

Knowledge dialogue through indigenous tourism product design: a collaborative research process with the Lacandon of Chiapas, Mexico

This research analyses an innovative process employed by indigenous entrepreneurs and employees to design new and imaginative products closely related to their cultural, social and natural heritage, values and resources. In the State of Chiapas, home to one of Mexico's largest indigenous population, where poverty has persisted for decades, government and international agencies have promoted the development of many indigenous tourism initiatives. However the employment of top-down strategies focused predominantly towards the provision of tourist facilities have failed to recognize the crucial role of tourism products and activities, thus sustaining and promoting stereotyped ideas of indigenous peoples. This paper will focus on the benefits of collaborative research and knowledge dialogue between scientific and traditional wisdom to overcome some of these limitations through the application of an Indigenous Tourism Product Development Model. Using a participatory research process with the management and staff of four indigenous (Lacandon) owned and operated companies located in the communities of Lacanjá Chansayab and Nahá (Lacandon Jungle) in Mexico, the paper also explores the capacity of this process to revitalize culture while fostering feelings of accomplishment, participation, cultural pride and creative confidence among the co-researchers.

Keywords: indigenous tourism, product design, knowledge dialogue, participatory and collaborative research

Introduction

In Mexico, being indigenous is directly associated with being economically and socially disadvantaged. According to the Indigenous People's Human Development Index (IP-HDI) 72 % of indigenous Mexicans live in conditions of economic poverty and 38% in extreme poverty. 93.9% of the indigenous population underperforms in at least one of

the key IP-HDI dimensions while 64.2% fail in no less than three of them (PNUD, 2010). Albeit a minority for Mexico, the country's 62 native groups constitute the largest indigenous population of Latin America with an official total of 14 million people (MGR & Hoare, 2011). Considering the challenges of statistical information on indigenous peoples (Bandah, 2004) and the legacy of the "statistical ethnocide" created by years of assimilation policies (Bonfil Batalla, 1989), indigenous organizations claim that at least a third of the 112 million Mexicans are of native descent (MGR & Hoare, 2011). The majority live in rural areas, and geographically, the distribution of these groups is also uneven, with 80% located in the southern region.

The State of Chiapas, with more than a million indigenous inhabitants, has the country's lowest level of development, with an HDI of 0.647 (PNUD, 2014), and a considerable poverty gap between indigenous (0.61) and non-indigenous people (0.76). The UNDP reports on Human Development have motivated a political response to address the poverty issues in Chiapas, recognizing the need to focus on Indigenous Peoples in order to reach the Millennium Development Goals (MGR & Hoare, 2011). Among these programs and policies several strategies have included alternative tourism projects as a tool for economic, social and cultural development of indigenous communities (Pastor-Alfonso, Gómez López, & Espeso-Molinero, 2012; Reygadas, Ramos, Montoya, Hernández, & Velasco, 2006; Valle-García, 2014).

Different authors coincide that although the region has received an important influx of money and attention, the tourism public programs lack the internal organization, continuity and strategic vision needed for its success (López & Palomino, 2008; Pastor-Alfonso et al., 2012; Valle-García, 2014). The 'top down' strategies focused almost exclusively upon the provision of tourism facilities including: cabins,

restaurants and recreational centres (López & Palomino, 2008). This emphasis on physical infrastructures has left uncovered important aspects of tourism development causing operational as well as social and cultural problems. The lack of indigenous participation on the design of policies and programs has led to inter-ethnic struggles, changes in social function and a transformation of cultural and natural capitals into global stock, less favouring indigenous people (Valle-García, 2014). Furthermore, the unstructured arrival of money into rural communities has generated issues of economic dependency, disinterest for entrepreneurial activity, unfulfilled growth expectations and the increase of false strategies purporting to promote women's participation in order to fulfil financial grant requirements (Pastor-Alfonso et al., 2012).

Additionally, while the Mexican government promoted indigenous tourism through essentializing images (Trench, 2005) an evaluation of projects funded by the Commission for the Development of Indigenous Peoples (CDI), found that “the most glaring absence is the lack of related cultural events that could harness the wealth of indigenous culture, especially its live demonstration activities” (López & Palomino, 2008, p.47).

As elsewhere, tourism development strategies following a ‘top-down’ approach do not always achieve the positive economic, social, political or cultural results planned. In this article we argue that in order to overcome the historical marginalization of Indigenous Peoples there is a need for more collaborative research between academics and indigenous communities as well as strategies that foster the exchange of ideas between traditional and scientific knowledge.

The purpose of this research is to explore the benefits of the dialogue between western and traditional knowledge in sustainable tourism development. Focusing on the

design of indigenous tourism products, the aim of this work is to understand how collaborative dialogue processes can assist indigenous peoples, planners and practitioners to develop sustainable tourism strategies.

Subsequently the following objectives were adopted to investigate collaborative dialogue processes. Through participatory research, four indigenous companies of the Lacandon Jungle of Chiapas worked on the design of experiential tourism activities. The employment of an Indigenous Tourism Product Design (ITPD) Model, based on western scientific theories, including New Product Development, the Experience Economy and Design Thinking, served as a mechanism to integrate traditional knowledge into the tourism products, generating new outputs by the combination of emic and etic inputs (Morris, Leung, Ames, & Lickel, 1999; Pike, 1967). This dialogue between traditional and scientific knowledge helped to overcome some of the limitations confronted by indigenous entrepreneurs. By designing memorable tourism experiences from within the company, the process gave cultural meaning to the physical offer. This assisted indigenous entrepreneurs to recover their cultural and natural capitals and improve opportunities to increase economic independence and advance the political agenda by sharing their own stories. By implementing the ITPD Model at the indigenous company level, the collaborative process allowed for an opening of the dialogue between a wide range of agents including women and employees from different ethnic groups. By means of innovation and creativity, this process fostered feelings of accomplishment, cultural pride, cultural recovery and entrepreneurial motivation which will be discussed further in the results section.

Literature Review

For the purpose of this paper indigenous tourism is defined as “tourism based on the group’s land and cultural identity and controlled from within the group” (Swain, 1989, p.85). In this early definition, originally published in the seminal compilation of Valene Smith (1977), Margaret Swain focused her attention on two key aspects relevant to this research. Firstly, she defines a type of tourism grounded on identity values. Johnston (2000, p.91), one of the most critical voices about indigenous tourism, defines it as “tourism that is based on indigenous knowledge systems and values, promoting customary practices and livelihoods”, emphasising that indigenous people “should not be the tourism attraction *per se*, but that visits should offer tourists an understanding and appreciation of the lifestyles of the Amerindians” (Sinclair, 2003, p. 141). A second crucial element of Swain’s definition is the control derived from the group. Control over economic aspects, or as Parker (1993, p.400) defines it: “any tourism product or service, which is owned and operated by Aboriginal people”, including control over social and cultural elements of the tourism product or service, where the indigenous actors decide the parcels of life that they want to share with tourists (Hinch & Butler, 2007; Johnston, 2006; McIntosh, 2004; Notzke, 2006; Sofield, 1991; Swain, 1989; Zeppel, 2006).

Following the definitions of Swain (1989), Parker (1993) and Johnston (2000), this work focuses on tourism initiatives owned and managed by indigenous peoples, where ethnic culture presents a competitive advantage and where the values and knowledge of native people guide the service and activities offered. Namely, those considered by Butler and Hinch (2007) as ‘culture controlled’. In this scenario tourism product design can be an instrumental tool for sustainable development when it is

developed from within the company following a systematic process that fosters participation, capacity-building, cultural enhancement, creativity and innovation. In order to understand the complexity of product development in an indigenous context, the literature reviewed here is taken from a multi-disciplinary perspective which embraces these diverse themes, from sustainable tourism planning; management; marketing; anthropology; creativity and design.

