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ABSTRACT

CULTURAL SUSTAINABILITY AND RURAL FOOD TOURISM IN TWO CANADIAN WINE REGIONS

Danielle Maria Robinson
University of Guelph, 2020

Advisor:
Dr. Wayne Caldwell

This interdisciplinary research analyses the relationships between cultural sustainability and food tourism by asking how rural tourism stakeholders understand these concepts, mobilize the interrelationships, and to what purpose. Researchers concerned with the complex, interrelated, and multi-scalar relationships between culture and rural tourism development have explored both positive and negative dimensions in diverse contexts; however, more systematic attention to the concept of cultural sustainability is needed to design supportive rural tourism policies and processes. Wine and food tourism is one of the fastest growing rural tourism niches and intersects with critical cultural sustainability issues such as local food systems, food sovereignty, and agricultural land use, therefore, it is particularly important to explore cultural sustainability in food and wine tourism environments. Comparative case studies in two Canadian wine regions, British Columbia's South Okanagan Valley and Nova Scotia's Annapolis Valley, are used to gain a better understanding of the relationships between local food cultures, rural tourism development, and sustainability in different provincial settings with a particular emphasis on the role of related public policy, planning
and governance. As this research aims to understand rural food tourism’s potential contribution to cultural sustainability, an appreciative approach was used. Secondary research, semi-structured interviews, and tourism strategic plans provide insights into how culturally sustainable food and wine tourism is conceptualized, recognized, developed, supported, and promoted in each case. Findings are discussed in relation to Soini and Dessein’s (2016) framework for culture in, for, and as sustainability. Three central recommendations are proposed: explicitly engaging with the idea and implications of local, exploring transformative potential, and future research that takes comparative, appreciative and reflective approaches.
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Appendix A  Semi-Structured Interview Questions
Chapter 1 Introduction

A short personal story introduces some of the themes addressed in this research:

There is a story in my family which has become legendary. My dad arrived in Halifax, at Pier 21 in the mid-1950s having travelled first from his small village, Poggio Picenze in the Abruzzian mountains, to Naples and then crossing the Atlantic in a journey which took about a month. Once in Halifax, my dad, his brother, and my Nonna continued their journey by train to Vancouver to reunite with my Grandpa, whom they had not seen in 4 years.

They had one large steamer case of belongings at the bottom of which prosciutto, pecorino, and other charcuterie and cheeses were carefully wrapped and hidden to avoid confiscation. These were their prize possessions. According to family lore, my Nonna put on a quite a melodramatic fainting display to avoid border inspection and managed to get the case and her sons onto the train.

It was a long, hungry journey across Canada. Speaking no English, she ordered her boys bread and a tin of sardines because they were the only things she recognized. Her sons enjoyed the Wonderbread sardine sandwiches, but when she took a bite herself, she cried, thinking, “If this is bread in Canada, I want to go home.” But, she didn’t go home. She made it to Vancouver where my Grandpa was overjoyed to be with his family again and to eat the food from home.

Growing up I ate homemade sausage, tomato sauce and gnocchi. I can so vividly recall the damp smell of the cantina lined with canning jars and curing meat. I never ate Wonderbread at my Nonna’s house, although strangely, she always served us processed Kraft cheese singles which we thought were a great treat, especially when paired with my Grandpa’s homemade wine mixed with 7Up.
Readers will likely have their own powerful food memories which touch on similar themes of cultural identity and cultural change. Food culture takes on even greater significance in an increasingly globalized, urbanized world facing a sustainability crisis. This research connects food culture and rural tourism to examine the multifaceted concept of cultural sustainability in two Canadian wine regions, the South Okanagan in British Columbia and the Annapolis Valley in Nova Scotia, with a particular emphasis on a comparative analysis of related policy, planning and governance. A better understanding of the relationships between food tourism and cultural sustainability will support the resilience of rural communities’ food cultures and capitalize on the potential of rural food tourism to contribute to cultural sustainability.

1.1 Topic and context

Cultural sustainability is increasingly recognized as a distinct aspect of sustainable development (Duxbury & Jeannotte, 2012; Hawkes, 2001; Young, 2008b); however, cultural sustainability is a problematic concept since cultural dimensions are challenging to define and measure with disparate conceptualizations of cultural sustainability reflecting the different disciplines and policy aims of individual scholars and organizations (Axelsson et al., 2013; Robinson, 1999; Soini & Dessein, 2016).
Globalization processes have resulted in an increased need to understand cultural sustainability in rural tourism contexts. The research that follows will explore how tourism stakeholders conceptualize cultural sustainability and will use food tourism to examine cultural sustainability and food sovereignty in rural settings with particular emphasis on a comparative approach to the role of related policy, planning and governance in two Canadian wine regions.

Rural tourism development expanded dramatically across numerous rural areas beginning in the 1970s (George, Mair, & Reid, 2009) as part of agricultural communities’ response to the economic, social, cultural, environmental, and political effects of globalization (George 2013; Levkoe, 2013; Wiebe, Nettie & Wipf, 2011). Tourism researchers concerned with the complex, interrelated, and multi-scalar, relationships between culture and rural tourism development have explored both positive and negative dimensions in diverse contexts (Johnson, Schnakenberg, & Perdue, 2016). Key themes range from the positive impacts of rural tourism as a form of sustainable development associated with cultural continuities like authenticity, peace, cross-cultural understanding, and cultural and economic revitalization, to negative impacts associated with cultural rupture such as, cultural conflict, cultural acculturation, cultural appropriation, loss of diversity, and loss of local control (Du Cros & McKercher, 2014; George et al., 2009).
Agricultural tourism, a commercial enterprise that generates additional income for the farm owner and is conducted for visitors to experience a working farm or other agricultural operation (McGehee, 2007), was one of the first rural tourism products. Food tourism may or may not be located on agricultural land, but always depends on agriculture; it is one of the fastest growing rural tourism niches (Croce, & Perri, 2017) and includes tourism related to wine and other beverages.

Food is one of the most significant aspects of culture (Bell & Valentine, 2013; Bourdieu, 1984; Everett, 2016, 2019; Mintz, 1996). Food sovereignty is an important consideration when joining food culture and sustainability because food sovereignty refers to the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agriculture system (La Via Campesina, 2018). Cultural sustainability is central to viable rural food tourism and to food sovereignty which relies on resilient food systems rooted in continuously adapting cultural practices of food provision and preparation.

There is little research concerning the links between food and tourism (Bessiere, 2001; Long, 2013; Sims, 2009) and between food tourism and the sustainability of the food culture on which said tourism is based. Various researchers argue that food tourism can improve sustainability (Everett, 2016, 2019a; Johnson, Schnakenberg, & Perdue, 2016; Sims, 2009). However,
tourism’s role in facilitating transformational cultural change for local and global sustainability requires further study (Coghlan & Gooch, 2011; Johnson, Schnakenberg, & Perdue, 2016; Lloyd et al., 2015; Pritchard, & Morgan, 2013; Reisinger, 2013, 2015; Senese, 2016). Of particular importance, there is limited research regarding how tourism stakeholders themselves conceptualize cultural sustainability (Calza et al., 2018). Findings can contribute to new sustainability definitions/frameworks, inform rural tourism decisions/conversations, and shape future research.

1.2 Relevance and importance

Several scholars have reviewed the interdisciplinary field of food tourism research to identify the central concepts, themes, and disciplinary approaches and recommend future research. De Jong et al. (2018) map gastronomy tourism literature from 1985-2015 utilizing a network and content analysis. They found the low keyword occurrence of “rural development” surprising given that gastronomy tourism is frequently considered a development tool. De Jong et al. also note that “sustainability” did not even rank in the final list of the 31 most frequently used keywords. Non-theoretical approaches are a weakness observed in the tourism literature more broadly. Non-theoretical approaches reveal food tourism’s potential as a visitor experience and developmental tool, but without critical perspectives food tourism research is limited to being an “applied field of inquiry driven by development, managerial, and business aims
that render limited questioning of neoliberalized narratives” (de Jong et. al., 2018, p. 143). Their main recommendations for the field of food tourism research are better interdisciplinary communication, more critical and theoretical approaches, and a greater engagement with sustainable development issues.

Ellis, Park, Kim, and Yeoman's (2018) cognitive mapping of food tourism articles between 1994–2017 revealed a transition in the literature from a management to a cultural anthropological perspective. Ellis et al. (2018) suggest that future research emphasize the “sustainable management of food cultural resources” in order to avoid the negative impacts of food tourism (p.261).

Finally, Everett (2019) builds on Ellis et al.'s (2018) review to offers insights about the potential of food tourism research to be an “illuminating conceptual vehicle which can be fostered to generate insightful understandings of the complexity and inter-connectedness of diverse culinary artefacts, identities and the experience of practiced place” (p. 3). Everett describes the evolution of the food tourism literature as moving from primarily economic considerations and positivist approaches to geographic considerations of place and space to cultural and critical analysis of identity and consumption.

There is an opportunity within the literature to make more explicit links between food tourism and sustainable development. In particular, there is a need to examine cultural aspects of sustainability with rural places. Cultural sustainability requires systematic attention in the study of rural tourism (George,
et. al., 2009; Jamal, Camargo, Sandlin, & Segrado, 2010; Koster & Lemelin, 2009). Although various researchers have explored sustainable food tourism (Bramwell & Lane, 1993; Carrigan et al., 2017; Everett, 2016; Hjalager & Johansen, 2013; Sidali et al., 2016; Sims, 2009), further research investigating food tourism’s potential to sustain place is required. De Jong et al. (2018) argue:

It is difficult to make a strong argument for the sustainability of gastronomy tourism in the absence of critical inquiry. Attending to this omission within the literature, it is not simply a matter of embracing or supporting “sustainability” terminology in the hope destinations become more sustainable; sustainability takes various forms, and these variations ought to be deconstructed. In the absence of such evaluation, the potentials of sustainability risks becoming unproductive terminology, where sustainability discourse is simply used as a way through which to gain funding and support, yet without understandings of how gastronomy tourism works as a way through which to generate place socially, culturally, environmentally, and economically (p. 144).

Soini and Dessein’s (2016) framework for cultural sustainability provides a structure for more rigorous interrogation while food sovereignty is a useful means to consider critical cultural issues within the context of food systems and rural tourism development.

An evaluation of knowledge in the field of food tourism demonstrates the need for more research on sustainable rural development, work that is interdisciplinary and rests in third-spaces and “in-betweenness” (Everett, 2019). This research moves forward with the understanding that there are mutually beneficial relationships between agriculture, tourism and food which can contribute to the sustainable development of rural places (Rinaldi, 2017). Food
production “easily bridges the gap between the three sustainability dimensions and therefore blurs any differences that might lead us to consider them as separate spheres” (Everett, 2016, p. 312). Cultural sustainability facilitates holistic and systemic approaches to “the inseparability of place and culture – to discuss sustainability in tourism destinations is to address people, place, and their cultural relationships with the biophysical world” (Jamal et al., 2010, p. 270). The intangibility of many aspects of culture and its dynamic, socially constructed nature means that careful, integrated analysis is needed to identify and address cultural sustainability (Jamal et al., 2010).

Findings can contribute to more precise definitions or robust analytical frameworks for the concepts of cultural sustainability. The findings can also be applied by rural communities concerned about supporting cultural sustainability through rural food tourism development by furthering understanding and improvement in the formal and informal mechanisms and tools by which rural communities organize themselves to achieve economic, environmental, political, and social-cultural objectives. In particular, this research can shape future collaborative research directions with rural communities.

1.3 Goal, Objectives and Research Questions

The goal of this interdisciplinary research is to investigate the relationships between cultural sustainability and rural food tourism by asking how rural tourism
stakeholders understand these concepts, mobilize the interrelationships and to what purpose. There are three specific objectives:

- To explore how rural tourism stakeholders understand and mobilize the concept of food sovereignty.
- To explore how rural tourism stakeholders understand and mobilize the concept of cultural sustainability.
- To compare the conceptualizations and mobilizations of food sovereignty and cultural sustainability in two Canadian rural tourism settings with a particular emphasis on the role of related planning, policy and governance.

These objectives are addressed by the following research questions:

1. How are the concepts of cultural sustainability and food sovereignty understood?
2. How is rural tourism used to support the sustainability of local food culture?
3. How is local food culture used in rural tourism?
4. How do rural tourism stakeholders understand and use policy to support food sovereignty and cultural sustainability?
5. How might rural tourism be used to support cultural sustainability and food sovereignty in the future?
6. How might food culture be used to support rural tourism in the future?

A comparative case study methodology was used with the primary research method being semi-structured interviews conducted in two Canadian tourism contexts: the South Okanagan in British Columbia, and the Annapolis Valley in Nova Scotia in 2018 and 2019. These regions have similar characteristics in terms of population density, distance from urban centres, and identity as a wine and agri-food tourism destination. There will be particular emphasis on a comparative approach to the role of tourism public policy, planning and governance. These are interconnected and ambiguous concepts,
but public policy can be understood broadly as “whatever governments choose to do or not do” (Dye, 1992, p. 2, as cited in Hall, 2008, p. 9), planning understood as a process of thought and action directed toward the future (Friedmann, 1987), and governance understood as the process by which authority, decision-making and accountability transpire (Tim Plumptre Institute on Governance (IOG), 2020). Using comparative cases permits an in-depth analysis of the similarities and differences in two provincial contexts. The collection and comparative analysis of case data allows for rich contextual description and potentially generalizable contributions (Bramwell et al., 2017; Reed, 2006; Yin, 2009).

This research aims to understand rural food tourism’s potential contribution to cultural sustainability; therefore, the research questions were phrased positively. Consequently, the questions for the semi-structured interviews were designed to have participants reflect upon what works. This approach borrows from appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987; Hammond, 2013; Ludema & Capperrider, 2006; Ludema et al., 2009) and is based on the position that inquiry and change occur simultaneously and that a better future is collaboratively constructed (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005).

Soini and Dessein’s (2016) conceptual framework for cultural sustainability is used as an analytical tool to explore the relationship between rural food tourism and cultural sustainability with the aim of contributing by refining and operationalising the conceptual approach and expanding the evidence base for
the role of culture in sustainable development. This research clarifies the interface, interrelationship, and overlap between culture and sustainable development in rural food tourism contexts and investigates how the three roles of culture work in practice with consideration of the political, philosophical and practical prerequisites.

1.4 Overview of the structure

This Dissertation is organized into 9 Chapters with Chapter 1 being this introduction. Chapter 2 reviews the literature, including theories of sustainable development, culture, and globalization processes as they relate to cultural sustainability in rural food tourism contexts. Chapter 3 presents the comparative case study research methodology, the methods, the rational for an appreciative approach, and limitations. Chapter 4 uses secondary research to introduce the case regions. Chapters 5 through 7 cover the research findings. Chapter 5 presents the findings related to research question one, two and three on how stakeholders understand and mobilize the concepts of cultural sustainable and food sovereignty in rural food tourism. Chapter 6 presents the findings related to research question four regarding how stakeholders view related policy. Chapter 7 presents the findings related to research question five and six on the future potential of food tourism. Chapter 8 discusses the findings and their significance in relation to the research objectives. Finally, Chapter 9 is the conclusion and includes recommendations, mobilization and future research opportunities.
Chapter 2 Literature Review

Rural food tourism creates “meeting-points” (Massey, 2005) of rural and urban, of local and global, of culture and nature, of development, change and sustainability, therefore, the study of rural tourism is an inter or trans-disciplinary meeting-point of social-science disciplines like geography, anthropology, sociology, psychology; humanities like philosophy and history; and applications like management, education and planning. Hence, the literature reviewed is wide-ranging. The literature review is organized into subsections related to central themes and moves from the more abstract and theoretical to the concrete and applied. It begins by reviewing the theories of sustainability and sustainable development. Then theories related to culture, particularly food culture, are reviewed. Culture and sustainability are subsequently brought together in the section on cultural sustainability where Soini and Dessein’s (2016) conceptual framework for understanding culture in, for and as sustainability is introduced. The next section examines globalization processes in relation to cultural sustainability. This part of the literature review marks a transition from conceptual to concrete, as the concepts are applied to rural agricultural settings. Finally, the development of rural tourism and food tourism in rural settings is reviewed.
2.1 Sustainability

Brundtland's *Our Common Future* (1987) brought the term “sustainable development,” defined as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs,” into global discourse. *Our Common Future* (1987) frames the current mainstream usage and critical response to the concept of sustainable development as an attempt to balance social, economic, and environmental spheres and intergenerational and intragenerational equity (Giddings et al., 2002; Mebratu, 1998). Aims of the social sphere include human rights, social justice, and health equity. The economic sphere concerns continued economic growth while the environmental sphere concerns the responsible use of natural resources to avoid their depletion or degradation. In this conceptualization, each sphere is distinct and humans are differentiated from nature/environment.

Over the past 30 years, conceptual and semantic debates about sustainable development have expanded, influenced by organizations with different goals and objectives, from multi-national corporations, to NGOs, to governments, to academics. The literature in this area is extensive. Medruta (1998) provides a comparative analysis of institutional, ideological and academic definitions. Lélé (1991) provides a conceptual map of the semantics of sustainable development that analyse the process and objectives of development and the literal, ecological and social connotations of sustainable. There are
further distinctions in the literature between “strong sustainability” which requires that critical natural capital be conserved, and “weak sustainability” which argues that human-made can be substituted for natural capital (Castro, 2004). Strong sustainability requires ideological and institutional changes, whereas weak sustainability emphasizing strategies like carrying capacity which imply that human intervention can control the environment.

