ABSTRACT

SIMÕES FERREIRA, BRUNO MIGUEL. Permatourism: Concept Development, Application and Empirical Validation. (Under the direction of Dr. Duarte Morais).

Grassroots tourism development models are reported to engender conscientization, entrepreneurial networking, self-efficacy, and the creation of locally owned and operated tourism microenterprises. However, actual local participation may be constrained by socio-political, legal, administrative and economic structures. In reaction to the inherent limitations of existing models, this study proposes an alternative form of tourism development, Permatourism, which pursues the complementarity between top-down and bottom-up approaches as well as between the informal and formal tourism sectors. In addition, this study leverages my extensive fieldwork in NC within the Fork2Farmer project, which aims to de-anonymize farm tourism microentrepreneurs (FMTEs) and create alternative revenue streams, as well as my involvement in a project in the ejido Playa Grande, Puerto Vallarta, Mexico, which aims at enabling dignified livelihoods through communitarian tourism entrepreneurship.

First, I drew on Permaculture design theory to develop the theoretical underpinnings of Permatourism. Namely, I drew from Permaculture’s three ethics and 12 guiding principles to delineate the conceptual foundation of the Permatourism development approach. In addition, I explored the extent to which the proposed framework helps explain successes and failures in tourism development case studies, and used those observations to outline best practices in tourism development. Second, considering that Permatourism advocates for a symbiotic alignment between formal and informal sectors, I used structural equation modelling to explore the extent to which self-efficacy among FTMEs in NC can be predicted.
by the level of bridging ties they have with formal private sector partners (e.g., celebrated farm-to-table chefs), public sector support agencies (e.g., Extension Offices and TDAs), and other peers (e.g., other farmers). Data from 207 FTMEs suggests that the bridging ties significantly and positively influence internal and external self-efficacy, and that internal self-efficacy significantly and positively influences microentrepreneurial intention. Finally, I conducted 28 in-depth interviews with two subaltern groups of tourism microentrepreneurs in Puerto Vallarta, namely 1) artisans in Bucerias who sell their art at markets and plazas and receive visitors through a local non-profit, and 2) ejidatarios of Playa Grande, who established a community-owned ecopark which offers canopy tours, horseback-riding, local food and glamping. Interviews were transcribed verbatim and theoretical thematic analysis was conducted to examine their perceptions of the local industry and adaptation strategies to optimize the scarce economic opportunities conceded by a tourism-generated socioeconomic apartheid. Findings suggest that although microentrepreneurs are cognizant that formal sector players have the upper hand, they are still able to glean livelihood opportunities by aligning themselves with the formal sector and providing complementary services and products.

My research follows a participatory action-research methodology in which I partner with the people and communities with whom I conduct my studies in the pursuit of a shared horizon of enabling locals to be meaningfully involved in tourism microentrepreneurship. Accordingly, during the five years of my study in rural North Carolina I have engaged with groups of farmers in 15 counties, assisting them in beginning to offer farm experiences, and helping develop county-level marketing coalitions that funded 14 short films about celebrated chefs and small scale farmers. In Mexico, the study communities and I have co-
created a service spring break package for American students, with the goal to bypass predatory local tourism retail monopolies. The community will host their first cohort of American students in March 2020. Besides the short-term direct benefits this approach generated to the participants in my two studies, this methodological approach afforded me with an immersive understanding of the microentrepreneurs and a more nuanced interpretation of my results. Overall, this dissertation advances understanding of how the tourism informal economy intersects with formal private and public sector, and could assist tourism governance officials in developing initiatives and policies that can make their destinations more equitable and competitive.
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CHAPTER 1: Introduction

1. Overview

The assertion that tourism has failed to deliver on its promise for equitable prosperity is perhaps too simplistic and naïve and may take away from the fact that in many economically challenged regions in the world, whether countries or communities, tourism may be the only viable route to economic growth. Notwithstanding, tourism being the imperative development strategy should not give leeway to its formal sector to hijack the industry through predatory monopolistic practices that generate socioeconomic apartheid which prevent equitable prosperity among locals. By the same token, we need to understand that such practices rather than representing some sort of inherent malice towards communities can be justified under the logic of profit maximization by minimizing exchanges between tourists and surrounding formal and informal businesses. Moreover, we should bear in mind that in the transnational tourism corporate sector, management is accountable to shareholders, not communities. Hence, the main point of this dissertation is that if we have hopes to change the reality in tourism, then we should walk away from solutions that are based solely in corporate environmental and social responsibility, and focus on business savvy solutions that represent a win-win situation for both formal and informal actors.

2. Research questions

This study proposes an alternative form of tourism development, Permatourism, which pursues the complementarity between top-down and bottom-up approaches as well as between the informal and formal tourism sectors. Drawing on Permaculture design theory, I will develop the theoretical underpinnings of Permatourism and explore the extent
to which it is relevant and useful as a conceptual framework to understand dynamics between the informal and formal tourism sectors in 1) the context of farm tourism microentrepreneurship North Carolina, and 2) communitarian tourism entrepreneurship and cultural tourism microentrepreneurship in Puerto Vallarta, Mexico:

a) What is the conceptual framework underpinning Permatourism?

b) Can Permatourism explain successes and failures in tourism development case studies?

c) What best practices for tourism development can be afforded by the Permatourism framework?

d) To what extent do synergies between farmers and formal sector actors contribute to elevated self-efficacy among the former?

e) How do local microentrepreneurs adapt to the economic apartheid system prevalent in sea, sun, sand and sex destinations?

3. Theoretical framework

3.1. Overview

This study draws on literature from various fields, including tourism studies, management, tourism anthropology, social psychology, community-psychology, economic sociology, economics, agriculture and development studies. While it has long been proposed that tourism is best described as a field rather than a discipline (Tribe, 1997), and therefore best examined though the lenses afforded by different areas of knowledge, this dissertation goes a step further by incorporating literature from unusual disciplines even to the hybrid field of tourism. I start with an analysis of the evolution of tourism development thinking, which aims at laying out the theories and perspectives that have shaped the way we currently
look at tourism. Then, I discuss economic inequality as a product of a neoliberal agenda that continues to control tourism development around the globe. I also make a critique to neoclassical economists whose seemingly infallible mathematical models have precluded the field from understanding the phenomenon from a relational point of view and posit that the methodological dexterity of the social sciences is a necessary condition to understand it. Then, I move into challenging the structuralist/dualist perspective on the informal and formal sectors of the economy, arguing that rather than competing with one another these are important parts of a mutually supporting system.

Next, I look into Permaculture design as conceptual framework that acknowledges and values diversity in an ecosystem, and adapt it to the study of the tourism economy, under the name of Permatourism. Under this model, microentrepreneurship is a manifestation of the tourism informal economy, and farm tourism microentrepreneurship a subset within it. I will show that the Fork-to-Farmer movement is the next iteration of the local foods movement. Importantly, a central component of this concept is the production of films describing the direct relationships between chefs and farmers. These films, despite unveiling a promotional agenda, may have a transformative power on the farmers, building agency and identity, which may help level the power differential between them and partnering chefs. Accordingly, chefs are represented in mainstream media as scions of King Midas, with the power to turn everything they touch into gold (Zaneti, 2017). Nevertheless, they may constitute an important source of social capital, self-efficacy, and reputation to farmers. Finally, I posit that, in addition to the provision of high-quality products, direct relationships with farmers bring transparency to the high-end restaurant sector and creates a perfect alignment with important causes for the American consumer, such as sustainability.
3.2. **Evolution of tourism development thinking**

Tourism is an important engine of economic growth, and is usually credited with generating employment, foreign exchange, and public tax (World Tourism Organization, 2018). Nonetheless, there is also ample evidence of many shortcomings that are persistently ignored by governments, who tend to look at tourism as the “imperative” economic strategy (Rich, 2007). Accordingly, critical scholars have raised concerns about the inequitable distribution of income, changes in the social fabric of the communities, and environmental degradation at destinations (Gmelch, 2012). In the following sections I will examine the evolution of tourism thinking, identifying strengths and pitfalls of models implemented.

3.2.1. **Modernization and tourism**

Modernization (1950s-1960s) was the implicit base for tourism development in less economically developed countries. This paradigm was promoted as a strategy to transfer technology to increase employment, generate foreign exchange, increase GNP, attract development capital, promote a modern way of life with Western values and generate rural transformations of traditional societies (Telfer, 2002). This worldview was compatible with a time of relative peace and prosperity in the aftermath of World War II. The devastation in the infrastructure as well as changes in public opinion in most European colonial powers left them vulnerable and unable to halt independence movements in the colonies (Wantchekon & García-Ponce, 2013). The exception would be Portugal who opted for a neutral position during the war, and therefore was able to hold on to its possessions until 1975 (Power, 2001), after over a decade of a bloody colonial war that left profound marks on the economies of Angola, Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique (Coelho, 2002). Nevertheless, most countries gained their independence pacifically, without major damage to the infrastructure. Despite that,
newly independent countries still had to deal with a largely uneducated population, primary resource-based economies with little to no diversification, and an infrastructure designed to efficiently ship those resources out to the metropolis (Ochonu, 2013).

Elites educated abroad vouched for industrialization, and the West nodded in agreement. However, the result was disastrous as the industrial revolution that took centuries elsewhere, was given only years in the former colonies. In the wake of a failed industrial revolution, loans from the IMF and the World Bank started soaring (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010). Tourism came into the picture as a panacea to all ills of the developing world. Given that tourism was largely perceived as a natural resource-based economy, there wouldn’t be a need for large investments to accommodate the tourism as with industrialization (Gmelch, 2012). At this point, tourism was believed to have the power to modernize countries through jumping directly from a resource-based economy to a service-based economy, without much need to develop the secondary sector. It was hypothesized that the influx of large numbers of tourists would not only spark the economy but also impregnate local societies with Western values and ways of life, that were thought to be superior and more advanced than those of the indigenous (Gmelch, 2012; Mehta, 2013).

Although worthy foreign behaviors can be emulated by locals through demonstration effects, such is the case of values of environmental protection, for the most part locals feel relative deprivation (Seaton, 1997). It means that locals may internalize a sense of inferiority, by comparing the tourists’ affluent lifestyle with their modest lives, oblivious to the fact that they’re in fact comparing their whole lives with likely the two weeks of the tourists’ year with more conspicuous spending.
3.2.2. Dependency and tourism

It has been argued that tourism development during the 1960s period created the equivalent of a new type of plantation economy (Gmelch, 2012). The leisure needs of developed countries were being met by the developing countries where the wealth generated from tourism was transferred from the ‘colony’ back to the developed world (Telfer, 2002). In this regard, tourist-host encounters are particularly interesting for the social sciences because they often put face to face the Global North and the Global South, wealthy and the poor, white and black, powerful and the subaltern, which in many ways reproduce the social dynamics seen in colonial times, when the indigenous populations existed to serve the needs of the colonists (Cleverdon & Kalisch, 2000). For example, Gmelch (2012) posits that the tourism monoculture in the Caribbean, which depends primarily on the North American and European markets resembles the sugar-cane monoculture model before independence.

At this stage, tourism was believed to bring in foreign exchange that would help stagnate inflation that affected many destinations (Hawkins & Mann, 2007). Neoclassical economists predicted that for each dollar spent on a vacation, 80 cents plus would trickle down to the local economy (Gmelch, 2012). Decades later, there is staggering evidence that the proportion might stand, but the order is reversed, that is eighty percent, or even high as 90, is leaked or repatriated to the West (Smith & Jenner, 1992). Among the main culprits are all-inclusive resorts and cruise-ships, often referred to as enclave tourism (Freitag, 1994), generally owned and managed by Western corporations (Tosun, 2000) with the connivance of local elites as had been common practice during colonial times (Coelho, 2002).
3.2.3. Economic neoliberalism and tourism

Development policies during the Economic Neoliberalism era (1970s-1980s) were implemented so that multinational tourism companies were free to operate across national borders unfettered by onerous regulation or protectionist measures (Telfer, 2002). Milton Friedman, distinguished professor at the University of Chicago was the leading figure and advocate of free market theory. His and his colleagues’ ideas have had a dreadful impact in the Asia, Africa and Latin America (Shleifer, 2009), but that didn’t preclude him to win the Nobel Prize in economics. Neoliberalism proposes Structural Adjustments Programs in financially challenged countries, which can entail privatization of public services, free movement of people and goods, and reduction in government spending in the social sector (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010). By persuading, sometimes coercing, countries to give up their protections in terms of laws and tariffs against foreign products and corporations, local economic players become defenseless against the take over from much larger, business-savvy, and ruthless Western multi-nationals (Leitner, Peck, & Sheppard, 2007). In tourism, this meant that airports could be privatized, environmental protections could no longer stop real-estate development in already vulnerable areas (Mosedale, 2016), or that high-end restaurants and hotels could offer imported meat and beverages to a growing and demanding international clientele (Thomas-Francois, von Massow, & Joppe, 2017).

3.2.4. Alternative development and tourism

Alternative development (1970s early 1980s) tourism is that which is consistent with natural, social, and community values and is a result of the disillusionment with mass tourism (Telfer, 2002). Sustainable development, the flagship theory of this movement, sustains that resources in a system should only be exploited to the point that they will remain available
indefinitely for future generations (Bossel, 1999). It does so by pursuing a triple bottom line comprising economic, social and environmental indicators (Slaper & Hall, 2011). In tourism, Butler’s (1980) destination lifecycle graph became very popular because it demonstrated that when the carrying-capacity of a destination is exceeded it leads to disillusionment of locals and resentment against tourists, which may lead to demise of the destination. Although sustainable tourism is still waived as the ideal model of tourism development, there are some who criticize the applicability, theoretical foundations and real impact of the concept (Berno & Bricker, 2001; Liu, 2003; Wheeller, 1991). Moreover, Müller (1994) claims that, in the event there was ever one, at some point it lost most of its meaning and became an empty cliché. It is almost as though “sustainable” and “tourism” are two words that are naturally attached to one another, and that anyone can say them out loud without fearing to be questioned about the validity of that statement, when in fact there is little evidence that sustainability goals or practices have ever been consistently put to use by the tourism industry (Sharpley, 2010). Perhaps this theoretical divide (Sharpley, 2000) is behind this department’s decision to add “equitable” before “sustainable tourism” in the official designation of the concentration within the PRTM graduate program. And, although the inclusion of “equitable” can be perceived as a redundancy, given that it results from the intersection of the economic and social dimensions, it is nonetheless harder to “abuse” given the novelty and provocative nature of the term “equitable”.

3.2.5. **The impasse and post-development and tourism**

The post-development paradigm (1980s early 1990s) rose out of a realization of the failures of development, the postmodern critique, and the rise of globalization. The late eighties saw the beginning of the downfall of the Soviet Union, which was the final blow to
Marx’s prophecies on the victory of socialism over capitalism (Fukuyama, 1989), and consequently discrediting an array of neo-Marxist perspectives on development. On the other hand, it started to become apparent that neo-liberalism, Reagenomics or Thatcherism, all fell short on their promise that the free-market economy and the trickle-down mechanism would generate economic opportunities for all levels of society (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010). In the third world, as developing countries were called at the time, modernization had been a catastrophe, leaving them with unpayable debts, totally at the mercy of world finance tycoons (Gmelch, 2012). Among other criticisms, modernization was imposed in a top-down fashion, non-democratically, ignoring the local culture, and renouncing indigenous knowledge (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010). Post-development is thus a response to the imposition of Western ideology on indigenous peoples. In tourism, this can take the form of grassroots tourism organizations or tourism microentrepreneurship, where locals pursue dignified and sustainable livelihoods through tourism (Morais, Ferreira, Nazariadli, & Ghahramani, 2017). They have passions and immensurable local knowledge that they want to share with visitors (Ferreira, Morais, Pollack, & Bunds, 2018). It is about locals educating tourists on indigenous ways of life, which is a response to previous assumptions that tourists would be the ones bringing knowledge and “modernity” to the destinations (Wallace & Valene, 2018). Moreover, tourists who traditionally travelled to destinations primarily to consume places (Urry, 1995), relegating locals to a role of mere passive “tourees” (Cohen, 1988) or underpaid servants in the formal tourism industry (Wilson, 2008), can now engage in authentic experiences with genuine microentrepreneurs amplifying their cultural exposition (Wallace & Valene, 2018).
3.2.6.  **Human development and tourism**

Human development (1990s-2000s) advocates have focused on how tourism can be a positive global force through pro-poor, responsible, appropriate, ethical and volunteer tourism. In the nineties, it was reasoned that tourism could be a positive global force through responsible, appropriate, and ethical travelling to under-resourced areas. In this regard, my own experiences as a volunteer tourist, trainer of volunteer tourists, and also recipient of volunteer tourists at the community, are to some extent consistent with concerns raised by scholars on the potential for negative impacts on host communities (Taplin, Dredge, & Scherrer, 2014). In particular, it is unclear whether voluntourists are driven by self-interest or altruism; and the extent to which volunteer tourism organizations truly act as agents of change or are simply a new instrument of commodification (Wearing & McGehee, 2013). Moreover, although I can attest to the enthusiasm and idealism of many of my former volunteers which energized host communities, I can also see how it created a dependency in communities, who would be on the lookout for the upcoming cohort that could fix the local playground or run the kindergarten (Mehta, 2013). Notwithstanding, perhaps the biggest criticism of all is that it is yet another form of neo-colonialism (Gillier & Zivanovic, 2014; Stein, 2017) – white people educating the “noble savage”.

At the center of this paradigm was the notion that ethical interactions between hosts and guests would enable development, not in the GDP sense but rather as an expansion of individual capabilities (Alkire, 2002). The expectation was that tourism demand would entice local organizations and individuals to leverage resources embedded in their networks to generate supply and contribute to decision-making. Social capital, discussed in detail in the next sections, was at the flagship of this development paradigm. At the same time, it was
gaining momentum as a prominent sociological theory and panacea in and outside Academia (Portes, 1998). However, according to Nelson and Prilleltensky (2010) social capital theory has served governments well to deflect responsibilities to undertake structural changes that are necessary to allow individuals to empower themselves.

3.2.7. Global development and tourism

Global development (2000s-2010s) is a comprehensive policy in areas of trade and economic cooperation, development cooperation, foreign and security policy that has a focus on conflict management and environmental policy to deal with biodiversity and climate change (Saarinen, Rogerson, & Manwa, 2011).

However, the model of tourism development advocated today may not differ greatly from other neoliberal models used in the past. One should remember that the early nineties saw a dramatic increase of cross-border mergers and acquisitions which resulted in the creation of massive multinational tourism corporations with the power to control local supply and demand (Theuvsen, 2004). To make matters worse, increase in corporate shareholder value since the late seventies has meant that once fair salaries, social security and retirement packages to frontline works are now off the table (J. Davis, 2013; Goldstein, 2012). This raises the question of why a recipe that failed largely in addressing national or regional problems should be a solution for a world that has grown to be even more challenging and unstable. I will use the example of Portugal to elaborate on my skepticism.

This country was severely affected by the 2008 economic world crisis, which forced a bailout by the troika: International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and Central European Bank (Soeiro, 2014). In return, the troika imposed a severe Structural Adjustment Program that sent many into poverty (Carneiro, Portugal, & Varejão, 2014). The same globalization that
enabled the ripple effect of the subprime mortgage crisis in the USA to reach a small, peripheral country like Portugal (Fligstein & Habinek, 2014), with dramatic consequences, also favored a wave of international tourism that helped kickstart the economy after harsh years of recession (Serra, Correia, & Rodrigues, 2014). On the downside, the “golden hordes” (Turner & Ash, 1975) that flocked to the country remained primarily in the capital, raising the price of real estate in the city many-fold, thus driving collective displacement (Gant, 2016). Today, renting a modest two-bed unit in an inconspicuous neighborhood can be as expensive as the value of three minimum wages, which is forcing many families to the suburbs (Correia, 2017). The gentrification of the inner city is nevertheless a good investment opportunity for the big boys, who can afford to buy whole dwellings and easily monetize the investment through short term vacation rentals, despite the concerning negative impact on the local availability of permanent rental housing (Gurran & Phibbs, 2017).

In sum, tourism in the developing world grew rapidly and, for the vast majority, did not take into account local perspectives and failed to deliver on the promise of equitable prosperity. Moreover, it may have worsened foreign dependency and reinforced socioeconomic inequalities (Brohman, 1996). According to Sharpley (2010), the reason why tourism is still chosen as the default route to development is, simply put, because there aren’t other viable alternatives in countries with a limited industrial sector and scarce natural resources. Next, I will discuss the meaning, core tenets and processes that contribute to economic inequality, drawing from the literature in economics and economic sociology. In doing so, I intend to expose some of the flaws of neoclassical economics scholarship, which
have contributed the most to the subfield of tourism economics (Song, Dwyer, Li, & Cao, 2012).

3.3. **Economic inequality**

Unlike economists, economic sociologists contend that inequality is a phenomenon sustained through relational dynamics (Granovetter, 2017; Lin, 2002; Tomaskovic-Devey, Hällsten, & Avent-Holt, 2015; Zelizer, 1978). They also differ in that the analytical starting point in economics is the individual actor, whereas in sociology it’s groups and institutions (Smelser & Swedberg, 2005). This becomes a problem in the study of economic inequality because the scope of research in economics fails to encompass perspectives that challenge *individual* rational choice theory. Regardless, neoclassical economists have historically paid little attention to the topic of economic inequality, attributing it to exogenous factors such as skill-based technological change (Krueger, 1993), which has received a lot of criticism from economic sociologists (Card & DiNardo, 2002). There is certainly a myriad of reasons for why mainstream economists may have chosen to avoid addressing the topic, but mostly due to two main factors (Sen, 1997): first, the core assumptions that go into mainstream economic theory; and, second, the field’s “utilitarian” and positivistic methodological tradition.

3.3.1. **Disciplines’ assumptions and methodologies**

One of the central tenets of neoclassical economic theory is the assumption of perfect competition, or information symmetry, which means that economic actors have access to the same amount and quality of information, therefore no one actor is therefore able to influence the terms of trade (Granovetter, 2017). Inequality may be seen as some sort of anomaly or malfunction, hence a temporary condition eventually deemed to be repaired by the “invisible
hand” (Fligstein & Habinek, 2014), and market equilibrium (Mertens & Hassan, 2010) can be restored as it always does.

The second factor, methodological, pertains to the pervasive reductionist approach to the analysis of economic action in mainstream economics research. According to Granovetter (2017), economists generally pursue “simple and elegant models” (p.3), with strong, though not explicit, built-in assumptions about human nature, not compliant with complex social processes or environmental conditions. Likewise, DiMaggio (2002) posits that processes that shape and are shaped by economic actors, like “animal spirits”, are taken for granted by economists as exogenous variables in neat models, and calls for the endogenization of “emotional buoyancy in order to explain its ebbs and flows” (p. 96). Heterodox economist Sen (1997) further criticizes neoclassical economists for their "super clever assumptions [...] that give the appearance of working very well [which] operate through hiding the choice of values and weights in some constructed opaqueness” (p.398). In sum, even if mainstream economists decided to pay more attention to economic inequality, a related though different concept from income inequality (Sen, 1997), they would still be ill-equipped and unprepared, given that, presumably, they don’t seem to have the necessary methodological dexterity for pursuing such endeavor.

3.3.2. Undersocialized vs. oversocialized approaches

If the undersocialized approach above may apparently not be ideal, the opposite oversocialized, even deterministic, perspective of human action, still pervasive among contemporary sociologists, offers little more to the study of economic inequality. In this regard, Granovetter (1985) claims that both converge in the atomization of the individual, arguing that actors do not behave isolated from a social context nor do they “adhere slavishly
to a script written for them” (p.487). Of course, this begs the question of whether there is an alternative middle ground level of analysis that can address the blind spot made apparent by inherent limitations of both approaches to human action. In that regard, Emirbayer (1997) argues that meaningful sociological enquiry can only be achieved through examination of the meso-level or relational setting. Similarly, in the context of community psychology, Rappaport (1987) contends that empowerment of individuals entails both a “psychological sense of personal control or influence and a concern with actual social influence, political power, and legal rights” (p. 121), which can be accomplished through mediating structures such as schools, churches or voluntary organizations.

Emirbayer (1997) also used economic inequality to expose the limitations of the substantialist perspective. According to him, inequality is most often than not defined as a matter of individual variations in the possession of “human capital” or other goods, with its primary causes being the actions of entities such as groups or individuals, rather than the dynamic relations among them. Likewise, an undersocialized approach is blind to the fact that “inequality comes largely from the solutions that elite and non-elite actors improvise in the face of recurrent organizational problems—challenges centering around control over symbolic, positional, or emotional resources” (p.292).

3.3.3. Elite capture, opportunity hoarding, and occupational closure

An example would be elite capture, a process that occurs when local elites, better equipped and more influential, are able to unabashedly usurp resources designated for the benefit of the larger population (Platteau & Gaspart, 2003). In tourism studies, elite capture is a recurring theme, especially in the context of eco-tourism, pro-poor tourism or community-based tourism, as privileged groups in the community often appropriate
themselves of the most profitable, prestigious and desirable roles and occupations in the projects, causing resentment and resistance in the subordinate groups, which ultimately compromises the economic performance and viability of the ventures (Lund & Saito-Jensen, 2013; Sene-Harper, 2016).

A distinct but related concept is opportunity hoarding, described by Tomaskovic-Devey, Hallsten, and Avent-Holt (2015) as the mechanism through which economic actors monopolize valuable resources for themselves and similar others. Emirbayer (1997) explains that members of a categorically bounded network usually start by acquiring control over a valuable resource, hoard their access to it, and develop practices that perpetuate this restricted access. Of course, a power differential between groups is a necessary condition because one group will be more effective in making claims and imposing its own agenda (Granovetter, 2017). For example, unscrupulous profit-seeking tourism corporations largely control distribution systems, relegating the rural subaltern to the “sidelines of the tourism economy, informally or even illegally gleaning bits of income not worthwhile to the formal industry” (Ferreira, Morais, Nazariadli, & Ghahramani, 2017, p.74).

Occupational closure is another relational process that provides further understanding of economic inequality. It is defined by Weeden and Grusky (2014) as “the practice of establishing barriers that protect occupational incumbents against competition from others who might want (a) to enter the occupation or (b) to provide the same or similar products or services from a “close” or competing occupation” (p. 482). For example, in my research with farm tourism entrepreneurs (Ferreira, 2016), I heard accounts of small-scale farmers who despite using farming techniques that protect the environment, public health, human communities, and animal welfare, are nonetheless unable to apply, let alone be
awarded, organic certification and accreditation. The lengthy, costly and bureaucratic application process dissuades small farm owners from even trying, forcing them into parallel or informal economies where they are least able to create and sustain economic rents. Tomaskovic-Devey and Lin (2011) define economic rent as “income above what would be realized in a perfectly competitive market (p. 541), which can be attained either through monopolies or market niches.

3.3.4. Structural constraints and homophily

Lin (2000) posits that inequality derives from individuals or groups’ relative differential access to social capital, due to both membership in poorer networks and homophily. The first has to do with the fact that specific social groups may occupy vulnerable socio-economic positions due to historical, political, racial, or other ascribed or constructed reason. The second pertains to the fact that individuals are likely to associate with those that are similar in one or more characteristic. In sum, individuals tend to network with members of the same group. Put in practice, individuals operating at lower strata will be embedded in networks with limited quantity and diversity of resources, whereas individuals operating in upper strata will have access to better resources, both in quantity and in diversity, which only augments the existing differential.

Despite cross-group ties being the exception rather than the rule, Lin (2000) acknowledges that members of disadvantaged groups may become cognitively aware of resource restrictions in their original networks and may feel motivated to establish bridging ties with advantaged groups. On the other hand, donors of social capital, generally members of advantaged groups, may have a vested interest making their ties available, because “they
afford a certain degree of social mobility across socio-economic strata and reduce the likelihood of conscientiousness, class conflict, and social upheaval” (p.787).

3.3.5. Socioeconomic apartheid at tourism destinations

The model of enclave tourism is designed to minimize interactions between tourists and ancillary formal and informal businesses, in order to increase resort profits (Freitag, 1994). A consequence of that is high leakage to western countries and limited economic opportunities for locals who are recruited mostly as cheap, unskilled labor for menial tasks at the resorts (Mbaiwa, 2005). In Puerto Vallarta, Mexico, Wilson contends that (2008) tourism development marginalizes great numbers of the local population by way of self-contained, all-inclusive resorts, which lead to segregation between locals and tourists and limit tourist spending outside the complex, creating a de facto socioeconomic apartheid. Although socioeconomic impacts of tourism have been primarily studied by anthropologists (Wallace, 2005), economists Alam and Paramati (2016) used panel econometric techniques to confirm that tourism increases income inequality in developing economies. Moreover, Lee (2009) found that within the industrialized US, tourism services-dependent counties have greater income inequality than non-tourism services-dependent counties.

As demonstrated with the examples of elite capture, opportunity hoarding, occupational closure, homophily, and socioeconomic apartheid it is apparent that unfolding transactions or lack thereof, and not preconstituted attributes, are best suited to explain economic inequality. This review also sheds light on the limitations of neoclassical economic theory and research, which has mostly influenced tourism economics to date.
4. Creating a new paradigm

Tourism as a field of scholarly interest has been around for many decades (Wallace & Valene, 2018). However, practitioners and academicians alike have been unable to deliver on the promise of tourism to engender equitable prosperity. Therefore, the search for an innovative, original and disruptive approach to tourism development is timely. Nelson and Prilleltensky (2010) contend that complex societal problems ought to be reframed in different terms in order to generate different responses from governments and communities. And, judging by the massive production of scientific knowledge in the field of tourism (Santos, Netto, & Wang, 2017), perhaps we don’t need to reinvent the wheel but rather look at the tourism business ecosystem through the lenses of a seemingly distant and unrelated discipline yet unconstrained by the way we usually look at the problem.

In the next sections I will discuss why the economic muscle of tourism should not be ignored and absent from discussions about Global Development. However, if the field is committed to make tourism a force for global development then we need to reject previous failed paradigms and embrace a new tourism development alternative that openly embraces the profit motive in industrialized capitalist societies, but has built-in guiding principles and mechanisms that facilitate integration with the local formal and informal economy.

4.1. Tourism development: transcending a dichotomy

Haughton (1998) contends that while rejuvenation of depressed areas has been present in the political rhetoric for decades, efforts on the ground have been predominantly top-down, large scale, inward investment, and infrastructure-centric. Accordingly, the focus is often on turning the area attractive through capital-intensive, flagship projects which are
believed to create the conditions to attract outside private sector interest. Hence, local benefits accrue through a trickle-down logic that comes with market success.

While there is a long record of failure of top-down approaches in many contexts such as environmental management (Fraser, Dougill, Mabee, Reed, & McAlpine, 2006), area-based economic rejuvenation (Haughton, 1998) or policy implementation (Matland, 1995), there is only limited evidence that grassroots models perform better than their counterparts. For example, Haughton (1998) posits that sometimes communities fear that their enhanced participation is synonymous with disinvestment from government officials.

Tourism development usually follows top-down approaches that include very limited local participation (Wang & Wall, 2007). Often, private organizations external to the community and with control over tourism distribution systems often “drop-in” with investment capital, access to markets, and with a vision on how they are going to profit from those communities' tourism appeal (Davis & Morais, 2004; Morais, Ferreira, Nazariadli, & Ghahramani, 2017).

Conversely, grassroots tourism development models have been shown to engender consciousness-raising, entrepreneurial networking, and self-efficacy (McGehee, Kline, & Knollenberg, 2014), as well foster the creation of locally owned and operated tourism microenterprises (Morais, Ferreira, & Wallace, 2017). However, Tosun (2000) cautions that actual local participation is largely constrained by socio-political, legal, administrative and economic structures. In addition, (Harrison, 1996) argues that communities are heterogeneous, which makes it difficult to unify local wishes and expectations to offer a practical guide to tourism development.
Therefore, we need to transcend traditional paradigms and embrace frameworks that allow for the integration of different economic actors for the optimization of system performance.

4.2. Permaculture design

Permaculture started in Australia by the hand of Bill Mollison and David Holmgren (Holmgren, 2017), who were concerned with energy inefficiencies of mechanized agriculture, whose energy output was dwarfed by energy inputs, mostly in the form of non-renewable, highly pollutant, fossil fuels. Their concerns were heightened by the oil crisis in the seventies and resonated highly with the back to the land movement. While permaculture primarily meant permanent agriculture, soon it became obvious that real permanent agriculture would be impossible with a permanent culture hinging on three ethics: care for the earth, care for the people and fair share.

