Volume 22 Issue 30
Originally issued as F3

Global Journal of Management and Business Research: F
Real Estate, Event and Tourism Management
Volume 22 Issue 3 Version 1.0 Year 2022
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals
Online ISSN: 2249-4588 & Print ISSN: 0975-5853

Governance Framework for Farm Tourism in Camarines Sur, Philippines

By Julyven Marta Fridas P. Maniscan

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.

Keywords: *farm tourism, network governance, governance framework, development.*

GJMBR-F Classification: *DDC Code: 338.479172981 LCC Code: G155.C35*

GOVERNANCEFRAMEWORKFORFARMTOURISMINCAMARINESSURPHILIPPINES

Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:

© 2022. Julyven Marta Fridas P. Maniscan. This research/review article is distributed under the terms of the Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BYNCND 4.0). You must give appropriate credit to authors and reference this article if parts of the article are reproduced in any manner. Applicable licensing terms are at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.

Governance Framework for Farm Tourism in Camarines Sur, Philippines

Julyven Marta Fridas P. Maniscan

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.

Keywords: farm tourism, network governance, governance framework, development.

I. Introduction

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

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

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

Author: e-mail: jmpadrigon@cspc.edu,ph

© 2022 Global Journals

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

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

II. Literature Review

a) Farm Tourism as an Engine of Sustainable Development

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

Farm tourism as a form of rural tourism is considered as a mechanism for inclusive and sustainable development through capacity development and technology transfer. Lack (1995) cited that in these parts of the world, farm tourism is viewed as a legitimate way to enhance farm income thus contribute to the stability of rural areas (Agricultural Land Commission, 1997). Morais et.al, in his study concluded that farmers and residents of North Carolina recognize that farm tourism is important for delivering an array of socio-cultural, environmental, and economic benefits to society. The widespread recognition of farm tourism as an educational tool and a way to preserve rural heritage (i.e., by educating the public about agriculture, preserving farmland, and sharing rural heritage and lifestyles) suggests that farm tourism farmers and promoters (e.g., local development agencies) need to capture those benefits in their advertisements to further promote the industry.

Dabphet (2006), stated that many researchers involved in the study of tourism have suggested sustainability as conceptually important. Some researchers (Archer & Cooper, 1998; Ham & Weiler, 2002) have attempted to concentrate on the relationship between economics and the environment. Alternately, Butler through broadly (1999b) defined the concept of sustainable tourism development within three areas of sustainable development (environmental, socio-cultural, economic) and associated it with the idea of carrying capacity. Lane (1994, p.102) suggested that sustainable tourism should aim 'to minimize environmental and cultural damage, optimize visitor satisfaction, and maximize long-term economic growth for the region'. These ideas gave rise to the emergence of several research studies in sustainable tourism, and farm tourism in particular. Schmitz, et.al (2013)conducted a study on the position of farm tourism in Walloon Tourist Market. He emphasized that there is a future in the farm tourism industry if the link to agricultural activities is maintained. Which means, that there should be greater participation from the farmers and the host community.

b) Farm Tourism and Stakeholders

Nagar's (2013) study, emphasized that identification of stakeholders' involvement in destination tourism planning and development, as well as the factors that might influence their level of involvement, are not only important for tourism destination planners, but also the host community's support for destination tourism development and competitive strategies. Similarly, in the case of farm tourism development, the role of stakeholders such as regulators, technology provider, communities, and owner-operators are very important. Their interrelationship will determine the positive and negative effects of farm tourism operations to participants. Likewise, it will also pave way to promote the industry.

Section 11 of the *Republic Act 10816* (RA10816) known as an 'Act Providing for the Development and Promotion of Farm Tourism in the Philippines' indicates the different bodies that should initiate and be involved in the promotion of farm tourism in the country. This includes the roles of the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), Agricultural Training Institute (ATI), Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA), and other agencies.

