. This was clearly shown in the response of Respondent 121, who stated that:

“Last year, I participated in the PR sale of rice in Tokyo station, along with the city officers. Nearly 100% of the passers-by did not know about GIAHS, which is so unfortunate.”.

A similar sentiment has been shared by Respondent 141:

“GIAHS alone will not enhance the tourism to brand the hotels, other facilities and services using the branded products of the island.”

Respondent 162 also shared some sentiments on how GIAHS should complement agriculture:

“It is good to make use of GIAHS for tourism development in the island. However, it is not clear how it helps in enhancing the island’s farming and primary industry. If there is no clear picture/explanation how GIAHS and tourism development can enhance farming, the farmers and youth may not be interested (e.g., How will hotels use rice, vegetables, and fish produced in the island to serve the tourists with a delicious and attractive dish?). It is said that bigger hotels don’t have repeaters (supposedly the food they provide is not delicious) while the homestay pensions serving local food have repeaters. City dwellers visit Sado not only for its nature but also for its food, as well as its hospitable people with warm personalities (heard that the cooks in bigger hotels

are dispatched from Kansai (western part of Japan) or foreigners). The concept should be not agriculture for tourism but tourism for developing agriculture.”

These narratives are in line with the point raised by Ohe (2013) which highlights the generation gap between younger and senior generations in recognizing the value of rural tourism, as well as the urban-rural mismatch with regards to rural tourism desires and expectations.

Table 4. Relationship of various selling locations with the farmers’ perceived level of GIAHS involvement using general linear model^b.

Response variable: GIAHS involvement		
Predictor	Estimate	Significance
Direct to consumers	-0.201	0.050*
Supermarket	0.199	0.552
Restaurant	0.679	0.216
Agricultural cooperatives	0.019	0.907
Central market	0.257	0.709
<i>Michi-no-eki</i> (roadside farmers market)	0.041	0.85
Food processors	-0.501	0.449
Internet	-0.34	0.53

*significant at $p < 0.05$

^b $y = B_0 + B_1X$

White test for heteroskedasticity: Chi-square=10.344, df=13, sig=0.666

Lack of fit test: F=1.402, sig=0.224

In addition to micro-level predictors, the effect of farmer expectations from ECA on GIAHS involvement was also tested (Table 5). In line with the theme of GIAHS which is ecological conservation, farmers who are doing ECA for *carbon sequestration* and *conservation of biodiversity* were more likely to feel involved towards GIAHS which is in agreement with previous studies (Reyes *et al.*, 2020; Yiu *et al.*, 2016). In addition, farmers who are doing ECA to promote the local industry are also more predisposed to feel involved towards GIAHS, which also agrees with other studies such as in Vafadari (2013) that identifies tourism as a key stimulant of local industry by opening up new jobs and enhancing local attraction of rural lifestyles in GIAHS communities. Indeed, the Sado island tourism webpage

(<https://www.visitsado.com/en/>, accessed March 11, 2021) features *Toki* museum tours, sightseeing, and forest parks.

Table 5. Relationship of farmer expectation on environmental conservation agriculture (ECA) with the farmers' perceived level of GIAHS involvement using general linear model^b.

Response variable: GIAHS involvement		
Predictor	Estimate	Significance
Carbon sequestration	-0.304	0.012*
Conservation of biodiversity	-0.252	0.005**
Conservation of water quality	-0.005	0.956
Underground water terrain improvement	-0.333	0.070
Add value in quality of products	0.063	0.455
Decrease effect of weather hazards	0.09	0.518
Increase farm related income	0.121	0.152
Promote local industry	-0.224	0.019*
Retain residents in rural area	-0.014	0.942
Others	-0.275	0.226

*significant at $p < 0.05$

**significant at $p < 0.01$

^b $y = B_0 + B_1X$

Breusch-Pagan test for heteroskedasticity: Chi-square=2.820, df=1, sig=0.093

Lack of fit test: F=1.087, sig=0.323

To determine if the farmer' global perspective on ECA activities has an effect on their perceived involvement towards GIAHS, their answer to the effect of ECA on climate change was used as predictors for their level of perceived involvement towards GIAHS. Here, farmers who expressed that ECA is an adaptation to climate change were twice as likely to feel involved towards GIAHS than those who do not (Table 6). This agrees with the earlier observation on farmer expectations regarding ECA. Testimonials such as by Respondent 153 reflects this trend in a farmer's point of view:

“Produce food that suits climate change. Sell them fresh with safety and good taste. This should be managed through institutional strategy under good leadership. Hotels should use the branded rice produced in Sado.”.