Permaculture is essentially a way of putting components together for their maximum benefit (Whitefield, 1997). It emerged in the late seventies primarily as a response to oil-dependent, energy inefficient agriculture, but its robust and creative design principles have since been adapted to create sustainable human habitats: building, town planning, water supply, purification, and commercial and financial systems (Whitefield, 1997). According to Orion (2015), permaculture design is rooted in the close study of dynamic living systems and “offers a unique set of solutions to a series of complex and seemingly intractable challenges” (p. 9).
4.3. **Permatourism**

Brothers, Morais, and Wallace (2017) and Ferreira (2018) define Permatourism as a tourism planning and management process that pursues the complementarity between formal private and public actors and local microentrepreneurs and grassroots community social structures. Permatourism expects the formal tourism sector to embrace the socio-cultural characteristics of the host community to make the local tourism experience more unique and competitive while at the same time ensuring that locals are better equipped to become involved in tourism. Additionally, Permatourism, requires the creation of a grassroots business development strategy that aligns local entrepreneurs with expected business opportunities generated by existing or upcoming big tourism investments in the region or large scope social movements and trends with high impact at the macroeconomic level.

Because it is results-driven, the effectiveness of Permatourism can be assessed through industry-popular metrics, such as credit card usage, self-reported occupancy rates, number of tickets sold at the region's most popular attractions, or visitor's overall satisfaction assessed through intercept interviews. However, equally important is the empowerment of residents as effective stakeholders in the regional tourism development process (Boley, McGehee, Perdue, & Long, 2014), the self-efficacy of local entrepreneurs (Ferreira, Morais, Pollack, & Bunds, 2017), or the extent to which they feel accurately portrayed in the destination brand (Bandyopadhyay & Morais, 2005). In addition to cross-sectional online survey data and focus groups with key stakeholders, destination managers should also invest in longitudinal and participatory methods to ensure that all voices in the community are heard (Aitchison, 2001).
Permatourism is a social innovation because it uses creative and novel solutions to solve complex problems created by profit-driven tourism development, such as inequitable distribution of income, changes in the social fabric of communities, and environmental degradation. Moreover, it does so by addressing these problems at their root, i.e. at the planning stages of tourism development. Hence, Permatourism tries to bring about social change, rather than just the amelioration of the conditions of locals through the provision of services. And, by deeply changing the way the tourism system works, often to the benefit of corporations, we are reducing the vulnerability of locals by enabling them to pursue microentrepreneurial opportunities offered by a more democratic tourism marketplace. Not only are they able to generate much needed income from sharing their passions and skills with visitors, the sense of ownership, pride and self-esteem that accrue from owning a local microenterprise feed into a self-determined, self-reliant model of community development that is advocated by Nelson and Prilleltensky (2010). Accordingly, it is not so much about “giving power” as it is to create the conditions that enable people to empower themselves, through leadership, voice, employment and entrepreneurship. By creating the economic opportunities and allowing the community to tap into resource rich social networks, we are enabling community members to be in the driving seat of their lives, in their own pursuit of liberation and well-being.

By challenging the status quo, social innovations always find resistance to their introduction. Those in power positions may fear that their privilege, social position, or economic status is undermined by the ensuing social rearrangement. And rightfully so. Often, empowerment of the masses translates into a loss of power of the elites. Moreover, the prospect of change brings about uncertainty. Even if there are tangible benefits to be gained
with change, fear of the unknown precludes people from supporting these initiatives. For example, the nature of feedback from reviewers at one of the world’s leading tourism conference on a paper proposing Permatourism concurs with my previous statement that the status quo does not desire to have their assumptions challenged, and will resist any substantial change to current social and, in this case, conventions in the field of inquiry. Accordingly, one issue that was identified on peer reviews was the redundancy of the concept Permatourism, which didn't differ substantially from Sustainable Tourism. In contrast, I argue that there are only but a few similarities between them, including the common vision of a permanent, indefinite, healthy and productive local tourism system. However, Sustainable Tourism, roughly, is a model dedicated to the triple bottom line that advocates for conscious exploration of resources of the destination, so that they remain available for future generations. In a way, tourism is seen as something inherently bad, which needs to be restrained. Moreover, pursuing the triple bottom line is barely a talking point nowadays, as we assume any legitimate enterprise or agency already has those concerns built-in into their mission statement.

4.4. Synergies between formal and informal sector

The informal economy is very far from being a neglectable slice of the world’s economy. Godfrey (2011) notes that in the developing world it may actually be greater and size and importance than the formal economy. Even in the developing world, the informal economy is believed to be an important part of the economy and can be visible for example in the form of early stage start-ups, family owned-businesses, farmers markets, or tourism microenterprises. Informal arrangements can also play an important role in companies operating in the formal sector, for informality often brings nimbleness, speed, and
adaptability to conditions of change. Moreover, the informal and formal sectors are believed to be part of a mutually supporting system, which can energize local economies in a variety of ways (Boanada-Fuchs & Boanada Fuchs, 2018). For example, microentrepreneurs in the informal tourism sector offer authentic off-the-beaten path experiences that enhance the local mainstream tourism product afforded by the formal sector (Morais et al., 2017).

Despite the importance of the informal sector, there is a generalized idea that it is an expression of business activity that has mostly a negative impact in the economy. For example, “black market” is a term that is often heard in mainstream media, and even in academia it is not unusual to find pejorative terms like the “shadow economy” (Apressyan, 1997). At the forefront of this perspective are neoclassical economists whose philosophical assumptions (e.g. utility maximization, accumulation of capital) may preclude them to understand that utility for a local artisan may have more to do with pride stemming from the opportunity to showcase to visitors some ancient technique learned from his or her parents than with any extra income made through this workshop. In the same vein, Ateljevic and Doorne (2000) remind us that tourism microentrepreneurs do not grow beyond their ability to reap joy from the activity and keep control of the business. Finally, growth can attract unwanted attention to one’s business by regulatory bodies, and therefore microentrepreneurs prefer to operate under the radar and/or in unregulated spaces.

While the tourism informal sector has always been pervasive, for example in the form of vacation homes rented directly by owner, summer jobs in the food industry at beach destinations, shuttle services for kayakers and rafters, or flea markets in hip downtowns of major cities, such instrumental and complementary services to the formal sector have never been properly acknowledged by the authorities nor studied in academia, let alone...
incorporated in the official local tourism offer by destination management organizations. The advent of the internet and the emergence of tourism webmarketplaces may have contributed to what Heberlein (2012) describes as a technological fix to the latter problem, by enabling and democratizing access to less known destinations and experiences with locals, not listed in the formal spheres. However, phenomena like overtourism serve to remind us that the formal industry continues to be a bottleneck and has enough power to influence demand by leveraging industry channels and influencers, for example through seeking easy-profit by creating and popularizing a destinations bucket list and pushing must-see attractions where they're sure they can arrange for better deals and benefit from economies of scale. On the supply side, microentrepreneurs finally could reach customers directly, bypassing tourism retails monopolies which control the flow of visitors and may charge up to 80% of admission price at the attraction. However, the digital divide still meant that there was an important slice of microentrepreneurs, arguably the most charismatic and in most need for a voice, which could not tap into the opportunities afforded by the peer to peer economy (Ferreira, Morais, & Lorscheider, 2015). In addition to low efficacy in the e-Marketing component of tourism e-microentrepreneurial self-efficacy, these individuals may also feel unable to marshal resources of different kinds from the public and non-profit sector (Ferreira, 2016).

The exception would be microentrepreneurs involved in the short-term rental accommodation market, who have experienced tremendous success since the inception of Airbnb in 2008. The exponential growth of the platform has presumably contributed to overtourism in popular bucket list destinations, which has led to the gentrification of once permanent residence neighborhoods in historical urban areas due to the appealing they have to tourists. On the other hand, the proliferation of Airbnbs in rural areas has had positive
effects in less travelled rural regions who suffered from chronic low number of beds. It is posited that low population and a modest number of frugal FTI (free independent travelers) didn’t afford the formal hospitality sector the economies of scale and revenue prospects that justified investment in units in these far-flung regions. Hence, Airbnbs have been instrumental in the promotion of rural areas and in the rejuvenation of local economies. Not only are property owners able to generate some extra needed income, especially important in the case of women on maternity leave or temporarily unemployed people, but also properties are in constant need of repair, maintenance, and local products, which in and of itself is another strong mechanism through which Airbnbs can reenergize economically depressed communities (Dolnicar, 2017). Nevertheless, until recently destination management organizations had paid little attention to the great service Airbnbs were paying to the communities they serve. This is perhaps do to the fact that in the US, DMOs are supported through occupancy tax, colloquially known as “bed tax”, which used to be charged to overnight tourists staying at accommodation units with five or more bedrooms. Airbnb microentrepreneurs, on the other hand, were not paying local or income taxes, which was seen as unfair competition by the formal sector. Given that Airbnbs operated in the fringes of the formal sector in an unregulated arena at the time, DMOs literally didn’t see appropriate using formal accommodation tax dollars to promote and support their counterparts in the informal sector. Later, as pressure built up from many sectors in society, authorities started requiring Airbnb to withhold due tax in money transactions between guests and hosts and hand it to local tourism development authorities. Hence, Airbnbs seamlessly moved from the illegal to the legal market, thus becoming to all practical matters fully legitimate and recognized businesses. This is a textbook example of the effectiveness of the structural fix in
cases where there is a strong support for such measures. Instead of investing in educational or punitive campaigns aiming at collecting tax money from Airbnb microentrepreneurs, the legislator focused upstream for the most effective collection strategy as well as to circumvent need for compliance from microentrepreneurs who might or might not have been willing to give up a percentage of their revenue. Despite that, for the purpose of my research, Airbnb microentrepreneurs are still to great extent informal businesses for they seldom afford full employment with benefits and still rely on unsanctioned family labor.

While the structural fix granted micro hospitality businesses membership to the formal sector, informal providers of genuine experiences, artisans, storytellers, small farmers, or artists, are still underserved by local tourism governance structures. And, it is unlikely that in the years to come, a similar measure will do for the latter what it accomplished for the former. In this case, my goal is that my research serves as a cognitive fix, that is educating local tourism officials, managers of large hospitality units, as well as chefs of high-end farm to table restaurants, that symbiotic relationships with informal actors are not only prestigious but may also make sense from a business standpoint, as they could benefit, respectively, from richer more varied local tourism experience, day trips to less visited though more authentic sites offered by locals, and enhanced transparency in restaurant practices.

In order to do that, I am relying on the assumption that formal sector actors’ negative attitude towards informal counterparts is supported by a simple vertical psychological structure anchored on evaluative beliefs that the informal sector is illegal or perhaps inefficient and that one should avoid involvement to remain respected in the tourism business ecosystem. Because of the seemingly fragile and weak connection between behavior
and actual beliefs, according to Heberlein (2012) it is easier to change behavior by reframing the problem in terms of profit, which is aligned with the entrepreneurial mindset of actors in the formal sector. Next, I provide a glimpse into tourism microentrepreneurship.

4.5. Tourism microentrepreneurship

Many authors have called for an increase in the stimulation and support of tourism microentrepreneurship by small business development authorities (Nyaupane, Morais & Dowler, 2005; K.C., 2015; LaPan, 2014; Mao, 2014). Consequently, the Manifesto of the People-First Tourism Movement (Morais, 2017), endorsed by tourism scholars world-wide, advocates that microentrepreneurship stands to make tourism a force for equitable community development by engaging previously alienated segments of society in tourism economics and in the planning of tourism development. Likewise, McGehee and Kline (2008) contend that entrepreneurship is well suited to the context of rural tourism development, because it “harmonizes with the philosophy that problems are best solved by solutions generated from inside the community, and that external consultants are not needed to propose successful strategies for economic redemption” (p. 123).

Tourism microenterprises typically employ five or fewer employees and tend to operate in under-regulated business environments that allow low entry barriers (Ferreira, Morais, & Lorscheider, 2015). Ateljevic and Doorne (2000) contend that tourism microentrepreneurs are people driven by non-economic motives, who prefer “staying within the fence” (p. 378) rather than pursuing unbridled growth. Similarly, Peters and Schuckert (2014) found that they tend to prioritize quality of life in lieu of enterprise growth. These individuals may simply intend to strive for some extra income to enhance, and sometimes secure, their livelihoods—they typically avoid suffocating market environments in order to
preserve their quality of life and, accordingly, rely mostly on niche markets (Morais, Wallace, Rodrigues, España, & Wang, 2014). Usually they are not affiliated with formal professional networks nor are their services available through the traditional distribution systems (KC, Morais, Peterson, Seekamp, & Smith, 2017).

5. The importance of the local foods movement on tourism microentrepreneurship

5.1. Farm to Table

Farm-to-table is a theme taken up by some in the high-end restaurant sector, capitalizing on the emerging local foods scene and a certain fetishization of the connections between actors in the network, such as those between farmers and consumers, chefs and farmers, and chefs and consumers (Weiss, 2012). Notably, sourcing locally policies have yielded chefs notable awards and significant business success (Boyce, 2013). On the other hand, small-scale farmers remain anonymous for the most part, thus receiving much fewer accolades, laboring from the backstage on the production of the fresh ingredients extremely valued by the chefs and the restaurant patronage (Morais, Lelekacs, Jakes, & Bowen, 2017). Chefs are nonetheless cognizant of the importance of their business counterparts and are committed and personally invested in their long-term success. However, the competitiveness of their business sector, their need for reliable access to ingredients, seasonality of most farm products like fruits and vegetables, and the logistics of coordinating with a large number of small suppliers often hinder the chefs’ ability to further support their network of local farmers. To make matters worse, direct farm-to-table food distribution, such is the case with farmers markets, while generally supported by a wide array of advocates, was found to comprise only a minor segment of the food distribution system both in terms of size and
importance (Tippins, Rassuli, & Hollander, 2002). As a result, offering farm experiences is becoming an increasingly popular strategy for family farming operations, because it allows farmers to earn additional revenue while also educating the public about where their food comes from (Nasers, 2009).

The local foods movement, through the emergence of farmers markets and the popularity of farm-to-table restaurants, has been instrumental in re-skilling the consumer by engaging foodies with local food systems. It has become hip to nerd out about the different varieties of kale that can be grown in the county and bought at the farmers market. However, chefs are always in the spotlight for they are the ones skillfully and artistically transforming raw ingredients into culinary jewels, relegating farmers to the sidelines of the high-end restaurant industry. Next, the fork to farmer movement promises to challenge the status quo by diverting the attention to the farmer.

5.2. The Fork to Farmer movement

A team of researchers at NC State teamed up with a filmmaker to produce a docu-series that celebrates invisible farmers, giving voice to the real stars of the farm-to-table movement. The team followed a collaborative and participatory approach, engaging farmers, restaurateurs, chefs, local extension offices and the local tourism authority. The videos were later used to entice foodies to engage in independent farm experiences or participate in “food journeys” organized by People-First Tourism, an NC State spin-off bound to support small tourism businesses (Morais, Ferreira, Hoogendoorn, & Wang, 2016). Fork2Farmer then emerged organically with a value proposition centered on the farmer, promising foodies authentic farm experiences with the passionate local farmers that supply high-end farm-to-table restaurants.
The innovative nature of this initiative was validated in 2017 with the award of a 3-year U.S. Department of Agriculture grant to scale-up the project across the state. One of the goals is to enable 40 new short videos, which will bring public visibility to other select examples of fruitful collaboration between farmers and chefs throughout North Carolina. And, while film production is not the end goal but a rather a catalyst to entice the community to organize and tackle agritourism opportunities, we need to be reminded of the transformative power of participatory video in underserved communities.

5.3. The transformative power of video and film

The presence of video and film in the social sciences dates back to the early 20th century, having firstly been used by anthropologists in ethnographic research (Lewis-Beck, Bryman, & Liao, 2003). MacDougall (2011) considers that anthropological filming is hard to define because of the historical fluctuation of what is considered anthropological. Notwithstanding, it falls under the umbrella of visual anthropology, which goes back to the 19th century when the focus was material culture and human physiology, and it might range from video as a recording technology to interpretive accounts of social and cultural life.

O’Rourke’s (1988) iconic Cannibal Tours is an anthropological film about wealthy European and American tourists on a cruise ship in the 1980s, traveling up the Sepik River in Papua New Guinea. The film consists of scenes of interactions between local people and tourists, who appear to be always involved in either taking pictures of the local people or negotiating the price of artifacts. Although haggling is not a sanctioned practice among the natives, western tourists make use of their illegitimate power to impose their own agenda (Granovetter, 2017). This is an acclaimed educational piece that sheds light on the
objectification of local cultures (Greenwood, 1989) and the ways tourism promotes unfair economic relationships.

Other non-anthropological applications of film usually have a transformative agenda but may or may not be participatory in nature. According to Mitchell and De Lange (2011), video in participatory research has been used in several ways in social science research, usually under the umbrella of such terms as collaborative video, community video, and participatory video. Collaborative video is usually referred to as a process where the researcher or community worker works with a group of participants to create a video production, whereas in participatory video the process involves a group of participants primarily constructing their own video texts with only minimal assistance from the research team. In either approach, the research is not the goal itself, but is rather aimed at assisting in improving the community: 1) by promoting cooperation between participants; 2) by addressing themes that are often taboo - the unspeakable; 3) by functioning as a catalyst for post-screening discussions; and 4) by engaging people in social change.

Friend and Caruthers (2016) used collaborative video with the goal to highlight issues of social justice and existing inequities in urban public schools in the United States. They worked with three elementary schools and two high schools located in the urban core of a Midwestern city, and their effort translated into two documentary short films. Using a deconstruction process to expose a concept as culturally constructed rather than as natural, the study exposed a racialized form of teaching that is tailored for poor students and students of color, directing them towards unskilled labor, while more affluent students are educated to be leaders.
Mitchell and Lange (2011) report on a community-based participatory video project implemented in the rural South African context to spark communication between community members about “unspeakable” topics. Videos created by small groups of community members focused on rape, gender, and poverty, and featured very provocative titles, which is testimony to the collective reflexivity the method brings about: Rape at school: Trust no one; How raping got me HIV&AIDS; Rape; Effect of poverty in school; and It all began with poverty. When the short videos were later screened in the community, the authors noted that message got easily through as collaborative video equals out power relations. In contrast, teaching and preaching have limited impact for they emanate from people “standing in front of them”.

Participatory video is also present in feminist research. Kindon (2003) reports on a bi-cultural project developed to explore the relationships between place, identity and ‘social cohesion’ in Maaori communities in New Zealand. The author hypothesized that participatory video could offer a feminist practice of looking, which actively works to engage with and challenge conventional relationships of power associated with the gaze in geographic research, and results in more equitable outcomes and/or transformation for research participants. The members of the community were actively involved in the documenting process, thus destabilizing the usual researcher-researched relationship. Members of the Maaori community were situated at the center of knowledge production. The use of participatory video then facilitates a “gaze” that does not objectify through “-isms”: masculinism, adultism, or colonialism, but creates the relationships that are needed to contribute to a new politics of knowledge in geography.
According to MacDougall (2011), the greatest advantage of film is that the viewer’s experience is closer to that of the researcher in the field, more than a written text would permit. The message also gets through easier because viewers can recognize many situations in other people’s lives and respond to them, even if they don’t understand the language. Finally, filming provides a further level of understanding by conveying postures and facial expressions.

However, in remote areas, not served by the power grid, there is a serious limitation if the locals cannot screen the videos themselves, given the goal is for the community to take ownership of the resulting productions (Mitchell & De Lange, 2011). Moreover, MacDougall (2011) acknowledges that a camera will always be an alien object standing between the researcher and the participants. Even though the days of massive filming equipment are over, the camera will remain the center of attention for it is an obtrusive method by definition.

A type of concern in the Fork2Farmer project would be the potential for representative dissonance (Bandyopadhyay & Morais, 2005). Urban tourists expect to encounter the rural “other” in agritourism experiences, whereas some farmers wish to be portrayed as sophisticated and entrepreneurial (Nazariadli, Morais, Barbieri, & Smith, 2017). Careful negotiation of expectations by the research team is advised and can play instrumental in the project.

Haw & Hadfield (2011) distinguish between video as data and video production as a process for generating data in social science research, although there might be some blurry lines in the examples reviewed previously. In addition, MacDougall (2011) posits that anthropological filmmaking is not another way to present knowledge acquired by other means, nor is it a recording method to extract data for analysis - it is a means of interacting
with the subject and exploring it in new ways. Fortunately, Haw and Hadfield (2011) offer five further modalities that pragmatically represent uses of video in various research that seem to shed some more light on the distinctions between them: 1) Extraction, video used to record a specific interaction so that it can be studied in more depth by the researcher; 2) reflection: using video to support participants to reflect upon their actions, understandings and constructions; 3) Projection and provocation; using video to provoke participants to critically examine and challenge existing norms, traditions and power structures; 4) Participation, using video to engage participants in a research project in ways that allow them to shape its focus and outcomes; and 5) Articulation: using video to help participants voice their opinions and communicate these to others.

The Fork 2 Farmer docu-series, in its 14 iterations so far, has utilized all these five modalities, although clearly focusing on a) reflection on the ways farmers wish to be portrayed in the authentic experiences tourism marketplace, b) provocation, as to elicit the understanding that farmers are as dependent on chefs as chefs are dependent on farmers, and c) Articulation, as providing a platform where farmers can voice their motivations and invite discerning tourists to the farms. Recuperating Aitchison’s (2001) interrogation “can the subaltern speak (in tourism)?”, it looks as though they may have not only a variety of media but also a large audience to do so.

5.4. The relationship between chefs and farmers

Given the observed power differential between farmers and chefs, invariably leaning towards the latter, one might wonder whether chefs engage in these partnerships out of altruism or expected reciprocity, or perhaps a combination of both (Fig. 1.1). Firstly, I will look into the non-economic assets that farmers seemingly obtain from chefs, namely social
capital, self-efficacy, and reputation as a facilitator in future transactions. Secondly, I will turn to non-economic assets that chefs obtain from farmers, namely the enhanced level of transparency that it brings to the restaurant’s practices, and the alignment with important core values that enable economic rent.

Figure 1.1. The symbiotic relationship between farmers and chefs

5.4.1. From chefs to farmers

5.4.1.1. Social capital

Social capital is a dominant theory in the social sciences which has gained wide acceptance in Academia as a successful theoretical perspective to understand social relations embedded in the social structures (Narayan & Cassidy, 2001). The concept also found its way to everyday language through general circulation magazines, rapidly becoming a panacea to all ills afflicting society (Portes, 1998). Perhaps the biggest downside accruing from its popularity was the loss of any distinct meaning as it was used in so many different contexts.
Social capital, as contemporarily conceptualized, was first defined by Bordieu (1986) as “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition – or in other words, to membership in group” (p. 286). In this study, we follow the author’s instrumental treatment of the concept, arguing that farmers will see their networks extended by way of partnership with chefs, therefore getting exposed to valuable non-redundant information through “weak ties” (Granovetter, 1973). I anticipate that exchange opportunities with other chefs may arise, as well the possibility to tap into resources like grants and low-interest loans.

Although Bordieu (1986) was perhaps the first to conceptualize social capital in the way it is contemporarily used, his sophisticated theorizing of the concept didn’t really find its way into the Anglo-Saxonic literature until much later, for it was originally published in French (Portes, 1998). Social capital has since been adopted and tweaked by a number of prominent authors (Coleman, 1988; Lin, 2000; Putnam, 1995), also finding its way into everyday language through general circulation magazines, rapidly becoming a panacea to all ills afflicting society (Portes, 1998). While there is not an agreed upon definition of the concept, I find Bordieu’s (1986) to be very discerning and certainly encompassing other nuanced perspectives.

Lin (2002) contends that contemporary theories of capital, including social, cultural, and human capital, are not distinct from classical capital, given that, regardless of the specific type, investment and mobilization of capital are alleged to enhance the outcomes desirable to individuals or communities. Similarly, Portes (1998) adds that social capital stands for “the ability of actors to secure benefits by virtue of membership in social networks or other social
structures” (p. 6). What these two postulations suggest (not necessarily their authors’ convictions) is that social capital is unreservedly a positive asset and that the more you have of it, the more likely you are to attain desired outcomes. For example, Zhang and Lin (2016) reported that foreign firms operating in China, suffering both from unequal institutional support and the liabilities of foreignness, privileged job applicants with higher social capital as the firms had high hopes that it could be leveraged to acquire economic resources, political support, and enhance legitimacy in the Chinese marketplace. They also found that social capital was more important for higher level positions, because senior management and other high ranks play a crucial role in establishing and nurturing interorganizational networks.

However, scholars are reluctant of the overly simplistic “more is better” approach and consider it to be actually a “downside” of social capital under certain circumstances (Agnitsch, Flora, & Ryan, 2006). Accordingly, several researchers have reported that there is a negative effect of excessive embeddedness in a social network consisting of close-knit trusting group members (Portes, 1998; Agnitsch, Flora, & Ryan, 2006). Similarly, Uzzi (1996) on the basis of original ethnographies of 23 apparel firms suggests that, despite increasing economic effectiveness, embeddedness yields positive returns only up to a certain point, after which returns from embeddedness become negative. The challenges posited by close-knit trusting groups gave rise to the theorization of two different forms of social capital, bonding and bridging (Putnam, 1995). Bonding social capital is inherently “inward-looking”, and it promotes exclusive identities and homogeneous group characteristics, enabling access mostly to homogeneous resources. Conversely, bridging social capital is inherently “outward-looking” and it fosters connection to other people or groups who are different from
each other in some way, therefore, possessing heterogeneous resources (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000).

5.4.1.2. Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy is a major theoretical paradigm utilized to explain motivation, perseverance and level of effort in a specific task (Bandura, 1982), defined as one’s belief in one’s ability to succeed in a target behavior, is a dominant theoretical paradigm used to explain people’s motivation, effort, and perseverance in a task (Bandura, 1977). The theory holds that if people perceive themselves to be capable of accomplishing certain activities, they are more likely to undertake them in the future (Alkire, 2002). Moreover, self-efficacy will also influence an individual’s level of motivation, as reflected in how much effort one will exert in a task, and how long one will persevere in the face of obstacles (Bandura, 1980). Concerning entrepreneurship, Boyd and Vozikis (1994) paved the way for the development and validation of self-efficacy in the entrepreneurial setting (Moberg, 2013). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy (ESE) has been defined as one’s belief in one’s ability to perform entrepreneurial related tasks and findings indicate it is a multidimensional construct (Chen, Greene & Crick, 1998; De Noble, Jung & Ehrlich, 1999; McGee, Peterson, Mueller & Sequeira, 2009; Moberg, 2013).

Ferreira, Morais, Pollack, and Bunds (2017) adapted the construct to of ESE to the context of tourism e-microentrepreneurship, which culminated in Tourism e-Microentrepreneurial Self-Efficacy (TeMSE), defined as one’s belief in one’s ability to successfully perform the various roles and tasks of microentrepreneurship in the tourism e-business sector. The first factor is Pursuing Innovation, which refers to a microentrepreneur striving for better ideas or methods, or integrating a new approach that addresses ever
changing market demands, materialized in competitive advantage by meaningful differentiation from mainstream competition in the tourism sector. The second factor is Marshaling Resources, and the dimension involves assembling resources of support from local agencies) to bring the venture into existence. The third factor is Adapting to Externalities; this dimension encompasses ways in which microentrepreneurs are able to either capitalize on or mitigate nuances in the legal landscape affecting the tourism sector that are out of their control. The fourth dimension is Aligning Core Purpose with Self, and it refers to the extent to which the microentrepreneur is able to articulate to stakeholders a core purpose of the business in line with personal idiosyncrasies and in support of a desired lifestyle. Lastly, e-Marketing denotes the competence and savviness of microentrepreneurs in regard to the effective use of social media to market their tourism businesses and engage with visitors and peers.

There are four sources of self-efficacy: enactive mastery experiences, modelling or vicarious learning, social persuasion, and physiological factors (Bandura, 1982). Firstly, relationship with chefs gives farmers access to resources embedded in the chefs’ networks that can be tapped into one’s agritourism business, thus increasing the likelihood of its success. Secondly, despite obvious managerial differences between running a restaurant and a farm, I consider there is enough overlap between the two to consider vicarious learning as a source of self-efficacy. Finally, encouragement, reassurance, and other forms of moral support provided informally by chefs during interactions. Although the real effect of social persuasion is found to be short-lived, I argue that successful chefs are “credible persuaders” (Bandura, 2008, p. 169) due to their high visibility and relatively successful endeavors, and
that their endorsement will have a significant impact on farmers’ TeMSE (Ferreira, Morais, Pollack, & Bunds, 2017).

### 5.4.1.3. Reputation

In commerce, trust problems have been ubiquitous ever since humans started trading commodities. According to Diekman, Jann, Przepiorka, and Wehrli (2014), in archaic societies, failure to reciprocate was punished by the loss of reputation and status; but when trade started transcending the borders of small communities, social and economic institutions evolved as a substitute for informal social control. A current example of such institutions are credit bureaus. Accordingly, Grosskopf and Sarin (2010) observe that an entrepreneur must be able to demonstrate a good credit history and hence a reputation for paying back loans promptly, or else fail to obtain the loans required to meet current needs and, thus, face bankruptcy.

In this study we define reputation as a set of beliefs that other players hold about an individual’s unknown characteristics and on the basis of which they predict future behavior. These beliefs depend on their initial beliefs and on their assessments of the individual’s past behavior (Milgrom & Roberts, 1982). I argue that endorsement by celebrated chefs can affect positively the beliefs or opinions held by other players in the marketplace about the farmers, namely other chefs, farmers or customers. Previous research suggests that reputation has a market value (Diekman, Jann, Przepiorka, & Wehrli, 2014). Thus, resulting enhanced reputation from this partnership may open doors to new markets that would otherwise be shut for entrant sellers with no reputation. In addition, according to the same authors, reputation may have a positive significant impact on sales and selling prices.
5.4.2. From farmers to chefs

5.4.2.1. Transparency

According to Bhaduri and Ha-Brookshire (2011), transparency relates to visibility and accessibility of business information, including a traceable supply chain that shows the movement of products from the source to the end consumer, deemed a necessary condition for building customer loyalty, reputation and brand image, and maintain legitimacy. In niche markets, such as farm-to-table restaurant industry, the topic of transparency may be even more critical given the nature of its core patronage, disproportionally composed of socially and environmentally conscientious millennials, who expect that chefs and restauranteurs take their commitment to sourcing locally seriously (Weiss, 2012). In addition, numerous incidents of fraud have been reported on popular media, involving for example alleged Florida Blue Crab being actually caught in the Indian Ocean, have given rise to an alternative derogatory denomination to the movement – fraud to table (Berr, 2016). We argue that a public close relationship with local farmers will give chefs and restaurants the necessary edge to claim transparency business practices, a necessary condition for farm-to-table restaurant economic success.

5.4.2.2. Alignment

The restaurant industry is often described as being fiercely competitive (Syed & Conway, 2006). Thus, customers are able to establish internal reference prices (Grewal, Monroe, & Krishnan, 1998), that is a price scale based in past experiences is stored in buyers’ memory that serves as a basis for judging or comparing actual prices, which then forces the price offering for the restaurant to be in accord with what the market expects to pay. This has serious implications for management because it undercuts the ability of the restaurant in
attaining economic rents, or payments to assets that exceed the competitive price (Dencker & Fang, 2016; Weeden & Grusky, 2014).

Conversely, by collaborating with local farmers, chefs and restauranteurs can align their value proposition with generally accepted core values in America (Kawasaki, 2011), such as sustainability, healthy living and localism (Flack, 1997). And, Shin, Im, Jung, and Severt (2017) found that health consciousness and community attachment positively influence attitudes towards visiting locally sourced restaurants, which ultimately influence willingness to pay more. Therefore, I argue that collaborating with local farmers enables chefs and restauranteurs to attain economic rents that will ensure high economic performance in a fiercely competitive industry.

5.4.3. Reciprocity vs. altruism

Previously, I have established that farmers may access social capital through chefs. The question that arises is why should the chefs make their social capital and resources available to farmers? Portes (1998) postulates that the neoclassical economics undersocialized approach to the analysis of human action sees social capital as “accumulation of obligations from others according to the norm of reciprocity” (p. 7), that is donors act primarily upon the expectation of full repayment at a later stage. Surprisingly, a diametrically opposed oversocialized approach that extends the concept to entire countries or cultures (Putnam, 1995; Temple, 2002) seems to derive a similar assertion. Accordingly, Sampaio da Nóvoa (2015), explains that Thomas Aquinas considered three levels of gratitude, a superficial first level of intellectual recognition; an intermediary second level of appreciation and gratitude, where actors give grace to someone for something that they are grateful for; and a deeper third level of gratitude, the level of commitment bond. He proceeds to suggest
that this multilayered construction may be embedded in linguistic symbolism, in particular in the way individuals thank one another in different European languages. Thus, the English “thank you” the German “zu danken”, would be indicative of a more superficial level of intellectual recognition; the French “mercy”, the Spanish “gracias”, or the Italian “grazie” would refer to the intermediary level of giving grace, and; finally, the Portuguese “ obrigado”, loosely translated to obliged, indebted, or beholden, would correspond to the deepest level of all. Hence, in my consciously oversocialized analysis of Sampaio da Nóvoa’s (2015) claim, “ obrigado” may signal an almost self-inflicted commitment to reciprocate by the recipient of social capital, which seems to pair up well with the undersocialized view that its donors act upon the expectancy of reciprocation. Therefore, we have donors with expectations to be repaid on the one hand, and recipients culturally constrained to pay their debts. The argument is most useful to demystify a common belief that I gleaned from extensive fieldwork, that chefs may be in the unlikely business of “helping” farmers survive. Most intriguing is even the fact that the fallacy is blatantly reproduced in the farmers’ discourse, in statements like “[without these partnerships] I wouldn't be able to exist... because I'm so small” (Browne, Ferreira, & Morais, 2016). Even in the unlikely event of being true, the contrary is more often than not obscured – Farm to table restaurants wouldn’t be able to exist either, were it not for the small organic farms that supply them.