Additionally, section 4 of RA 10816 cites that the Farm Tourism Strategic Action Plan in consonance with the National Tourism Development Plan shall likewise define the roles and responsibilities of national

© 2022 Global Journals

government agencies, local government units (LGUs), farm tourism operators, tour operators, educational institutions, and other industry stakeholders in its implementation. Also, Republic Act 9593 known as the *'Tourism Act of 2009'* states that the country shall 'strengthen the role of tourism councils and encourage the participation of non-government organizations (NGOs), people's organizations (POs) and the private sector in initiating programs for tourism development and environmental protection' and 'encourage private sector participation and farm tourism for countryside development and preservation of rural life.

Furthermore, it is important to note that these legal frameworks encourage cooperation among, and/or request the assistance of, departments, bureaus, offices, agencies or instrumentalities of the government, farm tourism stakeholders, financial and educational institutions, nongovernment organizations, people's organizations and other like-minded institutions and individuals in the implementation of its functions to effectively attain the promotion and development of farm tourism in the country.

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

c) Governance as Harmonizer of Stakeholders

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

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

III. Methodology

a) Methods and Design

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

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

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

IV. Results

a) Status of the Farm Tourism Industry

Table 1 summarizes the data gathered from the KII and desk review. It substantiates that the farm tourism industry in Camarines Sur is not yet well-established. In this case, the key essence of the Republic Act 10816 which is to disseminate the value of agriculture, provide additional income to farmers, and involve the community are not yet realized. At present,

© 2022 Global Journals

farm tourism industry is considered small scale but has potentials given the existence of stakeholders that can help farmers to develop their farms operate as a farm tourism site and lure visitors who can contribute to economic development. The perceptions simply imply that all stakeholders need to play significant roles so that more coordinated farm tourism development can be achieved. The fact that tourism demands a more systematic approach more than any other agencies requires a strong foundation for its development.

b) Profile of Stakeholders

i. *Farm Profile*

The results of the study show that the seven (7) farms included in the study offer diverse crops (Table 2). They offer unique farm tourism experience given the variety of activities that tourists can enjoy. Out of the seven (7) farms, there are two which can be considered as 'Gem Farms', farms planted with a specific crop which serves as its banner product. These are the Bicol Strawberry Farm known for its high-quality strawberry production and the MikeLiz Integrated Farm known for its dragon fruit plantation. Most of the farms show a very good fusion of agriculture and tourism. Another notable feature is the farms' product innovation which shows a great potential in attracting tourists and visitors. The MikeLiz Integrated Farm based on its profile, offers unique products from its farm produce. This displays good characteristics of a farm tourism site by making use of what is inside the farm and turn them into unique and profitable products.

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

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

c) Profile of the Government Agencies

Cited in Section 8 of the Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) of the Farm Tourism Development Act of the Philippines, is the creation of a Farm Tourism Development Board composed of the Department of Tourism (DOT), Department of Agriculture (DA), Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), and the Academe. These agencies are expected to take the lead in crafting and in the implementation of policies, projects, and activities toward the development and promotion of the industry. Table 3 shows its mandate as a government institution and their plans and current initiatives.

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

Governance among stakeholders is an important element to consider in the development of the industry. It is important to note that sustainable tourism development cannot be achieved without governance because of its nature; that of fostering common goal by collective action (Zeijl-Rozema, Cörvers, Kemp, & Martens, 2008). Table 5 shows the summary of the functions and roles of each stakeholder or national agencies as stated in the Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) of the RA 101816.

d) Profile of the Local Government Units (LGUs)

Topcu (2017), underscored the importance of farm tourism industry as a sector for the development of the locals who are dependent on farming. Thus, it requires initiatives from the LGUs.

Table 4 shows the profile of two offices which are the Tourism Office and Municipal Agriculture Office (MAO) in seven municipalities where selected farm tourism sites are located. They were profiled since they are two important pillars of the Local Government Units (LGUs) because of their mandates on tourism and agriculture development.