The mainstream three pillar approach of sustainability is based on allocating scarce resources across separate spheres. Giddings et al. (2002) provide an example of the common three-ring sector view of sustainable development in their critique to illustrate its limitations. Often environment is secondary to the primary objective of economic growth. But even if the environmental sphere were considered equally with the economic sphere, the problem is not just the allocation of resources, it is the concept compartmentalization that allocating itself implies.

Considering the economy as one of the pillars to sustain, is problematic given that the economy does not materially exist the way humans and the environment do. Even alternative understandings of sustainable development do not necessarily avoid compartmentalization. Reed’s (2002) proposed solutions include “trade-offs” and “on the one hand and on the other hand” examples (p. 183). Metaphorically framing the options as “on the one hand” and “on the other hand” reveals the compartmentalized worldview. Lele (1991) also identifies the
“trade-offs language” (1991, p. 615). When applied to sustainable development, the separation of the environment, the society, and the economy into different spheres leads to a “narrow, techno-scientific” approach (Giddings, et al, 2002 p. 188). Compartmentalized concepts of the world cannot solve complex problems, like sustainable development.

The three pillars approach to sustainable development suggest that existing economic relationships can cope with environmental issues. In other words, no cultural change required. However, other scholars argue that truly sustainable development requires cultural change. Jackson (2003) argues that “a cultural transition towards sustainable development might proceed, indeed might require us to proceed, from a different set of ideas, a different world-view, involving a new cosmology and a different metaphor” (p. 312). This necessitates both an alternative understanding of development and an understanding of the universe as integrated systems that interact in multi-dimensional ways.

In the modern context, development is strongly connected to imperialism (Said & Barsamian, 2003) and with constant pressure to “continue growing in economic output, in population, in prestige, in strength, in stature, in complexity” (O'Sullivan, 1999, p. 107) of which the obsession with the gross index of GNP (gross national product) is a persistent example. However, economic growth is only one aspect of development. A ‘whole system redesign’ perspective (Sterling, 2014) is increasingly supported within political ecology and ecological
economics; emerging models and cases are based on dynamic-equilibriums and development measured by the maximization of meaning rather than on profit maximization and continuous growth (Wals & Corcoran, 2012). Development occurs in social, cultural, environmental and economic terms and can be deliberate, such as the process and results from policies or programs, or it can be spontaneous. Although development happens as an individual and societal process, generally the contemporary focus has been on societal level development. Individual interior processes like spiritual development are not part of the mainstream development discourse, although Horlings (2016b) argues that inner dimensions of sustainability are critical. Well-being, defined as happiness, harmony, identity, fulfillment, self-respect, self-realization, community, transcendence, enlightenment, are the ultimate ends for sustainable development as described by Daly (1973) and Meadows (1998). Development, in its most integrated sense is central to the human desire for growth (O’Sullivan, 1999; Wilber, 2000).

Sustainable development fails in theory and practice without a systems approach that reflects reality (Giddings et al., 2002; Meadows et al., 1998; Meadows, 2008; Sneddon, Howarth, & Norgaard, 2006). A systems approach has the potential to provide alternatives to the scarcity worldview, and to the artificial separation of humans and nature which is reinforced by disciplinary approaches (Redclift, 2005). In addition, systems thinking would facilitate appropriately valuing the economy as a human/environment management activity.
rather than a pillar to sustain. Economy does not need to be considered a pillar to sustain because the economy's purpose is to sustain humans and the environment; its value is instrumental not intrinsic. Like corporations and nations, the economy exists only within our collective imagination, so it is reasonable to wonder as Harari (2015) does "why we find ourselves sacrificing our lives" to these social constructions (p. 206). Furthermore, a shift to systems thinking would lessen the theoretical justification for trade-offs between pillars such as between environmental degradation and GDP (Giddings et al., 2002).

Raworth’s (2017) conceptualization of doughnut economics shown in Figure 2.1 reflects a contemporary systems approach to sustainability.

![Figure 1.1 Sustainability as Doughnut](Raworth, 2017)
Raworth (2017) uses Rockstrom et. al.’s (2009) nine planetary boundaries as the environmental ceiling in the spirit of the seminal *Limits to Growth* (1972) which emphasized the ecological limits to growth while the 2015 United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) serve as the foundational minimum social requirements. The environmentally safe and socially just space lies between that social foundation and environmental ceiling. Raworth (2017) attributes the doughnut’s traction in diverse settings to the fact that it brings social and environmental concerns together in one powerful image. The doughnut offers a vision for an equitable and sustainable future (the ends), and opens space for discussion about the means to achieve that end. Other contemporary definitions of sustainability like Holden, Linnerud, & Banister's (2017) definition of sustainability as the state of “satisfying human needs, ensuring social equity, and respecting environmental limits” (p. 213) are made visible in the doughnut model.

Critically, Raworth decouples growth and prosperity by championing an agnostic approach to economic growth which recognizes the weak connection between economic growth and shared prosperity. Raworth’s description of the seven ways of thinking that are the heart of doughnut economics are essentially a description of the sustainable culture. These are “change the goal, see the big picture, get savvy with systems, design to distribute, create to regenerate, and be agnostic about growth” (p. 25). The emergence of sustainable development demonstrates an emerging awareness that modern approaches to development...
were failing to meet human needs and jeopardizing future generations’ ability to develop in a holistic way.

Contemporary conceptualizations of sustainability like Raworth’s (2017) represent different sustainability ‘cultures’ than the mainstream 3 pillars conceptualizations, but may not be as different from those presented by Brundtland in the 1980s upon closer examination. Hristova (2015) provides a useful re-contextualization of the vision for sustainable development presented in the *Our Common Future* (1989) concluding that “the report marked the cultural turn to a new developmental path” (as cited in Dessein, Soini, Fairclough, & Horlings, 2015, p. 23). Although culture is not explicitly named, the need for cultural change is clear. *Our Common Future* (1987) is labelled ‘mainstream’ but the report actually calls for a reconsideration of the concept of development and growth:

> We came to see that a new development path was required, one that sustained human progress not just in a few pieces for a few years, but for the entire planet into the distant future. Thus ‘sustainable development’ becomes a goal not just for the ‘developing’ nations, but for industrial ones as well. This inequality is the planet’s main ‘environmental' problem; it is also its main ‘development' problem” (Chairman’s Forward).

Sustainable development involves more than growth. It requires a change in the content of growth, to make it less material- and energy-intensive and more equitable in its impact. These changes are required in all countries as part of a package of measures to maintain the stock of ecological capital, to improve the distribution of income, and to reduce the degree of vulnerability to economic crises (2-35).
Our Common Future acknowledges that irrespective of economic justification, there are also moral, ethical, cultural, aesthetic, and purely scientific reasons for conserving diverse species. Consumerism is questioned, and the beginning of a systems understanding is clear in the recommendation that environmental issues be integrated with economic, trade, energy, and agricultural considerations, yet these aspects tend to be disregarded in the academic and policy discourse on sustainable development. Perhaps this is because as Healey (2011) suggests we are “more influenced by the intellectual climate of our times than we may like to think”, and “screen out or actively dismiss insights and arguments which reach towards a different way of thinking” (p. xi). Revisiting the origins of the contemporary conversation about sustainable development reveals culture and cultural change as the very heart of the struggle for sustainable development.

2.2 Culture

Culture is a contested concept (Swanson & DeVereaux, 2017); however, there are three meanings of culture prevalent in contemporary research and practice: culture as (1) a general process of intellectual, spiritual or aesthetic development; (2) a particular way of life, whether of a people, a period, a group, or humanity in general; and (3) works and intellectual artistic activity (Williams, 1985, 2016). The main cultural concerns of this research, food culture and
culture in tourism planning, policy and governance, predominately reflect the second meaning of culture as a way of life, but the first and third meanings are also reflected. Furthermore, the different meanings of culture are considered relationally. Culture is regarded in this research as cognitively and morally relevant, fragmented, and interconnected to complex global and local historical processes (Marcus, 2008).

2.2.1 Food culture

Food cultures reflect societies’ social and economic structures and have a tangible and intangible relationship with human life in specific places (Everett, 2016, 2019). Culture affects how food is produced, distributed, prepared and consumed and the meaning created and expressed through these activities. For example, cultural differences related to dimensions like centralization/decentralization and specialization/diversity distinguish the industrial and alternative paradigms of agriculture (Beus & Dunlap, 1990; Sumner et al., 2011). Food is deeply connected to national, regional and personal identity.

As one of the most significant aspects of culture, food has been explored using geographic, sociological and anthropological approaches. The connection between food and identity is analysed by Mintz (1996) who described eating particular foods as a way of making a cultural statement about personal identity. Howes (2002) called food a ‘cultural artifact’ which was used to forge a personal identity and to experience the ‘other.’ As a structural anthropologist, Levi-Strauss
presented a dualistic view of food where nature/raw symbolized uncivilized and culture/cooked symbolized civilized (Lévi-Strauss, 2012). However, this nature/culture dichotomy is challenged by cultural activities which have developed in reaction to over-cultured, processed foodstuffs, such as sourcing fresh produce at a local farmers’ market or u-pick. These more ‘natural’ activities seem to offer something more ‘civilized’ which is attractive to higher status consumers (Everett, 2016).

Bourdieu (1984) illustrated how food culture, such as the type of food and cultural practices related to preparation and consumption such as formal place settings and exotic ingredients, could act as cultural capital that enabled an individual to establish and maintain social class. Bell and Valentine (2013) use a cultural geographic approach to explore the relationships between food, ‘sense of place’ and personal and regional identity which updates Bourdieu’s food as cultural capital for the more fragmented postmodern context.

The work of anthropologist Mary Douglas (1966) is also important within the field because of her attention to meaning making through everyday activities like food preparation and her inclusion of alcohol “consumption as a medium for constructing social worlds and as a product used to perform the task of ritual, all with an economic consequence to society” (Hammer, 2016, p. 38). De Garine (2001) built on Douglas’ work, emphasizing that drinking behaviors are cultural status markers (Hammer, 2016).
The current world’s pervasive consumerism means purchasing consumer goods and services is a main way that people express and form their identities (Fischler, 2011; Urry & Larsen, 2011; Yeoman & McMahon-Beatte, 2016). The rise of “foodie culture” which prioritizes regional food cultures and specific locations (Richards, 2015) and the preoccupation with local evident in such things as the dramatic growth of farmers’ markets and food tourism (Bennett et al., 2014; Elton, 2010) are ways food is a lifestyle differentiator. Even the “foodie backlash” (Poole, 2012) which criticizes foodie culture for being pretentious demonstrates how powerfully food is a cultural symbol.

2.2.2 Culture in policy, planning and governance

There is growing recognition of culture’s importance in policy, planning and practice (Foster, 2018; Young, 2008) which have implications for how tourism development is understood as stakeholders engage with questions like: “How may culture be conceptually defined and made graspable for the planner given culture’s many forms and emergent realities?” and “How is it possible to develop a workable system to increase the authentic integration of culture in planning able to produce beneficial outcomes regardless of the value conflicts of a postmodern world of cultural diversity?” (Young, p. 5).

There are also cultural research streams within the business field relevant to tourism policy, planning and governance. For example, Hofstede (1983) identified cultural traits that could be measured across businesses internationally,
and Deal and Kennedy (1982) and Kotter (2008) present research evidence for culture’s central role in organizational success. Throsby’s (1999) conceptualization of cultural capital as an asset which provides both cultural and economic benefits has also been influential.

One of the key reasons to study organizational culture is the challenge of strategic change which is significant when considering the facets of cultural sustainability discussed in the next section. Schein (1990) defines organizational culture as “a pattern of shared basic assumptions that was shared by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration” (p.17). Organizational culture may hinder strategic change and innovation because cultures are predisposed to reproduce themselves. Bourdieu’s thinking on forms of capital is especially relevant to cultural sustainability (Erickson, & Murphy, 2013). Concepts like Boschma and Martin’s (2010) path dependency are also applicable to cultural sustainability and cultural change.

2.3 Cultural Sustainability

Culture was not one of the three original dimensions of sustainability because the “language of the modern period relegated culture to a sector of social life, rather than recognizing the cultural embedding of all social life” (Healey, 1997, p. 65, as cited in Young, 2008, p. 8). However, arguments have been made for culture’s inclusion as a distinct and separate dimension of
Cultural heritage refers to “the record of a people manifest in the tangible (cultural relics, handicrafts, monuments, architecture and sites) and intangible (literature, theatre, music, customs, history) aspects of their culture” (UNWTO, 2012, annex v). Concerns about the erosion of tangible cultural heritage date to the late nineteenth century/early twentieth century, particularly related to concerns about the destruction of cultural treasures during World War One (Brown, 2005). The Hague Convention (1954) contributed to the understanding that cultural losses transcended local or national boundaries since “damage to cultural property belonging to any people whatsoever means damage to the cultural heritage of all mankind, since each people makes its contribution to the culture of the world” (Brown, 2005, p.41). The scope of cultural heritage expanded beyond the focus on monuments and portable art which had been the previous focus (Brown, 2005). A recognition of the value of oral traditions and events emerged in the 1970s. Cominelli and Greffe (2012) elaborate by explaining that intangible cultural heritage involves the continually evolving “practices, representations, expressions, knowledge and skills that belong to communities and are held by specific members (p. 245). It is as if culture could not take its rightful place in the sustainable development discourse until the conceptual understanding of “culture” evolved. The challenge is determining how
meanings of tangible and intangible culture manifest and interact for sustainability in a globalizing world.

The concept of cultural sustainability has emerged slowly in both policy and academic discourse over the past 30 years. In 1982, the World Conference on Cultural Policies, concluded with a declaration stressing for the first-time culture’s importance for sustainable development (Auclair, 2014). Culture was given an anthropological definition, broader than earlier definitions which understood culture solely as a capital, limited to arts and heritage. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) established culture for development in 1994. This was followed by UNESCO’s (1996) World Commission report, Our Creative Diversity, emphasized preserving cultural diversity. Despite these recommendations, sustainable development policies rarely integrated cultural sustainability until the 2000s.

Culture is now a central to much development thinking (Young, 2008), at least at the international policy level. The international dialogue on culture-led sustainability policies centres on three strategies. The first uses culture to revitalize social engagement in public life and common identity. The second uses culture as a medium to attract tourists and entrepreneurs. The third targets growth in cultural production and sales (Lysgård, 2016). The field of cultural heritage management establishes and implements “codes and charters on conservation principles, in order to preserve cultural heritage assets for present
and future generations” (UNWTO, 2012, annex v). The action plan from the Johannesburg Summit (2002) expressed the obligation to protect cultural and biodiversity. UNESCO’s Declaration on Cultural Diversity (2001) preceded a convention on the protection and promotion of cultural diversity in 2005. The UNESCO Convention on the Rights of Indigenous People (2007) further stressed the concept of cultural rights (Auclair, 2014). Even more recently, UNESCO has implemented various international projects related to The Power of Culture for Development (2014), but an inclusive understanding of culture, and knowledge transfer between sectors continues to be problematic. For example, culture is a UNESCO mandate, but not part of the mandate for the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). There are various contentious issues with the field of cultural sustainability, such as those related to collective intellectual property rights, intangible culture and Indigenous culture (Brown, 2005). The emergence of cultural considerations as foundational to sustainable development in international discussions is summarized in Table 2.1.
Table 2.1 *International History of Culture and Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>World Conference on cultural Policies in Mexico – acknowledged the indivisibility of culture and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-1989</td>
<td>UNESCO launched the World Decade on Culture and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>UNDP launched the Human Development Report which emphasized developed as the enlargement of choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-1996</td>
<td>UN World Commission on Culture and Development prepared a report which expanded the view of cultural diversity to recognize all forms of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>difference that exclude people from development processes and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development in Stockholm – emphasized the value of cultural pluralism and creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>UNESCO – World Bank Intergovernmental Conference “Culture Counts: Financing Resources and the Economics of culture in Sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development” acknowledged the importance of cultural capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>UNESCO’s Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity – recognized culture and cultural diversity as an ethical imperative vital to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>achieving economic and social development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2004</td>
<td>United Cities and Local Governments Agenda 21 (Culture 21) program for cultural governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>UNESCO’s Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions – acknowledged culture’s contribution to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sustainable development and put culture and development together at its core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from UNESCO, 2014 p. 10)
Cultural considerations are also emerging in national discourse although Canada has not signed the UNESCO Convention on the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (Catherwood & Pollak, 2019). At regional and municipal levels, culture is offered, along with social, economic and environmental factors, as one of the four lenses through which to make development decisions that support community quality of life (Caldwell, 2013). The “cultural aspects of community life” are part of the definition of sustainability at the heart of the guiding principles for rural community economic development (Caldwell, 2013, p. 9). The popularity of culture-led sustainable development strategies such as tourism, cultural industries, and cultural heritage grew along with the recognition of culture as an aspect of sustainability. In addition, concepts and theories that integrate human and ecological systems more holistically, such as landscape research, bio-cultural diversity, actor-network theory, capability frameworks have significant cultural dimensions (Dessein et al., 2015). Nassauer’s (1997; 2004) work on cultural sustainability in the context of wetland conservation and Zhang’s (2016) work on culturally sustainable housing demonstrate how cultural sustainability is beginning to be applied across sectors as diverse as architecture and ecology. There are recent efforts to approach cultural sustainability more rigorously, such as Axelsson et al. (2013) research to support planning processes by establishing social and cultural sustainability criteria, indicators, and verifier variables in Sweden.
Joining the independently complex concepts of culture and sustainable development into the concept of cultural sustainability has created ideological and communication challenges as terms are constructed and re-constructed differently depending on context. The need to strengthen cultural sustainability’s conceptual framework was identified. COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology Action) initiated a four year (2011-2015), multi-disciplinary research project involving more than 100 researchers from 25 EU countries along with participants from Israel, New Zealand and Australia to investigate cultural sustainability. The research project’s objectives were to develop a conceptual framework, propose policies and politics to operationalize the new perspectives, consider issues of indicators and assessments of culture and sustainability, and to propose future research areas.

