GLAMPING IN TAIWAN: WHEN THE GLOBAL MEETS THE LOCAL

MASTER THESIS

University	ESHCC of Erasmus University Rotterdam
Master Program	MA in Tourism, Culture and Society
Student	Chih-Yi Meng (560037)
Lecturer	Dr. T.J. Hoebink
Date	18 Jun 2021

Glamping in Taiwan: When the Global Meets the Local

Abstract

Glamping is an increasingly blooming tourism trend in Taiwan lately. While it was introduced from abroad into the local context of Taiwan and became a prosperous tourism industry in only five years, the astonishing popularity makes glamping in Taiwan an interesting case to have considerable contributions to the academic debate about globalization. With the case, this study aims to respond to the academic requests for more empirical tourism studies in order to examine the underlying process of globalization, with relevant discussions underneath, including the concepts of cultural homogenization, localization, and glocalization. Besides, glamping in Asian countries as a rather understudied topic in terms of the interaction between the global and the local shows great potential for new visions. These conditions thus form the following research question: how do Taiwanese camping and glamping operators negotiate between the global and the local in view of the increasing popularity of glamping in Taiwan. To find the answer, a qualitative approach was adopted. Online interviews were conducted with thirteen Taiwanese glamping operators.

The results of this research show that the cultural homogenization model is confirmed to be a common and first strategy for Taiwanese glamping providers to develop the global idea of glamping into local contexts of Taiwan. A nuanced observation here is that glamping in Taiwan is homogenized towards examples in both Western countries and Asian countries, thereby rejecting the idea of homogenization as a complete Westernization. In addition, three major glamping localization

trajectories in Taiwan are found in this study. The first and the second are to deal with the inflexible and adaptable Taiwanese local resources respectively, while the third one is through local collaborations. In general, localization can already be seen in glamping development in Taiwan, although strictly speaking, it remains mostly on the additions instead of on the event of glamping itself.

An overall conclusion of glamping development in Taiwan is given as a glocalization process (Robertson, 1995), which contains simultaneous existence of the homogenization and the localization. An obvious time order within this glocalization model is welcomed by Taiwanese glamping operators as an effective way to develop glamping sites. Furthermore, the active role (Schuerkens, 2003) of Taiwanese glamping providers during the development underneath either homogenization or localization, represents that they are not defenseless, but capable to respond to the global forces by actions of imitating, adapting, adjusting or reinventing. Besides, information technology is a useful tool within the glocalization of glamping in Taiwan that cannot be overlooked. Finally, Pieterse's (1995) concept of cultural hybridization is proposed to describe the overall glamping development in Taiwan, as it better highlights the mixing of cultures, including interactions between the West and the East, as well as between the global and the local. Future suggestions for both tourism practices and tourism studies are given in the end.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

A year ago, it was getting closer and closer to the day I would depart for the Netherlands. I felt excited for the journey and brand-new school life in Rotterdam. But abruptly, I started missing Taiwan. I then decided to experience and to visit as many places in Taiwan as possible before I left. It was also the time when the coronavirus pandemic was raging. People began to prefer outdoor activities in far, spacious nature to avoid crowded and indoor places. Therefore, when I was making my before-leaving-to-do list, outdoor enjoyments became one of the options.

I then recalled my last outdoor experience during previous summer. My friends and I planned to camp during our trip to Eastern Taiwan. However, upon arrival, we found ourselves too lazy to set up the tents. The hot, suffocated weather made us regretted for the decision to camp. In the end, we took the campsite owners' suggestion to choose another accommodation at his campsite, the recreational vehicle. With pre-setup facilities including air conditioner, bed, and private toilet etc., we were satisfied. This was my first experience of camping with friends.

Inspired by this memory, an easy, relaxing, and enjoyable camping trip soon became a top choice on my list. I began to search for relevant information. What surprised me was that, there were in fact tons of camping offers like this in Taiwan already. Besides recreational vehicles, some campsites even promoted much bigger tents with beds and full equipment inside, which were far from the tents I used to see. When collecting information, the word "glamping" kept emerging and caught my attention, and then I realized: that is the so-called glamping! I was even more excited to experience "glamping" afterwards. Nevertheless, all glamping sites that I have found and consulted were fully booked. Most glamping providers informed me to wait for months to get the turn. I was amazed by such popularity. Considering that

1

I was about to travel abroad within one month, I eventually gave up this option. Yet, glamping left a strong impression on me ever since then.

The glamping tourism in Taiwan indeed keeps blooming. It is said that glamping has been developed in Taiwan for around five years only, but already gone viral (Ou-Yang, 2021). It is introduced, discussed and promoted widely throughout online news and blogs in Taiwan (Chen, 2020; Easycamp, 2017; Jhao, 2017; Ou-Yang, 2021). An increasing number of social media posts, nice pictures and sharing of experiences by Taiwanese influencers on their social media accounts also shows the frequency of the visits and the popularity, or even competitions, of having glamping experience among them. The glamping trend is further pushed in Taiwan by the outbreak of coronavirus (Chen, 2020; Yang, 2021). Since people cannot travel abroad, they start to pay attention to domestic travel and leisure activities by which they can be far from the crowds and close to the nature.

Glamping as a novel leisure event becomes an appealing option to the public in Taiwan naturally. Originally, the camping industry in Taiwan already witnesses a considerable growth. It is estimated that there are over two million Taiwanese going camping every year (Huang, 2021). The number of campsites plus growing glamping locations in Taiwan has almost reached two thousand (Yang, 2021). These statements all identify glamping as a new wave of tourism phenomenon in Taiwan.

In fact, glamping has already been conducted abroad for over ten years in countries such as the UK, the United States, Canada, etc. (Bahney, 2019; Dockterman, 2012), and it has raised further attentions in recent years again. Glusac (2018) suggested that relevant offerings and destinations of glamping were exploded especially in 2018 and gradually slipped into the mainstream tourism phenomenon. In 2020, Olmsted further signified glamping as an increasing tourism trend particularly during the stressful pandemic period. In view of this, when glamping was

introduced into and developed in Taiwan only within recent years, a social phenomenon is clear: a global cultural form has been brought into local contexts of Taiwan.

The development of glamping in Taiwan reflects the adagio of "globally produced and locally distributed" coined by Castells & Blackwell (1998). The influence of globalization can clearly be observed. Through this, the case of glamping in Taiwan forms an interesting contribution to the theoretical and academic debate about globalization. Besides, while Brooker and Joppe (2013) suggested that glamping is foremost a Western trend, van der Linden (2015) pointed at its gradual growth in Asian countries. He noticed that the common strategy for local Asian operators is to replicate glamping models of Western countries. Milohnic and Bonifacic (2014), on the other hand, stated that local cultural forms might be reinvented as a response to this global trend. These arguments manifest the potential of glamping in Asian countries as a case study for the globalization phenomenon and its divergent interpretations such as cultural homogenization, Westernization (as glamping offerings originates mostly in Western countries), localization and glocalization. These are common concepts to explain the interaction between the global and the local. Taiwan, as an Asian country with a glamping bloom, appears to be a suitable example to be investigated.

In order to explore the glamping development in Taiwan as a phenomenon influenced by globalization in general, and the interaction between global elements and the local contexts specifically, this study has the following research question: how do Taiwanese camping and glamping operators negotiate between the global and the local in view of the increasing popularity of glamping in Taiwan.

This study is relevant for glamping site owners or operators in Taiwan to have more insights into the overall process of their development, thereby focusing on the

3

advantages and hints of possible industry future suggested by this study. It is meanwhile expected to raise the Taiwanese policy makers' awareness of this novel tourism industry, followed by necessary and relevant regulation adjustments.

For the academic contributions, firstly the study enriches and updates the Taiwanese camping and glamping research, particularly with more supply-side perspectives. Moreover, following Robinson's (2007) observation of two categories of globalization literature, one about the concept of globalization itself and the other about specific issues related to globalization, this thesis focuses on the latter. It responds to several scholars' requests for more empirical tourism studies to examine the underlying process of globalization (Dogramadjieva, 2021; Mak et al., 2012; Robinson, 2007; Salazar, 2005); it also tackles the debates underneath globalization, including the identification of homogenization and localization, as well as the elaboration on glocalization. Additionally, camping and glamping as a rather understudied topic within the tourism field shows great potential for new visions in terms of the negotiation between the global and the local. Most importantly, as much research focused on glamping in Western countries (Aeberhard et al., 2020; Boscoboinik & Bourquard, 2012; Brochado & Brochado, 2019; Brochado & Pereira, 2017; Cerović, 2014; Craig, 2020; Cvelić-Bonifačić et al., 2017; Dorofeeva, 2020; Ergüven et al., 2015; Filipe et al., 2018; Ma et al., 2020; Milohnić et al., 2019), this study aims to mend this drawback and provides a non-Western glamping investigation by a non-Western researcher.

Aiming to answer the research question, this study adopts a qualitative approach to collect information to investigate the glamping development in Taiwan. Online interviews were conducted with thirteen Taiwanese glamping provider participants, to receive, explore, and analyze their insights into how they embed the global idea of glamping into the local contexts of Taiwan. Future academic research

suggestions and practical advice for Taiwanese glamping operators are provided at the end of the paper. But before that, it is significant to first dive deeper into the relevance of this study, with illustrations and discussions of existing globalization studies and its divergent interactions between the global and the local, as well as its implication by cases in tourism field, which will follow in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 GLOBALIZATION AND TOURISM

According to Sharpley (2018), the world nowadays is in a state of increasing globalization, a process of which the earth is shrinking and becoming a unified "global village". Robertson (1992) has provided a widely accepted definition: the world being compressed and the rising public's consciousness of this phenomenon. Giddens (1990) also defined it similarly, as the intensification of global relationships. In addition, Hannerz (1996) described it as a phenomenon of "long-distance interconnectedness", crossing national or even continental boundaries. These definitions exactly reflected the two defining characteristics of globalization suggested by Robertson and White (2007): the global connectivity and global consciousness.

Whether long-term or short-term, the generalized procedure of increasing global connectivity can easily be observed among nations, or among people (Scholte, 2002), in their everyday life practices, such as the broad use of communication technology and the diverse types of food or music from all over the world (Tomlinson, 2012a). These continuously expanding connections allow the places throughout the world to be closer, as Giddens (1990) said, so that local events could be influenced by events or decisions from faraway locations and vice versa. As to the other feature, the rising global consciousness, Robertson (1992) considered it as a rather conceptual part of globalization, which often worked together with global connectivity. However, people easily pay attention to only one of the two features. An example was given by Robertson and White (2007): while political scientists, international relations professionals or economists etc. normally put focus on

connectivity and consider it as the main feature of globalization, global consciousness is studied more often by anthropologists, historians, sociologists, and so on.

The divergence also appeared in the scholars' perspectives towards the nature of globalization. Velho (1999) regarded globalization as a single process where the world was moving as a whole. Similarly, Robertson (1992) offered the concept, "unicity", to indicate the world becoming singular. On the other hand, he also discussed another perspective: globalization as a multidimensional phenomenon. His suggestion to adopt a more inclusive perspective towards the globalization process as diverse and plural happenings can be seen in more scholars' research. For instance, Reiser (2003) referred to it as plurality, especially with different aspects of globalization (economic, cultural, political etc.). This argument showed that globalization represented the integration of not only territorial boundaries, but also intangible daily functionalities. How globalization should be researched was gradually reshaped, with more cross-disciplinary cases and approaches (Appelbaum and Robinson, 2005).

Likewise, the causes of globalization seemed to be multiple and complex. There was no collective recognition, and it was hard to be explained by a single cause (Hirst & Thompson, 1999, as cited in Sharpley, 2018). Among the attributions, the economic and cultural facets were discussed a lot by scholars. For instance, the continuously globalized economy reflected greater interdependence among countries, while the capitalist system appeared to become the major trajectory within the worldwide economy (Castells & Blackwell, 1998). The perceived inequality was often manifested in this system, leading to new social hierarchies among the nations (Robinson, 2007). But there were growing concerns towards the economic aspect of globalization (Robertson & White, 2007). To respond to it, Tomlinson

(2012a), for example, suggested that the global market can be understood easier through the observation of potential impacts on people's cultural experiences related to capitalism or consumerism. This showed how the economic and cultural development in terms of globalization can be significantly intertwined.

While Sharpley (2018) stated that tourism can make contributions to and meanwhile be influenced by globalization, Salazar (2005) considered tourism as an appropriate example proving globalization as both an economic and cultural phenomenon. As global tourism continues to flourish, its growth can especially be seen in newly industrialized nations or developing countries (Sharpley, 2018). However, the harvest of this growth often keeps benefiting developed countries. For example, a case study of a resort in Kenya showed that their tour products marketing ideas often are borrowed from existing Western cultural values. These kinds of capital-oriented tourism plans might lead to a result that their domestic tourism resources falling into control by external interest groups, such as multinational companies (Akama & Kieti, 2007). This was an indication of how the rise of tourism with an implicit capitalist system could have inevitable and uneven (Giddens, 2003) impacts on local economies and cultural identities.