Despite Granovetter’s (1985) criticism that both under and oversocialized approaches atomize the individual, arguing that, respectively, actors do not behave isolated from a social context nor do they “adhere slavishly to a script written for them” (p.487), it is rather noteworthy that two very different levels of analysis converge in the support of my argument. To be clear, I am not advocating for the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (Kay & Kempton,
1984) nor am I claiming that speakers of one language will feel more indebted than others. My argument is that whether we take an approach that focuses on the individual or one that focuses on societal factors, in either case we have a compelling argument to assume that chefs are not in the business of altruism towards small-farmers, rather they have 1) a strategic interest, primarily legitimacy and alignment with core values, and 2) that they expect and count on reciprocity.

6. Methodology

This dissertation follows a mixed methods approach that is going to be described in detail for each study. In addition, both studies are part of a bigger participatory action-research that aims at transforming the lives and communities of participants. Power differential between researcher and researched in this dissertation is discussed and mitigation strategies are presented.

6.1. Participatory action-research

Literature in community psychology calls for transformational scholarship, stressing the uselessness of conventional, seemingly objective research of mainstream psychology and other social sciences (C. Davis, 2008; Seymour-Rolls & Hughes, 2000; Wisner, Stea, & Kruks, 1991). Accordingly, participatory action-research goes beyond the boundaries of traditional paradigms of research that call for the least disturbance in the study environment. On the contrary, Kemmis and Mc Taggart (1988) participatory action-research (PAR) is “collaborative and achieved through the critically examined action of individual group members” (p. 5). Seymour-Rolls and Hughes (2000) define PAR as a method of research primarily concerned with bringing about social change to participants in the research
process. According to Nelson and Prilleltensky (2010), PAR cannot be defined by methods employed rather by the goals of research. And, because PAR is much more complex and nuanced than experimental or survey research, thus creating extra challenges on researchers that may at times, often unintendedly, give in to the forces of oppression, the latter authors propose the concept of psychopolitical validity to assess the epistemological and transformational value of research.

Wisner et al. (1991) discuss the differences between instrumental participation and transformative participation. Instrumental participation is mandated by governments and other institutions holding power to legitimize processes and decisions that are far from being democratic, but nonetheless require a token of popular representation. Conversely, transformative participation is genuine, from the bottom up, and usually flourishes into social change.

Participatory action-research is a central piece of this dissertation. Whether we refer to family farmers in NC or artisans and ejidatários in Mexico, my ultimate goal is the “conscientization” (Freire, 1970) of the community about the forces of oppression that pervade the monopolistic tourism retail system which exclude locals from the tourism industry (Morais, Ferreira, Nazariadli, & Gaharamani, 2017). After comes the “praxis”: community members will likely want to take action, which in this case can mean that they will want to have a seat at local tourism development authority (TDA) meetings and/or start their own tourism microenterprises that will offer the genuineness and authenticity demanded by discerning tourists which the formal sector will increasingly depend on but cannot afford.
When conducting participatory research, it is critical to consider how structural power dynamics play out in the communities within which I plan to conduct my research. Next, I will lay out each primary stakeholder group and their current level of power and how it will potentially impact the research process. Finally, I describe what strategies I plan to use to mitigate these undesired effects.

6.2. Power

Power can be analyzed at various levels and from different perspectives. For example, Nelson and Prilleltenski (2010) speak of power within, referring to the need for the “conscientization” of the individual and realization that he or she can influence the outcomes of his/her life, 2) power with, which refers to collective action putting together the strengths of community members and also other communities with whom coalitions may be forged, and 3) power to, which can be seen as “liberation”, the ability to pursue the goals that matter to the individual.

Because power is a largely study construct in many disciplines, a great number of definitions can be found in the literature. One that I particularly like for its simplicity and assertiveness is control over resources that one has and that the other covets. A slightly different one refers to the ability to impose one’s will despite resistance from others. Power can also be the ability to enable or constraint the actions and desires of others. All these three slightly nuanced definitions converge in that power is relational, that is occurs between two or more individuals or groups in a specific setting. The context is important because it will determine if intervenients in the exchange recognize each other’s power (or the lack of) in a particular situation. For example, the power differential between adviser and advisee is
recognized within academic boundaries but may not apply in other settings where the power differential may be reversed. Finally, it should be mentioned that the debate on influence of power on economic outcomes is not settled in the academic discourse, and perhaps will never be. Accordingly, Granovetter (2017) exposes how neoclassical economists brush issues of power under the rug for it would spoil their sanitized, “scientific”, predictive economic models, which is the source of much criticism by economic sociologists who tend to see power as a variable of primary interest.

In Chapter 3, I will focus in the Local Foods community, where four main stakeholder groups can be identified: small farmers, chefs, foodies, and extension/university. Here, community may not enclose a specific geographical setting, rather a shared space of common interests: local food. In this social system, in general, farmers are the ones with the least power. They are the ones who have to bow to the whims of chefs, who may change their daily orders in the last minute, may change their minds and return a whole pork butt that the farmer struggled to deliver the same day, withhold payments, and even exploit farmers by listing them on their menus, even after they no longer supply their restaurant. All these have been identified in my field work. They can do so, because if farmers don’t comply, they can simply resort to CISCO food systems. Farmers can’t afford that. Farmers rely heavily on restaurants because they represent a steady stream of orders, and avoids dependence on farmers markets, where they must abide by certain aesthetics sanctioned by urbanites, which often result in a lot of waste and giveaways. Foodies have power because they have choice. The concept of local is sometimes lose enough to enable a foodie in Raleigh to consume fruit grown in Florida and still feel great about themselves. Finally, extension agents and
researchers have the power that accrues both from their professional status and affiliation to the university.

I think that one form of power that is especially relevant in this system is the ability to impose cultural understandings and influence shared consciousness. Regarding the first, some farmers have told me that one of their goals in agritourism is to retort the prevalent misconception that southerners are “hillbillies and rednecks”, and that the new generation of organic farmers are a bunch of “potheads”. Others have refused to showcase their “rurality”, sought after by urbanites (Nazariadli, 2018), and preferred to portray themselves as industrious, sophisticated and entrepreneurial. I don’t think that chefs were the ones necessarily creating this social stigma, but I think it feeds well into their business model because the more rural and “primitive” the farmer can be, the more natural and “unspoiled” the products become in the eyes of their customers, the foodies. For example, even though most wine is mechanically harvested, all wine drinkers want to imagine those grapes being handpicked as they have seen in numerous promotional clips by the Portuguese Tourism agency.

Nevertheless, I think that chefs, and their army of PRs and media influencers, have some responsibility in the generalized idea that their business is enabling the livelihoods of small farmers, masking the fact that their business model also depends heavily on their work. Most strikingly, collaboration with small farmers is the foundation of the Farm-to-Table concept which is the “special sauce” in a very competitive business arena - it allows chefs to charge top dollar for organic products, and provides them the necessary legitimacy to draw socially conscientious foodies (who are ok with paying that top dollar). In sum, while there is a reciprocal relationship between chefs and farmers, the influence of the former in shaping a
shared consciousness in which chefs are the benefactors, as led some farmers to internalize it.

In chapter 4, I will focus on subaltern tourism entrepreneurs in the outskirts of Puerto Vallarta, Mexico. One sub-group is comprised of artisans in Bucerias that sell experiences through a non-profit engaged in responsible tourism. These individuals are not native to the area, as they migrated from economically depressed southern Mexican states like Oaxaca, Guerrero and Chiapas. They are relatively poor and vulnerable, which translated in a perceived marked power differential when I interacted with them. Because they are not native to the area, they are denied the right to sell their art at select plazas and other key locations where only the indigenous Huicholes are allowed to make business. Notwithstanding, recurrent visits from international tourists interested in their culture and craftsmanship may have contributed to reinforce their identity and it is apparent that they are proud of who they are and what they do. The other sub-group is the ejidatarios of Playa Grande, Jalisco, who created a communitarian tourism business. Although they are not an indigenous population, they have lived in the area for many generations and at least the families I interviewed are not as poor and disenfranchised as their counterparts in Bucerias. First, they have the rights to an immense stretch of land that, despite strict restrictions, they can use to support their livelihoods. Second, they have had to go through the bureaucracy of starting a business that operates in the formal sector (even though most processes are of informal nature), which means that to some extent they are well rounded in business practices and aware of resources available and funding opportunities. For example, they are beneficiaries of CONAFOR funds, a federal project that aims to restore ecosystems throughout the country, in which local communities become stewards of the surrounding
flora and fauna (Popovici, 2017). Notwithstanding, they are oppressed by tourism retail monopolies which exploit these community owned and run enterprises by controlling the flow of tourists and setting the prices as they wish.

Reflecting on my field notes, I am drawn to believe that the power differential between researcher-researched in Mexico is much higher than in North Carolina. This has to do with several reasons including my (deficient) mastery of the English language, dark skin tone, and provenience from a small peripheral country. Other reasons have more to do with the well-known vulnerability, low income and status of most graduate students in the US (Kelsky, 2015). Nevertheless, I acknowledge that I am more educated than most farmers I work with and that my line of work may be more prestigious than farming. In Mexico, the differential is steeper as I have lighter skin than most, use Spanish as a third language, and come from the United States, which is still believed to be the land of dreams for most Mexicans.

Regardless of my perceived status at either study site, I have a series of ethical considerations that drive my behavior when interacting with research participants. In North Carolina, I always drive an American made pick-up truck whenever I meet a farmer because driving a spotless sedan could give me away as just another university bureaucrat. I dress down and put on rugged boots because I want to make sure I can follow the farmer whenever he needs to go while we chat. Usually, I try to create rapport by disclosing my passion for Massey-Ferguson tractors, the brand we have at my farm in Portugal. Importantly, I am always respectful that plans can be altered quickly in the farm and always try to be flexible and understanding when visits need to be cancelled or postponed. In order to do that, I tend not to schedule more than three visits in a day, to give me the possibility to shuffle things around if need be. In Mexico, I avoid talking about the highlights of my life in the US and...
emphasize the normal day to day monastic life of a doctoral student. I try to eat the foods eaten by locals, even if that means drinking raw milk straight from the cow, milked under questionable sanitary conditions. I do that because it is a rite of passage that grants me access to more honest, truthful perspectives, for they will see me as someone who values and respects their culture.

6.3. Article 1

6.3.1. Background

Communities struggling to emerge from the collapse of agriculture or manufacturing, often lacking viable, readily implementable alternatives, have tertiarized their economy around the provision of leisure services to visitors. In such cases, where there is strong social and political pressure for economic rejuvenation, tourism development tends to follow the path of least resistance, wherein top-down approaches are preferred for their easier and faster implementation. Often, private organizations external to the community and with control over tourism distribution systems often “drop-in” with investment capital, access to markets, and with a vision on how to best exploit the destinations. In these contexts, local people are frequently relegated to the sidelines of the tourism industry and become passive tourees. Conversely, research shows that grassroots tourism development models may engender consciousness-raising, entrepreneurial networking, and self-efficacy, and promote the creation of locally owned and operated tourism microenterprises. However, actual local participation may be largely constrained by socio-political, legal, administrative and economic structures. In addition, communities are heterogeneous, which makes it difficult to unify local wishes and expectations to offer a practical guide to tourism development.
6.3.2. Purpose

In reaction to the inherent limitations of both models, this research proposes a third way to tourism development, Permatourism, which pursues the complementarity between top-down and bottom-up approaches to tourism development and acknowledges informality and formality in the tourism sector as a mutually supporting system.

6.3.3. Theoretical framework

Recently, Permatourism has been proposed as a third alternative to tourism development through a tourism planning and management process that pursues the complementarity between formal private and public actors and local microentrepreneurs and grassroots community social structures. It expects the formal tourism sector to embrace the socio-cultural characteristics of the host community to make the local tourism experience more unique and competitive while at the same time ensuring that local residents are better equipped to become involved in tourism. Also, it requires the creation of a grassroots business development strategy that aligns local entrepreneurs with expected business opportunities generated by existing or upcoming big tourism investments in the region or large scope social movements and trends with high impact at the macroeconomic level.

Permatourism is an application of the principles of Permaculture design in the field of Tourism. The latter emerged in the late seventies primarily as a response to oil-dependent, energy inefficient agriculture, but its robust and creative design principles have since been adapted to create sustainable human habitats: building, town planning, water supply, purification, and commercial and financial systems. Permaculture design is rooted in the close study of dynamic living systems and provides suis generis solutions to complex and apparently insurmountable challenges. Importantly, Permaculture is essentially a way of
putting components together for their maximum benefit, which starts with the observation and identification of existing patterns, and proceeds to work within the naturally occurring systems that are already there. Permaculture welcomes diversity for it provides alternative pathways for essential ecosystems functions in the face of changing conditions.

6.3.4. Implications

Although the sustainable tourism paradigm is recurrently waived as the ideal model of tourism development, it has nevertheless lost much of its meaning and it has become, to great extent, an empty cliché. Skeptical that resuscitating a concept that may have been abused beyond repair would bring any benefit to the field, I set out to develop the theoretical underpinnings of Permatourism and propose it as a new paradigm in tourism development, one that deliberately pursues symbiotic relationships between formal and informal actors within the tourism business ecosystem for the benefit of each individual and the system as a whole.

6.4. Article 2

6.4.1. Background

The rise of a neo-liberal agenda in the US government in permitted tobacco companies to invest in leaf production in the developing world, who sought to maximize profits by purchasing cheaper foreign leaf (Benson, 2008). For some decades government subsidies artificially kept domestic tobacco farming viable, but when the same government decided to put an end to protectionist measures on domestic leaf, U.S. leaf output was cut by over 50 percent from 1998 to 2004, creating financial hardships for farmers and dropping the number of tobacco farms about 40 percent. The result was that many farmers were forced to sell their farms for development, while a few have managed to switch to alternative crops.
The local foods movement has been instrumental in keeping some of these farms afloat, by affording farmers several additional outlets to outflow their products such as farmers markets, and more recently direct sales to high end farm-to-table restaurants. However, there is criticism that chefs hold considerably more power than farmers, with the partnership serving and benefiting primarily chefs (Zaneti, 2017). Morais, Lelekacs, Jakes, and Bowen (2017) suggest that farm experiences by local farmers and endorsed by chefs is a way to deanonymize the farmer and level the ground with chefs. But little is known about the farmers ability to use such endorsement for economic gain, or whether ensuing potentially heightened bridging social capital can be translated in tourism entrepreneurial intentions at the farm.

6.4.2. Purpose

Given that Permatourism advocates for a symbiotic alignment between formal and informal sectors, I will explore the extent to which self-efficacy among FTMEs in NC can be predicted by the level of bridging ties they have with formal private sector partners (e.g., celebrated farm-to-table chefs), public sector support agencies (e.g., Extension agents and TDAs), and with other peers (e.g., other farmers).

6.4.3. Method

An online survey was sent to 1,200 farmers listed on multiple agritourism-related databases, and will use Structural Equation Modeling (Garson, 2016) to create a causal model that ultimately predicts tourism entrepreneurial intention. I drew on extensive field work with farmers, DMOs, extension and tour operators to create items for latent variables “Integration with Zone 1”, “Integration with Zone 2”, and “Integration with Zone 3”. The latter three exogenous variables reflected personal bridging social capital (X. Chen, Stanton, Gong,
I was interested in this construct because the goal was to measure the portion network connections in a system that are owned individually by the farmer. Then, I hypothesized that social capital predicted tourism e-microentrepreneurial self-efficacy (Ferreira, 2016). In order to measure TeMSE, I used the scale developed by Ferreira et al. (2018) using a sample of 300 tourism microentrepreneurs. Finally, tourism entrepreneurial intention was measured with an adaptation of Chen, Greene, and Crick’s (1998) “entrepreneurial decision” scale.

6.4.4. Implications

This study advances our understanding of the farm tourism informal economy, sheds new light on the operationalization of intersectoral linkages and its benefits to the local tourism experience, and could assist tourism governance officials in justifying investment towards supporting initiatives that aim at engaging the informal sphere.

6.5. Article 3

6.5.1. Background

Puerto Vallarta is a Mexican beach resort city situated on the Pacific Ocean’s Bahía de Banderas. It is the second largest urban agglomeration in the state after the Guadalajara Metropolitan Area. The City of Puerto Vallarta is the government seat of the Municipality of Puerto Vallarta which comprises the city as well as population centers outside of the city extending from Boca de Tomatlán to the Nayarit border (the Ameca River). The municipality has an area of 1,300.7 square kilometers (502.19 sq mi). To the north it borders the southwest part of the state of Nayarit, where Bucerías (Human Connections’ headquarters) is located.
Tourism is one of the mainstays of the Mexican economy and its largest service sector. In Puerto Vallarta, it is estimated that over 25% of the total labor force work at restaurants and hotels. However, foreign patronage has sought out the lowest-waged workforce possible in the interest of profit making. Coupled with dislocation of residents, tourism development marginalized great numbers of the local population, creating a de facto socioeconomic apartheid. This is apparent in self-contained, often gated, all-inclusive resorts, which lead to segregation between locals and tourists and limit tourist spending outside the complex—thus giving little input to local small businesses or to linkages with the surrounding local economy. In addition, the consolidation of a great number of tour retailers has monopolized the market in the hands of four big players, allowing them to abuse their power and exploit tourism microentrepreneurs, who are unable to reach tourists directly. Local organizations are trying different approaches to reverse this situation.

Accordingly, Human Connections is a non-profit that offers experiential learning short trips to western tourists provided by local artisans, microentrepreneurs, and organizations. Through these educational programs, they provide a platform for local people to share their culture and have agency over their stories. These interactions are also financially rewarding for their sócios, as they pay them fairly for their time and help increase their sales. Their goal is to empower local communities while fostering conversations that shift visitors’ perspectives and increase cross-cultural understanding.

Conversely, the ejidos follow a for-profit logic. In Mexico, an ejido is an area of communal land used for agriculture, in which community members individually farm designated parcels and collectively maintain communal holdings. Ejidatários do not actually own the land, but are allowed to use their allotted parcels indefinitely as long as they do not
fail to use the land for more than two years. They can pass their rights on to their children. In the case of Playa Grande, the land is not arable nor is it suitable for animal husbandry. Since logging of timber has been discouraged due to environmental conservation reasons, the members of the ejido have recently created a small tourism company that they hope will generate revenue to continue stewarding the land while sustaining their livelihoods.

6.5.2. Purpose

The purpose was to examine the perceptions of subaltern tourism entrepreneurs in Puerto Vallarta on the local industry and their adaptation strategies to optimize the scarce economic opportunities conceded by tourism-generated socioeconomic apartheid.

6.5.3. Method

I conducted in-depth interviews with a) artisans in Bucerias who sell their art at markets and plazas and receive visitors through the local non-profit, and 2) ejidatarios of Playa Grande, who established a community-owned ecopark which offers canopy tours, horseback-riding, local food and glamping. Then, I followed a theoretical thematic analysis approach to analyze the data.

6.5.4. Implications

Pursuing a shared horizon (i.e. locals meaningfully involved in tourism), the study communities and I are co-creating recreational and educational packages for the American market, with the goal to bypass predatory local tourism retail monopolies by reaching tourists directly using web marketplaces.

7. Limitations of the study

My long time, international participation in the People-First Tourism research project afforded me invaluable insight which was used to lay the road map to this dissertation. A
limitation of the NC study is that we had limited control on who responded to the survey, given that the management role in the farm is complex and dynamic. Also, we used entrepreneurial intention as a proxy to entrepreneurial action, which is what we are mostly interested about. However, tracking how intention translates into *de facto* entrepreneurial action, meaning creating or adding value to an existing tourism business falls beyond the scope of this dissertation.

In Mexico, due to distance I did not have the same depth of understanding of the socio-cultural-economic context compared to NC. It would not be unreasonable to believe that my privilege may have created some blind spots in the research process which may have biased the analysis. Also, due to limited time I was only able to conduct so many interviews, although I believe theoretical saturation was achieved.

8. **Delimitations of the study**

The NC study was conducted in the context of farmers of NC, who enjoy a high market demand for locally grown or raised products. My sample was comprised of a variety of farmers and farms and the relationships of variables are expected to be observable in other contexts. Nevertheless, findings should not be generalizable to all farmers.

In Mexico, the specificity of artisans’ involvement with Human Connections as well as the unique characteristics of ejido Playa Grande, even comparing with other ejidos, may affect the transferability of results.

9. **Significance of the study**

In general, tourism has failed on its promise to engender equitable prosperity insofar as the formal sector continues exploit local communities and exclude local
microentrepreneurs. Hence, the field of tourism may need an alternative model that caters to the high economic expectations of the profit-seeking formal sector, while providing opportunities to informal entrepreneurs who may be in the business for subsistence or beyond purely economic motives.

10. Definitions of terms

A list of key terminology and definitions specifically related to this study include:

Microentrepreneurship: In the entrepreneurship continuum, microentrepreneurship stands out to be driven by non-economic motives such as freedom, passion, or lifestyle, in addition to economic motives that cut across all forms of entrepreneurship (Carland & Carland, 1997). Microentrepreneurs usually refrain from pursuing growth once their ventures enable a desired comfort level and lifestyle (Carland & Carland, 1997). Microenterprises employ five or fewer employees and tend to operate in under-regulated business environments that allow low entry barriers, but typically the ventures do not afford stable livelihoods nor health benefits (Ferreira, Morais, & Lorscheider, 2015). Small size and informal nature render microenterprises nimble and easily adaptable to the needs of changing economic landscapes (Mladenovic, 2013).

Tourism microentrepreneurship: Despite its ubiquity and importance to local communities, tourism microentrepreneurship is an understudied phenomenon (Morais, Ferreira, Nazariadli & Ghahramani, 2017; Morais et al., 2012; LaPan, 2014; K.C., 2015). For the purpose of this study, tourism microentrepreneurship is the expression of microentrepreneurship in the broader tourism segment, including but not restricted to its main four operating sectors: attractions, transportation, food services, and lodging (Walker
defined as the process of launching a new or adding value to an existing enterprise operating in any of the tourism sectors, employing no more than five people, with the aim to serve a local market and permitting the owner a desired comfort level and lifestyle.

Tourism e-microentrepreneurship: An expression of tourism microentrepreneurship enabled by the advent of the internet and particularly the emerging sharing economy. Webmarketplaces such as P1t, Etsy, Airbnb, and LocalHarvest now allow microentrepreneurs to showcase products and services to reach untapped markets (Ferreira, Morais & Lorscheider, 2015), overcoming their long-term inability to enter the formal tourism distribution system and consequent lack of access to markets that had been a barrier to engagement (Morais et al, 2012). I defined tourism e-microentrepreneurship as the process of launching a new enterprise or adding value to an existing one, relying partially on web marketplaces to attract visitors and operating in any of the tourism sectors, employing no more than five people, with the aim to serve a local market and permitting the owner a desired livelihood and lifestyle.

Permatourism: A conceptual framework for the holistic study of tourism and the design of equitable tourism development strategies, which leverages knowledge pertaining to adaptive complex systems and integrates permaculture design principles. Moreover, it pursues the symbiosis of formal and informal, and public and private sectors, through creating and nurturing meaningful, functional relations among different actors in the tourism business ecosystem.
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CHAPTER 2: Conceptualizing Permatourism

Abstract

Permatourism is a conceptual framework for the holistic study of tourism and the design of equitable tourism development strategies, which leverages knowledge pertaining to adaptive complex systems and integrates permaculture design principles. Importantly, Permatourism pursues the symbiosis of formal and informal, and public and private sectors, through creating and nurturing meaningful, functional relations among different actors in the tourism business ecosystem. Moreover, it expects the formal tourism sector to embrace the socio-cultural characteristics of the host community to make the local tourism experience more unique and competitive while at the same time ensuring that locals are better equipped to become involved in tourism. Likewise, it requires the creation of a grassroots business development strategies that align local microentrepreneurs with expected business opportunities generated by existing or upcoming big tourism investments. A plethora of examples are provided to illustrate the pertinence of the Permatourism framework in destination management in the face of changing conditions.

Target outlet: Tourism, Theory and Practice (book series)
1. **Introduction**

The study of tourism has been dominated by the purportedly value-free scientific-positivist tradition which has precluded a more desirable holistic, integrated approach to a phenomenon that is rather complex, involving multiple sectors and actors, complex dynamics, and with tremendous socio-economic and ecological impacts on communities (Tribe, 2001). The almost limitlessness of the tourism phenomenon has captivated many researchers from a myriad of scholarly traditions (Darbellay & Stock, 2012), who have approached the study of tourism from their discipline-bound perspectives, and looking at the most suitable variables and mechanisms for their methodological tool kits (Franklin & Crang, 2001; Darbellay & Stock, 2012). Whereas narrowed down, analytic, discipline-specific perspectives certainly allow the researcher a more focused and detailed examination, knowledge produced within each of the various scholarly niches has seldom been combined leading to a siloization of tourism scholarship (Morais, Ferreira, Nazariadli & Ghahramani, 2017; Cockburn-Wootten, McIntosh, Smith, & Jefferies, 2018). Moreover, there is also a tendency to treat tourism as a deterministic and unidimensional system, where inputs are processed and turned into predictable outputs and outcomes in a perfectly mechanized logic fashion (Ivars Baidal, Rodriguez Sanchez, & Vera Rebollo, 2013; Brouder, Clavé, Gill, & Ioannides, 2016). Conversely, Farrell and Twining-Ward (2004) postulate that the tourism system is better captured by the dynamics of a living system and call for multidisciplinary approaches which incorporate perspectives from the biological and natural sciences. One of the first attempts is Butler’s (1980) destination lifecycle, wherein tourist destinations emulate the dynamics of ecosystems, featuring growth, consolidation and, eventually, decline. Also, researchers have focused on the examination of the tourism business
ecosystem components individually, but there has been a paucity of scholarship examining the interactions between components and their intertwined functions (Farrell & Twining-Ward, 2004). The same could be said about the understanding of the meaning of ecosystem, which is often limited to the notion that it has a geographical dimension. Farrell and Twining-Ward (2004) conclude that much more could be learned from ecosystems ecology and that such knowledge “would help researchers understand [that] a tourism system is a special ecosystem in its own right, and welcome the incorporation of new work emerging from studies linking social and natural systems” (p. 286).

The call for the integration of knowledge pertaining to adaptive complex systems and a retreat from reductionism appears to have made some echo in the tourism research community. Stone & Nyaupane (2017), for example, contend that there have recently been significant scholarly contributions to the tourism literature using systems thinking theory examining topics like community participation and empowerment, stakeholder collaboration, and resource management techniques. However, there is limited evidence of approaches that engender equitable and sustainable tourism development, so there seems to be a continued need for integrated, holistic tourism research approaches that can inform actionable solutions for pernicious forces of unbridled growth and inequality that mar tourism.

Nelson and Prilleltensky (2010) contend that complex societal problems ought to be reframed in different terms in order to transcend the limitations of current knowledge and hopefully achieve novel and effective solutions. Accordingly, this paper examines the tourism ecosystem through systems thinking and design principles, two conceptual lenses
not yet commonly used to frame tourism problems or devise solutions. Namely, the purpose of this paper is to explain the conceptual framework of Permatourism for the holistic study of tourism and the design of equitable tourism development strategies.

2. Permaculture design

Permaculture started in Australia in the 1970s by Bill Mollison and David Holmegren (Holmgren, 2017), who were concerned with energy inefficiencies of mechanized agriculture, wherein the energy output was dwarfed by energy inputs, mostly in the form of non-renewable, highly pollutant, fossil fuels. Their concerns were heightened by the oil crisis in the seventies and resonated highly with the back to the land movement. While permaculture primarily meant permanent agriculture, soon it became obvious that real permanent agriculture would be impossible without a permanent culture hinging on three ethics: care for the earth, care for the people and fair share.

Permaculture is essentially a way of putting components together for their maximum benefit (Whitefield, 1997). Its robust and creative design principles have since been adapted to create sustainable human habitats: building, town planning, water supply, purification, and commercial and financial systems (Whitefield, 1997). According to Orion (2015), permaculture design is rooted in the close study of dynamic living systems and “offers a unique set of solutions to a series of complex and seemingly intractable challenges” (p. 9).

3. Permatourism

Haughton (1998) contends that while rejuvenation of depressed areas has been present in political rhetoric for decades, efforts on the ground have been predominantly top-down, large scale, inward investment, and infrastructure-centric. Moreover, top-down
tourism development usually only allows for very limited local participation (Wang & Wall, 2007). Often, private organizations external to the community and with control over tourism distribution systems “drop-in” with investment capital, access to markets, and with their own vision on how they are going to profit from those communities’ tourism appeal (Davis & Morais, 2004). In this scenario, local people are frequently relegated to the “sidelines of the tourism economy, informally or even illegally gleaning bits of income not worthwhile to the formal industry” (Morais, Ferreira, Nazariadli, & Ghahramani, 2017, p.74). While there is a long record of failure of top-down approaches in many contexts such as environmental management (Fraser, Dougill, Mabee, Reed, & McAlpine, 2006), area-based economic rejuvenation (Haughton, 1998) or policy implementation (Matland, 1995), there is only limited evidence that grassroot models perform better than their counterparts.

On the bright side, grassroot tourism development models have been shown to engender consciousness, entrepreneurial networking, and self-efficacy (McGehee, Kline, & Knollenberg, 2014), as well as the creation of locally owned and operated tourism microenterprises (Morais, Ferreira, & Wallace, 2017). However, Haughton (1998) posits that sometimes communities fear that their enhanced participation is synonymous with disinvestment by government officials. Likewise, Tosun (2000) cautions that actual local participation is largely constrained by socio-political, legal, administrative and economic structures. In addition, (Harrison, 1996) argues that communities are heterogeneous, which makes it difficult to unify local wishes and expectations to offer a practical guide to tourism development.
Therefore, we need to transcend traditional paradigms and embrace frameworks that allow for the integration of different economic actors for the optimization of system performance. Hence, Permatourism is a tourism planning and management framework grounded in systems thinking and design principles, which pursues the complementarity between formal private, public actors, local microentrepreneurs and grassroots community social structures, with the aim to regenerate economically depressed communities. In practice, Permatourism expects the formal tourism sector to embrace the socio-cultural characteristics of the host community to make the local tourism experience more unique and competitive while at the same time ensuring that locals are better equipped to become involved in the owning of tourism enterprises. Additionally, Permatourism, requires the creation of a grassroots business development strategy that aligns local entrepreneurs with expected business opportunities generated by existing or upcoming big tourism investments in the region or large scope social movements and trends with high impact at the macroeconomic level.

4. Ethics

Permatourism subscribes to the three Permaculture ethics: Care for the Earth, Care for People, and Fair-share. This core of ethics represents the popular triple bottom line of sustainability, that is, respectively, the environmental, social, and economic dimensions.

In times of resource scarcity and food insecurity, Care for the Earth is one of the most important challenges of humankind and certainly one that needs to be in the agenda of every organization, company or research program. In tourism, environmental sustainability has been traditionally concerned with issues such as solid waste management (Kumar, 2005).
energy efficiency (Gössling et al., 2005), water saving (Cole, 2012), and carbon footprint reduction (McKercher, Prideaux, Cheung, & Law, 2010). Permatourism, on the other hand, focuses on the tangible benefits that may accrue to the environment by way of having locals meaningfully involved in the tourism industry. For example, drawing from examples from engaged scholarship and extension projects in North Carolina, where tourism microentrepreneurship is being proposed as a low barrier strategy for economic rejuvenation of depressed rural areas, which may help slow down real estate development on multi-generational agricultural lands (Brookins et al., 2017; Morais, Lelekacs, Jakes, & Bowen, 2017; Ferreira, 2018). Likewise, Morais, Bunn, Hoogendoorn, and KC (2018) suggest that in South Africa tourism microentrepreneurship could help prevent rhino poaching and foster wildlife conservation behaviors among people in the gateway communities to the Krugger Park, who have been traditionally excluded from the safari industry. And Lopez, Dagostino and Garcia (2017) report that rural microentrepreneurs who own and manage ecotourism operations have become the best possible stewards for the protected forest surrounding the popular sol y playa destination of Puerto Vallarta, Mexico.