Soini and Birkeland (2014) analysed how the concept of cultural sustainability has been used in the academic literature by reviewing 86 peer-reviewed pieces published between 1997-2011 as part of the COST cultural sustainability project. Their research revealed that the concept was used in seven ways, which they refer to as interconnected and intersecting “storylines”: heritage, vitality, economic viability, diversity, locality, eco-cultural resilience, and eco-cultural civilization. These storylines reflected four political/ideological perspectives: conservative, neoliberal, communitarian and environmentalist. Their work is significant because it shows “culture is becoming a vehicle to
discuss, interpret, and relate to change in the meaning and role of sustainable development” (p. 221).

Soini and Dessein (2016) built on the earlier analysis of the scientific discourse on cultural sustainability, arguing that “it is important and necessary to explicitly integrate culture in sustainability discourse, as achieving sustainability goals essentially depends on human accounts, actions, and behavior which are, in turn, culturally embedded” (p. 1). They proposed culture in, for and as sustainability as a three-part, interdisciplinary conceptual framework based on the results from the COST research initiative. The following sections give descriptions of each representation accompanied by a visual model to illustrate the key points concerning how culture is understood and applied within that representation. How culture is defined, the value of culture, and the relationships between culture and development, society and nature differ in each conceptualization, as do the policy sectors, modes of governance and approaches to research considered most relevant.

2.3.1 Culture in sustainability

In this representation, tangible and intangible culture are treated as if it they have an independent role in sustainability which complements society. Essentially, culture becomes the fourth pillar of sustainability, parallel to environmental, social, and economic sustainability. Development processes
recognize the intrinsic value of culture and cultural diversity. Culture in sustainability is characterized by the conservation and preservation of material and immaterial culture and cultural diversity. This conceptualization reflects Williams’ (1985, 2016) third meaning of culture as works and intellectual artistic activity. Soini and Dessein explain that they begin with the pillar approach as a basis for analysis despite its limitations because it is a commonly known and popular approach to sustainability in research and policy work. Culture’s relationship to nature and connection to wider societal issues is obscured by culture in sustainability’s emphasis on culture as a separate policy and activity sphere. Sustainability requires a more holistic solution. Figure 2.2 below shows the visual model of culture as one of the pillars of sustainability and summarizes the characteristics of the culture in sustainability conceptualization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First: Culture in Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition of culture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture as capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture and development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture as an achievement in development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of culture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture and society</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complementing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture and nature</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human perspective on nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy sectors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modes of Governance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hierarchical governance, 1st order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mono/multidisciplinary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.2 Culture in Sustainability (Soini & Dessein, 2016)
2.3.2 Culture for sustainability

The culture for sustainability representation moves from culture as a concept with intrinsic value to a culture as a concept with instrumental value and therefore, an affording role since “culture affords sustainable society to keep running and evolve” (p. 6). In this sense, culture for sustainability mobilizes culture in sustainability; instead of culture being a distinct pillar of sustainability, tangible and intangible culture become a means to achieve community sustainability through development, and culture becomes a mediating lens through which to conceptualize and shape development processes, so that the process and objectives are contextual to the community culture. This conceptualization reflects Williams’ (1985, 2016) second meaning of culture as a particular way of life. Interestingly, Soini and Dessein (2016) give the tourism example of a heritage site to illustrate how the intrinsic and instrumental values of culture are interconnected. A heritage site has intrinsic historical and aesthetic value while simultaneously having instrumental value by generating tourism revenue. Figure 2.3 shows the visual model of culture as a means to economic, environmental and social sustainability and summarizes the characteristics of the culture for sustainability conceptualization.
2.3.3 Culture as sustainability

The final representation of culture, culture as sustainability, involves a transformational change. Therefore, “culture can be considered not only a structural component, but as a necessary agency in the transformation towards a more sustainable society” (p. 6). Sustainability is no longer seen as an option; rather sustainability becomes the shared cultural value in a culturally-embedded development paradigm that is held by policy-makers, citizens, businesses and public institutions. This conceptualization reflects Williams’ (1985, 2016) first meaning of culture as a process of intellectual, spiritual or aesthetic development. Culture as sustainability requires a conceptualization of social, economic, environmental and cultural spheres as part of a whole system. Culture
as sustainability “becomes an overarching dimension of sustainability” which encompasses the first two representations (Soini & Dessein, 2016, p. 3). Figure 2.4 shows the visual model of culture integrating the social, economic and environmental spheres and summarizes the characteristics of the culture as sustainability conceptualization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third: Culture as Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition of culture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture and development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of culture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture and society</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture and nature</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy sectors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modes of Governance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research approach</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.4 Culture as Sustainability** (Soini & Dessein, 2016)

There are interconnections and overlaps between the different conceptualizations; however, Soini and Dessein’s framework for conceptualizing cultural sustainability provides a structure to understand, organize, and act based on how concepts of culture, sustainability, and development are generally understood within each conceptualization. The proposed framework for analysing the three roles of cultural *in, for* and *as* sustainability is meant to serve
as a guide for research and policy activity. In particular the way the framework clarifies the linkages between culture and sustainability might facilitate the development of indicators and the collection of suitable quantitative and qualitative data regarding the relationships between culture and sustainability. The COST project concludes with the caveat that while culture in, for, and as sustainability should be considered as an independent research field, it should also be integrative and meditative across disciplines, temporal and spatial scales (Dessein et al., 2015). Table 2.2 summaries the characteristics of each conceptualization of cultural sustainability. In response to the “considerable confusion surrounding what is to be sustained” (p. 214) that Redclift (2005) observes, perhaps culture in for and as sustainability is a possible framework to explore differences.
Table 2.2 Cultural Sustainability Characteristics by Conceptualization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Culture in Sustainability</th>
<th>Culture for Sustainability</th>
<th>Cultural as Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition of culture</td>
<td>culture as capital</td>
<td>culture as a way of life</td>
<td>culture as a semiosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and development</td>
<td>culture as an achievement in development</td>
<td>culture as a resource and condition for development</td>
<td>development as a cultural process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of culture</td>
<td>intrinsic</td>
<td>instrumental and intrinsic</td>
<td>embedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and society</td>
<td>complementing</td>
<td>affording</td>
<td>transforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and nature</td>
<td>human perspective on nature</td>
<td>interaction of culture and nature</td>
<td>nature constituent of culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy sectors</td>
<td>cultural policies</td>
<td>all policies</td>
<td>new policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modes of Governance</td>
<td>hierarchical governance, 1st order</td>
<td>co-governance, 2nd order</td>
<td>self-governance, meta-governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research approach</td>
<td>mainly mono/multidisciplinary</td>
<td>mainly multi- and interdisciplinary</td>
<td>mainly inter-and transdisciplinary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Soini & Dessein, 2016)

2.4 Globalization processes and cultural change

Globalization has significantly impacted rural areas. The term globalization exploded in academic and politic debate in the 1990s and is the result of advances in communications systems and the social and political impacts of new technology since the 1960s (Giddens, 2000). It commonly refers to the
increased movement of ideas, people, goods and capital because of increased economic integration, international trade, and investment (Horlings, 2016a; UNWTO, 2012). Globalization is economic and cultural, political, and technological (Giddens, 2002). Globalization is also ecological, as environmental problems like global warming make obvious.

Globalization has increased inequalities within and between societies (O'Sullivan, 1999; Piketty, 2015; Sneddon, Howarth, & Norgaard, 2006). Global economic and cultural processes have spatially differentiated effects which result in spatially dispersed issues like resource depletion and economic inequalities being particularly acute in rural areas (Horlings, 2016). Rural areas have experienced “declining populations, the weakening of traditional livelihoods, and the introduction of new livelihoods challenge the social and cultural structures and dynamics of rural areas” (Kivitalo et al., 2015, p. 94). Globalization has altered local identities, ways of life and social structures in complex ways (Prince, 2016). Robertson and Lechner (1985) explain that the ‘periphery’ suffers, “both by being reduced to mere cogs in the machine and by objective domination from the core” (p. 112).

Though diverse, the critics of globalization shares a common cynicism about market-driven culture that is influenced by Marxian economics and continental philosophers such as, Bourdieu, Gramsci and Habermas (Cowen, 2002). There is a general sense that globalization threatens “a community’s
sense of its own authenticity” (Brown, 2005, p. 43). Globalization forces are often considered hegemonic because globalization processes disconnect places of production and consumption, and commodify land, landscapes, and culture resulting in cultural uniformity. This process results in what is described by some scholars as ‘erasure of place’, ‘non-places’, or ‘place-lessness’ (Horlings, 2016, p. 32). Common tenants of the critique are “that economic globalization under corporate capitalism is, potentially economically devastating, culturally homogenizing, and ecologically destructive to local communities” (Gruenewald & Smith, 2014, xiii). However, the consequences of globalization are more nuanced than they are sometime presented. The argument that globalization destroys cultural diversity rests on a collectivist conceptualization of diversity measured by differentiation over geographic space. When diversity is considered individually, globalization may in fact increase individual choice and improve cultural diversity (Cowen, 2002). It is also important to distinguish between operative (access to) diversity and objective (existence of) diversity (Cowen, 2002).

Globalization/modernity has increased operative cultural diversity while it reduces objective cultural diversity. Cowen (2002) argues that poorer societies, and this could be applied also to rural societies, should not be required to serve as diversity slaves. He argues that when trade increases choice in a poorer society, but decreases choice in a developed society, the poorer country’s gain in choice is more important than the developed country’s loss. To illustrate, Cowen gives the example of bringing a Walmart to Papua New Guinea. He argues that
move would increase diversity for the local community as they have more to choose from in employment and purchasing, but may give the collector of traditional New Guinea craft less diversity of choice if traditional craft is no longer pursued given the other choices available to the local people. The tension is whether the freedom to participate in marketplace exchange conflicts with other freedoms, “such as an individual’s ability to choose or maintain a particular cultural identity” (Cowen, 2002, p. 4). Cowen contends that “many commentators are not, in reality, strongly attached to cultural diversity as a value, whether it be diversity within or across societies. Rather they favour designated manifestations of diversity determined by their preferences” (Cowen, 2002, p. 132). What kind of cultural diversity matters, collectively and individually, and why have become critical questions.

The relationship between global and local forces are also nuanced since “globalization cannot be reduced to the subordination of the local by global forces; nor the power of the global to domination” (Woods, 2007, p. 502). Rather, globalization reshapes places through politics and processes. Colonial regimes have not eradicated non-Western civilizations, although the situation is often present in that manner (Erickson & Murphy, 2013). The tensions have increased with contemporary forms of globalization, but cross-cultural contact and cultural change are the historical norm.
Appadurai (1990) labels the tension between “cultural homogenization and cultural heterogenization” as the primary problem in globalized interactions (p. 556). While globalization in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries is unique in speed and scope, cross-culture contact has long historical roots worth examining to provide insights into processes of cultural change. Appadurai (1990) and Trouillot (2004) qualify their discussion of globalization by acknowledging that globalization exemplified by trade, warfare and exploration has existed for centuries, particularly since the sixteenth century. Complications of time, distance and technology did limit earlier cultural transactions, but there are historical examples within and between continents of long-term cultural interaction with a variety of results from assimilation to resistance (Diamond, 2005). The hundreds of now extinct Indigenous languages of South-east Asia and the Khoisan population on the Cape of Good Hope are two examples Diamond shares. Cowen (2002) provides further evidence of the fundamentally multi-cultural foundations of historical civilizations. For example, Europe’s emergence from the dark ages was the result of a process of reglobalization, as contacts with Asian and Middle Eastern worlds were reestablished. Cowen (2002) argues that cultural arts labelled “Indigenous” are actually hybrids that incorporate global influences and technology: Inuit carving, and printmaking date from the mid-twentieth century, Navajo weaving began using European dyes in 1800, South African Ndebele art use post-contact beads, Zairean popular music is rooted in the culturally diverse work camps of the 1920s. Levi-Strauss’ (1985) mythological
analysis of Bella Bella and Kwakiutl Indigenous groups in British Columbia is another example that demonstrates how culture is borrowed and adapted. Trouillot (2004) argues that the prevailing narratives of globalization are a “massive silencing of the past on a world scale, the systematic erasure of continuous and deep-felt encounters that have marked human history throughout the globe” (p. 34).

Revisiting how cultural change is understood within the different historical conceptualizations of culture has significant implications on interpretations of globalization’s cultural effects. The idea of cultural difference and “other” has been integral to modernization and globalization (Said & Barsamian, 2003). The ideology and programs of modernization in the second half of the twentieth century implied that cultural variation was undesirable, and that traditional cultures were inferior. Robertson and Lechner (1985) explain that the analysis of sociocultural change which continued through the 1960s was grounded in an understanding of sequential cultural change from primitive/traditional to developing to developed societies. Therefore, modernization was generally equated with Westernization (Boskovic & Eriksen, 2008). Said’s (1979) work captures the distress that the “other” can never be known since what we might consider traditional culture is actually a reaction to Western impacts (Ortner, 1984). There is an implicit assumption that culture maintains the status quo unless outside influences force it to adapt.
Political economy, Marxism, feminism, post-colonialism, and postmodernism, share a concern for processes of cultural change and the interrelationship between culture and power (Erickson & Murphy, 2013). Gramsci’s (1971) concept of hegemony shows how culture is the site of political struggle and central to exploring the interrelationship between culture and power as it relates to exploring how certain perspectives dominate over others (Halfacree, 2007). Historically, hegemony was expressed in civilizing missions, but in the present environment takes different forms with examples ranging from English language dominance in peer-reviewed publications to multi-national corporations’ all-encompassing physical and digital presence (Venn, 2006). Culture is increasingly understood according to its multiplicity and capacity for change. Indigenous, non-Western, native, nativist, anthropologies of the South and world anthropologies critique dominant cultural change discourses (Boskovic & Eriksen, 2008).

Culture is now often understood according to its capacity for change. For example, Lury, Parisi and Terranova (2012) use the field of topology to argue that culture is a “field of connectedness” rather than a “structure based on essential properties, such as archetypes, values, norms, or regional location” (p. 5). Resilience refers to the capacity to incorporate change to support continued existence (Holling, 1989). A culture’s sustainability depends on this capacity. Contemporary conceptions of resilience stress adaptation, learning and transformation processes rather than ‘bouncing-back’ to how things were.
The concept of resilience is central to cultural sustainability when it is approached with a systems’ view that recognizes the interdependence between social systems and natural systems, and their co-evolution (Berkes et al., 2003). The central questions of cultural change and cultural sustainability increasingly relate to how abilities to change are revealed and mobilized, and to what affects.

2.5 Farms and food

Globalization has dramatically altered agriculture. Canadian rural agricultural communities face numerous distinct challenges such as declining farm incomes, higher food costs, fewer family owned farms and depopulation (George 2013; Levkoe, 2013; Wiebe, Nettie & Wipf, 2011). These challenges are related to the extensive changes in Canadian agriculture over the past 50 years (Connell, et al., 2013). Mariola (2005) described this as a transition from a farming lifestyle based on culture to a business orientation involving mechanical and chemical inputs and commodity outputs. Termed “productivist agriculture,” this orientation sought to maximize farm productivity through intensification, concentration, and specialisation. Incentives and supports such as subsidies, protective tariffs, and tax relief that were intended to alleviate financial pressures on farmers and reduce economic risk have primarily benefited larger producers (Troughton, 2005). The prevalent public policy framework since the 1980s has
been a neoliberal one that favours market-based approaches over government involvement (Sullivan, Ryser, & Halseth, 2014).

These shifts in agricultural practices and policy have increased competition, decreased commodity prices, and necessitated the further industrialization of agricultural activities to achieve greater economies of scale which further supports agri-food sector concentration (Food Secure Canada, 2015a; Troughton, 2005; Woods, 2007). This has placed an economic strain on small family farm enterprises which have been the foundation of the rural economy in many Canadian regions (George, 2013; Scrinis, 2016). While yields and gross farm revenue increased over the past three decades, farmers’ share of that value has decreased significantly (Qualman, 2011) and farmers are increasingly pressured to enlarge and corporatize and the number of farms has decreased (Statistics Canada, 2017a).