At the same time, tourism was discussed by several scholars to be a useful model to observe globalization in terms of the interaction between global and local. Crick (1994) considered global tourism as a potential field to explore how localities respond to globalizing cultural identities. Nuryanti (1996) and Chang et al. (1996) also emphasized the importance of involving the global and the local in the understanding of the tourism process, since the struggles emerging in tourism development can often be manifested at both the global scale and the local scale (Teo & Li, 2003). Likewise, Tomlinson (2012a) stated that the study of global tourism

is a useful way to explore how culturally influenced local movements can have globalized results.

These statements displayed that both actions within economic and cultural globalization can be observed in the tourism industry, and it would largely relate to topics such as the unequal phenomenon throughout countries or the connections between the global and the local.

Additionally, what tourism and globalization in general also have in common in terms of the relationship between the global and the local is that they are both heavily impacted by the rapid advance of technology, especially the information technology. For instance, it enables tourists to easily access travel information and to be reminded of the latest local news such as festivals or terrorist activities (Sharpley, 2018). Besides, information technology also contributes to the growing global connectivity in general, thereby leading to more cross-cultural tourism productions involving a diverse range of local values (Salazar, 2005).

As globalization potentially reflects both economic and cultural developments, it is a rather vague and broad theme to be studied. No wonder Ritzer (2003) suggested the need for better clarification and distinction towards the concept of globalization. Many scholars also tried to tackle this issue, causing various globalization interpretations of which some were even contradictory. In the following paragraph, some of the academic debates on possible consequences in terms of globalization that are relevant for this study are explored.

2.2 CULTURAL HOMOGENIZATION

As mentioned above, the conflicting nature of globalization indicates the possibility of divergent orientations between the global and the local. For the locals,

globalization usually refers to the constant contact with external cultural elements (Schuerkens, 2003). These exterior elements would cross the traditional territorial boundaries and enter into local contexts. This process can happen in various ways, and the trajectory of cultural homogenization is considered as a common one, appearing in both cultural globalization (Tomlinson, 2012a; Pieterse, 2015) and tourism (Sharpley, 2018).

Cultural homogenization normally means that global cultural forms occur and develop in a one-way direction to make the world more standardized (Schuerkens, 2003). Similar ideas, with different terms, were proposed by several scholars. Mlinar (1992) spoke of it as "cocacolization" to stress the widespread uptake of the Western brand in terms of consumerism. The concepts of "Americanization" (Antonio & Bonanno, 2000) and "McDonaldization" (Ritzer, 2002) suggest that globalization not only shows homogenizing tendency but also continues as an ongoing process. Ritzer illustrated his idea with the image of the fast-food restaurant which became dominant all over the United States, and which later conquered the entire world gradually. Robertson and White (2007) further explained that although Ritzer did not explicitly speak of it as a form of cultural globalization along the imperial line, this concept still showed its importance, as the idea of McDonaldization succeeded in portraying a predictable form of homogenization, yet resulting in the trajectory of developments not following the same rationality. People notice the possible danger of it, but cannot help to accept it. Tomlinson (2012b) proposed a similar idea, "cultural imperialism", to comment on the successive expansion and domination of strong cultures on other subordinate cultures in terms of daily habits and values. He especially stressed that compulsory acceptance of unfamiliar customs can be the severest situation, and the continuous Western cultural influences on former colonial nations was one example in practice.

It is worth noting that these different terms together reflected the overall tendency that the world is gradually homogenized following the Western culture. In fact, Pieterse (1995) already observed this phenomenon. He suggested it as one of the most common explanations of globalization. The world becomes more standardized and unified towards the West, in fields like technology, commerce, culture, etc. Hettne's (1995) concept of "Eurocentric bias" also indicated the understanding of uneven globalization towards European (Western) culture. These seemed to point out the idea that globalization and Western countries are intimately connected.

Robinson (2007) has further explained this connection by the manifestation of the Western capitalist culture, based on Wallerstein's concept of the world capitalist system. The structure of this capitalist system was witnessed to divide the world into three areas. Developed and the most powerful regions, including Western Europe, North America and Japan, were the center of this system. The next level was the periphery, which seemed to be subordinated to the core in the capitalist system, such as Latin America, Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe and so on. Semi-periphery was the third category to indicate those regions moving up or down within this hierarchy. While values pass and circulate among the three categories, exploitation and inequality also reproduce within the system. This uneven classification suggested that as the periphery was kept overwhelmed by capitalist values, these values might be adopted gradually until the periphery being alike with the Western countries, leading to the suppressing or disappearing of local identities (Hannerz, 1990; Schuerkens, 2003; Teo & Li, 2003). Therefore, the phenomenon of cultural homogenization, with the help of (Western) capitalist culture, can be regarded as a process of Westernization. It is a continuous Western culture extension and exercise of force.

This cultural homogenization tendency often appears in the development of several fields, such as cuisine, consumption pattern, and global tourism etc. (Robinson, 2007). Among them, tourism is especially considered as a major pipeline for homogenization towards the world (Held et al., 2000; Teo & Li, 2003). With the expanding capitalist culture and their use of novel technology (Robinson, 2007), tourism also became part of the capitalist system to promote the Western culture by the increasing multinational tourism corporations throughout the world (Sharpley, 2018). The vertical and horizontal corporation integration, either through collaboration or franchise, could facilitate the growth of these organizations, gradually holding control over all tourism package elements including transportation, accommodation, and entertainment of the whole trip.

Although cultural homogenization comes with disadvantages, it may have contribution to tourism in some ways. For instance, although growing cultural homogeneity might reduce tourist destinations' individual attractiveness by degrees, some consider the Westernized appearances after the process of cultural homogenization to be much safer and even appealing to tourists, making the tourism grow (Sharpley, 2018).

2.3 LOCALIZATION AND GLOCALIZATION

Cultural homogenization is not the only way for global elements to access the local context. The external cultural inflows, on the other hand, might enter into an interaction and negotiation level with the locals, and which can be seen as a process of localization (Cawley et al., 2002; Schuerkens, 2003).

Different possible trajectories were proposed by scholars within the localization process. For instance, Boli & Lechner (2004) suggested that the locals may interpret

the global elements in various ways in order to adapt them to the daily lives and environment. These global elements are often accepted, adapted, transformed or refused according to the conditions and experiences locally. Besides, Cawley et al. (2002) stated that local resources are normally utilized in the process of integrating the global cultural forms. Schuerkens (2003) supported this viewpoint by explaining that referencing the local cultures or values tends to bring the sense of stability and consistency. These local references, of which Hannerz (1996) called "form-of-life frame", mostly come from local daily life. They are often taken for granted, including practices in local families, work and neighborhood, local relationships among people and so on. Interestingly, Hines (2013) believed that sometimes the locals are able to treat this situation (their elements being employed) as a suitable method for them to preserve traditions and practices. For the locals, it appeared to be a kind of self-identifying participation as well as resistance to cultural homogenization (Schuerkens, 2003).

The point of view above has suggested the active role of the locals during the process (Schuerkens, 2003). Teo and Li (2003) held a similar perspective that the locals do not remain as merely recipients; instead, they are desperately willing to participate in the transformation or modification of local practices with the imported global sources. Robertson and White (2007) provided a practical description for this: people from developing countries might not completely agree with or be eager to fully accept the external influences from rather privileged areas. Then, this localization strategy opens up opportunities for them to strive for their cultural autonomy. Either through the global adapting to the local or the global making use of the local (as mentioned above), these could possibly lead to the reinforcement, revitalization, or even reinvention of local practices (Schuerkens, 2003), producing novel cultures or traditions locally (Gotham, 2005). However, at its most extreme

situation, localization is also likely to be viewed as nearly a kind of isolation (Cawley et al., 2002). It refers to the local adoption of almost everything, including locally developing industries, local resources, local personnel and more. These different interpretations reveal the various performances within the localization process.

In fact, Hannerz already proposed a similar concept before, called "creolization" (Hannerz, 1992). From his perspective, although local culture might become subculture with the position beneath the global culture, a certain degree of differentiation can still remain, through creolization. Coincidentally matching with the core-periphery division of the capitalist system mentioned above, he argued that both diffusion and differentiation could appear in the relationships between core regions and the periphery. Both areas have enough time to digest, to adjust and to modify external influences. For instance, new cultures are likely to be generated at the periphery, especially through innovative employment of both imported and local resources. Rather than a one-direction process from the core to the periphery, the interplay in-between is emphasized. Periphery can also respond and react. Similarly, Schuerkens (2003) complemented that peripheral culture is not defenseless; they can respond with the performance of innovative actions. Furthermore, Kaplan and Lööw (2002) considered that it is even possible for the new culture developed at the periphery to challenge the globalization influences from superior cultures in turn.

Robertson (1995) has proposed a more synthesized concept, "glocalization", to describe the interacting process between the global and the local. It was a relatively novel concept at first, but gradually received attention within the business studies to further understand the relationship between the global and the local. Then, Robertson introduced the concept into the social-scientific field, which later became one of the central motifs in the discussion of globalization.

Robertson considered the use of glocalization to better manifest the interplay between the global and the local, as well as to represent the simultaneous existence of both homogeneity and heterogeneity within globalization. He made a comparable statement: "particularization of universalism and the universalization of particularism". Appadurai's (1990) earlier thinking reflected almost the same idea. He considered one of the main issues within globalization was the interaction between cultural homogenization and cultural heterogenization, of which the latter indicated that the external elements would enter into new places and somewhat became localized. He agreed with the efforts from both sides to impact and penetrate into each other. Ritzer (2003) also defined glocalization as the mutual interpenetration between the global and the local. He denied the possibility of a complete homogenization towards the world by Western culture. Instead, he believed that glocalization can lead to the emergence of unique cultural forms in different local areas. Likewise, Salazar (2005) emphasized the importance of glocalization is to capture the dynamic, successive, two-way features between the global and local interaction. Global offerings can be accepted and altered to fit the locals' needs, while local practices are likely to be used, influenced and then reconstructed or recreated, through innovative processes (Gotham, 2005; Robertson, 1995; Salazar, 2005). All of these well underlined the concept of glocalization, which was meant to transcend the dualism between the global and the local in order to entitle the process of globalization with a more precise illustration (Roudometof, 2005).

2.4 TOURISM EXAMPLES OF THE GLOBAL AND THE LOCAL

As mentioned above, it is common for most people to consider the local as the opposite of the global, thereby falling into the binary view towards globalization and localization, which was discussed in the section above. Even with the proposal of new hybrid view of glocalization, Roudometof (2016) still considered most scholars failed to make distinctions between globalization and glocalization. Therefore, instead of struggling with the confirmation of any dualism, it is more important to focus on the identification of the interacting process between the global and the local, and then back to examine and complement the concepts themselves. A great amount of research can be found to tackle this issue using examples from the tourism field.

Wood (2000) has researched Caribbean cruise tourism to see the manifestation of globalization in several aspects: industry restructure, new styles for global recruitment and cultural themes application. The results showed that globalization at sea area reflected an ongoing but relatively contradictory and ambiguous process causing by the disjuncture from regular continental economic interactions.

In 2003, Teo and Li researched the case of Haw Par Villa in Singapore. They commented that landscapes might evolve according to the influence of the global and the local on each other, and the Haw Par Villa exactly reflected the unstable consequences of this interaction. It was turned into a world class Oriental Disneyland yet eventually back to its original Chinese mythological roots. This unsuccessful transformation into a Western style theme park implied that after the controversy caused by external forces, the locals were able to reconstruct the park based on the glorious past and local culture. It signified a victory of the local over the global.

Additionally, Gotham's (2005) used a case study of The Mardi Gras celebration in New Orleans to examine how global forces stimulated the local actions to further boost the development of urban tourism. The results indicated that at The Mardi

Gras, globalization and localization happened simultaneously. During the same year, Salazar (2005) conducted research about local tour guides in Yogyakarta. He found that these tour guides were exposed to globally popular culture and new technologies in their daily lives. However, during their work, they remained professional to introduce the already "glocalized" life by actively constructing local uniqueness to provide a Javanese experience to satisfy diverse international tourists.

Mak's et al. (2012) study of food consumption in tourism showed that, although globalization (with its homogenizing force) was often seen as a threat to local gastronomic identities, it could also function as a catalyst for the reinvention of local cuisine products.

Pratiwi & Arka (2016) conducted a research by carefully observing the Bali tourism advertisement. They analyzed how local culture in Bali was globalized. Particularly, the local terms or symbols of Bali were often employed by international tourism operators or agencies etc. to showcase the local ideology of Bali.

Yavuz and Savran (2020) explored the relationship between glocalization and tourism by investigating how the region of White City in Tel Aviv in Israel has been promoted to emphasize local touristic values, in order to break the traditional impression of the touristic characteristics worldwide including sea, sand and sun.

In 2021, Dogramadjieva is still on the track of responding to the need for more investigation towards how global trends are implemented into local contexts, and the challenges induced by Covid-19 towards a shift of focus from global to local, in terms of markets, product development, and service organization. The author chooses the case of innovative guided tours in Sofia in Bulgarian. As a recently popular trend worldwide, these tours are considered as the embodiment of the idea of glocalization.