Permatourism also subscribes to the Care for People ethic for the improvement of the lives and livelihoods of hosts as its central goal. This people-centered approach to tourism development is grounded on People-First Tourism scholarship which espouses that host community involvement in tourism microentrepreneurship has the potential to enable communities to harness the economic force of tourism to address their own needs and goals (Morais, Ferreira, & Wallace, 2017). As expressed in the Manifesto of the People-First Tourism Movement (Morais, 2017), local governments and grassroots organizations
“... must be persistent in facilitating local participation and ownership of tourism. Host communities need their leaders and civic organizations to understand economic forces of tourism and to strive to make tourism serve the interests of their constituents. Civic and democratic processes of community involvement in tourism planning and ownership will ensure that tourism generates long-term culturally appropriate livelihood opportunities to diverse social groups.”

Indeed, a growing body of scholarship suggests that local involvement in tourism microentrepreneurship may support livelihoods, self-determination, and entrepreneurial self-efficacy (Kc, Morais, Seekamp, Smith, & Peterson, 2018; Thomas-Francois, von Massow, & Joppe, 2017b; LaPan, Morais, Wallace, & Barbieri, 2016; Mao, 2014; Nyaupane, Morais, & Dowler, 2006). Thus, in the context of Permatourism, Care for People means equipping local communities with the leadership and skills to react to the opportunities and challenges afforded by tourism to shape the destiny of their communities.

The ethics of Permatourism are consistent with the environmental and social sustainability agenda in that it promulgates the pursuit of these goals, even when it is hard to buy into the vision of sustainability for an industry that is predicated on hordes of people moving around on jet planes to consume places. Much like Permaculture was always about the “little guy” (Holmgren, 2017) and the small but important contributions they could make to effect change, Permatourism highlights the potential role of local people in participating meaningfully in the destination product, as microentrepreneurs, leaders, and cultural ambassadors, and not just as mere tourees (Cohen, 1988).
Within the logic of capitalism, however, economic sustainability often becomes the stronger component within the triple bottom line, relegating the social and environmental dimensions to merely legitimizing economic growth (Longo, Clark, Shriver, & Clausen, 2016). Hence, the Fair-share ethic embodies very little of the economic sustainability piece as it is usually understood by the public and even in the academic realm. Fair-share is not concerned about the profitability of a transnational conglomerate that decides to live up to their social and environmental responsibility. It is rather about the locals who choose the microentrepreneurial route to overcome unemployment and underemployment. It is about leveraging the economic opportunities of the formal sector to create income generating opportunities for microenterprises, which are naturally nimbler and more adaptable to changing economic landscapes.

5. Principles

Permatourism is guided by 12 principles, which delineate its conceptual foundation. These principles serve as guidelines for the practical application of Permatourism in the management of entire destinations as well as individual businesses. The examples provided describe situations where the application of one of the principles or lack thereof best explains a real or intended outcome. Importantly, that doesn’t mean that all 11 other principles are irrelevant to the case; however, they may simply not be as obvious. Ideally, a Permatourism project would be guided by all 12 principles, even if with varying degrees of importance.
Principle 1: Observe and interact. By taking the time to engage with different stakeholders in a local tourism ecosystem (e.g. tourists, tour retailers, microentrepreneurs, TDA, residents) we can design solutions that suit each community’s characteristics.

In a fast-paced, growth-oriented capitalist society we often say that "time is money". Accordingly, research on the impact of management-imposed time pressure suggests that actors in the business ecosystem cope with time constraints by reducing the amount of trust and knowledge-sharing with others (Thomas, Fugate, & Koukova, 2011). While universities are not immune to neo-liberal imperatives (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2000; Bunds & Giardina, 2017), academic teams engaged with destinations tend to have more flexibility and time than tourism boards or consulting firms, as suggested by the following examples.

The Outer-Banks are a prime beach destination for thousands of vacationers in North Carolina, where many visitors opt to rent out self-catered homes for convenience and savings. While this model serves homeowners and real estate agencies well, many of these vacation home renters arrive to their destination with home-bought groceries, which represents a significant revenue loss for local farmers. This problem was observed by researchers at NC State University, who reached out to local extension offices, TDAs, NGOs, real estate agencies, and farmers, in a combined effort to develop a system that provided weekly fractions of farm production shares to vacationers (Vause, 2019). This initiative, titled Vacationer Supported Agriculture was only possible because researchers had been engaging with communities across the state for years through participatory-action research (Morais et al., 2017) which gave them the necessary insight into market conditions, and the needed relationships with local public and private partners.
Similarly, in Mexico, the University of Guadalajara works directly with rural communities invested in tourism social enterprise, by assigning graduate students to different sites where they work side by side with community members to develop heritage and nature trails, create business plans and management solutions, and identify consumer profiles (Espinoza Sanchéz, Camacho Valdéz, Gordian Dávila, Covarrubias Rubio, 2011). In such cases, graduate research becomes more than a mere theoretical exercise, as it is grounded in real life experiences and granted practical application for the benefit of communities.

Hence, universities could take advantage of their network centrality (Huggins, Prokop, Thompson, 2019) in the tourism ecosystem, institutional legitimacy, and engaged scholarship mandates to embrace this principle, i.e. to take the time to observe and interact with communities long-term, and to develop and assess socio-entrepreneurial solutions to persistent, even common shortcomings of tourism.

**Principle 2: Catch and store energy.** *By developing systems that collect resources when they are abundant, we can use them in times of need.*

Farrell and Twining-Ward (2004) contend that complex adaptive tourism systems share many affinities with other ecosystems, including a continuous loop resembling a reclining figure eight, which represents the flow of energy in the form of human capital, energy, materials, or investment. Importantly, the front loop represents a steady movement towards conservation, characterized by the accumulation of energy.
In the Permatourism approach, universities and other community stakeholders must develop human capital, particularly in the form of homegrown tourism entrepreneurs. First, universities should strengthen their tourism educational offerings with entrepreneurial curricula that enable future graduates to start their own ventures (Ferreira, Morais, & Brothers, 2019); second, local authorities should strive to develop a broad scope tourism product that includes small businesses (Morais & Ferreira, 2019). The importance of having high local human and social capital becomes apparent when a tourism system or destination is disturbed, and instability ensues. The Permatourism development process involves building both the local capacity to understand the challenges and opportunities afforded by tourism and the social and human capital to address them. This way, when a destination enters decline or crisis and uncertainty abounds, there are local entrepreneurial individuals, the “movers and shakers” (Russell & Faulkner, 1999), to identify and tackle new opportunities and lead the destinations’ path to rejuvenation. However, if human energy is not “caught and stored” in due time in the form of local microentrepreneurs, who understand the tourism system and market forces, and possess the necessary skills and network ties, the destinations will be in constant peril to be seized without a fight by external capital (Barr, 1990).

**Principle 3: Obtain a yield.** *Ensure that you are getting truly useful rewards as part of the work that you are doing.*

Tourism yield generally refers to economic and financial gains accruing from tourism at a destination or country (Northcote & Macbeth, 2006). The authors further explain that it is important to measure the real impacts of tourism, in an industry under public scrutiny
known to cause a lot of environmental, social and cultural distress. The same line of thought should be applied to the micro level, for example on farm tourism, in the sense that each farm tourism microentrepreneurs should be concerned with the assessment of tangible economic benefits from this activity, considering all the valuable resources that go into it, such as time, purchase of liability insurance, website management, or infrastructure upgrades (e.g. tillets, picnic area). Accordingly, we notice that there are many farmers showcasing a romanticized vision of agritourism, sometimes with no real intention to monetize it, wherein educating the public emerges frequently as their main motivation for embracing this activity. While there’s many ways farmers can obtain a yield from farm tourism, which may or may not involve direct charges for experiences (e.g. direct sales, brand awareness), nonetheless there should be an explicit and deliberate effort towards generating and measuring value. Accordingly, Schilling, Attavanich, and Jin (2014), contend that impacts of tourism on farm income are rarely assessed by objective means, rather through the farmer’s own informal, qualitative and unreliable judgement. Moreover, according to Barbieri (2017) que question of whether agritourism is a profitable activity has not been settled in the literature. In the worst-case scenario, some farmers may be wasting valuable resources on an activity that is not having an impact on farm profitability, being thus a futile distraction from other activities more critical to their farms’ viability.

**Principle 4: Apply self-regulation & accept feedback.** *We need to discourage inappropriate activity to ensure that systems can continue to function well.*

The need for the application of self-regulation in the tourism ecosystem is expressed in Butler’s (1980) destination life cycle model. According to Butler, reaching the carrying
capacity of a destination triggers an inflection of the growth curve towards decline if measures are not implemented towards the rejuvenation of that destination. This may be the case of Venice, where overtourism is collapsing the city physically and socially, to the point that anti-tourism movements are calling for a \textit{trexit} (exit from tourism) despite an anticipated economic breakdown (Seraphin, Sheeran, & Pilato, 2018). Moreover, in nearby Barcelona, the Guardian reported that slogans such as “Tourists go home, refugees welcome” started appearing on city walls and anti-tourism protests have taken place in Venice, Rome, Amsterdam, Florence, Berlin, Lisbon, and Palma de Mallorca (Burgen, 2018).

Overtourism refers to a stage of tourism development in which private and public stakeholders were propelled by the growth imperative and excluded the input or regulation by local residents. In those situations, the local community becomes extremely antagonistic towards the industry and resentful towards tourists. All-out \textit{trexits} are often not feasible for tourism dependent destinations, therefore overtourism and tourismphobia are being hotly debated among destination authorities who are considering built-in self-regulation and community feedback mechanisms in future destination strategic plans (Martins, 2018).

\textbf{Principle 5: Use & value renewable resources & services.} \textit{Make the best use of the community’s abundance to reduce leakage and dependence on imported labor and goods.}

Tourism advocates have historically put forth that tourism-generated foreign exchange is a necessary condition to stagnate inflation that affects many destinations in the developing world (Hawkins & Mann, 2007). According to Gmelch (2012), they were backed by neoclassical economists, who predicted that for each dollar spent on a vacation, 80 cents plus would trickle down to the local economy. Presently, there is staggering evidence that
the proportion might often be in the reverse order, that is eighty percent leaked to the West in the form of imports or share-holder dividends (Smith & Jenner, 1992).

Given that food alone may account for as much as 30% of the tourist expenditure, according to Thomas-Francois, Von Massow and Joppe (2017b) a reduction of food imports would significantly help reduce leakage in the Caribbean. However, they acknowledge that this is a hard proposition given that local products are hard to obtain due to a declining agriculture, and that the quality is generally low. Even in Mexico, a major beef producer, Torres (2003) reported that 25% of meats consumed at high-end hotels are grain-fed prime-cuts imported from the US due to the clientele’s preference over grass-fed Mexican beef.

Sourcing foods locally has nevertheless some advantages that have been leveraged by a luxury resort in the Caribbean country of Grenada to cater to a high-profile, discerning clientele eager to experience a “taste of place” (Thomas-Francois, Von Massow, & Joppe (2017a). According to the authors, tourists arrive with the expectation to be served foods indigenous to Grenada in what is called “Caribbean Fusion” cuisine (traditional island recipes with a modern touch). Importantly, this value proposition was co-created by the resort management in collaboration with a network of 80 local trusted farmers, who seem to take pride in supplying an award-winning hospitality unit. To accommodate periods of larger demand, the staff shares information on the resort’s occupancy and holds periodic meetings with farmers to communicate estimated product needs for the season. Farmers are also paid a higher market price, benefit from reliable income, and spare themselves the hassle of having to sell at multiple local markets.
Principle 6: Produce no waste. By valuing and making use of all the resources that are available to us, nothing goes to waste.

Holmgren (2017) bemoans the waste of human resources due to a global economy that devalues traditional skills and precludes people from applying informal, ancient knowledge productively. While the hospitality service sector benefits from the cheap labor of uneducated and unskilled workers, under circumstances tourism can in fact sustain dying skills and bring back defunct traditions. For example, Morais, Wallace, Rodrigues, España, & Wang (2014) reported that “(tourism) microentrepreneurs are interested in showcasing their traditional knowledge and they proclaim to play a key role in the survival of that knowledge” (p. 348). They give the example of a basket-maker in Portugal, apparently the last of 25 basket-makers in this village, who is still able to make a living because tourism brings him customers interested in the artistic as well as the functional value of his pieces. A famous example of the recuperation of a forlorn tradition by way of tourism was the revival of Bali’s traditional dance repertoire (Picard, 1990; Putri, 2017). Despite religious hard-liners condemning any performance for commercial gain, the Balinese have been able to generate income from tourism, while becoming self-conscious spectators of the Indonesianization of their own culture (Picard, 1990).

One other way we can look at this principle is through the lenses of entrepreneurial bricolage (Fisher, 2012). This unorthodox form of entrepreneurship occurs in resource-constrained environments in which entrepreneurs are nonetheless able to create something from nothing, making do with the few resources they have available. Ferreira, Morais, Brother, Brookins, and Jakes (2019) observed how communitarian entrepreneurs in Playa
Gande, Mexico, were able to turn a largely unproductive tract of land into a productive multi-activity ecopark, using extensively in-house, amateur and self-taught skills, as well as combining and reusing resources to explore different niches and jump into opportunities as they arose.

**Principle 7: Design from patterns to details.** By stepping back, we can observe patterns in the community and the industry. These can form the backbone of our designs, with the details filled in as we go.

This principle is patent in the idea that microentrepreneurs are most successful when they align themselves with opportunities made available by the formal tourism industry or with business trends that influence customers behavior. For example, North Carolina enjoys a vibrant foodie scene spearheaded by a “sisterhood” of chefs and producers, as reported by Severson (2015). And, the farm-to-table model capitalizes on a certain fetishization of the connections between chefs and farmers, chefs and consumers, and, importantly, farmers and consumers Weiss (2012). Accordingly, the Fork to Farmer movement (Morais, Jakes, Bowen, & Lelekacs, 2017) engages farmers, restaurateurs, chefs, local extension offices and local destination management authorities to create a value proposition centered on the farmer, promising foodies authentic farm experiences with the passionate local farmers that supply high-end farm-to-table restaurants. The initiative uses short videos to entice foodies to engage in independent farm experiences or participate in “food journeys”, creating the demand necessary to afford farmers an alternative farm revenue source.

**Principle 8: Integrate rather than segregate.** By putting the right things in the right place, relationships develop between them and they support each other.
This principle operationalizes one of the central tenets of Permatourism — the symbiotic relationships between interzonal system actors. Permatourism’s vision of an integrated tourism destination is unabashedly at odds with the model of enclave tourism, which is designed to minimize interactions between tourists and local formal and informal businesses (Freitag, 1994). The enclave model is best exemplified by self-contained, all-inclusive resorts which lead to segregation between locals and tourists, marginalizing locals and creating socioeconomic apartheids (Wilson, 2008).

While the enclave model is still the modus operandi in most of the pleasure periphery, destination management authorities and tourism consulting firms are starting to recognize that today’s leisure vacation traveler is looking for unique, experiential opportunities, that could and should be complementary to the formal industry (Destinations International, 2019). In Raleigh, NC, these experiences can range from a downtown coffee shop stroll by a local artist, a hands-on sustainable farming experience with a local grower, or a thrift shopping expedition with a resident. Accordingly, the reputable consulting firm Jones Lang LaSalle (2018), advised the Greater Raleigh CVB to develop “authentic visitor experiences that are customized to traveler preferences and that allow for a scale that would have measurable impact on Wake County’s overnight visitation” (p. 95). In the wake of this report, tourism stakeholders and economic development authorities in the county are devising plans to devote financial and human resources to increase and curate the inventory of microentrepreneurs and experiences.
**Principle 9: Use small and slow solutions.** Small and slow approaches are easier to implement and maintain than big ones, making better use of local resources and producing more sustainable outcomes.

Holmgren (2017) contends that for any given production system there is an optimum scale for best productivity and management efficiency. Expanding the operation beyond this optimum commands energy input until a new equilibrium is achieved, and in some cases a whole new different production system may be required. Accordingly, in the tourism ecosystem, microentrepreneurs often prefer “staying within the fence” (Ateljevic & Doorne, 2000) rather than pursuing unbridled growth, operating at levels deemed sufficient to support self-employment and a desired lifestyle (Ferreira, Morais, Pollack, & Bunds, 2018). For example, we can think of a small, successful, often fully booked, family-owned and operated restaurant seating only a limited number of customers, but generating enough revenue to support full-time employment for four family members. While expanding the operation could make sense given the success of the restaurant, it would likely force the family to move out of the neighborhood in search for larger space, get a high-interest loan to buy equipment and furniture, hire external staff, and obtain new licenses. Also, it could require changes in the production system such as serving quicker preparation dishes in lieu of the slow, traditional cooking that brought fame to the restaurant in the first place. Most importantly, the family would compromise greatly their quality of life just trying to make ends meet until reaching new system equilibrium.

Just as in the case of size, there is also an optimum speed for the implementation of production systems (Holmgren, 2017). In tourism, economic and political forces, accelerate
the pace of development to levels beyond the ability of adaptation by local people and companies. Accordingly, Gurung and DeCoursey (2000) described how tourism growth in Mustang, Nepal, was just “too much too fast”, getting out of control in just a few years. Interestingly, the plan looked good on paper, from several checks and balances mechanisms in place to the high-level government commitment to give back 60% of the tourism revenue for rural development and environmental conservation. Despite the government's good intentions, they decided to ignore a local agency's recommendation to postpone the process of opening up Mustang three years, the time deemed necessary to train the local community to manage lodges and campsites, and build basic infrastructure to support the influx of tourists. In addition, the number of allowed international visitors which was set to 200 increased 5-fold in the span of just one year, putting in evidence even more the unpreparedness of the community and the lack of infrastructure. The authors then conclude that “a slow, iterative planning and management style based on a small pilot project would have been more appropriate to Mustang [emphasis added]” (p. 253).

Principle 10: Use and value diversity. Diversity reduces vulnerability to a variety of threats and takes advantage of the unique characteristics of the tourism business ecosystem.

A self-evident interpretation of this principle is that minority and subaltern groups in a destination should participate and provide their unique perspectives and concerns in the decision-making processes in a way that they can also benefit from the industry. The problem with the latter statement is not the cliché itself, but rather the fact that diversity alone is not a guarantee of system stability, if it does not translate into relevant functional connections to a self-regulating system (Holmgren, 2017). Hence, the failure of the project
in Mustang, which despite presenting, at the outset, actors from many different spheres of the tourism ecosystem (residents, microentrepreneurs, tour operators, local and central government, non-profits), it was marred by poorly defined stakeholder roles and relations, which with time contributed to eroding mutual trust and caused the project to fall in disarray (Gurung & DeCoursey, 2000).

The importance of functional connections or symbiotic relationships (in Permatourism lingo) is apparent on the role that the very same species, or actor, can play in different ecosystems. For example, authorities cracked down on short term rental accommodations (STRA) platforms, in particular Airbnb, in Paris, Barcelona, and Santa Monica, Ca. (Investopedia, 2019) in an effort to curb gentrification, overtourism and tourismphobia. It is important to note that in popular city destinations the availability of beds in the formal hospitality sector is seldom a problem; which has raised the question of unfair competition for hotels, aggravated by the fact that short term rental accommodations don’t seem to create any additional value to the community and local economy (Reinhold & Dolnicar, 2017). On the other hand, the proliferation of Airbnbs in rural areas has had positive effects in less travelled rural regions who suffered from chronic shortage of accommodation infrastructure (Cvelbar & Dolnicar, 2017). Not only are property owners able to generate some extra needed income, especially important in the case of women on maternity leave or temporarily unemployed people, but also properties are in constant need of repair, maintenance, and local products, which in and of itself is another strong mechanism through which airbnbs can reenergize economically depressed communities (Sigala & Dolnicar, 2017).
**Principle 11: Use edges & value the marginal.** *The interface between things is where the most interesting events take place. These are often the most valuable, diverse and interesting elements in the system.*

Lamprey-eels are jawless, slimy, blood sucking fish which epitomize people’s neophilia/neophobia ambivalence when it comes to food (Mennell, Murcott, & van Otterloo, 1992). Until recently a marginal food in central Portugal, the lamprey was only consumed by the clergy and nobility classes (Correia & Fonseca, 2010), known for their exquisite palate, or by impoverished riverside communities who saw in it an affordable and abundant source of protein (L. Amante, personal communication, August 26, 2019).

Then, abundance turned into scarcity due to the disruption of migration routes and obstructed access to spawning grounds caused by the construction of dams. This prompted a local organization, the Brotherhood of the Lamprey, to lobby local authorities to protect the species on the one hand, and leverage its economic potential on the other, as it catered to a rising “neolocalism” (Flack, 1997). In order to make it more appealing to outsiders, popular chefs were seen periodically on national TV elegantly preparing lamprey dishes, and the municipality sponsored the participation in the national contest ‘7 Wonders of Portuguese Gastronomy’, broadcasted during prime time. As expected, the efforts undertaken by the Brotherhood and the local authorities led to an increased influx of tourists, with significant economic impact in the food and hospitality sectors.

Cognizant of its importance for the local economy, local and central governments funded the installation of fish ladders and the construction of waste-water treatment plants. Moreover, fishing was tightly controlled and even projects for the construction of new dams
came to a halt, so that the fish stock could increase up to a sustainable level. While the lamprey will perhaps never stop being a marginal product, distasteful to many, its notoriety has attracted thousands of gourmets and their families, who if unmoved by the main dish always have the option of more mainstream local gastronomic delicacies. According to Valadares and Ribeiro (2013), “what occurred with the lamprey in the Baixo Mondego region can be regarded as a textbook example of sustainable tourism management and preservation of local heritage” (p. 206). Moreover, it is a testimony to the power of market-based solutions leveraging the economic muscle of tourism in the protection of the environment, made possible through symbiotic relationships between the government spheres, local associations and the formal sector.

**Principle 12: Creatively use and respond to change.** We can have a positive impact on inevitable change by carefully observing, and then intervening at the right time.

As seen in Principle 2, change and uncertainty are inherent parts of an ecosystem. Given they are not anomalies, actors in the tourism ecosystem will only be as resilient as their ability to accept these terms and understand that operating under the assumptions of stability is not a good business strategy (Ruiz-Ballesteros, 2011). Holmgren (2017) concurs in that, when dealing with powerful external forces, resistance and rigidity are not nearly as effective as dynamic stability. That said, one can’t stop wondering why the taxicab industry has elected to fight ride-sharing apps by lobbying regulators to slow down their growth (Wallsten, 2015), instead of upgrading taxi service or moving into business niches. Even if we agree that the taxicab industry is overly and unfairly regulated, in the few cases they’ve actually succeeded in obtaining more favourable regulations or preventing ride-sharing
platforms to operate at all, it may be nothing more than a short life line as self-driving cars are a near-future inevitability (Yang & Coughlin, 2014).

In the meanwhile, there might still be some opportunities available in specialized transportation services, such as 1) a kids taxi to drop them off at soccer practice or pick them up from a play date, in the face of parents’ hectic schedules (profitableventure, 2019); 2) a medical taxi to transport non-urgent patients who are unable to drive themselves (profitableventure, 2019); or, in the context of Vacationer Supported Agriculture (discuss in principle 1), 3) a “veggies” taxi to aggregate and/or deliver VSA produce to vacationers at their vacation rentals, given that farmers are usually disinclined to take on tasks that push them away from the farm. Unfortunately for taxi drivers, Uber has certainly excelled at applying principle 12, and recently moved into the business of food delivery, capitalizing on their growing pool of microentrepreneurs and technological advantage, as well as a careful reading of the marketplace which craved for a higher variety of food to be delivered at home.

Table 2.1. Permatourism principles

<p>| Principle 1: Observe and interact. By taking the time to engage with the different stakeholders in the local tourism ecosystem (e.g. tourists, tour retailers, microentrepreneurs, TDA, residents) we can design solutions that suit our community’s situation. |
| Principle 2: Catch and store energy. By developing systems that collect resources when they are abundant, we can use them in times of need. |
| Principle 3: Obtain a yield. Ensure that you are getting truly useful rewards as part of the work that you are doing. |
| Principle 4: Apply self-regulation &amp; accept feedback. We need to discourage inappropriate activity to ensure that systems can continue to function well. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 5: Use &amp; value renewable resources &amp; services. Make the best use of the community's abundance to reduce leakage and dependence on imported labor and goods.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 6: Produce no waste. By valuing and making use of all the resources that are available to us, nothing goes to waste.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 7: Design from patterns to details. By stepping back, we can observe patterns in the community and the industry. These can form the backbone of our designs, with the details filled in as we go.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 8: Integrate rather than segregate. By putting the right things in the right place, relationships develop between them and they support each other.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 9: Use small and slow solutions. Small and slow approaches are easier to implement and maintain than big ones, making better use of local resources and producing more sustainable outcomes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 10: Use and value diversity. Diversity reduces vulnerability to a variety of threats and takes advantage of the unique characteristics of the tourism business ecosystem.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 11: Use edges &amp; value the marginal. The interface between things is where the most interesting events take place. These are often the most valuable, diverse and interesting elements in the system.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 12: Creatively use and respond to change. We can have a positive impact on inevitable change by carefully observing, and then intervening at the right time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. Permatourism zones

The zones and sectors in permaculture site design are the best understood concepts of Permaculture (Holmgren, 2017). When adapted to the context of a tourism system, it allows us to visualize the relative location of the different actors (i.e., zones) and the forces (i.e., sectors) they are subjected to. Unlike the original model, where the zones might be partly physical and geographical in Permatourism they are purely conceptual (Figure 2.1).
They represent layers of distinct types of involvement in the industry, in a decreasing power of influence, stemming from Zone 0, the pull-factor, and reaching out to Zone 4, residents who are ultimately impacted by the influx of visitors. Conversely, under the right conditions, locals can start and run small tourism semi-formal and informal businesses, take a leap towards formality if there is a market advantage, then form or take part in professional associations and civic organizations in charge of destination management and consultancy, and in select cases, become one of the destination’s pull factors.

Figure 2.1. Permatourism site design

One may be skeptical that previously disenfranchised residents would ever be able to climb such a steep mountain, and we should not be so naïve as to ignore the structural forces which maintain the status quo. Nevertheless, one should be reminded that Permatourism is about leveraging microentrepreneurship to foster agency, self-determination and self-efficacy among locals. And, the “peasants turned tourism entrepreneurs” of Puerto Vallarta provide
us evidence that such climb is possible, when their community owned eco-resorts are starting to become one of the destination’s most sought-after attractions (Ortiz Lopez, Chávez Dagostino, & García García, 2017).

The Permaculture site design can be used to assess the scope and economic impact of the local tourism product, be it a daytrip, a journey or an all-inclusive package. The idea here is to involve all zones in the model so that money spent at the destination can permeate through all sectors of the population. For example, a tourist would be drawn to the destination by its pull-factor (Zone 0), e.g. pristine nature, which had been promoted by the destination management authority (Zone 1), stay at a formal hospitality unit such as a boutique hotel (Zone 2), and book a guided tour to a historic neighborhood from a local artist (Zone 3). Moreover, research suggests that bridging ties with formal actors contributes positively towards the success as well as entrepreneurial intentions of microentrepreneurs (KC, Morais, Smith, Peterson, & Seekamp, 2019; Ferreira et al., forthcoming). Therefore, multi-zone bundles and partnerships should be encouraged and supported by local authorities to foster a unique, rich, locally owned tourism product.

7. Implications for practice

Permatourism is a social innovation because it uses creative and novel solutions to solve complex problems created by profit-driven tourism development, such as inequitable distribution of income, changes in the social fabric of communities, and environmental degradation. Moreover, it does so by addressing these problems at their root, i.e. at the planning stages of tourism development. Hence, Permatourism tries to bring about social change, rather than just the amelioration of the conditions of locals through the provision of
services. And, by deeply changing the way the tourism system works, often to the benefit of corporations, we are increasing the resilience of locals by enabling them to pursue microentrepreneurial opportunities offered by a more democratic tourism marketplace. Not only are they able to generate much needed income from sharing their passions and skills with visitors, the sense of ownership, pride and self-esteem accrued from owning a local microenterprise feed into a self-determined, self-reliant model of community development (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010). Accordingly, it is not so much about “giving power” as it is to create the conditions that enable people to empower themselves, through leadership, voice, employment and entrepreneurship. By creating the economic opportunities and allowing the community to tap into resource rich social networks, we are enabling community members to be in the driver’s seat of their lives, in their own pursuit of liberation and well-being.

At its core, Permatourism postulates that destination managers must find ways to integrate microentrepreneurs into the tourism system in ways that benefit the formal sector and that advance the interests of the community. Doing so will make the local tourism product a lot more vibrant, rich and competitive, and it will engage the local host community in a positive way so that they become proud brand ambassadors of their destination.

8. Implications for theory

Farrell and Twining-Ward (2004) postulate that there is a comprehensive body of literature on the individual components of the tourism business ecosystem components individually, but less is known about the interactions between them and their functions in the system. Hence, Permatourism could be the systems ecology framework necessary to
examine the evolution of select destinations in terms of periods of growth, stagnation, decline or rejuvenation where traditional cookie cutter, cause-effect approaches can’t equate the complexity of the system.

Moreover, considering that Permatourism model is premised on a symbiotic alignment between formal and informal sectors, it would be useful to explore the extent to which psychological mechanisms such as entrepreneurial self-efficacy among tourism microentrepreneurs could be predicted by the level of bridging ties they have with formal private sector partners, public sector support agencies, and with other peers. Research on this topic should look at the effectiveness of tailored Permatourism interventions in facilitating the integration of informal local businesses into the local tourism product and its impact on individuals’ intentions to take on entrepreneurship in the future.

Finally, destinations characterized by top-down development concede scarce economic opportunities for locals, which are thought to be victims of tourism-generated socioeconomic apartheid (Wilson, 2008). However, there is evidence that in some destinations communities have been able to overcome structural barriers and thrive through providing complementary services to the formal industry (Sánchez González, 2017). Hence, Permatourism could be used to examine microentrepreneurs’ adaptation strategies that optimize scarce opportunities, through their businesses’ alignment with outstanding opportunities afforded by the formal sector. Conversely, it is possible that despite alignment with the formal sector, in propensive exclusionary environments (e.g. enclave tourism) aggravated by the natural competitive nature of business and the higher leverage of large formal sector business partners, small local businesses might be relegated to a passive, irrelevant role, and ultimate failure.
9. Conclusion

Permatourism is conceptual framework, a practical tool kit, and a social innovation, which leverages the economic muscle of the formal tourism industry to generate business opportunities to disenfranchised locals. It advances our understanding of the tourism informal economy, sheds new light on the operationalization of intersectoral linkages and its benefits to the local tourism experience, and could assist tourism governance officials in justifying investment towards supporting initiatives that aim at engaging the informal sphere.
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CHAPTER 3: The Effect of Synergies Between the Informal and Formal Tourism Sectors on Farmers’ Tourism Microentrepreneurial Intentions

Abstract

Scholars are increasingly interested in exploring ways to catalyze tourism microentrepreneurship to enhance destination equity and competitiveness. Leveraging the popularity of the foodie scene, signature farm tourism is emerging as one of the most promising niches for tourism microentrepreneurs. However, both psychological and structural constraints seem to be holding farmers back in their intention to start offering farm experiences or expanding their existing farm tourism portfolio. We argue that Permatourism-enabled bridging social capital affords farmers sources of entrepreneurial self-efficacy, which in turn enhances entrepreneurial intention. To test our conceptual model, we surveyed 207 farmers in North Carolina and used Structural Equation Modeling to examine the hypothesized relationships between constructs. Analysis revealed an adequate model fit and strong significant relationships between bridging social capital and both dimensions of tourism microentrepreneurial self-efficacy. Internal self-efficacy factors were strongly and significantly associated with entrepreneurial intention, while adapting to externalities self-efficacy was non-significant. Triangulation of these statistical results with qualitative data from five years of participatory action-research with farm tourism microentrepreneurs in the study region reinforced the importance of informal networking processes to model entrepreneurial behavior and receive positive reinforcement that boosts self-efficacy and reaffirms microentrepreneurial intentions. In turn, farm tourism microentrepreneurs’ adaptancy to externalities is not influencing their intentions because they operate under a significant level of uncertainty in face of their inability to obtain definitive answers about key policy, liability and business support issues.