High volume, low-priced commodities like canola, wheat and soybeans and foods with high costs, like beef and seafood, are exported, while higher value products like wine, baked goods and produce are imported. As a result, Canada’s food system loses diversity, becomes more export dependent, and loses lucrative opportunities to contribute value-added activities (National Farmers Union [NFU], 2017). In addition, the pressure to maximize production under this model creates dependencies on technology and chemicals which
degrade the natural environment (Qualman, 2011) and make the food system more vulnerable to external pressures.

A variety of popular social movements that aim to re-localize agriculture have emerged (Andrews, 2008; Everett, 2016; Feagan, 2007; Mair et al., 2008); however, not all of these popular movements engage with issues like class and race. For example, Alkon (2012) critiques the popular food movement because critical elements such as migrant workers’ rights and Indigenous food sovereignty are omitted. In Alkon’s (2012) examination of farmers’ markets in North Berkeley and West Oakland, California she argues that we cannot “think about the food system without also thinking about social equity. Race and class have much to do with the ways that food systems operate, producing uneven access to food, health, and economic opportunities” (p. 7). Local is often connected to the ability to ‘taste place.’ Using taste to differentiate places depends on possession of the cultural capital to differentiate between ‘good local food’ from ‘bad global food’ (de Jong & Varley, 2017). Justice issues such as improved wage and working conditions have been perceived as threats to capitalism, therefore, it may not be surprising that justice issues are marginalized within the business community (Alkon, 2012).

The food sovereignty movement which emerged as part of a “response to the failure of current approaches to alleviate the linked challenges of global food insecurity and environmental degradation” (Wittman, 2015, p. 174) is a useful
way to examine these challenges. Food sovereignty refers to “the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agriculture system” (La Via Campesina, 2007, para. 3). Food sovereignty has its roots in the international peasants’ movement, La Via Campesina, that was founded in 1993 (La Via Campesina, 2018). The 6 key principles that underline much of the recent literature on food sovereignty: food for people, value for food providers, local food systems, local decision-making, knowledge and skill-building and work with nature (Chaifetz & Jagger, 2014) are outlined in Table 2.3.

### Table 2.3 Principles of Food Sovereignty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food for people</td>
<td>The right to sufficient, healthy, and culturally appropriate food for all people, including those who are hungry, under occupation, and marginalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for and to food providers</td>
<td>Support contributions and respects rights of all the people who cultivate, grow, harvest, and process food. Rejects policies that undervalue and threaten providers’ livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect local food systems</td>
<td>Elevate the importance and impact of local food through providers and consumers investing in local and guarding against poor quality and unhealthy foods, including via development aid or genetically-modified foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local access and decision-making</td>
<td>Local access to and control of land, water, seeds, livestock, and aquaculture populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share best knowledge and skills</td>
<td>Build on each other’s strengths and capacities. Ensure access to new research and best practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with nature, support ecosystems</td>
<td>Utilize agroecological production and harvesting methods that maximize the contribution of ecosystems and improve resilience and adaptation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Chaifetz & Jagger, 2014, p. 87)
Food systems that seek to emphasize food sovereignty require reorienting agricultural production to domestic consumption, safeguarding adequate incomes for food producers and environmental sustainability (Wiebe, Nettie & Wipf, 2011). Food sovereignty seeks to ensure access to productive resources and food distribution (Edelman et al., 2014) to ensure adequate production and distribution of needed food. Food sovereignty movements encourage agriculture that uses regenerative approaches and approaches that help mitigate global warming like carbon farming (Loring, 2019). Food sovereignty frequently supports the expansion of agroecology which is generally understood as an ecology of food systems that includes innovative approaches to agro-ecosystem management and social action devoted to transformational food system change for sustainability (Altieri & Nicholls, 2008; Francis et al., 2003; Moragues-Faus & Marsden, 2017). Agroecological initiatives that emphasize more nutritious crop varieties and crop diversification can play an important role in improving environmental sustainability, reduce carbon emissions, and also enhance diet quality (Fanzo et al., 2013; Scrinis, 2016). Although similar key principles are evident in recent food sovereignty literature as previously noted, the food sovereignty movement is not without contentious issues and internal disagreement (Chaifetz & Jagger, 2014; Edelman et al., 2014). For example, the distinction between food security and food sovereignty has been an area of intense scholarly argument and political conflict, but both concepts are useful in understanding, debating and devising food policies (Clapp, 2014).
The concept of food sovereignty has been taken up by a broad cross-section of social movements and non-governmental organizations including farmer organizations, Indigenous rights organizations, and environmental groups (Fairbairn, 2012). The Slow Food movement, which originated in Italy in 1986, but became a global phenomenon, is of particular significance because it strives to preserve traditional and regional foods in response to the globalization of fast food values and the industrial food system (Andrews, 2008). The Slow Food principles of “good: quality, flavorsome and healthy food; clean: production that does not harm the environment, and fair: accessible prices for consumers and fair conditions and pay for producers” (Slow Food, 2013), reflect the 6 key principles of food sovereignty identified by Chaifetz and Jagger (2014) and discussed above.

Rural communities contend with food sovereignty issues because of the industrial food system in a variety of ways. For example, the types and crops that are grown and how the land is farmed in rural agricultural communities can be market driven rather than serving community food needs (Food Secure Canada, 2015a). Local infrastructure and equipment are frequently lacking, making rural communities and smaller growers dependent upon highly centralized infrastructure for food production such as, abattoirs, grain storage (Food Secure Canada, 2015a). Prohibitive land costs and land planning which prioritizes commercial, residential and industrial uses can reduce access to land for small-scale agriculture (Connell et al., 2013; Food Secure Canada, 2015a).
Despite living near sites of food production, some rural people face systemic barriers that make this food inaccessible (Edelman et al., 2014). Poverty is higher and food more expensive in rural and remote communities, making it more difficult for residents to afford nutritious store-bought food. Long distances to stores and a limited public transportation can aggravate the effect of poverty on food access in rural communities (Lauzon, 2017).

Rural agricultural communities in Canada represent a “great variety of local growing conditions, cultures, political and economic circumstances” (Wiebe, Nettie & Wipf, 2011, p. 5), but agriculture continues to be the social and economic foundation of many of them. Despite or perhaps sometimes because of the challenges faced by rural communities, they are also home to great strengths.

Economically, rural and small town places are proving themselves to be highly innovative in terms of responding to the pressures of low-cost global competitors. Socially, the rural stereotype of having a strong sense of community where everyone knows everyone is supporting new pathways for social organization, economic development, and local capacity building... Environmentally, rural places are not artificially separated from, but they are intimately set within, the natural environment. Issues of sustainability, environmental impact, conservation, and engagement with nature are not abstract; they are part of daily life....rural regions are on the front lines of negotiating the new realities of reconciliation and wealth sharing with First Nations and Aboriginal communities (Lauzon, Bollman, & Ashton, 2015, p. ii).
These rural communities produce nutritious and affordable food for Canadians, steward the natural environment upon which sustainable food systems depend, make significant contributions to Canada’s economy (Canadian Federation of Agriculture [CFA], 2016) and organize and educate Canadians about local and sustainable food systems. In fact, many food sovereignty strategies, “from local control over markets, to sustainable production of culturally and seasonally appropriate foods are rooted in the current and historical practices of Canada’s agrarian communities” (Wiebe, Nettie & Wipf, 2011, p. 8). Among the most important current and historical practices are cooperative efforts and alternative food networks which provide pathways for local producers to interact directly with consumers to obtain a greater return-on-investment for their efforts (National Farmers Union [NFU], 2018).

These initiatives “connect rural and urban communities interested in alternative sources, varieties and cultures of food” (Wiebe, Nettie & Wipf, 2011, p. 9). The resiliency of local food systems and rural regions are improved by these rural-urban connections (Knickel et al., 2018). Residents of Canadian communities large and small benefit from access to local products, opportunities for education and enrichment through food, and a greater appreciation of the vision and diligence needed by small farm operations to sustain annual harvests of food for their enjoyment (Sumner et al., 2011; Wittman et al., 2012). Rural agricultural communities are linked to urban and global systems through supply
chains, jobs, food security, and ecosystems (Loring, 2019), and through rural food tourism.

2.6 Rural Tourism

The United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) defines tourism as the activity of visitors where “a visitor is a traveller taking a trip to a main destination outside his/her usual environment, for less than a year, for any main purpose (business, leisure or other personal purpose) other than to be employed by a resident entity in the country or place visited” (as cited in Butler, 2015, p. 17). This definition underpins most academic research. Tourism is one of the fastest growing global industries which is exemplified by the global growth of international arrivals defined as the number of tourists who travel to a country outside their usual residence (TIAC, 2016). From a total of 25 million international arrivals in 1950, international arrivals numbered over 903 million in 2007 (Sharpley, 2009). Tourism represented 10% of global GDP and generated $1.5 trillion USD in export earnings in 2015. UNWTO, which provides international project and policy leadership in tourism development, projects an average 3.8% global growth between 2010 and 2030 (UNWTO, 2018).

Rural tourism acts as a force of globalization through mass mobility (Parrinello, 2001; Richards & Wilson, 2007), and also functions as a rural and urban response to globalization. Rural tourism is considered an activity that connects visitors with experiences in non-urban environments. Critical scholars
emphasize issues of politics and power in how rural tourism is defined (Chambers & Buzinde, 2015; Halfacree, 2014). Theories of rural tourism development are based on supply factors, demand factors, and motives, with most current theories taking an evolutionary process approach to tourism development (Streimikiene & Bilan, 2015).

Rural tourism development expanded across numerous rural areas beginning in the 1970s in response to what George et al. (2009) call “devastating blows” (p. 27) from economic restructuring and a reduction in government support at provincial and national levels. As rural communities struggled with economic, social, cultural, environmental, and political changes connected to globalization, tourism became an increasingly popular economic development mechanism (Reid, 2003; George et al., 2009). Rural areas were perceived as having retained traditional landscapes and values which appealed to urban residents who saw rural tourism as an escape from modernity and the physical and mental exhaustion of work (Carneiro et al., 2015; George et al., 2009; Gruenewald, & Smith, 2014; Jepson & Sharpley, 2014; Kastenholz & Figueiredo, 2014; Lane & Kastenholz, 2015; MacDonald, & Jolliffe, 2003).

Rural economic development through tourism operated within a neoliberal political and economic context that placed responsibility for economic growth with localities and relied on increasing entrepreneurship (George, 2006; Mair, 2006). Tourism was recognized by rural communities, and by governments, as a
valuable activity that offered rural regeneration benefits with manageable risks, particularly in areas with declining agriculture, resource-extraction and industrial production (Lane & Kastenholz, 2005). It did not require intense capital investments, was built on existing local assets, and was largely small scale. Entrepreneurial opportunities in rural tourism began to attract new, often skilled and well-resourced lifestyle migrants from cities (Brooker & Joppe, 2014).

Rural tourism includes a breadth of activities which reflects different development approaches, different natural, social, economic and cultural assets, and different market conditions (Bramwell & Lane, 1994; Lane & Kastenholz, 2015). Contemporary rural tourism is more experience than product based in keeping with transitions from relatively fixed modes of production and consumption to a knowledge-based economy and neo-Fordist modes of consumption (Everett, 2016). Recent tourism developments emphasize creativity, experience, learning, and environmental sensitivity influenced by trends like cultural economy (Ray, & Sayer, 1999), experience economy (Pine, & Gilmore, 1999), learning economy (Asheim, 2012), creative class (Florida, 2012). This reflects a more fluid distinction between work and leisure (Falk et al., 2012; Uriely, 2005), and mirror changes in how learning is understood as experiential (Dewey, 1998/1938; Kolb, 1984), transformative (Cranton, 2016; Freire, 2000/1970; Mezirow, 2000; Taylor, 2007), and place-based (Grunewald, & Smith, 2014; Smith, 2002; Sobel, 2004).
Along with new products/experiences, alternative development processes have emerged. For example, Integrated Rural Tourism (IRT) (Clark & Chabrel, 2007), community-based tourism (Dodds et al., 2016; Idziak et al., 2015; Stone, & Stone, 2011), asset-based community development (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993), community benefit tourism (Simpson, 2007), slow tourism (Fullagar et al., 2012), transformational tourism (Reisinger, 2015; 2013; Senese, 2016), hopeful tourism (Pritchard, & Morgan, 2013), and justice tourism (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008). Each approach is different, but they share values based on local community participation for more just, holistic and sustainable development.

Most notably, sustainable tourism emerged in response to the environmental impacts of the growing industry and the greater societal concern for sustainable development that was first formally articulated by Bruntland (1987). Sustainable tourism is an approach to tourism development rather than a niche type of tourism. The understanding of sustainability which previously evoked environmental considerations exclusively has expanded to include social, cultural, economic, and political issues (Berno et al., 2014; Bramwell et al., 2017; Global Sustainable Tourism Council [GSTC], n.d.). The United Nations World Tourism Organization defines sustainable tourism as “tourism that takes full account of its current and future economic, social and environmental impacts, addressing the needs of visitors, the industry, the environment and host communities”(UNWTO, n.d., para. 1).
UNWTO is explicit about sustainable development entailing “striking a balancing” between economic, social, and environmental pillars which are simultaneously complementary and in competition (UNWTO, 2012). Balancing these spheres is the foundation of much of the current sustainable tourism policy paradigm as is the need for continued economic growth (Bramwell et al., 2017). While reports and policies have proliferated and there are localized successes, overall concerns continue particularly in terms of tourism’s contribution to climate change (Hall et al., 2013; Mundt, 2011), and the unsustainability of mass tourism which has been termed “overtourism” (Dodds & Butler, 2019; Higgins-Desbiolles et al., 2019; Milano et al., 2019). The continuing contribution of a growing tourism industry to environmental change challenges the so called ‘balanced’ approach which continues to promote limitless economic growth (Hall, 2011).

In this research the term food tourism is used inclusively as seen in Figure 2.5 to include wine-related tourism, food and culinary related tourism, and tourism related to other beverages such as beer, cider, and spirits, and agritourism which refers to any facet of food tourism that occurs on-farm.
Figure 2.5 Food Tourism Facets

Farmers’ markets are a good example of why the inclusive term food tourism is suitable when discussing tourism development in the case regions. Farmers’ markets will typically include local wine and cider, beer, spirits sampling and sales, local produce and prepared food, and typically do not occur on agricultural land. The term food tourism captures this wide variety of connected activity. The literature on agritourism, wine tourism, and food tourism are now reviewed.
2.6.1 Agritourism

Agritourism was one of the first rural tourism products (McGehee, 2007). Although agriculture is the foundation of all food and wine tourism, it is also frequently considered separately. Agritourism has become widespread in Italy and other parts of Europe, since the Italian National Legal Framework for Agritourism was established in 1985 to encourage “agriturismo.” Agritourism is considered an on-farm income diversification tactic that maintains farming activities and the agricultural landscape (Chase et al., 2018; Colton & Bissix, 2016; Sonnino, 2004; Vaugeois et al., 2017). In Europe, the production of regionally specific food and drink are central to agritourism, a connection reinforced by designation of origin (PDO), protected geographical indication (PGI), and traditional specialties guaranteed (TSG) labelling and production regulations (Croce & Perri, 2017), such as Prosciutto di Parma PDO in Italy or Landwein PGI wine in Austria. Agritourism is becoming more common outside Europe as farmers look to maintain their livelihoods and farming communities look to diversify their local economy (Nickerson et al., 2001). Agritourism includes activities such as farm markets, wineries, U-Picks, farming interpretive centres, farm-based accommodation and harvest festivals (Colton & Bissix, 2005). In Figure 2.6 Chase et al. (2018) build on Phillip, Hunter, & Blackstock's (2010) typology for defining agritourism. Their model thematically classifies agritourism activities as education, hospitality, outdoor recreation, direct sales and entertainment. Then the typology shows how each of these types of
agritourism are expressed from core agritourism activity which occurs on agricultural land, such as farm stands, farm-to-table dinners and tours, through to peripheral agritourism activities which occur off-farm.

Figure 2.6 Five Categories of Agritourism (Chase et al., 2018)

Berno, Laurin and Maltezakis (2014) argue that “agriculture is at the heart of food tourism – agriculture provides the product, culture provides the authenticity; and tourism provides the infrastructure and services” and means to “rejuvenate traditional agricultural and artisan practices, or as a vehicle to create new ones” (p. 113). Agritourism creates a mutually reinforcing development process since food is produced for tourists and tourists are a market for food production (Sonnino, 2004). In addition, tourism encourages the continuation of local agricultural practices and products (Everett, 2016). For example, Sharples'
A study of the Chatsworth Farm shop found that rural food tourism renewed demand for local products which kept farms alive. Kim, Lee, Lee, Jeong and Moon (2019) conducted the first study to empirically examine the long-term effects of agritourism experiences on food purchase patterns. They found agritourism experience significantly alters consumers’ spending patterns on grain, vegetable, fruit, meat, and fish. By offering various activities that increase consumers’ involvement and by nurturing continued emotional attachment through social and social media networks, post visit consumption of agriproducts can be maximized (Kim et al., 2019). The research found one example of food sovereignty being brought explicitly into food tourism discourse. Food Sovereignty Tours seeks to help participants understand the realities of the global capitalist food system and promotes informed activism and food sovereignty (Brimm et al., 2014).