Challenges of indigenous tourism planning

Academic literature devoted much of its interest to the planning and development of sustainable indigenous tourism (Higgins-Desbiolles, Trevorrow, & Sparrow, 2014; López & Palomino, 2008; Sofield, 1993; 2003; Whitford & Ruhanen, 2010; Yang & Wall, 2009). Multiple authors are committed to the economic benefits that a well-planned indigenous industry could provide to the most disadvantaged groups (Manyara & Jones, 2007; Notzke, 2006; Zeppel, 2006). Fuller et al. (2005, p.902) consider that small indigenous business “could yield substantial economic and social benefits for the owner-operators, employees and the wider community ... while at the same time, ensuring minimal cultural and environmental impacts”. Tourism among indigenous groups is also presented as a positive alternative to extractive industries such as logging, mining, or hunting, common in indigenous territories (Zeppel, 2006), helping communities integrate with a cash economy that they were unaware of until very recently (Notzke, 2006; Pastor-Alfonso & Gómez López, 2010; Zeppel, 2006). The economic power produced by tourism is also generating political influence to fight for legal rights over land (Johnston, 2006), intellectual property (Posey & Dutfield, 1996; Whittaker, 1999) and other historical claims (McAvoy, 2002; Weaver, 2010).

However, even with the best intentions on the part of planners, international agencies and local governments, “a growing body of scholarship has demonstrated that there are significant gaps between *vision* and *execution*” (Youdelis, 2013, p.161). Sofield’s (1993) case study on ‘the implementation gap’ in the Solomon Islands shows how planning measures imported from outside and implemented from above, fail to pay enough attention to the traditions and values of the indigenous communities. In Australia, despite all efforts by the government, the results of public policies to support indigenous tourism have not achieved the expected results (Altman, 1993; Whitford, Bell, & Watkins, 2001; Whitford & Ruhanen, 2010). In an analysis of public policies claiming to be sustainable, Whitford and Ruhanen (2010, p.491) found that the “the vast majority overtly focused on economic issues, arguably often at the expense of socio-cultural and environmental issues”. They also found that in most cases a ‘top-down’ approach existed, where indigenous groups were treated as objects of the policies and not concerned parties of them. Simonsen (2006, p.113) noted that “evidence from around the world confirms that the failure of many community development projects is not attributable to indigenous incompetence but to inappropriate externally conceived ‘top down’ strategies that fail to acknowledge and incorporate local cultures and institutions”. Other authors reflect on the excessive reliance on foreign aid, which prevents projects progressing properly, causing problems of paternalism and dependency (Dixey, 2008; Manyara & Jones, 2007; Pastor-Alfonso et al., 2012).

Collaboration and knowledge dialogue

It is precisely because of the limited success of ‘top down’ policies and the dependency on foreign aid and NGOs that some authors advocate for strategies that emerge from the

community through bottom-up planning (Sakata & Prideaux, 2013; Theerapappisit, 2009) or grassroots business (Clark, 2009). We argue that regardless of how projects originate or who supports them, there is greater need for full participation and involvement of indigenous peoples in order to bridge these gaps. Lemelin & Blangy (2009) call for more collaborative research, where academics and indigenous communities work together to advance knowledge. Through collaboration it is possible to incorporate indigenous voices, issues, concerns and meanings (emic perspective) and describe and analyse them from a scientific, external point of view (etic perspective). However, collaboration between people is not enough; there is need for more dialogue of knowledge. Dialogue means not just to understand and incorporate the emic point of view; it also involves a conversation between the traditional epistemology and the western empirical methods. It is necessary to admit the possibility of the existence of other visions of the world where nature, spirituality and human relationships play a leading role in shaping the conformation of knowledge (Chambers & Buzinde, 2015; Chilisa, 2011; Delgado Burgoa & Ricaldi, 2012). According to Haverkort (2012) without this ontological dialogue, it would be impossible to find solutions for problems that positivist science has not been able to reach, such as food security and environmental sustainability. Alternative approaches to poverty alleviation in rural areas that rely on the revitalization and strengthening of indigenous knowledge interacting with western theory are showing interesting results (Delgado Burgoa, Rist, & Escobar Vasquez, 2010; Dietz, 2012; Haverkort, Hooft, & Hiemstra, 2002). Programs based on these principles in Bolivia, Canada or New Zealand, have shown that the revitalization of ancestral knowledge transcends empowerment and strengthened self-consciousness, contributing actively to reduce poverty (Haverkort, 2012).

Therefore knowledge dialogue entails a complete understanding of Indigenous Peoples' realities from an emic and etic approach. It also requires searching for mechanisms that foster conversation and exchange of ideas between different forms of knowledge while helping revitalize traditional values and ancestral wisdom. This research responds to the collaboration and knowledge dialogue needs in tourism studies, through the design of indigenous tourism products.

Dialogue through product design

Research on tourism product

There is considerable agreement on the importance of tourism product development. Extensive research commissioned by the World Bank in Africa indicates that “tourism offering diversified products can reach the poor while protecting natural assets and conserving cultural heritage” (Messerli, 2011, p.337).

Product development is predominantly studied from the planning (Gunn & Var, 2002; UNWTO & ETC, 2011) as well as from the marketing perspective (Medlik & Middleton, 1973; S. L. J. Smith, 1994; Xu & Chan, 2010). However in tourism, marketers, planners and policymakers give much more attention to other aspects of the marketing mix such as segmentation, customer behaviour, advertising and promotional strategies than they do to product development (S. L. J. Smith, 1994). In the field of indigenous tourism studies, marketing research has had a consumer focus approach with studies on the characteristics of the indigenous tourism market, motivations and attitudes, segmentation efforts, tourists' experiences and tourists' preferences (Kutzner, Wright, & Stark, 2009; McIntosh & Ryan, 2007; Moscardo & Pearce, 1999; Moscardo,

Pearce, & Morrison, 2001; Ryan & Huyton, 2000; Ryan, 2002; Ryan & Higgins, 2006). These studies inform the expectations and requirements of tourists visiting indigenous settings giving important cues for product development.

In addition several texts highlight the lack of market-ready products and activities in different indigenous areas (López & Palomino, 2008; Notzke, 2006), the difficulty for tourists to find such experiences (McIntosh, 2004), as well as the tendency to imitate existing products (Pettersson, 2002; Ryan & Higgins, 2006). However, very few studies focus on the practical aspects of product development. One exception is the collaborative research efforts of the Tl'azt'en Nation and the University of Northern British Columbia. Although centred on consumer perceptions, they advance an extra step on product development research by developing with the community co-researchers different descriptions of potential products (Kutzner et al., 2009). Conversely, the literature shows several examples where indigenous peoples are applying interpretation techniques to communicate their cosmology and worldviews, challenging the Eurocentric traditional perspectives of history and taking the opportunity that tourism offers to correct misperceptions about indigenous cultures (Getz & Jamieson, 1997; McAvoy, 2002; Pitchford, 2006; Pretes, 2002).

Medlik and Middleton (1973, p.29) established two levels of tourism products: the 'total' level or overall tourism product, which covers "the complete experience from the time [the tourist] leaves home to the time he returns to it" and the 'specific' level, which comprises the services offered by the individual tourism providers. The ITPD Model implemented for this research focused on the 'specific' level of tourism product design in an indigenous context.

