

CHAPTER 6

Conclusion and Recommendations

Rural tourism has been considered as an effective tool for rural economic development (Sharpley 2002, Iorio & Corsale 2010, Saxena & Ilbery 2007). Agritourism specifically has been drawing many researchers' attention to its sustainability in rural areas and to integrated rural tourism in the emerging space of agriculture and tourism (Aikaterini 2001, Choo & Jamal 2009, Holloway et al. 2006). There have been several approaches to conducting research in agritourism including policy analysis, food production and consumption, gender, rural labor division, organic farms, and sustainability. A rising question is whether agritourism as an integrated space of sustainable tourism and sustainable agricultural practices is sustainability. To some extent, the socio-economic and environmental impacts embedded in local communities have been examined. There has been a lack of theoretical framework in agritourism. Some studies on stakeholders' perspectives and motivations in agritourism examine how the concept of sustainability in agritourism needs more work in order to fully develop (McGehee 2007, Ilbery and Saxena 2007). Barbieri is a tourism extension specialist. Aside from her many works on assessing the sustainability of agritourism (Barbieri 2013, Valdivia & Barbieri 2014), she also explored and studied perceived benefits (Tew & Barbieri 2012), motivations (Barbieri 2010), perspectives of stakeholders of the concept of agritourism, (Arroyo et al. 2013) and its prospects (Gao et al. 2014). Her studies shed new light on agritourism research, and on stakeholders' motivation, perspectives, and prospects. Her main method is quantitative and failed to examine social relations, networking, and stakeholders' practices. Therefore, my study is to fill in this gap by employing participant observation, interviews, and official documents to explore how farmers in An Giang turned their perspectives and motivations of agritourism into reality. Moreover, I assess the sustainability according to sustainable tourism principles to

argue that agritourism to some extent showed economic benefits, educational opportunities, community participation to improve social welfare, and farmers' identity as agricultural producers.

6.1 Major Findings of the Study

Since the *Doi Moi* policy, the Vietnamese government has been very controversial. Socialism has been argued to promote the government as a top-down approach with the centralized power (Womack 1992, Thayer 1992, Porter 1993). Thus, Kerkvliet (1995) and Thrift and Forbes (1986) found that social forces were also important voices because they decentralized the government's power due to its lack of capacities. I agreed with Griffin (1998) in that economic development in Vietnam was pushed bottom-up to overcome poverty when examining economic transition, especially farmers and workers who were the main forces during the revolution for liberation. Vietnam was similar to China when it used the "trial and error" method for the *Doi Moi* policy. It meant that the government had to observe social forces' resistance for every action. This decentralization can be seen as a kind of negotiation for democracy. However, it is still doubtful that the government's capacity in the administrative system and institution changes in terms of efficiency, which constricts people's voices.

My study is to examine the rural institutional changes in regards to the government. These changes occurred when with the shift from the collective agriculture to farmer household economy. This change made farmers become the main decision makers and transformed their roles livelihoods by turning them into entrepreneurs to avoid agricultural risks and seek for more security. Agritourism was introduced by an international agri-agency through the Vietnam government in An Giang. The process helped to spread this new kind of business to local farmers and assisted in the better understanding of how farmers' perspectives and motivations were integrated into their practices, which possibly coined the term of sustainability. To a certain extent, I investigated how farmers made their own decisions and demonstrated their new roles in agritourism, an emerging space of agriculture and tourism. My findings are to answer

the research questions, including (1) why and how agritourism happened in An Giang, and what were tourism providers' rationality; (2) how farmers integrated agritourism into their practices; (3) and how farmers contributed to sustainable agritourism.

Firstly, agritourism was able to meet farmers' demands by diversifying their livelihoods and avoiding potential risks associated with farming. An Giang included 15 communes, but certain communes possessed geographical features which worked to its advantage. Farmer practices in agriculture changed according to the market since the shift from rice monoculture to many kinds of crops. This was done in order to increase economic efficiency and avoid environmental risks. Due to technology application and land accumulation, farmers can freely change their professionals or livelihoods. There have been more jobs outside agricultural sectors. However, lack of land cultivation and the local economy was unable to provide sufficient jobs for the local community, which caused a large percentage of the population to migrate into cities. At local level, farmers unions under the control of local government provided members with training workshops, which are usually about how to apply new varieties, technology, many kinds of plant protection products to cut the production costs, but still keep the same productivity. *Doi Moi* policy facilitates many locally organized associations for transportation, irrigation and so on to support farmers. Changing banking systems also brought more opportunities for farmers in rural areas. Some successful farmers in An Giang proved that the more they can supply agricultural products according to the market, the more economic efficiency they can gain. This, in turn, is dependent on individual ability to prove themselves as capable actors in the market. Accessing the market is still one of the three difficulties that restricts farmers aside from capital and investment. Farmers usually rely on traders, who have more power in negotiating agricultural prices. Farmers are vulnerable to the environment and the market as well. Therefore, agriculture is mostly considered as a difficult, vulnerable, and unstable job that even farmers with large land accumulation want to shift out of eventually by investigating in their children education.