The benefits of agritourism to the farm, host community and tourism operator are summarized by Vaugeouis et al. (2017). Highlights of the benefits of agritourism to the farmer, host community and tourism operators are presented in Table 2.4.
Table 2.4 Benefits of Agritourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits of agritourism for farms</th>
<th>Benefits of agritourism for host communities</th>
<th>Benefits of tourism for tourism operators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generates income and jobs which improves farm viability and may keep/attract young people</td>
<td>Preserves rural agricultural landscapes</td>
<td>Expands the tourism season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raises awareness of farm products, local agriculture and food systems issues</td>
<td>Multiplies the effects for local business</td>
<td>Diversifies the tourism experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds business skills</td>
<td>Creates cultural exchange opportunities</td>
<td>Increases partnership opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revitalizes local food and agriculture traditions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attracts more tourists and new markets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(based on Vaugeois, Bence, & Romanova, 2017, p. 12)

Agritourism can also benefit tourists because it serves to “connect travelers to local food culture” and helps “create diverse and memorable food tourism experiences for traveler” (Bennet, Kim, Miller, 2014, p. 251). Johnson, et al. (2016) re-conceptualize agritourism tourism as a “place-based cultural activity that can raise awareness, teach, and produce progressive social change” (p.8) in their research on the Blue Ridge Women in Agriculture High Country Farm Tour. Agritourism is a marketing channel which is most effective when the experience is meaningful.

Integrating agritourism successfully into a farm requires farmers to rethink their product offerings and interact more directly with their customers (Agricultural Land Commission (ALC), 2016; Vaugeois et al., 2017).
commodity business to a business based on selling an experience directly to the consumer can be challenging for many farmers (Bennet, Kim, Miller, 2014). Issues such as possible rezoning application if the intended uses are not permitted by current government regulations, additional infrastructure required to welcome tourists, and the possible interference of agritourism with other agricultural activities should be considered (Vaugeois et al., 2017).

Farmers are looking for a way to remain viable in the face of globalization while changes in consumer demand have created new opportunities (Vaugeous et al., 2017). Agritourism’s increasing popularity as a rural development strategy in Canada reflects the themes discussed thus far. However, academic literature examining agritourism in Canadian settings is still limited (Colton & Bissix, 2016; H. Reid, 2017).

2.6.2 Wine tourism

Although drink is implied in the term food tourism, wine tourism is often treated as a distinct form of tourism. Hall and Macionis (1998) have a frequently referenced definition of wine tourism which echoes their food tourism definition: “visitation to vineyards, wineries and wine festivals and wine shows for which grape wine tasting and/or experiencing the attributes of a grape wine region are the prime motivating factors for visitors” (p. 197). Wine tourism is the most widely researched sub-category and predates research on food tourism perhaps
because frameworks like the 1855 Classification of Wine in France which ranked producers from 1\textsuperscript{st} to 5\textsuperscript{th} growth gave “wine-producing regions identity and marketable differentiation” earlier than other agri-foods (Everett, 2016, p. 111). The top wine producing countries are France, Italy, Spain, but wine tourism literature is focused on New World regions such as Australia, New Zealand, and the US. Everett (2016) notes that France has been less inclined to develop wine tourism. Gómez, Pratt, & Molina (2018) offer an overview of wine tourism academic research finding that the literature has focused on 4 areas: supply, demand, supply and demand and other. Wine tourism commonly connects the wine product with the destination to create a cultural experience of “consuming place” (Bell 2008, as cited in Carmichael & Senese, 2012).

Wineries are where wine is made and vineyards and where grapes are grown. Not all wine tourism occurs where wine grapes grow as “wine is used to generate tourism in urban and non-producing areas in the form of festivals and events” or commercial wineries (Everett, 2016, p. 111). Since most wine tourism in rural areas occurs at the cellar doors of farm wineries much wine tourism is agritourism. The amenity value of vineyard production reflects the production-consumption convergence of a valuable crop and a valued cultural product. Consumption of wine, at the point of production, carries substantial class attachment (Senese, Randelli, & Hull, 2016; Yeoman & McMahon-Beatte, 2016a). Hammer (2016) explains how wine is a “powerful symbol and metaphor for embodying and expressing nature and culture, and by extension the identity
of the wine producer and the region, to themselves and the world outside of themselves” (p. 37).

Like agritourism for other types of farmers, wine tourism offers economic benefits (Baldwin & Mellows, 2013; Croce & Perri, 2017; Everett, 2016). The provision of value-added services and experiences diversify agricultural production, especially for small producers who profit from direct to consumer sales and use tourism to create brand and product loyalty (Getz & Brown, 2006; Macionis, 1998; Sidali, Kastenholz, & Bianchi, 2015). The 3rd UNWTO Global Conference on Wine Tourism (2018) concluded that wine tourism is a growing tourism niche because of tourist demand. Wine tourism and connected opportunities in handicrafts, nature tourism, food, and agritourism can generate income and employment in struggling rural regions.

Terroir is a central reference point connected to wine tourism (Croce & Perri, 2017; Marlowe & Bauman, 2019; Marlowe & Lee, 2018; Unwin, 2012). The literal meaning of the French word is ‘soil,’ but terroir has a deeper meaning in French culture, and there is no adequate translation into other languages. Terroir typically refers to the unique characteristics that identify a geographic area including physical ones such as elevation, climate, soil, and may also include characteristics related to human interventions such as irrigation and terracing, which are cultural (Unwin, 2012). Dougherty (2012) highlights the cultural variables that are part of terroir such as, viticultural decisions about which
grape variety to plant, vine spacing and canopy management, and winemaking decisions about tools and methods like use of oak and whole berry maceration. Promoting a unique terroir can create a powerful marketing identity to attract tourists and residents (Senese et al., 2016).

The concept of terroir is nuanced and contested particularly in countries without the tradition of terroir (Berno, Laurin & Maltezakis, 2014). For example, whether these characteristics are exclusively physical or both physical and cultural and if/how terroir exerts a distinctive influence on the aroma and flavor of wine or food produced in a particular area is disputed (Unwin, 2012). Different interests influence different interpretations. For example, a French land owner with a plot designated Appellation d’origine controlee would have a vested interest in advancing the argument that terroir is based on geological/physical characteristics in order to garner the highest price for his or her grapes (Unwin, 2012). Furthermore, some might argue it is problematic to apply the term terroir to New World wine regions with short histories of quality wine production (Carmichael & Senese, 2012). Understandings of terroir in New World regions evolves as the region develops. Use of the term terroir is often associated with wine regions, but has also been linked with food and other forms of agricultural production (Trubek, 2008).
2.6.3 Food tourism

Culinary tourism, gastronomy tourism, food tourism, food and drink tourism, and food and beverage tourism are equivalent terms that refer to a type of special interest tourism category (Everett, 2016) focused on food and beverage attractions. Culinary tourism was the original term used in the late 1990s to early 2000s. However, the term culinary was found to have elitist connotations, so there has been a transition to the term food tourism although the term gastronomy continues to be common in Europe (Wolf, 2014). Formal recognition of food as an impetus for travel emerged only over the past 2 decades (Everett, 2016). Food is now considered a main motivation for travelers choosing their destinations. Travelers are spending more time and money on unique food and beverage experiences and there has been an increase in food focused tourism development and marketing efforts (Bussell et al., 2014; Croce & Perri, 2017; Dixit, 2019; Pateman & King, 2016).

The idea that visitors travel for food emerged in academic literature in the late 1990s. The term “culinary tourism” was coined in 1998 by Long in *Culinary Tourism: A Folkloristic perspective on eating and otherness*. Edited collections from Hall et al. (2004) and Hjalager and Richards (2003) were followed by an increase in academic work in food tourism. The term was first used outside of academic discourse in 2001 with a white paper written by Erik Wolf who went on to found the International Culinary Tourism Association which is now the World
Food Tourism Association. The paper introduced the concept of visitors motivated by unique and memorable food and drink experiences.

A frequently cited definition of food tourism which specifies food as a primary motivator is that of Hall and Mitchell (2001): “visitation to primary and secondary food producers, food festivals, restaurants and specific locations for which food tasting and/or experiencing the attributes of specialist food production regions are the primary motivating factor for travel” (p. 308). A more comprehensive definition, and the one used in this research, includes food tourists with primary or secondary motivation. This distinguishes food tourism from the more generic hospitality sector, but still captures food tourism activity by visitors who make the decision to visit specific food tourism sites once in the location (Everett, 2016). Food and drink tourists can be conceptualized along a continuum from high interest and motivation to low interest and motivation that reflects Cohen’s (1979) influential tourism typology (Everett, 2016).

Food tourism, wine tourism and agritourism were overviewed here with the understanding that these tourism types are integrated in rural food tourism. The close relationship between wine, food, and agritourism is evident in Old World settings like Italy. In the New World, there are examples of wine tourism destinations maturing into more comprehensive food tourism destinations. For example, “California’s success in attracting visitors to wine tastings at vineyards in Sonoma and Napa counties has been extended to artisanal cheese trails, beer
trails, and tourism involving other value-added specialty products” (Chase et al., 2018, p. 15). Culture is central to all of these food tourism niches because they all use rural ways of life as a form of cultural experience in common with other descriptions of rural cultural tourism (Carneiro et al., 2015; Green & Dougherty, 2008; Koster & Lemelin, 2009; MacDonald, & Jolliffe, 2003; Pateman & King, 2016). Therefore, food tourism is an “agricultural act” (Berry, 1990) that connects the visitor to the land. It is also a “cultural act” (Andrews, 2008, p. 182) with far reaching political and social implications.

The emergence of food tourism was the result of the twentieth century transition from a predominately rural agricultural society to a predominately industrial urban one (Altieri, 2009; Croce & Perri, 2017). Evolving social and economic conditions changed attitudes towards food and agricultural land. Rural food culture became appealing “only after people had experienced what it was like to live in a society where eating well was the norm” (Croce & Perri, 2017, p.7).

Food writers, critics and award winning chefs like Alice Waters of Chef Panisse, Slow Food’s Carlo Petrini and Michael Pollan have shaped public opinion and relationships towards food, as have social media and television shows like Anthony Bourdain: Parts Unknown (Alkon, 2012; Beer, Edwards, Fernandes, & Sampaio, 2002; Berno, Laurin, et al., 2014; Croce & Perri, 2017; Pateman & King, 2016). Food tourism now includes the full range of experiences,
cooking classes, producer visits, enjoying street food, restaurants, wineries and brew pubs (Bennett et al., 2014). Industry interest in food tourism developed with a better understanding of the economic impact. Visitors spend on average a quarter of their travel budget on food and drink, and food tourism increases both length of stay and visitor expenditure (UNWTO, 2019).

Food tourism reflects the post-modern cultural evolution toward individualized experiences (Buhalis, 2000; Poon, 1993). Food tourists create their sense of identity through food (Yeoman & McMahon-Beatte, 2016). Early examples of food tourism were labelled by Boswijk (2005) as first-generation experiences because they reflected the qualities of the experience economy, coined by Pine and Gilmore in 1999, and were designed to engage tourists’ senses holistically for meaningful and memorable experiences (Richards, 2015). The mid-2000s marked second generation experiences which were designed for more knowledgeable and skilled consumers who could take a more active role, while third generation food experiences are characterized by a holistic approach that uses food to creatively connect people in shared experiences of production, preparation, and consumption, such as picking grapes and then returning to help with wine blending (Richards, 2015).

Richards (2015) argues that policy makers must recognize that tourists and locals converge in third generation experiences since they can belong to the same community of interest. Helsinki’s Culinary Culture Strategy (2014) is given
as an example of combining sustainable culinary offerings for residents and visitors. Tourism becomes more relational and the roles are fluid since “tourists are active in place-making as co-producers and co-performers in a relational process of productive consumption thereby co-creating communities (Richards, 2015). Intimacy in the form of small-scale, family run establishments is considered a rural feature (Sidali et al., 2016). In addition, food tourism can contribute to economic regeneration that subsequently sustains local food cultures in rural and peripheral destinations (Everett, 2016; Lee et al., 2014; Rachão et al., 2019). There are also opportunities for rural food tourism to contribute towards other Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) like responsible consumption and production (UNWTO), 2019). Food tourism can be an experiential opportunity for tourists to restore the deep caring for community and place required for global sustainability (Casey, 2001; Delind, 2006; Horlings, 2015 Everett & Aitchison, 2008). The UNWTO’s (2019) Guidelines for the Development of Gastronomy promotes gastronomy tourism as a tool to progress towards sustainability in the destination and the contribution of tourism to the SDGs.

The potential negative impacts of food tourism are also provided in the literature. While food tourism can help preserve culture, research has also demonstrated that food tourism has the potential to “unnaturally fossilise, restrict or commodify ways of life and traditions in the name of cultural sustainability” (Everett, 2916, p. 321; see also Everett, 2007). Carolan (2017) critiques accounts
of the transformational effects of food tourism since the creation of alternative food communities is unlikely to be established through tourism given the limited duration of these experiences. Food tourism may seem a small-scale business since food is frequently used for rural development, but “an influx of tourists to a destination likely requires an excessively high volume of food consumption which impacts on local food supply systems” (Ellis et al., 2018, p. 261). The importance of strategic planning was stressed in the WFTA’s 2019 State of the Food Travel Industry report and the UNWTO’s Guidelines for the Development of Gastronomy Tourism. However, food tourism often proceeds without any strategy in place (Wolf, 2014). Furthermore, which locals have power is an important question since not all community voices are privileged in rural tourism planning and decision making (Chambers & Buzinde, 2015; George et al., 2009; Werry, 2008).

2.7 Themes

As shown in this literature review, rural agricultural communities have increasingly turned to food and wine tourism as a response to globalization with various cultural effects. Landscape, authenticity, local, and place are key concepts related to cultural sustainability and rural food tourism in the current context. While the key concepts discussed are sometimes presented dichotomously as local/global or place/placeless, they are more usefully understood as existing along a continuum with each concept including material and socially constructed aspects.
2.7.1 Landscape

Landscapes have natural and cultural significance used in tourism marketing and destination development (Ramsey & Malcolm, 2017). Landscape is what is seen in a place, so it can be thought of as terroir made visible, but how a landscape is perceived depends on the viewer’s perspective or cultural background. Discussion of scapes in food tourism echo Appadurai’s (1990) scapes and other culture concepts, like assemblages, associated with topology and discussed in reference to culture earlier. The sense of sight is the first way visitors experience a region, therefore the landscape is their first sensory experience (Croce & Perri, 2017, p. 30). The concept goes below visual perceptions of landscape since food tourism engages all the senses; it “involves an immersive physical internalizing of a culture, as opposed to a distanced, passive gaze” (Everett, 2016, p. 46). Urry fleshed out his thinking about the “tourist gaze” (1990) in a later interview about how tourists experience place when he explained: “I think there is a multiplicity, and the way to approach the analysis of these multiplicities of tourist gaze is, among other things, to think about the taste-scapes, smell-scapes, sound-scapes, touch-scapes” (Franklin, 2001, as cited in Everett, 2016, p. 46). The term “tourismscape” (Stoffelen & Vanneste, 2015) is used in general, while the term “winescape” is used to described features of wine regions (Bruwer & Gross, 2017; Quintal et al., 2015).
Winescapes’ manifest power dynamics are shown in Wesscholar, Yelvington, Dillon-Sumner, and Simms’ (2014) analysis of the winescapes of California, where policy makers have responded to wine industry lobbying by remaking production spaces into consumption spaces for visitors. The term “foodscape” is also used to join food experience with sense of place (Casciola et al., 2014). These culinary identities are created through the interaction of global and local flows where places compete to distinguish themselves and attract tourists; foodscapes also forge and revitalize local identity (Richards, 2015). In fact, Ingold, (2011) uses the term “taskscapes” (1993) to describe how people produce regional and local identities across space and time.

2.7.2 Authenticity

Processes of globalization are central to the concept of authenticity. The modern movement of people, products, and ideas of the late 20th century has fostered a quest for authenticity at three different levels, global, national, and local. Discussions of authenticity relate to distinctions between essentialism, which requires adherence to a “true” historical essence and constructivism which recognizes that cultures change over time (Sims, 2009, p. 324). Wang (1999) conceptualized existential authenticity as subjective personal response to tourism activities and contrasts this with object-related authenticity which could be objectively measured. Yeoman et al., (2007) describe food tourists as “authentic-seeking.” The issue of dichotomization and power are evident again as
authenticity is understood as part of a binary paired with inauthenticity, but Bell and Valentine (2013) argue that the appeal of regional authenticity as captured in specific food and drink continues to appeal when the regional traditions are “mere inventions.” Authenticity concerns the “appearance and experience of what is perceived as being a true or genuine activity, item or setting” (UNWTO, 2012, annex v). Since the evaluation of authenticity has typically belonged to the outside observer it depends on their cultural understanding. More recent work regarding authenticity stresses the internal, self-evaluation of authenticity within a culture (Du Cros & McKercher, 2015).

