

CHAPTER 4

The Villagers' Perception of Tourism Development and Influence on Social Relations

This chapter will examine the villagers' perception of the changes that were brought about by the village's tourism development. First, this chapter will pay attention to the real voices from the individual villagers based on my ethnographic field research findings. This chapter will explain the village tourism and the resultant changes. Also, CBT will be discussed as a specific case of Mae Kampong. Furthermore, examining changes in the village made by tourism is very important too. Therefore, this chapter discusses the changes, paying particular attention to social elements of the village such as the changes in human relations among the villagers.

4.1 Villagers' Opinions and Perception of Tourism Development and the Culture of Mieng Production

In this section, the people's different perception of development and culture will be explained based on the occupational, spatial, generational differences.

4.1.1 Occupational Difference

"Mae Kampong should become like it was in the past. We need neither more tourism development nor investment into tourism. Nature in this village is being degraded" (a 60-year-old woman. Personal Interview: April 2016).

"I want to have more tourism development so that I can sell more products in my shop" (a 60-year-old female store owner. Personal Interview: April 2016).

Individual perception of the village tourism varies from person to person. As the two contradicting statements made by the villagers mentioned above indicate, even among the people who have the same age and sex, their opinions are completely different. As table 3 indicates, as far as the results of my questionnaire are concerned, interestingly, while a young person thinks conservatively about the village's development, some elderly people would like to have more development; similarly, whereas a person who lives in Pang Klang, outside the tourist area, says that she wants to have more tourism development in order to increase her sales to tourists, some people who live in the tourist area say that they do not need further development.

Difference in individual occupations influences on how the people think about their future visions. In fact, similar to the 60-year-old community store owner in the table below, a young female interviewee, who owns traditional Thai dress shop in the village, said that she would be happy if more tourists come to the village because she will be able to sell more of her products in the village and showed no concern about problems the tourists could bring about. In addition, those from homestay-serving households showed some welcoming attitudes towards village tourism in my interviews. Some homestay owners said that they enjoyed having guests in their houses because they can talk with them (if the guests are Thai) and learn something from them.

Generally speaking, it seems that the majority of the people think that they have the sufficient level of tourist visitation and that if they have more, it will lead the village to a more chaotic situation. Thus, now, people think that they have a good balance between their traditional way of life and tourism activities, and more development in tourism is not needed. Indeed, out of 19 respondents of the questionnaire, 13 said that they would like Mae Kampong to keep as it is or to revert to how it was in the past whereas only 3 said that they wanted to have more development in the village.

Table 4.1: The common villagers' answers to a question in a questionnaire, "What do you want Mae Kampong to be like in the future?"

Respondent	Cluster	Occupation	Comment
A 60-year-old woman	Pang Nok	Employee in a homestay house, Massage	Mae Kampong should be like it was in the past. We need neither more tourism development nor investment into tourism. Nature in this village is being degraded.
A 38-year-old woman	Pang Nok	Employee	I hope to have the village like it was in the past. But, I suppose I can't. Maybe Mae Kampong will turn into a place like a slum in the future?
A 28-year-old woman	Pang Nai 1	Homestay, Community store	Mae Kampong should continue as it is now. I don't want to see it changes.
A 48-year-old woman	Pang Nai 1	Mieng, Coffee, Homestay	Mae Kampong should be a silent village in a mountain. We don't need more development. I just want people who love nature to visit this village.
A 55-year-old woman	Pang Nai 1	Coffee	Mae Kampong should develop as much as it can.
A 60-year-old woman	Pang Klang	Community store	I want to have more tourism development so that I can sell more products of mine.
A 60-year-old man	Pang Klang	Mieng, Coffee	I want all the clusters to have the same level of economy. Now, only Pang Nai 1 and 2 have high income level.

4.1.2 Spatial Difference

"Pang Ton, Pang Nai no.1, and Pang Nai no.2 turned into a tourist attraction and just a commercial area now. It does not feel a real village to me anymore" (Personal Interview: April 2016).

In addition to the occupational difference, a spatial difference within the village also constitutes the villagers' different perceptions of development and the culture of Mieng production. In fact, some informants from Pang

Nok lamented over the recent changes that occurred in the village. The above comment was made by one of my interviewees in Pang Nok. Generally, in popular tourist area such as Pang Nai No.1 and No.2, people tend to pay more attention to alternative economic activities such as homestay service and souvenir making than those who are in Pang Nok (furthest cluster from the tourists' center) do. For the people in Pang Nok, for example, homestay service is still not so popular – only 3 households open their homes as homestay hosts while more than 20 homestay-serving households are located in Pang Nai No.1 and Pang Nai No.2. In Pang Nai No.1, Pang Nai No.2, and adjacent Pang Ton, all of which are the most frequently visited sites by tourists, people have a lot of economic opportunities. In fact, cafés, restaurants, noodle shops, commodity stores, and souvenir shops are concentrated in these clusters. For the households dwelling in those clusters, Mieng production is not a sole work whereas the clusters far away from the tourists' area has less opportunities in that kind of occupations induced by tourism.