Target outlet: Tourism Planning and Development
1. Introduction

There is a growing call for empirically-based and theoretically-driven solutions to support tourism microentrepreneurship (TMEship) initiatives, which stand to enhance the authenticity, uniqueness and competitiveness of the destination (Hallak, Brown, & Lindsay, 2012; Morais, Ferreira, Gaharamani, & Nazariadli, 2017; Jones Lang LaSalle, 2018; Destinations International, 2019; Çakmak, Lie, & Selwyn, 2019). Leveraging the popularity of the foodie scene (Weiss, 2019), signature farm tourism is emerging as one of the most promising niches for tourism microentrepreneurs (TMEneurs) (Morais, Lelekacs, Jakes, & Bowen, 2017; Ferreira, Morais, Bowen, & Jakes, forthcoming). In addition to diversifying farm income (Barbieri, 2017), agritourism contributes to the preservation of productive agricultural lands (Vafadari, 2013) and the empowerment of rural women (Garcia-Ramon, Canoves & Valdovinos, 1995). However, farm tourism is uncharted territory for most farmers who may not be confident entering a new business line they may know little about (Mikko Vesala, Peura, & McElwee, 2007; Haugen & Vik, 2008; Joyner, Kline, Oliver, & Kariko, 2018). In addition, destination management authorities have not adequately reached out to farmers, and thus have not consistently incorporated farm experiences in the local tourism product (McGehee, 2007). In the current work, we seek to explore the effect of symbiotic vertical and horizontal relationships between farmers and actors in the tourism business ecosystem on farmers’ intentions to offer or expand the existing portfolio of farm tourism activities. We posit that permatourism-induced bridging social capital affords farmers various sources of entrepreneurial self-efficacy, which leads to increased entrepreneurial intention.
2. Background

2.1. Farm tourism

There has been an increased demand and supply of farm tourism experiences over the last decades (Barbieri, Xu, Gil-Arroyo, & Rich, 2016). Agritourists seek educational and recreational experiences, quality of life enhancement and socialization opportunities, and relaxation (Srikatanyoo & Campiranon, 2010; Barbieri, 2017). A sense of nostalgia evoked by farmscapes, also seems to drive some visitors (Joyner, Kline, Oliver, & Kariko, 2018). Farmers see farm tourism has one way to generate supplemental farm income to retain family farmland and lifestyle in the face of financial pressure (Ollenburg & Buckley, 2007), such as the continued price drop of commodity crops (Barbieri & Mahoney, 2009) and the demise of tobacco farming (Benson, 2008).

Importantly, agritourism also provides the opportunity for the diversification of product lines, with some farmers switching to specialty crops as increasingly more people shorten their food supply chains to support local farmers (Schilling, Sullivan, & Komar, 2012). Accordingly, the local foods movement has been instrumental in this transition by affording farmers additional outlets to outflow their products such as farmers markets, community supported agriculture (CSA), and more recently direct sales to high end farm-to-table restaurants (Morais, Lelekacs, Jakes, & Bowen, 2017). In turn, foodies eager to learn more about where their food comes from may increase the demand for farm experiences (Chase, Stewart, Schilling, Smith, & Walk, 2018).

However, farm tourism continues to be uncharted territory to many farmers who fear that tourism will detract from their traditional farming lineage. For example, Ohe (2018) found that Japanese farmers with a more traditional farming identity were reluctant to
charge for experiences, providing these services merely out of social responsibility. Similarly, in Finland, farmers with a diversified portfolio of income generating farm-related businesses (i.e., portfolio farmers) had higher perceived entrepreneurial identities than traditional farmers, but lower entrepreneurial identities than other non-farm entrepreneurs (Mikko Vesala, Peura, & McElwee, 2007). Additionally, some farmers are reluctant to open their farms to visitors because they fear legal liability (Centner, 2010; Pegas, Ollenburg, & Tynon, 2013), which has prompted rural development agencies such as Cooperative Extension to deliver training to farmers on the identification of operational improvements and the adoption of best practices in the areas of farm safety and liability management (Infante-Casella, 2018). Furthermore, there is an apparent disconnect between farmers’ perceptions and the likely experiences and imagery sought after by urban tourists (Joyner, Kline, Oliver, & Kariko, 2018; Nazariadli, Morais, Bunds, Baran, & Supak, 2019). Finally, they may be worried that agritourism will drain time and resources from farming, and are skeptical whether or not there is actually money to be earned in farm tourism (Schilling, Attavanich, & Jin, 2014). With so many perceived barriers for farmers’ entry into tourism entrepreneurship, it is not surprising that many farmers are not interested in becoming involved in farm-based tourism (Haugen & Vik, 2008; Galluzzo, 2018). Nevertheless, we believe that these perceived constraints should not preclude farmers from attaining the economic and non-economic benefits afforded by diversification into agritourism. Hence, there is a need to better understand how to support them and increase their entrepreneurial intentions.
2.2. Social Capital

Research on community-based tourism has consistently identified the critical role of social capital in influencing individuals’ involvement in tourism entrepreneurship (Jones, 2005; Pawson, D’Arcy, & Richardson, 2017; Diedrich, Benham, Pandihau, & Sheaves, 2019; Musavengane, 2019). Indeed, social capital is a dominant theory in the broader social sciences, gaining wide acceptance in Academia as a successful theoretical perspective to understand social relations (Narayan & Cassidy, 2001). The concept also found its way to everyday language through general circulation magazines, rapidly becoming a panacea to all ills afflicting society (Portes, 1998). It has been widely used in tourism research, although some find it a “slippery construct” because it is difficult to operationalize due to the fact that it is context-dependent (Jones, 2005; McGehee, Lee, & O’Bannon, 2010; Rodriguez-Giron & Vanneste, 2019). Social capital, as contemporarily conceptualized, was first defined by Bordieu (1986) as “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition – or in other words, to membership in group” (p. 286).

Not surprisingly, social capital is often conceptualized as a positive asset in the sense that more is better, and that it may enhance outcomes desirable to individuals or communities (Portes, 1998; Lin, 2002). For example, Jones (2005) found that a high level of social capital manifested particularly in locals’ commitment to collective action was instrumental to the development of a community-run ecotourism camp in Gambia. Similarly, Diedrich, Benham, Pandihau, and Sheaves (2019) reported that fishermen with higher social capital perceived fewer entry barriers to start and operate sportfishing tourism microenterprises in Papua New Guinea. Likewise, informal tourism microentrepreneurs in
Thailand considered their social networks crucial for accessing economic capital through sharing information about business opportunities (Çakmak, Lie, & Selwyn, 2019).

However, the “more is better” approach may be over-simplistic, considering that excessive embeddedness in a social network may be counterproductive in close-knit groups who may turn their backs to the outside (Portes, 1998; Agnitsch, Flora, & Ryan, 2006). Moreover, Uzzi (1996) posited that embeddedness yields positive returns only up to a certain point, after which they turn negative. Similarly, findings from a study with wildlife tourism microentrepreneurs suggest that higher numbers of business ties tend to diminish the levels of trust, reciprocity, and togetherness toward connected microentrepreneurs (KC, B., Morais, Smith, Peterson, & Seekamp, 2019).

It is important to distinguish between two different forms of social capital, bonding and bridging (Putnam, 1995). Bonding social capital is inherently “inward-looking”, and it promotes exclusive identities and homogeneous group characteristics, enabling access mostly to homogeneous resources common to every member. In turn, bridging social capital is inherently “outward-looking” and it fosters connection to other people or groups who are different from each other in some way, and therefore possessing heterogeneous resources from one another (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000).

Although KC, Morais, Peterson, Seekamp, and Smith (2019) found that business ties (e.g. bridging ties) were more prevalent than family and friends ties (e.g. bonding ties) among wildlife tourism microentrepreneurs, the latter were perceived as more important. Despite this, Rastrollo-Horrillo and Díaz (2019) reported that tourism medium and microenterprises’ ability to tap into resources provided by external agents impacted strongly their innovative behavior and success. Similar results were obtained by Martínez-
Pérez, Elche, García-Villaverde, and Parra-Requena (2019), who found that Spanish tourism enterprises with higher number of bridging ties outside a business cluster performed significantly better on radical innovation. We argue that by extending farmers’ networks to different levels of social ties within the tourism business ecosystem, farmers will be better prepared to take on farm tourism microentrepreneurship.

2.3. Permatourism

Rodriguez-Giron and Vanneste (2019) contend that social capital at destinations resides in three levels of social ties, namely internal ties in a group; bridging horizontal ties with new actors or groups; and linking vertical ties with actors or groups in power or in control of key resources. Similarly, Ferreira et al. (forthcoming) propose that the success of grassroots tourism initiatives depends on the ability of microentrepreneurs to establish symbiotic relationships with actors in three tiers of the Permatourism model. Namely, microentrepreneurs should network with other microentrepreneurs, with formal private tourism sector actors, and with destination managers and other support organizations. Permatourism is a destination management framework which pursues the complementarity between formal private and public actors, local microentrepreneurs and grassroots community social structures. Accordingly, Karampela, Kavroudakis, and Kizos (2019) reported that the symbiosis with “conventional” tourism in the Greek islands sustains local agritourism, due to limited accessibility and high travel costs to those islands, which otherwise would deter outside visitors.

The Permatourism model is divided in five conceptual zones, 0 through 4, starting outwards from the destinations’ pull factor, followed by local government branches and support agencies, then the tourism formal sector, afterwards the informal
microentrepreneurial sector, and finally residents. In the context of farm tourism, symbioses refer to real working, mutually benefiting, relations between farm tourism microentrepreneurs (FTME) and 1) destination management authorities, cooperative extension services, professional organizations, university, and other economic development agencies; 2) chefs and restaurateurs; 3) other FMTEs.

An example of a Permatourism-grounded initiative would be the Fork to Farmer movement in North Carolina (Morais, Lelekacs, Jakes, & Bowen, 2017). In this project, a team of researchers partnered with multiple community stakeholders to produce a docu-series celebrating genuine relationships between local small farmers and chefs committed to source locally. The goal was primarily to use the power of social media to promote agritourism among patrons of iconic local farm-to-table restaurants. Notably, relationships with Zone 1 materialized with TDAs funding the video and marketing it through formal channels and agritourism training being delivered to FMTEs by extension agents; in Zone 2, chefs and restaurateurs endorsed the farm experiences and even organized “farm dinners” at the farm; and, in Zone 3, farmers who were on the fence whether to receive visitors in their farm, felt energized which facilitated the creation of county level networks of FTME by extension offices.

However, the literature also points out some potential limitations of farmers’ network ties. In Zone 1, destination managers are often unable to articulate the merits of agritourism to tourists and fail to incorporate such activities in the mainstream tourism product (McGehee, 2007; Barbieri, Stevenson, & Knollenberg, 2019). Likewise, small business development centers and agriculture extension agencies, unfamiliar with this activity, may be ill-equipped to provide support to farmers willing to diversify to farm-based tourism
(Arroyo, Barbieri, & Rich, 2013; Ferreira, Morais, Bowen, Jakes, forthcoming). In Zone 2, while collaborations between chefs and farmers are becoming increasingly popular, such events are often organized, managed and promoted by chefs, relegating the farmer to a secondary and passive role (Zaneti, 2017). Also, in a study conducted by Curtis, Cowee, Havercamp, Morris, and Gatzke (2008), evaluative assessments conducted with farmers and local chefs revealed that both groups lacked appropriate information concerning production possibilities, market needs, and customer preferences. In Zone 3, research has shown that, on the one hand a high number of network ties may be associated with lower levels of trust among tourism microentrepreneurs (KC, B., Morais, Smith, Peterson, & Seekamp, 2019), and on the other the informality of the networks tends to favor the importance of family ties in lieu of business ties (KC, Morais, Peterson, Seekamp, & Smith, 2019).

So far, we have described how under Permatourism conditions, farm tourism microentrepreneurs may develop elevated social capital among through bridging ties with various actors in the tourism business ecosystem, consequently granting them access to pools of resources not previously available to them. Next, we argue that interactions with salient actors in the 3 tiers of Permatourism also afford farmers opportunities for modelling entrepreneurial behavior and gaining entrepreneurial self-efficacy.

2.4. Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy, defined as one’s belief in one’s ability to succeed in a target behavior, is a dominant theoretical paradigm used to explain people’s motivation, effort, and perseverance in a task (Bandura, 1977). Self-efficacy theory holds that if people perceive themselves to be capable of accomplishing certain activities, they are more likely to undertake them in the future (Alkire, 2005). Moreover, self-efficacy will also influence an
individual's level of motivation, as reflected in how much effort one will exert in a task, and how long one will persevere in the face of obstacles (Bandura, 1980).

Concerning entrepreneurship, Boyd and Vozikis (1994) were pioneers in the development and validation of self-efficacy in the entrepreneurial setting (Moberg, 2013). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy (ESE) has been defined as one's belief in one's ability to perform entrepreneurial related tasks, and findings indicate it is a multidimensional construct (Chen, Greene & Crick, 1998; De Noble, Jung & Ehrlich, 1999; McGee, Peterson, Mueller & Sequeira, 2009; Moberg, 2013). Ferreira, Morais, Pollack and Bunds (2018) adapted the construct to tourism microentrepreneurship, defining it as one’s belief in one's ability to successfully perform the various roles and tasks of microentrepreneurship in the tourism e-business sector. In addition, confirmatory factor analysis on a sample of 300 urban tourism microentrepreneurs suggested that tourism e-microentrepreneurial self-efficacy (TeMSE) may be structured into five dimensions, including Pursuing Innovation, Marshaling Resources, Adapting to Externalities, Aligning Core Purpose with Self, and e-Marketing (Ferreira, Morais, Pollack & Bunds, 2018).

The examination of entrepreneurial self-efficacy among farm tourism microentrepreneurs is central to this study. Firstly, because of the amply documented positive relationship between self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intention (De Noble, Jung & Ehrlich, 1999; Markman, Balkin, & Baron, 2002; Arenius and Minniti, 2005; Markman, Baron, & Balkin, 2005; Wilson et al., 2007), and secondly because of the mediating role of self-efficacy on the impact of social capital on successful behaviour (fig.1) (Liñán & Santos, 2007; Brouwer, Jansen, Flache, & Hofman, 2016).
2.5. Hypotheses

Past studies showing a positive relationship between social capital and entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and between the latter and entrepreneurial intention form foundation for the argument that permatourism-enabled network ties can elevate farmers’
TeMSE levels, and consequently their intentions to start or add value to an existing farm tourism microenterprise. Hence, the research hypotheses were developed as follows:

**H1**
There is a positive relationship between bridging social capital and tourism e-microentrepreneurial self-efficacy

**H2**
There is a positive relationship between tourism e-microentrepreneurial self-efficacy and tourism microentrepreneurial intention.

3. **Method**

3.1. **Participatory action-research (PAR)**

This study subscribes to a transformative worldview (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010), wherein the research team and study participants are equals in the research process and pursue a shared horizon in which tourism is an enabler of socioeconomic prosperity in the community. Accordingly, literature in community psychology calls for transformational scholarship in the social sciences, stressing the uselessness of conventional, seemingly objective research of mainstream psychology and other social sciences (Davis, 2008; Seymour-Rolls & Hughes, 2000; Wisner, Stea, & Kruks, 1991). Hence, PAR goes beyond the boundaries of traditional paradigms of research that call for the least disturbance in the study environment, being instead a method primarily concerned with bringing about social change to participants in the research process (Seymour-Rolls & Hughes, 2000; Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010).
In terms of research methods, PAR can use either quantitative or qualitative methods or both (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010). In this study, PAR lends itself to a sequential methodology QUAL-QUANT-QUAL (Flick, 2014), wherein 1) qualitative approaches were used to co-generate research questions and develop the questionnaire; 2) a quantitative methods were utilized to test the hypotheses; and, 3) qualitative data was used to deepening and assessing results.

3.2. Qualitative data

Accordingly, all members of the research team have extensive experience working and conducting research with rural communities in North Carolina. In particular, over the course of the past five years, the lead researcher has made over 50 individual visits to farms, interviewed over 20 chefs involved in the local foods movement, met with upwards of 30 Cooperative Extension directors and destination managers, in the scope of multiple participatory-action research projects. In addition, the two lead researchers kept a reflexive journal throughout the research process where they recorded thoughts, highlights from impromptu conversations, and field observations (for examples see Flick, 2014; Morais, Ferreira, & Wallace, 2017; Nazariadli, Morais, Bunds, Baran, & Supak, 2019).

3.3. Quantitative data

The aim of this study is to better understand predictors of farmers' intentions to be involved in direct sales of product and experiences to visitors; therefore the research team sought to develop a database of North Carolina farms with varying degrees of involvement in the direct sales of products and experiences to the public. Accordingly, we created a database with 1,200 farms participating in projects like People-First Tourism and Fork to
Farmer, farms publicly listed in web databases like Appalachian Grown, visit NC farms, and Carolina Farm Stewardship, and farms listed in the web pages of select farm to table restaurants. Once the database was completed, we sought the input of select Extension county directors or agents to validate and supplement the list of farms in their respective counties.

A survey instrument was created and was first sent to peers and to committee members for suggestions on improvement and quality-check. Once the survey was edited and refined based on the feedback, it was submitted for IRB approval along with the detailed data collection plan. When IRB approval was obtained the survey was inserted into Qualtrics for online administration. The survey was first sent to select partners in rural North Carolina for pilot-testing. After receiving the results of pilot-testing, select revisions were made and the specific dates and times of the first invitation to participate in the survey and the subsequent four reminder emails were identified. The solicitations and reminders were scheduled to fall on various days of the week to include weekdays and weekends, and at various times of the day to foster a better response rate. At the end of the survey, participants were invited to enter their email address to qualify for a prompt participation incentive of a $25 gift certificate to a farm supply store. Specifically, the first 100 participants to complete the survey and volunteer their email address were notified of their gift certificate via email, and the gift certificates were sent to them via snail mail promptly after culminating data collection.

The web-based administration of the survey yielded 273 responses, corresponding to a 23% response rate which is in line with expected response rates of survey research in a region like North Carolina (Groves et al., 2011). Response rates across the many counties in
North Carolina were relatively homogeneous; however, the sampling frame included more participants from the Western counties so, as illustrated in Figure 2, farmers from Western counties are more represented in the study sample.

![Figure 3.2. Location of study participants by NC county](image)

### 3.4. Instruments and data analysis

Three constructs were included in the proposed model. The construct of Individually-Owned Bridging Social Capital was adapted from Chen, Stanton, Gong, Fang, and Li (2008) to the context of farm TMEship, to reflect relationships with actors in the three zones proposed by the permatourism model. Hence, we developed three subscales, for Zones 1-3, respectively with 5, 4, and 4 items, using a five-point Likert-like scale with 1 = ‘none’ through 5 = ‘all’. The construct of tourism microentrepreneurial self-efficacy was adopted directly from Ferreira, Morais, Pollock, and Bunds (2018). The TeMSE scale is originally a set of 5 sub-scales, representing 5 facets of the construct. However, because it was developed with a sample of urban microentrepreneurs, it was expected that the scale’s underlying structure
might change in the context of farm TMEship. Hence, we decided to do exploratory factor analysis on this scale before we validated the model, as suggested by Garson (2015). Consequently, principal component analysis with varimax rotation on the 13 items revealed a two-factor underlying structure (Garson, 2013). The first factor included 8 items relating to internal entrepreneurial capabilities, whereas the second 5-item factor reflected capabilities pertaining to aptation to externalities. These two subscales use a five-point Likert-like scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree through 5 = Strongly Agree. Finally, the construct of entrepreneurial intention was adapted from Chen, Greene, and Crick’s (1998) to the context of farm TMEship, following DeVellis (1991) recommendations. It is an 8-item Likert-like scale with 1 = Extremely Unlikely through 5 = Extremely Likely. All items are available in table 1.

When testing a model like the one presented previously, both the validity of the measures as well as the structural relationships between the constructs need to be tested (Garson, 2015; Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2017). Accordingly, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) were performed using AMOS within the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). In terms of sample size, recommendations vary in the literature, based on the number of parameters to be estimated, the number of variables in the model, and missing data. In this study we follow Garson’s (2015) recommendation of a sample of at least 200 to provide significance tests with adequate power.

Several criteria were used to assess the goodness of fit to the observed data. The first was the chi-square statistic; however, due to its sensitivity to sample size, the following criteria recommended by Garson (2015) were also used: 1.) a ratio of chi-square to degrees
of freedom [CMIN/DF] less than 2.0 (Byrne, 2001); 2.) two incremental indices, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI) greater than or equal to .90 (Hu & Bentler, 1999); 3.) a Standardized Root Mean Square Residual smaller than or equal to .07 (Hu & Bentler, 1999); and Root Mean Square of Approximation (RMSEA) smaller than or equal to .07 (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). The CFI and TLI test the model against a null or independence model, which assumes there are no covariances among the observed values in the population. The SRMR compares the actual sample correlation matrix to the population correlation matrix resulting from the model and represents the average of the standardized residuals between the two (Brown, 2006). The RMSEA evaluates a hypothesized model by comparing it to a model with perfect fit and takes into account sample size and model complexity.

3.5. **Reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity**

CFA also provides a stringent test for construct validity. Accordingly, composite reliability (CR) was used to measure the internal consistency of the factors, where values greater than .70 indicate good reliability (Hair, Black; Babin, & Anderson, 2010), although values greater than .6 may be acceptable for exploratory research (Garson, 2016). Discriminant validity is achieved if average variance extracted (AVE) is greater than the maximum shared squared variance (MSV) or the average shared squared variance (ASV); for achieving convergent validity, AVE should be equal or greater than .50 and lower than CR (Hair, Black; Babin, & Anderson, 2010).
4. Results

4.1. Respondents’ socio-demographic profile and their engagement in agritourism

Participating farmers were mostly female (56.5%), white (93.2%) and in their mid-adulthood (53.6 years old), which is consistent with demographic trends among farm tourism microentrepreneurs in North Carolina (Xu, Barbieri, Rich, Seekamp, & Morais, 2014). More than two-thirds (38.2%) of the participants worked exclusively on-farm; and most (42%) held a bachelor’s degree. Importantly, for the goal of this study, the vast majority (92.8%) indicated being either the owners or co-owners of the farm.

Regarding their engagement in farm tourism, most farmers indicated that sales of product at the farm (29%) and sales of experiences to farm visitors (26.6%) were absolutely essential to the financial viability of the farm. However, the distribution of responses appears to be bimodal with approximately the same number of farmers indicating these activities being not important at all. Also, despite apparently being important to farmers, revenue from sales of farm experiences was on average only 14.4% of total farm revenue.
### Table 3.1. Farmers demographic and agritourism profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender (n=206)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to respond</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity (n=206)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to respond</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (n=206)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (in years)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(53.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (high school diploma or equivalent including GED)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college but no degree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree in college (2-year)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree in college (4-year)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree (JD, MD)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On and Off farm employment (n=207)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employee off the farm</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employee off the farm</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run another business</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker (care for household)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired from previous career</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time farmer - no other employment</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position in the farm (n=207)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Co-owner</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm manager</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time farm worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal contract worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Agritourism profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Farm (n=207)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of farm (in acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(87.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of farmed land (in acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Importance on financial viability (n=207)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of product at the farm (farm stand, U-pick)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important At All</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Little Importance</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Average Importance</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely Essential</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of experiences/tours to farm visitors (workshops, farm dinners, farm stays, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important At All</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Little Importance</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Average Importance</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely Essential</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage of total farm revenue (n=207)

| Sales of product directly to chefs and restaurants 1 |   | 13.9    |
| Sales of product directly to visitors of your farm, farm stand or farmers market 2 |   | 41.2    |
| Sales of experiences/tours/stays to visitors of your farm 3 |   | 14.4    |
4.2. Measurement model

The initial CFA conducted on the proposed model revealed marginal fit, prompting us to re-specify the model. The first step was to prune out indicator variables with the lowest path weights. Garson (2015) suggests that standardized path weights be .7 or higher, whereas Meyers, Gamst, and Guarino (2017) posit that paths are meaningful when they are significant and greater than .3. Hence, we used a cutoff of .6 because it enabled us to have at least three indicator variables per latent variable while being close to the conservative cut-off proposed by Garson (2015). Secondly, we allowed one pair of error terms to covary in TeMSE Internal, because in previous studies the corresponding items, Q3.2_7 and Q3.2_2, comprised the TeMSE dimension e-marketing. At this point, CFA revealed that the measurement model had an acceptable fit with the data: $\chi^2 (265) = 412.9$, CMIN/DF=1.556, CFI=.950, TLI=.944, SRMR=.075, RMSEA=.052).
### Table 3.2. CFA of complete measurement model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE AND ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individually Owned Social Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permatourism Zone 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of all the governmental, professional, and civic organizations in your community (e.g. tourism development authority, chamber of commerce, cooperative extension, farmers associations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.2.3 ... how many represent your rights and interests?</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.770*</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.2.4 ... how many of them seem committed to your success?</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.906*</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.2.5 ... how many do you think would help you upon your request?</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.831*</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permatourism Zone 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the many chefs, restaurateurs, and hoteliers in your community...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.3.2 ... how many of them buy farm products from you?</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.640*</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.3.3 ... how many of them seem committed to your success as a farmer and business partner?</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.956*</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.3.4 ... how many do you think would help you upon your request?</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.822*</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permatourism Zone 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of all the farmers in your community...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.4.2 ... how many of them collaborate with you?</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.600*</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.4.3 ... how many of them seem to share your views on selling product and experiences to visitors at the farm?</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>.787*</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.4.4 ... how many of them do you think would help you upon your request?</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.815*</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Efficacy Internal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2.1 I am able to form partnerships with other businesses to strengthen my own tourism business.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>.742*</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2.2 I am able to use internet to market my tourism business.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.738*</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2.3 I am able to discover ways to improve the appeal of tourism experiences I offer.</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>.836*</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2.5 I am able to create experiences that fulfill tourists’ interests.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.894*</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2.6 I am able to be myself while providing good customer service to tourists.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.743*</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3.6 I am able to get others to believe in my plans for my tourism business.</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.675*</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2.7 I am able to use internet to engage customers and business peers with my tourism business.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>.843*</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Efficacy External</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3.1 I am able to understand tourism legislation that applies to my tourism business.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.658*</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3.2 I am able to get the type of insurance I need for my tourism business.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.775*</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3.3 I am able to understand what my liability is in case of an accident involving tourists.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>.783*</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2.4 I am able to find helpers for my tourism business when I need to tackle a problem or opportunity.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>.633*</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the next 12 months, how likely are you to...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6.2.2 ... start or expand sales of farm experiences to farm visitors (e.g., tours, workshops, farmstays)?</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>.783*</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6.2.5 ... organize events at your farm (e.g., weddings, farm dinners, hayrides, corn mazes)?</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td></td>
<td>.735*</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6.2.7 ... explore more avenues to diversify your farm’s revenue by attracting visitors?</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>.869*</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6.2.8 ... seek ways to make your farm an integral part of the tourism offerings of your community?</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>.937*</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6.2.9 ... participate as a host in a regional farm tour event (e.g., cycle to farm, art and farm)?</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>.689*</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=207; Measure of model fit: chi-square (265) = 412.9, CMIN/DF=1.556, CFI=.950, TLI=.944, SRMR=.075, RMSEA=.052); R = standardized regression coefficient; AVE = average variance extracted; CR = construct reliability; and α Cronbach’s alpha

* p = .001
Table 3.2 shows that Self-Efficacy Internal, Self-Efficacy External and Intention had adequate reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. However, second-order variable Social Capitals’ convergent validity and reliability values fell short of the cutoff values proposed by Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson (2010). This could be because the first order-variables, Zones 1-3, represented different tiers of social capital, thus unlikely to be highly correlated (Garson, 2015). Hence, according to the same author “if SEM analysis shows good fit, this is an indication that indicator variables reflect the latent variables they are supposed to and that the latent variables are different from each other. That is, CFA establishes convergent and divergent validity in the proposed model (p. 23)”. In face of these mixed results, we further assessed the internal consistency construct validity of each first order factor through the Cronbach-alpha statistic and concluded that they are acceptable for exploratory purposes.

4.3. **Structural model and test of hypotheses**

Following the validation of the measurement model, hypotheses were tested using, for the effect, the magnitude and the significance of the relationships between latent variables. First, the structural model’s goodness of fit was assessed using the same statistics utilized for the CFA. The SEM revealed adequate model fit: $\chi^2 (267) = 470.4$, CMIN/DF=1.762, CFI=.931, TLI=.923, SRMR=.1253, RMSEA=.061). Although the structural model showed a lower fit than the measurement model, this was somewhat expected as recursive models cannot improve fit when compared to the CFA (Heir et. al, 2010).
Figure 3.3. Structural equation model

Hypothesis H1a and H1b tested the relationship between Social Capital and Self Efficacy. Given that Social Capital had a positive and significant relationship both with Internal Factors Self-Efficacy (β=.27; p <.05) and External Factors Self-Efficacy (β=.34; p <.05), both hypotheses H1a and H1b were supported by the study. This finding supports previous reports in the educational context where social capital was also found to have a positive relationship with self-efficacy (Liñán & Santos, 2007; Brouwer, Jansen, Flache, & Hofman, 2016).

In addition, this finding is also corroborated by qualitative data. For example, research team members took part in several meetings led by an agritourism specialist from the NC Department of Agriculture (Zone 1), in the scope of the counties’ participation in an app promoting agritourism experiences. The specialist addressed intricacies of farm tourism, including aspects related to self-representation, programing, and legal matters, which stimulated ideas for innovation and clarity on how farmers can seek help to cope with
externalities (i.e., internal and external entrepreneurial self-efficacy respectively). Additionally, during a field visit with an ostrich farmer and tourism microentrepreneur, he reiterated the importance of developing partnerships with formal tourism industry partners (Zone 2), indicating that “[the chef] wanted to get to know me right off the bat... that was important because, especially starting out, we don’t have relationships with anybody... we kinda don’t know what we’re doing... and we look to guidance a lot from the people who’ve been in the industry for a long time.” Finally, the importance of bridging ties between peer microentrepreneurs (Zone 3) was evident in several counties in which we work, when a farmer who was the pioneer of agritourism in the county decades ago is revered by his/her fellow farmers as a source of inspiration and knowledge, and is instrumental in starting a network of farm tourism microentrepreneurs so that they can convince the local authorities to increase their support for their initiatives.

Table 3.3. Hypothesized relationships between constructs and observed relationship from the SEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Hypothesized relationship</th>
<th>St. Regression Weights</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Support for Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>Social Capital → Self-Efficacy Internal</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>Social Capital → Self-Efficacy External</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy Internal → Entrepreneurial Intention</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy External → Entrepreneurial Intention</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=207; Measure of model fit: χ²(267) = 470.4, CMIN/DF=1.762, CFI=.931, TLI=.923, SRMR=.1253, RMSEA=.061). * p = .05

Hypothesis H2a and H2b tested the relationship between Self Efficacy and entrepreneurial intention. Internal factors Self-Efficacy had a positive and significant relationship with intention (β=.63; p <.05), therefore hypothesis H2a is supported by the study. This finding also supports previous research in entrepreneurship where self-efficacy was also found to have a positive relationship on entrepreneurial intention (De Noble, Jung
& Ehrlich, 1999; Markman, Balkin, & Baron, 2002; Arenius and Minniti, 2005; Markman, Baron, & Balkin, 2005; Wilson et al., 2007). However, External Factors did not have a significant relationship with entrepreneurial intention, which warrants further examination. Although not expected, this finding is partially supported by qualitative data, which suggests that most farmers do engage in agritourism regardless of their knowledge of the regulatory framework governing agritourism. Our fieldwork suggests that farm tourism microentrepreneurs have to cope with a lot of ambiguity and uncertainty because the local government is unable to provide clear regulation or support. This situation is epitomized by a farmer’s grievance that his log cabin had been denied a license to operate as a Bed & Breakfast, but was nonetheless abiding the law if listed as Airbnb. In addition, another farmer complained that “It was a nightmare to have them approve my project. Every time they came to inspect, somehow they always managed to find something wrong.” The inability to find competent farm helpers, was also mentioned during our fieldwork as a challenge to farm tourism microentrepreneurship. Yet, it is mostly an indirect impact, in the sense that owners can’t engage in agritourism in cases where they are not able to delegate agricultural production related tasks that drain all their time. For example, one particularly active farmer in the hosting of weddings and farm dinners, complained that she had gone through four immigration attorneys and spent over $20,000 trying to obtain a green card for her foreign farm manager, so that she could be freer from farming and pursue other activities.

5. Discussion

Over the last few decades, small farmers in North Carolina (as in other US regions) have struggled to adapt to progressive challenges to their business conditions. Some have embraced emerging opportunities to sell products directly to consumers with varying
degrees of success and some have explored new revenue streams by offering product and experiences to visitors. The conceptual framework described earlier explains that entrepreneurs’ involvement with and perseverance on a new business activity is highly dependent on their self-efficacy and their self-efficacy is highly dependent on the role modeling and affirmation they receive from reference groups. Accordingly, the purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which farmers’ intentions to be involved in tourism microentrepreneurial activities is influenced by their ties to other business partners and public agencies.

We posited that low bridging social capital limits opportunities for farmers to model entrepreneurial behavior from business partners and to receive positive encouragement from supporting organizations, thus impeding the development of the farmers’ microentrepreneurial self-efficacy and their intentions to start tourism enterprises at the farm. We drew on social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1978), social capital theory (Bourdieu, 1985), and the Permatourism framework (Ferreira et al. 2019) to propose that resources should be directed to programs and initiatives that foment and nurture symbiotic relationships between farmers, business partners and public agencies, so as to boost farmers’ social exchange opportunities across power and authority gradients in the tourism business ecosystem. Such exchanges can be important sources of self-efficacy through a number of mechanisms, which have a positive effect on the development of entrepreneurial intentions.