Acculturation and appropriation are related terms. Acculturation refers to “the adoption by one group of cultural or psychological traits from another group as a result of cross-cultural interaction” (UNWTO, 2012, annex v). The term tends to be used in a negative sense where aspects of a local culture are replaced with “Western” culture. Cultural appropriation is the contentious issue of culture being ‘borrowed’ or taken without consent or benefit to the ‘owners’ (George et al, 2009). Unlike cross-culture influence, cultural appropriation exploits power differentials (Dessein et al., 2015, p. 24). There is no obvious pattern in how societies evaluate external cultural influences although passage of time is relevant, and the ability of cultural aspects to be incorporated and synthesized seems to be applied as a criterion. Cowen (2002) argues that “citizens develop common markers of what constitutes their culture, and then become sensitive to the loss or depreciation of these markers” (p. 140).
2.7.3 Place

“Place” is an important interdisciplinary concept that can be broadly understood as “space endowed with meaning” (Johnson et al., 2016, p. 4). Understandings of place reflect the “cultural turn” (Alexander, 1988) which approaches place-identity as plural and contradictory with landscapes also seen as a symbolic material-cultural construction (Cresswell, 2011). Place is a conceptual tool used to create interdisciplinary opportunities to concretize the lived experience of people in their diverse and unique environments (Harvey, 1993; Massey, 2005) and the ongoing dynamic relationships within and between places (Ruitenberg, 2005). Places are the expression of how the interconnected and interrelated spheres of ecology, economy, and community interact (Coole & Frost, 2010; Marsden, 2000).

There are concerns that modern processes, particularly those of industrial agriculture, disconnect people from place and cause a sense of “placelessness” (Johnson et al., 2016). But people continue to be connected to their community and/or region and the identities that they associated with those places even in a globalized world (Appadurai 1996; Feagan 2007; Hammer, 2016). Place matters because place is where people’s resources are located, where services are delivered, and where governance happens (Reimer & Markey, 2008). Place is especially significant to current policy discourse as “an arena of place-based
debates, power struggles and negotiations... as spaces endowed with meaning and values... [and] as site of policy-interventions” (Horlings, 2016, p. 33). As such, place offers “both a lens and a pathway for moving forward” (Policy Horizons Canada, 2011, p. 30) and is particularly important when considering sustainability transitions (Coenen et al., 2012; Marsden, 2013).

The centrality of place is evident in the World Food Tourism Association (WFTA) definition of food tourism as “The act of traveling for a taste of place in order to get a sense of place” (What is Food Tourism | World Food Travel Association, para. 1.). Sense of place refers to a subjective, personal, emotional connection to place (Cresswell, 2011). Place-making is foundational to human culture as it consists of the “social, political and material processes by which people iteratively create and recreate the experienced geographies in which they live” (Pierce, Martin, & Murphy, 2011, p. 54, as cited in Sears & Weatherbee, 2019, p. 384). This includes tourism destination place branding (Carmichael & Senese, 2012; George et al., 2009; Poitras & Getz, 2006). A place’s brand is the result of “dialogue, debate and contestation” as a place’s identity “emerges in the conversation between stakeholders” (Kavaratzis & Hatch, 2013, p. 82). Local food products have place-based qualities that contribute to sense of place (Bell & Valentine, 2013; Rinaldi, 2017). Place promotion has become a prominent and political aspect of rural tourism development. Indigenous scholars, Battiste and Henderson (2000) unite culture with place, saying that they “reject the concept of culture to mean Indigenous knowledge, heritage, and consciousness, and
instead connect each Indigenous manifestation as part of a particular ecological order” (as cited in Armstrong, 2010, p. 39). In this sense, Indigenous culture is place.

2.7.4 Local

Initiatives at the local level, often on the fringes of industrial society, that are founded on the commitment of individuals and groups to particular places show particular promise for cultural sustainability (Gruenewald & Smith, 2014). For example, Escobar’s (2001) work on place-based struggles as multi-scale localization strategies bridges the discussion of globalization and social movements with particular places and cultures. Like Escobar, Horlings (2016) calls attention to the “agency of local actors, whilst also examining the broader economic and social relations — both historical and contemporary — which locate places within wider networks” (p. 32).

It is local places leading the way for a more hopeful and humane global future. Globalized economic flows are often presented as deterritorializing forces; however, increasingly globalized markets can also create conditions for the “territorialization of production activities around place-specific production potentials that provide some insulation from the forces of global competition” (Cox, 1997, p. 6). For example, the concept of counteracting an apparent dilution of culinary distinctiveness lies at the centre of many arguments for the promotion of local and distinctive food and drink which are a reaction to culinary

Local food is thought to provide a variety of environmental, social, cultural and economic benefits (De Jong & Varley, 2017). Local food systems are framed in opposition to global food systems and reflect a common nostalgia for rural landscapes (Halfacree, 2007). Globalization is perceived as oppressive, hegemonic and unsustainable while local food culture is perceived as radical, subversive, sustainable (Feagan, 2007). The concept of local food is broadly understood thanks to popular books like The 100-mile diet: A year of local eating (Smith, & MacKinnon, 2009). Everett (2016) explains that in the food tourism context local is used to describe everything from the “place of processing, geographical proximity, spatially limited production, local tradition and histories and stories, low carbon, and/or family and homemade” (p. 324). Local food is the subject of many food tourism studies (Everett & Slocum, 2013; Johnson, et al., 2016; Sims, 2009). “Eating locally” is central of tourism branding and marketing; this marks a dramatic difference from the early 1990s when local food was largely absent from tourism advertising (Schnell, 2011). However local is problematic because the term is ambiguous. Sims (2009) probes the concept of local by questioning whether the Cumbrian specialty gingerbread can be
considered local when the sugar and spices it uses come from international sources. Coley et al. (2006) wonders whether the carbon emissions of someone who drives to purchase organic vegetables directly from a farmer may even be greater than the emissions from large distributors (Everett, 2016).

A local/global dichotomy is too simplistic (Hinrichs, 2003) because globalization is a complex multi-dimensional mixture of global homogenisation and local heterogenization, therefore, globalization’s impacts “across countries and time should be approached and studied in ways that acknowledge its haphazard, discontinuous and sometimes contradictory nature” (Everett, 2016, p. 72). Swyngedouw's (1997) “glocalization” challenges the polarization of the local and global which are in fact deeply intertwined and “never fixed, but are perpetually redefined, contested, and restructured in terms of their extent, content, relative importance, and interrelations” (p. 141). Swyngedouw argues for a process-based approach that focusses on political action at different scales. Similarly, Friedman (1999) describes glocalization as a “process by which local communities incorporate aspects of foreign cultures that enrich them, but reject others that would negatively affect their traditions or identity” (as cited in Smith & Richards, 2013, p. 191). Of course, issues of power and political economy are deeply embedded in whether this ‘glocalization’ is healthy for the local community.
Neither globalization or cultural change are automatically negative. Cowen (2002) contends that when “cross-cultural exchange replaces an old set of markers with a new set, perhaps this should not be intrinsic cause for concern” given that the historical markers are not necessarily normatively superior (p. 147). Globalization and cultural change may be positive when they enlarge “the narrow preoccupations and compartmentalization of national economies” and cause a deeper appreciation for “the imperative of limits, a changed development aim and differentiated approaches to achieve these aims” (Dessein et al., 2015, p. 23). Sustainability may require cultural change in response to the changes wrought by globalization. Who has the power to determine and enforce what constitutes culture for a place, and how that culture is used can be illuminated by a political economy perspective that highlights the politics, power relationships and social struggle involved in rural tourism and cultural sustainability (George et al. 2009).

The emergent themes of authenticity, place, local and landscape all relate to cultural sustainability which is increasingly recognized as a distinct aspect of sustainable development (Duxbury & Jeannotte, 2012; Hawkes, 2001; Young, 2008b). As demonstrated in this literature review, globalization processes have resulted in an increased need to understand cultural sustainability in terms of mobilities, rural communities and food systems. Rural food tourism brings these ideas together. Therefore, further research can contribute valuable insights into important complexities and inter-connections.
2.8 Research Openings

Cultural sustainability is a problematic concept since cultural dimensions are challenging to define and measure with disparate conceptualizations of cultural sustainability reflecting the different disciplines and policy aims of individual scholars and organizations (Axelsson et al., 2013; Robinson, 1999; Soini & Dessein, 2016). Of particular importance, there is limited research regarding how tourism stakeholders themselves conceptualize cultural sustainability (Calza et al., 2018). Likewise, there is little research concerning the links between food and tourism (Bessiere, 1998; Sims, 2009). Food tourism in rural regions is described as a reaction response to globalization, but little is understood about how this is expressed (Everett, 2016). Various researchers argue that food tourism can improve sustainability (Everett, 2016, 2019a; Johnson, et al., 2016; Sims, 2009). However, the benefits are often presented as a list without conceptual structure of theorizing that make the benefits operational and generalizable. In addition, food tourism’s role in facilitating transformational cultural change for local and global sustainability requires further study (Coghlan & Gooch, 2011; Reisinger, 2013, 2015; Morgan, 2010; Pritchard & Morgan, 2013; Senese, 2016; Johnson et al., 2016; Lloyd et al., 2015).

Public policy is vital to tourism development, but receives insufficient attention (De Jong & Varley, 2017; Everett, 2019b; George et al., 2009; Hall, 2008). Bramwell et al. (2017) observe that research and policies related to
sustainable tourism frequently focus on understanding and changing individual values and actions, to the detriment of understanding and altering social and economy structures and systems. As a political process, it is critical to appreciate the perspective of those involved in tourism policy design and implementation and perceptions of policy effectiveness. This research explores how rural food tourism stakeholders understand cultural sustainability, thereby adding an explicitly cultural component to the work of Sims (2009), and Everett and Slocum (2013), who previously examined the power relations, motivations and challenges of the food tourism policy environment relating to social, economic and environmental sustainability.
Chapter 3 Methodology

The goal of this interdisciplinary research is to investigate the relationships between cultural sustainability and rural food tourism by asking how rural tourism stakeholders understand these and related concepts, mobilize the interrelationships, and to what purpose. The research questions are as follows:

1. How are the concepts of cultural sustainability and food sovereignty understood?
2. How is rural tourism used to support the sustainability of local food culture?
3. How is local food culture used in rural tourism?
4. How do rural tourism stakeholders understand and use policy to support food sovereignty and cultural sustainability?
5. How might rural tourism be used to support cultural sustainability and food sovereignty in the future?
6. How might food culture be used to support rural tourism in the future?

Question one addresses how the concepts of cultural sustainability and food sovereignty are understood. Questions two and three examine how food culture is used in rural food tourism and why. Question four considers the intersection of policy with food tourism and cultural sustainability. Research questions five and six pertain to the future possibilities of food tourism. Together these questions explore the relationships between food tourism and cultural sustainability in order to support the sustainability of rural communities’ food cultures and capitalize on the potential of rural food tourism to contribute to cultural sustainability.
This research uses Soini and Dessein’s (2016) framework for cultural sustainability as an analytical tool to explore the relationship between rural food tourism and cultural sustainability with the aim of contributing by refining and operationalising the conceptual approach and expanding the evidence base for the role of culture in sustainable development. This research clarifies the interface, interrelationship, and overlap between culture and sustainable development in rural food tourism contexts and investigates how the three roles of culture work in practice with consideration of the political, philosophical and practical prerequisites.

The findings can contribute to more precise definitions or robust analytical frameworks for the concepts of cultural sustainability. The findings can also be applied by rural communities concerned about supporting cultural sustainability through rural food tourism development by furthering understanding and improvement in the formal and informal mechanisms and tools by which rural communities organize themselves to achieve economic, environmental, political, and social-cultural objectives. In particular, this research can shape future collaborative research directions with rural communities.

3.1 Research paradigm

Paradigms are “shared social agreements about the nature of reality” (Meadows, 2008, p. 163) which involve “a set of assumptions about the social world, and about what constitute proper techniques and topics for inquiring into
that world” (Punch, 2006, p. 31). This research uses a paradigm of appreciative inquiry (AI) which has 5 central principles: the constructivist principle which refers to the ongoing social process by which we create our reality, the simultaneity principle which means that inquiry and change occur simultaneously, the poetic principle which stresses the importance of language and metaphor, the anticipatory principle where the vision of the future guides current behavior, and the positive principle which requires social bonding to facilitate change (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). Hammond (2013) presents 8 assumptions which convert the underlying principles of AI theory into more approachable language.

1. In every society, organization, or group something works.
2. What we focus on becomes our reality.
3. Reality is created in the moment, and there are multiple realities.
4. The act of asking questions of an organization or group influences the group in some way.
5. People have more confidence and comfort to journey to the future (the unknown) when they carry forward parts of the past (the known).
6. If we carry parts of the past forward, they should be what is best about the past.
7. It is important to value differences.
8. The language we use creates our reality. (p. 14-15).

This research proceeds from these assumptions in the spirit of AI while recognizing that this research does not reflect the participatory nature, nor all the typical “steps” of the AI process. Further background on the appreciative inquiry paradigm and how it influences this research is now described.
Both research and organizational management have been traditionally characterized by a problem-solving mode of inquiry. David Cooperrider challenged this approach in the 1980s. Where the basic assumption of a problem-based approach is that “an organization is a problem to be solved” (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005, p. 13), the basic assumption of AI is that “in every organization something works and change can be managed through the identification of what works, and the analysis of how to do more of what works” (Hammond, 2013, p. 3). These basic assumptions drive very different approaches to research as shown in Figure 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Solving</th>
<th>Appreciative Inquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic assumption:</strong> An organization is a problem to be solved</td>
<td><strong>Basic assumption:</strong> An organization is a mystery to be embraced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of problem</td>
<td>Appreciating and valuing the best of what is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of causes and possible solutions</td>
<td>Envisioning what might be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action planning (treatment)</td>
<td>Dialoguing what should be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.1 Problem Solving Compared to Appreciative Inquiry** (based on Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005, p. 13)

AI is inspired by Lewin’s (1959) and Gergen’s (1985) research on human perceptions and social constructionism and Vicker’s (1980) notion of “appreciative systems” (Koster & Lemelin, 2009, p. 258). As a strength-based approach, AI is part of a human strengths lineage that includes Hindu and
Buddhist philosophies and the works of Carl Jung, Abraham Maslow, Erik Erikson, and positive psychologists like Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (Nyaupane & Poudel, 2012). Other strength-based applications are found in asset-based community development (Caldwell, 2013; Flora et al., 2004) and sustainable livelihood (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993) and design thinking (Buchanan, 1992; Kelly, 2016; Rowe, 2008).

In addition to addressing the shortcomings of problem-based research, AI offers a number of advantages. For example, the positive approach can foster self-reinforcing positive relationships within the research organization or community (Ludema et al., 2009). Hammond (2013) provides several arguments that AI “pays off in performance” (p. 19). For example, she notes the higher ratio of positive to negative discourse in constructive teams and the successful use of positive mental rehearsal in elite athletics. AI’s potential also serves as an anecdote to eroding goals in systems (Meadows, 2008).

Hammond (2013) describes AI as a “philosophy for change” (p. 3, emphasis mine) and relates Cooperrider’s resistance to creating a manual for AI because of his concern that AI would become a prescriptive technique rather than a thought process as intended. The AI models which have developed are iterative, therefore models for the generative process are usually presented in a circle as seen in Hammond’s 5D cycle of define, discover, dream, design, destiny shown in Figure 3.2.
Facilitated large and small group workshops and peer-interviews are common techniques. Critically, each of these stages is inclusive and participatory. Hammond (2013) emphasizes the importance of broad stakeholder inclusion from the initial define stage.

Despite extensive use within the field of organizational development, AI’s contributions to research-derived knowledge are more limited. Instances of AI research approaches are found largely in the fields of education and health care (Couch, 2017; MacDonald, 2006; Reed, 2006). There are few studies in the tourism field where AI was used (Koster & Lemelin, 2009; Nyaupane & Poudel, 2012; Raymond & Hall, 2008a). Koster and LeMlin (2009) studied a tourism operator in rural Manitoba, Canada who used an AI approach in experiential tourism development. Nyaupane and Poudel (2012) investigated the interrelationships between conservation, livelihood, and tourism in Nepal. Raymond and Hall (2008a) conducted appreciative inquiry into volunteer tourism
programs’ contributions to cross-cultural understanding with a follow-up article suggesting the significant potential of AI as a research approach in the tourism field (2008b). In their case study of rural wellbeing from the perspectives of community members in two rural communities in Nova Scotia, Kevany and MacMichael (2014) use AI to investigate rural wellbeing and to foster engagement between communities and universities. Kevany and MacMichael (2014) found that AI provides an approach to researching community wellbeing because of four key characteristics (1) relational dynamics, (2) positivity, (3) multivocality and social construction, and (4) generativity and action orientation (p. 38). Similarly, Nyaupane and Poudel (2012), Koster and LeMlin (2009) and Aziz et al (2013) advocate for AI as a promising tourism research tool to understand tourism potentials in rural communities.