The studies described above provided insights into the interplay between the global and the local as well as the manifestation of glocalization in diverse sections of the tourism industry. Nonetheless, as Salazar (2005) recommended, the concept of glocalization is complicated of which should be identified by more grounded research to explore from daily cultural practices, and tourism offers a great number of appropriate cases. Likewise, Robinson (2007) called for more empirical studies of local diversity in light of globalization, in order to identify the abstractions of globalization theories with more practical life experiences. In 2012, Mak et al. (2012) again pointed at the gaps between the scarce number of globalization studies applied to the context of tourism. Even today, Dogramadjieva (2021) still states that more investigation is needed on how global trends are implemented in local contexts. The point to be made here is that rather than placing the global and the local negotiation in a non-stop academic debate, more practical way is to examine how the interaction between the global and the local truly takes place in real life. And the diverse possibilities from different tourism cases offer great resources to dive into.

This is why the study focuses on the development of glamping tourism. So far, the theme of camping or glamping is rather understudied in terms of the concept of globalization or glocalization. Thus, it appears to be a concrete and empirical example for globalization that the authors above expect for. As a newcomer among tourism industries, with its success around the world and increasing influences on local tourism development, glamping provides a great potential for the exploration of the global trend being embedded in local contexts.

2.5 THE GLOBAL DEVEOPMENT OF GLAMPING

Glamping is one of the most popular tourism trends in recent years. There are various statements about where it comes from. Some scholars do not consider it as a new concept. Sakáčová (2013) tried to trace back to the period of Ottoman Empire, where luxurious tents made of silk and other expensive decorations were produced for the royalty. Brooker and Joppe (2013) regarded the safaris activity in early 1990s in Africa as the model of glamping. The wealthy travelers did not want to sacrifice the luxury and comfort during safari, and thereby leading to the emergence of luxury tents with full amenities. These origins can all be considered as the inspiration or model for glamping nowadays in different forms.

But the idea of the new term, "glamping", came out only within recent years. It was gradually regarded as a sub-sector of camping, or an entirely new activity in the tourism field (Brooker & Joppe, 2013). Its popularity was pushed mostly by the transformation in the camping industry (Cerović, 2014; Cvelić-Bonifačić et al., 2017; Milohnić et al., 2019). Originally, camping allowed people to have chances for physical and mental recovery in a natural setting. However, campers gradually expected to have more comfort, including people from the silver generation, family units or firm financial position (Milohnic & Bonifacic, 2014). The needs from the new millennials for a novel and authentic way to learn about the world in order to differentiate themselves have also pushed camping into a new chapter (Milohnić et al., 2019).

On the other hand, with gradual maturity of the industry, it became urgent for the camping providers to make supplying improvements, especially in Europe (Brooker & Joppe, 2013; Milohnić et al., 2019). While some of them believed that specialization in the services and equipment can attract new customers (Cerović, 2014), some entrepreneurs already positively looked to glamping as the solution of campsites makeover (Carter, 2011). For instance, they removed unattractive

elements of camping such as smelly sleeping bags, and renovated existing offerings into pre-setup accommodations with homey decoration (Boscoboinik & Bourquard, 2012). Some suppliers chose to extend their campsites to accommodate more glamping style lodgings, with diversified forms such as safari tents, cabins, yurts, tipis, treehouses, etc. (Boscoboinik & Bourquard, 2012). Many providers even established additional onsite recreational facilities including restaurants, bars, and spas. These various transformations and developments reveal the fact that glamping is more like a concept which can be embedded in different locations and landscapes, rather than a fixed activity or accommodation (Brooker & Joppe, 2013). It combines the advantages of both camping tourism and the hospitality industry: the guarantee of a stay in the natural environment without sacrificing comfort (Dorofeeva, 2020). In addition, innovative styles of accommodation (Cvelić-Bonifačić et al., 2017; Dorofeeva, 2020; Milohnić et al., 2019) with unique furnishing and design (Aeberhard et al., 2020) is also another feature of glamping. Some scholars even emphasized the luxury settings, with top-quality services and facilities (Cvelić-Bonifačić et al., 2017; Milohnić et al., 2019).

Increasing research on the topic of glamping represented its rapid development in recent years. Both Milohnić et al. (2019) and Dorofeeva (2020) pointed out that the term "glamping" was first largely used in the UK. Besides, many scholars agreed with its evident popularity throughout Europe, the United States and Australia (Aeberhard et al., 2020; Boscoboinik & Bourquard, 2012; Cerović, 2014; Dorofeeva, 2020; Ma et al., 2020; Milohnić et al., 2019). For instance, Brooker and Joppe (2013) has observed that compared to the continuous upgrade of glamping sites and service quality in Australia, glamping growth in America is relatively limited, due to strict legal rules.

The number of literatures about glamping in Europe was found to be the most, of which these sources indicated that the general situation of European glamping concentrated on exploring more innovative and diverse options. Hence, higher standards are constantly set for this industry. Both Cerović (2014) and Cvelić-Bonifačić et al. (2017) investigated cases in Croatia; the former was about how tourists view mobile houses as glamping accommodation, while the latter explored tourists' requirements for innovative accommodation. In addition, Milohnić et al. (2019) explored glamping in Croatia from stakeholders' perspectives. Additionally, Ergüven, Yılmaz and Kutlu (2015) have investigated glamping as a hybrid tourism product in Turkey. Furthermore, from 2017 to 2019, three research studies were conducted towards glamping in Portugal of consumers' reviews and motivations (Brochado & Pereira, 2017; Filipe et al., 2018; Brochado & Brochado, 2019). In a case study of Jesolo International Club, Aeberhard et al. (2020) examined it as a glamping pioneer in Italy. Dorofeeva (2020) investigated the general glamping development in Russia.

These studies identified what Brooker and Joppe (2013) have observed of the evident Western trend of glamping. They meanwhile mentioned that the glamping trend gradually emerged in Asian countries. Van der Linden (2015) supported this argument. He suggested this new trend of glamping is often developed rapidly in these upcoming Asian markets, since the local business owners attempted to catch up with the trend by replicating the existing and successful examples in Western countries. By adopting this strategy, they might lose the chance to adjust glamping to local culture and remain as the safer, success-guaranteed "Westernized" appearances. However, Milohnic and Bonifacic (2014) considered otherwise that the way to deal with this global trend is to re-explore and redesign local culture and values. These two different points of views show exactly that both homogenization

(or Westernization) and localization are likely to be the development pattern of glamping in Asian countries, becoming an appropriate case within the tourism field to be studied in the theoretical context of globalization.

2.6 CAMPING AND GLAMPING IN TAIWAN

Camping rapidly became a widespread leisure activity in Taiwan, and the development has changed throughout the years. Lai (2016) provided that it was first started during the Japanese occupation for military purpose. Chen (2009) has categorized the growth of camping in Taiwan into three clearer phases, of which he argued to be different from abroad due to the impact of wars and political issues.

According to Chen, from 1950 to 1970, camping in Taiwan was mainly conducted in scout training and educational camping trips. It aimed to convey patriotic ideology. Obviously, it was part of the education training instead of leisure activities at that time. The next twenty years, owing to the gradually industrialized society and stable income in Taiwan, people's willingness to enjoy leisure events also enhanced. Camping turned into a kind of group event for both educational and recreational purposes. From the end of the 1990s onwards, the prosperous domestic economy significantly raised more people's desire for relaxation and entertainment. Camping tourism has then transformed into a complete leisure engagement, with family units as the major trend. It has evolved into one of the main outdoor activities in Taiwan nowadays (Li, 2014).

Camping itself became the major purpose of traveling, which reflected the importance of campsites (Chen, 2009; Wu & Shen, 2015). The campsites development also varied following the progress above. In the past, strict legal regulations prohibited the mountain area in Taiwan to be used for camping. With the

lessened restrictions in recent years, increasing lands opened for camping and the camping association was established to promote safer locations. People turned from camping in the wilderness to camping at organized campsites. In 2016, Lai (2016) offered the information that there were around 1300 campsites in Taiwan; the estimate in 2018 was over 1500 (Li, 2018), while most of them were managed by private sectors. In 2021, the number of campsites plus glamping sites reaches almost 2000 (Yang, 2021).

This considerable growth of camping in Taiwan, plus increasing public preferences to minimize discomfort of outdoor activities in the nature, have reflected the need for progress and innovation of the industry (Hsieh, 2019; Lai, 2016; Lee, 2020). Lee (2020) has proposed three aspects for camping in Taiwan to focus on in the future in his research: the improvement of amenities, products to satisfy the public's needs of amusement and social interactions, and the integration and preservation of the natural environment. Surprisingly, the emergence of the idea of glamping in Taiwan provides exactly what these Taiwanese providers need, with upgraded facilities and the remainder of the camping essence, the nature. No wonder the glamping activity soon becomes a popular tourism trend in Taiwan.

So far, the academic debates of camping or glamping in Taiwan is a relatively new and understudied topic. There is almost no academic discussion about glamping in Taiwan. As for camping, most of the studies focused on tourist motivation or views. The supply-side perspectives are less studied. These blind spots, combined with the argument mentioned above in section 2.5 (glamping in Asian countries as appropriate case for research in the context of globalization), have made glamping in Taiwan a suitable case among Asian countries to be studied in terms of the interaction between the global and the local towards homogenization or localization

tendency. More detailed justification of the glamping case in Taiwan for this study is

elaborated in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3 METHODS

3.1 CASE STUDY OF TAIWAN AND THE RESEARCH QUESTION

Following the theoretical discussion above, it is clear that the complex nature and process of globalization leads to various versions of interaction between the global and the local. Some scholars explored the perspective of cultural homogenization (Schuerkens, 2003; Sharpley, 2018; Tomlinson, 2012a) or Westernization; others discussed the viewpoint of localization (Boli & Lechner, 2004; Cawley et al., 2002; Hines, 2013; Schuerkens, 2003) or glocalization (Gotham, 2005; Ritzer, 2003; Robertson, 1995; Roudometof, 2005; Salazar, 2005). It is difficult to draw the distinctions between these terms. Even for each concept can be interpreted into different meanings by different scholars. Therefore, more empirical research is needed to examine the process of negotiation between the global and the local. The results from real case studies can better complement and identify these theoretical concepts. And this study aims to respond to the need.

This research intends to focus on the interaction between the global and the local in the case of the glamping development in Taiwan. The research question is as follows: how do Taiwanese camping and glamping operators negotiate between the global and the local in view of the increasing popularity of glamping in Taiwan? The case has been chosen due to the increasing popularity and astonishing growth among the tourism industries in Taiwan in recent years. A local Taiwanese local magazine "CommonWealth Magazine" published an online article in 2021 about the topic of glamping in Taiwan nowadays. It mentioned that glamping has grown and become an extremely popular trend in Taiwan within only five years (Ou-Yang, 2021). In 2019 and 2020, the trend was especially pushed by the coronavirus

pandemic. People who cannot travel abroad start to look at domestic travel. Due to the pandemic, avoiding crowds in public and keeping less contact with people make them notice this novel outdoor activity. Glamping soon becomes an appealing choice to them (Chen, 2020), and leads to its increasing popularity in Taiwan.

Since it was introduced into Taiwan only within recent years, it can be seen as a phenomenon of global inflows into the local contexts, namely the process of globalization. Plus, among various tourism topics, the theme of glamping is rather under-researched in terms of globalization or glocalization model. These conditions make glamping in Taiwan a great case to be studied for globalization, shedding light on its development process for the understanding between the global and local interaction. In addition, so far, most research of glamping itself focused on cases in European countries or the United States, reflecting the obvious Western trend in this industry (Brooker & Joppe, 2013). With the case of Taiwan, this study diversifies the academic debates of glamping with a non-Western example by a non-Western researcher. However, it should be noted that it is still inevitable to study the case with a relatively Western theoretical basis.

3.2 SAMPLING

To get insights into the interaction between the global and the local, this study adopted a qualitative approach, as the theory of globalization was expected to be inducted out of the detailed negotiation between the global and the local within the glamping development in Taiwan (Bryman, 2012). The Taiwanese camping and glamping providers were chosen as the samples in this study. They play key roles in the introduction of glamping into Taiwan; meanwhile, they are major contributors to the subsequent development of this novel industry. Hence, their experiences are

26

able to be turned into valuable perspectives towards how this global trend of glamping is embedded in the local environment of Taiwan.

Purposive sampling approach was employed (Bryman, 2012). And among various choices underneath this sampling method, I selected maximum variation sampling. This strategy emphasized the samples to be as wide and diverse as possible (Bryman, 2012), and in this research they were reflected on the variation of glamping locations, managing styles, and accommodation types, etc. Thus, enlarging the range of variable glamping offers could lead to more diverse experiences sharing from Taiwanese glamping providers (Flick, 2009), thereby more insights related to the research question about interaction between the global and the local. I collected contact lists by visiting each Taiwanese glamping site website. Sixty emails were sent out in total. The contact process lasted a whole month.

However, it was not an easy task to reach these Taiwanese glamping operators in person. It took me much time to email them several times again and finally had a valid number of participants. An interesting observation during the process and also one of the causes to difficulties was these glamping operators' different perspectives towards glamping. This confusion mostly related to various glamping's Chinese translations presented in online news or social media, leading to different meanings such as "luxurious camping", "lazy camping", "equipment-free camping", etc.; many of them argued that they did not provide "glamping" offerings but merely "better quality camping offers", thereby rejecting my invitation.