As suggested by the literature in other fields, Social Capital was significantly associated with self-efficacy. Nevertheless, to our knowledge, this study was the first to empirically examine this relationship in the context of farm tourism microentrepreneurship.
Additionally, this finding also attests to the effectiveness of informal networks to nurture and support farm tourism microentrepreneurs as opposed to unwelcoming, rigid, bureaucratic and threatening formal structures (Karampela, Kavroudakis, & Kizos, 2019). Hence, in the interest of destinations’ uniqueness and competitiveness, destination management organizations may need to loosen their formal requirements for partnerships and collaborations with informal players. One such constraint we have observed in the field is the requirement of TDAs to support only businesses that overtly contribute to overnight stays (the source of occupancy tax). Such a shift in institutional approach would help TDAs better address the increasing expectations for them to align their work with community interests and not just with the interests of the formal lodging industry (Destinations International, 2019).

In addition to being positively associated with Social Capital, Self-Efficacy Internal was a positive and significant predictor of microentrepreneurial intention. This suggests that Self-Efficacy is a central tenet in the Permatourism model, as it seems to be the mechanism through which tourism microentrepreneurs convert the resources embedded in their networks into intentions of engaging in tourism business. In this regard, Bandura (2006) posits that “the value of psychological theory is judged not only by its explanatory and predictive power, but by its operational power to make change” (p.319).

In turn, Self-Efficacy External was not significantly associated with intention. This is surprising, because one would assume that farmers’ perceived ability to abide by regulation governing the industry, acquire adequate liability coverage, or find staff would have an influence on their intention to engage in microentrepreneurship. However, our experience in the field suggests that farmers, out of choice or need, do not necessarily wait until they
have a good domain of the legal landscape surrounding farm tourism to start their ventures. Furthermore, compared to internal factors, the observed lower values of External Self-Efficacy suggest that there is ambiguity of information in respect to licenses, insurance, and taxes due for a tourism business. Airbnb is a good example: it’s prohibited in some cities but not in others; legislation is enforced in some regions but not in others; some counties collect levies upon booking/transaction, while in others the microentrepreneur is to report that income. Thus, farmers that are involved in tourism microentrepreneurship appear to be doing so tentatively and under a high degree of uncertainty, unable to receive clear and effective support from local organizations, and hoping that nothing will go terribly wrong. This attitude is well illustrated in this statement made by a rural tourism microentrepreneur “We are just like feudal peasants... We are trying to carve a simple livelihood without drawing too much attention to ourselves.”

Permatourism principles can also be applied at the micro-level. For example, it appears as though farmers realized the importance of using and valuing diversity (principle 10) and have consistently invested in farm diversification as a measure to reduce farm vulnerability (Mikko Vesala, Peura, & McElwee, 2007). Moreover, farmers also appear to be designing from patterns to details (principle 7), in the sense that they understood that farm tourism is a growing trend, in a first moment tried to seize the opportunity the best they could, and are now filling in the details as they go (i.e. learning regulations and bringing the operation up to code).

While farmers’ concern about liability for personal injuries of participants, as well as their revindication for clear instructions from agritourism regulatory bodies is not new (Leff, 2011; Centner, 2010), this study suggests that these are not necessarily perceived as
impediments for engaging in those activities. Hence, agencies tasked to deliver agritourism training focusing on insurance, liability, or risk management (Infante-Casella, 2018), should target nascent farm tourism microentrepreneurs as well as those already in business.

5.1. Limitations

Although widely used in tourism research, many have found social capital difficult to operationalize because it may mean different things in different contexts (Jones, 2005; McGehee, Lee, & O’Bannon, 2010; Rodriguez-Giron & Vanneste, 2019). Accordingly, after looking at other measures of social capital we concluded that Chen, Stanton, Gong, Fang, and Li’s (2008) Individually-Owned Bridging Social Capital scale had the greatest potential for adaptation to the context of farm tourism microentrepreneurship. Although, we believe that we were able to capture the construct adequately, reliability and convergent validity analysis suggest that the scale may need further refinement.

Also, findings of this study may not be generalizable to other countries or even other states in the United States. For example, Chiodo et al. (2019) found singular differences and national specificites in agritourism case-studies in the USA, Brazil, Italy and France. And, Karampela, Kavroudakis, and Kizos (2019) reported that geographic characteristics in insular or continental Greece, determined the type of agritourism units, the scale of the operation and the strength of the networks.

5.2. Further research

While this study suggests that partnerships with formal industry partners, like chefs and restaurateurs, may constitute important sources of social capital and self-efficacy among farmers, we need to recognize that the exchange of non-economic assets is not
unidireccional. Thus, future research should look into the mechanisms through which chefs and restaurateurs capitalize on partnerships with local farmers to improve their businesses. Namely, the enhanced level of transparency (Bhaduri & Ha-Brookshire, 2011) that farm visits bring to the restaurant’s practices, and the alignment with important core values should be examined.

In niche markets, such as the farm-to-table restaurant industry, transparency is critical given the nature of its core patronage, disproportionately composed of socially and environmentally conscientious millennials, who expect that chefs and restaurateurs take their commitment to sourcing locally serious (Weiss, 2012). For example, numerous incidents of fraud have been reported on popular media, giving rise to an alternative derogatory denomination to the movement – fraud to table (Berr, 2016). In addition, the restaurant industry is often described as being fiercely competitive (Syed & Conway, 2006). However, by collaborating with local farmers, chefs and restaurateurs are able to align their value proposition with generally accepted core values in America (Kawasaki, 2011), such as sustainability, healthy living and localism (Flack, 1997), which appear to influence consumer’s willingness to patronize locally sourced restaurants (Shin, Im, Jung, & Severt, 2017).

Some processes and mechanisms of farm tourism microentrepreneurship appear to fall under what Baker and Nelson (2005) and Fisher (2012) describe as entrepreneurial bricolage. It is a strategy employed by entrepreneurs to overcome resource-constrained environments through recycling and repurposing available material and human resources to literally create something from nothing. In particular, one area where FTMneurs appear to enact bricolage is in the institutional and regulatory environment, “by refusing to enact
limitations with regard to many "standards" and regulations, and by actively trying things in a variety of areas in which entrepreneurs either do not know the rules or do not see them as constraining, bricolage creates space to "get away with" solutions that would otherwise seem impermissible" (Baker & Nelson (2005, p. 349). Hence, we believe that entrepreneurial bricolage is a promising conceptual framework to examine FTMship in future studies.

6. Conclusion

This study used a mixed-methods approach to explore the extent to which farm-based tourism entrepreneurial intentions can be predicted by the strength of bridging ties with public sector support agencies (e.g., Extension agents and TDAs), formal private sector partners (e.g., farm-to-table chefs), and with other peers (e.g., other farmers involved in farm tourism microentrepreneurship). Importantly, these three levels of potential farm partnerships represent, respectively, Zones 1-3 under the Permatourism paradigm (Ferreira et al., in press). In the model proposed, Social Capital predicts both dimensions of entrepreneurial self-efficacy, Internal and External factors. However, only Internal factors self-efficacy has a significant relationship with entrepreneurial intention, which suggests that farmer’s intention to engage in farm tourism microentrepreneurship is independent of their perceived efficacy in understanding the regulation governing the industry, getting adequate liability coverage, and ability to find helpers. In addition, lower scores in this dimension also suggest that farmers may decide to go forward with their entrepreneurial projects despite apparently unprepared to deal with important aspects of the business. Not only is this uncertainty problematic because of potential legal implications of non-compliance with the regulatory frameworks, but also because it may lead to venture failure and decreased entrepreneurial self-efficacy (which may hold farmers back in future
occasions). In totality, this study supports that multilateral tourism initiatives involving actors across different Permatourism zones are effective in increasing farmer's intention to develop supply of farm tourism experiences. At the same time, evidence equally suggests that formal training focusing on legal aspects of agritourism is necessary for the success of farm tourism, given that these competencies, due to their complexity and ambiguity, may be difficult to bring up to adequate levels in an informal setting.
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CHAPTER 4: Resisting Tourism-Induced Socioeconomic Apartheid through Microentrepreneurship

Abstract

Despite receiving harsh criticisms from academia, the model of enclave tourism continues to be widely implemented by transnational conglomerates in regions with malleable governance. Accordingly, enclave mass tourism development, materialized in the form of all-inclusive resorts, may create forms of socioeconomic apartheid at destinations, through removing locals from tourist spaces where host-guest exchanges are most likely to occur. However, results from a qualitative study conducted in Bahía de Banderas — Puerto Vallarta, Mexico, suggest that despite adverse conditions, microentrepreneurs are still able to glean some economic opportunities. Yet, they must be extremely judicious in how they choose to take advantage of the available opportunities; there seems to be a thin line between moderate success on the one hand and total failure on the other, with immediate repercussions in their livelihoods. These findings challenge common assumptions that host communities are helpless victims of continual oppression by the tourism industry because participants demonstrated a persistent resolve to carve out a growing share of the tourism economy for their communities even in the face of a critical consciousness of the hegemonic power of the local multinational/public tourism system.

Target outlet: Annals of Tourism Research
1. **Introduction**

Tourism-induced social and economic inequality is a topic widely studied by tourism scholars, who have been prolific in documenting the causes of a phenomenon for which they have largely failed to produce a cure. At the epicenter of this discussion is the model of enclave tourism, designed from the get-go to reduce interactions between guests and the community (Freitag, 1994). While this model has received harsh criticisms from academia, the mounting scholarship on the topic has not precluded transnational conglomerates from continuing to build and operate enclave resorts for the despair of the most vulnerable individuals at the destinations. However, although enclave mass tourism development may create apparent socioeconomic apartheid at destinations by removing locals from tourist spaces where host-guest exchanges are most likely to occur, there is growing evidence that ingenious informal tourism microentrepreneurs are surprisingly able to glean bits of income through offering experiences and products to tourists. Hence, the purpose of this study is threefold: 1) understand the level of conscientization of subaltern microentrepreneurs about the oppressive practices of the formal tourism industry in Puerto Vallarta; 2) explore the nuances of their microentrepreneurial activity in terms of business strategies, experiences and products offered, and narratives employed; and, 3) examine the applicability of the Permatourism conceptual framework to explain the mechanisms through which the local tourism development model in Puerto Vallarta enables or hinders equitable and sustainable development.

2. **Literature review**

Tourism grew rapidly in the developing world but, for the vast majority, it did not take into account local perspectives and failed to deliver on the promise of engendering
equitable prosperity (Shaw & Shaw, 1999; Gmelch, 2012; Morais, Ferreira, Nazariadli, & Ghahramani, 2017; Thomas-Francois, von Massow, & Joppe, 2017). Moreover, tourism has often worsened developing countries’ dependency on former colonizing powers and reinforced domestic socioeconomic inequalities (Brohman, 1996). According to Sharpley (2010), the reason why tourism is still chosen as the default route to development is because often there are no other viable alternatives in countries with a limited industrial sector and with scarce natural resources. Nonetheless, tourism microentrepreneurship is increasingly being regarded as a viable, locally-led, meaningful alternative to classic tourism development that stands to change the face of tourism in many destinations (Morais, Ferreira, Nazariadli, & Ghahramani, 2017; Sigala & Dolnicar, 2018).

2.1. Socioeconomic inequality

Economic sociologists contend that inequality is a phenomenon sustained primarily through relational dynamics (Granovetter, 2017; Lin, 2002; Tomaskovic-Devey, Hällsten, & Avent-Holt, 2015), that is through the dynamic, unfolding processes that take place in a system wherein power emerges not as a static substance but rather as a consequence of asymmetric transactions between actors (Emirbayer, 1997). For example, elite capture occurs when local elites, better equipped and more influential, are able to unabashedly usurp resources designated for the benefit of the larger population (Platteau & Gaspart, 2003). In tourism studies, elite capture can be observed in the context of ecotourism, pro-poor tourism or community-based tourism, when privileged groups in the host community appropriate themselves of the most profitable, prestigious and desirable roles and occupations in NGO-led community-based projects, causing resentment and resistance among subordinate
groups, which ultimately compromises the economic performance and viability of the ventures (Lund & Saito-Jensen, 2013; Sene-Harper, 2016).

A distinct but related concept is opportunity hoarding, described by Tomaskovic-Devey, Hällsten, and Avent-Holt (2015) as the mechanism through which economic actors monopolize valuable resources for themselves and similar others. Emirbayer (1997) explains that members of a categorically bounded network usually start by acquiring control over a valuable resource, hoard their access to it, and develop practices that perpetuate this restricted access. Of course, a power differential between groups is a necessary condition because one group will be more effective in making claims and imposing its own agenda (Granovetter, 2017). For example, unscrupulous profit-seeking tourism corporations largely control distribution systems, relegating the subaltern to the “sidelines of the tourism economy” (Morais, Ferreira, Nazariadli, & Ghahramani, 2017, p.74). One such example is the model of enclave tourism, intendedly designed to minimize interactions between tourists and ancillary formal and informal businesses, in order to increase resort profits (Freitag, 1994).

A consequence of that approach is high economic leakage to western countries and limited economic opportunities for locals who are recruited mostly as cheap, unskilled labor for menial tasks at the resorts (Mbaiwa, 2005). In Puerto Vallarta, Mexico, Wilson (2008) contends that tourism development marginalizes great numbers of local residents by way of self-contained, all-inclusive resorts, which led to segregation between locals and tourists and limit tourist spending outside the complex, creating a de facto socioeconomic apartheid. Despite scarce opportunities for economic exchange Morais, Ferreira, Nazariadli, and Ghahramani (2017) posit that locals, in such contexts, have been able to informally glean
income from some opportunities unexploited by the formal industry because the size of the opportunity is not worthwhile to be pursued by the formal sector.

Despite apparent asymmetric relational dynamics and uneven power balance the dynamics that make tourism a potentially critical business, Tribe (2008) contends that tourism research has been primarily guided by positivism and technical rationality. While the latter are important because may lead to a better operational management of the industry, critical research is crucial for setting an agenda for ethical management, governance and coexistence with the wider world (Tribe, 2008). This is especially important today, as the industry is shifting from destination marketing/management towards a destination stewardship paradigm, wherein professionals strive to be sensitive to the residents' needs and aspirations and transparent in their decisions which will affect the quality of life and quality of place in the community (Destinations International, 2019).

2.2. The informal economy

The informal economy is a major component of the world’s economy. Godfrey (2011) notes that in the developing world it may actually be greater in size and importance than the formal economy. Even in the developed world, the informal economy is believed to be an important part of the economy and can be visible for example in the form of early stage startups, family-owned businesses, farmers markets, and second-home vacation rentals. Informal arrangements can also play an important role in companies operating in the formal sector, because informality often brings nimbleness, speed, and adaptability to conditions of change. Moreover, the informal and formal sectors are believed to be part of a mutually supporting system, which can energize local economies in a variety of ways (Boanada-Fuchs
& Boanada Fuchs, 2018). For example, microentrepreneurs in the informal tourism sector offer authentic off-the-beaten path experiences that enhance their local destinations' richness and competitiveness (Morais et al., 2012; Çakmak, Lie, & Selwyn, 2019).

Despite the importance of the informal sector, there is a generalized idea that it is an expression of business activity that has mostly a negative impact on the economy. For example, “black market” is a term that is often heard in mainstream media, and even in academia it is not unusual to find pejorative terms like the “shadow economy” (Apressyan, 1997). At the forefront of this perspective are neoclassical economists whose philosophical assumptions (e.g. utility maximization, accumulation of capital) may preclude them to understand that utility for a local artisan may have more to do with pride stemming from the opportunity to showcase to visitors some ancient technique learned from his or her parents than with the extra income made through this workshop. Finally, growth can attract unwanted attention to one’s business by regulatory bodies, and therefore microentrepreneurs often prefer to operate under the radar and/or in unregulated spaces.

2.3. Tourism microentrepreneurship

Many authors have called for an increase in the stimulation and support of tourism microentrepreneurship by small business development authorities (Kc, Morais, Seekamp, Smith, & Peterson, 2018; LaPan, Morais, Wallace, & Barbieri, 2016; Mao, 2014; Nyaupane, Morais, & Dowler, 2006; Peroff, 2015). Consequently, the Manifesto of the People-First Tourism Movement (Morais, 2017), endorsed by tourism scholars worldwide, advocates that microentrepreneurship stands to make tourism a force for equitable community development by engaging previously alienated segments of society in tourism economics.
and in the planning of tourism development. Likewise, McGehee and Kline (2008) contend that entrepreneurship is well suited to the context of rural tourism development, because it “harmonizes with the philosophy that problems are best solved by solutions generated from inside the community, and that external consultants are not needed to propose successful strategies for economic redemption” (p. 123).

Tourism microenterprises typically employ five or fewer employees and tend to operate in under-regulated business environments characterized by low entry barriers (Ferreira, Morais, & Lorscheider, 2015). Ateljevic and Doorne (2000) contend that tourism microentrepreneurs are people driven by non-economic motives, who prefer “staying within the fence” (p. 378) rather than pursuing unbridled growth. Similarly, Peters and Schuckert (2014) found that they tend to prioritize quality of life in lieu of enterprise growth. These individuals may simply intend to strive for some extra income to enhance, and sometimes secure, their livelihoods—they typically avoid highly competitive market environments in order to preserve their quality of life and, accordingly, they rely mostly on niche markets (Morais, Wallace, Rodrigues, España, & Wang, 2014). Usually they are not affiliated with formal professional networks nor are their services available through traditional distribution systems (Kc et al., 2018).

A key to the effectiveness of tourism microentrepreneurship is its support by public agencies and its integration with the formal private sector. Accordingly, Permatourism is centered in this crux of integrating formal and informal tourism enterprises.
2.4. Permatourism

Ferreira et al. (forthcoming) define Permatourism as a tourism planning and management process that pursues the complementarity between formal private and public actors and local microentrepreneurs and grassroots community social structures. Permatourism encourages the formal tourism sector to embrace the socio-cultural characteristics of the host community to make the local tourism experience more unique and competitive while at the same time ensuring that locals are better equipped to become involved in tourism. Additionally, Permatourism, requires the creation of a grassroots business development strategy that aligns local entrepreneurs with expected business opportunities generated by existing or upcoming big tourism investments in the region or large scope social movements and trends with high impact at the macroeconomic level. The model can be best understood as an abstraction of the range of fluid and ever changing symbiotic relationships between different actors in the tourism business ecosystem, stemming primarily from the destination’s pull-factor(s) and ramifying towards the fringes where one will find intervening government structures, formal and informal industry and residents, in this order. Importantly, inwards it is apparent a hierarchy of power of influence whereas the number of players tends to increase outwards.

Permatourism is the application of the concept of Permaculture, developed in Australia by the hand of Bill Mollison and David Holmegren (Holmgren, 2017), to the tourism business ecosystem. Permatourism subscribes to the three Permaculture ethics: 1) Care for the Earth, 2) Fair-share, and 3) Care for People. Moreover, Permatourism is also guided by 12 principles, which delineate the conceptual foundation of this development approach: 1) Observe and interact; 2) Catch and store energy; 3) Obtain a yield; 4) Apply self-regulation
& accept feedback; 5) Use & value renewable resources & services; 6) Produce no waste; 7) Design from patterns to details; 8) Integrate rather than segregate; 9) Use small and slow solutions; 10) Use and value diversity; 11) Use edges & value the marginal, and; 12) Creatively use and respond to change. Finally, Permatourism can be thought of as “deep sustainability” (see Holmgren, 2017) and speaks to the shift from a destination marketing to a destination stewardship paradigm, which demands comprehensive and integrated sustainability for the long-term economic, social and environmental viability for a destination (Destinations International, 2019).

3. Methodology

3.1. Research setting

This study is being conducted in two communities along the Bahía de Banderas, on the Mexican west Coast, which encompasses the states of Jalisco and Nayarit. Tourism is the main driver of the local economy and its largest service sector. Accordingly, it is estimated that over 25% of the total labor force in Puerto Vallarta works in the restaurant and hospitality sectors (Wilson, 2008). However, as seen elsewhere, in the interest of profit making, salaries are usually very low and opportunities for career advancement are limited (Gmelch, 2012). In addition, according to one of the participants, the consolidation of a great number of small tour operators into a handful of powerful players, has led to the cartelization of the tours marketplace to the disadvantage of community-led eco parks who largely depend on middlemen for access to customers.

The first site is the ejido Playa Grande, located in the outskirts of the world-famous sea, sun, sand and sex beach resort city of Puerto Vallarta. An ejido is an area of communal land used for agriculture, in which community members individually farm designated
parcels and collectively maintain communal holdings (Chávez Dagostino, Sánchez González, & Fortes, 2017). Ejidatários do not actually own the land but can use their allotted parcels indefinitely if they do not fail to use the land for more than two years (Jones & Ward, 1998). However, only 4.4% of the almost 20,000 acres that comprise the ejido Playa Grande is arable or suitable for animal husbandry, with the bulk of the property consisting of native forest. And, given that logging has been discouraged by the government and environmental agencies, 43 members of the ejido created communitarian tourism enterprise aiming to generate revenue to steward the forest, create self-employment, and support the elders in the community. This community-led ecopark offers canopy tours, horseback-riding, bird watching, local food and glamping. Because nouns are gendered in the Spanish language, the word ejidatário refers to a male member of an ejido, and the word ejidatária to a female member.

The second site, Bucerías, is a quaint, cobblestone-paved tourism town located 25 km to the north, in the southwest part of the state of Nayarit. Outside the tourist center, there is an agglomeration of relatively poor dwellings, which are home to a majority of people who migrated primarily from southern states like Chiapas, Guerrero or Oaxaca. Some of these individuals are skilled crafters who sell their art to tourists at markets and plazas and receive visitors at their homes through a local non-profit focused on responsible tourism. The non-profit’s stated mission is to empower local communities while fostering conversations that shift visitors’ perspectives and increase cross-cultural understanding. Henceforth, we will use the words sócio (male) and sócia (female) to refer to participant members of the non-profit. It can be loosely translated as business partner and it is the language used within the
organization, apparently to convey a message of a horizontal hierarchy not only towards the outside but also to their members.

The two approaches to entrepreneurship, although quite distinct in terms of organizational dynamics and goals, have in common the pursuit of business opportunities afforded by an increasing demand for authentic local experiences by visitors (Destinations International, 2019). They also share the fact that they strive to offer experiences that are complementary to the traditional sol y playa tourism product. Accordingly, one of the participants said that by offering off-the-beaten path experiences they were not necessarily competing with the formal industry, but rather “meeting visitors’ needs”. Finally, both embody a bottom-up model of tourism development which encourages consciousness-raising, networking, and self-efficacy (McGehee, Kline, & Knollenberg, 2014), necessary conditions for self-reliant community development. Hence, this study does not compare the two approaches, rather it seeks to understand the strategies employed by bottom-up tourism development actors in Puerto Vallarta - Bahía de Banderas to break through resource and opportunity constraints under socioeconomic apartheid conditions.

3.2. Data collection

This study subscribes to a transformative worldview (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010), wherein the research team and study participants are equals in the research process and pursue a shared horizon in which tourism is an enabler of socioeconomic prosperity in the community. Accordingly, literature in community psychology calls for transformational scholarship in the social sciences, stressing the uselessness of conventional, seemingly objective research of mainstream psychology and other social sciences (Davis, 2008;
Seymour-Rolls & Hughes, 2000; Wisner, Stea, & Kruks, 1991). Hence, participatory action-research goes beyond the boundaries of traditional paradigms of research that call for the least disturbance in the study environment, being instead a method primarily concerned with bringing about social change to participants in the research process (Seymour-Rolls and Hughes, 2000; Nelson and Prilleltensky, 2010).

In the context of this study, social change will come through the expansion of participants’ communitarian tourism enterprise which will essentially translate into more jobs for the ejidatários and their children on the one hand, and the possibility to distribute a portion of the profits among the elders in the community, who have been outside the formal employment system all their lives, and are therefore ineligible to receive pensions. In this sense, participants made it quite clear during interviews and impromptu conversations that they expected to collaborate with the research team to devise strategies to reach out to international customers directly, in order to bypass local tour operators that keep a large portion of the price paid by tourists. Importantly, the shared horizon of microentrepreneurial development pursued by researchers and participants is a testimony to the collaborative (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988) and the transformative (Wisner, Stea, & Kruks, 1991) nature of the research approach that guided this study.

Accordingly, between March 2017 and May 2018 the research team engaged with members of the ejido and staff at the NGO through e-mail and virtual meetings, seeking to evaluate interest for a participatory action-research project in these sites, culminating in discussions about potential research questions. During the same period, the research team also consulted regularly with researchers from an American University who had been engaged in the region with the ejido. In May 2018, the lead researcher did a one-week long
familiarization trip to the study region. The researcher was hosted by the ejidatários, which enabled him to visit extensively with other ejidatários and observe interactions with tourists in the eco-park. The researcher also visited the NGO and four microentrepreneurs in Bucerías, observing interactions with tourists in their homes. In addition to observations and impromptu conversations, three formal interviews were conducted with ejidatários. As a result, it was jointly proposed that the three parties should collaborate to organize a service Spring break (SSB) for American undergraduate students, which would take place at the two locations, as a means to diversify the portfolio of both organizations.

The familiarization trip was also useful to inform the IRB application for the study, which was approved in March 2019. In April, the same team member travelled to the study region where he stayed for 10 days, again living in the community and participating in local events and activities. This was instrumental to gain access to individuals and institutions (Flick, 2014) because hanging out with key elements of the community allowed for much quicker acceptance. However, this didn’t preclude him from having to undergo a series of informal rites of passage, namely experiencing a local drinking ritual called pajareta, consisting of straight-from-the-udder raw milk squeezed onto local liquor set ablaze in a clay mug. The researcher also assumed different roles in different communities, mostly depending on the time spent on-site and the way he was introduced to the context. For example, while he was an active member in Playa Grande, he was only a visitor in Ejido Benemerito las Americas and Bucerías (Flick, 2014). Nevertheless, regardless of the role undertaken he always took the side of and aligned himself with the agenda of the participants, which overlapped fundamentally in that tourism should be leveraged to the development of local communities, and not the other way around.
The research team asked the leadership at the ejidos and the non-profit to send invitations to all members to participate in individual face-to-face interviews aiming to assess their experience with tourism microentrepreneurship. This was done through email, phone call, and sometimes on-site verbally. All who agreed to participate were interviewed. In a few cases, the researcher also made requests in locu to participants who were not scheduled to be interviewed. For example, while joining the president of the Ejido Playa Grande on a trip to meet high-level tourism officials in the state of Jalisco, the researcher used the opportunity to formally interview the president of the most successful ejido in the region. In total, 25 participants were interviewed (7 female, 18 male), with each interview lasting on average 43 minutes. Of those, 22 were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. The interview protocol covered five main themes: livelihood, voice, social capital, self-efficacy, and success. All but one interview was conducted in Spanish, given that two researchers in the team are fluent in this language and almost all participants were either native or fluent speakers. All interviews were transcribed verbatim — the lead researcher transcribed three interviews to immerse himself ever further in the data, and outsourced the remainder transcriptions for the sake of economy of time. In addition, the researcher kept a reflexive journal throughout the research process where he recorded thoughts, highlights from impromptu conversations, and field observations (Flick, 2014; Morais, Ferreira, & Wallace, 2017; Nazariadli, Morais, Bunds, Baran, & Supak, 2019).

We followed a theoretical thematic analysis approach to code the data using NVivo (Flick, 2014). According to Braun and Clarke (2016), this method is best suited to identify patterned responses and meaning in the data, pertaining to topics that are of special relevance to answer to the research questions and to which the researcher has been
sensitized beforehand. To reduce bias and ensure trustworthiness, regular peer-debriefing sessions were conducted (Flick, 2014). Finally, to enhance credibility, data from the interviews were triangulated with journal entries. In addition, the lead researcher conducted member-check by sharing the complete manuscript with five members of the community to ensure that meanings and perspectives were not misrepresented (Birt, Scott, Cavers, Campbell, & Walter, 2016). Importantly, the team also asked for input on the most effective and meaningful way to share research findings with all the participants in the study. It was agreed that the research team would create a synthesis using lay terms, in Spanish, with a focus on the practical implications for tourism microentrepreneurship.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Oppression or business as usual?

The participants in this study are entrepreneurs operating and achieving relative success in a very harsh and competitive business environment (Wilson, 2008; Gmelch, 2012; Chávez Dagostino, Sánchez González, & Fortes, 2017). These individuals stand out in their communities for their own merit, are extremely proud of their accomplishments, attempt to retain control over their lives, and in some cases, they have become leaders and sources of inspiration in the community (Ponce Lázaro, Pérez Ramírez, 2017). Accordingly, this may speak to the emancipatory power of entrepreneurship, which beyond the creation of wealth may enable the pursuit of freedom and autonomy relative to an existing status quo (Rindova, Barry, & Ketchen, 2009). Furthermore, Fleischmann (2016) postulates that entrepreneurship may contribute to “liberating” individuals from a state of unfreedom and powerlessness, in addition to allowing social mobility and elevating their political status.
Hence, the evidence suggests that involvement in tourism microentrepreneurship facilitates the participants’ conscientization (Freire, 1970) to the oppressive forces which create socioeconomic apartheid that curtails their livelihood opportunities. Thus, although the researcher never used the word apartheid, the topic of socioeconomically segregated spaces emerged naturally during some interviews. For example, one sócio who had recently been forced to close her family’s small restaurant due to limited customer traffic during the low season, said

“This road [Boulevard Riviera Nayarit] divides two very different worlds (...) we were on this side of the road, which is the non-tourist area, and tourism is obviously concentrated across the road, and so it was getting harder for me to keep the restaurant open (...) we’ve talked to some tourists in Nuevo Vallarta who asked, Where can I meet local people?, and we told them precisely to come to our neighborhood, but they said, Not there because it is dangerous. And I thought, How can it be dangerous? The same people who live there are the same people who go to work in Nuevo Vallarta, it is illogical (...) I think that a local person does not think about starting a business in Nuevo Vallarta (...) you need a lot of money to invest and a lot of money to survive, to keep the business afloat.”

Another sócio, who spearheads a family-owned wool tapestry business, also seems to be well aware that he’d be much better off selling at high-end, exclusive tourist zones. However, contrary to his peer microentrepreneur’s forecast, he does think about moving in an area busy with affluent tourists, although that is off the table in the near future:

“That is my goal, to have a gallery and work [as a craftsman]. Like that, I would think of myself as a successful entrepreneur (...) right now I am looking at a couple of them in Marina
Vallarta (...) near the cruise ships. I think that would be great, but the units are too expensive (...) [I am going] to save money and, when I have enough, I will find one that I really like and lease it, because they only do it for a minimum of one or two years”.

Prohibitive real estate prices seem to be a deterrent for scios in their quest to expand their businesses. And, while ejidatários have the advantage of owning prime real estate where to plant their businesses, such privilege comes with threats because of its tremendous value in a burgeoning city bound by the ocean, which can only stretch towards the mountain. On the one hand, leasing it to outside adventure sports outfits may attract unscrupulous capitalist partners, the kind that “...take advantage and get you out, as they have done with so many places. So much natural potential in Mexico and foreign companies arrive and you become nothing but a gardener, maybe a waiter if you’re lucky, but you are the [real] owner, and a petty job is the most you’ll ever get”. On the other hand, not doing anything with it makes it an easy prey for the real estate development sector. A local professor, ejidatário, explained that “...had they not gotten organized, the hotel industry would have acquired everything by now, they would be left with nothing. In fact, they are still at risk of having someone show up and buy everything...”.

The inability to access tourist spaces, means that, in order to make some money, locals are forced to taking jobs or enter into disadvantageous partnerships with hotels and spas, often on an exclusivity regime. For example, a sócia explains that “a massage in an elegant recognized spa (...) is very expensive, but the masseuse is given very little. The spa charges 800 pesos to the customer, but only give 200 to the masseuse (...) that’s why they want to be independent (...) but they can’t advertise their services outside the hotel, that cannot be done, if a customer asks, I like your massage, how can I find you after? They can’t.” Moreover, the all-
inclusive model has had a negative impact in the ejidos bottom-line because given that massage therapy, meals, and recreation opportunities are available at the hotel and included in vacation packages, it does little to encourage tourists to spend money on local foods and experiences in the community. This is consistent with Naidoo and Sharpley’s (2016) postulation that enclave tourism restricts entrepreneurship and favors local elites.

While business capitalists and the hospitality sector are perceived by some ejidatários as the biggest threats, others lament unfair competition from peer entrepreneurs managing competing attractions, like one who "prefers to give tickets away cheap but sell a lot, bad stuff, of poor quality, it does not matter that he squashes the tourists like sardines in the van," said one ejidatário in Playa Grande. Another ejidatário mentioned that competition sometimes spreads negative and untruthful rumors about the ecopark, with the goal to steal customers and undermine the business’ reputation. Moreover, the inability to cooperate among different ecoparks has seriously undermined their ability to bargain better deals with tour operators. Accordingly, in times there was an agreed minimum rate of 400 MXN per person for the zipline tour, which had been informally agreed by all major ecoparks. Eventually, one of the ecoparks started using zip line tours as a loss-leader, realizing they could make more money selling food and souvenirs. This caused all other ecoparks to lose their leverage over tour operators, who were now sending the bulk of their traffic to the ecopark which allowed for higher margins.