Table 6. Relationship of farmer-perceived effect of environmental conservation agriculture (ECA) on climate change with the farmers' perceived level of GIAHS involvement using ordinal logistic regression^a.

Response variable: GIAHS involvement			
Predictor ^b	Estimate	Odds Ratio	Significance
ECA as an adaptation to climate change	-1.09	297.43%	0.002**
ECA reduces the effect of climate change	-0.665	194.45%	0.068
ECA has no impact on climate change	-0.184	120.20%	0.618
Others	-0.027	102.74%	0.971

^aLink function: Cauchit: $\tan(\pi(F_k(x_i)-0.5))$

^bTest of parallel lines: Chi-square=0.168, df=4, sig=0.997

Model fit: Chi-square=22.906, df=4, sig=<0.001

**significant at p<0.01

Conclusion

Results from the survey in this study have shown higher incidence of reduced farmer involvement towards GIAHS. While it is one of the direct goals of GIAHS designation to promote awareness and visibility for the farmers working in these sites, results from this study does not support the notion of a direct relationship between farmer visibility and farmer involvement as previously hypothesized. To further understand this observation, the effects of various socio-demographic and GIAHS factors on farmers' perception towards GIAHS involvement were tested. Reduced perception towards promotion of youth involvement, Sado island branding, and tourism management has an enhancing effect on reduced farmer perception towards GIAHS involvement. Further evidence presented through the various farmer narratives corroborate this observation prompting for integration of farmer-level input towards community level implementation of GIAHS.

Upon evaluation of the effects of farmer expectations with their perceived GIAHS involvement, it was found that promotion of local industry has an enhancing effect on farmer involvement. This observation hints at the need for better diffusion of resulting branding (*Tokimai*) from the GIAHS initiative to other local industries in Sado island, as well as to target consumers who may not know about *Tokimai*. Based on farmer narratives, there is a need for better uptake of the *Tokimai* branding across different local industries, such as restaurants,

hotels, and supermarkets, for the continuous development of farmer communities and GIAHS sites.

The enhancing effect of carbon sequestration and biodiversity conservation towards farmer perception on GIAHS involvement was also shown, as expected of an environment-conscious community. This is in alignment with the observation that farmers who feel that environmental conservation agriculture (ECA) is an adaptation to climate change has higher likelihood to feel involved towards GIAHS. A study focusing on the effects of various farmer-related factors towards ECA continuation may also provide additional insights on the holistic view of the integration between farmer activities with biodiversity conservation.

The data gathered from this study can serve as a framework for local government officials, and policy makers on strengthening and developing the GIAHS efforts across Japan, and other countries as well. When magnified in a global scale, the themes explored in this study can lead to a deeper interplay of farmers' knowledge and perception with GIAHS objectives.

Acknowledgement:

This paper is a partial output of the joint research project, "Moving Towards Climate Change Resilient Agriculture: Understanding the Factors Influencing Adoption in India and Japan", Principal Investigator: Dr. Keshav Lall Maharjan, funded by Japan Society for Promotion of Sciences (JSPS); JP JSBP 120197904. Authors would like to thank the members of the project, Dr. Akinobu Kawai, Professor by special appointment, The Open University of Japan and Mr. Akira Nagata, Visiting Research Fellow, United Nations University, Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability, Japan for their valuable inputs in conceptualization of the research, constructing questionnaire and conducting the survey. The authors are also thankful to, Mr. Shinichi Saito, Chair, Board of Directors and the members of the "*Toki-to-kurasu-satojukuri*

suishin kyogikai" (Council for Promotion of Community Development Living with Toki) and Sado Municipality Agriculture Policy Division for their cooperation in conducting the survey. The authors would also like to thank Ms. Ruth Joy Sta. Maria for her help and expertise in the preparation of figures for this article.