This research aims to understand rural food tourism’s potential contribution to cultural sustainability; therefore, an appreciative approach is appropriate. Although this research does not reflect the participatory nature, nor all the characteristic phases of a 5D AI process, several aspects of the methodology reflect the appreciative paradigm. Figure 3.3 shows how the 5D cycle influenced this research.
The research questions were framed positively because of the assumption that what we focus on becomes our reality. The semi-structured interview questions were phrased to solicit positive examples both because of the assumption that “the act of asking questions of an organization or group influences the group in some way” (Hammond, 2013, p. 14) and because the interview questions were guided by the discover and dream stages of an appreciative inquiry. For example, the question “Tell me about initiatives that support local food tourism in your region” asks participants to identify the best of what currently exists which is the objective of the discover stage. The questions “What aspects of local food culture would you like to keep? Why?” and “What aspects of local food culture would you like to change? Why?” ask participants to consider future possibilities as in the dream phase of an AI cycle. This research is focused on successes, so the findings reflect what participants thought worked. Where participants shared the negatives, they were usually reframed as future opportunities and included in
Chapter Seven’s findings on the future of rural food tourism and cultural sustainability. The AI assumption that language creates reality was applied to analysis of interview findings and analysis of the significance of the language used in key tourism strategy documents. An appreciative approach also influenced the conclusions because the researcher used the vision of culturally sustainable rural food tourism described by participants to propose ways this vision might be achieved.

3.2 Research design

This research uses a comparative case study methodology to investigate the research questions in two Canadian wine regions. Canadian wine production is insignificant by global standards, representing only 0.03% of global wine production (Canadian Vintners Association, n.d.). However, wine is an important part of local economies and identities in several provinces: Ontario, which accounts for approximately 2/3 of the Canadian wine industry, British Columbia which is the next largest, followed by Quebec, Nova Scotia, and some very limited participation in other provinces (Rimerman & Eyler, 2017). The South Okanagan Valley in British Columbia has been home to the researcher for 15 years and she is familiar with food tourism development in the area through previous work. A preliminary jurisdictional scan supported using the Annapolis Valley in Nova Scotia as a comparable case region. Both regions have
traditionally had agricultural economies and have similar characteristics in terms of population density, distance from urban centres, and identities as wine and agri-food tourism regions. The different provincial contexts and different stages of wine industry development provided valuable points of comparison.

Case study research is appropriate because current social circumstances and phenomenon are being studied (Yin, 2009) and case research facilitates the investigation of local responses to global concerns (Noor, 2008). In particular, case reports are considered the most appropriate form to report work using alternative paradigms (Lincoln & Guba, 2012) because at their best, cases offer “resonance, rhetoric, empowerment, and applicability” (p. 2).

Regions are used because regions are considered the ideal basis for sustainable adaptive management and innovation (Cooke, 2013; Pike, Rodríguez-Pose, & Tomaney, 2016) and regional approaches are often taken in place development and promotion within tourism; however, what exactly constitutes a “region” is disputed. Nevertheless, Bell and Valentine (2013) argue that examining regions and how regional identities are constructed and marketed through food are fruitful ways to explore the interrelationships between globalization process and places that consider themselves regions. By taking a spatial perspective the “hierarchical scaling of events, things and processes, conceptually, practically and politically” are highlighted (Kindon, Pain,
& Kesby, 2007, p. 3). This attention to scale is particularly relevant in the inter-scalar tourism sector.

These comparative case studies will highlight learning that is “specific to each setting and learning that summarizes dynamics across environments” (Reed, 2007, p. 148). Within case and across case comparisons will allow for rich contextual description and potentially generalizable contributions towards a theoretical framework regarding the factors that support cultural sustainability which future case studies could test.

Bramwell et al. (2017) note a predominance of single case studies and the need for more comparative cases. Using comparative cases permits an in-depth analysis of the similarities and differences in two locations since the collection and comparatively analysis of case data allows for study of exemplars, such as the value and social impact of culture in diverse sustainability contexts and comparative research reveals contingency and path dependence, in different contexts (Burawoy, 2009; Flyvbjerg, 2006; Yin, 2009). Intra-country cultural differences and their effect on rural food tourism is an area identified for future research (Calza et al., 2018).

Determining case boundaries is challenging because boundaries differ by physical geography, cultural practice, political jurisdictions and sectoral interests such as wine associations. Bounding the cases is even more complicated when the subject under consideration, tourism, comprises the movement of people
across the bounds of a system. The researcher took an economic development-centric approach to bounding the cases under consideration because the literature reviewed revealed a gap in understanding cultural sustainability within rural development, specifically development related to food tourism. Therefore, the BC region is the Okanagan Similkameen and the Nova Scotia region is the Annapolis Valley Economic zone. Within those regions the focus was on areas most active in food tourism which, as previously mentioned, is understood here as inclusive of food and drink in keeping with the World Food Tourism Association's definition (World Food Travel Association, n.d.).

3.3 Methods

A variety of research methods were used, with semi-structured interviews being the main method of data collection. Other sources included journal articles, books, documents, and websites related to local, regional and provincial policies that intersect with food tourism in the South Okanagan Valley and the Annapolis Valley. Tourism strategy documents were considered particularly important sources because of their future orientation. Key sources were reviewed multiple times and thematically coded manually where appropriate using content analysis to identify themes and concepts within the data. Content analysis is a systematic, but not prescriptive, way to code and classify data (Weber, 1990).
These sources were used in Chapter 4 to introduce the comparative cases, in the findings and extensively in the discussion and recommendations.

The guide for the semi-structured interviews is found in Appendix A. The final question “Tell me about a rural place that does food tourism well.” was added and slight adjustments were made to the original phrasing and question order as a result of piloting the questions with a rural tourism stakeholder from another region in August 2018. The interview guide provided a starting point, but the interviews were semi-structured, so evolved based on participants’ personal responses. All interviews began with the personal experience question, “Tell me about your role in your organization?” as a means to establish rapport and shared background context. The second question asked participants to describe food culture in their region. In some cases, participants answered subsequent questions without the interviewer needing to ask all the questions directly. For example, while discussing food culture, some participants also discussed what they felt should be sustained and how this might be done. Questions were asked in their general form first. If the participant gave a very short answer, the first prompt was a pause, and if there was no further elaboration, then a prompt like “Were there other things you were thinking…?” was given. Sometimes the interviewer sought to deepen the inquiry by using specific prompts as shown in the interview guide, such as asking if the participant observed cultural or social benefits of using food culture in tourism. Patterns regarding prompting are noted in the findings. Specific prompts, such as questions about Indigenous culture and
environmental sustainability, were also used to probe differences between BC data and NS data. Again, when these kinds of specific prompts were used, it is indicated in the findings. Efforts were made not to lead participants; however, the questions and prompts were designed to create opportunities for participants to notice aspects of cultural sustainability and food tourism which they may not have been fully aware of until they were asked. The researcher opened the door, but the participants decided whether they wanted to walk through it.

Interviews are considered an appropriate case study data collection method because of the level of detail provided in interviews (Yin, 2009; Flyvbjerg, 2011). The interviews were supplemented with participant observation documented in field notes and photographs. In the South Okanagan, that participation included involvement in rural food tourism planning, but in the Annapolis Valley the researcher participated as a rural food tourist. The researcher participated in food tourism experiences in the South Okanagan and the Annapolis Valley during the field work such as visiting farms, farmers’ markets, wineries, breweries, and restaurants. The researcher was also able to attend and participate in the following events in the South Okanagan:

- TOTA Annual Summit and AGM in Osoyoos, November 14, 2018
- Okanagan Research Forum “Eating the Okanagan” Exploring change in our local food systems in Kelowna, December 3, 2018
- Okanagan Bioregional Food System session in Penticton, January 21, 2019
- BCWI Insight Conference in Penticton, March 12, 2019
• Honourable Mélanie Joly, Minister of Tourism, Official Languages and La Francophonie luncheon organized by the Penticton and Wine Country Chamber of Commerce in Penticton, May 23, 2019
• Fortify Artisan Fermenters and Distillers Business Conference in Penticton, November 19, 2019 which also included a presentation by Pete Luckett from the AV.

The researcher took notes during or immediately following participant observation occurrences as appropriate. These “snapshots of empirical phenomena” (Grix, 2010, p. 130) were valuable additional findings for qualitative analysis.

This research sought interview participants who were rural food tourism stakeholders. Freeman (1984) defined stakeholders as individuals or groups directly affected or affecting the policymaking process. Businesses, governmental and non-governmental organizations involved in agriculture, food and drink production, and tourism are stakeholders, and given tourism’s broad effects any local resident is also a stakeholder. This creates a rather large pool of potential participants! The research questions take a systems’ view of food tourism; therefore, it was appropriate to interview stakeholders who were in a position to see the region holistically. Participants were selected based on their leadership roles in tourism related governmental or non-governmental organizations, associations with direct involvement in policy development and/or reputation as an engaged food tourism actor. Many participants served in multiple capacities. For example, owning a food tourism business and serving on a tourism related board. Several participants with more informal influence based
on their public profile, educational attainments, and/or innovative tourism offering were included. These participants tended to be younger than those involved in formal roles. Where their perspective seems unique it is noted, but with some caution because of the small sample size.

Participants were identified through internet searches of relevant organizations as well as through existing industry knowledge and referrals. In the case of referrals, the individuals making the referrals were asked to provide the researcher’s contact information to leads. Most recruitment occurred through email. Potential participants were emailed a short summary of the project and invited to participate. There was an excellent response rate with only 2 or 3 prospective participants not responding to interview requests in each province.

A total of 52 semi-structured interviews involving 60 participants were conducted between November 2018 and July 2019. Of these, 26 semi structured interviews were conducted in British Columbia with a total of 30 participants. Given previous work experience and the fact that the researcher’s home is in the South Okanagan, 20 of the 28 participants were already known to the researcher though none were close friends. Twenty-four semi structured interviews were conducted in Nova Scotia with a total of 28 participants. Dr. Kathleen Kevany at Dalhousie University and several BC contacts acted as a conduit to community introductions in Nova Scotia. Two in-person trips were made to Nova Scotia: one two-week trip in Spring 2019 to conduct interviews and one shorter follow-up trip
in August 2019. Two additional virtual interviews were also conducted with participants working at national and international levels familiar with culinary tourism in both provinces to provide further perspective. Most interviews took place in person at participant’s place of business or a neutral public location (i.e. coffee shop). There were 14 interviews conducted virtually. Table 3.1 shows the interview details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Interview #</th>
<th>Participant #</th>
<th>Average interview time (mean)</th>
<th>Virtual</th>
<th>In-person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>Nov. 2018-Mar 2019</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65 minutes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Mar. 2019-June 2019</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>73 minutes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>May-June 2019</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One interview included virtual and in-person sessions.
Destination, regional and provincial and national perspectives were represented by participants. Tables 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 outline South Okanagan, Annapolis Valley and national participants according to the following organization types:

- Community
- Destination Marketing/Management Organizations – DMO (staff or board)
- Economic development (included Indian bands in the Okanagan)
- Education and training,
- Industry (staff or board)
- Informal influencer (where there was no formal organizational role outside the food tourism business, but the participant offered valuable perspective)
- Local government (elected and/or staff)
- Provincial government (staff)
### Table 3.2 South Okanagan Valley Participant Code/Organization Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Code</th>
<th>Organization Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Industry association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Education and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3*</td>
<td>DMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4*</td>
<td>Community organization/society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>DMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Industry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>DMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>Community Organization/society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>DMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>Local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>Industry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>Industry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>DMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>Informal Influencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19a, b, c**</td>
<td>Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A20</td>
<td>DMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21</td>
<td>Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22**</td>
<td>Provincial government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23**</td>
<td>Provincial government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24</td>
<td>Industry association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A25</td>
<td>Community organization/society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A26</td>
<td>Industry association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A27</td>
<td>Community organization/society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A28</td>
<td>Informal Influencer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* interviewed together, coded separately
** interviewed together, coded together
### Table 3.3 Annapolis Valley Participant Code/Organization Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Code</th>
<th>Organization Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>DMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Industry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7 a, b, c**</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>Community organization/society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>Industry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>Provincial Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12 a, b**</td>
<td>Informal Influencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14 a*</td>
<td>Informal Influencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14 b*</td>
<td>Industry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Informal Influencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16 a, b**</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>Industry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18</td>
<td>Community organization/society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22</td>
<td>Informal Influencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23 a, b**</td>
<td>Informal Influencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24</td>
<td>DMO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* interviewed together, coded separately
** interviewed together, coded together

### Table 3.4 National Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Code</th>
<th>Organization Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Efforts were made to include participants from across each region because there was considerable within-region variation in terms of economic activity, population density and other demographic factors. Four Annapolis Valley participants had previous experience living and working in food/wine/tourism in the Okanagan Valley, but now lived/worked in the Annapolis Valley. Both national participants served in a variety of consultative roles across Canada. One national participant was based in BC and the other was based in Ontario.

Notes were taken by the researcher during the interviews and all interviews were audio recorded. After the interviews, the researcher reviewed the notes and audio which allowed the researcher to hear and reflect more deeply on what participants were saying. Both direct transcription and paraphrasing were used to create interview summaries which were approximately 6 pages in BC (mean 1524 words) and 9 pages in Nova Scotia (mean 2340 words). Early analysis was integrated in this review process which established the initial coding framework since interview summaries were organized in broad categories such as: food sovereignty, sustainability, food culture, policy. Each participant received their interview summary via email and was asked to review it for accuracy and provide any revisions as a quality control strategy. Eight participants requested minor revisions to their notes, either factual corrections or a request that a specific detail be altered or removed to protect their anonymity or because that information was not publicly available. Respondent validation of the interview transcriptions/notes was an important quality control measure (Torrance, 2012).
Initial patterns, different perspectives and commonalities and differences within and between regions began to emerge as the researcher was immersed in the specific details of the data (Patton, 2005).

Interview summaries were then imported into NVivo. Coding in NVivo involved an iterative approach and multiple readings where data were coded into categories, and then thematic codes and sub-codes using content analysis (Weber, 1990). For example, the first reading was coded by category such as “food culture” which often reflected the broad framework created during the review process. Next themes were coded. For example, a thematic code of “food culture” was “agricultural”. “Diversity” was a sub-code of “agricultural” which was further sub-divided into different dimensions, such as “product diversity” and “regional diversity”. Coding was not code or category exclusive since data could reflect multiple categories or codes simultaneously.

Analysis was not conceived as a one-time activity, but an ongoing process sensitive to the case contexts and holistic in keeping with Patton’s (2015) qualitative research themes. A process of constant comparison influenced by Dick (2007) was applied as shown in Figure 3.4.
Data sets were compared within, across and beyond the South Okanagan and Annapolis Valley case regions. Each interview was considered a data set within its case, so was compared to other interview data sets within the same region during coding. Each case was considered a data set, so findings from interviews and other sources related to food tourism in the two regions were compared. The body of literature related to cultural sustainability and rural food tourism also formed a data set. Data generation and analysis were interconnected in an analysis process that explored agreement or disagreement between datasets.
Constant comparison created perpetually extending data sets from individual interview, to case, to comparative case, to broader literature (breadth) and layers of analysis from additional interviews, and secondary research (depth).

Analysis was both inductive and deductive. Data analysis was more inductive in the early stages beginning with interpretation of the empirical data. The results of analysis comparing interviews, case documents and participant observation notes are given in Chapters 5, 6, and 7. The researcher did not compare data to the body of literature at this stage although literature previously reviewed, appreciative principles, and Soini and Dessein’s (2016) cultural sustainability framework informed what evidence the researcher sought (Grix, 2004). The findings are aggregated by province rather than by participant type within each region or across regions because the sample of each participant type was too small to generalize. Results are based on an analysis of all of the interviews. Once the thematic findings were established, the researcher worked with the transcripts to convey these themes in a narrative fashion (Flyvbjerg, 2006) arranged case-by-case where there were significant differences, or amalgamated where findings were similar. Participants’ provided rich description (Creswell, 2003; Erlandson et al., 1993; Longboat, 2012) which is emphasized through use of both integrated and longer block quotes. Some participants, particularly those who were informal influencers or otherwise able to express themselves without the burden of professional/organizational restraint, were adept storytellers; their voice is used more frequently in direct quotes, but what
they communicated was representative of the whole unless noted. We also hear more from participants directly involved in initiatives which other participants mentioned frequently and participants who were able to compare regions through their own direct experience in both provinces. Differences of opinion and unique perspectives are flagged as such and rationale for their inclusion is given. Photographs, maps and comparative tables are also employed to communicate the themes. The findings use a “show, don’t tell” tactic which is characteristic of effective teaching (Dirksen, 2012). The reader may notice some friction as they personally construct their own interpretations while reading Chapters five through seven. The researcher’s interpretation then follows in Chapters eight and nine.

In the Chapter 8 discussion, the findings are analyzed more deductively through direct comparison to Soini and Dessein’s culture in, as, for sustainability, food sovereignty principles and other literature. Diagrams are used in the discussion to synthesize findings and relate the findings directly to the research questions. The Chapter 9 recommendations emerged through the analysis process, particularly by comparing the extensive written reflections, questions, and connections noted by the researcher during earlier data analysis phases to relevant literature in order to identify opportunities. These reflections included the practice of self-aware meta-analysis known as critical reflexivity where the researcher acknowledges and questions biases (Lincoln & Guba, 2012; Mitchell et al., 2017). For example, noting questions like “Why does this bother me so much?” or “What other ways could this be interpreted?” or “Is there an
appreciative way to convey this finding?” Another important aspect of comparative analysis was the ongoing involvement of the researcher's advisor and advisory committee who pushed the researcher to question, explore alternatives, and interrogate the research paradigm, process and product, thereby acting as a validation group (McNiff et al., 2003).