Design of new products, services, and experiences

Kotler and Rath (1984) consider design “a powerful but neglected strategic tool”.

Design is the process of seeking to optimize consumer satisfaction and company profitability through the creative use of major design elements. The beginning of the century has seen a paradigm shift in the marketing literature going from a goods-centred approach to a service-dominant paradigm. Product development in “this new logic focuses on intangible rather than tangible resources, co-creation of value rather than embedded value, and relationships rather than transactions” (Li & Petrick, 2008, p.328).

Another two theories with strong impacts on the service design literature are the Experience Economy (Pine II & Gilmore, 1998) and the precepts of Design Thinking (Brown, 2008), both with specific impacts on tourism research (Quadri-Felitti & Fiore, 2012; Stickdorn, 2012).

However, these theories are customer-centric and thus consider consumer behaviour must drive product development. In the case of indigenous tourism, a customer-centric approach in the process of cultural commodification could lead to the collapse of cultural meanings (Cohen, 1988; Greenwood, 1977; MacCannell, 1976; Whitford, 2009). While several case studies show the capacity of tourism to enhance cultural pride and support the regeneration of indigenous identities (See for example, Esman, 1984; Henderson, 2003; Hiwasaki, 2000; Medina, 2003; Theodossopoulos, 2013), the key for the recovery, consolidation and revitalization of culture, resides on local people’s agency and the intentionality that informs the construction of cultural meanings (Adams, 1997; Grünewald, 2002).

Theories about experience and service design acknowledge the importance of the co-creation process, and consider providers of the service as key components of the experience (Grönroos, 2008). However, the final aim of the service design is to attain user satisfaction, limiting the role of providers to the fulfilment of this mission. In indigenous design “communities need to assess the level of contact and involvement in tourism that they feel comfortable with and that does not compromise their cultural values” (Kutzner et al., 2009, p. 111). Therefore their participation cannot be limited to the provision of services.

Furthermore, when applying the principles of design to indigenous tourism, the concepts of profitability, development, growth or success have to be seen from a wider perspective, as the social, cultural and environmental benefits can have much more weight for communities than strict economic value. Factors such as prestige, empowerment, the common good, community employment or maintaining traditional ways of life, should not be overlooked when designing products or measuring the success of indigenous tourism enterprises (Ryan & Crofts, 1997; Whitford et al., 2001; Fuller et al., 2005; Buultjens & Gale, 2013).

We contend that a new model of experience design is needed to offer opportunities to indigenous peoples to incorporate their values, concepts, limits and cultural expressions into the final tourism product. According to Koler and Rath (1984, p.17) “the objective of design is to create a high satisfaction for the target consumers and profits for the enterprise”. Thus, the objective of indigenous tourism experiences design is to create a high satisfaction for the target consumers while fostering the principles and values of the local community, whilst also seeking social, cultural, environmental and economic benefits for the enterprise.

Indigenous Tourism Product Design (ITPD) Model

The ITPD Model (see Figure 1) developed for this research, presents a systematic approach to product design based on scientific theories serving as a mechanism to foster dialogue with local knowledge. To address the implementation gap between vision and implementation Altman (2004, p.531) defends the need for “creative and innovative solutions to the complex economic development issues faced by remote Indigenous communities”. The ITPD Model employs creativity techniques to enhance the capacity of local indigenous entrepreneurs to develop their own tourism activities.

Figure 1. ITPD Model

According to Kotler et al. (2002, p.320) companies must constantly develop new products even though the process is difficult and the risk of failure high. The key to solve these barriers “lies in strong new product planning and in setting up a systematic new product development process for finding and nurturing new products”. The basic guidelines and stages of the New Product Development (NPD) process presented by Kotler et al. (2002), combined with the principles of the Experience Economy and Design Thinking were employed to establish a research-training model for the systematic design of new product ideas and complimentary services at the indigenous company level. Kotler et al. (2002) also acknowledge the expensive nature of product design. Applying the systematic search for new products to companies in peripheral and remote rural areas required a new approach to design cost. Thus this process is based on the combination of existing resources (tangible and intangible) owned by the company

and the creativity and knowledge of the indigenous owners and employees, without any further cost added.

The ITPD Model (Figure 1) and its associated activities (Table 1) follows four basic stages: vision, analysis of the current situation of the organization, creative process, and finally, the pilot of the new product. At each stage of the process, different activities were planned to generate dialogue and add value for the final product (S. L. J. Smith, 1994). Each activity is driven by a specific focus on the tourists (customer centric) and on the local group, its culture, principles and values (indigenous peoples' centric) (see Figure 1) searching at all moments to generate balanced experiences between the desires and needs of guests and hosts.

Table 1. ITPD Model phases, activities and techniques

Research site

The Lacandon Maya Indians of Southern Mexico, one of the smallest indigenous groups in Mesoamerica, has generated fascination among visitors and scholars. Referred by themselves as Hack Winik (the 'True People'), this small group of around 1000 people, have been profusely researched. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, the study of this small group has been central for international authors such as Alfred M. Tozzer, Frank Blom, Gertrude Duby, Robert Bruce, Didier Boremanse, Joel Palka, Marie-Odile Marion, Jon R. McGee, Jan de Vos or Tim Trench. Their cultural and historical works have focused on the Lacandon Maya language; religious and funerary rituals; the impressive oral traditions and rich mythology; their traditional knowledge of herbal medicine, agriculture and hunting practices; social behavior, organization and their

debated history (Boremanse, 1998; de Vos, 1980; McGee, 2002). Characterized by their unique attire and coiffure the recurrent images projected by anthropologists, travelers, the media and government officials, the Hack Winik are perceived as the most 'indigenous' amongst all indigenous groups of Mexico, becoming the advertisement symbol for Chiapas (Trench, 2005).

Even though fascination among scholars continues to be high, latest reports about the Lacandon people abound on tales around disappearance of traditional religion; formal education replacing the Lacandon mythic world through acculturation processes; diet changes and lost knowledge on gastronomy and curative plants; and general accounts of irreversible cultural changes (McGee, 2002; Valle-García, 2014).

The Hack Winik People, mostly concentrated in the communities of Nahá, Mezabok and Lacanjá Chansayab, have a long tradition of hosting visitors. Since the first academic expeditions and the early travellers wished to explore the archaeological site of Bonampak, many indigenous families have provided food and accommodation to researchers and travellers. Today, tourism has replaced traditional economic activity for many families, especially since 1994, when the Mexican Government finished the circular road through the Jungle to control the insurgents of the indigenous Zapatista movement. This road now connects Lacanjá Chansayab with Palenque and San Cristóbal de las Casas, the main tourist hubs of the State, favoring tourism development. The Lacandon people have enjoyed land rights since 1972 facilitating business ownership and management through private, family, cooperative or community legal structures. In the last 15 years, a series of public programs, the improvement of secondary roads, and the generalization of electricity and communication services have consolidated a solid offer of alternative tourism facilities. In most cases, the

construction of these facilities has followed a top-down strategy, generating very similar outcomes in terms of design and structure including: lodges with 5-6 cabins; small open air restaurants and handicraft shops.

The Hack Winik entrepreneurs of the Lacandon Jungle combine the elements needed for the purpose of this study: small tourism companies owned and managed by indigenous people, families that hold ancestral knowledge and a destination rich in cultural and natural resources that offers a variety of possibilities for the design of original tourism products closely linked to the territory.