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

e) SWOT Analysis of Municipalities

Table 5 shows the SWOT analysis of each municipality included in the study. It highlights the resources of the municipality which they can capitalize and areas which needed attention. Strengths include the

© 2022 Global Journals

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

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

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

f) Stakeholders' Relationship

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

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

The network map generated (Figure 1) shows that the DOT is the most central stakeholder as it has the biggest size of node. It has also the highest number of ties for in and out-degree centrality. Considering the in-degree centrality, the DOT and DA-ATI are the central actors. This implies that these agencies are the ones seen by other stakeholders prominent in the farm tourism development. According to the Freeman's approach, if the actor receives many ties, they are often said to be prominent, or to have high prestige. That is, many others seek to direct ties with them, and this may indicate their importance. This is because that they received the most number of arrows from other stakeholders. For the out-degree centrality, the DOT followed by the CBSUA display highest level of awareness of the stakeholders who need to be involved in the farm tourism industry in Camarines Sur. This implies that these agencies are willing to have a tie or coordination with the stakeholders they referred to

Anchoring on the social network analysis, the stakeholders are also analyzed through a power and interest matrix. According to Mayers (2005), stakeholder power can be understood as the extent to which stakeholders are able to persuade or coerce others into making decisions, and following certain courses of action. Power may be derived from the nature of a stakeholder's organization, or their position in relation to other stakeholders (for example, line ministries which control budgets and other departments) while interest is how actors respond and get involved in different farm tourism activities. In this case, the Department of Tourism (DOT), Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), Central Bicol State University of Agriculture (CBSUA), and Agricultural Training Institute (ATI) are classified as stakeholders with high power and interest. Their power is derived from their position as government agencies. In terms of relation to other organizations, the DOT and DA-ATI as shown in the stakeholder's analysis are central actors considering the in-degree centrality. They are seen as prominent stakeholders. Meanwhile, the DOT and CBSUA are considered actors with the highest level of awareness in terms of stakeholders with crucial role in the farm tourism industry. These characteristics of stakeholders are manifestations of their high interest while their position as government agencies is a manifestation of their high power. On one hand, the Local Government Units (LGUs) are classified as stakeholders with high power but low interest in farm tourism. This is supported by the social network analysis wherein LGUs are seen as an important stakeholder by government agencies as well as farm owner-operators. However, a very limited number of LGUs are functional in the farm tourism industry. None of them has incorporated farm tourism initiatives in their Tourism Development Plans and functions of the Tourism Office as well as the Agriculture office. Lack of personnel to handle farm tourism projects is also a challenge to the LGUs. All of these are manifestations of low interest on farm tourism despite having direct contact with the community and has the full responsibility over the resources in their locality.

Meanwhile, farm tourism site owners are seen to be the stakeholders with high interest but low in

© 2022 Global Journals

power. They posed very high interest on farm tourism by their commitment in farm development and engaging in farm tourism operations. However, the lack of farm tourism association which can be a medium for their concerns make them less empowered to access technical and financial support from the government. Nonetheless, the government agencies recognize them as crucial in farm tourism development as shown in the social network analysis. Lastly, the community is viewed as the stakeholder with low interest and power because of their lack of knowledge on farm tourism and less involvement in farm tourism operation which need to be given attention because of their vital role in the industry.

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

g) Governance Framework for Farm Tourism in Camarines Sur

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

As cited by Huppe, et.al (2012) in the "Frontiers of Networked Governance", governance networks do not merely aggregate resources, but are structured to take advantage that each participating sector brings different resources to the fore; they combine the voluntary energy and legitimacy of the civil-society sector with the financial muscle and interest of businesses and the enforcement and rule-making power and coordination and capacity–building skills of states and international organizations (Börzel, 1998; Creech, 2008; Goldsmith & Eggers 2004; Reinicke & Deng, 2000). These networks create bridges that enable various participants use the advantage the synergies between the resources that they contribute, allowing for the pooling of knowledge, the exchange of experience, and for the generation of a feasible institutional framework for fruitful collaboration. Because they span socioeconomic, political, and cultural differences, networks can transform what might otherwise degenerate into counterproductive confrontations across public, private and civil society sectors into constructive, collaborative relationships (Reinicke & Deng, 2000). Additionally, governance networks allow part of societal steering and problem solving to be accomplished by a wide variety of actors that agree to create problem solving spaces outside the government, to address all or some of the stages of strategy formation: (1) problem analysis (2) goal formulation stage, and (3) strategy development and implementation.

