

Governance Framework for Farm Tourism in Camarines Sur, Philippines

Julyven Marta Fridas P. Maniscan

Received: 1 January 1970 Accepted: 1 January 1970 Published: 1 January 1970

Abstract

This study aims to design a suitable governance framework for the promotion of farm tourism in the province of Camarines Sur. This was done by describing the current state of the industry, profiling farm tourism stakeholders, and determining the existing relationship between stakeholders and the current governance set-up in the province. Different government agencies, Local Government Units (LGUs), academe and farm-owner operators are involved as respondents of the study. Qualitative method including Key Informant Interviews (KII) and desk review were done to collect data. The findings revealed that the farm tourism industry in Camarines Sur is still young yet developmental. Likewise, the social network analysis illustrates a self-managed type of network governance. This results to limited efforts on farm tourism done in the area. Hence, the study recommends a process framework for its transition to NAO type of governance.

Index terms— farm tourism, network governance, governance framework, development.

1 I. Introduction

ourism is undeniably one of the most important industries in the world because of its major contributions to the economic growth of different countries. Its role is not limited in achieving economic development goals but also vital in fulfilling social, environmental, and human development goals (Millennium Development Goals). It has been included as targets in SDG Goals 8, 12, and 14 on inclusive and sustainable economic growth, sustainable consumption and production (SCP) and the sustainable use of oceans and marine resources respectively.

One sub-set of tourism which is currently emerging in the Philippines is agri-tourism or farm tourism. It is defined as an activity, enterprise or business that combines elements of tourism with elements of agriculture (Tennessee Agritourism, 2003). Moreover, the Farm Tourism Development Act of the Philippines known as RA 10816 explains farm tourism as the practice of attracting visitors and tourists to farm areas for production, educational and recreational purposes. It involves any agricultural and fishery based operation or activity that educates and trains farm visitor and tourists and provides venue for outdoor recreation and accessible family outings. This shows a combination of agriculture, tourism, environmental conservation, and education which could help further boost economic growth and generate additional

Author: e-mail: jmpadrigon@cspc.edu.ph employment. It is a hybrid concept that can be harnessed as a form of special interest tourism focusing on unique travel experiences and activities that people may enjoy in agricultural settings. Hence, a niche product that has a lot of potentials.

The concept of farm tourism is not a new phenomenon. Since the early twentieth century, it has been recognized worldwide (Busby and Rendle, 2000) and emerged in the 1990s in many countries when sustainable development became one of the recent trends. In a study conducted in 2012 by Xu, et.al in North Carolina, farmers and residents concluded that farm tourism is important for delivering an array of sociocultural, environmental, and economic benefits to society. Its development can provide an added value to farm lands and different forms of livelihood to the community. It also enables transfer of skills among farmers and people of all ages from all walks of life.

Underscoring the importance of the industry, it is beneficial if the potential of agrifarms in areas where agriculture and tourism are major contributors in local economy will be magnified through stakeholders'

3 B) FARM TOURISM AND STAKEHOLDERS

46 engagement. Therefore, this study aimed to design a governance framework which helps to define the roles
47 and functions of each stakeholders necessary for the development of farm tourism in Camarines Sur.

48 In 2012, Camarines Sur became also the top tourist destination with a record-breaking of 2.5 million visitor
49 arrivals (PSA PR-201502-NS1-01). However, in 2013, it was reported by the Philippine Statistics Authority
50 (PSA) that Camarines Sur has declined in Year 2022 ()F

51 Camarines Sur is one of the provinces in Bicol Region, Philippines. It has a land area of 5,497.03 km² which is
52 29.87% of the total regional area. It is considered as the largest in terms of population and land area among the
53 4 other provinces in the region. It has a lot of strengths in both tourism and agriculture sectors. Its strengths
54 include a very strategic location and fertile soil suited to the growing and production of a wide variety of food
55 and commercial crops. Its locally grown fruits and ornamentals are already gaining popularity in foreign markets,
56 hence, the existence of many farms. In 2015, it was considered as the province which posted positive growth
57 production (DA Annual Report). The province has become one of today's most exciting growth areas in the
58 country's business market because of its natural resources which continue to attract foreign and domestic tourists.

59 terms of tourists' arrival due to the lack of activities in some of its well-known tourist destinations. Because of
60 this, a convergence effort of stakeholders is seen to form a strong foundation to continuously boost the economic
61 growth of the area, make the tourism industry more vibrant, and promote awareness of more products and
62 services that agriculture and tourism could offer. Furthermore, an established governance framework can help
63 encourage more farmers in making their farms a hub for learning and receiving tourists from different places.

64 Therefore, to attain all of these, it is helpful to describe the state of farm tourism industry in Camarines Sur,
65 examine the relationship of its stakeholders, and determine the governance framework that will harmonize the
66 actors, so that the industry will be developed, thereby, serve as an engine of sustainable and a more inclusive
67 form of development.

68 2 II. Literature Review a) Farm Tourism as an Engine of 69 Sustainable Development

70 Although there are different forms of tourism, Nagar (2013) accounted in his study that tourists are looking for
71 a balance between tourism, nature and culture, conservation and development in every place they visit. In the
72 1990s there has been a growth of new types of tourists in rural spaces, with behavior patterns clearly different
73 from the homecoming motivation of traditional rural tourism ??Brown & Hall, 2000 ?? Perales, 2002). This
74 paves the opportunity for developing nontraditional tourist destination, such as the countryside tourism. This
75 shows that tourists visit destination not only for recreation but for a more meaningful cause. Nowadays, tourists
76 are more attracted to go rural which is developed at a smaller scale than mass tourism. Also, tourist's inclination
77 towards novelty, culture, history, adventure, heritage and interaction with local people, urge policy makers to
78 develop rural tourism, a new trend in tourism which satisfies the current needs of tourists that are unhappy with
79 mass tourism. It constitutes an alternative to traditional mass tourism. Hence, the emergence of farm tourism.