I clarified myself by explaining that they were invited because their offerings were certain to be different from traditional camping modes, with upgraded amenities, equipment-free service or additional activities, etc. But their divergent opinions on glamping showed that they were still in transition period from camping

27

to glamping. This is also why I mentioned both camping and glamping operators in the research question.

After my explanation and invitation with a few more emails, thirteen Taiwanese respondents were confirmed eventually. All participants were males, and were a glamping site owner or a major person in charge. The characteristics of their glamping sites were diverse, including glamping sites located in Northern, Eastern, Southern, and Western Taiwan; near city center, near the ocean and beach, in the countryside, in the mountains, or near popular tourist destinations; managed by new and independent business owners, original campsite owners, leisure farm, hotel, or indigenous people; providing tent accommodation, recreational vehicle accommodation, yurt accommodation, or pipe shape cabin. The samples represented much variation and differentiation (Flick, 2009; Bryman, 2012), which contributed to a better overview of glamping in Taiwan for the study (see Appendix A).

3.3 INTERVIEWING

In order to get underneath their stories, thirteen participants were interviewed via semi-structured interviews, allowing to receive both detailed information following the interview guide and open-ended responses given by respondents (Flick, 2009; Bryman, 2012). All interviews took place online and were recorded through Zoom, each lasting between 40 minutes to 60 minutes. Notes were taken in-between. The choice of online meetings was due to the limit of location difference (research conducted in the Netherlands) instead of the purpose to broaden understanding of online communities (Kozinets, 2010).

The interviews proceeded mainly around four topics. The first topic, basic introduction of themselves and their glamping sites, was aimed at a relaxing opening for the interview and initial understanding of the participants and their glamping sites (including core values and main features of glamping sites). The second topic focused on the relationship between glamping and globalization. I asked about respondents' recognitions and perspectives towards the glamping popularity in Taiwan in general, as well as their overall understanding of Taiwanese camping industry. Then, the topic was also understood from their knowledge and impression of glamping business abroad.

The theme of the interaction between the global and the local was the basis of the third topic, which consisted of two parts. On the one hand, the discussion of Taiwanese operators' sources of inspiration and idea of glamping, as well as how they see their glamping sites similar to foreign glamping references, was meant to explore the degree of cultural homogenization that was possibly presented in glamping in Taiwan. Their opinions on the relationship between this similarity above and Western culture were also asked in order to identify to what extent Taiwanese glamping is westernized. On the other hand, questions about the interviewees' experiences of glamping development in the local contexts of Taiwan were intended to see the localization level of glamping, especially their attitudes towards the overall developing process as well as how they view their glamping sites different from models abroad.

Finally, the purpose of the last part in the interview consisted of respondents' overall reflections on their glamping business development, including a comparison between their perceptions of glamping before and after developing, as well as their views on the glamping future in Taiwan.

The interview guide (see Appendix B) prepared in advance enabled me to receive similar structures of the answers from most interviewees (Bryman, 2012). But flexibility (Flick, 2009) was also seen in some discussions, in which unexpected answers were given by respondents. These were then followed up by me. Unexpected topics like this included the Taiwanese jurisdiction around campsites. Besides, the debate between different glamping's Chinese translations and the general meaning of glamping was another issue I picked up from first few interviews as an addition for the following ones. Overall, all participants agreed to be presented anonymity throughout the study, with the use of pseudonyms (see Appendix A).

3.4 TRANSCRIBING AND ANALYZING

The transcribing was conducted manually and in Chinese. The analysis of interview contents started by several readings and noting down initial thoughts of possible codes. Then, the official open coding process proceeded (Bryman, 2012), with the help of qualitative analysis software, ATLAS.ti 8. During the coding process, Chinese transcripts were coded into English codes. After the first round of coding, transcripts were read twice again to make adjustments to the initial codes. I also checked back and forth between the codes in order to merge similar ones and delete redundant ones. One last review of the entire transcript and all the codes was done after that. Code trees were organized with the tool of ATLAS.ti 8 as well.

The approach of thematic analysis was adopted to organize and to classify the codes (Bryman, 2012). Three main themes were identified (here shows my initially rough theme names): glamping copying, glamping developing process in the local context, and respondents' perspectives of glamping. Following this, the results of initial analysis were presented also in three parts. Firstly, the glamping models and

elements that respondents copied from abroad were analyzed and manifested with the theoretical concept of cultural homogenization. Then, their glamping sites development process were compared and categorized based on different localization trajectories suggested by different scholars. The final theme was about respondents' general perspectives towards glamping in general and glamping in Taiwan, such as the characteristics of glamping. After several discussions with the supervisor and adjustments, the last topic was given up. Overall, the decisions of the codes, subthemes and themes during the analysis were mostly made according to repetitions of a topic, as well as similarities and differences among the interviewees' perspectives toward a same topic (Ryan & Bernard, 2003).

Based on the commonalities, differences, and unexpected findings in the analysis, a description was given in the following section, of both the homogenized and the localized strategies employed by Taiwanese glamping operators during the development. That leads to a synthesized observation of a glocalization model as the interacting process between the global and the local within glamping development in Taiwan.

CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.1 CULTURAL HOMOGENIZATION OF GLAMPING IN TAIWAN

4.1.1 WESTERN CULTURE MODEL

When being asked about the strategy of duplicating international glamping examples, almost all respondents keep a positive attitude. Glamping is an unknown area to them at the beginning, and the information gap is the greatest challenge during the development. That is why referencing and imitating overseas cases is normally their initial strategy. In fact, some respondents even consider it as a necessary first step for development. Here is an example:

> I think so far, imitating is the major step, since glamping becomes more popular only within recent one or two years. It becomes a popular tourism trend (in Taiwan) also because people saw it from the abroad. The only concern is how do you introduce it into Taiwan… Neil (Yilan City).

This emphasis of the necessity of imitation identifies what van der Linden (2015) suggested for most upcoming Asian countries will do to develop glamping: to replicate existing examples. While almost all the interviewees agree that glamping in Taiwan is still in the phase of growing and learning, it leads to the phenomenon observes by Sam (Nantou City): "The development of glamping in Taiwan is quite similar to the process abroad, no big difference. It is the same activity, just that it now moves to Taiwan." The highly similar developing trajectory as well as similar

appearance of some glamping sites and facilities highlight the characteristics of

homogenization that Schuerkens (2003) said to be more standardized and unified.

While discussing the inspiration of glamping that they learn from the abroad,

many of these Taiwanese business owners suggest that they reference models in

Western countries. Some of them are inspired by glamping examples in Europe, such

as the seaside districts in Spain, England, Switzerland and Northern Europe.

Additionally, Kevin (New Taipei City) shares that as a member of the Formosa

Camping and Caravanning Club in Taiwan, he travels to Europe and participates in

the international camping rally every year. Then, he brings back what he sees and

learns of the advantages and disadvantages of glamping in Europe. He also mentions

that the glamping site that he is responsible for is exactly the result learning from a

model in Amsterdam.

Glamping examples in other Western countries are also mentioned. Sam and

Alan first learned about glamping and further explored it during their working

holidays and the camping trip in Australia:

> I stayed in Australia for two years for working holidays. At that time, I heard of this idea
>
> and I tried to understand it more. Glamping has been developed and conducted abroad
>
> for a long time! Unlike Taiwan, which only started in recent two to three years...I also
>
> began to explore what glamping could be like...I truly realized how common it is
>
> abroad. Sam (Nantou City).

> Why do I want to achieve the model abroad?...I have camped in Australia for one
>
> month, with a recreational vehicle. One biggest difference is that a full schedule or
>
> many leisure activities during traveling are often the mainstream in Taiwan. (However,)
>
> when I camped in Australia, I found that they could spend a whole night only with a

glass of wine in a wonderful landscape…so I also expect my customers to fully enjoy

the time and space spent in my glamping site. Alan (Taichung City).

Furthermore, some respondents search on the Internet for information about glamping sites in the national parks in the United States as their inspiration, including Joshua Tree National Park in South California and the glamping site called "Under Canvas Yellowstone" in Yellowstone National Park. It is noticeable that Taiwanese respondents mention frequently about camping models with recreational vehicles abroad, which are commonly used in both the US and Australia.

These foreign glamping references from Europe, the United States and Australia fit exactly the regions categorized by Robinson (2007), in the center, powerful area within the capitalist system. It shows how much the Taiwanese glamping providers have relied on Western culture as learning models for glamping. This confirms the homogenization of glamping in Taiwan to be part of the process of "Westernization".

Furthermore, from the replies, it can be seen that the elements of glamping that Taiwanese providers intend to learn from the Western countries are diverse. For instance, the experience in the natural environment without sacrificing comfort (Dorofeeva, 2020) is viewed as one of the major characteristics of glamping by operators in Taiwan as well. In addition, the idea of the internal space of glamping to have spacious, independent and private spots in each tent is also the concept learned from the Western culture. Some of the Taiwan's glamping providers even directly import glamping equipment from Western countries. Tom (Hualien County) comments that he considers his glamping site to be similar to the glamping models in the UK for sure, since he imports the tents from there. Moreover, what many respondents suggest to learn the most is the exotic style and atmosphere of Western countries. For example, some respondents express that they attempt to build their

glamping sites into a space where the visitors can enjoy the lifestyle or atmosphere abroad. Ryan (Keelung City) is one of them:

> The concept of glamping was indeed extended from the abroad…in foreign countries, especially the Western countries, people value daily life quality significantly, which means they value relaxation like leisure activities a lot. That is what we can learn. Basically, what we are trying to imitate is the same kind of atmosphere...for example, we had a promotional banner before stating that "vacation as being abroad, traveling study as in Lapopie". When people visit our glamping site, we will give them passports to make them feel like traveling abroad...a way for them to escape from the original working environment.

Meanwhile, Ryan also finds the inspiration for the name of his glamping site from a village in France:

> Our glamping site was named after Southern France…., we often travel with our families abroad…you know, Southern France usually gives the impression of romance…one time, we saw (on the Internet) a village over two hundred years old in Southern France during out trip planning, called Saint-Cirq-Lapopie. In the pictures, there is a stream near the village, and red brick walls were everywhere…so we decided to use the name "Lapopie" for our newly established glamping site. Our expectation is to create and bring the atmosphere of that village to our glamping site, where everyone can feel happy, relaxed and romantic, and where everyone is willing to share the happiness with their friends and families…

Moreover, some Taiwanese glamping owners adopted Western culture as their main decoration or promotion inspiration:

> We made the place look like a map of Europe, Asia and Africa...and we adopted some elements (for naming each recreational vehicle) such as "Gypsy". Gypsy is nomad, and going camping is much like a nomad who wanders outdoors. So, we used these themes to create such atmosphere that staying in our glamping site is like wandering outdoors...especially when people cannot travel abroad during the pandemic nowadays...then, they can feel like they are really traveling abroad to Europe and many other countries... Kevin (New Taipei City).

From these quotes, it is clear that besides the idea of glamping, there is indeed a strong influence of Western culture in the development of glamping elements, atmosphere and decoration in Taiwan. Following what Pieterse (1995) suggested, this influence homogenized glamping sites in Taiwan to be unified with the glamping models in Western countries. The homogenization learning model is again confirmed to fall in line with the Westernization tendency to some extent.

However, it can be seen that Taiwanese glamping site holders play a relatively active role during the development, as Schuerkens (2003) suggested. They are not passively receiving, or like Tomlinson (2012b) said being enforced to accept the global glamping trends dominated by Western cultures. Instead, they either travel abroad or proactively use information technology to look for Western inspirations. Then, they actively select and make use of those elements, for ideas such as the name or decoration, of which Sharpley (2018) stated to be safer and appealing "Western appearances", that they think will be successful in Taiwan. These examples

offer nuances to the one-way feature (Schuerkens, 2003) emphasized in the cultural homogenization model.

In this sense, it is no doubt that some glamping owners in Taiwan also try to make use of exotic styles other than Western culture. Tom (Hualien County) describes his experiences:

> ...the name of my tents, one of them is Amazon, one is Uganda, one is Bora-Bora...we want to make the visitors feel like they are in Amazon, with atmosphere in dense rainforests. So, the color green is the main color for the design of that tent, with some plants or decorations, allowing visitors to truly feel as if they were in Amazon. As for the Uganda, more African style, the decoration tends to be with carpets, elephants, zebra stripes, or wilderness...these are the feelings I want to bring to the guests.

He selects diverse cultures from all over the world to decorate the glamping site. It reflects the possibility that the homogenization model of glamping in Taiwan may involve elements from non-Western countries. Indeed, from some respondents' replies, another main reference of glamping appears to be countries in Asia.

4.1.2 ASIAN CULTURE MODEL

Following the argument above, it is surprising that some respondents indicate to be inspired by trends in several Asian countries. This points out the defect of considering cultural homogenization only as being standardized towards the West (Pieterse, 1995). Instead, Asian culture turns out to be another major source of their homogenizing model, which is slightly overlooked in (Western) academia.