Methodology

Philosophical perspective

In tourism, it is quite uncommon to specify the assumptions that underline research (Botterill, 2001; Tribe, 2009); however, working on indigenous contexts, the theoretical characteristics that inform the investigation are as important as the methods and instruments employed. The present work “understands that all inquiry is both political and moral” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p.2) and therefore a critical approach to research is needed (Tribe, 2008). Linking with the co-transformative learning and action principles of the “hopeful” approach to tourism knowledge production (Pritchard, Morgan, & Ateljevic, 2011) and acknowledging its limitations (Higgins-Desbiolles & Whyte, 2013), this research intends to attain a decolonizing paradigm (Chambers & Buzinde, 2015; Chilisa, 2011; Mignolo, 2009; Tuhiwai-Smith, 2012). As western researchers, a collaborative inquiry process, with a clear positionality and intense reflexivity was the appropriate methodology to employ (Ateljevic, Harris, Wilson, &

Collins, 2005; Hall, 2004; Nicholls, 2009). Aiming to reach meaningful changes in the lives of the co-researchers, we opted for an active approach that acknowledges the power of practical problem solving as an empowering tool (Reason & Bradbury, 2008) and “the creative action of people to address matters that are important to them” (Heron & Reason, 2006, p.144).

Participatory Action Research (PAR) involves a spiral of self-reflective cycles (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005). This paper forms part of an ongoing collaborative research project that started in 2008 between the Intercultural University of Chiapas, the University of Alicante and the indigenous entrepreneurs at the Lacandon communities. In this collaborative agreement the principles of Respect, Relevance, Reciprocity and Responsibility (Kirkness & Barnhardt, 1991) as well as the Ownership, Control, Access and Possession (OCAP) model (Schnarch, 2004) were carefully observed during all its phases. The results described on this paper constitute one of these cycles.

Research methods

Research for the specific cycle presented in this paper was conducted in June and July of 2012. Reflecting on the results of a previous PAR cycle, the objective of this phase was to test the ITPD Model at the company level.

In terms of instruments and methods of data collection, in PAR, all techniques are valid as long as they ethically and practically fulfil its mission (Greenwood, 2000). The main rule is to be very aware of the choices that the researcher takes and its consequences. Ideas and practices must be based on a solid theoretical framework “but always free to respond creatively to the requirements of context” (Reason & Bradbury, 2008, p. xxvii). For this study, data was collected in a multi-modal form, through

participatory observation, anecdotal records, field notes and semi-structured interviews, however the main sources of information are the documents (pictures, drawings, inventories, prototypes, etc.) produced by the research team during the implementation of the ITPD Model.

The ITPD Model was set to be implemented in four days with each participant company and the process aimed to produce a new ‘specific’ product design at each business that could be materialized immediately without added cost.

For the selection of participants units (tourism business organizations, regardless of their legal structure) we opted for a purposive sampling (nonprobability), selecting deliberately our sample based on the project objectives (Teddlie & Yu, 2007). Units were selected based on three criteria: (1) control (indigenous ownership and management); (2) basic quality standards (participation in certification and quality standard programs); and (3) interest and commitment to the project.

Sixteen tourism projects in the communities of Lacanjá Chansayab, San Javier, Nahá and Metzabock were analyzed under the first two criteria. After the first selection under criteria 1 (control) and 2 (quality) eight entrepreneurs were contacted. Four companies showed the interest and commitment to participate in the research program, criteria (3) (See Table 2).

Table 2. Purposive sampling

The ITPD Model was implemented in each unit independently. Creative teams were formed by the principal researcher of this paper and members of management and staff decided by each unit. Participants were carefully informed of the research aims

and objectives and signed for informed consent. The workshops were held on the premises of each participant unit in order to accommodate participants' schedules and business needs. Work sessions were open to participation to other family members or staff, including children. The characteristics of each team are presented in Table 3.

Considering only consenting participants, twenty two people were involved in this research, of which nine were women and thirteen men. A woman is a shareholder in two of the businesses and decided to participate with both. The youngest was 13 years and the oldest 52 years. Three participants are not of Lacandon origin but married to Lacandon men, and thus, according to Lacandon custom, considered part of the community. Two participants were staff members from the neighbouring Tzeltal ethnic group. Regarding education, two participants have university degrees, four received secondary education, eight primary and eight had no formal education.

Table 3. Participant units

This PAR cycle concentrates on the design phases of product development. The market entrance and real implementation of the final products remains outside of the scope of this particular paper. The external researcher does not speak Maya Lacandon, thus the workshops were conducted in Spanish, the second language of the co-researchers.

Results

The results explain the outcomes of the integrated process employed in collaboration with the Lacandon companies. Through the model application, underpinned by knowledge transfer and dialogue, four new indigenous tourism products were designed.

Here it is explained how the model effectively integrated key values and identities of the indigenous culture which led to additional benefits and outcomes for the Lacandon co-researchers including the revitalization of cultural knowledge, participation, feelings of accomplishment, cultural pride and creative confidence.

The products

The application of the ITPD Model (Figure 1) was extremely valuable for development of tourism experiences in an indigenous context. The outline of the four main products designed by the companies demonstrates the application of the ITPD Model to generate positive synergies between traditional and scientific knowledge. It assisted indigenous entrepreneurs to design experiential tourism activities incorporating their own resources and cultural values.

1/ “Seed, plant and give life to the Rainforest”: Participation in the reforestation program of Tres Lagunas

The owners of *Tres Lagunas* campsite were involved in a reforestation program funded by the Mexican government. The tree nurseries were located inside the tourism complex presenting an opportunity for product development. The creative team of *Tres Lagunas* built their concept around the role of trees in the Hach Winik cosmology, communicating the importance of reforestation to visitors, especially young children. Understanding the need for experiential activities, the team developed a hands-on itinerary including an easy trail in the jungle to search for seeds, a seeding activity at the tree nursery, and a short ride on boat through the lake to reach the dense rainforest to plant a tree in the Lacandon Rainforest. Returning to the restaurant, the visitors would

be offered refreshments and receive a certificate of collaboration with the reforestation program with the exact location of the planted tree.

2/ *“From water and earth to your plate”*: An experience of conviviality and Lacandon gastronomy

In *Top Che*, the restaurant facilities forming part of the campsite are run independently and often not open to the public. When this happens, the family that runs the accommodation facilities welcomes guests to eat at their table. These familiar encounters are enjoyed by family and guest and therefore the team decided to create an experience of conviviality. Besides the accommodation business, the *Top Che* family run a fish-farm and maintain a small milpa (traditional orchard). Based on these resources the team designed a half day experience where tourists could learn about traditional food habits and how these had changed with environmental restrictions and globalization. “To engage individual customers in a way that creates a memorable event” (Pine II & Gilmore, 1998, p.98) the creative team focused on active and immersive elements for their experience. Guests would be invited to fish on the pond using traditional and modern fishing techniques; collect vegetables while learning the environmental uniqueness of the Lacandon milpa; cook their own traditional meal in the family kitchen and lunch at the table with the entire family. Every part of the activity is presented by different members of the family giving guests an opportunity to interact with men, women and children (McIntosh, 2004).