80 Farm tourism as a form of rural tourism is considered as a mechanism for inclusive and sustainable development
81 through capacity development and technology transfer. Lack (1995) cited that in these parts of the world, farm
82 tourism is viewed as a legitimate way to enhance farm income thus contribute to the stability of rural areas
83 (Agricultural Land Commission, 1997). Morais et.al, in his study concluded that farmers and residents of North
84 Carolina recognize that farm tourism is important for delivering an array of sociocultural, environmental, and
85 economic benefits to society. The widespread recognition of farm tourism as an educational tool and a way to
86 preserve rural heritage (i.e., by educating the public about agriculture, preserving farmland, and sharing rural
87 heritage and lifestyles) suggests that farm tourism farmers and promoters (e.g., local development agencies) need
88 to capture those benefits in their advertisements to further promote the industry. Dabphet (2006), stated that
89 many researchers involved in the study of tourism have suggested sustainability as conceptually important. Some
90 researchers (Archer & Cooper, 1998; Ham & Weiler, 2002) have attempted to concentrate on the relationship
91 between economics and the environment. Alternately, Butler through broadly (1999b) defined the concept of
92 sustainable tourism development within three areas of sustainable development (environmental, socio-cultural,
93 economic) and associated it with the idea of carrying capacity. Lane (1994, p.102) suggested that sustainable
94 tourism should aim 'to minimize environmental and cultural damage, optimize visitor satisfaction, and maximize
95 long-term economic growth for the region'. These ideas gave rise to the emergence of several research studies in
96 sustainable tourism, and farm tourism in particular. Schmitz, et.al (2013) conducted a study on the position of
97 farm tourism in Walloon Tourist Market. He emphasized that there is a future in the farm tourism industry if
98 the link to agricultural activities is maintained. Which means, that there should be greater participation from
99 the farmers and the host community.

100 3 b) Farm Tourism and Stakeholders

101 Nagar's (2013) study, emphasized that identification of stakeholders' involvement in destination tourism
102 planning and development, as well as the factors that might influence their level of involvement, are not only
103 important for tourism destination planners, but also the host community's support for destination tourism
104 development and competitive strategies. Similarly, in the case of farm tourism development, the role of
105 stakeholders such as regulators, technology provider, communities, and owner-operators are very important.

106 Their interrelationship will determine the positive and negative effects of farm tourism operations to participants.
107 Likewise, it will also pave way to promote the industry. Furthermore, it is important to note that these
108 legal frameworks encourage cooperation among, and/or request the assistance of, departments, bureaus, offices,
109 agencies or instrumentalities of the government, farm tourism stakeholders, financial and educational institutions,
110 nongovernment organizations, people's organizations and other like-minded institutions and individuals in the
111 implementation of its functions to effectively attain the promotion and development of farm tourism in the
112 country.

113 Lastly, Dabphet noted that educational institutions also play important roles in the process of sustainable
114 tourism development. They are seen as the producers of the educational experience and are ultimately responsible
115 for planning, development, and delivery of the tourism knowledge.

116 **4 c) Governance as Harmonizer of Stakeholders**

117 Governance refers to the management of the country's economic and social resources for development (World
118 Bank, 1987). The United Nations describes it as a complex mechanism, process, relationships, and institutions
119 through which citizens articulate their interests, exercise their rights and obligations and mediate their differences
120 while Kooiman (1993) defines it as 'the pattern or structure that emerges in a socio-political system as a common
121 result or outcome of the interacting intervention efforts of all involved actors'. These definitions show that it
122 involves people, policies, and processes to provide framework to which certain decisions and actions will take
123 place. More so, it includes the identification of roles, responsibilities, capacities, and accountability of each
124 stakeholder and how they interact with one another to attain certain goals.

125 Governance functions as harmonizer of stakeholders. It balances competing goals between each of them.
126 Bourne (2015) para phrased Cadbury's (2002) definition of governance 'as holding the balance between economic
127 and social goals and between individual and communal goals. The governance framework encourages the efficient
128 use of resources and require accountability for the stewardship of those resources. The aim is to align as nearly
129 as possible the interests of individuals, the organization and society". This is also very much relevant to how the
130 World Development Report (WDR) 2017 defined governance as the process to which state and non-state actors
131 interact to design and implement policies within a givens et of formal and informal rules that shape and are
132 shaped by power, which makes others act in the interests of those groups and individuals and to bring about
133 specific outcomes. In this sense, governance is very much needed in order for the stakeholders to function well
134 and manage themselves well to ensure the responsible use of the resources they have. The practice of a suitable
135 type of governance such as collaborative governance or network governance should take into place.

136 **5 III. Methodology a) Methods and Design**

137 This study is an exploratory research. It is also qualitative as it aimed to explore the meaning and understanding
138 of a complex social environment such as the relationship of farm tourism stakeholders and its current governance
139 set-up. Analyses were based on the data gathered from the field and did not employ any statistics to explain the
140 findings.