Many interviewees mention that they look for glamping examples on the Internet of Asian countries, including Japan, Korea, Southeast Asian countries, and China. Tom (Hualien County) provides information about glamping in Japan from a magazine he bought. It shows that Japan has also developed the glamping industry for a long time. The number of Japanese glamping locations grows rapidly and almost reaches a hundred glamping sites up to date. They are also diverse in the types of glamping accommodation that they offer. In addition, James (Nantou City) shares that he finds Japanese service culture of glamping impressive, and which makes him decide to adopt the same model. Neil (Yilan City) has even been to Japan for referencing in person:

...I have been to Japan for referencing. I visited the headquarters of one of their camping brands, "Snowpeak" ...to them, camping is like a lifestyle. It is not limited to be conducted with families only...and as for glamping, they do not make it too exaggerated...I remembered that one of their glamping sites within the hotel provides activities for visitors to "experience camping". Customers can receive the feeling of camping by chopping the wood and setting up by campfire themselves...

Additionally, several oceanic island states in Southeast Asia, including the Philippines, Thailand, Indonesia (especially Bali) are major learning sources for some respondents. According to their descriptions, glamping sites in these countries are normally situated near the beach or in dense rainforests. The major glamping style is often at the scale of a whole resort or seaside resort. Neil (Yilan City) shares another investigating experience of his to visit a glamping site like this in Thailand:

I used to travel abroad to do some research about glamping…there was a world ranking

glamping site in Kwai in Thailand, and I went there to learn and to experience…quite far

from the city center. From what I saw, the main customers there are from Europe or

America. Locals cannot afford it. It is almost as expensive as the cost of a five-star

hotel…I think the location and the weather there are perfect for glamping

development. No typhoons or other natural disasters…the atmosphere is wonderful.

Visitors can immerse themselves into the whole rainforest…glamping sites are

equipped with full modern facilities, including air conditioner, toilet, and shower…

These statements of glamping examples have denied the cultural homogenization

model being the same as Westernization. The Taiwanese glamping owners learn the

industry ideas from various Asian countries as well, including Japan (which is the only

Asian country Robinson (2007) categorized in the powerful, center region in the

capitalist system), and Korea, China as well as Southeast Asian nations in the

periphery. The wide adoption of Asian culture indicates another de-Westernized

pattern for glamping development in Taiwan (Iwabuchi, 2010). It can be explained by

the concept of "Oriental globalization" (Pieterse, 2006) or the phrase

"Orientalization in globalization" (Hobson, 2012) to emphasize the gradual dominant

Eastern role in the making of globalization.

However, the quote above in fact includes other message, that major customers

of the glamping site in Thailand are from Western countries. Then, it implicitly points

out the possibility for the location to be designed to cater their preferences. It shows

that even the Asian cultural elements that Taiwanese providers treat as the

inspiration can still involve Western influence to some extent. This identifies what

Hobson (2012) suggested, that pure Orientalization or pure Occidentalization does

not exist. Instead, it should be viewed as a mutually intertwined process.

To sum up, it is possible to say that the development of the global glamping idea in Taiwan fits the model of homogenization. Nonetheless, Taiwanese glamping providers' adoption of both Western and Eastern glamping examples provides a nuanced understanding of this homogenization within globalization. Neither does it equal to the common thought of homogenization as Westernization, nor the more extreme concept of cultural imperialism (Tomlinson, 2012b). The cultural homogenizing process of glamping in Taiwan does not witness the exercise of merely Western power, or what Schuerkens (2003) concerned of the full acceptance of Western elements.

In addition, from the respondents' reactions, it is obvious that they do not consider the learning and imitating strategy for glamping development as problematic. On the contrary, they welcome this method through homogenization model, and treat it as their starting point for glamping, as what Ben (New Taipei City) expresses, "...for most of the time, we see things by standing on the shoulders of giants. If you try to invent something new from the very beginning, it is always the slowest...".

Besides, during the homogenizing level, Taiwanese glamping owners stand at a relatively active position rather than a passive one receiving information. As Hannerz (1992) suggested, actors in the periphery can also respond and react. They are capable of assimilating, digesting and modifying the external cultural influences. This statement can be further supported by Tom's (Hualien County) perspective:

Camping can be done in various ways. I think the most important thing is to learn more and understand more from diverse examples and perspectives, then, it will be more possible to create new and different things. Do not think copying will leave no space for individual features. When you copy and learn, and later try to combine all the

things you learn from different areas, you will definitely be able to create something

new and different.

This quote has revealed that besides learning from existing examples (either from the West or the East), Tom considers that it is important to adjust and to combine other elements in order to generate new creations. He is not the only one to hold the idea. Alan (Taichung City) also agrees, "Referencing and copying are indispensable…the only problem is whether you will make any adjustment during the process, or do you just learn and copy." These comments show that interviewees also value the importance of further steps after referencing. In other words, glamping owners in Taiwan are gradually aware of besides Western and Eastern elements, the significance of additional adjustments for creating individual characteristics of their glamping sites.

4.2 LOCALIZATION OF GLAMPING IN TAIWAN

While talking about the process of how the respondents develop the idea of glamping into the local context of Taiwan, most of them emphasize the significance of negotiating with local cultural forms, after referencing foreign elements. In fact, this already sheds light on the exact process that Cawley et al. (2002) and Schuerkens (2003) called "localization". The Taiwanese glamping providers regard it as an important way to create individual characteristics of the glamping site, as suggested in their comments:

The way to make the glamping site different from others' is to integrate with local

features, to provide visitors the feeling that they really experience extraordinary local

41

cultures...so at first, I mostly reference others' stuff, and then add my own thoughts.

Tom (Hualien County).

Camping in different areas in Taiwan will certainly have various camping

experiences…so, integrating with locals is a great step. Of course, during the process of

integration, difficulties will emerge for sure, since it is not easy to match and fit

perfectly…what we can do is to decide how we apply this glamping idea to the existing

facilities or services (of the place). Then, it can be turned into your own featured

offerings. Joe (Yilan City).

Following the statements above, the respondents view localization as an essential

method for further development of glamping in Taiwan. In addition, the two

messages indicate that they not only considered it important, but in fact, some of

them have already started to put it into practice, which is presented in sections

below.

Besides, the two comments also pointed out the two main localization

trajectories of glamping in Taiwan to some extent. The sentence of "…how we apply

this glamping idea to the existing facilities or…" indicates the first strategy glamping

operators in Taiwan has used, which is the same as what Boli and Lechner (2004)

suggested for localization, or Robertson (1995) and Salazar (2005) proposed for

glocalization, to interpret the global idea according to local experiences and

conditions, in order to better fit in the daily environment in Taiwan. Another

sentence, "…integrate with local features…" seems to points to the second strategy,

which is to utilize local resources during the global element's adaptation process

(Cawley et al., 2002). These two localization patterns of glamping in Taiwan are

discussed below.

The inflexible local refers to the first strategy as mentioned above. It shows that Taiwanese glamping operators interpret and adapt the global idea of glamping based on local experiences in Taiwan, through acceptance and alteration etc. (Boli & Lechner, 2004; Robertson, 1995; Salazar, 2005). The situation that requires this pattern mostly belongs to the local elements that are fixed and impossible to be changed, at least within short-term period. From the interviewees' responses, three inflexible local elements in Taiwan are observed, leading to the adaptation of global idea of glamping: the local weather, the local environment, and legal issues.

Generally, the integration of glamping with the local weather is not a pleasurable process. Many of the respondents' glamping sites, especially those located in Northern and Eastern Taiwan, encounter problems of heavy rainfall during every rainy season:

> ...typhoons are a great issue. Whenever it comes, the settings and decorations are in danger. They are often damaged by the typhoon. And also, the Plum Rain Season. It causes the tents and the decorations to be humid and moldy easily. Neil (Yilan City).

The humid weather leads to the need for frequent replacement of damaged facilities, inevitably increasing the costs of the glamping site. In addition, respondents suggest that rainy days normally lower visitors' willingness to go glamping, or provide an awful glamping experience for them; it also makes the glamping site more difficult to manage. Some outdoor activities are limited by the

rains. However, instead of struggling with it, Neil (Yilan City) tries to solve the problem by strengthening the amenities:

> ...I added some sheds and pillars above and outside the tents. Then, the tents can be settled and fixed under those sheds. With these, we do not have to repeat the actions of taking out and putting away the tents all the time...they can also be seen as waterproof protections; meanwhile, they work as beautiful decorations...

Furthermore, the long windy weather forces the glamping providers to face similar challenges and adjust by similar means as above. The regional wind system often causes strong winds such as seasonal mountain winds. In addition, the glamping sites situated in Eastern Taiwan (thus close to the seashore) are often challenged by strong Northeast monsoon or sea winds. Tom (Hualien County) shares his personal experience:

> The Northeast monsoon is strong...especially at the Northeast seashores or the provinces in the Eastern Taiwan. However, because we stayed in urban areas most of the time before...we did not think it would cause any problem...we started the glamping business, and realized very soon that the winds were extremely strong...our tents were damaged several times due to this issue. It is a tough obstacle...it is a matter of great nature...sometimes it just happens in the middle of the night...the tents will be shaken all the time. It makes visitors feel scared...so, we built some pillars around the tents afterwards, and also put on some windproof materials...

From their sharing, it can be seen that the local element of the weather emerges as a challenge rather than a catalyst most of the time during the glamping localization in

Taiwan. However, these Taiwanese glamping sites owners respond, as Schuerkens (2003) suggested with active attitudes, to the challenge. They play an active role in performing innovative solutions (Gotham, 2005) to adapt glamping elements to better fit the local environment in Taiwan.

In addition, it is worth noting that many of the glamping providers decide to use recreational vehicle (RV) as their main accommodation offering. However, in order to cater to the local environment of Taiwan, most of these RVs are transformed into fixed houses in glamping sites. This usage is different from how it is often used abroad, as described by John (Taoyuan City):

Unlike the lands abroad which are rather broad and flat, a lot of glamping sites in Taiwan are situated in the mountains. It is inconvenient and narrow for recreational vehicles to drive. Besides, most owners do not welcome visitors to bring their own recreational vehicles because they will ruin the artificial grass at the sites. Gradually, less people buy personal recreational vehicles. Instead, more and more glamping business owners become the ones to buy them, and settle them in their glamping sites as an option of fixed accommodation to live in.

From this quote, it is clear that these Taiwanese glamping operators interpret the recreational vehicles in a different way compared to the common employment throughout the global (Boli & Lechner, 2004), in order to overcome the difference of Taiwanese local environment. Rather than driving them to conduct outdoor activities in Taiwan, these providers, follow what Robertson (1995) and Salazar (2005) suggested, alter the RVs into immovable facilities as a new type of living option for visitors to experience. They also continuously upgrade the equipment inside, such as a full package of beddings, private shower rooms and even a small living room. John

meanwhile suggests that many of them choose recreational vehicle as it can technically still count as a "moving" stuff. Then, it is easier to skillfully avoid relevant land usage legal regulations. Glamping operators can argue that they manage motor houses instead of real lands for camping that may easily be illegal. This points out the third inflexible local element that many Taiwanese glamping owners have faced, which might be the most challengeable one.

The legal issues regarding camping and glamping sites in Taiwan are brought up a lot among respondents. It is an unforeseen finding in this research. From the news covered by Huang (2021) and Jhang (2020), it is known that the majority of campsites in Taiwan is illegal. Complemented by the interviewees' replies, three primary legal problems of this are seen and classified.

Firstly, it is difficult for Taiwanese business owners to set up a legitimate campsite in Taiwan as the application is extremely complicated. The camping operators need to meet numerous regulations and rules. For instance, they have to foremost confirm whether the land can be used for the purpose of camping.

Then, the long application process is caused by the unclear division of work among the Taiwanese administration bureau. Respondents comment that people who are in charge of the monitor of the camping industry often come from different government departments. Some campsites are told to report to the tourism bureau, while some have to consult the department of land administration, etc. These different officers tend to give different opinions that would confuse the applicants of camping. There is no common guideline to follow.

These two legal difficulties above can both be attributed to the third legal problem, which is the confusion of camping laws and regulations. Lai's (2016) research suggested that this problem has existed for a long time for Taiwan's camping industry. Current laws related to camping are outdated and therefore limit

46

further development of camping, not to mention the new glamping industry.

Besides, there are actually no specific regulations directly for camping or campsites,

as Alan (Taichung City) comments:

> ...the biggest cause to this situation is that there are no specific camping regulations or
>
> laws in Taiwan. Thus, campsite owners often conduct the business in the grey area….
>
> the event of camping itself is not illegal, but the employment of lands for the purpose
>
> of camping or glamping might be illegal.

These urgent legal issues for the camping and glamping business in Taiwan lead to a

chaos easily, and many of the Taiwanese operators just choose to develop the

business illegally. With the vicious circle of those legal problems remain and new

operators again select illegal pathways, the chaos may keep growing and eventually

result in a "total misunderstanding of this industry" that Alan worries. Similar to

what Brooker and Joppe (2013) suggested for the glamping growth in the United

States restricted by rigorous laws, this legal challenge in Taiwan can possibly limit the

glamping development to a large extent.