Naturally enough, the occupational inequality that derives from the spatial difference influences the people's attitudes towards Mieng. The difference of the attitudes among the villagers was able to be discerned in a subtle way from the interviews. For interviews with the people in Pang Nok, the topic of the conversation was almost all about Mieng, and it seemed that they enjoy talking about it with the interviewers. It was seen that their everyday concerns are predominantly about Mieng. For example, they always talked about the current condition of Mieng growing in the orchards. On the other hand, when interviewing with the people in Pang Nai, many of them complained about the worsening market situation of Mieng and started to stress the necessity of involvement into tourism-related activities and other alternative cash crops such as coffee. Perhaps, having various alternative sources of income made the people in Pang Nai less interested in Mieng production and rather more in the tourism businesses. People's changing awareness of occupational interests and the varying degree of it in different areas are significant in considering the current situation of Mae Kampong.

This point will be further discussed in the next section. In addition to the villagers' opinions about Mieng, it is important to examine their opinions about tourism development.

4.1.3 Generational Difference

“Mieng is not a good business any more. In the past, we sold Mieng for much higher prices than that of now. But now, we sell it for as low as 12 baht for one package. Producing Mieng requires a hard work, but the current low price of it does not pay off” (a 56-year-old woman. Personal Interview: April 2016).

Generational difference in the villagers' perception can be the most clearly seen in how they see the culture of Mieng production. Among the elderly villagers, there seems to be a complex feeling about Mieng. On the one hand, some elderly village members, who still do not have acute physical difficulty, show energetic attitudes towards working for Mieng. On the other hand, other elderly people, some of whom have difficulty in their bodies or physical disabilities and some of whom are more than 60 years old, showed their resigned faces when asked about Mieng. Therefore, the difference of perception about Mieng among the elderly members mainly derives from their physical conditions and each member's operability of arduous work of Mieng. In addition, while some members (mostly from the area most actively involved in homestay service) show welcoming attitudes towards the tourism activities, saying that Mieng alone cannot guarantee them economic stability anymore, and in the past also they had felt some “everyday concerns about their stomachs (fear of money and food shortage)”, some other members do not.

What was striking was the young villagers' reaction to my questions as to what they think about Mieng and whether they want to work for Mieng in the future. When they were asked about such questions, they showed quite positive reactions. In fact, a 12-year-old female interviewee, despite her youth, clearly said: *“Mieng is the symbol of Mae kampong. So, we need to follow my parents to make it and cherish the culture of Mieng”* (Personal

Interview: April 2016). In addition, a 23-year-old woman, who works in a traditional Northern Thai dress (as souvenir for the tourists) shop answered that she would like to make Mieng after her parents become no longer able to work for it. At the same time, she also stated that Mieng would no longer be able to be her main occupation and she would need to do well for the tourism activities. Therefore, in these people's cases, (although it is not clear whether they will really work for Mieng in the future) it can be said that the younger generation in Mae kampong has a quite positive attitude toward Mieng and that because of the fact that even 12-year-old girl said that Mieng was the symbol of the village, the importance of Mieng to the Mae Kampong villagers seems to be communicated to the young people.

The contrast between the elderly people's resigned attitudes towards Mieng work and younger people's positive attitudes towards it was striking. Perhaps, the resigned attitudes come from the fact that the elderly people remember the good old days when they could sell Mieng for much better price and know today's difficult situations and hardness of the physical labor in the Mieng field. On the other hand, the young people's positive attitude might come from their lack of knowledge and experience pertaining to Mieng. However, it would not be optimistic to say that Mieng will remain, culturally, the most important element of Mae Kampong in the future since, informal education about the importance of Mieng to the younger people is still effective.

A number of the interviewees who are over 50 years old showed some expression over the fact that young people nowadays are not keen to work for Mieng. Although they understand that the situations of the past and present are different- in the past, there was virtually no occupational variety but Mieng to make ends meet while now for the villagers, a wide variety of occupational choices such as homestay service, coffee production, and other tourism-related activities are available-, many of them fear that Mieng could completely disappear from the village and that Mae Kampong could eventually turn from a site of Mieng production into a sheer tourist destination village for the urban dwellers and foreigners. In addition,

naturally enough, many elderly people now wish that young people both out of and inside the village come back to the Mieng fields and restart working for Mieng production because they put a particular affection into their own Mieng lands since they are the most important legacy from their parents and grandparents.

