TAKING CHARGE OF TOURISM – TOURISM SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURIAL PROCESSES ON CULION ISLAND, PHILIPPINES

Richard S. Aquino,*[1] Heike A. Schänzel[2] and Michael Lück[3]
School of Hospitality & Tourism, Auckland University of Technology
[1]raquino@aut.ac.nz [2]heike.schanzel@aut.ac.nz [3]mlueck@aut.ac.nz
*Corresponding author

Abstract

Tourism social entrepreneurship (TSE) is described as an alternative approach to tourism development, characterised by goals of eradicating local social problems, maximising the positive outcomes of tourism, and delivering sustainable societal transformation (Sheldon, Pollock, & Daniele, 2017). Alongside more efficient resource-use and knowledge exchange, and with social entrepreneurs' visions, TSE is facilitated through tourism social enterprises: tourism businesses aiming to drive positive social change, usually at the host community level (Aquino, Lück, & Schänzel, 2018; Phi, Whitford, & Dredge, 2017). Although TSE is becoming popular in tourism development practice, there is scant empirical evidence of the processes and activities performed by tourism social enterprises in achieving their social goals. Some previous studies have applied a business model framework in exploring the implementing mechanisms of tourism social enterprises and understanding how these social ventures operate (Franzidis, 2018; von der Weppen & Cochrane, 2012). However, most of the extant literature on this topic has been developed from pre-determined applied management constructs and the knowledge of tourism social entrepreneurs; these studies have not considered the perspectives of host community actors (e.g. residents). This is a significant omission, as it has been argued that the strategies pursued by tourism social enterprises vary according to their host community, since social entrepreneurial practices are dependent on local conditions.

To address this gap in the understanding of tourism social entrepreneurial processes, a constructivist research approach was used. A single case study methodology was employed to explore the processes being facilitated by Kawil Tours, a tourism social enterprise on Culion Island in the Philippines. Culion is an island community commonly known as (formerly) the largest leper colony in the country, which has been engaged in tourism through the initiatives of Kawil Tours since 2011. Case study research was chosen for this study because it enables the in-depth exploration of a phenomenon or organisation bounded by its setting (Stake, 1995). The case study comprised qualitative research methods performed with 19 TSE and host community actors, namely residents, government officials and tourism social entrepreneurs. Fifteen semi-structured interviews and one community engagement workshop were conducted to collect

qualitative data. These data collection strategies were supplemented by direct observations and archival research in order to develop a contextual understanding of the phenomenon. Using *NVivo 12*, grounded theory analysis procedures informed by a constructivist research paradigm were applied to analyse the elicited information (Charmaz, 2014). Cycles of line-by-line, incident with incident, and focused coding schemes resulted in an integrative model that illuminates the processes that are being implemented by the tourism social enterprise.

The findings of this study illustrate the emergent categories that comprise the model, which are predominantly social enterprise-led. These categories encapsulate processes and sub-processes that are in parallel with the tourism social enterprises' economic, social and environmental goals *for* the community. The paper concludes by critically discussing the degree of community involvement and scale of potential impacts that the emergent tourism social entrepreneurial processes foster in the island community. Finally, the findings of this study are relevant for individuals and social organisations aiming at proliferating community-based TSE activities in localities facing similar social challenges and contextual conditions.

References

Aquino, R. S., Lück, M., & Schänzel, H. (2018). A conceptual framework of tourism social entrepreneurship for sustainable community development. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 37*, 23–32.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). London, England: SAGE Publications.

Franzidis, A. (2018). An examination of a social tourism business in Granada, Nicaragua. *Tourism Review*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1108/tr-04-2017-0076

Phi, G. T., Whitford, M., & Dredge, D. (2017). Knowledge dynamics in the tourism-social entrepreneurship nexus. In P. J. Sheldon & R. Daniele (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship and tourism: Philosophy and practice* (pp. 155–172). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

Sheldon, P., Pollock, A., & Daniele, R. (2017). Social entrepreneurship and tourism: Setting the stage. In P. J. Sheldon & R. Daniele (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship and tourism: Philosophy and practice* (pp. 1–18). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

von der Weppen, J., & Cochrane, J. (2012). Social enterprises in tourism: An exploratory study of operational models and success factors. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 20*(3), 497–511.

students´ collaborations with the local community? I wanted to introduce a pass/fail system, so if students participate they pass, and that my comments can be focused on what went well and how they can do more of that. So far I have not been able to introduce such a system.