141 A combination of secondary and primary data gathering methods are used in the study. Data about the current
142 state of farm tourism (plans, programs, initiatives, projects) were gathered through Key Informant Interviews
143 (KIIs). Mandates of the government agencies were reviewed from their respective websites. Likewise, brochures,
144 pamphlets, and other materials from selected farm tourism sites were also collected and became the sources of
145 other relevant information. Furthermore, a desk review method was also done for the Implementing Rules and
146 Regulations (IRR) of the RA 10816 and other relevant documents.

147 The researcher analyzed the profile of stakeholders and their perceptions on the current state of farm tourism
148 industry through content analysis. Other methods used are, social network analysis (SNA), power interest analysis
149 and SWOT analysis. The power interest matrix is used to classify stakeholders according to the level of power
150 an interest they have. On the other hand, the SWOT analysis is done to highlight the resources of municipalities
151 on farm tourism and identify areas which needed attention.

152 **6 IV. Results**

153 **7 a) Status of the Farm Tourism Industry**

154 Table ?? summarizes the data gathered from the KII and desk review. It substantiates that the farm tourism
155 industry in Camarines Sur is not yet well-established. In this case, the key essence of the Republic Act 10816
156 which is to disseminate the value of agriculture, provide additional income to farmers, and involve the community
157 are not yet realized. At present,

158 **8 Global Journal of Management and Business Research**

159 Volume XXII Issue III Version I Year 2022 () farm tourism industry is considered small scale but has potentials
160 given the existence of stakeholders that can help farmers to develop their farms operate as a farm tourism site and
161 lure visitors who can contribute to economic development. The perceptions simply imply that all stakeholders
162 need to play significant roles so that more coordinated farm tourism development can be achieved. The fact that

163 tourism demands a more systematic approach more than any other agencies requires a strong foundation for its
164 development.

165 9 b) Profile of Stakeholders i. Farm Profile

166 The results of the study show that the seven (7) farms included in the study offer diverse crops (Table ??). They
167 offer unique farm tourism experience given the variety of activities that tourists can enjoy. Out of the seven (7)
168 farms, there are two which can be considered as 'Gem Farms', farms planted with a specific crop which serves as
169 its banner product. These are the Bicol Strawberry Farm known for its high-quality strawberry production and
170 the MikeLiz Integrated Farm known for its dragon fruit plantation. Most of the farms show a very good fusion of
171 agriculture and tourism. Another notable feature is the farms' product innovation which shows a great potential
172 in attracting tourists and visitors. The MikeLiz Integrated Farm based on its profile, offers unique products from
173 its farm produce. This displays good characteristics of a farm tourism site by making use of what is inside the
174 farm and turn them into unique and profitable products.

175 Considering the accreditation status of farms, it is noteworthy that currently, only Sonrisa Farm was granted
176 an accreditation by the Department of Tourism (DOT) as a farm tourism site. Nonetheless, some are already
177 certified in Good Agricultural Practices (GAP), Organic Agriculture, recognized as Learning Sites of the
178 Agricultural Training Institute (ATI) and Farm School of the Technical Education and Skills Development
179 Authority (TESDA). These are indications that farms are either integrated or diversified, specialized farm
180 producing a specific commodity, or it demonstrates a special technology.

181 In addition, only the Iriga City Organic Agriculture Learning Farm (ICOALF) is owned and funded by the
182 government and the rest are small family farms which affirm the statement in the previous part that most of farm
183 tourism sites in the Philippines are still privately owned and operated. Thus, collaboration of stakeholders is much
184 needed, otherwise, farms will just be operating independently without the participation of other stakeholders.

185 10 c) Profile of the Government Agencies

186 Cited in Section 8 of the Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) of the Farm Tourism Development Act of
187 the Philippines, is the creation of a Farm Tourism Development Board composed of the Department of Tourism
188 (DOT), Department of Agriculture (DA), Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), and the Academe. These
189 agencies are expected to take the lead in crafting and in the implementation of policies, projects, and activities
190 toward the development and promotion of the industry. Table ?? shows its mandate as a government institution
191 and their plans and current initiatives.

192 In general, it is good to affirm that each of the major agencies has taken initial steps to at least help the farmers
193 appreciate the value of farm tourism, expand partnerships, and develop the industry in general. However, from
194 the profile, there is no stated activities and projects which show collaborative effort between the four of them.
195 This implies that there is a need for a comprehensive strategic action plan which will involve stakeholders and
196 other line agencies and can guide them address their needs, share resources, expand network, and explore possible
197 options to develop the industry in Camarines Sur.

198 Governance among stakeholders is an important element to consider in the development of the industry. It
199 is important to note that sustainable tourism development cannot be achieved without governance because of
200 its nature; that of fostering common goal by collective action (Zeijl-Rozema, Cörvers, Kemp, & Martens, 2008).
201 Table ?? shows the summary of the functions and roles of each stakeholder or national agencies as stated in the
202 Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) of the RA 101816.

203 11 d) Profile of the Local Government Units (LGUs)

204 Topcu (2017), underscored the importance of farm tourism industry as a sector for the development of the
205 locals who are dependent on farming. Thus, it requires initiatives from the LGUs. are the Tourism Office
206 and Municipal Agriculture Office (MAO) in seven municipalities where selected farm tourism sites are located.
207 They were profiled since they are two important pillars of the Local Government Units (LGUs) because of their
208 mandates on tourism and agriculture development.

209 The findings show that efforts of the LGUs on farm tourism, do not focus much on farm tourism. Nonetheless,
210 there are plans for implementations. The data show that there is still a need for collaboration between the two
211 offices at the local level and a comprehensive understanding of their roles and functions being the pillars off arm
212 tourism development at the LGU level.