Kenis and Provan (2008) categorized network governance into three modes(Table 8), the self-managed or participant-governed network, lead organization-governed network, and the network administration organization (NAO). Each of these has different structures and characteristics which may be considered in adopting the type of network governance in farm tourism.

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

- There is no separate entity which facilitates the operation.
- There are very limited networks between stakeholders.

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

The characteristics of the farm tourism industry in Camarines Sur show that the network administrative organization (NAO) form of network governance is suitable to be adopted in Camarines Sur. This means that the industry should evolve from self-managed to network administrative organization type (NAO) of network governance. This considers the diversity of the stakeholders which come from the different sectors, the number of industry actors, and the need to centralize the processes so that a certain entity would be able to manage and sustain the network. It should be noted, however, that movement from either shared governance or a lead organization to an NAO involves strategic choice. That is, evolution is not simply a natural process that occurs as contingency components. Hence, a

© 2022 Global Journals

separate entity or NAO should be created first to make the framework functional. In creating the NAO, an organization should take the initiative to capacitate the stakeholders which will be involved. During this process, the industry may adopt the lead organization type of governance. Through this, decisions and activities are coordinated to the DOT-RO V as the lead organization.

NAOs typically have board structures that include all or subsets of network members (Evan and Olk 1990; Provan, Isett, Milward. 2004). Hence, the DOT is selected as it has the capacity and resources to organize the stakeholders and capacitate actors in the provincial level (based from the SNA). The process of forming the NAO should be included in the initial steps of shifting the industry from a self-managed to a brokered-type of governance (Figure 7). Table 9details how the industry could shift from a self-managed to a network administrative organization (NAO) type of governance.

h) NAO Structure

In creating the structure of the NAO, this study proposes to pattern it to the composition of the Farm Tourism Board in the national level. The National Farm Tourism Board is included in the IRR of the RA 101816. This is to ensure that the operations of the industry will be facilitated and all stakeholders from the different sectors are well-represented. The structure which is based on the national level also ensures that accountability and responsiveness are considered.

Figure 3shows the proposed organizational structure for the PFTDB. It illustrates the governance framework for farm tourism stakeholders in Camarines Sur adopting the network administrative organization type of network governance. Figure 4 shows that each stakeholder has a two-way arrow indicating interdependency between networks. All of them should create and strengthen network with the identified actors/agencies to make the governance framework functional. The Provincial Farm Tourism Farm Board is situated at the center being the lead agency or the entity which is responsible for managing and sustaining the stakeholders' network. The NAO which needs to be functional serves as a broker among stakeholders within the province and initiator of programs on farm tourism.

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

V. Conclusion

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

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

Results of the study revealed that the farm tourism industry in Camarines Sur is still young, and developmental. The profile of the farms also revealed that farm tourism sites in Camarines Sur are diverse in terms of activities, crops produced, as well as services offered. Lack of policy orientation and in-depth

© 2022 Global Journals

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

The roles, strengths, weaknesses, as well as the stakeholders' implications in involving them in governance were also assessed based on their profile and the current relationship that they have. In terms of the current relationship that the stakeholders have, the DOT is considered as the most central actor. The network map shows that the DOT and the DA-ATI are the most prominent entities in the industry while the DOT and CBSUA are the one with high level of awareness as to the stakeholders with important roles in farm tourism industry. This also implies their willingness to have a network with greater number of stakeholders.

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

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

Statement of Contribution

- What is the Contribution to Knowledge, Theory, Policy or Practice Offered by the Paper?

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

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

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

- How does the Paper Offer a Social Science Perspective/Approach?

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

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

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

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

Research Highlights

- The farm tourism industry in Camarines Sur, Philippines is young, yet, developmental.
- The stakeholders of the industry exhibit a self-managed mode of governance.
- Harmonizing and limiting factors are identified and considered for a functional governance framework.
- The farm tourism industry in Camarines Sur has to evolve from a self-managed to a network administrative organization (NAO) mode of network governance.