Agritourism was introduced to farmers as an alternative livelihood that can support and reinforce farmers' roles as agricultural producers and propose new roles as entrepreneurs. This turned farmers into active tourism object. The project provided farmers with training workshops, capital, investment, consultant and opportunities to access to the market. It included two phases to build farmers' capacity in agritourism and Rural Tourism Center in order to manage farmers' business. Farmers volunteered to join the project according to Mr. Tùng's assessment of their house conditions and capacities, including their prestige at the community and morality, seeking to assure the tourists' safety. Agritourism combines with cultural tourism to add more value to the tours. The three communes in my study includes Mỹ Hòa Hưng, Vàm Nao and Ô Lâm all have different activities consisting of homestays, sightseeing, visiting cultural and spiritual places, and participating in agricultural activities. The tours were organized in regards to each commune's special characteristics. Homestays were advertised a lot in Mỹ Hòa Hưng, as a place where tourists can enjoy farmers' lives the environment, historical sites, and traditional occupations. Vàm Nao was popular for its agricultural activities in flooding seasons. O Lam was promoted as a Khmer cultural village. Tourists came in during different times of the year when farmers can flexibly manage their crops and tourists. In conclusion, I would argue that agritourism engaged farmers in an alternative market, which made farmers' roles as entrepreneurs viable in the emergent space of the tourism market and tourists market. Famers became active tourism object agents in commoditizing rurality to make agritourism products.

Secondly, I argued that farmers at different levels (international, national and local) created their own identity, which opened a space for communication among farmers in agritourism business. During all this communication, Agriterra, an international agri-agency, convinced farmers that they can empower themselves in business as entrepreneurs, meaning that farmers possibly played two roles, one as an agricultural producer and the other as an entrepreneur. The agri-agency has a broader network throughout the world, connecting farmers and giving them a space to exchange their knowledge. Therefore, the agritourism project fulfilled the Vietnam government's goals of sustainable development for the promotion of democracy and a people-centric society. The project proved to be an example to change farmers' roles into

entrepreneurs' roles by playing as an agency, which actively connects their production and consumption in the market. Agriterra provided capital, investment, consultancy, and trainings to local farmers to motivate them to engage in the project. Simultaneously, local farmers had to contribute their work, capital, and investment in building and developing agritourism through their membership. Agriterra became an external institution proposing a model of local economic development and supported farmers in dealing with their difficulties in capital, knowledge, and investment. Empowering farmers' ability in the market is Agriterra's formal rationality in agritourism project beyond their substantial rationality of improving farmers' welfare.

Mr. Tùng, the An Giang Leader of Farmer Union, has a discourse of a moral leader of farmers, whose responsibilities are to care about farmers' life and social welfare. His duties were to find suitable farmers who were financially qualified and willing to engage in the project. He gradually shifted his role into marketing manager for the economically sustaining agritourism business. Thus, Mr. Tùng needed to negotiate strategically with local farmers to engage them in the project by proving himself as a moral leader and a capable entrepreneur, serving as an example for the farmers. He used agritourism as a tool to develop farmers' welfare. As a representative of farmers, he worked on the commercialization of farmers' life stories and agricultural activities. He received pressure from both sides of sustaining tourism business and proving an entrepreneur' s successful role. Consequently, Agriterra transformed the Provincial Leader of Farmer Union into Marketing Manager, working separately under the governmental sector and farmers into entrepreneurs, working for themselves in tourism business.

Farmers' calculation of their rationality through agritourism proved their ability to be entrepreneurs. Their own calculations opened a negotiated space to communicate with other Agriterra as an international agency and Mr. Tung as a local government. Farmers' substantial rationality included self-reliance in managing and organizing tourism, economic hope, learning opportunity. Self-reliance emphasized on farmers' roles in managing and organizing tourism business and work with other actors such as

tourists, travel agency, local government and the marketing manager. Economic hope is security for assuring their investment in agritourism when they believe that agritourism is an upcoming trend for city people. Being a member in the project, they had opportunities to learn about agritourism, communication skills, cooking skills, doing business, and other related skills and knowledge. Farmers also learned through their hosting tourists about culture and new knowledge when they shared their conversations. Formal rationality including income and jobs generation, and promoting locally agricultural products are also farmers' concerns. Farmers weighed their formal and substantial rationality differently from each commune.