4.2 Tourism

4.2.1 Community-based Tourism (CBT) as Countermeasures

For the deleterious effects of the mass tourism, a number of alternative forms of tourism has been proposed and widely discussed by academicians and in tourism industry sectors. Examples of the alternative forms of tourism include CBT, Eco-tourism, Sustainable tourism, Fair trade and ethical tourism, and Pro-poor tourism (Mowforth and Munt 2009: 99-100). Among them, in order to deal with the negative impacts on host communities, it is highly expected that the notion of CBT would help the local communities regain the initiative in tourism activities. Although the definition of the concept has not yet been well established since the study of the new tourism forms is still young, CBT refers to an alternative form of tourism development grounded on the philosophy of community participation and empowerment so as not to be trapped by the hegemonic power of well-financed private sector of the tourism industry and the national elites. The aim of CBT is to achieve harmonious tourism development with the host communities' needs and aspiration in order to sustain their economies, not the economies of others, and to conserve their culture and traditions on the strength of grass-roots participation and the community decision-making (Fitton 1996, cited in Timothy 2002: 150).

CBT is expected to play a role in counteracting the negative impacts of the mass tourism based on the premise that by allowing host community members to have participatory and decision-making roles, the decisions will be more conducive and reflect in their own future visions and meaningful voices in the organization and administration of tourism. Acts from grassroots participation and decision-making will better the community

members' attitudes towards tourism, and the results will turn more fruitful and successful because tourism development will be the most successful when those most affected are involved from the start (Gunn 1994, cited in Timothy 2002: 153). This is clearly opposed to the widespread situation of mass tourism that is dependent on external control, which leads to the eroded community cohesion and cooperation, unhealthy competition, individualism, and degraded community welfare. Indeed, today it is recognized that for achieving the goals of sustainable tourism, grassroots participation in the stages of planning and development is essential, more suitably involving a wide range of stakeholders such as lower-level governments, business associations, public agencies, and non-governmental organizations(NGOs) (Timothy 2002: 155).

According to Boyd and Singh (2003), CBT is highly expected to achieve the win-win situation between the community and the tourism industry, as opposed to the lose-win scenario of the mainstream mass-tourism. The win-win scenario is the situation where both community and tourism benefit, and CBT, in which the community is in support of tourism and the local community members are the main actors of it, is the obvious example (Boyd and Singh 2003: 26-27).

CBT can make a situation in which the community members' voices and their indigenous knowledge are reflected in the tourism activities, leading to the local control of any stage in the tourism actions, harmonious development with local culture, and enhancement of the local people's sense of self-esteem. As opposed to this, exogenous power, as the conventional mass tourism has been doing, often leads to various negative impacts because outsiders have little knowledge about the unique situations and local culture of the destination communities. Therefore, getting local people involved in planning and decision-making allows the community to protect their sacred spaces from tourists and entitle the people who have been traditionally under-represented to convey their voice (Timothy 2001, cited in Timothy and Tosun 2003: 187).

For grass-roots participation into planning and decision-making to be implemented, many techniques have been advocated. One of them is “Planning for real method”, in which the locals set up meetings where the community members attend and discuss for better implementation of CBT activities before the planning process begins. In the meeting, the community members, not private planners or government servants, initiate discussion so as to encourage them to speak up and exchange their opinions with other members; the community members are provided with maps and situation-based scenarios so that they can simulate for when they actually have tourists and locate where they think services and infrastructure are needed; and, when the meeting comes to ends, round-table discussion is held for them to brush up and wrap up what they talked about in the previous session (Timothy and Tosun 2003: 188). Another method is household surveys. By carrying out surveys, the community members will be given opportunity to think about their opinions and to make clear their demands and whether they want to participate in tourism or not. These methods have been implemented in a number of CBT communities and proved that they are effective.

Although local community members, especially those who are in developing countries, have little experience as tourists, they are advantageous than outsiders in terms of tourism management because they are familiar with social, cultural, geographical, environmental, and economic aspects of the community. The significance of this broad sense of indigenous knowledge is becoming widely recognized. In fact, many scholars today state that answers to various difficult questions about the host communities’ environments can be found in the communities themselves for the peoples in traditional communities do not regard themselves unconnected from nature (Timothy and Tosun 2003: 187). The local people’s traditional economy, culture, and managerial methods for natural resource are often quite useful in achieving effective tourism management.

Although CBT is based on the idea that the host community members should retain control and participate in planning and decision-making

processes for better implementation of tourism activities, partnership with external institutions is, for sure, essential. Since community members are often unaware of the tourist's needs and have little knowledge about the state of the art methods and a trend pertaining to tourism, collaborating with external institutions is quite helpful for them. In fact, for better implementation of CBT activities in terms of harmony, equity, and holistic growth, CBT planning should include not only the host community members but also other stakeholders such as advocacy groups, public agencies, business associations, and non-governmental organizations (Timothy and Tosun 2003: 187).