The public sector is also mentioned as a source of wrongdoing. For example, one ejidatário mentioned that most funds are used in the beautification of tourist spaces with neglect for public infrastructure in areas outside the tourist enclaves. Moreover, the word “mafia” is used to refer to the seemingly conflict of interest of high-ranked local tourism
authority officers who own tourism attractions in the municipality. There seems to be some resentment towards politicians seeking political gain from the ejidal tourism model success, even though few ejidatários are comfortable to express it out loud with the majority opting to play along and make the best of the situation. However, in a meeting with high-level officials one of the ejidatários requested the floor to say “next time it would be good to know ahead of time the content and goals of the meeting, for I came here today to learn about the achievements of this ejido and not so much to hear politicians who have a record of talking a lot but doing very little”. Later, when interviewed, this participant confided that he was upset because the political sphere is trying to get credit for something they are not responsible for or may not even have supported in the first place.

If there seems to be a blatant criticism and cynicism from some ejidatários and sócios towards the powerful players in the local tourism business ecosystem, it is also true that, at least in regard to tour operators and the hospitality industry, participants understand that formal actors are, to a great extent, subject to the very same forces that affect their own bottom lines. For example, one ejidatário explained that one can’t really blame tour operators for their seemingly unfair business practices because “they are a people without a salary, their job is to sell to the tourists, persuade them and send them to (attractions) where they can get higher margins”. Another ejidatário, admits that “if we propose an attractive partnership, I think they (the operators) would help us ... They have not come here yet, though... we have not seen them ... but ... (the operator will be like) make me a proposal and I’ll send you tourists... give me a percentage and that’s just how business is”. Similarly, one of the non-profit staff members laments that they don’t get a lot of traffic from tour operators but recognizes that, in order to pay sócios fairly for their time, they can’t “offer the type of commissions that
most of the huge companies do. And they offer like 40% commissions...”. In a way, this participant also seems to exculpate the local tourism authority for not getting more involved with the non-profit, which despite contributing to the diversification of the local tourism product, may be offering a product that may be just too out of the ordinary for them to know what to do with it.

“"They don’t care about us very much! We have a relationship with our destination - Riviera Nayarit - they're encouraging, and we have relationships with local nonprofits, which is also encouraging! But in terms of the tourism board and so forth, we really haven’t been very participative with them either... just because there's not a category for us. You don’t exist. We're not in nature tourism, we're not in archeological tourism. We don’t really exist inside of their matrix...

So far, we have seen evidence of socioeconomic apartheid, oppressive business practices, and, conversely, rationale exculpating some of the potentially unethical behavior showcased by the political and formal sector spheres. However, there is also a group of participants that genuinely are not concerned with issues of power and access and apparently did not spend too much time thinking about it, or perhaps it’s just not at the top of their priorities. For example, when asked about his opinion on the way tour operators go about business, one ejidatario said “I am really disconnected from Puerto Vallarta, perhaps my opinion would not be of much use to you, I am not involved, I do not know how they (tour operators) are managed, how they work”. Similarly, one sócia, jewelry maker, said she was unsure about whether it was customary for high-end hotels to invite local artists for demos and exhibitions in the premises and did not look particularly excited or intrigued with the prospect of such partnership. Also, in the case of communitarian entrepreneurs in the ejidos,
there seems to be some degree of specialization and delegation which may contribute to some disconnect from topics that are beyond one’s assigned roles in the business. For example, one ejidatário seemed oblivious to his ejido’s contention with tour operators, saying that “In my case, I am not very involved with the enterprise, because I am not a manager, but I don’t think they’ve ever caused us any problems.”

Despite different, at times opposing, perspectives on the legitimacy and fairness of formal actors’ practices in the local tourism ecosystem, one thing that stands out throughout all interviews, with no exception, is a focus on individual responsibility for both the successes and failures of their entrepreneurial activity. At no point was there suggested that they were victims of the constraints imposed by the system or other actors in particular. Although the existence of socioeconomic structures negatively affecting their lives was acknowledged, it nonetheless does not serve as justification in the face of failure or only limited success. On the contrary, the latter are generally explained in terms of factors under their locus of control, such as excessive casualness, dissent in the cooperatives, lack of effort and inability to navigate the system.

For example, one sócio said that many see obtaining sale permits as an insurmountable obstacle because “people do not bother to read the instructions properly or do not meet all the requirements (...) I get everything in order and up to date, in the first attempt, all good (...) I think they just want you to abide the law (...) It’s like having a car, you have to take care of it”. For ejidatários, it is hard to get a group consensus on the best strategy to explore the property, and decades-old rivalries, some dating back to the foundation of the ejidos, can sometimes cause its governing bodies to cease their activities, let alone strategize
for the future. One ejidatário said, after one disgruntled member impeded the ordinary general assembly from taking place.

“That man does not want to cooperate; he does not want to go to the assemblies. We invite him to the assemblies, and he says no. He does not want to cooperate. Fifty of us offered to pay him 100 pesos each (to buy him out) plus gasoline for him to move away. He has never cooperated with us, it has been years, he does not show up at the assemblies.”

Likewise, a rural consultant, with vast experience working with ejidos, lamented that the existence of rival factions in the ejidos, explaining that when power is passed on to a rival faction all previous work, projects and ideas go to the trash (van por la basura), which makes it almost impossible to have a long term strategic plan for the ejido. Even when there is some consensus in the group, ejidatários make mea culpa on their lack of effort in reaching out to hotels for joint experiences as well as to develop truly unique products. One ejidatário said

“The hotels don’t let tourists get out much, but there are partnerships, what happened is that we fell short of partnering up with all-inclusive hotels, because despite being all-inclusive, I have heard that sometimes their packages include adventure tours. They actually partner with projects like ours (...) We have not done it yet, but I suppose that sooner rather than later we will have to do it, that’s the idea. In reality, we failed to diversify a little more, offer a product different from what was already in the market, maybe rappel, or maybe other things that are not so common.”

Finally, one ejidatário mentioned that the same way it is important to be business savvy and work towards diversification of the tourism product, one also needs to learn how
to navigate the political jungle and know the funding cycles well in order to be effective at securing grants.

“The most important thing is that we know how to get to the right person, politician, deputy, alderman, senator, municipal president, project director, or the people who are responsible for granting funds (...) (however) they’re available only during a certain period in the year (...) It must be done during the first trimester.”

In sum, not only did participants not see themselves as helpless victims of a potentially oppressive system, they also took responsibility for mistakes and lack of adequate effort and direction in some instances of their entrepreneurial lives. Importantly, although they recognize the magnitude of some of the constraints, participants tend to see them as rules of a game that is equally harsh for all involved. Yet, in most studies locals continue to be portrayed mostly as self-righteous victims, wherein they are deprived of their agency and self-determination, and thus unable to fight back and resist the system (Ashworth, 2009; Meyer, 2013; LaPan, Morais, Barbieri, & Wallace, 2016). On the contrary, Wang and Morais (2014) reported that Mosuo women in China are able to find crafty solutions to counter industry-led hegemonic representations of their culture. Similarly, Nazariadli, Morais, Bunds, Baran, and Supak (2019) found that rural farm microentrepreneurs both reject and leverage urbanites’ stereotypes of the rural North Carolina for their advantage in the promotion of farm experiences. Finally, McGehee, Kline, and Knollenberg (2014) demonstrated that tourism dependent rural communities are able to come together in similar ways to social movements, to pursue and achieve tourism-related economic and social change.
Under social exchange frameworks, however, which usually inform this kind of research, locals are assumed to hold the least power at all times and situations, when in fact power is transient and contextual (Cheong & Miller, 2000). Moreover, although we don’t subscribe to a positivist paradigm nor do we believe that seemingly neutral and objective research serves the interests of the communities we work with, unwarranted paternalism or unexamined assumptions don’t either. It appears western researchers by way of their upbringing and education in individualistic democratic societies have a propensity to spot oppression and inequality even when the apparent victims see nothing wrong (Haidt, 2012). Accordingly, researcher bias is discussed by Hammersley (2000) who describes it as the problematic conscious or unconscious production or interpretation of data by social science “in a way that inclines towards erroneous conclusions, conclusions which are in line with their political or practical commitments (13)”. For example, Smith (1989) noted that the dominantly negative reaction to tourism development by tourism anthropologists, in particular how tourism changed communities and culture, fit geometrically well with the established critique of modernization in the literature. Finally, we turn to Spivak (1988), who urged western intellectuals to unlearn their privileged as their loss before they could speak for the subaltern, for they neither had the Other knowledge nor were they equipped to understand it.

4.2. Business strategies

The individual or collective pursuit of a competitive advantage over the formal tourism industry is apparent across all participants. They all seem to understand that competing efficaciously with established actors entails a high degree of differentiation and sometimes even the creation of niche markets. One sócio commented on the need to truly
embrace the tenets of ecotourism, for it may be the only effective strategy for his ejido to stand out among a myriad of other ones offering similar zip-lining experiences.

“That’s why we want to be different, that’s why I tell my peers, mind that we have to create a unique concept which nobody else can claim as their own, one that we don’t have to worry about competition, we have the raw material, we have the mountain, interpretive trails where you can hike listening to the sound of birds in the sky, the trees, feeling the energy of nature”.

Accordingly, not only do sócios find value in offering authentic, unique products and experiences reflective of their culture and identity, but also it becomes a driver for owning their own businesses as opposed to taking jobs in the formal sector (which are more limiting on their skill-set and creativity). One sócio commented that restaurants where he used to work as a cook had static menus, for the most part featuring a somewhat disappointing and predictable mix of world cuisine and mainstream mexican dishes:

“I imagine they are afraid it does not sell [out-of-the-ordinary dishes], as they already have an established menu which sells well (...) I like what I do, to come up with unique dishes, different from all other Mexican restaurants. I might have enchiladas, that’s ok, though combined with different flavours, such as Oaxacan mole sauce, and recipes from Chiapas or Yucatan. I do not know of any restaurant here selling mixiotes, green pipián, red pipián, and several other delicious typical Mexican dishes”.

If on the one hand thinking outside the box appears to be a key strategy, on the other microentrepreneurs need to also keep in mind that most tourists expect and look for mainstream services and products. For example, the sócio above has relied largely on his
knowledge of Spanish and Italian cuisine not only to secure employment as a line cook but also to deliver as a hired personal chef when tourists book him to cook at their vacation homes. Moreover, another sócio said although he enjoys crafting unique pieces, he still prefers to produce his less risky and easier to price wood turtles and palm trees, for fear of being left with unsold stock and lots of haggling to do. Accordingly, he said “if I craft something a little bit out of the ordinary, I will have to carry it in my backpack, back and forth, for two weeks before I am able to sell it”.

The same challenge is posed to the non-profit who, on the one-hand takes on the mission of changing the tourism paradigm in Puerto Vallarta, but on the other still needs to meet the expectations of what a tour operator should look like. A staff member said that the agency had to adopt some of the standards and language of the industry in order to become financially sustainable, while at the same time making sure their mission didn’t drift.

“...when we were trying to run tours that were really about like, you know... interact with local people and learn about their lifestyles... that wasn’t selling anything. And so we’ve learned how to brand ourselves in a way that’s attractive... like focusing on cultural exchange, but also the fun element, you know, like... make your own tortillas, and (...) we moved into this office (with a hip vibe) trying to playing the game of being this tour company... and we have an air-conditioned Sprinter van.”

Similarly, the ejidos are faced with the need for infrastructure upgrade and the professionalization of their practices in order to approach the standard of the formal sector, although they have limited industry knowledge as most come from a farming background, as well has limited resources and access to capital. Consequently, they alternate between the
informal and the formal, the professional and the amateur, and the intentional and accidental to make do with the limited resources they have at hand. For example, one ejidataria said that despite not being formally employed by the enterprise "... sometimes we have to go and help out so that we don't have to pay more employees. Washing dishes, wait tables, take care of guests (...) I don’t get paid (...) because (the enterprise) is growing and we don’t have a lot of money to spend". Despite this, management decided that they should invest particularly in marketing and sales and thus hired one ejidatária full-time to visit tour operators in the busy streets of Puerta Vallarta to raise awareness about the ejido’s offerings. She said "Every day I have an area to go (...), I have to go well prepared with my advertising, price lists of what I charge and willing to walk (...) you show them the brochure, I have photos, videos and start to see ".

Nevertheless, even if the enterprise has the capacity to employ a significant number of people full-time, the vast majority are ejidatários or their children who had to rekindle their skillset on the job to be able to perform in the tourism industry. Remarkably, they were able to turn a largely unproductive tract of land into a productive multi-activity ecopark, using extensively in-house, amateur and self-taught skills, as well as combining and reusing resources to explore different niches and jump into opportunities as they arose.

Permatourism principles can also be applied at the micro-level. For example, it appears as though ejidatários realized the importance of producing no waste (principle 6), by valuing and making use of all the material and immaterial resources available to them to overcome shortages of funds, labor, and specialized skills. Permatourism’s Principle 6 may be aligned with the concept of entrepreneurial bricolage and may warrant further research. According to Baker and Nelson (2005) and Fisher (2012), bricolage is a strategy employed
by entrepreneurs to overcome resource-constrained environments through recycling and repurposing available material and human resources to literally create something from nothing, making do with the few resources they have available.

However, the extensive use of entrepreneurial bricolage in multiple domains can result in a bricolage “trap” which can limit enterprise growth (Fisher, 2012). Cognizant that the enterprise desperately needed a cash injection to sustain growth, and knowing that it would be extremely unlikely to obtain it through government grants or bank loans, management of ejido made the difficult decision to ask each individual shareholder the equivalent of $800. The goal was to revamp the enterprise, including purchasing new furniture and other equipment, boost social media presence, and hire a professional manager with experience in the industry.

Overall, it seems that the ejidatários are becoming more business-savvy and working towards long-term favorable agreements with capitalist partners to exploit their assets more sustainably, from a financial standpoint. For example, one ejidatário mentioned that the practice of older ejidatários was to sell the land to real estate developers, though for a good price, but not having the vision to reinvest it, wasting the money mostly in “functions, tequila and mariachis”, thus compromising the well-being of generations to come. He added that his ejido entered an agreement with Mexican investor for the construction of a hotel/mall/parking lot in prime land, wherein the partner is putting all the money and the ejidatários provide the land. Moreover, there is a clause stating that after 5 years the ejido can decide whether to keep the agreement as is, sell their shares to the partner, or buy the partner’s shares.
4.3. **Permatourism**

The label of socioeconomic apartheid applied to Puerto Vallarta by Wilson (2008) is symptomatic that the destination does not meet the “integrate rather than segregate” principle, relying largely on the resort enclave model which excludes local microentrepreneurs. Despite that, evidence that big hospitality consortiums are reaching out to the ejidos and microentrepreneurs for tours outside the four walls of their units suggests that they have become aware that the sol y playa model may become obsolete in the near future, if it is not upgraded with off-the-beaten path local experiences which seem to increasingly interest tourists (Destinations International, 2019).

Integrate rather than segregate is intricately related with the idea of symbiotic relationships between actors in the tourism business ecosystem, in particular those between the formal and the informal sector. For example, the relationship between the tour operators and entrepreneurs appears to be not based on a true partnership among equals, like the symbiotic relationships advocated by Permatourism, but rather a relationship wherein the bigger partner leverages the existing power asymmetry to their advantage. In their defense, and as seen before, especially smaller tour operators also struggle to generate business and therefore naturally drive tourism traffic to attractions where they can make the most profit. However, although it may help tour operators in the short term, the practice of rewarding mediocre service quality may hurt the destination in the long run. Hence, tour operators may be unwittingly compromising the financial viability of the most legitimate enterprises, harming the competitiveness of the destination and with serious consequences for the broader business ecosystem.
Although under the Permatourism model functional relations between the tourism formal sector are fundamental to the success of microentrepreneurs, so are relations with the public sector which encompasses government spheres and universities. Regarding the former, results suggest that destination management authorities have chosen to ignore responsible tourism niche proposed by the non-profit agency in Bucerias, for it is too detached from the mainstream tourism product, as explained by a staff member. We argue that it also may be the case that these organizations, by way of their mandates and rigid bureaucratic structure, do not understand nor are they equipped to work with and empower informal microentrepreneurs. In the case of the ejidos, the high economic impact of eco and adventure tourism combined with the relatively romantic appeal of the “farmers turned entrepreneurs” story (Chávez Dagostino, Sánchez González, & Fortes, 2017), is starting to catch the authorities’ attention. Regardless of whether this sudden interest in communitarian bottom up tourism development is staged theatricals, the fact is that there is a genuine interest from authorities to support the replication of the model across many ejidos.

The local university has a good record of working with communities wishing to pursue livelihoods through tourism (Espinoza Sanchéz, Camacho Valdéz, Gordian Dávila, Covarrubias Rubio, 2011; Chávez Dagostino, Sánchez González, & Fortes, 2017). For example, graduate students are assigned to different sites where they are expected to work side by side with community members to develop heritage and nature trails, create business plans and management solutions, or identify consumer profiles. One ejidatário confirmed that his ejido has received a lot of support from the university in the form in the form of consultancy and extension service. While the support is apparent and well documented,
there are some who think that the university could do much more and complain that students’ support lasts only until they have collected all their data. In addition, students come with their minds already made up in terms of the goals of their projects and don’t spend too much time addressing the real needs of the ejido.

“I had an episode with a couple of students, they wanted to do their thesis and told me, We are going to make a project with trails, and I said, What for? We don’t need trails. ... I said, You know what? Let’s do something that is useful for both of us. I need to do a business plan for the company (...) Why don’t you help me with that? (...) They thought I was insane and left, they ended up doing what they wanted in the first place, I think they already defended their theses (...) they did not take us into account, at all”.

This account reflects a pervasive ethical problem in the way community research is normally conducted, despite an “ethics creep” imposed by regulatory bodies on the review process (Haggerty, 2004). Hence, researchers continue to use the communities to harvest data and advance their careers, but do not give anything back and sometimes do not even circle back to share study results (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010; Morais, Ferreira, Nazariadli, & Ghahramani, 2017; Kara, 2018). However, as a team of participatory action-researchers we also feel that it is extremely difficult to conduct ethical and useful research, the kind that empowers communities, in the context of the neo-liberal university (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2000), which is by far more concerned with numbers than with process and relevance.

5. Conclusion

While much scholarship has critiqued enclave tourism, this study adopted a participatory action approach to examine how the locals in the Bahía de Banderas employ
tourism microentrepreneurship to advance their livelihood goals in face of the socioeconomic apartheid created by formal sector tourism companies and government. However, the results suggest that the assumption of a “continual oppression” of locals by the tourism industry needs to be revisited (Cheong & Miller, 2000), as participants across different bottom-up development models seemed impervious to forces of oppression in the local tourism system. Accordingly, despite adverse conditions microentrepreneurs are still able to glean some economic opportunities, provided that they are extremely judicious in how they choose to exploit those same opportunities for there seems to be a thin line between moderate success on the one hand and total failure on the other, with immediate repercussions in their livelihoods.

Whereas it was postulated that microentrepreneurs were fated to operate in the margins of the formal tourism industry, surviving off of a few unexploited niches (Morais, Ferreira, Nazariadli, & Ghahramani, 2017), this study provides some evidence that grassroots tourism MEship may be evolving into a vital and meritorious complement to the traditional sol y playa tourism product in PV-BB.

PAR was instrumental for this project for it allowed access to participants and data, which would otherwise be off the table had we pursued another methodological route. In turn, the research team was able to carry out successfully the communities’ plan to offer experiences to American students. Accordingly, the service Spring break proposal was submitted to two American Universities in August 2018, and one of them approved it in July 2019. The first group of service Spring breakers is scheduled to arrive in Puerto Vallarta in March 2020, a commercial partnership between the local community and an online tourism retailer has been formalized, and similar SSB packages are being marketed to additional
universities. It is estimated that week-long stay for each 15-people group will generate a yearly gross revenue of approximately $7,000 in the two communities.

Overall the study stands to provide novel insight into the enclave tourism business ecosystem, departing from a rather unavailing critique to the model that has proven to be resilient despite academic censure, to emphasizing the ingenuity and resourcefulness of microentrepreneurs, which allows them to escape employment in the hospitality service sector or even alienation in some cases.
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CHAPTER 5: Conclusion

This study has been presented in three articles. In Chapter Two, I looked at the limitations of current tourism research and planning paradigms, and proposed a new framework — Permatourism; in Chapter Three, I explored the effect of cross-zonal symbiotic relationships on farm tourism microentrepreneur’s intention to engage in farm tourism; in Chapter Four, I examined the mechanisms through which tourism microentrepreneurs are able to glean sustainable and dignified livelihoods through tourism under conditions of socioeconomic apartheid.

1. Article summaries

1.1. Article 1

This article examined the tourism ecosystem through systems thinking and design principles, two conceptual lenses not yet commonly used to frame tourism problems or devise solutions. Namely, the purpose of this paper was to explain the conceptual framework of Permatourism for the holistic study of tourism and the design of equitable tourism development strategies.

Accordingly, research shows that grassroots tourism development models may engender consciousness-raising, entrepreneurial networking, and self-efficacy, and promotes the creation of locally owned and operated tourism microenterprises. However, actual local participation may be largely constrained by socio-political, legal, administrative and economic structures. In addition, communities are heterogeneous, which makes it difficult to unify local wishes and expectations to offer a practical guide to tourism development. Permatourism stands out as a third way to tourism development. I defined it
as a tourism planning and management process that pursues the complementarity between formal private and public actors, and local microentrepreneurs and grassroots community social structures. Furthermore, it calls for the formal tourism sector to embrace the socio-cultural characteristics of the host community to make the local tourism experience more unique and competitive while at the same time ensuring that local residents are better equipped to become involved in tourism. Finally, it requires the creation of a grassroots business development strategy that aligns local entrepreneurs with expected business opportunities generated by existing or upcoming big tourism investments in the region or large scope social movements and trends with high impact at the macroeconomic level.

Permatourism is an application of the principles of Permaculture design in the field of Tourism. The latter emerged in the late seventies primarily as a response to oil-dependent, energy inefficient agriculture, but its robust and creative design principles have since been adapted to create sustainable human habitats: building, town planning, water supply, purification, and commercial and financial systems. Permaculture design is rooted in the close study of dynamic living systems and provides sui generis solutions to complex and apparently insurmountable challenges. Importantly, Permaculture is essentially a way of putting components together for their maximum benefit, which starts with the observation and identification of existing patterns, and proceeds to work within the naturally occurring systems that are already there. Permaculture welcomes diversity for it provides alternative pathways for essential ecosystems functions in the face of changing conditions.

Permatourism subscribes to the three Permaculture ethics: 1) Care for the Earth, 2) Fair-share, and 3) Care for People. Moreover, Permatourism is also guided by 12 principles, which delineate the conceptual foundation of this development approach: 1) Observe and
interact; 2) Catch and store energy; 3) Obtain a yield; 4) Apply self-regulation & accept feedback; 5) Use & value renewable resources & services; 6) Produce no waste; 7) Design from patterns to details; 8) Integrate rather than segregate; 9) Use small and slow solutions; 10) Use and value diversity; 11) Use edges & value the marginal, and; 12) Creatively use and respond to change.

1.2. Article 2

Considering that the Permatourism model is premised on the a symbiotic alignment between the formal and informal sectors, I explored the extent to which psychological mechanisms such as entrepreneurial self-efficacy among tourism microentrepreneurs could be predicted by the level of bridging ties they have with formal private sector partners, public sector support agencies, and with other peers. In particular, I looked at the effect of cross-zonal partnerships in the scope of local foods on farm tourism microentrepreneurs’ intentions to take on entrepreneurship in the near future.

Accordingly, scholars are increasingly interested in exploring ways to catalyze tourism microentrepreneurship to enhance destination equity and competitiveness. Leveraging the popularity of the foodie scene, signature farm tourism is emerging as one of the most promising niches for tourism microentrepreneurs. However, both psychological and structural constraints seem to be holding farmers back in their intention to start offering farm experiences or expanding their existing farm tourism portfolio. We argue that Permatourism-enabled bridging social capital affords farmers sources of entrepreneurial self-efficacy, which in turn enhances entrepreneurial intention. To test our conceptual model, we surveyed 207 farmers in North Carolina and used Structural Equation Modeling.
to examine the hypothesized relationships between constructs. Analysis revealed an adequate model fit and strong significant relationships between bridging social capital and both dimensions of tourism microentrepreneurial self-efficacy. Internal self-efficacy factors were strongly and significantly associated with entrepreneurial intention, while adapting to externalities self-efficacy was non-significant. Triangulation of these statistical results with qualitative data from five years of participatory action-research with farm tourism microentrepreneurs in the study region reinforced the importance of informal networking processes to model entrepreneurial behavior and receive positive reinforcement that boosts self-efficacy and reaffirms microentrepreneurial intentions. In turn, farm tourism microentrepreneurs’ adaptancy to externalities is not influencing their intentions because they operate under a significant level of uncertainty in face of their inability to obtain definitive answers about key policy, liability and business support issues.

1.3. Article 3

Destinations characterized by top-down development concede scarce economic opportunities for locals, which are thought to be victims of tourism-generated socioeconomic apartheid (Wilson, 2008). However, there is evidence that in some destinations communities have been able to overcome structural barriers and thrive through providing complementary services to the formal industry (Sánchez González, 2017). Hence, Permatourism was used to examine microentrepreneurs’ adaptation strategies that optimize scarce opportunities, through their businesses’ alignment with outstanding opportunities afforded by the formal sector.

Despite receiving harsh criticisms from academia, the model of enclave tourism continues to be widely implemented by transnational conglomerates in regions with
malleable governance. Accordingly, enclave mass tourism development, materialized in the form of all-inclusive resorts, may create forms of socioeconomic apartheid at destinations, through removing locals from tourist spaces where host-guest exchanges are most likely to occur. However, results from a qualitative study conducted in Bahía de Banderas — Puerto Vallarta, Mexico, suggest that despite adverse conditions, microentrepreneurs are still able to glean some economic opportunities. Yet, they must be extremely judicious in how they choose to take advantage of the available opportunities; there seems to be a thin line between moderate success on the one hand and total failure on the other, with immediate repercussions in their livelihoods. These findings challenge common assumptions that host communities are helpless victims of continual oppression by the tourism industry because participants demonstrated a persistent resolve to carve out a growing share of the tourism economy for their communities even in the face of a critical consciousness of the hegemonic power of multinational companies and local government.

2. Methodological considerations

This dissertation subscribes to a transformative worldview (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010), wherein the research team and study participants are equals in the research process and pursue a shared horizon in which tourism is an enabler of socioeconomic prosperity in the community. Accordingly, literature in community psychology calls for transformational scholarship in the social sciences, stressing the uselessness of conventional, seemingly objective research of mainstream psychology and other social sciences (Davis, 2008; Seymour-Rolls & Hughes, 2000; Wisner, Stea, & Kruks, 1991). Hence, participatory action-research goes beyond the boundaries of traditional paradigms of research that call for the least disturbance in the study environment, being instead a method primarily concerned
with bringing about social change to participants in the research process (Seymour-Rolls & Hughes, 2000; Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010).

For farm tourism microentrepreneurs, social change meant the ability to retain family farmland and lifestyle (i.e. a farming lineage) in the face of financial pressure. This can be accomplished through farm diversification, wherein farm tourism is a relatively low entry barriers activity with a growing market demand. In the context of article 3, social change meant the expansion of participants' communitarian tourism enterprise which essentially translates into more jobs for the ejidatários and their children on the one hand, and the possibility to distribute a portion of the profits among the elders in the community, who have been outside the formal employment system all their lives, and are therefore ineligible to receive pensions. Importantly, the shared horizon of microentrepreneurial development pursued by researchers and participants is a testimony to the collaborative (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988) and the transformative (Wisner, Stea, & Kruks, 1991) nature of the research approach that guided this study.

Nonetheless, disadvantaged people are often distrustful of researchers (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010). In order to build trust, I had to drop the university insignias, disempower myself, and prove myself worthy of the participants' investment in the research process. This meant that in field work I had to be flexible and respectful of the participants' schedules, be prepared with a plan B in case of a last minute change of plans, be prepared to follow-up on new leads as they arose, and even undergo rites of passage when appropriate.

In terms of research methods, PAR can use either quantitative or qualitative methods or both (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010). In article 2, PAR lent itself to a sequential methodology QUAL-QUANT-QUAL (Flick, 2014), wherein 1) qualitative approaches were
used to co-generate research questions and develop the questionnaire; 2) a quantitative methods were utilized to test the hypotheses; and, 3) qualitative data was used to deepen and interpret results. For example, the latter was instrumental in article 2 to interpret a somewhat surprising non-significant relationship between External Self-Efficacy and tourism microentrepreneurial intention. Moreover, in article 3, PAR was critical for gaining access to individuals and institutions (Flick, 2014), because hanging out with key elements of the community allowed for much quicker acceptance. The level of detail and depth of data collected is even more noteworthy considering the relatively short time spent in the research site.

PAR has a longitudinal component grounded on long-term relationships with communities and individuals, which makes it costly, hard to implement, and not suitable with traditional research funding cycles (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010; Morais, Ferreira, Nazariadli, and Ghahramani (2017). In order to overcome some of these challenges, I went about structuring this study to ensure a continuity in the involvement of NC State with the participating communities. In NC, the Tourism Extension office is committed to secure funding continually to maintain a significant and steady level of fieldwork, carried out by faculty and graduate students. In Puerto Vallarta, the annual service Spring Break trip means that a cohort of trained, socially conscious students will be conducting face-to-face interviews, collecting longitudinal data on the impact of tourism microentrepreneurship on the participants’ lives, natural environments, and communities. Moreover, I collaborated with a private sector partner, a US-based tourism retailer. This means that now that the products have been developed, the company has an inherent revenue motivation to reach
out to new markets and improve the products and services provided by communities in both destinations.

3. **Theoretical implications and recommendations for future research**

   Farrell and Twining-Ward (2004) postulate that there is a comprehensive body of literature on the individual components of the tourism business ecosystem components individually, but less is known about the interactions between them and their functions in the system. To fill this gap, this dissertation was conducted to find support for the case of Permatourism as a systems ecology framework necessary to examine the evolution of select destinations in terms of periods of growth, stagnation, decline or rejuvenation where traditional cookie cutter, cause-effect approaches can’t equate the complexity of the system.

   In article 2, I suggested that partnerships with formal industry partners, like chefs and restaurateurs, may constitute important sources of social capital and self-efficacy among farmers. However, we need to recognize that the exchange of non-economic assets is not unidirectional. Thus, future research should look into the mechanisms through which chefs and restaurateurs capitalize on partnerships with local farmers to improve their businesses. Namely, the enhanced level of transparency (Bhaduri & Ha-Brookshire, 2011) that farm visits bring to the restaurant’s practices, and the alignment with important core values should be examined. This important because through collaborations with local farmers, chefs and restaurateurs are able to align their value proposition with generally accepted core values in America (Kawasaki, 2011), such as sustainability, healthy living and localism (Flack, 1997), which appear to influence consumer’s willingness to patronize locally sourced restaurants (Shin, Im, Jung, & Severt, 2017).
In article 3, I suggest that the assumption of a "continual oppression" of locals by the tourism industry needs to be revisited (Cheong & Miller, 2000), as participants across different bottom-up development models seemed impervious to forces of oppression in the local tourism system. Accordingly, despite adverse conditions microentrepreneurs are still able to glean some economic opportunities, provided that they are extremely judicious in how they choose to exploit those same opportunities for there seems to be a thin line between moderate success on the one hand and total failure on the other, with immediate repercussions in their livelihoods.

Baker and Nelson’s (2005) concept of bricolage may explain some features of the entrepreneurial processes observed in communitarian tourism entrepreneurship in Mexico and farm tourism microentrepreneurship in North Carolina. Accordingly, the authors describe entrepreneurial bricolage as a strategy employed by entrepreneurs to overcome resource-constrained environments through recycling and repurposing available material and human resources to literally create something from nothing. However, while ejidatários seem to enact bricolage primarily to overcome shortages of material resources, labor availability, specialized skills, and create new markets, farmers appear to enact bricolage to cope with a complex and ambiguous institutional and regulatory environment governing farm tourism.

Despite the ingenuity and resourcefulness showcased by informal microentrepreneurs, there is a generalized idea that it is an expression of business activity that has mostly a negative impact in the economy. For example, “black market” is a term that is often heard in mainstream media, and even in academia it is not unusual to find pejorative terms like the “shadow economy” (Apressyan, 1997). Moreover, in tourism, the informal
sector is often considered a parasite of the formal industry (Carter, 2007). However, Morais, Ferreira, Nazariadli, and Ghahramani (2017) postulate that the relationship between informal tourism microentrepreneurs and the formal sector is better described by commensalism, given that the latter is unaffected by the former. In other words, microentrepreneurs are able to make a living off of unexploited opportunities generated by the formal sector, but do not cause them any harm. This study goes further by providing evidence that, in fact, the relationship may be one of mutualism, wherein both parties are benefited. Accordingly, I postulate that farm tourism microentrepreneurship in North Carolina and grassroots tourism microentrepreneurship in Puerto Vallarta may be evolving into vital and meritorious complements to the local foods and sol y playa tourism, respectively, which might contribute significantly to the uniqueness and competitiveness of both destinations.