Thus, how farmers actively engaged in tourism market and tourist market presented differently in the scales of entrepreneurs' identity. Farmers in An Giang benefited capital, investment, and consultancy from the Agriterra, as an external institution. The project helped them overcome their difficulties to invest and try the new model of agritourism. Simultaneously, farmers also contributed their work and effort through their membership and commitment to the project. Training workshops from the project Agriterra transmitted their ideas of being farmers as entrepreneurs and empowered them in the market. Accordingly, he clarified farmers' roles and duties in business to motivate their responsibility. Therefore, different identities engaged farmers at different level to mutual negotiated space to communicate each other, basing on their calculation of formal and substantial rationality.

Thirdly, I argued that farmers' practices in agritourism represent their identity differently in different scales of entrepreneurs to educate tourists in agricultural activities as their dignity and build connectivity with tourists through the space of consuming local food. Rural space was a space of storytelling, which was culturally and environmentally constructed. Farmers utilized their life stories at home with family and in the fields to make agritourism products. The authentic agricultural activities were reproduced in farmers' performance in the field to accommodate with tourists' demand. Farmers also added more socio-economic and cultural values in their agricultural products especially in the space of consuming local food, which was utilized to build connectivity with tourists. For homestay groups in Mỹ Hòa Hưng, tourists engaged with

a farming family, where they could understand farmer family's life stories through conversations. Farmers engaged tourists in different levels of contact and experience with agriculture by selling their life stories. They talk and interact with family members. Farmers were active to find tourists through their personal relationships and to make their houses more appealing. They are paid according to the amount of tourists they receive. Homestays worked as a form of farmer household economy. The income from tourism was high compared to agricultural practices, which also motivated them to find more tourists. Farmers in Mỹ Hòa Hưng transformed themselves into entrepreneurs, who actively engaged in tourism market and tourist market to produce a high economic value. Meanwhile Vòm Nao and Ô Lâm were different because of how they organized and managed their activities. The activities were organized by a group of farmers. Farmers were paid according to how many tours they have and their works such as servants, boat drivers or tourist guides. The payment was almost the same as agricultural income. Therefore, they were not satisfied with this alternative job when they sometimes have to adjust their crop schedule to participate in agritourism. Thus, they still hoped for more tourists. Another reason was that the amount of tourists was not enough to prove its economic efficiency. Farmers in Vòm Nao, and Ô Lâm proved to be weak entrepreneurs when they didn't have high incentives to engage in tourists market.

The space for consuming local food helped to build connectivity with tourists to bring them in the process of making tourism products. Drinking and eating space also played roles to motivate farmers' full engagement. Food is a kind of tourism product, which is culturally, socially, and environmentally created. The making space of drinking and eating as tourism products promoted to consume locally agricultural products. It also built and expanded farmers' relationship especially tourists are governmental officials. Depending on the conversation and the interaction in the drinking and eating tables, farmers can build their new relationships for future helps when they called each other as brotherhoods and sisterhood. Farmers usually shared with tourists about how to make food, where they are collected, and how it tasted. Local food was compared to what the restaurants provided in the cities in term of the freshness and prices. They are typically representative of the regional name, where there are unique tastes. Farmers also cared

about the tourists' work. They talked to each other about their experience and difficulties. Depending on how tourists were willing to talk and interact with them, farmers will show their respect and hospitality to tourists by giving them local food as presents such as fish sauce. The space of drinking and eating was the art of telling stories to build their brotherhood and sisterhood for future help and to bring in more tourists. Therefore, the agricultural activities, homestays, and eating and drinking are historically developed and used among farmers. These authentic activities were re-organized in order to accommodate tourists' demand.