Some people at various levels in the administrative system recognize my need and would like to change the system to my benefit, others react very negative. It is interesting that the negative reactions are emotional rather than rational. This question seems to connect to deeply held emotions of professional identity and feelings of security for teachers. Unfortunately, this also means that these people are not open to rational arguments. No matter how much research I refer to showing how learning actually is promoted, this has no effect.

I am therefore eager to hear how others within the tourism education community of sustainability, value based and community development education have dealt with this problem. My strategy is to find allies in this struggle.

References:

Lotz-Sistika, H, A. EJ. Wals, D. Kronlid, D. McGarry "Transformative, transgressive social learning: rethinking higher education pedagogy in times of systemic global dysfunction" in Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, Volume 16, 2015.

Wiek, A., Withycombe L., C.L. Redman "Key competences in sustainability: a reference framework for academic program development" in Integrated Research System for Sustainability Science, United Nations University and Springer, 2011.

Abstract

Design Thinking in Social Enterprise

Suchi Smita Mahato

Researcher in Training

Research Group: Organizational networks, Innovation and Development of Tourist Strategies and Products(ONIT), Organization, Business Management And Product Design

University of Girona

Suchi.mahato@udg.edu or Suchi.mahato@gmail.com

Use of the Design Thinking process in Local Social Enterprises supporting Tourism Activities

Social Entrepreneurship creates solutions to solve problems that markets and governments have failed to mitigate (Dees 2001). Local social enterprises create social value both in the social and environmental frame, and are embedded within the local community ecosystem. The tourism sector is dependent on many other sectors for the provisions of both goods and services at a local level. Tourism social entrepreneurship can be considered a major driver of social value creation (Sigala, 2013) and leads to social change (Ateljevic & Doorne, 2003). The very definition of social entrepreneurship is contested (Choi and Majumdar, 2014) but in essence it refers to a an entrepreneurial activity bearing profit with an aim to solve given social problems that it dedicates itself to. Coined by Bill Drayton of Ashoka in the 1980's it is a relatively new field (Brock and Steiner, 2009). In their effort to examine academic production in social entrepreneurship (Macke, Sarate, Domenghini and Da Silva, 2018), observe that the research on social entrepreneurship remains fragmented with little or no consolidation of the terms used within the field.

"Design Thinking" is a problem solving process popularized more recently in the mainstream by Tim Brown and IDEO (Johannsson-Sköldberg, Woodilla and Cetinkaya, 2013). John E Arnold, an MIT Professor, a "creative engineer" was one of the first to combine the technical skills of engineering with a more comprehensive human-centered approach in the past to form the foundations of design thinking and its uses as we see it today. He reframed the design process as problem solving requiring creativity and tools in order to think about problem solving differently (Clancey, 2018, p 5). Initially used only by designers, design thinking is now finds application in several fields from product / industrial design to education and social entrepreneurship as in this study.

The design thinking methodology stresses the importance of inculcating the end user into the design process in order to create enhanced solutions (Kummitha, 2016). Local social entrepreneurship solves problems for the people, by the people. Design thinking and social entrepreneurship has some important parallels as pointed out by Chou, 2018. Delving deeper into the design thinking methodology and its connection to sustainable development through tourism and its linkages with local social enterprises is a tangent that has not been explored deeply in academia in different geographical locations. In

this research, design thinking is approached from a specific approach of added value creation specifically for social entrepreneurs. One of the few academic papers, "Applying design thinking method to social entrepreneurship project" by Chou talks about design thinking in the context of social entrepreneurship and emphasizes the similarities in the process of both design thinking and social entrepreneurship. He especially focuses on the Human Centered Focus for both Social Entrepreneurship and Design Thinking which makeit a compatible pair. Other factors include the importance of innovation along with a collaborative approach, testing and prototyping, use of technology and altruism (Chou, 2018). Social Enterprise Development can benefit immensely from the Design Thinking methodology due to this very compatibility that has not been exploited so far by majority social entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurship accelerators, incubators or mentors.