3/ *“A visit to the Grandmas: A journey through the lives and works of Lacandon women”*

Ya'ax Ha is a women's co-operative that manages a restaurant and a convenience store. The co-operative shareholders are family members of the late Old Chank'in, famous shaman of Nahá. For more than 50 years, Old Chank'in shared tales and knowledge of the Lacandon people to visitors and scholars, becoming a well-known character. He had four spouses, the two who are alive, Koh María and Koh Paniagua live in the compound that used to host academics and friends of Old Chank'in. They, as well as her granddaughters, belong to the *Ya'ax Ha* co-operative. Although the old women did not form part of the original creative team, when her granddaughter Adriana Cruz, asked them to form part of the tourism product they were very happy to interact with visitors again. Since Old Chank'in died and the tourist lodge was built in Nahá, very few visitors chose to stay with them. The possibility to regain an extra income from visitors was welcome as widows in the Lacandon communities experience hardships. With their help the tourism concept was developed around a visit to the old ladies, giving visitors an opportunity to see them in everyday life context (McIntosh, 2004). The creative team designed an intergenerational experience to share with guest the lives and works of Lacandon women. Guided by a young Lacandon girl visitors would be invited to share an afternoon tea with the two ladies. The three Lacandon women will show them the technological and social evolution of women's work whilst tourists learn to make their own tortillas. The young girl plays a double role in this activity. On one hand she would guide the tourist on a journey through the lives and works of Lacandon women of the past (her grandmothers lives and tales) and the present (her own contemporary perspectives). On the other, she would serve as interpreter and translator between hosts and guests preventing intercultural barriers (McIntosh & Ryan, 2007).

4/ “Threats to the Lacandon Jungle”: An Awareness Tour about the challenges of conservation in the Lacandon rainforest

The team at the *Nahá Ecotourism Campsite* decided to centre their awareness tour product around the Area for the Protection of Flora and Fauna (APFF) of their community. From the beginning of the process the creative team showed a clear concern for the environment. Problems identified to communicate to tourists included: invasive flora and fauna species, fragmentation of ecosystems and habitats, the danger of slash and burn practices, pressure from the surrounding populations, intensive agriculture, cattle rising and forest fires. Cars would pick up tourists early in the morning and transfer them to the Ocotalito Lake, at the heart of the APFF. In traditional cayucos (small wood canoes) guided by a Lacandon, tourists would cross the long lake observing birds and nature. The tour incorporates some interactive activities such as searching for invasive species and learning to counteract problems through conservation practices. Back at the campsite, tourists would receive a folded information page as a souvenir of the experience with the history and characteristics of the APFF and all the images and names of the air, land and water animals of the Ocotalito Lake.

Evaluation of the collaborative knowledge dialogue process

The following anecdotal evidence shows how the process of collaboration and knowledge dialogue supports resilience while fostering participation, feelings of accomplishment, cultural pride and recovery, and creative confidence among the co-researchers:

Capacity to redesign activities

The ITPD Model encourages the review and update of processes and results reinforcing the resilience of the designed products.

The product concept trial of the first three products presented in the previous section, showed a clear potential for success. However the complexity of the fourth concept, the tour on the Ocotitalito Lake, proved to be excessively ambitious during the test. The difficulty of the tour made impossible to keep proper timings. The weather conditions and the accumulative delay made the bird watching activity disappointing and the appointed guide for the experience had difficulties remembering the nature based knowledge. Back to the centre, the creative team decided to give a new orientation to the project. The lake visit in the early morning hours was still beautiful and the interactive elements of the route worked well. The team also realized that although the guide had difficulties with the nature discourse, he was an excellent storyteller. The team then reshaped the experience. The main theme and awareness aims remained the same but the discourse changed completely in order to avoid raising expectations among visitors.

During the review of the concept developed with the Nahá widows, concerns about carrying capacity of the product arouse among the creative team. Understanding the social and cultural fragility of the concept, the ladies were consulted. They surprised the research team with a predetermined decision: They will only receive groups twice a week with a maximum of 4 tourists at the time, showing a natural capacity to plan tourism activities.

The ITPD Model gives communities resilience tools to accommodate needs, answer to deviances and to adapt to new situations.

Participation

The implementation of the model at the company level opened up the creative dialogue to people who are often excluded from capacity building and participatory processes such as individuals from other ethnic groups, women and elders.

Doroteo Maldonado, a 32 year old Tzeltal employee at *Tres Lagunas*, has been living with his wife and five kids at the company premises since its foundation, six years ago. Until he joined the creative team for this research he had never attended any formal or informal education program or participatory process. It has to be said that his contributions to the animals and plants inventories were remarkable.

In *Top Che*, some of the family women did not form part of the creative team but followed the whole process, listening on the workshops and becoming active participants on the end tourism product. Furthermore, when the first product was designed, they approached the external researcher with a new product proposal.

The involvement of elder women was paramount in this research. Although they did not form part of the initial creative teams, in *Top Che* and *Ya'ax Ha* their active participation on the product development process was crucial. In addition as protagonists of the tourism activity, they were key transmitters of traditional knowledge.

Children were always welcome in the workshops, as their free approach to creativity encouraged adults to follow their path generating a playful and creative environment, avoiding the frustrating and tedious procedures that characterize some formal processes. Three of the four creative teams were helped by children. In all cases, children engaged actively on the process enjoying the activities and positively contributing to the final results. Through their participation they learned about practices,

believes and traditional customs, reinforcing knowledge transmission. On the other hand, the inclusion of young community members in the process helped them to learn about the design and characteristics of tourism products. This cheerful involvement with the family business could contribute to the strength of business succession, crucial for indigenous ventures.

Feelings of accomplishment

The ITPD Model, based on a series of progressive steps towards the design of tourism products, helped generate feelings of satisfaction and accomplishment. As the team was completing small goals, they were showing increased pride at the results.

The field work was conducted during the low tourist season in order to facilitate the research and creative aims of the project. The lack of tourists did not allow incorporating the real implementation phase as part of the research. However, in two instances, products 2 and 3 were sold while the research was still ongoing, allowing the creative teams to analyse its outcomes and interview its users. In both cases, customers declared to be extremely satisfied with the activities, and congratulated the creative team. For the purpose of this study, customer satisfaction is mentioned because it gave rise to an incredible feeling of satisfaction and pride among the creative teams, enhancing the self-confidence of participants. Confidence is a crucial element of any capacity-building process (Moscardo, 2008).

Cultural pride and recovery

The inclusion of cultural elements on all designed products attests the importance co-researchers give to their past and ethnic traditions. However, the process also revealed

the limited knowledge many young people had about some cultural elements. Previous research on the area has concluded that tourism brought cultural pride to the Lacandon communities and with it certain cultural recovery (Pastor-Alfonso & Gómez López, 2010; Pastor-Alfonso, 2012). Conversely, this research has shown that in many cases the cultural recovery has been limited to the re-use of external symbols such as the traditional hairstyle and dress. During the research process, most young Lacandon showed little awareness about traditional practices, mythology or history. Nevertheless, along the creative process they presented a clear interest for the recovery of that lost knowledge and kept including cultural elements to their tours. Preparing for rehearsals, young participants with guiding roles on the designed activities engaged in conversations with their elders, taking notes and trying to learn every detail of their past traditions.

The intergenerational conversations and product rehearsals also presented an opportunity for memory recovery, as older people had a chance to remember the past and re-enact some forgotten traditions. For instance, the widows at *Ya'ax Ha* declared to have forgotten to do the *k'uch*, a spiritual cotton thread traditionally offered to pregnant women. However, by practising during product rehearsals they were able to extract dormant memories. Subsequently the ITPD Model indicated great potential as a tool for intergenerational dialogue and cultural knowledge recovery and revitalization.