However, some of the interviewees consider the emergence of this global

glamping trend in Taiwan might possibly pose a positive influence on this local

setback. Although it has not led to any revitalization (Schuerkens, 2003) or

reinvention (Robertson, 1995; Salazar, 2005) towards local legal issues in Taiwan yet,

some interviewees believe it as a potential stimulation or reminder for the officials

to notice the need for revitalizing relevant legal practices. Shawn (Taichung City) is

one of these believers:

… (the trend of glamping in Taiwan) might positively attract the governments' attention towards this novel industry…allowing them to see this new market. While most of the camping business are illegal so far, governments have the responsibility to protect the customers (who participate in the camping activities). They have to intervene actively and make regulations and laws updated. This may be something positive.

In general, it is possible to say that during the negotiation between the global idea of glamping and the local inflexible elements in Taiwan (the weather, the environment, legal issues), namely the localization process (Cawley et al., 2002; Schuerkens, 2003), both challenges and opportunities emerge on the way. The local weather and legal issues soon appear as major challenges in the process. How to make recreational vehicles suitable to the environment and attractive to visitors also struggles respondents. However, the Taiwanese glamping owners view these difficulties as practical or potential chances, such as with creative modifications (Gotham, 2005), or as possible stimulation for legal regulations recreation. These efforts and attitudes well manifest that the Taiwanese glamping providers act as active roles (Schuerkens, 2003) instead of passive recipients (Teo & Li, 2003) during the localization process of glamping in Taiwan.

4.2.2 THE ADAPTABLE LOCAL

Another localization pattern in the development of glamping in Taiwan is discussed in this section. It relates significantly to what Cawley et al. (2002) and Schuerkens (2003) proposed for the global idea integration to utilize local resources during the process. Especially, the adaptable local here means that these local elements may not only be used, but even undergo revitalization or recreation influenced by the

glamping ideas from the abroad (Robertson, 1995; Salazar, 2005; Schuerkens, 2003). They are not fixed but can be adapted. These kinds of adaptable locals applied in the glamping development in Taiwan are observed to mostly come from everyday life environment, of which Hannerz (1996) called form-of-life frame. In this study, such resources include the local labor, local cuisine and ingredient as well as local culture.

Several respondents have mentioned recruiting local personnel. For instance, Neil (Yilan City) shares that as an indigenous person himself, he hires people mostly from his own indigenous community to be employees, or coaches for activities. Similarity, Ryan (Keelung City) attempts to recruit most workers from the place where his glamping site is located. From his comment, it is obvious that he holds the same idea as Schuerkens (2003), to believe that using resources from the local can bring a sense of stability for his business:

> …to develop our own feature…mainly focusing on local features and local resources, including personnel, that can bring stability…almost 80 percent of our employees are local residents…we want to provide a pleasant working environment for the employees, as we believe that happy workers make happy visitors. This is one successful localization example we had so far...

Furthermore, most respondents are proud of their integration of local cuisine, local dessert, local fruits and featured Taiwanese street food into the glamping offerings. For instance, Joe (Yilan City) mentions that he offers local soy milk as a major beverage for visitors instead of typical offerings like soda or juice. Some respondents work with local restaurants to offer local featured dishes or famous meals in their glamping sites. Beside regular collaboration, Neil (Yilan City) shares that he works with a local ramen restaurant to create a new ramen flavor combining the traditional

spice, "Litsea cubeba", from the "Atayal" indigenous group in Taiwan. This responds to what Robertson (1995), Salazar (2005) and Schuerkens (2003) suggested of the recreation of local elements during the localization of glamping in Taiwan.

In addition, Joe and Kevin particularly emphasize their employment of local ingredients:

Our ingredient...in Yilan (an Eastern province of Taiwan), there are local farmed pigs. So, we have a lot of local ingredients of pork, and we also cook a lot of pork cuisine such as sausage and meatballs...they are famous local street food (here)... Joe (Yilan City).

...we realized most of our neighbors are farmers...since we develop a leisure farm plus campsite here, it is also our duty to fulfill the corporate social responsibility. For example, we collaborate with those farmers nearby who grow vegetables, rice, sweet potatoes...that all of their products can be sold to our campsite as our ingredients, local ingredients... Kevin (New Taipei City).

The Taiwanese glamping providers' use of local food and ingredients reflect that the localization of glamping in Taiwan offers the opportunity for them to not just preserve (Hines, 2013), but even promote traditional Taiwanese local food in their glamping sites. Meanwhile, it also provides the space for the reinvention of local cuisine (Robertson, 1995; Salazar, 2005; Schuerkens, 2003). Another benefit of this localization model is that the glamping sites owners can have a steady source of cooking ingredients while contributing to the local communities.

Moreover, local culture tends to be one of the most common elements to be used in localization process. And this can be seen in glamping development in

Taiwan. Several different local cultures are employed. For example, John (Taoyuan City), Neil (Yilan City), and Sam (Nantou City) are themselves indigenous people or personally close to the indigenous culture. Thus, it is natural for them to promote their own culture in their glamping sites. John (Taoyuan City) integrates it into glamping with decorations and activities:

> ...as to the tents, we tried to combine some Atayal traditional weaving pattern to the decoration, both inside and outside of the tents, including some indigenous specific pictures...besides, since my wife is from the Atayal tribe, and she is also interested in weaving, she organizes some activities to teach weaving, making a recycle bag etc.

Also, Sam (Nantou City) promotes indigenous culture in guided tours as part of the glamping activities:

> ...due to the lack of labor, I seek help from my (indigenous) community. We take visitors to some nearby landscapes and sometimes to our community to participate in our (traditional) cultural activities...thus while managing the glamping site, we also bring our activities and culture inside.

Besides indigenous culture, the local history and culture of a place appear to be another great source. Ryan (Keelung City) offers an example. He makes use of the local history and culture of the location where his glamping site is situated:

> ...other than guided tours (with local history introduction), we also prepared some handicraft courses or do-it-yourself activities with local culture, such as the Indigo Dyeing (from Hakka culture, visitors experience designing and dyeing a cloth

themselves) and the scout rope experience. We teach customers to tie the scout rope into some useful handicrafts...this scout rope is part of the culture and history here. It was a scout training campsite twenty or thirty years ago...to pass on this scout training culture also counts as local culture integration.

Briefly speaking, these Taiwanese glamping owners' employment of the local food, ingredients, and culture (either kind) has followed a similar trajectory: localization allows them to protect their local resources (Hines, 2013), and even promote and pass on, via glamping industry in Taiwan. Particularly, for the use of local cultures, glamping decorations and additional activities are two most common means that glamping operators adopt for the localization of their glamping sites.

In general, these utilizations of local resources identify Schuerkens's (2003) viewpoint, that referencing local cultures or values enables the Taiwanese glamping operators to provide stability and consistency in their glamping business, since some visitors might be willing to participate in this new glamping experience with some local elements that they are familiar with.

4.2.3 COLLABORATION WITH THE LOCAL

A third commonly seen localization strategy from the interviewees' replies is through local collaboration. The discussion of local food and ingredients above already show some collaborating examples with local restaurants and farmers. Some of the respondents share that they work with different Taiwanese local brands that they admire. Neil (Yilan City) talks about at least three of his successful cooperation with local brands in various sectors, and here is one of them:

...recently we work with a local ice pop brand. Their ice pop is made of purely fruits, sugar and water, no chemical additions. Besides, they help and support local farmers by buying from them all the fruits not in good condition or not sold out in time...to avoid wastes...so, although their products are a bit more expensive, the quality is guaranteed. Thus, we worked with them.

In addition, the quote regarding borrowing indigenous culture in the previous section reveals that Sam (Nantou City) seeks assistance from his indigenous community. This indicates another local collaboration type, with local communities. He further explains:

...for the activities, I mostly collaborated with the travel association in my community...for example, they offer tours for our customers to visit some landscapes that most people do not know...it is a kind of integrating local resources. Because it is impossible to make it perfect only by ourselves. We need to work with the community.

It is worth noting that he is not the only one to collaborate with local communities. James (Nantou City) also looks for help from nearby community to provide ecological guided tours which allow visitors to recognize not only the glamping site, but also the whole village, community and the nature around. Moreover, Ryan (Keelung City) collaborates with an independent local culture and history studio to receive useful information of the place, in order to plan the glamping site in a broader environment framework. Besides, Shawn (Taichung City) invites local volunteering groups to promote the local ecology at his glamping site:

> ...it is hard to deal with the part of ecology...it is a difficult part for us to overcome.
>
> Since there are already lots of volunteers or volunteering groups in Taiwan who keep
>
> protecting and promoting the local ecology, we work with them and invite them to give
>
> lessons at our glamping site. It is a fast way to fix the problem.

Apparently, collaboration with different local brands and restaurants enable the

Taiwanese glamping providers to keep renewing their offers at the glamping site in

order to upgrade the whole glamping experience. While the collaborations with local

communities, local studios, and volunteering groups seem to be an effective solution

or a means for them to complement their glamping industries. It can thus also be

seen as a kind of method to receive local resources during glamping localization

(Cawley et al., 2002; Schuerkens, 2003).

However, as Kevin (New Taipei City) suggests, "…to further develop locally is not

an easy but a complicated communicating and interacting process, especially with

local residents". Although some successful examples were shown above,

coordinating with local residents appears to be a challenge during localization

process of glamping in Taiwan. Since local residents and glamping site owners might

hold different perspectives towards how the place should be developed. Kevin

further provides that issues such as traffic jam and sound pollution are common

challenges in this situation. Also, Ben (New Taipei City) proposes another problem

emerging during negotiating with the local residents, the gap between generations:

> One of the challenges is the difference of thoughts and perceptions between new and
>
> old generations. In terms of management or the place development, these elderly
>
> generation local residents cannot not understand or accept the novel industry of
>
> glamping. It leads to difficulties in promotion...we expect to plan some collaborations

with some local traditional shops, but owners of these shops cannot see the benefits

from collaborating together...

From their experiences, it is obvious that the challenges they meet during the

collaboration with local residents are mostly caused by different perspectives and

understanding of this new glamping business. The locals tend to hold suspicious

attitudes towards glamping for the local contexts in general. For instance, damages

emerging during the glamping development may interfere with the living

environment for the local residents. Thus, for Taiwanese glamping operators,

communicating with the locals becomes an important and necessary step during the

localization of glamping.

In general, it is evident that the development of glamping in Taiwan start to

witness the tendency of localization. It happens in various trajectories, including the

adaptation of global glamping elements to the inflexible local conditions (Boli &

Lechner, 2004;), the employment of diverse and adaptable local resources in Taiwan

(Cawley et al., 2002; Schuerkens, 2003), and the local collaborations. The first one is

often full of difficulties; however, Taiwanese glamping providers are able to turn the

challenges they meet into unexpected opportunities and make adjustments

accordingly, in order to embed into local contexts (Boli & Lechner, 2004). Likewise,

glamping localization in Taiwan through collaborating with local brands,

communities and local residents also shows both opportunities and challenges. It is

indeed a useful way to complement the glamping sites with local resources, but the

conflicts in-between require the glamping providers to pay more attention to both

what they need and what the locals want. Additionally, the use of local resources at

glamping sites, such as employees, the food, the local culture, to some extent

confirms the localization model as an effective means as Hines (2013) suggested, for

glamping operators in Taiwan to preserve and even showcase the local traditions and practices in their glamping sites. Interestingly, even with more local collaborations, it is still nearly impossible for glamping in Taiwan to reach the localization level that Cawley et al. (2002) stated as local isolation, with everything locally.

However, examined from a narrow perspective, the localization of glamping in Taiwan in fact seems mostly remain at the additions of glamping, such as the activities or the meals. Because what glamping owners in Taiwan have done so far, are to use and display existing local culture and activities in their glamping sites. Although these employments may really guarantee the preservation (Hines, 2013) or even the reinvention (Robertson, 1995; Schuerkens, 2003) of local resources, they are still the localization of additions for glamping, not the event of glamping itself.

The localization degree of glamping itself in Taiwan is not obvious yet. So far, only the changes in glamping facilities might be qualified as localization of glamping itself. For example, the adaptation of recreational vehicles to the local environment in Taiwan (Boli & Lechner, 2004), or the employment of local culture for tent decorations (Cawley et al., 2002), can be counted as localization, as they are things that are the closesest and most necessary for glamping.

To sum up, either through the strategy of interpretating global elements into the inflexible locals, or the global employment of adaptable local elements, it represents that glamping in Taiwan already shows some localization progress during the development. It provides great potential to be a catalyst boosting the preservation, revitalization or even recreation of local practices in Taiwan.

4.3 OVERALL GLAMPING DEVELOPMENT IN TAIWAN: GLOCALIZATION

A brief summary of the overall results in this study is presented here. In section 4.1, the cultural homogenization model is confirmed to be a common and first strategy for Taiwanese glamping providers to develop the global idea of glamping in local contexts of Taiwan. A nuanced observation for homogenization here is that glamping in Taiwan is homogenized towards examples in both Western countries and Asian countries, responding Ritzer's (2003) idea to disagree homogenization as a complete Westernization. In the following section 4.2, three trajectories are found as the localization process of glamping in Taiwan. The first and the second are to deal with the inflexible and adaptable Taiwan's local elements respectively. During the integrating process, both challenges and opportunities emerge. In general, certain degree of localization is sure to happen in glamping development in Taiwan already.