Lastly, I argue that farmers' shifting roles of agricultural producers, educators and entrepreneurs in agritourism reproduced rurality in articulating farmers' identity and building connectivity. Due to the limited amount of tourists, agritourism in An Giang did not prove a high economic efficiency gains except in Mỹ Hòa Hưng, even though it contributed in creating more jobs, increasing income, and promoting the consumption of local agricultural products. To some extent, there have been some benefits in learning and educating opportunities and community participation to promote social welfare, farmers' identity as agricultural producers and practices when farmers played roles of educators for agricultural practices. Since farmers had opportunities to learn from their travel and training workshops, they also interacted with outsiders including city people, government officials, students, and foreigners. They also helped tourists understand more about the farmers' environment. In return, farmers could learn from tourists about personal hygiene, living styles, and stories in cities, which expanded farmers' boundaries. Farmers felt empowered when given the opportunities to manage and organize their own agritourism business. Farmers who were not engaged in the project could also participate indirectly in agritourism by leasing their cultivated land, selling their agricultural products with higher prices, or serving as laborers. Agritourism was developed in 2007. But, the tourism center was built three years later after it proved some economic benefits and its prospect. So far, it has been a gradual development and managed by farmers, who are bearing in mind that agritourism is farmers' tourists and it takes time to create their prestige. Farmers' roles as a capable actor has been proving agritourism's sustainability in An Giang.

6.2 Theoretical Discussion of the Findings

In my study, I borrowed Philip et al.'s definition of agritourism (Philip et al. 2010) to better examine how tourists' contact and experience with agriculture through various farmers' interpretations of *authentic* farmers. In this way, the farmers played the role of agricultural producers in the making of these agritourism products. I employed the agritourism model based on Weberian perspective (McGehee 2007) in order to locate farmers as agritourism providers engaged in the agritourism business, and how they communicated with each other to accomplish collective goals, in spite of their differing rationalities. Moreover, I used the concept of *communities of practices* to investigate how farmers learned about new concepts of agritourism, and came into their new identities as entrepreneurs, who were not purely motivated by economic benefits. The last concept that I drew from, was the concept of sustainability, drawn from the principles of ecotourism (Choo & Jamal 2008), to assess farmers' shifting roles as entrepreneurs, educators, and agricultural producers in sustainable agritourism.

The definitions of agritourism range widely. Philip et al. (2010) developed a typology for defining agritourism, which is based on the various characteristics of working farms and agritourism contacts. According to them, there are five types of agritourism. The first is *non-working farm* agritourism, meaning that tourist activity is not based on a working farm. The second is *working farm* with a passive type of contact, for example accommodation in a farmhouse. The third is *working farm* with an indirect contact, for example a farm that serves tourists its own produce. The fourth is a working farm with direct contact, which might have farming demonstrations. And the last is a working farm with direct contact, t, authentic agritourism. This would entail tourist participation in farm tasks (Philip et al. 2010: 756). Though the authors have clear definitions of working farms, indirect, direct, and passive contact, and clearly define authenticity, this typology was still developed within the context of Europe, and was not fully applicable to Vietnam in terms of defining indirect, direct, and passive contact. As I had an opportunity to interview a French woman about the concept of agritourism, she said "agritourism in Mekong Delta is not agritourism. Tourists are treated as guests.

Meanwhile, in Europe farmers ask tourists to help them with agricultural practices” (Interview tourist 2015).

Flanigan et al. (2014) integrated providers and visitors’ perspectives in Philip et al.’s typology of defining agritourism (2010) by three discriminators, including the nature of interaction between visitors and agriculture, and working farm characteristics, and authentic agriculture. Their definition further clarified the meaning of interaction with agriculture and *working farm*. Authentic agriculture is still controversial to the concept of authentic-staged agritourism. Thus, agritourism in An Giang is not based on a *working farm*. But tourists could still interact with authentic agriculture. According to farmers, agritourism is not staged, but rather a genuine portrait of their authentic lives. However, the concept of “authentic-staged” agritourism needs further studies to integrate both farmers’ and tourists’ perspectives (Flanigan et al. 2014). Farmers in An Giang also thought of how to make the environment and their houses clean and attractive for tourists. This can be considered a type of “authentic-staged” performance, or a cultural point when most Vietnamese people think that they need to keep their house clean to invite guests to respect them and show their tidiness. In the study of how farmers’ identities changed in agritourism, I found out that farmers had their got to choose how to define authentic agricultural producers to accommodate tourists when they claimed agritourism as “Du Lịch Nông Dân” or “Farmers’ Tourism.” Therefore, I would recommend that the concept of authenticity be assigned to certain components of types of tourism, rather than being focused on tourism services. Authentic identity is another concerning aspect.