Creative confidence

The process generated confidence in the creative skills of participants. Even though the aim of the research was to design only one product per company, the participants boosted with new ideas. In *Top Che*, following the second part of the ITPD Model, a

handicraft workshop was designed. In Nahá, a night-time and socializing cultural activity was developed in parallel to the main products. In the last hours of fieldwork research, while waiting for the bus with the external researcher, the creative team of *Ya'ax Ha* developed a new full day long concept based on the Lacandon life cycle.

The generation of unplanned products and services shows how the collaborative process has nurtured an interest for entrepreneurial activity among participants. The active participation of women in all new proposals indicates that the model may be an effective tool against lack of real women participation in publicly funded projects (Pastor-Alfonso et al., 2012).

Conclusions

This collaborative process using the ITPD Model is considered a useful contribution to planning and development of sustainable indigenous tourism. Although scholars and policy makers acknowledge the importance of indigenous product development, little attention is paid to the practical aspects of its design and development. From a policy stand point, 'top-down' strategies have limited its reach to the physical plant failing to recognize the crucial role of tourism products and activities (López & Palomino, 2008) or had promoted a type of staged product that fail to respond to market demands (McIntosh, 2004) sustaining stereotyped ideas of indigenous peoples (Cohen, 1993; Ryan & Higgins, 2006). Discussions about sustainable indigenous tourism focus on the importance of a development "that is culturally sustainable, that is, owned, controlled, acceptable and desired by the indigenous communities affected, as well as economically sustainable" (McIntosh, 2004, p.1). According to the literature, when strategies are imposed from above, disregarding local cultural identities and specific realities of the

indigenous entrepreneurs the chances of success are reduced (Whitford et al., 2001; Whitford & Ruhanen, 2010; Altman, 1993; Sofield, 1993). Findings from this research show how the full participation and involvement of indigenous peoples through collaborative strategies that foster knowledge dialogue between scientific and traditional wisdom present a viable solution to the implementation gap.

The combination of a systematic approach to product design based on scientific theory with the power of creative application and the cultural and environmental knowledge contributed by indigenous entrepreneurs facilitated the design of tourism activities that incorporate indigenous perceptions, voices, interest and cultural meanings.

Although the nature of tourism is generally of consumption, McIntosh (2004, p.3) confirmed that tourists consuming indigenous products achieve some level of cultural understanding, and therefore “these experiences may facilitate intercultural understanding or appreciation”. Product development gives the opportunity to indigenous entrepreneurs and communities to decide the times and uses of their sacred lands, to enrich visitors experiences with their unique symbolism and cosmology of the landscape and furthermore to share their own story on their own terms. Furthermore, through learning and sharing experiences, visitors become knowledgeable about indigenous issues and concerns, helping them to become more respectful tourist and helping to advance the political agenda of Indigenous Peoples.

By integrating emic perspectives into product design, the ITPD Model provides an opportunity for Indigenous communities to share their concerns and challenge Eurocentric perspectives (Getz & Jamieson, 1997; McAvoy, 2002; Pretes, 2002). Through the implementation process, the ITPD Model have the capacity to foster

feelings of accomplishment, generate motivation and self-confidence among participants, allow the participation of traditionally excluded agents and reinforce feelings of cultural pride and cultural recovery.

This research presents an initial contribution to the knowledge dialogue in tourism studies. The combination of traditional and scientific wisdom and the collaboration between external researchers and local communities presents an interesting contribution to sustainable indigenous tourism planning and development and a potential opportunity to overcome the challenges of the new Sustainable Development Goals.

References

References

- Adams, K. M. (1997). Ethnic tourism and the renegotiation of tradition in Tana Toraja (Sulawesi, Indonesia). *Ethnology*, 36(4), 309-320.
- Altman, J. C. (1993). *Indigenous Australians in the national tourism strategy: Impact, sustainability and policy issues*. (Discussion Paper No. 37). Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research
- Altman, J. C. (2004). Economic development and indigenous Australia: Contestations over property, institutions and ideology. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, 48(3), 513-534.

- Ateljevic, I., Harris, C., Wilson, E., & Collins, F. L. (2005). Getting 'entangled': Reflexivity and the 'critical turn' in tourism studies. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 30(2), 9-21.
- Bandah, J. P. (2004). *Data collection pertaining to indigenous peoples: Issues and challenges*. (PFI/2004/WS.1/13). New York: UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs
- Bonfil Batalla, G. (1989). *México profundo: Una civilización negada* (2nd ed.). México, D.F., México: Grijalbo.
- Boremanse, D. (1998). *Hach Winik: The Lacandon Maya of Chiapas, southern Mexico*. New York, NY: University Press of Colorado.
- Botterill, D. (2001). The epistemology of a set of tourism studies. *Leisure Studies*, 20(3), 199-214.
- Brown, T. (2008). Design thinking. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(6), 84-92+141.
- Buultjens, J., & Gale, D. (2013). Facilitating the development of Australian indigenous tourism enterprises: The business ready program for indigenous tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 5, 41-50.
- Chambers, D., & Buzinde, C. N. (2015). Tourism and decolonisation: Locating research and self. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 51(0), 1-16.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.12.002>

- Chilisa, B. (2011). *Indigenous research methodologies*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Clark, P. (2009). Rriparju Yidaki: Aboriginal social frameworks in a musical ecotourism business. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 8(2), 176-192.
doi:10.1080/14724040802696056
- Cohen, E. (1993). The study of touristic images of native people: Mitigating the stereotype of a stereotype. In D. G. Pearce, & R. Butler (Eds.), *Tourism research. critiques and challenges* (pp. 36-69). London, UK: Routledge.
- Cohen, E. (1988). Authenticity and commoditization in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(3), 371-386. doi:10.1016/0160-7383(88)90028-X
- de Vos, J. (1980). *La paz de dios y del rey: La conquista de la selva lacandona 1525-1821*. México, DF: Fonapas/Chiapas.
- Delgado Burgoa, F., & Ricaldi, D. (Eds.). (2012). *Desarrollo endógeno y transdiscipliniedad en la educación superior: Cambios para el diálogo intercultural entre el conocimiento eurocéntrico y el conocimiento endógeno*. Cochabamba, Bolivia: AGRUCO.
- Delgado Burgoa, F., Rist, S., & Escobar Vasquez, C. (2010). *El desarrollo endógeno sustentable como interfaz para implementar el vivir bien en la gestión pública boliviana*. Cochabamba-Bolivia: AGRUCO. CAPTURED. PLURAL.

- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). Introduction: Critical methodologies and indigenous inquiry. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln & L. Tuhiwai-Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 1-20). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Dietz, G. (2012). Reflexividad y diálogo en etnografía colaborativa: El acompañamiento etnográfico de una institución educativa “intercultural” mexicana. *Revista de Antropología Social*, 21, 63-91.
- Dixey, L. (2008). The unsustainability of community tourism donor projects: Lessons from Zambia. In A. Spenceley (Ed.), *Responsible tourism: Critical issues for conservation and development* (pp. 323-341). London, UK: Earthscan.
- Esman, M. R. (1984). Tourism as ethnic preservation: The Cajuns of Louisiana. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11(3), 451-467.
- Fuller, D., Buultjens, J., & Cummings, E. (2005). Ecotourism and indigenous micro-enterprise formation in northern Australia opportunities and constraints. *Tourism Management*, 26(6), 891-904. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2004.04.006
- Getz, D., & Jamieson, W. (1997). Rural tourism in Canada: Opportunities and entrepreneurship in aboriginal tourism in Alberta. In S. J. Page, & D. Getz (Eds.), *The business of rural tourism: International perspectives*. (pp. 93-107). London: International Thomson Business Press.
- Greenwood, D. J. (1977). Culture by the pound: An anthropological perspective on tourism as cultural commoditization. In V. L. Smith (Ed.), *Host and guest: The*