References Références Referencias

1. ANSELL, C. (2012). Collaborative Governance. Handbook on Theories of Governance. Oxford University Press, pages 498-511.
2. ARCHER, B. & COOPER, C. (1998). The Positive and Negative Impacts of Tourism. Global Tourism, Chapter 5, 3rd Edition.
3. ARGANOFF, R. (2001). Big Questions in Public Management Research. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, Volume 11, Issue 3, July 2001, Pages 295–326, https://doi.org /10.10 93/oxford-journals.jpart.a0 03504

© 2022 Global Journals

4. APRITADO, J. et.al. (2014). Status and Prospects of Agri-Tourism in Selected Municipalities of the 4th District of Batangas. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, Vol.2, No.4.
5. ARROYO, et.al. (2013). Defining Agritourism: A Comparative Study of Stakeholder Perceptions in Missouri and North Carolina. North Carolina State University, Texas, USA.
6. AVILA, E., & LIBOSADA C. (2009). Tourism Development for LGUs.
7. BALOGH, S., KIRK, E., & NABATCHI, T. (2011). An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory. Oxford University Press. International Institute for Sustainable Development.
8. BARBIERI, C. AND TEW, C. (2009). A Preliminary Assessment of Agritourism in Missouri. University of Missouri, USA.
9. BATTIG, M., DE LACY, T., MOORE, S., and NOAKES, S. (2002). Public/Private Partnership for Sustainable Tourism. Delivering a Sustainable Strategy for Tourism Destinations. CRC for Sustainable Tourism, Griffith University, Australia.
10. BLACKSTOCK, K., et. al. (2009). A Typology for Defining Agritourism. Journal on Tourism Management.
11. BORGATTI, S. P., EVERETT, M.G., & FREEMAN, L.C. (2002). Software for Social Network Analysis. Harvard, MA: Analytic Technologies.
12. BOURNE, L. (2015). Governance and Stakeholders. Retrieved from_https://www.apm.org.uk/blog/governance-and-stake-holders/
13. BROOKS, F., HEINRICH, H., MARXEN, L., & SCHILING, B. (2006). The Opportunity for Agritourism Development in New Jersey. A report prepared for the New Jersey Department of Agriculture. Food Policy Institute, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, Administrative Services Building III, 3 Rutgers Plaza New Brunswick, NJ 08901.
14. BRUCH et.al. (2005). Agritourism in Focus: A Guide for Tennessee Farmers. University of Tennessee, USA.
15. BUTLER, R. (1999). Sustainable Tourism. A state-of-the-art review. Tourism Geographies. Retrieved from
16. CADBURY, A. (2002). Corporate Governance and Chairmanship: A Personal View. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.ph/books/about/Corporate_Governance_and_Chairmanship.html?id=KhPcrLPQbIC&redir_esc=y
17. CARADA, W. (n.d). Government Trends, Forms, and Measures. A PowerPoint presentation. College of Public Affairs and Development, UPLB.
18. CARADA, W. (n.d). Government Trends, Forms, and Measures. A Power Point Presentation. College of Public Affairs and Development, UPLB.
19. CHRISTIAN (2015). Value Nets of the Main Types of Actors in the Tourism Industry. Retrieved from http://www.aalep.eu/value-nets-main-types-actors-tourism-industry.
20. COMEN, T., (n.d). Critical Success Factors for Agritourism Entrepreneurs: A paper presented at the 2nd International Congress on Marketing, Rural Development, and Sustainable Tourism. Pinar Del Rio, Cuba. Department of Business and Economics, Johnson State College.
21. CREECH, H., HUPPE, G., & KNOBLAUCH D. (2012). The Frontiers of Networked Governance. International Institute for Sustainable Development. 161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3B 0Y4.
22. DABPHET, S. (2006). The Key Stakeholders in the Implementation of Sustainable Tourism Development in Two Rural Towns of Thailand. International Journal of Business Tourism and Applied Sciences, 1–11. Retrieved from http://www.ijbts-journal.com/images/main_1366796758/0029-Siripen.pdf.
23. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (2015). DA Region V Annual Report. Pili, Camarines Sur.
24. DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM (2004). Accreditation Standards on Farm Tourism Sites.
25. DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM (2016). Implementing Rules and Regulations of the RA 101816.
26. DUBOIS, C., & SCHMITZ, S. (2013). What is the Position of Agritourism on the Walloon Tourist Market? European Countryside, *5*(4), 295. https://doi.org/10.24 78/euco-2013-0019.
27. EVAN, W. & OLK , P. (1990). R&D Consortia: A New US Organizational Form Management Review, 31 (3) (1990), pp. 37-46
28. FREEMAN, E. (1984). A Stakeholder Approach to Strategic Management. SSRN Electronic Journal. 10.2139/ssrn.263511.
29. GABOR, M. (2016). Why Farm Tourism. Retrieved from http://www.businessmirror.com.ph/why-farm-tourism/
30. HAM & WEILER. (2002). Building Community Capacity for Tourism Development.
31. HARRILL, R. (2004). Residents Attitude towards Tourism Development. A Literature Review with Implications for Tourism Planning. Journal of Planning Literature. https://doi.org/10.11 77/08 854 12203260306
32. HUPPE, et.al. (2012). Frontiers of Networked Governance. The International Institute for Sustainable Development Report. 161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3B 0Y4
33. INDIANA STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE. (n.d. Planning for Agritourism: A Guide for Local Governments and Indiana Farmers. Indiana State