213 12 e) SWOT Analysis of Municipalities

214 Table ?? shows the SWOT analysis of each municipality included in the study. It highlights the resources of the
215 municipality which they can capitalize and areas which needed attention. Strengths include the

216 13 Global Journal of Management and Business Research

217 Volume XXII Issue III Version I Year 2022 () F © 2022 Global Journals

218 Table ?? shows the profile of two offices which existing industries such as ecotourism and faith tourism which
219 can complement the farm tourism industry. Aside from hospitable people, other municipalities cited community
220 participation, accessibility, good water and electricity supply, and their farmers as strengths. These characteristics
221 can strengthen farm tourism and enable them to sell unique rural experience to visitors.

222 Moreover, the municipalities also cited weaknesses which can limit farm tourism development in their areas.
223 Both are cognizant about the limited budget, lack of support from other stakeholders, and lack of capital of small
224 farmers to develop farm tourism sites. These weaknesses can be the bases of the LGU for future initiatives. The
225 identification of needs suggests that farm tourism development should be prioritized.

226 In general, the strengths and opportunities identified by the Local Government Units (LGUs) affirm the
227 statement that Camarines Sur has an edge over other provinces in the Bicol Region. This implies that the farm
228 tourism industry can be further developed by capitalizing on each municipality's resources. The strengths of
229 the municipalities indicate that tourism and agriculture are both major industries. However, interventions from
230 the government are needed to address the weaknesses cited. The interventions should come from the concerned
231 agencies through careful analyses and validation.

232 14 f) Stakeholders' Relationship

233 This study applied the Social Network Analysis to determine the existing relationship of stakeholders. However,
234 only the degree of centrality is determined. Degree Centrality is an attribute of individual actors as a consequence
235 of their position. The sizes of nodes (stakeholders) shown in the network map indicate who are the central actors
236 among all stakeholders considering the number of ties they have. Here, the in and out degree centrality are
237 examined. In-degree centrality is the total number of ties the node (stakeholder) has, as a result of referral from
238 other nodes (stakeholders) while the out-degree centrality indicates the number of stakeholders that the node has
239 referred to. Freeman's approach was used in determining the degree centrality.

240 The SNA was done through a network map which was drawn from the responses of the Key Informants (KIs) of
241 the different agencies. Each of the respondents identified agencies or entities (not limited to the ones included in
242 the study) which they consider as farm tourism stakeholders. There was no limit as to the number of stakeholders
243 they referred to.

244 The network map generated (Figure ??) shows that the DOT is the most central stakeholder as it has the
245 biggest size of node. It has also the highest number of ties for in and out-degree centrality. Considering the
246 in-degree centrality, the DOT and DA-ATI are the central actors. This implies that these agencies are the ones
247 seen by other stakeholders prominent in the farm tourism development. According to the Freeman's approach, if
248 the actor receives many ties, they are often said to be prominent, or to have high prestige. That is, many others
249 seek to direct ties with them, and this may indicate their importance. This is because that they received the most
250 number of arrows from other stakeholders. For the out-degree centrality, the DOT followed by the CBSUA display
251 highest level of awareness of the stakeholders who need to be involved in the farm tourism industry in Camarines
252 Sur. This implies that these agencies are willing to have a tie or coordination with the stakeholders they referred
253 to. Anchoring on the social network analysis, the stakeholders are also analyzed through a power and interest
254 matrix. According to Mayers (2005), stakeholder power can be understood as the extent to which stakeholders
255 are able to persuade or coerce others into making decisions, and following certain courses of action. Power may
256 be derived from the nature of a stakeholder's organization, or their position in relation to other stakeholders (for
257 example, line ministries which control budgets and other departments) while interest is how actors respond and
258 get involved in different farm tourism activities. In this case, the Department of Tourism (DOT), Department
259 of Trade and Industry (DTI), Central Bicol State University of Agriculture (CBSUA), and Agricultural Training
260 Institute (ATI) are classified as stakeholders with high power and interest. Their power is derived from their
261 position as government agencies. In terms of relation to other organizations, the DOT and DA-ATI as shown
262 in the stakeholder's analysis are central actors considering the in-degree centrality. They are seen as prominent
263 stakeholders. Meanwhile, the DOT and CBSUA are considered actors with the highest level of awareness in
264 terms of stakeholders with crucial role in the farm tourism industry. These characteristics of stakeholders are
265 manifestations of their high interest while their position as government agencies is a manifestation of their high
266 power. On one hand, the Local Government Units (LGUs) are classified as stakeholders with high power but
267 low interest in farm tourism. This is supported by the social network analysis wherein LGUs are seen as an
268 important stakeholder by government agencies as well as farm owner-operators. However, a very limited number
269 of LGUs are functional in the farm tourism industry. None of them has incorporated farm tourism initiatives in
270 their Tourism Development Plans and functions of the Tourism Office as well as the Agriculture office. Lack of
271 personnel to handle farm tourism projects is also a challenge to the LGUs. All of these are manifestations of low
272 interest on farm tourism despite having direct contact with the community and has the full responsibility over
273 the resources in their locality.

274 Meanwhile, farm tourism site owners are seen to be the stakeholders with high interest but low in Year 2022 (
275) power. They posed very high interest on farm tourism by their commitment in farm development and engaging
276 in farm tourism operations. However, the lack of farm tourism association which can be a medium for their
277 concerns make them less empowered to access technical and financial support from the government. Nonetheless,
278 the government agencies recognize them as crucial in farm tourism development as shown in the social network
279 analysis. Lastly, the community is viewed as the stakeholder with low interest and power because of their lack

280 of knowledge on farm tourism and less involvement in farm tourism operation which need to be given attention
281 because of their vital role in the industry.