Nevertheless, perhaps, partnership or collaboration with other stakeholders is one of the most difficult things in CBT implementation. For the issue of partnership, according to Telfer (2003), such questions will come up as follows: To what extent is the collaboration process inclusive?; Are all of the participants fully involved in the discussion?; and, are all participants equally influential in the negotiations and decision-making process? (Telfer 2003: 170). For this, Hall (2001) shows the similar concern for the issue of partnership in CBT, maintaining that unless some attempts are to be made to give all stakeholders the equal opportunities to play a role in collaborative planning, partnership will end up in an unhealthy situation as it always happens in the traditional mass tourism (Hall 2001, cited in Telfer 2003: 171). These are the major difficulties many CBT communities have experienced. Since community participation and decision-making and partnership seem to be ambivalent concepts, it is often difficult to take a balance between them. In addition, there are often complex power relations between the host community and government institution, business associations, and so on, which makes the sense of equality among the various stakeholders a quite difficult story.

4.2.2 CBT in Mae Kampong and the Peoples' Perception

As was mentioned earlier, the village tourism program began in 2000, with 3 households that open their houses to accept visitors as guests of the

homestay service. Currently, there are 27 homestay-serving households, most of which gather in the 2 clusters, Pang Nai No.1 and Pang Nai No.2. According to interviews with the homestay-serving households, in a very rough calculation, there are four times of visits per month, and averagely two persons stay in one time in each household. This makes monthly household revenue of 2,800 Baht and annually 33,600 Baht. This would make no less significance on economy of a former agrarian community like Mae Kampong.

Naturally, a difference between the homestay-serving households and non-homestay-serving households must be examined. There are roughly two reasons why some households operate homestay service while some do not. First, whether a household decides to participate in homestay or not depends on what facilities they have. To serve homestay service, they need accommodation capacity (at least one bedroom for visitors), a dining room which is big enough to accommodate guests and family members themselves, clean bathrooms, and so on. This aspect that derives from each household's economic situations decides whether the household will get involved in homestay business or not. Second, more importantly, it is each person's psychological perception of having strangers as guests in their homes that decides whether or not they serve homestay. In fact, many people from non-homestay-serving households I interviewed with answered as follows: *"I don't want to have strangers in my house because I want to keep privacy and do not want to risk having troubles with them"* (Personal Interview: April 2016). Indeed, many trouble cases with homestay guests have been reported. For example, some years ago, there was a trouble case that a western homestay guest got drunk in a homestay house and pour some liquor on the head of a young girl of the host family (Personal Interview: April 2016). In addition, the villagers, especially those from homestay-serving households, often complain about the noise and some undesirable acts of homestay guests from a certain country.



Figure 4.1 Tourists in Mae Kampong 1



Figure 4.2 Tourists in Mae Kampong 2



Figure 4.3 A food stall for tourists



Figure 4.4 A rubbish bin (a container originally for fermenting tea leaves)

4.3 Positive Sides of Tourism: Income, Employment, and Environmental Aspects

Examining both positive and negative impacts caused by expansion of tourism within communities has been one of the biggest concerns for a number of scholars from sociological background, and it has been the most intensively researched area as a part of the so-called “sociology of tourism”. Those concerns that are often talked about in sociology of tourism involve socio-cultural issues such as the uneven power relation between private business entities and the local people and inequality and changing social relations among the community members.

In the area of tourism studies, examining power relations between private business and destination community's members has been one of the most important agendas. Tourism often exposes local communities to wider national and international systems, which could lead to a concomitant loss of local autonomy and to a situation in which the community's welfare depends more and more on external factors (such as the national and world economy), which is beyond its control (Greenwood 1972, cited in Cohen 1996: 61). As was mentioned earlier, the mainstream mass tourism has been criticized by a number of scholars in that tourism sites throughout the world are often dominated by private business entities that are owned by outsiders, and the local people in the destination sites have no control over decision-making and fewer shares in the wealth distribution. In addition, it is natural to think that outsiders often lack a sense of responsibility towards the results of their tourism programs because the fact that the decision-makers are not in the site can make them ignorant about the local communities and sometimes disruptive to the everyday life of the local people. In addition, as a nature of profit-making organizations, private businesses often try to seek short-term profit by attempting to hire as few employees as possible and pay as little salary as possible to the local people. For this, the level of tourism multiplier phenomenon such as income and employment generation is often not as much as it is believed to have because of leakages or poorly paid jobs (Ioannides 2003: 51).

In Mae Kampong's case, those things mentioned above could not be found. Since they have strict rules that seclude private business owners who are from outside of the village from influencing the village, the main players of decision-making and planning processes of the village tourism remain the villagers themselves. In addition, the strict rules between the private business owners and the village and its punitive actions in case of the rules are breached function as impeding effects to the over influence of the private business owners. Because of some rules and agreements with the business owners, Mae Kampong still retains a powerful position in relation to private businesses owned by outsiders and keeps economic autonomy.