- anthropology of tourism* (pp. 129-138). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Greenwood, D. J. (2000). De la observación a la investigación-acción participativa: Una visión crítica de las prácticas antropológicas. *Revista de Antropología Social*, 9, 27.
- Grönroos, C. (2008). Service logic revisited: Who creates value? and who co-creates? *European Business Review*, 20(4), 298-314. doi:10.1108/09555340810886585
- Grünewald, R. D. A. (2002). Tourism and cultural revival. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(4), 1004-1021. doi:10.1016/S0160-7383(02)00005-1
- Gunn, C. A., & Var, T. (2002). *Tourism planning: Basics, concepts, cases* (4th ed.). New York; NY: Routledge.
- Hall, M. (2004). Reflexivity and tourism research: Situating myself and/with others. In J. Phillimore, & L. Goodson (Eds.), *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies* (pp. 137-155). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Haverkort, B. (2012). El aprendizaje en distintas ciencias. Desarrollo endógeno y transdisciplinariedad en la educación superior. In F. Delgado Burgoa, & D. Ricaldi (Eds.), *Desarrollo endógeno y transdisciplinariedad en la educación superior: Cambios para el diálogo intercientífico entre el conocimiento eurocéntrico y el conocimiento endógeno*. (pp. 151-190). Cochabamba, Bolivia: AGRUCO.
- Haverkort, B., Hooft, K. v., & Hiemstra, W. (2002). *Ancient roots, new shoots: Endogenous development in practice*. London: Zed Books Ltd.

- Henderson, J. (2003). Ethnic heritage as a tourist attraction: The Peranakans of Singapore. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 9(1), 27-44.
- Heron, J., & Reason, P. (2006). The practice of co-operative inquiry: Research 'with' rather than 'on' people. In P. Reason, & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of action research: Concise paperback edition* (pp. 144-154). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F., Trevorrow, G., & Sparrow, S. (2014). The Coorong Wilderness Lodge: A case study of planning failures in Indigenous tourism. *Tourism Management*, 44(0), 46-57. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2014.02.003
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F., & Whyte, K. P. (2013). No high hopes for hopeful tourism: A critical comment. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 40(1), 428-433.
- Hinch, T., & Butler, R. (2007). Introduction: Revisiting common ground. In Richard Butler, & Tom Hinch (Eds.), *Tourism and indigenous peoples: Issues and implications* (pp. 1-12). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann. doi:10.1016/B978-0-7506-6446-2.50005-3
- Hiwasaki, L. (2000). Ethnic tourism in Hokkaido and the shaping of Ainu identity. *Pacific Affairs*, 73(3), 393-411.
- Johnston, A. M. (2000). Indigenous peoples and ecotourism: Bringing indigenous knowledge and rights into the sustainability equation. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 25(2), 89-96.

- Johnston, A. M. (2006). *Is the sacred for sale? tourism and indigenous peoples*. London; UK: Earthscan.
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2005). Participative action research: Communicative action and the public sphere. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 559-603). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Kirkness, V. J., & Barnhardt, R. (1991). First nations and higher education: The four R's--respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility. *Journal of American Indian Education, 30*(3), 1-15.
- Kotler, P., Bowen, J., & Makens, J. C. (2002). *Marketing for hospitality and tourism* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kotler, P., & Rath, G. A. (1984). Design: A powerful but neglected strategic tool. *Journal of Business Strategy, 5*(2), 16-21.
- Lemelin, R. H., & Blangy, S. (2009). Introduction to the special issue on aboriginal ecotourism. *Journal of Ecotourism, 8*(2), 77-81. doi:10.1080/14724040902730581
- Li, X. R., & Petrick, J. F. (2008). Tourism marketing in an era of paradigm shift. *Journal of Travel Research, 46*(3), 235-244.
- López, G., & Palomino, B. (2008). Políticas públicas y ecoturismo en comunidades indígenas de México. *Teoría y Praxis, (5)*, 33-50.

- MacCannell, D. (1976). *The tourist: A new theory of the leisure class*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Manyara, G., & Jones, E. (2007). Community-based tourism enterprises development in Kenya: An exploration of their potential as avenues of poverty reduction. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(6), 628-644. doi:10.2167/jost723.0
- McAvoy, L. (2002). American Indians, place meanings and the old/new west. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34(4), 383-396.
- McGee, R. J. (2002). *Watching Lacandon Maya lives*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- McIntosh, A. J. (2004). Tourists' appreciation of Maori culture in New Zealand. *Tourism Management*, 25(1), 1-15. doi:10.1016/S0261-5177(03)00058-X
- McIntosh, A. J., & Ryan, C. (2007). The market perspective of indigenous tourism: Opportunities for business development. In Richard Butler, & Tom Hinch (Eds.), *Tourism and indigenous peoples* (pp. 73-83). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann. doi:10.1016/B978-0-7506-6446-2.50012-0
- Medina, L. K. (2003). Commoditizing culture: Tourism and Maya identity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(2), 353-368. doi:10.1016/S0160-7383(02)00099-3
- Medlik, S., & Middleton, V. T. (1973). Product formulation in tourism. *Tourism and marketing* (pp. 173-201). Berne: AIEST.

- Messerli, H. R. (2011). Transformation through tourism: Harnessing tourism as a development tool for improved livelihoods. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 8(3), 335-337. doi:10.1080/21568316.2011.591162
- Mignolo, W. D. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and decolonial freedom. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 26(7-8), 159-181.
- Minority Rights Group International (MGR), & Hoare, J. (Eds.). (2011). *State of the world's minorities and indigenous peoples 2011: Focus on women's rights*. London, UK: Minority Rights Group International (MRG).
- Morris, M. W., Leung, K., Ames, D., & Lickel, B. (1999). Views from inside and outside: Integrating emic and etic insights about culture and justice judgment. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4), 781-796.
- Moscardo, G. M. (2008). Community capacity building: An emerging challenge for tourism development. In G. M. Moscardo (Ed.), *Building community capacity for tourism development* (pp. 1-15). Wallingford, UK; Cambridge, Mass.: CABI.
- Moscardo, G. M., & Pearce, P. L. (1999). Understanding ethnic tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), 416-434. doi:10.1016/S0160-7383(98)00101-7
- Moscardo, G. M., Pearce, P. L., & Morrison, A. (2001). Evaluating different bases for market segmentation. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 10(1), 29-49. doi:10.1300/J073v10n01_03

- Nicholls, R. (2009). Research and indigenous participation: Critical reflexive methods. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 12(2), 117-126.
doi:10.1080/13645570902727698
- Notzke, C. (2006). *The stranger, the native and the land: Perspectives on indigenous tourism*. Concord, Ontario: Captus Press.
- Parker, B. (1993). Developing aboriginal tourism - opportunities and threats. *Tourism Management*, 14(5), 400-404.
- Pastor-Alfonso, M. J. (2012). Turismo y cambio en el entorno de los lacandones. Chiapas, México. *PASOS. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, 10(1), 99-107.
- Pastor-Alfonso, M. J., & Gómez López, D. (2010). *Impactos socioculturales en el turismo comunitario. Una visión desde los pueblos implicados (Selva Lacandona, Chiapas, México)*. Salamanca, España: Editorial Agua Clara.
- Pastor-Alfonso, M. J., Gómez López, D., & Espeso-Molinero, P. (2012). Turismo comunitario y sus consecuencias entre los lacandones de Chiapas: Organismos y sistemas de apoyo. In A. Santana, A. J. Rodríguez Darías & P. Díaz Rodríguez (Eds.), *Responsabilidad y turismo* (pp. 23-43). Tenerife: PASOS, Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural.
- Pettersson, R. (2002). Sami tourism in northern Sweden: Measuring tourists' opinions using stated preference methodology. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 3(4), 357-369.