© 2022 Global Journals

Department of Agriculture, One North Capitol Avenue, Suite 600, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
34. INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL NETWORK METHODS: Chapter 1. Retrieved from http://faculty.ucr.edu/~hanneman/nettext/C10_Centralit.html#Intro.
35. IOANNIDES, D. (2001). Sustainable Development and the Shifting Attitudes of Tourism Stakeholders: Toward a Dynamic Framework. Tourism, Recreation and Sustainability: Linking Culture and the Environment. 55-76.
36. ISETT, MILWARD, PROVAN 2004. The Oxford Handbook of Political Networks. Oxford University Press
37. KATES et.al. (2005).What is Sustainable Development? Goals, Indicators, Values, and Practices. Published as an issue of Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development, vol.47, number 3, pages 8-21.
38. KENIS, P., PROVAN, K. (2008). Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management and Effectiveness. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory. DOI: 10.1093/jopart/mum015 · Source: OAI.
39. KNICKEL & RENTING 2000. Rural Development: From Practices and Policies Towards Theory. SociologiaRuralis. 40. 391 - 408. 10.1111/1467-9523.00156.
40. KOOIMAN, J. (2003). Governing as Governance. SAGE Publications. Retrieved from https://phil-papers.org/rec/KOOGAG
41. LANE, B. (1994). What is Rural Tourism? Journal of Sustainable Tourism. 2. 7-21. 10.1080/096695 894 09510680.
42. LANE, B., & BRAMWELL, B. (2000). Collaboration and Partnerships in Tourism Planning. Tourism Partnerships and Collaboration: Politics, Practice and Sustainability (pp. 1 - 19). Channel View Publications, Clevedon.
43. LAGO, N. (2017). Tourism Demand and Agriculture Supply: Basis for Agritourism Development in Quezon Province. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, Vol. 5, No. 3.
44. LAPID, M. (2011). An Indicative Plan for the Establishment of a Tourism Enterprise Zone (TEZ) at the Mount Makiling Forest Reserve. University of the Philippines Los Banos.
45. LAZARO, F. (2017). National Convergent Agri-tourism Program Convergence Launched in Ilocos. Retrieved from https://news.mb.com.ph/2017/06/25/national-convergent-agri-tourism-program-launched-in-ilocos/
46. MAYERS, J. (2005). Stakeholder Power Analysis. Focus, (March), 24. Retrieved from http://www.policypowertools.org/Tools/Understanding/docs/stakeholder_power_tool_english.pdf.
47. MCEVILY, B., PERRONE, V. and ZAHEER, A. (2003) Trust as an Organizing Principle. Organization Science, 14, 91-103.
48. MORAIS, et.al. (n.d). How Beneficial is Agritourism? North Carolina Farmers and Residents Respond. North Carolina State University.
49. MOSCARDO, G., (2008). Building Capacity for Tourism Development. CAB International, USA.
50. NEUMANN, R. (1994). Data Analysis for Non-Statistician. Volume16, Issue 2. https://doi.org/10.1002/vnl.730160205
51. NOGUEIRA, S. F. M., & PINHO, J. C. M. R. (2014). Examining tourism stakeholder networks and relationship quality: The specific case of peneda gerês national park (PNPG). Revista Portuguesa de Estudos Regionais, *36*(1), 22–33.
52. OCHTERSKI, J., & ROTH, M., (n.d). Getting Started in Agritourism: A Cooperative Extension guide on to how to begin, what visitors expect, customerrelations, income streams, liability, marketing and other useful resources. Cornell University.
53. PERDUE, .et.al (1990). Us and them: Social categorization and the process of intergroup bias. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59(3), 475-486. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.3.475
54. PHILLIP, S., HUNTER, C., & BLACKSTOCK, K. (2010). A typology for defining agritourism. Tourism Management, 31(6), 754–758. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.08.001.
55. PHILIPPINE STATISTICS AUTHORITY. (2013). Annual Report.
56. PRZEZBORSKA, L., SCRIMGEOUR, F., & SZNAJDER, M. (2009). Agritourism. CAB International, USA.
57. RANI, Y. S. (2013). Stakeholders' Analysis on Karaikudi as a Rural Tourism Destination. Kalasalingan University.
58. REPUBLIC ACT 101816. (2016).An Act for the Development of Farm Tourism in the Philippines.
59. SACHS, J. (2015). The Age of Sustainable Development. Columbia University Press.
60. SALES. (2000). Unpublished Thesis on Development Management and Governance. University of the Philippines, Los Baños.
61. SAMONTE, V. (2014). Briefer on Farm Tourism in the Philippines.
62. SCOTT, C. (2000). Accountability in the Regulatory State. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6478.00146
63. SCHUMAN, S. (2006). Creating a Culture of Collaboration. The International Association of Facilitators' Handbook.
64. SHAND, R. (n.d). The Governance of Sustainable Rural Renewal: A Comparative Global Perspective.
65. SHUANGYU et.al. (n.d). How Beneficial is Agritourism? North Carolina Farmers and Residents