In Mae Kampong, there are some private hotels and accommodation service. Although they have a form of private business, they pay some dividend to the village. They pay 50 Baht per one tourist and some amount of annual fee to the village for its tourism management. This rule was set up after a conflict that occurred some years ago in which

one private hotel, which uses the beautiful scenery of the village and its nature as attraction to draw their customers, refused to pay any fee to the village, and the village committee decided to shut down the water supply to the hotel as a sanction. After this experience, the hotel came to show the attitude of cooperation with the village, hiring local people as staff and paying properly to the village. This coercive attitude of the village for tourism management makes the situation in which today there is no significant conflict between the village and the private hotel and accommodation businesses. Moreover, the villagers have the right to sell their lands to outsiders, but they have to talk with the village committee and get permission by them to do so.

Tourism surely brought about a number of positive effects to Mae Kampong. Ever since the village decided to involve in tourism activities, the village economy has broadened its horizon, providing a lot of opportunities of new businesses such as pillows stuffed with tea leaves making, souvenirs, dance and music show service, Thai massage, local cafés and restaurants, and local shops. In fact, while the first year of CBT revenue, according to the former village headman's estimation, was just around 80,000 Baht, the village record says the total revenue by 2012 reached over 2.6 million Baht. For this economic growth, homestay plays a significant role. It functions as a hub of the entire village's tourism because tourists, thanks to the homestay service, can stay longer and spend more in the various tourism-related activities. In addition, private businesses such as hotels and a zip line service company, *Flight of the Gibbon*, which serves their zip line attraction service in the forest within Mae Kampong, create a lot of employment for the villagers of Mae Kampong. According to an interview with one of the officers of *Flight of the Gibbon*, 70 per cent of the employees in the company are Mae Kampong villagers, and it seems that although the officers and managers of the company are mostly foreigners and some Thai people in Bangkok, the salary for the village employees is as much as that of the average workers in Chiang Mai city (Personal Interview: April 2016).

Interestingly, according to the former village headman, there will be no more private business owned by outsiders allowed in Mae Kampong (Personal Interview: April 2016). This idea was suggested in the village committee meeting and acknowledged by the common villagers in the village meeting. The intention of this decision is to protect the

villagers from outsiders in order to maintain their autonomy in economic activities. For this, it can be said that the village's way of managing private businesses is quite coercive, and they are regulated under the punitive actions from the village when rules are breached. All in all, considering the facts that a certain level of employment of the villagers by the private businesses is secured; that the level of salary given to the villagers is as much as the regional standard level; and that those businesses are under the strict rules and well controlled by the village, it would be safe to say that Mae Kampong has a good relationship with the private business owners, and no significant problems that were mentioned in the area of tourism studies can be witnessed.

Those private businesses provide the villagers with job opportunities in the private tourism industry. It is often true that as the national economy develops, people, especially younger people, do not wish to work in a primary industry such as farming and fishing. Instead, they often prefer to work in the manufacturing and service industries. Indeed, as is the case in many local communities throughout the world, many young people who grew up in Mae Kampong moved to cities to get better education and jobs. In this sense, the presence of the private companies in Mae Kampong has ambivalent effects on socio-economic elements of the village. In other words, while the employment from the tourist industry saves the need of the villagers to work in Mieng fields and somehow alienate them from Mieng, it surely gives them an economic stability. More importantly, the village tourism could bring back the young people who moved to cities because of the job opportunity served by the tourism industry. In fact, one of the interviewees said as follows: *“working in the tourism industry, rather than for Mieng, is suited to the wishes of young people today who tend not to prefer Mieng as a main job, and it can enhance the sense of self-esteem among the young people and ultimately could bring back those who moved out of the village”* (Personal Interview: April 2016). This wish of the villager's is plausible considering the pull effects of tourism industry in the labor market. In fact, tourism helps the destination community retain members who would otherwise migrate away, especially younger people who are unemployed or underemployed because of lack of employment in local communities (and also can possibly bring back those who have migrated already); and it also attracts people from areas outside the communities in search of job opportunities (Cohen 1996: 62).

Tourism has a positive side in environmental aspect of the village too. In the past, when people had only Mieng as an economic activity, some of them would go to the forest and cut the trees illegally to supplement their household incomes. This led to the environmental degradation of the village's forests, which was against the government's forest conservation policy. This custom has been outdated since the village decided to start CBT programs, which provide the villagers with a variety of economic opportunities. Now that the village serves CBT, natural resource is no longer something to be exploited but is something to be cherished and well managed for it is one of the great attractions to draw tourists. In addition, now the people grow coffee trees in forests and make organic honey, making use of the naturally inhabited bees with installed wooden beehives. Both products are now sold to outside the village and also to the tourists in the village. In this way, CBT brought a new horizon of the village economy and simultaneously a great sense of harmony with the village's flora and fauna. By the same token, however, negative impacts brought about by the tourism industry in Mae Kampong should be discussed.