282 Generally, the stakeholders which are high in power and interest should be kept satisfied while those classified
283 as low in power but with high interest should be monitored. On the other hand, those with low interest but high
284 in power should be managed closely and the stakeholders which are low in power and interest should be kept
285 informed.

286 **15 g) Governance Framework for Farm Tourism in Camarines** 287 **Sur**

288 This part of the study combines the network analytical and "governance" perspectives. Thus, network governance
289 is discussed in this section. Network as a form of governance is viewed as a mechanism of coordination, or
290 network governance (Kenis and Provan, 2008). It promotes interdependency and coordination for mutual benefit
291 (Arganoff, 2001). Sectors and actors (state, market, and civil society) come together in a policy cycle through
292 joint interest in a specific activity and outcome that no one party can address without the contributions of the
293 other.

294 As cited by Huppe, et.al (2012) in the "Frontiers of Networked Governance", governance networks do not
295 merely aggregate resources, but are structured to take advantage that each participating sector brings different
296 resources to the fore; they combine the voluntary energy and legitimacy of the civil-society sector with the
297 financial muscle and interest of businesses and the enforcement and rule-making power and coordination and
298 capacity-building skills of states and international organizations (Börzel, 1998; Creech, 2008; Goldsmith &
299 Eggers 2004; Reinicke & Deng, 2000). These networks create bridges that enable various participants use the
300 advantage the synergies between the resources that they contribute, allowing for the pooling of knowledge,
301 the exchange of experience, and for the generation of a feasible institutional framework for fruitful collaboration.
302 Because they span socioeconomic, political, and cultural differences, networks can transform what might otherwise
303 degenerate into counterproductive confrontations across public, private and civil society sectors into constructive,
304 collaborative relationships (Reinicke & Deng, 2000). Additionally, governance networks allow part of societal
305 steering and problem solving to be accomplished by a wide variety of actors that agree to create problem solving
306 spaces outside the government, to address all or some of the stages of strategy formation: (1) problem analysis
307 (2) goal formulation stage, and
308 strategy development and implementation.

309 Kenis and Provan (2008) categorized network governance into three modes (Table ??), the selfmanaged or
310 participant-governed network, lead organization-governed network, and the network administration organization
311 (NAO). Each of these has different structures and characteristics which may be considered in adopting the type
312 of network governance in farm tourism.

313 By examining the stakeholders' profile and the network map of stakeholders using the characteristics of the
314 three modes of network governance, two main factors were noted:

315 The current farm tourism governance can still be improved by adopting a form of governance which will
316 mold more functional stakeholders. Therefore, this study considered the four contingency conditions proposed
317 by Kenis and Provan (2008) that are likely to affect the successful adoption of any of the three forms of network
318 governance. According to them, these factors (trust, number of participants, goal consensus, need for network-
319 level competencies) are important and can explain considerable variance in the choice of one form or another. In
320 general, they argue that as trust becomes less densely distributed throughout the network, and as the number
321 of participants gets larger, as network goal consensus declines, and as the need for network-level competencies
322 increases, brokered forms of network governance, like lead organization and NAO, are likely to become more
323 effective than sharedgovernance networks.

324 The characteristics of the farm tourism industry in Camarines Sur show that the network administrative
325 organization (NAO) form of network governance is suitable to be adopted in Camarines Sur. This means that
326 the industry should evolve from self-managed to network administrative organization type (NAO) of network
327 governance. This considers the diversity of the stakeholders which come from the different sectors, the number
328 of industry actors, and the need to centralize the processes so that a certain entity would be able to manage
329 and sustain the network. It should be noted, however, that movement from either shared governance or a lead
330 organization to an NAO involves strategic choice. That is, evolution is not simply a natural process that occurs
331 as contingency components. Hence, a separate entity or NAO should be created first to make the framework
332 functional. In creating the NAO, an organization should take the initiative to capacitate the stakeholders which
333 will be involved. During this process, the industry may adopt the lead organization type of governance. Through
334 this, decisions and activities are coordinated to the DOT-RO V as the lead organization.

335 **16 Global**

336 **17 h) NAO Structure**

337 In creating the structure of the NAO, this study proposes to pattern it to the composition of the Farm Tourism
338 Board in the national level. The National Farm Tourism Board is included in the IRR of the RA 101816. This

339 is to ensure that the operations of the industry will be facilitated and all stakeholders from the different sectors
340 are well-represented. The structure which is based on the national level also ensures that accountability and
341 responsiveness are considered.

342 Figure ?? shows the proposed organizational structure for the PFTDB. It illustrates the governance framework
343 for farm tourism stakeholders in Camarines Sur adopting the network administrative organization type of network
344 governance. Figure ?? shows that each stakeholder has a two-way arrow indicating interdependency between
345 networks. All of them should create and strengthen network with the identified actors/agencies to make the
346 governance framework functional. The Provincial Farm Tourism Farm Board is situated at the center being the
347 lead agency or the entity which is responsible for managing and sustaining the stakeholders' network. The NAO
348 which needs to be functional serves as a broker among stakeholders within the province and initiator of programs
349 on farm tourism.