© 2022 Global Journals

Respond. North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service. North Carolina State University.
66. SCHMIT ET. AL (2013) Position of Farm Tourism in Waloon Tourist Market. DOI: 10.2478/euco-2013-0019
67. SOUTHEAST ASIAN REGIONAL CENTER FOR GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURE. (2012).The SEARCA Diary. Volume 41, no.2, pages 2-3.
68. SOUTHEAST ASIAN REGIONAL CENTER FOR GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURE. (n.d). Agritourism in the Philippines. Retrieved from http://searca.org/index.php /knowledge-manage-ment/seminar-series/568-agri-tourism-in-the-philippines-untapped-potential
69. STOKER, G. (2004). Collaborative Governance. Oregon State University. Retrieved from https://secure.oregonstate.edu/ap/cps/documents/view/118213
70. THE WORLD BANK. (2017). An Annual World Development Report.
71. THOMPSON, R. (n.d) Stakeholders' Analysis. Retrieved from https://www.mindtools.com/pages /article/newPPM_07.htm
72. TOPCU, E. (2007). Agri-Tourism: As a New Element of Country Planning. A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences. Middle East Technical University.
73. UNITED NATIONS. (2018). Working Together: Integrations, Institutions, and the Sustainable Development Goals. World Public Sector Report 2018. United Nations, New York.
74. WASSERMAN, S., & FAUST, K. (1994). Structural analysis in the social sciences. Social network analysis: Methods and applications. New York, NY, US: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815478
75. XU, et.al. (2012). Branding Assessment for Recreation on Farms. Journal of Travel Research. 55. 10.1177/0047287515605930.

© 2022 Global Journals