This research seeks to assess the status and role of design thinking in creating higher value within social entrepreneurship in tourism, specifically during the Vietnam Walking symposium. The goal is to design an exploratory study to be conducted during the Walking Workshop through qualitative enquiry using in-depth interviews with Local Social Entrepreneurs visited during the symposium both in the primary and tertiary sectors supporting tourism. Focusing the interviews in order to understand how local social enterprises solve problems and plan their business development activities in order to create higher social value along with their interactions with tourism related business opportunities can help us analyze these linkages better. The interview questions would focus on the five stages of design thinking, and if the social entrepreneurs utilize one or more of these stages in their day to day or long term processes. The questions would also include an understanding of the use of the concepts of Human Centered Design and the core concept of empathy and empathetic design of the tourism products and the day to day problem solving. Understanding the use of design thinking and its effects on local social enterprise in attaining their sustainable development goals is an important aspect of this study. This research seeks to explore the exposure of Social entrepreneurs in the tourism field to design thinking and its components, to form the basis as to how social entrepreneurs in tourism are using Design Thinking. It aims to evaluate if the Social Entrepreneurs have been using any of the prescribed design thinking methodologies in the inception of the Social Entrepreneurship, problem solving in its day to day operations and in its growth in the future. The research objectives are to contribute outside the given dimensions of available literature by examining and understanding the use of design thinking techniques in conjugation with Human Centered Design principles in order to design usable. sound and profitable solutions.

Abstract

INTRODUCTION: COMMUNITY BASED ACTIVI, SOCIAL ENTERPRISE AND TOURISM

Evan Seitz & Tazim Jamal
PhD student
Texas A&M University
Recreation, Parks and Tourism Sciences (RPTS)
Email: eseitz@tamu.edu

Key Words: *Community Based Tourism (CBT), Social Entrepreneurship, Design Theory, Decolonizing Methodologies, Arts Based Methodologies*

My name is Evan Seitz. I am a first year PhD student at Texas A&M University working with Dr. Tazim Jamal. My international travel experience, theoretical background and research skills are light, but my passion and commitment to social entrepreneurship and social well-being is deep and long-standing. My goal is to become an academic activist, engaged in social change through community-based tourism and social entrepreneurship. Globalization continues to affect tourism in Vietnam, and nurturing its community-based and social enterprises is vitally important. My goal is to facilitate socially-oriented enterprises and community well- being by becoming a community-embedded researcher, understanding our ethical responsibilities and engaging in critical thinking: for instance, understanding the discursive domains of power-knowledge in which problems emerge and solutions are negotiated; how the problem is defined (and why); who is involved; understanding the diversity of not only the stakeholders but also their interests and values. Decision making, self-determination and autonomy must rest with the local. My current task at the symposium will be to explore a design thinking approach to facilitate social entrepreneurship and research, incorporate decolonizing methodologies, for 'colonization' imbues our research too (Smith, 1999).

Furthermore, I would like to explore how arts-based methodologies can contribute to decolonizing research, as well as to social and psychological empowerment at the enterprise and community level. The central purposes of arts- informed research are to enhance understanding of the human condition through alternative (to conventional) processes and representational forms of inquiry, and to reach multiple audiences by making scholarship more accessible knowledge (Cole & Knowles, 2008). The methodology infuses the languages, processes, and forms of literary, visual, and performing arts with the expansive possibilities of scholarly inquiry for purposes of advancing knowledge (Cole & Knowles, 2008). Through the

utilization of arts based methodologies, arts and social inquiry will be removed from the elitist intuitions and relocated within the local communities. This community empowered research design, blended with design thinking provides the locals a venue for conversation around their food, arts and culture and how they wish to share it.

This opportunity to work with The Tourism CoLab and participate in the symposium and Vietnamese walking tour will be life-changing on many levels. It would be an honor to attend it and assist as needed to the goal of developing a

School for Tourism & Social Entrepreneurship in Southeast Asia that might be transferable to similar contexts elsewhere.

References:

Cole, A. L., & Knowles, J. G. (2008). Arts-informed research. In J. G.Knowles, & A. L.Cole (Eds.), Handbook of the arts in qualitative research: Perspectives, methodologies, examples, and issues (pp. 55–70). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Smith, L., T. (1999). Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples. London; New York: Zed Books