350 The framework acknowledges that publicprivate tourism partnership represent pooling of knowledge, expertise,
351 capital and other resources from various stakeholders (Bramwell and lane 2000). However, it should always
352 be considered that the NAO or any type of governance does not guarantee a perfect and smooth operations.
353 Hence, the coordination between stakeholders, willingness/commitment to contribute to the desired goal, and
354 cooperation are three important institutional functions which facilitate the development of the industry. Kenis
355 and Provan (2008) further clarified that a particular governance has practical implications. From a policy
356 perspective, it should be clear that selection of governance form, whether through mandate or funding incentives,
357 can have critical implications for overall network effectiveness. From a management perspective, effective network
358 management requires the need to recognize and respond to both internal and external network demands, both
359 when selecting a governance form and when managing tensions that arise as part of that form.

360 18 V. Conclusion

361 This study generally aimed to design a governance framework suitable for the farm tourism industry in Camarines
362 Sur. The objectives of the study focused on the current status of farm tourism in Camarines Sur and
363 the relationship of stakeholders. Several stakeholders were identified based on the Implementing Rules and
364 Regulations (IRR) of the Farm Tourism Development Act otherwise known as RA 10816. The agencies included
365 are the Department of Tourism-Regional Office V, Agricultural Training institute-Regional Office V, Department
366 of Trade and Industry-Camarines Sur Provincial Office, and the Central Bicol State University of Agriculture
367 as the representative for the academe sector. These stakeholders were chosen as they were identified by the
368 government to comprise the Farm Tourism Development Board. Likewise, there were seven (7) farm tourism
369 sites chosen to be a part of the study. These farms are practicum-partners of Central Bicol State University
370 of Agriculture and have satisfied the pre-requisites of a farm tourism site. Interviews were also conducted
371 among Tourism Officers and Municipal/City Agriculturists of municipalities where selected farms are located.
372 Secondary data were also obtained from secondary sources such as brochures from farms, Tourism Development
373 Plans (TDPs) of municipalities, and other relevant documents from the agencies. The mandates of government
374 agencies were also taken from their official websites.

375 The study was qualitatively interpreted. The current status of farm tourism industry was analyzed and
376 described based on the perceptions of the major agencies. The researcher used content analysis in interpreting
377 the data gathered. Other data were analyzed using the social network analysis through the use of the UCINET
378 software, power interest analysis and case study which highlights one of the farms which applies best practices
379 in farm tourism and SWOT analysis.

380 Results of the study revealed that the farm tourism industry in Camarines Sur is still young, and developmental.
381 The profile of the farms also revealed that farm tourism sites in Camarines Sur are diverse in terms of activities,
382 crops produced, as well as services offered. Lack of policy orientation and in-depth NAOs typically have board
383 structures that include all or subsets of network members (Evan and Olk 1990; Provan, Isett, Milward. 2004).
384 Hence, the DOT is selected as it has the capacity and resources to organize the stakeholders and capacitate
385 actors in the provincial level (based from the SNA). The process of forming the NAO should be included in the
386 initial steps of shifting the industry from a self-managed to a brokered-type of governance (Figure ??). Table
387 ?? details how the industry could shift from a self-managed to a network administrative organization (NAO) type
388 of governance.

389 19 Global Journal of Management and Business Research

390 Volume XXII Issue III Version I Year 2022 () F © 2022 Global Journals

391 understanding on farm tourism are posed as challenges of government agencies in initiating farm tourism-
392 related programs. Meanwhile, the profile of the Local Government Units (LGUs) shows that there is a need for
393 understanding and appreciation of farm tourism concepts among the tourism office and agricultural office in the
394 municipal level. Lack of designated personnel to handle programs on farm tourism is also a problem. Although
395 some municipalities are exerting effort to assist farmers, the coordination between the two offices (tourism and
396 agriculture) still needs to be strengthened.

397 The roles, strengths, weaknesses, as well as the stakeholders' implications in involving them in governance
398 were also assessed based on their profile and the current relationship that they have. In terms of the current

399 relationship that the stakeholders have, the DOT is considered as the most central actor. The network map shows
400 that the DOT and the DA-ATI are the most prominent entities in the industry while the DOT and CBSUA are
401 the one with high level of awareness as to the stakeholders with important roles in farm tourism industry. This
402 also implies their willingness to have a network with greater number of stakeholders.

403 Overall, the study concluded that network administrative organization (NAO) type of network governance is
404 the suitable mode of governance for the development of farm tourism industry in Camarines Sur. In establishing
405 this, the industry should evolved from a self-managed to a NAO type of governance through different strategies.
406 This way, stakeholders can build networks and promote convergence effort. This form of governance also enhances
407 learning between network actors, and may result in strategic alignment towards common goals and collective
408 outcomes, thus enhance the ability of the network to create shared value. The NAO type of governance can be
409 attained by capacitating the Provincial Government of Camarines Sur through the effort of the Department of
410 Tourism-Regional Office V (DOT-RO V0 which is considered as the most prominent actor among the stakeholders.

411 Further, the study recommends the conduct of research studies focusing on community participation on farm
412 tourism and the acceptability of NAO as a governance framework for the industry in Camarines Sur.

413 20 Statement of Contribution

414 This research introduces concepts and ideas necessary in understanding the basic principles of farm tourism as an
415 industry. It is an exploratory study which considers the current status of the farm tourism industry, relationship
416 of stakeholders, and current governance set-up as bases in determining the ideal governance framework.

417 More so, the study is anchored on the concept that governance serves as harmonizer of stakeholders. Thus,
418 study contributes to the knowledge building of network governance and its application to the development of an
419 emerging industry such as farm tourism.

420 The output of the study aims to serve as basis in developing strategies and policies on farm tourism and
421 provide better understanding of the importance of the elements of public governance such as such as institutions,
422 systems and processes, and actors of development.