4. Practical implications

Permatourism is also a practical toolkit and a social innovation, which leverages the economic muscle of the formal tourism industry to generate business opportunities to disenfranchised locals. It advances our understanding of the tourism informal economy, sheds new light on the operationalization of intersectoral linkages and its benefits to the local tourism experience, which could assist tourism governance officials in justifying investment towards supporting initiatives that aim at engaging the informal sphere.

For example, article 2 suggests that multilateral tourism initiatives involving actors across different Permatourism zones are effective in increasing farmer’s intention to develop supply of farm tourism experiences. This is important for destination managers because an
adequate supply of authentic farming experiences can improve the uniqueness and competitiveness of the local tourism products.

Notwithstanding, article 2 equally suggests that formal training focusing on legal aspects of agritourism is necessary for the success of farm tourism, given that these competencies, due to their complexity and ambiguity, may be difficult to bring up to adequate levels in an informal setting.

Article 3 found evidence of the socioeconomic apartheid in Puerto Vallarta (Wilson 2008), wherein the tourism economy relies largely on the resort enclave model which excludes local microentrepreneurs. Despite that, there is evidence that big hospitality consortiums are reaching out to the ejidos and microentrepreneurs for they have become aware that the sol y playa model may need to be upgraded with off-the-beaten path local experiences. Hence, local destination managers should support microentrepreneurs and catalyse these partnerships in order to strengthen Puerto Vallarta’s position in the world's sol y playa tourism market.
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Will you utilize private academic records?
No

Explain the procedures and document permission for accessing these records.

Employees?
No

Describe where (in the workplace, out of the workplace) activities will be conducted.

From whom and how will permission to conduct research on the employees be obtained?

How will potential participants be approached and informed about the research so as to reduce any perceived coercion to participate?

Is the employer involved in the research activities in any way?
No

Please explain:

Will the employer receive any results from the research activities (i.e. reports, recommendations, etc.)?
No

Please explain. How will employee identities be protected in reports provided to employers?

Impaired decision making capacity/legally incompetent?
No

How will competency be assessed and from whom will you obtain consent?
Mental/emotional/developmental/psychiatric challenges?
No
Identify the challenge and explain the unique risks for this population.

Describe any special provisions necessary for consent and other study activities (e.g., legal guardian for those unable to consent).

People with physical challenges?
No
Identify the challenge and explain the unique risks for this population.

Describe any special provisions necessary for working with this population (e.g., witnesses for the visually impaired).

Economically or educationally disadvantaged?
No

Racial, ethnic, religious and/or other minorities?
No

Non-English speakers?
No
Describe the procedures used to overcome any language barrier.

Will a translator be used?
No
Provide information about the translator (who they are, relation to the community, why you have selected them for use, confidentiality measures being utilized).

Explain the necessity for the use of the vulnerable populations listed.
No

State how, where, when, and by whom consent will be obtained from each participant group. Identify the type of consent (e.g., written, verbal, electronic, etc.). Label and submit all consent forms. Consent Form Template for NC State Research -- Adults Parental Permission and Minor Assent.
The online survey will have an intro screen with the informed consent statement (see survey/questionnaire). Participants will acknowledge their consent by clicking on a button which will direct them to the first questions of the instrument.

If you Participants are minors, describe the process for obtaining parental consent and minor's assent (minor's agreement to participate).
No

Are you applying for a waiver of the requirement for consent (no consent information of any kind provided to participants) for any participant group(s) in your study?
No

For each participant group that you are requesting a waiver of consent for, please state what method this waiver is needed for, why it is needed and address each of the above 5 criteria to justify why your study qualifies for a waiver of consent.

Are you applying for an alteration (exclusion of one or more of the specific required elements) of consent for any participant group(s) in your study?
No

Identify which required elements of consent you are altering, describe the participant group(s) for which this waiver will apply, and justify why this waiver is needed.

Are you applying for a waiver of signed consent (consent information is provided, but participant signatures are not collected)? A waiver of signed consent may be granted only if: The research involves no more than minimal risk; The research involves no procedures for which consent is normally required outside of the research context.
Yes

Would a signed consent document be the only document or record linking the participant to the research?
Yes

Is there any deception of the human subjects involved in this study?
No
Describe why deception is necessary and describe the debriefing procedures. Does the deception require a waiver or alteration of informed consent information? Describe debriefing and/or disclosure procedures and submit materials for review. Are participants given the option to destroy their data if they do not want to be a part the study after disclosure?

For each participant group please indicate how many individuals from that group will be involved in the research. Estimates or ranges of the numbers of participants are acceptable. Please be aware that participant numbers may affect study risk. If your participation totals differ by 10% from what was originally approved, notify the IRB.

The survey will be sent out to 1192 farmers through e-mail, but we estimate that only about 200 will respond to the participation request.

How will potential participants be found and selected for inclusion in the study?

Participants are NC farmers involved in local foods programs and partnerships. We have created a database with approx 1192 farmers that were listed in the P1Lab database as well as in public web databases (Appalachian Grown, visit NC farms, Carolina Farm Stewardship, farm to table restaurants, user farmers lists, etc).

For each participant group, how will potential participants be approached about the research and invited to participate? Please upload necessary scripts, templates, talking points, flyers, brochures, and announcements.

We will send an email with an invitation for participating in the survey, using the script provided in this IRB application (see recruitment material). The script provides a very vague description of the scope of the study.

Describe any inclusion and exclusion criteria for your participants and describe why those criteria are necessary. (If your study concentrates on a particular population, you do not need to repeat your description of that population here.) Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be reflected in all of your recruitment materials and consent forms.

N/A

Is there any relationship between researcher and participants - such as teacher/student, employer/employee?

No

What is the justification for using this participant group instead of an unrelated participant group? Please outline the steps taken to mitigate risks to participants from the pre-existing relationship, including power dynamics of this relationship and/or perceived coercion.

Describe any risks associated with conducting your research with a related participant group.

Describe how this relationship will be managed to reduce risk during the research.

How will risks to confidentiality be managed?

Address any concerns regarding data quality (e.g. non-candid responses) that could result from this relationship.

In the following questions describe in lay terms all study procedures that will be experienced by each group of participants in this study. For each group of participants in your study, provide a step-by-step description of what they will experience from beginning to end of the study activities.

Participants will receive an email invitation with a survey link. The ones that are interested will follow link to the welcome screen of the online survey where they will read the consent statement. Once they acknowledge their consent, they will click a button and proceed to answering the body of the instrument.

We will ask participants to share their email address so that we can track their responses over time - i.e., we plan to administer follow-up surveys each winter.

Are you requesting the use of existing information to be used as data for this research project or are you requesting secondary data to be used as data for this research project? (Discuss the following: access, transfer, storage, destruction, (re)identifiable nature of the data and if data is subject to FERPA or HIPAA)

Data will be collected via online survey in March using Qualtrics platform.

Social/Reputational?

No

Psychological/Emotional?

No

Financial/Employability?

No

Legal?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic (affect grades, graduation)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (affect job)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (affect financial welfare)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical (harm to treatment)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurability (harm to eligibility)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal (reveals unlawful behavior)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private behavior (harm to relationships/reputation)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious issues/Beliefs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe the nature and degree of risk that this study poses. Describe the steps taken to minimize these risks. You CANNOT leave this blank, say 'N/A', none or 'no risks'. You can say "There is minimal risk associated with this research." For each ‘Yes’ selected above, describe the probability of the risk occurring and the magnitude of harm should the risk occur. Discuss how you are mitigating these risks through participant selection, study design, and data security.

There is minimal risk associated with this research.

If you are accessing private records, describe how you are gaining access to these records, what information you need from the records, and how you will receive/record data. Private records may include educational, medical, financial, employment. Some of these private records may be subject to laws such as FERPA and HIPAA. Your content here should match what you've discussed on the procedures tab.

N/A

Are you asking participants to disclose information about other individuals (e.g., friends, family, co-workers, etc.)?

No

You have indicated that you will ask participants to disclose information about other individuals (see Populations tab). Describe the data you will collect and discuss how you will protect confidentiality and the privacy of these third-party individuals.

If you are collecting information that participants might consider personal or sensitive or that if revealed might cause embarrassment, harm to reputation or could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability, what measures will you take to protect participants from those risks?

N/A

If any of the study procedures could be considered risky to and of themselves (e.g. study procedures involving upsetting questions, stressful situations, physical risks, etc.) what measures will you take to protect participants from those risks?

N/A

Describe the anticipated direct benefits to be gained by each group of participants in this study (compensation is not a direct benefit).

N/A

If no direct benefit is expected for participants describe any indirect benefits that may be expected, such as to the scientific community or to society.

Results from this study will help local governments and tourism development authorities in deciding how to best support local farm entrepreneurs engaged in farm tourism.

Will you be receiving already existing data without identifiers for this study?

No

Will you be receiving already existing data which includes identifiers for this study?

No

Describe how the benefits balance out the risks of this study.

Will data be collected in a way that would not allow you to link any identifying information to a participant?

No
Will any identifying information be recorded with the data (e.g., name, phone number, IDs, e-mails, etc.)?
Yes

Will you use a master list, crosswalk, or other means of linking a participant's identity to the data?
Yes

Will it be possible to identify a participant indirectly from the data collected (i.e., indirect identification from demographic information)?
No

Audio recordings?
No

Video recordings?
No

Images?
No

Digital/electronic files?
Yes

Paper documents (including notes and journals)?
No

Physiological Responses?
No

Online survey?
Yes

Restricted Access (who, what, when, where)?
Yes

Password Protection (files, folders, drives, workstations)?
No

Suggestion of anonymous browsing?
Yes

Locks (office, desks, cabinets, briefcases)?
Yes

VPN (transfer, upload, download, access)?
Yes

Encryption (files, folders, drives)?
No

Describe all participant identifiers that will be collected from each data collection method (surveys, interviews, focus groups, existing data, background data collected via host site or software). Discuss why it is necessary to record identifiers at all and describe the de-identifying process.

We will ask participants to share their email address so that we can track their responses over time - i.e., we plan to administer follow-up surveys each winter. The PI will create a master list of participants with names, email addresses, and a participant code (e.g., 2016-0001) to assign the correct code to the data collected from each participant. Next, the data column with the email addresses will be deleted from the data file so that there will not be identifying information of the participants in the data file. The master list with participant codes is needed so the PI can track consecutive surveys of each participant (e.g., one per year).

If recording identifiable information about participants, discuss any links between the data and the participants and why you need to retain them. Discuss destruction of links or removal of identifiers.

The master list of name and email addresses will be an Excel file saved in my office desktop hard drive (Duarte B. Morais, PI). The desktop computer is password protected and the office is locked when I am not here. The hard drive is backed-up using standard NC State procedures.

Discuss if you'll be working with your departmental IT to create a data management plan and if you're using NC State managed devices, NC State Google Drive or other NC State non-networked device. If using a personal device, discuss data protection.

None.

Describe any ways that participants themselves or third parties discussed by participants could be identified indirectly from the data collected and describe measures taken to protect identities. (Data can be reidentified by researcher access, technology employed, researcher expertise, and triangulation of data or other information. Discuss the probability of reidentification and the magnitude of harm to participants should the data be reidentified. Discuss the probability of reidentification occurring and the magnitude of harm should it occur).
N/A
For all recordings of any type, describe the type of recording(s) to be made. Describe the safe storage of recordings. Who will have access to the recordings? Will recordings be used in publications or data reporting? Will images be altered to de-identify? Will recordings be transcribed and by whom?

Na.

Describe how data will be reported (aggregate, individual responses, use of direct quotes) and describe how identities will be protected in study reports. Reporting data may sometimes reidentify your participants. If needed, you can adjust how you report your data to protect the identities of your participants. Discuss.

Descriptive data about the sample will be reported on aggregate form.

Will anyone besides the PI or the research team have access to the data (including completed surveys) from the moment they are collected until they are destroyed? This includes sharing data with sponsors, journals, or using the data for future research endeavors. If you are sharing the data, this should be in your consent form.

No.

Describe any compensation that participants will be eligible to receive, including what the compensation is, any eligibility requirements for that compensation, and how that compensation will be delivered. Examples of compensation include: monetary compensation, research credits, raffle/raffle drawing, novel items. Make sure to check with your department regarding issues of tracking payments as your department accounting office may have requirements that affect your human subjects privacy (such as the mandatory tracking of anyone who receives compensation). This tracking may influence the confidentiality/anonymity of your research and must be addressed in this application.

At the end of the survey, participants will be invited to enter their email address to qualify for a participation incentive of a $20 gift certificate to Tractor Supply stores. Specifically, the first 100 participants to complete the survey and volunteer their email address will be notified of their gift certificate via email, and the gift certificates will be sent to them via mail promptly after culminating data collection.

Explain compensation provisions if the participant withdraws prior to completion of the study.

Participants will have to complete the survey to be eligible for compensation.
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Fork to Farmer 2019 survey

Start of Block: Informed Consent

Q1.1

Welcome to the 2019 Agribusiness and Tourism survey!

The goal of this survey is to examine farmers’ integration with other economic sectors as well as your level of involvement in farm tourism. The survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete. There are no right or wrong answers – please use your best judgment to respond to each question. This information will be kept confidential and your identity will be protected in any publishing of the findings. All data will be reported at the group level and all responses will be stored on a password protected computer until completion of the study, at which time your responses will be permanently deleted.

To encourage prompt participation, the first 100 participants will receive a $20 gift card to Tractor Supply.

☐ I consent, begin the study (1)

☐ I do not consent, I do not wish to participate (2)

End of Block: Informed Consent

Start of Block: Block 1

Q2.1

PART A

In this section you will be asked about your farm
Q2.2 Please indicate how important each of the following revenue sources is for the financial viability of your farm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Not Important At All (1)</th>
<th>Of Little Importance (2)</th>
<th>Of Average Importance (3)</th>
<th>Very Important (4)</th>
<th>Absolutely Essential (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sale of product to distributors and other wholesalers (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of product to chefs and restaurants (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of product to other retail establishments (groceries, food coops, other food businesses) (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of product to institutions (school systems, nursing homes, childcare centers, etc.) (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of product through CSA - Community Supported Agriculture (Weekly boxes sold directly to consumers) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of product through VSA - Vacationer Supported Agriculture (Weekly boxes sold directly to vacationers) (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of product at the farm (farm stand, U-pick) (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of product at farmers markets (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of experiences/tours to farm visitors (workshops, farm dinners, farm stays, etc) (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2.3 What percentage of your total farm revenue do you estimate to come from the following sources?  
[These percent figures should add up to 100%]
Sales of product directly to chefs and restaurants: _______ (1)
Sales of product directly to visitors of your farm, farm stand or farmers market: _______ (2)
Sales of experiences/tours/stays to visitors of your farm: _______ (3)
All other sources of farm revenue: _______ (4)
Total: _______

Q2.4 Which of the following associations and programs do you belong to or have been involved with? (Check all that apply)

☐ People-First Tourism (1)
☐ NC 10% Campaign (2)
☐ Feast Down East (3)
☐ Carolina Farm Stewardship Association (4)
☐ Blue Ridge Women in Agriculture (5)
☐ NC Agritourism Networking Association (6)
☐ Appalachian Sustainable Agriculture Project (7)
☐ NC Cooperative Extension (8)
☐ NC State’s Fork to Farmer Program (9)
☐ NC State’s Vacationer Supported Agriculture (11)
☐ Others (10) ____________________________
Q2.5 Click to write the question text

- What is the total land size of your farm (in acres)? (1)
  __________________________

- How many acres of your land are actively farmed (in acres)? (2)
  __________________________

- Which is the zip code of your farm address? (3)
  __________________________

Q2.6 Which of the following best describes your current position in your farm?

- Owner/Co-owner (1)
  
- Farm manager (2)
  
- Full time farm worker (3)
  
- Seasonal contract worker (4)
  
- Volunteer/apprentice/intern (5)
  
- Other (6) __________________________

End of Block: Block 1

Start of Block: Block 2

Q3.1
PART B

Running a successful farm tends to require skills in many areas.

In this section we ask you about your entrepreneurial skills in regards to selling experiences and products to visitors to your farm (i.e., tourism).
Q3.2 How much do you agree or disagree with the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am able to form partnerships with other businesses to strengthen my own tourism business. (1)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to use the internet to market my tourism business. (2)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to discover ways to improve the appeal of tourism experiences I offer. (3)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to find helpers for my tourism business when I need to tackle a problem or opportunity. (4)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to create experiences that fulfill tourists’ interests. (5)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to be myself while providing good customer service to tourists. (6)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to use the internet to engage customers and business peers with my tourism business. (7)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q3.3 How much do you agree or disagree with the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am able to understand tourism legislation that applies to my tourism business. (29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to get the type of insurance I need for my tourism business. (30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to understand what my liability is in case of an accident involving tourists. (31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a quality check, select disagree for this statement choice. (32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to get support from local government or non-profit organizations for my tourism business. (33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to get others to believe in my plans for my tourism business. (34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to develop my tourism business so it can support my desired lifestyle. (35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4.1 PART C
Running a successful farm tends to require collaborations and partnerships. In this section we ask you about your business connections.

Q4.2 Of all the governmental, professional, and civic organizations in your community (e.g. tourism development authority, chamber of commerce, cooperative extension, farmers associations)...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>... how many do you know particularly well? (1)</th>
<th>None (1)</th>
<th>A few (2)</th>
<th>Some (3)</th>
<th>Most (4)</th>
<th>All (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... how many do you participate in or interact with? (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... how many represent your rights and interests? (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... how many of them seem committed to your success? (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... how many do you think would help you upon your request? (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page Break
### Q4.3 Of the many chefs, restaurateurs, and hoteliers in your community...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None (1)</th>
<th>A few (2)</th>
<th>Some (3)</th>
<th>Most (4)</th>
<th>All (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... how many do you know personally?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... how many of them buy farm products from you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... how many of them seem committed to your success as a farmer and business partner?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... how many of them do you think would help you upon your request?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q4.4 Of all the farmers in your community...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None (1)</th>
<th>A few (2)</th>
<th>Some (3)</th>
<th>Most (4)</th>
<th>All (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... how many do you know personally?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... how many of them collaborate with you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... how many of them seem to share your views on selling product and experiences to visitors at the farm?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... how many of them do you think would help you upon your request?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5.1
PART D
Running a successful farm tends to require a supportive business environment.

In this section we ask you about factors that influence your success.

Q5.2 How much do you agree or disagree with the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have been to every country in the world. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business partners rarely encourage me to continue investing in my farm. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I come across a tough business challenge at the farm, I work at it until I solve it. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People I look up to have advised me to stay away from farm tourism. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am often able to help my fellow farmers with entrepreneurial advice. (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The business side of farming has always been a very difficult endeavor for me. (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page Break
Q5.3 How much do you agree or disagree with the following?

| I am inspired by some of the entrepreneurs I know in the local foods scene. (1) | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Neither agree nor disagree (3) | Agree (4) | Strongly agree (5) |
| My business partners have singled me out as having poor entrepreneurial skills. (2) | | | | |
| I have always had a natural talent for running my farm. (3) | | | | |
| Many of my fellow farmers are in, or intend to enter, the farm tourism business. (4) | | | | |
| Other people generally see me as a very good entrepreneur. (5) | | | | |
| Agriculture agencies and organizations I collaborate with have staff with good entrepreneurial skills. (6) | | | | |
Q5.4 How much do you agree or disagree with the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have received many praises for my ability to run my farm. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get a sinking feeling when I think of the risk of diversifying farm products and services. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually don’t worry about my ability to find ways to turn a profit from the farm. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get really uptight while receiving visitors at the farm. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have usually been at ease while having guests at the farm. (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving visitors at the farm makes me feel uneasy. (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People I look up to (e.g. farmers, business partners...) are successful entrepreneurs. (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of Block: Block 4

Start of Block: Block 5

Q6.1 PART E

Selling product and experiences to farm visitors can be a component of running a successful farm.

In this section we ask you about your intentions to seek revenue from visitors to your farm.
Q6.2 In the next 12 months, how likely are you to...  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely unlikely (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat unlikely (2)</th>
<th>Neither likely nor unlikely (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat likely (4)</th>
<th>Extremely likely (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... start or expand on-farm sales of product to farm visitors (e.g., farm stands, U-pick)? (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... start or expand sales of farm experiences to farm visitors (e.g., tours, workshops, farmstays)? (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... develop or expand partnerships with restaurants and hotels to form multi-day food and farm tourism packages? (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... this is a quality check, select extremely unlikely for this statement choice. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... organize events at your farm (e.g., weddings, farm dinners, hayrides, corn mazes)? (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... avoid involvement with visitors and focus on production of product for wholesale? (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... explore more avenues to diversify your farm’s revenue by attracting visitors? (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... seek ways to make your farm an integral part of the tourism offerings of your community? (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... participate as a host in a regional farm tour event (e.g., cycle to farm, art and farm)? (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6.3 Overall, to what extent are you satisfied with your current farm tourism entrepreneurial activity?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Q6.4 Some people feel they have complete free choice and control over their lives, and others feel that what they do has no real effect on what happens to them. Please indicate how much freedom of choice and control you feel you have over the way your life turns out!

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

End of Block: Block 5

Start of Block: Block 6

Q7.1

PART F

Information About You

Q7.2 What is your year of birth?

__________________________________________

Q7.3 What is your gender identity?

Male (1)  Female (2)  Transgender/In-transition (3)  Other (4)  Prefer not to respond (5)
○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Q7.4 What is your race/ethnicity?

- African American (1)
- Native American (3)
- Hispanic/Latino (5)
- Asian (7)
- Pacific Islander (2)
- Caucasian/White (4)
- Other (6)
- Prefer not to respond (8)

Page Break

Q7.5 What is your highest level of formal education?

- Less than high school degree (1)
- High school graduate (high school diploma or equivalent including GED) (2)
- Some college but no degree (3)
- Associate degree in college (2-year) (4)
- Bachelor's degree in college (4-year) (5)
- Master’s degree (6)
- Doctoral degree (7)
- Professional degree (JD, MD) (8)

Q7.6 In addition to your farming activity, please identify what is your current employment status? Check all that apply.

- Full-time employee off the farm (1)
- Part-time employee off the farm (2)
- Run another business (3)
- Student (5)
- Retired from previous career (6)
- Other (7)
- Homemaker (care for household) (4)
- Full-time farmer - no other employment (8)
Q8.1 Thank you for completing the 2019 Agribusiness & Tourism survey! The first 100 participants in this survey will receive a $20 gift card to Tractor Supply Co.

Q8.2 To qualify, please write your email and postal address below.

☐ Email: (1) ________________________________

☐ Address: (2) ________________________________
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Describe all participant identifiers that will be collected from each data collection method (surveys, interviews, focus groups, existing data, background data collected via host site or software). Discuss why it is necessary to record identifiers at all and describe the de-identifying process.

Although we will be audio recording and transcribing the interviews, no identifiers will be collected, making it almost impossible to link responses to participants.

If recording identifiable information about participants, discuss any links between the data and the participants and why you need to retain them. Discuss destruction of links or removal of identifiers.

Audio recordings on digital devices will be transferred to a password protected computer in a secured office, then deleted from the digital device. Once the recording is transcribed, it will be deleted from the password protected computer. At that point, the data will become anonymous.

Discuss if you'll be working with your departmental IT to create a data management plan and if you're using NC State managed devices, NC State Google Drive or other NC State non-networked device. If using a personal device, discuss data protection.

N/A

Describe any ways that participants themselves or third parties discussed by participants could be identified indirectly from the data collected, and describe measures taken to protect identities. (Data can be reidentified by researcher access, technology employed, researcher expertise, and triangulation of data or other information. Discuss the probability of reidentification and the magnitude of harm to participants should the data be reidentified. Discuss the probability of reidentification occurring and the magnitude of harm should it occur).

Audio recordings on digital devices will be transferred to a password protected computer in a secured office, then deleted from the digital device. Once the recording is transcribed, it will be deleted from the password protected computer. At that point, the data will become anonymous.

For all recordings of any type, describe the type of recording(s) to be made. Describe the safe storage of recordings. Who will have access to the recordings? Will recordings be used in publications or data reporting? Will images be altered to de-identify? Will recordings be transcribed and by
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Morales - 16592 - IRB Protocol assigned Exempt status

IRB Administrative Office <nirp_notifications@ncsu.edu>
Reply-To: irb-coordinator@ncsu.edu
To: balmose@ncsu.edu

Mon, Mar 11, 2019 at 3:14 PM

Dear Simoes Fernandes:

Date: March 11, 2019
IRB Protocol 16592 has been assigned Exempt status
Title: Reducing socioeconomic inequality through tourism microentrepreneurship in Puerto Vallarta
PI: Morales, Darian I.

The research proposal named above has received administrative review and has been approved as exempt from the policy as outlined in the Code of Federal Regulations (Citation: 45 CFR 46.101; Exemption 602). Provided that the only participation of the subjects is as described in the proposal narrative, this project is exempt from further review. This approval does not expire, but any changes must be approved by the IRB prior to implementation.

1. This committee complies with requirements found in Title 45 part 46 of the Code of Federal Regulations. For NCSU projects, the Assurance Number is: FWA0000342.
2. Any changes to the protocol and supporting documents must be submitted and approved by the IRB prior to implementation.
3. If any unanticipated problems or adverse events occur, they must be reported to the IRB office within 5 business days by completing and submitting the unanticipated problem form on the IRB website: http://research.ncsu.edu/irb/programs/compliance/irb-unexpected-events.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

*****************************************

Jennie Olnstein
NC State IRB Office
919.515.8756 (email is best)
- ncstateirb@ncsu.edu (Exemptions, Renewals, Amendments, sIRB issues, and Letters related concurrence)
- irb-coordinator@ncsu.edu (Expedited, Full Board, Religious Agreement related concurrence)
- irb-director@ncsu.edu (Participant Concurrence, Non-compliance issues, Training/FAQ Requests, Just in Time Requests, and review process, all other issues)

Special Note: Between October 1, 2018 and January 31, 2019 the IRB office will be working diligently on meeting your needs, but please note we are in transition regarding staffing in our office (filing and training). As a result, normal requests are expected to take a longer amount of time to finalize. If you have an urgent request, please email one of the addresses above as noted and we will prioritize your work as appropriate. You are more likely to reach the IRB office via email during this time.
Appendix F: Interview protocol Article 3

MICROEMPRESARIADO TURÍSTICO

PROTOCOLO DE LA ENTREVISTA

El propósito de este estudio es comprender mejorar los medios de vida con el turismo en Puerto Vallarta. Nos gustaría dedicar de 20 a 30 minutos para hacerle preguntas sobre sus percepciones de la industria de turismo local. No es necesario que nos dé su nombre, pero nos gustaría grabar nuestra conversación para asegurarnos de capturar bien sus percepciones. Si siente incómodo con alguna de las preguntas, puede no responder o detener la entrevista en cualquier momento. Que nosotros sepamos, no hay riesgos o beneficios para usted personalmente asociados a participar en este estudio.

Para participar en la entrevista, usted debe tener 21 años o más. Si está de acuerdo con participar en la entrevista, implica que también acepta participar en el estudio y ser grabado en audio. Si tiene alguna pregunta sobre la entrevista, pregúnteme en cualquier momento. Si tiene preguntas o inquietudes sobre la entrevista en el futuro, utilice la información de esta tarjeta de presentación para comunicarse con nosotros.

¿Tiende usted alguna pregunta?

¿Usted da su consentimiento para participar en el estudio y para que sus respuestas sean grabadas en audio?

Fecha: ___________________________

Hora en que la entrevista empezó: _______________ Hora en que la entrevista terminó: _______________

Nombre de la entrevistadora: __________________________

Código de ID del empresario: __________________________

A. Datos biográficos y de los medios de vida


3. ¿Dónde vive? ____________________________________________________________________________

4. ¿Por cuánto tiempo ha vivido allí? ____________________________________________________________________________

5. Nuestros medios de vida se componen de todos los medios que utilizamos para asegurar nuestras necesidades vitales. Algunos son puramente monetarios (por ejemplo, el trabajo salarial), pero también trabajamos para hacer trueques o para nuestra propia subsistencia. ¿Puede por favor enumerar las diversas formas en que usted sustenta sus necesidades de vida!
6. ¿Qué proporción de su medio de vida total es proveniente de sus ingresos del turismo? _____% 

7. Describa las experiencias o productos que usted vende a los turistas. 

8. ¿Cómo descubrió que podría ganar dinero vendiendo estos productos y experiencias? 

9. ¿Por qué cree que los turistas están interesados en el tipo de productos o experiencias que ofrece? 

10. ¿Es fácil hacer dinero del turismo? 
    a. Hay una gran cantidad de demanda? 
    b. ¿Usted siente que hay mucha competencia? 

11. ¿Cree que las acciones de las autoridades han apoyado su negocio, creado problemas, o que no lo impacto? 

12. ¿Relacionado al sector turístico formal, como hoteles, restaurantes y operadores turísticos? ¿Cree que sus acciones lo han apoyado, creado problemas, o qué no lo impacto? 

13. ¿Qué tipo de oportunidades prevé usted para los empresarios locales en el turismo? 
    a. ¿Y los desafíos? 

14. ¿Qué lo motiva a tener su propio negocio?
B. Voz

15. ¿Qué cosas usted y su comunidad ofrecen a los turistas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usted</th>
<th>Su comunidad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. ¿Qué le gusta mostrar a su familia y amigos cuando la/lo visitan?

17. Hemos estado hablando mucho acerca de cómo iniciar y ser dueño(a) de un negocio turístico. Como empresaria(o) de turismo, ¿Qué mensajes / lecciones / historias quiere transmitir a los turistas?

18. ¡Indique algunos ejemplos de ideas falsas que los turistas tienen sobre su gente y su región!
C. de Capital Social

19. Se espera que los gobiernos locales y las organizaciones no gubernamentales ayuden a las pequeñas empresas turísticas. ¿Qué habilidades, experiencia y conocimientos tiene usted que le resultan útiles como empresaria(o); y qué nuevas habilidades deberían estas organizaciones ayudarle a obtener?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habilidades y experiencias que le son útiles</th>
<th>Habilidades y experiencias que le faltan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HABILIDADES</td>
<td>HABILIDADES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIENCIAS</td>
<td>EXPERIENCIAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Por favor, enumere las redes de empresas o grupos sociales que afectan positiva o negativamente sus medios de vida.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombre de la red productiva / grupo social / asociación</th>
<th>Cómo le han afectado sus medios de vida</th>
<th>😊 / 😞</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E. La autoeficacia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cláusula</th>
<th>Muy en desacuerdo</th>
<th>Algo en desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>Muy en acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soy capaz de formar asociaciones con otras empresas para fortalecer mi propio negocio turístico.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy capaz de utilizar Internet para promocionar mi negocio turístico.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy capaz de descubrir maneras de mejorar el atractivo de las experiencias turísticas que ofrezco.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy capaz de encontrar ayudantes para mi negocio turístico cuando necesito para hacer frente a un problema o oportunidad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy capaz de crear experiencias que satisfagan los intereses de los turistas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy capaz de ser yo mismo mientras proporciono un buen servicio al cliente a los turistas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy capaz de utilizar el Internet para entablarme con clientes turísticos y colegas de negocios.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy capaz de obtener el tipo de seguro que necesito para mi negocio turístico.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy capaz de entender lo que mi responsabilidad es en caso de accidente con los turistas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy capaz de obtener el apoyo de organizaciones gubernamentales o sin fines de lucro locales para mi negocio turístico.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy capaz de conseguir que los demás crean en mis planes para mi negocio turístico.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy capaz de desarrollar mi negocio turístico para que pueda apoyar a mi estilo de vida deseado.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy capaz de entender legislación turística que se aplica a mi negocio turístico.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Éxito

21. ¿Me puede decir cómo se imagina su vida en 5 años como un empresario turístico exitoso?

22. ¿Qué cosas podrían evitar que alcance ese escenario ideal de éxito?

23. ¿En qué medida está usted satisfecho con su actividad empresarial actual?

   1 ··· 2 ··· 3 ··· 4 ··· 5 ··· 6 ··· 7 ··· 8 ··· 9 ··· 10
   Muy insatisfecho        Neutral        Muy satisfecho

24. Algunas personas sienten que tienen libertad y control sobre sus vidas, y otros creen que lo que hacen no tiene ningún efecto real sobre lo que les sucede. ¡Por favor, indique el grado de libertad y control que siente que tiene sobre la manera en que su vida resulta!

   1 ··· 2 ··· 3 ··· 4 ··· 5 ··· 6 ··· 7 ··· 8 ··· 9 ··· 10
   Ninguno en absoluto     Muchísimo

Muchas gracias!