After the clarification of both models from globalization phenomenon in Taiwan's glamping industries, it is possible now to conclude that the overall development of glamping in Taiwan can be considered as, what Robertson (1995) proposed, a glocalization process. The simultaneous existence of both the homogenization process and the localization process within glamping in Taiwan meets Robertson's concept of glocalization to contain both the homogeneity and heterogeneity. Besides, it is able to see a time order within the glocalization of glamping in Taiwan that is welcomed by most respondents. Interestingly, the active role of Taiwanese glamping operators during the development of both homogenization and localization model in glamping in Taiwan, as well as their employment of information technology as major glamping idea collecting source, are two intriguing and valuable findings that cannot be overlooked. In the following conclusion chapter, these insights are further explained and elaborated.

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

5.1 OVERALL OBSERVATION AND DISCUSSION

The results of this study show that, from a broader perspective, the overall glamping development in Taiwan is a glocalization process. The tendency of both cultural homogenization and localization are observed during the development. This confirms what Robertson (1995) meant for glocalization. Both homogeneity (from cultural homogenization) and heterogeneity (from localization) exist together in the process of globalization trend of glamping embedded in the local contexts of Taiwan. Appadurai's (1996) point of view can also be used to describe the glamping development in Taiwan: besides the forces of homogenization from the West and the East, heterogeneity still remains through the localization of glamping in Taiwan.

From another point of view, it can also be said that glamping operators in Taiwan adopt a glocalization strategy to negotiate the global glamping trend with the local traditions and practices in Taiwan. This responds to the research question of this study. With this strategy, Taiwanese glamping providers welcome both homogenization and localization process. They learn glamping examples from both Western countries and Asian countries as the inspiration for their own glamping development, including the glamping concept, facilities, style and atmosphere. This identifies that both Western and Asian cultural influences can be seen in the glamping development in Taiwan. Thus, the homogenization model within the glocalization strategy applied in Taiwan's glamping does not show a full pattern towards Westernization (Ritzer, 2003). After that, Taiwanese glamping owners subsequently make adjustments of these global resources in order to develop individual features for their glamping sites. One strategy is to interpret and adapt the

58

global elements according to the inflexible local conditions in Taiwan such as the weather, the environment and legal issues (Boli & Lechner, 2004). Another is to make use of the adaptable local resources including the local personnel, food and culture (Cawley et al., 2002; Schuerkens, 2003). Besides, local collaboration is also a widely used localization tool for Taiwan's glamping development. Though strictly speaking, the localization of the glamping in Taiwan remains at the additions. Yet overall, these applications follow what Gotham (2005), Robertson (1995) and Salazar (2005) agreed to be the process of glocalization in terms of the interaction between the global and the local: global offerings are altered to fit the locals' needs, while local practices are used, influenced, and reinvented through innovative actions.

In addition, from the overall descriptions, it is obvious that this glocalization model in glamping development in Taiwan often contains a time order. Almost all respondents are in line with van der Linden (2015) to consider referencing global existing examples as a first step for glamping development in Taiwan. Then, they subsequently emphasize the significance of negotiating with local cultural practices to create individual glamping site characteristics. These findings enrich the concept of glocalization. It shows that while homogenization and localization models exist together in glamping in Taiwan, they usually come at different timings. And Taiwanese glamping owners encourage this glocalization strategy with a sequence in-between, in order to cultivate their business in an effective and efficient way.

Besides, it is worth noting of the active role of Taiwanese glamping providers during the process (Schuerkens, 2003). Either facing the forces of homogenization from abroad, or dealing with the challenges emerging during localization, most of the Taiwanese glamping operators show a proactive attitude to make use of and adapt the global, to employ and reinvent the local, as well as to turn the difficulties they meet in-between into opportunities by innovative thoughts and adjustments

throughout the whole glamping development. As Teo and Li (2003) suggested, or Hannerz (1992) and Schuerkens (2003) described in creolization, the locals are not defenseless or passive recipients; they are capable to respond to the global forces. This well reflects what Ritzer (2003) and Salazar (2005) have called to be a dynamic and successive mutual interpenetration between the global and the local in the glamping development in Taiwan.

However, within this glocalization model of glamping in Taiwan which emphasizes the mutual interplay between the global and the local, one thing that is not witnessed is that: glamping in Taiwan so far has not posed an influence on global cultural elements, or even challenged the global glamping idea from superior cultures, as Kaplan and Lööw suggested (2002). It can relate to the comments made by most of the interviewees: glamping in Taiwan is still in the phase of learning and growing. It needs more time.

Interestingly, the information technology, especially the Internet, is often employed by respondents to search for both Western and non-Western glamping ideas. This responds to what Sharpley (2018) proposed of this technology as an important part of the ongoing process of both tourism and globalization. This study then identifies the information technology as a useful tool for glocalization development, through the case study of glamping in Taiwan. Particularly, Taiwanese glamping operators rely significantly on it as the major information sourcing during coronavirus pandemic nowadays.

To sum up, the interaction between the global and the local in view of glamping development in Taiwan is confirmed as a glocalization model in this research. Perhaps it can even be better described with Pieterse's (1995) concept of "cultural hybridization". While the homogenization process of glamping in Taiwan witnesses foreign cultural influences from both Western and Eastern countries, the developing

trajectory also indicates the gradual tendency towards localization. Thus, glamping development in Taiwan in general actually includes both the interaction between the West and the East, and between the global and the local. In other words, the development of Taiwanese glamping industry can be described as hybridization, to emphasize the mixing of diverse cultures during the growth of a continuously evolving cultural form (Pieterse, 1996).

5.2 FUTURE SUGGESTION

In view of the glocalization strategy is how Taiwan responds to the phenomenon of the globalization of glamping, this study contributes to both tourism practices and tourism academic studies, as mentioned in section 5.1. For the former, some further practical suggestions are listed here in the hope of becoming a basis or inspiration for glamping providers in Taiwan of future improvements.

Firstly, either from previous Taiwanese camping studies or from the results of this paper, it is clear that the camping industry in Taiwan has struggled with the long-term problem of legal issues, and this study shows that the prosperous glamping might become a stimulation for the Taiwanese government to take actions towards the ease of regulations. This uncovers an issue: are these camping regulations applicable to glamping? While camping emphasizes remaining the natural appearances and glamping focuses on the enjoyment outdoors with upgraded amenities, this points out the possibility for future new camping regulations still in conflict with glamping industry, thereby limiting the industry future. Thus, glamping owners in Taiwan may have to be more proactive to strive for their rights to protect their glamping sites. This issue can also relate to the confusion mentioned before about the ambiguity between camping and glamping in Taiwan. Some operators do

not consider themselves as managing glamping industry. The lack of consensus among Taiwanese glamping providers can only lead to more people's misunderstanding towards this industry. And there is no collective power for glamping owners to protect themselves. Hence, I recommend the glamping operators in Taiwan to work together by establishing a joint online platform of glamping or a joint glamping association in Taiwan. It provides better opportunities for their collective voices to be heard by the government.

Besides, while glamping providers in Taiwan continue to strive for individual features of their glamping sites, they are encouraged to draw ideas and lessons from this study to further develop glamping locally and to decide the future position of their glamping sites. I invite them to see from this study of how they themselves actively turn challenges into opportunities during the development of glamping, by imitations, adaptations, adjustments and reinventions. In this way, they can be better prepared for future glamping trends and challenges, especially confronting the gradual release of coronavirus pandemic and reopen of international tourism.

As for the academic contributions of this study, as already discussed in section 5.1, it complements the theoretical concept of globalization with an empirical investigation, as well as set an example for future camping and glamping tourism to be studied in terms of the globalization framework. Here, some suggestions for future research are presented based on the findings in the study.

From the results, it is clear that the widely biased perspective of cultural homogenization as Westernization needs a more critical assessment. It can be started from the examination of more Asian sources about homogenization perspectives, in order to come up with an alternative and more inclusive approach to identify what can be called cultural homogenization, that stands not from the West or the East but from both sides and even more.

In addition, due to the fact that the glamping trend in Taiwan is boosted considerably by the Internet influencer culture and the coronavirus pandemic, it will be intriguing to investigate the influences of coronavirus on glamping in Taiwan, as well as the relationship between the growth of Taiwanese glamping business and famous influencers.

At last, while glocalization strategy is verified to be the development model between the interaction of the global and the local in terms of glamping in Taiwan, in this study, it is also found to have rather extraordinary features from the case in Taiwan, the time order in-between the process, that enriches existing glocalization studies. Therefore, future research is encouraged to apply the glocalization model to further investigate more newly prosperous tourism trends throughout the world, such as sustainable tourism or independent traveling, to identify more potential characteristic.

REFERENCES

Abu-Lughod, J. L. (2000). Book review of AG Frank. *ReOrient: Journal of World History*, 111-14.

Aeberhard, M., Caminada, A., Comino, S., Gowin, D., Krall, M., McDonald, B., ... & Walter, M. (2020). Case Studies and Best Practice Examples of Luxury Tourism. In *Luxury Tourism* (pp. 275-318). Springer, Cham.

Akama, J. S., & Kieti, D. (2007). Tourism and socio-economic development in developing countries: A case study of Mombasa Resort in Kenya. *Journal of sustainable tourism*, *15*(6), 735-748.

Antonio, R. J., & Bonanno, A. (2000). A New Global Capitalism? From" Americanism and Fordism" to" Americanization-Globalization". *American Studies*, *41*(2/3), 33-77.

Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Theory, culture & society*, 7(2-3), 295-310.

Appelbaum, R. and Robinson, W.I. 2005. *Critical Globalization Studies.* New York: Routledge.

Bahney, A. (2019, March 1). Yurts, domes and luxury tents — next level glamping is here. CNN Business. Last visited June 17, 2021 from https://edition.cnn.com/2019/03/01/success/glamping-resorts-outdoor-travel/index.html

Boli, J., & Lechner, F. J. (Eds.). (2004). *The globalization reader*. Blackwell.

Boscoboinik, A., & Bourquard, E. (2012). Glamping and rural imaginary. *From Production to Consumption. Transformation of Rural Communities. Münster: Lit Verlag*, 149-164.

Brochado, A., & Brochado, F. (2019). What makes a glamping experience great? *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*.

Brochado, A., & Pereira, C. (2017). Comfortable experiences in nature accommodation: Perceived service quality in Glamping. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, *17*, 77-83.

Brooker, E., & Joppe, M. (2013). Trends in camping and outdoor hospitality—An international review. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, *3*, 1-6.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods.* Oxford university press.

Carter, G. (2011, July 26). Camping's extreme makeover. *Entrepreneur Europe.* Last visited June 17, 2021 from

https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/220037

Castells, M., & Blackwell, C. (1998). The information age: economy, society and culture. Volume 1. The rise of the network society. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, *25*, 631-636.

Cawley, M., Gaffey, S., & Gillmor, D. A. (2002). Localization and global reach in rural tourism: Irish evidence. *Tourist Studies*, *2*(1), 63-86.

Cerović, Z. (2014). Innovative management of camping accommodation. *INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL SERIES A SOCIAL AND HUMANITARIAN SCIENCES*, 55.

Chang, T. C., Milne, S., Fallon, D., & Pohlmann, C. (1996). Urban heritage tourism: The global-local nexus. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *23*(2), 284-305.

Chen, S. C. (2020, August 12). Recreational vehicles, luxurious tents: new trend of glamping. *Taiwan Awake News*. Last visited June 17, 2021 from https://anntw.com/articles/20200812-ZA8U [陳是祈. (2020). 露營車、豪華帳篷，精緻露營新趨勢. *臺灣醒報*.]

Chen, S. S. (2009). *Plans and assessments of National Forest Recreation Area campsites and activities: final report*. Retrieved from Forestry Bureau website: https://www.forest.gov.tw/ [陳盛雄. (2009). *國家森林遊樂區露營場地與活動之規畫評估-結案報告.* 取自 行政院農業委員會林務局.]

Craig, C. A. (2020). Camping, glamping, and coronavirus in the United States. *Annals of Tourism Research*.

Crick, M. (1994). *Resplendent sites, discordant voices: Sri Lankans and international tourism*. Psychology Press.

Cvelić-Bonifačić, J., Milohnić, I., & Cerović, Z. (2017). Glamping–creative accommodation in camping resorts: insights and opportunities. *Tourism in South East Europe...*, *4*, 101-114.

Dockterman, E. (2012, September). Happy Glampers. *Time Magazine*. Last visited June 17, 2021 from http://content.time.com/time/subscriber/article/0,33009,2123798,00.html

Dogramadjieva, E. (2021). Glocalization strategies and current transformations of innovative city tours of Sofia, Bulgaria. In *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 92). EDP Sciences.

Dorofeeva, A. (2020). GLAMPING IN RUSSIA: RELEVANCE AND DEVELOPMENT PROSPECTS. *Human Progress*, *6*(2), 1.

Easycamp. (2017, May 08). Glamping as camping new trend [Blog post]. Last visited June 17, 2021 from https://news.easycamp.com.tw/DOC_2743.html [露營樂. (2017). Glamping 露營新風潮.]