423 The study encompasses the fields of governance, development management, and farm tourism.

424 It covers concepts on network governance as a mechanism to promote interdependency and collaboration for
425 mutual benefit. Hence, the researcher included state and non-state actors as respondents of the study.

426 It also highlights the roles and importance of stakeholders from various sectors which is anchored on the
427 very aim of Development Management -to capacitate the government, private sector, and civil society as major
428 development actors.

429 Lastly, the paper highlights farm tourism not just as a subset of tourism but a tool in achieving a more inclusive
430 and sustainable form of development.

431 21 Research Highlights

432 ? The farm tourism industry in Camarines Sur, Philippines is young, yet, developmental. ? The stakeholders of
the industry exhibit a selfmanaged mode of governance. ¹

Year 2022

Volume XXII Issue III Version I

)

(

Global Journal of Management and Business Research

Figure 1:

433

- 434 [Przezborska et al. ()] , L Przezborska , F Scrimgeour , M Sznajder . *Agritourism. CAB International* 2009.
- 435 [PHILIPPINE STATISTICS AUTHORITY ()] , *PHILIPPINE STATISTICS AUTHORITY* 2013. (Annual
436 Report)
- 437 [/06/25/national-convergent-agri-tourism-programlaunched-in-ilocos] /06/25/national-convergent-agri-tourism-
438 programlaunched-in-ilocos,
- 439 [? What is the Contribution to Knowledge, Theory, Policy or Practice Offered by the Paper? ? How does the Paper Offer a Social
440 ? What is the Contribution to Knowledge, Theory, Policy or Practice Offered by the Paper? ? How does the
441 Paper Offer a Social Science Perspective/Approach?,
- 442 [Barbieri and Tew ()] *A Preliminary Assessment of Agritourism in Missouri*, C Barbieri , C Tew . 2009.
443 University of Missouri, USA
- 444 [Freeman ()] ‘A Stakeholder Approach to Strategic Management’. E Freeman . 10.2139/ssrn.263511. *SSRN*
445 *Electronic Journal* 1984.
- 446 [Blackstock ()] ‘A Typology for Defining Agritourism’. K Blackstock . *Journal on Tourism Management* 2009.
- 447 [Phillip et al. ()] ‘A typology for defining agritourism’. S Phillip , C Hunter , K Blackstock .
448 10.1016/j.tourman.2009.08.001. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.08.001> *Tourism Man-*
449 *agement* 2010. (6) p. .
- 450 [Scott ()] *Accountability in the Regulatory State*, C Scott . 10.1111/1467-6478.00146. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6478.00146)
451 [1111/1467-6478.00146](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6478.00146) 2000.
- 452 [Department and Tourism ()] *Accreditation Standards on Farm Tourism Sites*, Department , Tourism . 2004.
- 453 [Bruch ()] *Agritourism in Focus: A Guide for Tennessee Farmers*, Bruch . 2005. University of Tennessee, USA
- 454 [An Act for the Development of Farm Tourism in the Philippines ()] *An Act for the Development of Farm*
455 *Tourism in the Philippines*, 2016.
- 456 [Balogh et al. ()] *An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance*, S Balogh , E Kirk , T Nabatchi . 2011.
457 Oxford University Press. (Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory. International Institute for
458 Sustainable Development)
- 459 [Arganoff (2001)] ‘Big Questions in Public Management Research’. R Arganoff . 10.1093/oxford-
460 journals.jpart.a003504. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxford-journals.jpart.a003504> *Journal*
461 *of Public Administration Research and Theory* 2001. July 2001. 11 (3) . (Pages 295-326)
- 462 [Brooks et al. ()] F Brooks , H Heinrich , L Marxen , B Schiling . *The Opportunity for Agritourism Development*
463 *in New Jersey. A report prepared for the New Jersey Department of Agriculture. Food Policy Institute, Rutgers,*
464 *the State University of New Jersey, Administrative Services Building III, 3 Rutgers Plaza, (New Brunswick,*
465 *NJ 08901)* 2006.
- 466 [Ham Weiler ()] *Building Community Capacity for Tourism Development*, Ham & Weiler . 2002.
- 467 [Ansell ()] *Collaborative Governance. Handbook on Theories of Governance*, Ansell , C . 2012. Oxford University
468 Press. p. .
- 469 [Schuman ()] *Creating a Culture of Collaboration. The International Association of Facilitators’ Handbook*, S
470 Schuman . 2006.
- 471 [Comen] ‘Critical Success Factors for Agritourism Entrepreneurs: A paper presented at the 2nd International
472 Congress on Marketing, Rural Development, and Sustainable Tourism’. T Comen . *Cuba. Department of*
473 *Business and Economics*
- 474 [Department and Agriculture ()] *DA Region V Annual Report*, Department , Agriculture . 2015. Pili, Camarines
475 Sur.
- 476 [Arroyo ()] *Defining Agritourism: A Comparative Study of Stakeholder Perceptions in Missouri and North*
477 *Carolina*, Et Arroyo . 2013. Texas, USA. North Carolina State University
- 478 [East] Portage Avenue East . *6th Floor*, (Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3B 0Y4)
- 479 [Huppe ()] *Frontiers of Networked Governance. The International Institute for Sustainable Development Report.*
480 *161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor*, Et Huppe . 2012. Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3B 0Y4.
- 481 [Bourne ()] *Governance and Stakeholders*, L Bourne . [https://www.apm.org.uk/blog/](https://www.apm.org.uk/blog/gover-nance-and-stake-holders/)
482 [gover-nance-and-stake-holders/](https://www.apm.org.uk/blog/gover-nance-and-stake-holders/) 2015.
- 483 [Carada ()] *Government Trends, Forms, and Measures. A Power Point Presentation. College of Pub-*
484 *lic Affairs and Development*, W Carada . UPLB. 19. CHRISTIAN. [http://www.aalep.eu/](http://www.aalep.eu/value-nets-main-types-actors-tourism-industry)
485 [value-nets-main-types-actors-tourism-industry](http://www.aalep.eu/value-nets-main-types-actors-tourism-industry) 2015. (Value Nets of the Main Types of Actors
486 in the Tourism Industry)
- 487 [Carada] *Government Trends, Forms, and Measures. A PowerPoint presentation*, W Carada . UPLB.
- 488 [Shuangyu] *How Beneficial is Agritourism? North Carolina Farmers and Residents*, Shuangyu .