The agritourism model based on Weberian perspectives needed more work to contribute to its framework. The concept of rationality from the Weberian perspective could not explain and examine stakeholders’ communication of the common ground, which either economic or non-economic benefits. I argued the concept of rationality was not limited to the individual. Therefore, the boundless group rationality is the issue; it requires more research, but someone must study how group rationality presents famers' motivations in the tension of formal and substantial rationality, or economic and non-economic

rationality. The agritourism model in An Giang included farmers, the marketing manager, tourists, and travel agencies, and Agriterra as an external institution and initiator. As have I laid out clearly since the beginning, I mainly focused on farmers' practices and their own interaction as agritourism providers. Farmers were not limited to their boundaries in defining their identities. The findings also proved that agritourism was a negotiated space for farmers at different levels to present their farmers' identities. My limitation was that I failed to identify the rationality of tourists and travel agencies. Thus, there has been some weakness in the model that I can offer. Firstly, by examining stakeholders' relationships in the model, I found out that farmers' self imposed identities became a common place or negotiated space for Agriterra, the marketing manager, and local farmers to communicate in agritourism even though they have different rationality. This also made a unique agritourism instance in An Giang, for farmers were shifting between their multiple roles of agricultural producers, entrepreneurs, and educators in agritourism business. This research spelled out the importance of studying agritourism providers' motivations and perspectives as an starting point for sustainable agritourism.

The mutual agreement for tourism providers, tourists, and travel agencies needs further development beyond economic benefits, meanwhile farmers and the marketing manager mutually worked according to their initial moral bonds and social welfare beyond gaining more income. Moreover, further work must be done on how farmers calculate their formal and substantial rationalities, which guided their communication in the negotiated spaces, and their practices. Ilbery and Saxena (2007) employed the concept of actor practices in integrated rural tourism, in which tourism is sustainably situated in the context of local economy, society, culture, nature, and human structure. This concept can also be used to study about each actors' practices and performance to know how actors employ their identities in relation to each other and the role of their performance in local network . It is helpful to combine with the concept of communities of practices (Wenger 1998) and overcome the weakness of the agritourism model based on Weberian perspective. Thus, the concept romanticized the actors' roles that they themselves can balance and fit together as solar system.

There was limited time in the field so while ethnography was used, the full extent could not be explored. The concept of communities of practices (Wenger 1998) also needs more improvement to have full analysis of everyday practices bad sentence. This concept emphasizes the learning process of individuals necessary to change their capacity, and construct their identity and power to negotiate with others through the membership of a group. Agritourism in An Giang was introduced by an outside institution, Agriterra. Farmers are still learning how to operate agritourism by themselves. Thus, the project initially used a top down learning process. Lessons and workshops were planned so that farmers learned and practiced their knowledge rather than the learning process was from the bottom-up. Their membership was set up when they first joined the project, and once they began work in the farmers' tourism cooperative. The project also facilitated farmers to build up their skills and capacity through training workshops, and travel to outside boundaries. Members of the project were supposed to have certain rights and benefits that the concept of access can be considered to dig deeper. Currently, farmers start the learning process by themselves. The farmers' tourism cooperative was recently established in 2010 to motivate more common places for collective action, which was the project's aim to improve farmers' participation. Therefore, how farmers operated agritourism by themselves to build connectivity with outsiders, including travel agencies, and how their membership can improve the participation, are all issues for further studies when the project ended.

Lastly, I employed ecotourism principles to assess farmers' shifting roles of entrepreneurs, agricultural producers, and educators while contributing to sustainable agritourism. My findings showed that agritourism was related to the concept of sustainability even though Agriterra implied that sustainability was interpreted to comply with "the PPP principles: respect for people, planet, profit and "do no farm." It is based on the existing community and farm live and utilization of the environment" (Interview Agriterra 2015). They considered agritourism as a tool to promote farmers' self-reliance in managing and organizing, and as a tool to empower farmers as capable actors in the market. What they meant by "respect for people, planet, profit" was to utilize the existing community, and environment. Farmers' lives prove that farmers can commoditize their life and activities for additional income. According to farmers'