4.4 Negative Side of Tourism

4.4.1 Social Changes: *Gemeinschaft* to *Gesellschaft*?

Before and in the early stage of the development trajectory, the sense of unity among the villagers based particularly on the social capital that had been fostered by the cultural capital of Mieng was quite strong. Also, since the micro hydro power generators were set in the village, cooperative actions were also set in the rule as a way to manage it as the village's common property shared by all the villagers. However, with the declining level of Mieng production and of the collective labor for it, as they proceed to the development path, particularly after the involvement of the village tourism, the contemporary development consequently brought about the division of labor to the village. In fact, as Komsan and Gruen (2012) states, it is true that the more involvement into the tourism activities the villagers get, the more money they can get (Komsan and Gruen 2012: 1). Therefore, presumably, as the tourism development proceeds, the financial gap (and perhaps even psychological gap too) between the villagers broadens. Hence,

it can be assumed that the expansion of the tourism businesses in the village and division of labor that are coupled with it started to affect the social cohesion, gradually leading the village members to more individualistic behaviors and some change in social relations in the village.

In order to discuss this point, it would be essential to look at some scholars who paid particular attention to the components of communities. A German sociologist, Ferdinand Tonnies, made it clear that there are two kinds of categorization of social groupings: community (*Gemeinschaft*) and society (*Gesellschaft*). According to him, all kinds of social groups that are familiar, comfortable, and exclusive are categorized as *Gemeinschaft*; and on the other, *Gesellschaft* means groups that got far away from intimate regional human relations and life in the outside world. For Tonnies, Community means genuine, enduring life together, whereas Society is a transient and superficial thing. Thus *Gemeinschaft* must be understood as a living organism in its own right, while *Gesellschaft* is a mechanical aggregate and artefact (Harris 2001: 18).

Similarly, Durkheim sets up the concepts of mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity. In mechanical solidarity, social cohesion and integration comes from the homogeneity of individuals: people feel connected through similar work, educational and religious training, and lifestyle, which is often based on the kinship ties of familial networks. On the other hand, organic solidarity is social cohesion based upon the dependence individuals have on each other in more advanced societies. It comes from the interdependence that arises from specialization of work and the complementarities between people. According to Durkheim, the full realization of organic solidarity will synthesize a solidarity encompassing individuality at the same time as the whole. However, modern individualism finds its home in organic solidarity, but in so far as this has not followed its normal development because of the pathologies of modern society (Jones 2001: 116).

The pathologies of modern society are prevalent in any parts of the world, especially in countries that have advanced economic levels based on the

great division of labor, and the world witnessed the devastating effects of them. For this, it cannot be denied that Mae Kampong, through the current process of division of labor, would also be trapped in the pathologies of modern society at some point of the development path in the future. Perhaps, one can say that Mae Kampong, which used to predominantly depend upon Mieng production as a source of income to sustain itself and nowadays has been securing various economic activities for the village members through tourism, might be in transition from mechanical solidarity to organic solidarity, and also from *Gemeinschaft* to *Gesellschaft*. This process will inevitably entail a great deal of changes to social relations in Mae Kampong.

The area of tourism studies has attempted to examine social impacts that can be brought about by the tourism industry on host communities. Apart from the impact to local culture and entailing cultural changes, it has been widely discussed that introduction of tourism in local communities often causes the division of labor in the communities and could result in fragmentation of the community members. In fact, it has been argued that tourism brings about some negative effects such as the opening of previously non-existent social divisions or the exacerbation of already-existing divisions, and these divisions are often seen as the form of increasing differences between the beneficiaries of tourism and those who are marginalized by it (Mowforth and Munt 2009: 104). Also, in the level of interpersonal relations in host communities, tourism often results in loosening community solidarities and increasing individualization (Stott 1978, cited in Cohen 1996: 61), and it creates stress and conflicts among the members, exposing pressures for a greater formalization of local life to the communities (Redclift 1973; Boissevain 1977; Andronicou 1979, cited in Cohen 1996: 62).

Wealth made out of tourism often causes social divisions of host communities, usually many of which were previously homogeneous agrarian communities, because it is often true that once the community members get used to work for tourism, they seek economic gain from tourists and tend not to care about human relations with other members. In fact, in tourist destination communities, pursuit of economic gain often

becomes the most dominant concern in local people's attitudes and relationships not only when they deal with tourists but also among community members themselves (Cohen 1996: 61). Once the considerations of economic gain becomes the predominant concern among the community members and if there is no sufficient community control on tourism, tourism development often becomes the most important mission for the communities, and everything else including human relations among community members and environmental concerns will be set aside as marginal things. Those phenomena have been actually witnessed in many parts of the world including Mae Kampong.