Ergüven, M. H., Yılmaz, A., & Kutlu, D. (2015). Hybrid tourism within the context of touristic product diversification: glamping. *Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, (41), 255-265. Abstract retrieved from https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/20163047973

Filipe, S., Santos, C. A., & Barbosa, B. (2018, September). TOURISTS'MOTIVATIONS
AND OBSTACLES FOR CHOOSING GLAMPING: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY. In *CBU
International Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 6, pp. 113-119).

Flick, U. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research.* sage.

Giddens, A. (1990). The consequences of modernity. *Cambridge: Polity*.

Giddens, A. (2003). *Runaway world: How globalization is reshaping our lives*. Taylor
& Francis.

Glusac, E. (2018, June 15). Glamping Slips Into the Mainstream. *The New York Times*.
Last visited June 17, 2021 from

https://www.nytimes.com/2018/06/15/travel/luxury-camping.html

Gotham, K. F. (2005). Tourism from above and below: globalization, localization and
New Orleans's Mardi Gras. *International Journal of Urban and Regional
Research*, *29*(2), 309-326.

Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. *Theory, culture &
society*, *7*(2-3), 237-251.

Hannerz, U. (1992). *Cultural complexity: Studies in the social organization of
meaning*. Columbia University Press.

Hannerz, U., & Ulf Hannerz, H. (1996). *Transnational connections: Culture, people,
places*. Taylor & Francis US.

Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (2000). Global transformations:
Politics, economics and culture. In *Politics at the Edge* (pp. 14-28). Palgrave
Macmillan, London.

Hettne, B. (1995). Development theory and the three worlds: towards an
international political economy of development.

Hines, C. (2013). *Localization: A global manifesto*. Routledge.

Hobson, J. M. (2012). 1 Orientalization in Globalization. *Globalization and Development in East Asia*, *2*, 12.

Hsieh, P. F. (2019). The Effect of Leisure Campers' Motivation and Season on Preference for Environment Attributes of Campsite (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://ndltd.ncl.edu.tw/cgi-bin/gs32/gsweb.cgi/ccd=PzENlo/webmge?mode=basic [謝佩芳. (2019). 休閒露營者參與動機與活動季節 對營地環境屬性偏好之影響 (國立臺北教育大學社會與區域發展學系碩士班碩士論文). 取自 臺灣博碩士論文知識加值系統]

Huang, S. W. (2021, February 16). 4 billion output value of the industry in total, legal campsites only account for 11% throughout Taiwan. *The Storm Media*. Last visited June 17, 2021 from https://www.storm.mg/new7/article/3465729 [黃信維. (2021). 總產值上看 40 億 全台合法露營場僅佔 11%. *風傳媒*.]

Iwabuchi, K. (2010). Globalization, East Asian media cultures and their publics. *Asian Journal of Communication*, *20*(2), 197-212.

Jhang, K. J. (2020, April 18). Glamping becomes the boom, but illegal locations account for 40%. *Newsweek.* Last visited June 17, 2021 from http://shuj.shu.edu.tw/ [張可君.(2020). 豪華露營成風潮 違法營區卻達四成. *小世界*.]

Jhao, M. R. (2017, March). Glamping, more comfortable than home. *CommonWealth Magazine, 617*. Last visited June 17, 2021 from https://www.cw.com.tw/article/5081177?template=fashion&from=search [趙曼汝. (2017). 豪華露營 比在家更舒適. *天下雜誌 617 期*.]

Kaplan, J. S., & Lööw, H. (Eds.). (2002). *The cultic milieu: Oppositional subcultures in an age of globalization*. Rowman Altamira.

Kozinets, R. V. (2010). *Netnography: Doing ethnographic research online*. Sage publications.

Lai, Y. T. (2016). The construction of rural space in camping sites: a case study of Pasture YEN family in Taomi (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://ntcuir.ntcu.edu.tw/ [賴宜廷. (2016). 露營區鄉村空間的建構-以桃米坑顏氏牧場為例 (PhD Thesis).]

Lee, C. F. (2020). Understanding the Factors Determining the Attractiveness of Camping Tourism: A Hierarchical Approach. *Tourism Planning & Development*, *17*(5), 556-572.

Li, G. S. (2014, December). Camping is popular, active life 2.0. *Taiwan Panorama*. Last visited June 17, 2021 from http://www.taiwan-panorama.com/tw/show [李國盛. (2014). 露營夯，行動生活 2.0. *臺灣光華雜誌*]

Li, H. C. (2018). A Study on Leisure Motivation, Leisure Involvement and Well-being of Camp participants (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://ir.nptu.edu.tw/ [李蕙君. (2018). 露營活動參與者休閒動機, 休閒涉入與幸福感之研究 (PhD Thesis).]

Mak, A. H., Lumbers, M., & Eves, A. (2012). Globalisation and food consumption in tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, *39*(1), 171-196.

Ma, S., Craig, C. A., & Feng, S. (2020). Camping climate resources: the camping climate index in the United States. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-9.

Miller, D. (1992). The Young and the Restless in Trinidad A case of the local and the global in mass. *Consuming technologies: Media and information in domestic spaces*, 163.

Milohnic, I., & Bonifacic, J. C. (2014). Global trends affecting camping tourism: managerial challenges and solutions. In *Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management in Opatija. Biennial International Congress. Tourism & Hospitality*

Industry (p. 380). University of Rijeka, Faculty of Tourism & Hospitality Management.

Milohnić, I., Bonifačić, J. C., & Licul, I. (2019). Transformation of Camping Into Glamping–Trends and Perspectives. *Tourism in South East Europe...*, *5*, 457-473.

Nuryanti, W. (1996). Heritage and postmodern tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, *23*(2), 249-260.

Olmsted, L. (2020, June). Glamping Is a Growing Travel Trend—From New York City to the Rockies. *Forbes*. Last visited June 17, 2021 from https://www.forbes.com/sites/larryolmsted/2020/06/25/glamping-is-growing-travel-trendfrom-new-york-city-to-the-rockies/?sh=3184bb823093

Ou-Yang, C. R. (2021, May). Enjoy Japanese Wagyu and hot springs? In 2021, glamping can be like this. *CommonWealth Magazine Web Only*. Last visited June 17, 2021 from https://www.cw.com.tw/article/5114780?template=fashion [歐陽辰柔. (2021). 吃和牛、泡溫泉？2021 年，豪華露營還能這樣玩. *天下雜誌線上版*.]

Pieterse, J. N. (1995). Globalization as hybridization. *Media and Cultural Studies*, *658*.

Pieterse, J. N. (1996). Globalisation and culture: Three paradigms. *Economic and political weekly*, 1389-1393.

Pieterse, J. N. (2006). Oriental globalization. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *23*(2-3), 411-413.

Pieterse, J. N. (2015). *Globalization and culture: Global mélange*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Postelnicu, C., Dinu, V., & Dabija, D. C. (2015). Economic deglobalization–from hypothesis to reality. *Ekonomie a Management (E&M)/Economics and Management*, *18*(2), 4-14.

Pratiwi, D. P. E., & Arka, I. W. (2016). Cross-cultural Values in Glocalization: A Case Study of Balinese Tourism Advertisements. In *Jakarta: LIPI International Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities*.

Reiser, D. (2003). Globalisation: An old phenomenon that needs to be rediscovered for tourism?. *Tourism and hospitality research*, *4*(4), 306-320.

Ritzer, G. (2002). An introduction to McDonaldization. *McDonaldization: The Reader*, *2*, 4-25.

Ritzer, G. (2003). Rethinking globalization: Glocalization/grobalization and something/nothing. *Sociological theory*, *21*(3), 193-209.

Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture* (Vol. 16). Sage.

Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity»: 25-44. *Global Modernities. Londres, Sage Publications*.

Robertson, R., & White, K. E. (2007). What is globalization. *The Blackwell companion to globalization*, 54-66.

Robinson, W. I. (2007). Theories of globalization. *The Blackwell companion to globalization*, 125-143.

Roudometof, V. (2005). Transnationalism, cosmopolitanism and glocalization. *Current sociology*, *53*(1), 113-135.

Roudometof, V. (2016). Theorizing glocalization: Three interpretations1. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *19*(3), 391-408.

Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2003). Techniques to identify themes. *Field methods*, *15*(1), 85-109.

Sakáčová, K. L. (2013). GLAMPING–Nature served on silver platter. *Aalborg University*.

Salazar, N. B. (2005). Tourism and glocalization "local" tour guiding. Annals of tourism research, 32(3), 628-646.

Scholte, J. A. (2002). *What is Globalization?: The Definitional Issue-Again*. CSGR.

Schuerkens, U. (2003). The sociological and anthropological study of globalization and localization. *Current Sociology*, *51*(3-4), 209-222.

Sharpley, R. (2018). *Tourism, tourists and society*. Routledge.

Teo, P., & Li, L. H. (2003). Global and local interactions in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *30*(2), 287-306.

Tomlinson, J. (2012a). Cultural globalization. *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization*.

Tomlinson, J. (2012b). Cultural imperialism. *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization*. Abstract retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/9780470670590.wbeog129

van der Linden, L. (2015). Trends in Hospitality and the Leisure Industry: How Social Welfare and Spending Power Influence Holiday Trends. In *Educational Strategies for the Next Generation Leaders in Hotel Management* (pp. 1-15). IGI Global. Abstract retrieved from https://www.igiglobal.com/chapter/trends-in-hospitality-and-the-leisure-industry/131189

Velho, O. (1999). Globalization: object—perspective—horizon. *Journal of Latin American Anthropology*, *4*(2), 320-339.

Wood, R. E. (2000). Caribbean cruise tourism: Globalization at sea. *Annals of tourism research*, *27*(2), 345-370.

Wu, M. H. & Shen, I. L. (2015). A Study into Camping Development and Sites in

Taiwan. *Leisure & Society Research*, (11), 85-96. [吳明花, & 沈易利. (2015).

臺灣露營活動發展與型態之探討. *休閒與社會研究*, (11), 85-96.]

Yang, Y. Y. (2021, May 05). The Ministry of Transportation and Communications will

amend the law, lands only for agriculture, forestry and animal husbandry

purposes will open for camping usage, illegal campsites can apply for

assistance. *News & Market*. Last visited June 17, 2021 from

https://www.newsmarket.com.tw/aboutus/ [楊語芸. (2021). 交通部將

修法，一公頃以下農牧林地全面開放露營使用，已違規者可申請輔導

合法. *上下游*.]

Yavuz, K. B., & Savran, S. An Architectural Style Effect on Local Tourism: Bauhaus

Architecture in Tel Aviv Example. *İDEALKENT*, *11*(Kentleşme ve Ekonomi Özel

Sayısı), 1-1.

Overview of Taiwanese Glamping Operator Respondents

Order	Interview Date	Pseudonym	Location of glamping site	Area of glamping site in Taiwan	Position in the glamping site
1	April 13, 2021	John	Taoyuan City	Northern	owner
2	April 13, 2021	Tom	Hualien County	Eastern	owner
3	April 13, 2021	Bill	Nantou City	Central (Western)	Co-owner
4	April 15, 2021	Neil	Yilan City	Northern	owner
5	April 15, 2021	Sam	Nantou City	Central (Western)	owner
6	April 16, 2021	Joe	Yilan City	Northern	main operator
7	April 19, 2021	Alan	Taichung City	Central (Western)	main operator
8	April 19, 2021	Ben	New Taipei City	Northern	main operator
9	April 21, 2021	William	Pingtung County	Southern	main operator
10	April 21, 2021	James	Nantou City	Central (Western)	owner
11	April 21, 2021	Kevin	New Taipei City	Northern	main operator
12	April 22, 2021	Shawn	Taichung City	Central (Western)	main operator
13	April 22, 2021	Ryan	Keelung City	Northern	Co-owner

Interview Guide: Glamping Development in Taiwan

Before starting

- About researcher / Purpose of research and interview / Confidential promise

Topic 1: Basic Introduction

- Can you briefly introduce yourself? (Professional position)

- Can you briefly introduce your camping / glamping site? (back-up: core managing values / main features of the site)

Topic 2: Globalization and Glamping

- How do you explain the increasing popularity of glamping in Taiwan?

- Can you briefly share recent camping development in Taiwan?

  - What are the similarities or differences between camping and glamping, according to you?)

- What are your perspectives towards global glamping developments?

Topic 3: The Global and the Local (Taiwanese Glamping Development Process)

Part 1

- Where did you get your inspiration and idea from, to start / develop the glamping site?

- How do you see your glamping site similar to foreign glamping models?

  - To what extent do you see your glamping site adopting or copying?

  - How will you explain the similarity between your glamping site and the Western glamping examples?

Part 2

- How do you negotiate the idea of glamping within the local environment in

  Taiwan?

  ➢ How will you describe this overall process?

- How do you see your glamping site different from foreign glamping models?

Topic 4: Overall Reflection and Future of Glamping in Taiwan

- How has your image of glamping changed, before and after the development of

  your glamping industry?

- What are your opinions towards the future of glamping in Taiwan?

Thanks for your participation! Anything else you would like to share with me? or

any questions you want to ask?