perspectives and practices, sustainability means economic sustainability, meaning that farmers can sustain the agritourism business even after the funded project has ended. In agricultural practices, high market price is the ultimate indicator for farmers' calculations of identifying their crop varieties beside avoiding agricultural risks. Farmers also tend to use the plant protection products properly and apply technology to cut production costs, but still keep the same productivity. Morality was also mentioned in their practices. In some cases of short-day plants such as cucumbers, farmers cannot isolate spraying days before selling because it is easy to damage. Generally, market demand is a pushing factor for sustainable agricultural practices. Technical consultancy is also important for farmers to increase their products' values. Most studies examined agritourism' sustainability in terms of organic practices or environmental-orientation impacts or its community impacts rather than the motivations and perspectives of operators' practices. I argued that understanding agritourism providers' economic and non-economic motivations helped to explain farmers' action and practices, and signaled sustainability by examining the tension between economic and non-economic motivations. I found out that sustainable tourism in An Giang is now overcoming poverty, which was historically driven since the *Doi Moi* policy of the 1980s. Thus, farmers had their own calculations of the input and output of agricultural production, in order to have their own feeling of security, which can shape their future behaviors. Therefore, if the concept of sustainability can satisfy the farmers' needs and demands, it can be a guiding principle for farmers' practices, too.

6.3 Implication of the Study

According to my findings and theoretical discussions, this study has recommendations for further research, and perhaps even has implications for future policy. Theoretically, the typology of defining agritourism (Philip et al. 2010, Flanigan et al. 2014) can be further developed in terms of exploring the interaction of farmers and tourists to integrate more perspectives in the emerging space of agriculture and tourism. This helps to connect tourist consumption and rural production in a sustainable way. The relationship of agriculture and tourism should be examined in the supplemented rather

than destructive ways, which can orientate sustainability. The ideas of commoditizing farmers' life stories, environment and space, and their practices poses the question of sustainability through a socio-cultural-environmental lens that preserves and expands farmers' identities as agricultural producers and entrepreneurs. Therefore, another issue is about sustainable agricultural practices.

The agritourism model based on the Weberian perspective (McGehee 2007) is helpful in identifying stakeholders in agritourism, and their respective rationalities, as well as their obstacles against communication. The model left the question of how to identify the stakeholders' calculation of formal and substantial rationality, which motivates strategic communication in negotiated space. According to my findings, the model should integrate the ideas of actors' practices with rural tourism (Ilbery and Saxena 2007) to examine their communication through their social network, rather than focusing on the rationality and strategy employed to fulfill basic motivations and needs. This model does not clearly define the concept of communication. Thus, the common ground can be the motivations for all the stakeholders to improve the model's sustainability. The concept of sustainability can be put in the common ground to find the strategic communication for other stakeholders through their relationship. Ilbery and Saxena (2007) similarly supposed that stakeholders in agritourism have their own roles to perform. The authors to some extent romanticized the model, claiming that it performed the balance by itself. This weakness can be fixed by basing agritourism project models based on Weberian perspectives.

The concept of sustainability has been controversially conducted in agriculture and tourism in practices at locality. The problem is that actors' practices are relying on their motivations and needs, which can shape their behaviors. It is helpful for further research to integrate their perspectives into practices towards sustainability. In another aspect, the concept of sustainability can be implicated under their motivations, needs, and perspectives that can be further studied. Therefore, research on actors' rationalities should be conducted to examine the possible prospects of sustainability.

By examining farmers' rationality and practices, I would recommend that policy should focus on factors that intervene in farmers' decision making in agriculture as well as agritourism. Farmers make their own calculations for their investment, and look out for their own security. They also face difficulties regarding capital, investments, and access to markets; all things that the government can help to facilitate for farmers. For instance, relaxing banking regulations for agriculture, supporting infrastructure development in the countryside, or capacity building through training workshops, and providing other market information. Another important factor is how farmers connect to markets by themselves or with the support of outside institution such as agritourism case in An Giang Province. Due to an agriculture-based economy and the rising demand for food security, the government can empower farmers' abilities to access their own benefits in the market by using development projects or outside consultants to promote self-reliance in management and organization. In other words, the government can implement its policy effectively when it fulfills farmers' calculations, and involves itself in the mutual communication or negotiations to find common ground rather than top-down or bottom-up approaches. Thus, the government is losing its power when engaging in the liberalizing market. This made researchers doubtful of its capacity regarding various engagements of social forces' negotiation for their own self-interests. The common ground is farmers' engagement, which the government should consider, and work to find sustainable solutions. Another problem is the gap between agricultural consumption and production, and rapid increase in agricultural products' values, which improves farmers' access to the market.

In conclusion, the government should pay attention to development projects that build farmers' capacities. The policies should integrate farmers' rationalities and practices to capitalize on their successes. Improving farmers' accessibility is also a solution for the government to save its time to find and solve obstacles in development. Lastly, development projects, especially ones regarding infrastructure and city planning, can be effectively interpreted through the lens of farmers' practices and rationalities. These projects absolutely have an impact on farmers' livelihoods, and agriculture.