21 RESEARCH HIGHLIGHTS

- 489 [Department and Tourism ()] *Implementing Rules and Regulations of the RA 101816*, Department , Tourism .
490 2016.
- 491 [Lazaro ()] *National Convergent Agritourism Program Convergence Launched in Ilocos*, F Lazaro . [https://news.mb.com.ph/20](https://news.mb.com.ph/2017) 2017.
- 493 [Planning for Agritourism: A Guide for Local Governments and Indiana Farmers] *Planning for Agritourism: A*
494 *Guide for Local Governments and Indiana Farmers*, (Indiana State)
- 495 [Battig et al. ()] *Public/Private Partnership for Sustainable Tourism. Delivering a Sustainable Strategy for*
496 *Tourism Destinations*, M Battig , T De Lacy , S Moore , Noakes , S . 2002. Australia. CRC for Sustainable
497 Tourism, Griffith University
- 498 [Evan and Olk ()] *R&D Consortia: A New US Organizational Form Management Review*, W Evan , P Olk .
499 1990. 1990. 31 p. .
- 500 [Harrill ()] 'Residents Attitude towards Tourism Development. A Literature Review with Implications for
501 Tourism Planning'. R Harrill . 10.1177/08. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08> *Journal of Planning Literature*
502 2004. 854 p. 12203260306.
- 503 [Samonte ()] V Samonte . *Briefer on Farm Tourism in the Philippines*, 2014.
- 504 [Borgatti et al. ()] *Software for Social Network Analysis*, S P Borgatti , M G Everett , L C Freeman . 2002.
505 Harvard, MA: Analytic Technologies.
- 506 [Rani ()] *Stakeholders' Analysis on Karaikudi as a Rural Tourism Destination*, Y S Rani . 2013. Kalasalangan
507 University.
- 508 [Apriteado ()] 'Status and Prospects of Agri-Tourism in Selected Municipalities of the 4th District of Batangas'.
509 J Apritado . *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research* 2014. 2 (4) .
- 510 [Butler and Cadbury ()] *Sustainable Tourism. A state-of-the-art review. Tourism Geographies. Retrieved from 16,*
511 *R Butler , A Cadbury . [https://books.google.com.ph/books/about/Corporate_Governance_](https://books.google.com.ph/books/about/Corporate_Governance_and_Chairmanship.html?id=KhPcrLPQbIC&redir_esc=y)*
512 *and_Chairmanship.html?id=KhPcrLPQbIC&redir_esc=y* 1999. 2002. Oxford University Press. (Cor-
513 porate Governance and Chairmanship: A Personal View)
- 514 [Sachs ()] *The Age of Sustainable Development. Columbia University Press. 60. SALES*, J Sachs . 2015. 2000.
515 Los Baños. University of the Philippines (Unpublished Thesis on Development Management and Governance)
- 516 [Creech et al. ()] *The Frontiers of Networked Governance*, H Creech , G Huppe , & Knoblauch D . 2012.
517 (International Institute for Sustainable Development)
- 518 [Shand] *The Governance of Sustainable Rural Renewal: A Comparative Global Perspective*, R Shand .
- 519 [Dabphet ()] 'The Key Stakeholders in the Implementation of Sustainable Tourism Development in Two
520 Rural Towns of Thailand'. S Dabphet . [http://www.ijbts-journal.com/images/main_1366796758/](http://www.ijbts-journal.com/images/main_1366796758/0029-Siripen.pdf)
521 [0029-Siripen.pdf](http://www.ijbts-journal.com/images/main_1366796758/0029-Siripen.pdf) *International Journal of Business Tourism and Applied Sciences* 2006. p. .
- 522 [Archer and Cooper ()] *The Positive and Negative Impacts of Tourism. Global Tourism*, B Archer , C Cooper .
523 1998. (3rd Edition)
- 524 [Avila and Libosada C ()] *Tourism Development for LGUs*, E Avila , & Libosada C . 2009.
- 525 [Perdue ()] 'Us and them: Social categorization and the process of intergroup bias'. . Et Perdue . 10.1037/0022-
526 3514.59.3.475. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.3.475> *Journal of Personality and Social*
527 *Psychology* 1990. 59 (3) p. .
- 528 [Dubois and Schmitz ()] *What is the Position of Agritourism on the Walloon Tourist Market?*, C Dubois
529 , S Schmitz . 10.2478/euco-2013-0019. <https://doi.org/10.2478/euco-2013-0019> 2013. European
530 Countryside. 5 p. 295.
- 531 [Gabor ()] *Why Farm Tourism*, M Gabor . <http://www.businessmirror.com.ph/why-farm-tourism/>
532 2016.