4.4.2 Tourism and the Division of Labor

The advent of the tourism industry in Mae Kampong created different roles of the villagers in the village economy. While tourism creates economic benefits to host communities, in that it creates new employment opportunities and brings about income generation, it was necessarily coupled with emergence of the division of labor. The division of labor is a crucial element for economic growth because it enhances effectiveness of production. In the economics perspectives, it has been hailed as a key factor of the contemporary economic development in the post-industrialized world. However, in the sociological perspective, it made some negative effects on local communities. Especially, in tourism destination communities, many of which used to be traditional agrarian communities, the tendency is more obvious. In fact, one of the liveliest discussions about negative impacts of tourism is its introduction of the division of labor to the communities. According to Cohen (1996), the division of labor gives some negative impacts on economy of destination communities, especially on young women who now find employment in tourism industry such as hotels, crafts and souvenirs, and also tourism-oriented prostitution, and this can change the women's status vis-à-vis her families and lead to increased conflict and deviance within the family (Noronha 1977; Boissevian and Serracino-Inglott 1979, cited in Cohen 1996: 62).

Despite the fact that community is capable of dealing with changes, an excessive torrent of influence of external changes into community can threaten, or in the worst case terminate it. Zigmunt Bauman is one of the most influential scholars who give an alarm for the threat of modernization and globalization to community. According to Bauman, the modern capitalist world is characterized by a great deal of individualism, which was not significantly seen before the era of western industrial revolution. Civilization in the modern age was a process in which people had to give up certain amount of freedom of self-assertion in order to encourage discipline that enables people to live in a harmonious modern society.

Ever since the emergence of the industrial revolution, the role of individuals in a society has dramatically changed; the masses were cast out of the habit-ruled web of communal interactions and were incorporated into the task-ruled factory floor, a symbolic set-up of highly disciplined capitalistic society (Bauman 2001: 27). Thus, old routines based on the old social network that used to secure autonomy and communal bond among the community are no longer in use, giving a way to a more systematic and bondless community under the capitalistic production systems. In the industrial era, individuals were forced to turn into a 'mass', deprived of their traditional communally supported habits, and merged into the cold and impersonal setting of the factory under the surveillance and punitive regime so that they can become uniform laborers (Bauman 2001: 27).

Division of labor also eradicated the meaning of work for people. Individuals have an inborn repulsion to purposeless drudgery, futile effort, and meaningless bustle; and this human nature of repulsion to purposeless work had been made possible by the existence of "community, that tangled web of human interactions which endowed work with meaning, forging mere exertion into a meaningful work, into an action with purpose" (Bauman, 2001: 28). Thus, it can be said that division of labor brought about a great industrial productivity, which achieved a great deal of material success and overcame the long-lasting limitation human beings had been facing, at the expense of the individual dignity of work and a great mentality

and spirituality of community that had enabled the meaningfulness of the individuals in their own way in relation to the community.

On top of the negative impact on individual level, division of labor influences the social cohesion of destination communities. Tourism makes money flow into destination communities, thus this broadens the economic gap between active members in tourism industry and less active ones or those who are marginalized by it. In other words, tourism leads to the advent of the middle class, those who benefit from it, and at the same time also turns the less advantageous members in the communities into the lower class. This way, social stratification in communities is accelerated by the presence of tourism. Therefore, tourism creates negative impacts on social components of destination communities by augmenting their social disparities and hence widening the span of the local stratification systems (Cohen 1996: 63).

Economic gaps made by the division of labor in tourist destination communities are often coupled with a gap of recognition towards tourism activity by the community members. While those who have a good deal of benefit from tourism activities tend to see tourism as a favorable economic activity, disadvantaged locals' perception of tourism would be often negative (Ap 1992, cited in Shaw and Williams 2004: 180). Also, those who play actively in and therefore are dependent on tourism tend to place a higher value on economic returns than on religions or maintaining their culture (Shaw and Williams 2004: 180). For this it can be said that tourism brings about the gap of individual perception between those who benefit from it and those who do not, and this gap could result in the disharmony of the social relations and ultimately fragmentation of the members of the destination communities.

One of the examples that well illustrate some negative impacts on destination communities brought about by tourism is, as Williamson and Hirsch (1996) argue, the case of *Koh Samui*, a small island near the Gulf of Thailand in Southern Thailand. Before 1984, when Koh Samui officially

started to embark on tourism project, it had been a major producer of coconuts and some coconuts processed foods for export to the Thai mainland and other countries with a limited number of cheap accommodations for low-budget travelers. However, since the designation of TAT, capitals for investment has started to flow into Koh Samui, and outside investors have begun establishing luxurious resorts on the island. Because of the contemporary development in Koh Samui, the traditional economic system was hugely affected. In fact, the coconuts farmers, who used to be the main players and the back-bone of Samui's economy, are now marginalized; some people are trying to make fortune out of tourism; some people sold their lands and cut ties with the island; some out-migrated because of the higher prices of its food, transportation, and other services; (Williamson and Hirsch 1996: 200). The local people's morality and values have also significantly changed. In fact, some of the respondents of Williamson and Hirsch's simply said that the island has changed and the people living there are no longer as friendly as they used to be and they think only about money; and many respondents lamented that in the past, there were little variations in their life style including their production and consumption that distinguished people in the village, and although there were rich families and poor families, they usually lived alongside each other, eating the same food and knowing each other's name (Williamson and Hirsch 1996: 200). Those social changes that occurred in Koh Samui broke the traditional ties among the local people and turned them into the losers of tourism development. Like Koh Samui, Mae Kampong is also experiencing some social changes.