References:

- Duraiappah, A., Nakamura, K., Takeuchi, K., Watanabe, M., and Nishi, M. 2010. Satoyama–Satoumi ecosystems and human well-Being: Assessing trends to rethink a sustainable future (Policy brief 10-7).
- Ducusin, R., Espaldon, M., Rebancos, C., and De Guzman, L. 2019. Vulnerability assessment of climate change impacts on a Globally Important Agricultural Heritage System (GIAHS) in the Philippines: the case of Batad Rice Terraces, Banaue, Ifugao, Philippines. *Climate Change*, 153: 395-421. DOI: 10.1007/s10584-019-02397-7
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2020. Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems, Geographical Indications and Slow Food Presidia. Technical Note.
- Garcia, M., Yague, J., Nicolas, V., and Diaz-Puente, J. 2020. Characterization of Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS) in Europe. *Sustainability*, 12: 1611. DOI: 10.3390/su12041611
- Japan National Tourism Organization. 2020. Overnight Travel Statistics Survey. Japan Tourism Agency. Available online: <https://statistics.jnto.go.jp/en>. Accessed March 11, 2021.
- Kajihara, H., Zhang, S., You, W., and Min, Q. 2018. Concerns and Opportunities around Cultural Heritage in East Asian Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS). *Sustainability*, 10: 1235. DOI: 10.3390/su10041235

433 Kohsaka, R., Matsuoka, H., Uchiyama, Y., and Rogel, M. 2019. Regional management and
 434 biodiversity conservation in GIAHS: text analysis of municipal strategy and tourism
 435 management. *Ecosystem Health and Sustainability*, 5(1): 124-132. DOI:
 436 10.1080/20964129.2019.1610336

437 Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries of Japan (MAFF). 2019. *Globally Important*
 438 *Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS)* [Brochure]. Rural Policy Department, Rural
 439 Development Bureau, Japan.

440 Matanle, P. 2005. Shrinking Sado: Education, Employment and the Decline of Japan's Rural
 441 Regions, In P. Oswalt (ed.) *Shrinking cities – Complete works 3 Japan*, Berlin: Project
 442 Office Philipp Oswalt: 42-53.

443 Moucheng, L., Lun, Y., Yanying, B., and Qingwen, M. 2018. The impacts of farmers'
 444 livelihood endowments on their participation in eco-compensation policies: Globally
 445 important agricultural heritage systems case studies from China. *Land Use Policy*, 77:
 446 231-239.

447 Ohe, Y. 2008. Characteristics and issues of rural tourism in Japan. *WIT Transactions on*
 448 *Ecology and the Environment*, 115: 305-316. DOI: 10.2495/ST080301

449 Ohe, Y., Kurihara, S. 2013. Evaluating the complementary relationship between local brand
 450 farm products and rural tourism: evidence from Japan. *Tourism Management*, 35: 278-
 451 283. DOI: 10.1016/j.tourman.2012.07.003

452 Reyes, S., Miyazaki, A., Yiu, E., and Saito, O. 2020. Enhancing sustainability in traditional
 453 agriculture: indicators for monitoring conservation of Globally Important Agricultural
 454 Heritage Systems (GIAHS) in Japan. *Sustainability*, 12: 5656. DOI:
 455 10.3390/su12145656

456 Santoro, A., Venturi, M., and Agnoletti, M. 2020. Agricultural heritage systems and landscape
 457 perception among tourists. The case of Lamole, Chianti (Italy). *Sustainability*, 12: 3509.
 458 DOI:10.3390/su12093509

459 Uchiyama, T., Loble, M., Errington, A., and Yanagimura, S. 2008. Dimensions of
 460 intergenerational farm business transfers in Canada, England, USA, and Japan. *The*
 461 *Japanese Journal of Rural Economics*, 10: 33-48. DOI: 10.18480/jjre.10.33

462 Usman, M., Sawaya, A., Igarashi, M., Gayman, J., and Dixit, R. 2021. Strained agricultural
 463 farming under the stress of youths' career selection tendencies: a case study from
 464 Hokkaido (Japan). *Humanities & Social Sciences Communications*. DOI:
 465 10.1057/s41599-020-00688-4

466 Sun, Y., Timothy, D., Wang, Y., Min, Q., and Su, Y. 2019. Reflections on agricultural heritage
 467 systems and tourism in China. *Journal of China Tourism Research*. DOI:
 468 10.1080/19388160.2019.1578713

469 Yamashita, R. 2021. Saving tradition in Japan: a case study of local opinions regarding urban
 470 university students' participation in rural festivals. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Regional*
 471 *Science*, 5: 125-147. DOI: 10.1007/s41685-020-00172-6

472 Yiu, E., Nagata, A., and Takeuchi, K. 2016. Comparative study on conservation of agricultural
 473 heritage systems in China, Japan and Korea. *Journal of Resources and Ecology*, 7(3):170-
 474 179.