- Pike, K. L. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- Pine II, B. J., & Gilmore, J. H. (1998). Welcome to the experience economy. *Harvard Business Review*, 76, 97-105.
- Pitchford, S. R. (2006). Identity tourism: A medium for Native American stories. *Tourism, Culture and Communication*, 6(2), 85-105.
doi:10.3727/109830406777410616
- PNUD. (2010). *Informe sobre desarrollo humano de los pueblos indígenas en México 2010: El reto de la desigualdad de oportunidades*. México: Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo.
- PNUD. (2014). *Índice de desarrollo humano municipal en México: Nueva metodología*. México: Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo.
- Posey, D. A., & Dutfield, G. (1996). *Beyond intellectual property: Toward traditional resource rights for indigenous peoples and local communities*. Ottawa, ON, Canada: International Development Research Centre.
- Pretes, M. (2002). Touring mines and mining tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(2), 439-456.
- Pritchard, A., Morgan, N., & Ateljevic, I. (2011). Hopeful tourism. A new transformative perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(3), 941-963.

- Quadri-Felitti, D., & Fiore, A. M. (2012). Experience economy constructs as a framework for understanding wine tourism. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 18(1), 3-15.
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (2008). *The SAGE handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Reygadas, L., Ramos, T., Montoya, G., Hernández, F., & Velasco, A. (2006). Estilos de manejo y gestión de proyectos ecoturísticos en la selva lacandona de Chiapas, México. In R. Guevara Ramos (Ed.), *Estudios multidisciplinarios en turismo. Vol. I* (pp. 71-102). México: Secretaria de Turismo
- Ryan, C. (2002). Tourism and cultural proximity: Example from New Zealand. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(4), 952-971. doi:10.1016/S0160-7383(02)00006-3
- Ryan, C., & Crofts, J. (1997). Carving and tourism: A Maori perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(4), 898-918. doi:10.1016/S0160-7383(97)00052-2
- Ryan, C., & Higgins, O. (2006). Experiencing cultural tourism: Visitors at the Maori arts and crafts institute, New Zealand. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44(3), 308-317. doi:10.1177/0047287505279002
- Ryan, C., & Huyton, J. (2000). Who is interested in aboriginal tourism in the Northern Territory, Australia? A cluster analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8(1), 53-88.

- Sakata, H., & Prideaux, B. (2013). An alternative approach to community-based ecotourism: A bottom-up locally initiated non-monetised project in Papua New Guinea. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(6), 880-899.
doi:10.1080/09669582.2012.756493
- Schnarch, B. (2004). Ownership, control, access, and possession (OCAP) or self-determination applied to research. *Journal of Aboriginal Health*, 1(1), 80-95.
- Simonsen, R. (2006). Joint ventures and indigenous tourism enterprises. *Tourism, Culture and Communication*, 6(2), 107-119. doi:10.3727/109830406777410607
- Sinclair, D. (2003). Developing indigenous tourism: Challenges for the Guianas. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15(3), 140-146.
- Smith, V. L. (1977). *Hosts and guests: The anthropology of tourism*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Smith, S. L. J. (1994). The tourism product. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3), 582-595.
- Sofield, T. H. B. (1991). Sustainable ethnic tourism in the south pacific: Some principles. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 2(1), 56-72.
- Sofield, T. H. B. (1993). Indigenous tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20(4), 729-750.
- Sofield, T. H. B. (2003). *Empowerment for sustainable tourism development*. Boston: Pergamon.

- Stickdorn, M. (2012). Tourism and service design thinking: Who learns from whom? *Touchpoint*, 4(1), 58-61.
- Swain, M. B. (1989). Gender roles in indigenous tourism: Kuna Mola, Kuna Yola, and cultural survival. In V. L. Smith (Ed.), *Host and guest: The anthropology of tourism* (2nd ed., pp. 83-104). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Teddle, C., & Yu, F. (2007). Mixed methods sampling a typology with examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 77-100.
- Theerapapitt, P. (2009). Pro-poor ethnic tourism in the Mekong: A study of three approaches in northern Thailand. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 14(2), 201-221. doi:10.1080/10941660902847245
- Theodossopoulos, D. (2013). Dance, visibility, and representational self-awareness in an embera community in panama. In H. Neveu Kringelbach, & J. Skinner (Eds.), *Dancing cultures: Globalization, tourism and identity in the anthropology of dance* (pp. 121-140). Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Trench, T. (2005). Representaciones y sus impactos: El caso de los lacandonos en la selva lacandona. *Liminar. Estudios Sociales y Humanísticos*, 3(2), 48-69.
- Tribe, J. (2008). Tourism: A critical business. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(3), 245-255.
- Tribe, J. (2009). *Philosophical issues in tourism*. Bristol, UK: Channel View Publications.

- Tuhiwai-Smith, L. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Zed Books.
- UNWTO, & ETC. (2011). *Handbook on tourism product development*. Madrid: UNWTO.
- Valle-García, S. (2014). Ecotourism: Sustainable indigenous policies and its effects in Mayan communities, southern Mexico. In C. A. Brebbia, S. Favro & F. D. Pineda (Eds.), *Sustainable tourism VI* (pp. 239-250). Southampton, UK: WIT Press.
- Weaver, D. B. (2010). Indigenous tourism stages and their implications for sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(1), 43-60.
doi:10.1080/09669580903072001
- Whitford, M. M. (2009). Oaxaca's indigenous Guelaguetza festival: Not all that glistens is gold. *Event Management*, 12(3-4), 143-161. doi:10.3727/152599509789659777
- Whitford, M. M., Bell, B., & Watkins, M. (2001). Indigenous tourism policy in Australia: 25 years of rhetoric and economic rationalism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 4(2-4), 151-181.
- Whitford, M. M., & Ruhanen, L. (2010). Australian indigenous tourism policy: Practical and sustainable policies? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(4), 475-496.
doi:10.1080/09669581003602325

- Whittaker, E. (1999). Indigenous tourism: Reclaiming knowledge, culture and intellectual property in Australia. In M. Robinson, & P. Boniface (Eds.), *Tourism and cultural conflicts* (pp. 33-45). Wallingford, UK: CAB International.
- Wright, S., Suchet-Pearson, S., Lloyd, K., Burarrwanga, L. L., & Burarrwanga, D. (2009). 'That means the fish are fat': Sharing experiences of animals through indigenous-owned tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 12(5-6), 505-527.
doi:10.1080/13683500903042907
- Xu, J., & Chan, A. (2010). Service experience and package tours. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 15(2), 177-194.
- Yang, L., & Wall, G. (2009). Ethnic tourism: A framework and an application. *Tourism Management*, 30(4), 559-570. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2008.09.008
- Youdelis, M. (2013). The competitive (dis)advantages of ecotourism in northern Thailand. *Geoforum*, 50, 161-171.
- Zeppel, H. (2006). *Indigenous ecotourism: Sustainable development and management*. Wallingford, UK: CABI Pub.

Table 1. Purposive sampling

Table 2. Participant units

Table 3. Model phases, activities and techniques

Figure 1. Indigenous tourism product design model