4.4.3 Social Changes in Mae Kampong

“Since the beginning of the tourism project, human relationship in this village seems to have changed. In the past, we helped each other without any return, like letting other villagers use Mieng processing tools for free, but now we have to pay to use them” (A 62-year-old woman. Personal Interview: April 2016).

In Mae Kampong, the situation today is not as severe as Koh Samui. Nevertheless, if tourism development goes further and there is no sufficient control or check on it, Mae Kampong has a chance to follow the footsteps of Koh Samui. In fact, similar things about the interpersonal relations are happening in the village. Because now the village's economy, in which Mieng used to play the predominant role in the past, is diversified because of the tourism industry, the traditional social ties that were maintained by the presence of Mieng production seem to be under threat. In fact, as was the case in Koh Samui, as tourism development grows in a local community, the community shifts toward a commercial area, and the social relations among the members also turn into business like. The statement of one of my interviewees cited above, accords with the notion that the division of labor and economic gap affect the traditional values of local tourist destination communities. This is because, in many cases, one's economic interests come to play the most important role in the community life, and tourism development often turns the communities into commercial groups where money comes into play in every corner of human relations among the members.

In the village, the outspoken conflicts among the villagers can be rarely seen. It seems that the villagers are accustomed to show their image as a harmonious traditional village to the tourists so that they can assure the tourists to enjoy themselves in the village. Nevertheless, it seems that how the villagers perceive of the tourism development varies depending on where they live. In fact, in the three clusters, Pang Ton, Pang Nai no.1, and Pang Nai no.2, where most homestay households are located in, the people seem to have welcoming attitudes towards tourists and showed almost no concerns about the future prospect of the village. In addition, most homestay-serving households said that they were proud of contributing to the village's cooperative system. However, on the other hand, respondents from Pang Nok, Pang Klang, and Pang Khon reacted differently. In fact, most of the residents of the three clusters showed some negative opinions about the tourism development, citing that having tourists at their houses

will destroy their privacy and quiet life as a predominant reason why they do not get involved in homestay activities. Thus, In Mae Kampong, there is a clear spatial difference between a tourist area, namely Pang Ton, Pang Nai no.1, and Pang Nai no.2 and a non-tourist area, Pang Nok, Pang Klang, and Pang Khon, in that the residents in the former feel that tourism is necessary for the village's development and showed some positive reactions to it whereas those in the latter seem to be more skeptical about the contemporary development of the village tourism.

In addition, one of my interviewees said: *"It is nice to have a lot of tourists because they certainly bring money to the village. But, nowadays, people living in the tourist area seem to care only about their businesses"* (Personal Interview: April 2016). These sincere comments came from respondents from Pang Nok, the furthest cluster of Mae Kampong, and importantly, it was virtually impossible to hear this kind of voice from those who live in the tourist area. Thus, there is a huge perceptual gap about the village tourism between those who live in tourist area and those who do not, and the gap comes from their level of involvement into tourism activities, leading to the village's ambivalent attitudes towards tourism.

Because it has been only about 15 years since Mae Kampong started to get involved in tourism, the long-term impact of tourism on the village is open to question. In order to fully examine qualitative aspects of tourism consequences such as changing human relations among the villagers, a further research in the longer period must be required. Nevertheless, even now, there are some testimonies from the villagers that indicate that the village is changing in a negative way. Therefore, one has to accept that the village will have more tourism development in order to deal with the current situation of the declining demand of Mieng, but the tourism development has to be under the village's control so that it does not ruin the traditional way of the villagers' life.

Summary

This chapter talked about Mae Kampong's CBT and various changes that were coupled with it. CBT in Mae Kampong is based on the village's cultural capital and social capital and created economic benefits to Mae Kampong. However, negative impacts brought about by tourism, especially in terms of changing human relations and escalating competition among the villagers were witnessed during my field research. These negative impacts were prevalent and often seen in destination communities, such as Koh Samui, as usual by-products of tourism development. The division of labor that was made possible by tourism and people's inflating business ambitions in tourism could cause negative impacts on the human relations in the community and affect the social cohesion of the village. Because Mae Kampong has a system of CBT, the degree of social changes in the community will not be as much as that of Koh Samui. However, there are some evidences-although they are subjective views of individual villagers- that indicate that human relations within the community are deteriorating. It may be too early to make a conclusion here because it has been only 15 years since Mae Kampong started its village tourism programs. Nevertheless, as long as there are the villagers' voices of concerns about the current tourism development, there is a great need of tourism development being well managed and under control of the village.

Next chapter will discuss issues of Mae Kampong in terms of participation and leadership. Power relations between the common villagers and local authority for successful CBT implementation will be a key point of the next chapter.

ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่
Copyright© by Chiang Mai University
All rights reserved