### 3.4 Limitations

Quality in qualitative research is dependent upon demonstrations of “trustworthiness” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Longboat, 2012; Mitchell et al., 2017; Williams & Morrow, 2009), a concept which refers to the researcher's “accountability to the broader research community, including participants, and general readership” (Mitchell et al., 2017, p. 673). The design, data collection, analysis and reporting described in this chapter demonstrate that this research embraces the three facets of trustworthiness identified by Williams and Morrow (2009): integrity of data, clear communication of findings, and a balance between subjectivity and reflexivity. However, there are limitations related to researcher positionality, the use of a cultural sustainability framework, the positivity bias inherent to appreciative approaches, and issues related to community participation.

Case studies are the product of interaction between the researcher, participants and place, and therefore, “rooted in the person, character,
experience, context, and philosophy of the constructor (Lincoln & Gube, 2012, p. 3). I am deeply aware that my insider positionality influences all aspects of my research construction (Herr & Anderson, 2005; Morse et al., 2002). I have a kind of privileged in-betweenness or what Collins (1991) calls ‘the outsider-within.’ I have been the only woman and the youngest person in the room with wine tourism policy players; I took minutes. I have been at parties where guests reminisced about the financial hardship of having to sell their Porsche while I wondered if I could afford to buy diapers. I see the wasted water and pesticide wash to the lake. I know whose temporary foreign workers are made to sleep and shower in the cellar. My friends are tasting staff whose value is extolled while they are denied sick pay. I have also had this time to study, been the sweat equity partner in a winery, travelled internationally, and enjoyed many multi-course winemaker dinners in stunning settings.

My positionality creates outsider and insider lenses since I sometimes assume or identify with a marginalized outsider perspective (as a women in male dominated economic development meetings, as a term contract employee, etc.), but also have an insiders’ involvement and commitment (Coghlan & Brydon-Miller, 2014). I am aware of my tendency to be biased against powerful, advantaged entities like big businesses and formal authorities, and biased towards producers like agricultural workers and winemakers. I sometimes feel that I do not have a voice, but also know that I have a much greater voice than many others as an educated, white woman.
My research influences me, my participants, their regions and a wider audience (McNiff et al., 2003). I justify this influence with my intention to create and validate new knowledge with the purposes of positive personal and social development. I care about the rural food tourism people and places with whom I identify. This study aims to support these people and places. The question of how I should use the power I have was constant company.

I live with my husband and two children in the South Okanagan. I have personal experience in the BC wine industry. My husband is a winemaker and I teach tourism courses in the Okanagan School of Business at Okanagan College. I am not objective in the sense of personal distance from the BC participants in this study; however, as described earlier, quality control strategies were used throughout the research process to ensure the research accurately captured the case details (Patton, 2015) and multiple sources and methods were used to support validity (Mertens, 2015). Participants were selected based on their tourism leadership role. Inviting participation from a representative sample of key stakeholder organizations meant that some of the BC participants were previously known to me personally and/or professionally. I am not in a position of power over any participants where our existing relationship would be likely to coerce participation. Minimal social risks were managed by ensuring confidentiality and protecting participants’ privacy. It was made clear throughout the research project that participation was voluntary and that participants could stop at any time or decline to answer any questions without risk of repercussion.
The comparative aspects of analysis were challenging since there was such a disparity between my personal knowledge and connection in the two cases. I was able to probe deeply more quickly during BC interviews where relationships were sometimes already established and basic understanding of the contexts were commonly known. Establishing rapport and positive relationships is essential to qualitative interviewing, so the insider relationships may have been an advantage (Kilpatrick et al., 2019) though I was conscious of the need to set aside pre-existing notions of how people think and how things work, so I could be open to new perspectives.

I was completely unfamiliar with NS before visiting to collect data in May 2019. I had no pre-existing connection to Annapolis Valley (AV) participants. It was easier to be open minded in a new setting, but it was more challenging to take the conversations and analysis to a deeper level. My familiarity with the BC context and BC participants may explain why BC interviews tended to be somewhat shorter (by an average of 8 minutes) than Nova Scotia interviews and Nova Scotia interview summaries were longer (9 versus 6 pages). The difference may also relate to cultural communication differences between the provinces. Even though I am an outsider to the Annapolis Valley, I consider myself a researcher-practitioner in both cases because of my involvement in the food tourism field (McNiff et al., 2003). I endeavored to analyse and present findings in a way that balanced subjectivity and reflexivity (Williams & Morrow, 2009). I was more comfortable paraphrasing in the South Okanagan.
because of my own knowledge and experience. I rely more heavily on direct quotes from participants in the Annapolis Valley.

Although the participation rate was good, there were still some important perspectives which were not included because individuals or organizations did not respond to requests to participate. I felt it was inappropriate to press for participation beyond a second invitation. In addition, selecting participants who held leadership roles within tourism was suitable to the research goals, but it meant that the perspective of a wide variety of other very important stakeholders, especially those who have been historically marginalized because of age, race, class, and sexual orientation, were not represented.

Theoretically, the research was framed by, but not bound by, Soini and Dessein's (2016) conceptualization of culture in, for and as sustainability. There are several limiting weaknesses in their proposed framework. Most critically, the framework represents a Western and academic perspective on cultural sustainability since it comes out of Soini and Birkeland's (2014) analysis of how the concept of cultural sustainability was used in the academic literature which was part of a COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology Action) initiated research project. In addition, while community culture is neither homogeneous nor static, these nuances are lost in the conceptual framework. The conceptual model may inadequately reflect the world's complexity, but culture in, for, as sustainability is a useful way to begin researching the different
relationships between culture and rural tourism and can be enriched through consideration of the specific characteristics of a case study.

There are also limitations related to the appreciative research paradigm. A significant critique of appreciative approaches is that by stressing the positive, the negative is dismissed (Bradbury & Reason, 2006). The fear is that as a result of this positivity bias, a partial version of the truth emerges and analysis is inaccurate (Fitzgerald et al., 2010). In view of the extensive problem-based work that has already been done in rural tourism research, it is possible that a partial version of the truth (negative) has already emerged, and appreciative research can make contributions to the wider rural tourism and cultural sustainability fields through other partial truths (positive). Reed (2007) explains:

The AI [Appreciative Inquiry] study is, therefore, one study among others, part of an approach to redressing the balance in the body of work, which, if it is in line with traditional research approaches, will have primarily explored problems and deficits …seeing a study as part of a body of work moves away from the image of research as being a disengaged and distinct exercise, carried out in isolation from other conversations, and therefore, sheds a different light on issues such as validity and knowledge” (p. 76).

An appreciative approach is not proposed as a panacea for all research challenges or as a replacement for other research approaches. Its value is that it offers researchers and communities “another worldview and methodology for framing and conducting tourism research…. which initiates positive changes in communities” (Nyaupane & Poudel, 2012, p. 986). Although an appreciative
approach limits the type of evidence gathered, this is an intentional limitation based on the belief that communities and organizations develop in the direction of what is investigated (van der Haar & Hosking, 2004). The line of questioning and the research design intend to foster the construction of positive social realities as determined by stakeholder participants. This research concerns not “arriving at an eternal truth,” but “developing ideas that help people to do things” (Reed, 2007, p. 195).

A further concern is that the researcher-directed nature of this study is not well-aligned with the participatory qualities of appreciative inquiry. This limitation is also reflected in the existing appreciative research in tourism and rural development which includes using appreciative questions within a structured interview (Raymond & Hall, 2008a) or community participation at consultative and collaborative levels (Koster & Lemelin, 2009; Nyaupane & Poudel, 2012; Raymond & Hall, 2008b). I was not able to find examples of appreciative tourism research where community participation was collegiate with research being a process of mutual learning controlled by local people.

This doctoral research was originally envisioned as participatory because of my commitment to collaborative research processes and social change (Bradbury & Reason, 2006). The original intention was to follow the semi-structured interviews with focus groups in an effort to transition the research from a researcher-initiated process to a collaborative process; however, the extensive data gathered at the interview stage was found to have adequately answered the
six research questions. As a result, the second stage of the proposed research was omitted, as was a seventh research question: How might a participatory research approach foster positive social change in the future? Respondent validation did not include inviting participants to comment on the final themes and recommendations which would have been part of focus groups.

The kind of appreciative inquiry/participatory action research I envisioned in my earliest proposal remains my ideal though the constraints of academic structures and pragmatic concerns made me appreciate that researcher-directed processes are more efficient. I consider this research a first phase that may establish the relationships and lay the groundwork that will make more inclusive participatory research possible as part of either post-doctoral research, or other academic/applied research. As such, seeking understanding rather than judgment was prioritized at this stage. The results of this research could be fodder for collaborative critical analysis in the future.
Chapter 4 Comparative Cases

The two case regions are now introduced based on a review of the literature. This background information about the Annapolis Valley Economic region in Nova Scotia and the Okanagan Similkameen region in British Columbia is intended to provide a sense of the social, economic and geographic context.

4.1 British Columbia’s South Okanagan Valley

British Columbia (BC), Canada’s most western province, covers 922,503.01 square kilometres with a total population of 4,648,055 (Statistics Canada, 2016a). The South Okanagan (SO) is the southern portion of the approximately 260 kilometer long and 130 kilometer wide Okanagan Valley located in the southern interior of BC (Buschert et al., 2018). The region borders the Washington State county of the Okonogan (American spelling) in the United States to the south, the Thompson-Nicola and Central Okanagan to the north, the Fraser Valley to the west, and the Kootenay Boundary to the east as shown in Figure 4.1
The largest urban centre in the Okanagan is Kelowna with a current population of 194,882 (Statistics Canada, 2016c). Driving time from the South Okanagan to Kelowna ranges from almost 2 hours to 45 minutes. The region is about 400 km or 4 ½ hour drive from the Vancouver metro area and 667 km or 7 ½ hour drive from Calgary. There is an international airport in Kelowna and a small airport in Penticton with flights to Vancouver and Calgary.

The region has been home to the Syilx/Okanagan people for thousands of years and is on unceded Syilx Okanagan territory (ONA, n.d.). The first Europeans to travel through the Okanagan were fur traders in the early part of the 19th. European settlement began with a Catholic mission in the central Okanagan Valley in 1859. Gold miners followed in the mid-late 1800’s (Senese et
al., 2012; Whittall, 2019). Most towns in the SO were incorporated between 1902-1946.

Administratively, the SO is part of the Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen (RDOS). The region is 10,411.68 square kilometers (Statistics Canada, 2016a). Travelling north to south the region begins with the district of Summerland, followed by the city of Penticton, and then the towns of Oliver and Osoyoos. The SO also includes 5 rural electoral areas: Area A Rural areas surrounding Osoyoos, including Anarchist Mountain to the east between Rock Creek and Osoyoos; Area C Rural areas surrounding Oliver; Area D Rural areas and unincorporated communities south of Penticton, including Kaleden and Okanagan Falls; Area E Rural areas and unincorporated settlements to the northeast of Penticton including Naramata; Area F Rural areas west of Summerland and northwest of Penticton. The RDOS also includes the Similkameen Valley, but this research did not focus on the Similkameen Valley because it is culturally and geographically distinct. The RDOS South Okanagan Regional Growth Strategy Bylaw No. 2770, 2017 is focused on the South Okanagan specifically as shown in Figure 4.2.
Figure 4.2 Map of the South Okanagan Regional Growth Plan Region
(South Okanagan Regional Growth Strategy, 2017)
The 2016 Census the Demographics of the Regional District of the Okanagan-Similkameen are shown in Table 4.1.

### Table 4.1 2016 Population of the Okanagan Similkameen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penticton</td>
<td>33,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerland</td>
<td>11,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>4,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osoyoos</td>
<td>5,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>2,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keremeos</td>
<td>1,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D and I</td>
<td>5,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Reserves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis, Ashnola, Blind Creek, Chopaka, Chuchuwayha, Lower Similkameen</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osoyoos</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penticton</td>
<td>1783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Similkameen</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>83,022</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistics Canada, 2016d)
In 2016 the population density was 8.0 persons per square kilometre (Statistics Canada, 2016d). However, population density varies significantly within the region. For example, the population density per square kilometre of Summerland is 156.8 while Area F which includes rural areas west of Summerland and northwest of Penticton has a population density per square kilometre of 3.5. The total population of the region increased by 2.8% between 2011 to 2016. However, this regional population growth was uneven. For example, Area F’s population declined by 4.1% during the same period while the town of Osoyoos increased by 5%.

The regional population is older than the provincial average with 31.1% of the RDOS population being 65 and over compared to 18.3% at the provincial level. The majority of regional residents (84.77%) are non-immigrants with 62.40% of private households having been in Canada for three or more generations (Statistics Canada, 2016a). The RDOS proportion of people who are a visible minority is 7% compared to 30% for the province as a whole. Again, there is considerable range within the region. For example, while 3.7% of the RDOS population give South Asian ethic origins, in Area C people of South Asians origin make up 15.6% of the population whereas in Summerland, South Asian origin is less than 1%. The percentage of the RDOS population identifying as having an Aboriginal identity is 7.6% (Statistics Canada, 2016d). The median total income of households in 2015 was $57,069 (Statistics Canada, 2016d).
The region has a continental climate with a growing season marked by long days because of the latitude and low rainfall because of the Coastal Mountain Range. Temperatures range from lows of \(-20^\circ C (-4^\circ F)\) in the winter to highs of \(+40^\circ C (104^\circ F)\) in the summer. Low levels of humidity keep pest and disease pressure low, but make irrigation essential. The series of lakes that runs through most parts of the Okanagan Valley provides some natural moderation of the climate extremes, but frosts in spring and fall and extreme winter cold are still agricultural risks (BCWI, n.d.). The most southern portions of the Okanagan Valley are semi-arid desert and not moderated by the large Lake Okanagan (Whittall, 2019). There are serious concerns about the impact of climate change given the region’s arid climate (Belliveau et al., 2006).

The South Okanagan has a long history of supporting food production. The Sylix people practiced a unique sustainable harvesting method which can be described as permaculturing because of the dry climate (Armstrong, 2007). The first European agriculture consisted of cattle ranching and grain which suited the open, arid landscape (Senese, et al., 2012). In the early twentieth century, there were improvements to transportation with rail and steamboats, and the provincial government’s South Okanagan Lands Project installed and operated gravity-fed irrigation water. As a result, the landscape transformed from the brown of grazing land and hay fields to green, pastoral orchards (Sense et. al., 2012; Whittall, 2019). As of the 2016 Census, there were 1,292 farms down from 1,506 in 2011. Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting represent 7.57% of the RDOS workforce.
Of the 1,292 farms, 912 were fruit and tree nut farms of which 414 farms reported growing grapes (Statistics Canada, 2016e).

The first grapes in the Okanagan were planted in mid 19th century by Father Pandosy, a Catholic missionary, and there were some other early efforts at grape growing and wine making (Whittall, 2019), but the wine industry remained relatively small until the 1960s for reasons which are discussed below (Senese, et al., 2012; Whittall, 2019).

The modern BC wine industry followed the signing of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in January 1989. NAFTA’s terms made a wider range of wines available to Canadian consumers at lower prices which encouraged domestic wineries to focus on producing quality vinifera grapes and wine. Up until that time protections afforded to the industry made innovation and quality improvements an unnecessary expense (Whittall, 2019). Changing market demand and government policy such as the Grape Wine Adjustment Assistance Program (GWAPP) encouraged domestic wineries to focus on producing quality vinifera (traditional European grape varieties) and wine and the number of wineries began to significantly increase (Senese, et al., 2012; Whittall, 2019).

By 2015, there were approximately 929 grape growers in BC with a combined vineyard acreage of 10,260. Canada’s Wine Economy – Ripe, Robust, Remarkable (2015) showed that the BC wine and grape industry contributed over
$2.77 billion to the provincial economy: $1.95 billion in business revenue, $312 million tax revenues and $512 million wages. This represented an increase of almost $760 million since 2011. The average bottle of wine made in BC produces $33.84 of business revenue, $5.42 of tax revenue and $8.91 of wages (Rimerman & Eyler, 2017).

There are now 280 wineries in 9 wine regions of BC designated with geographic indicators (BCWI, n.d.-a). Figure 4.3 shows the wine regions and the number of wineries in each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Indicator (GI)</th>
<th>No. of wineries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Islands</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenays</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilooet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan Valley</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuswap</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similkameen Valley</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Valley</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Island</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3 BC Wine Regions (BCWI, n.d.-a)
As demonstrated in Figure 4.3, the Okanagan Valley (BCWI, 2017) is the most significant wine region in the province. Because of the large size of the Okanagan Valley, the region is divided into 5 unofficial sub-regions to reflect the varying geographic conditions in the different parts of the valley (BCWI, 2017). Four of the five sub-regions and the vast majority of grapes grown in the Okanagan Valley are from the SO. These South Okanagan sub-regions of Penticton, which includes Summerland and Naramata, Okanagan Falls, Golden Mile and Black Sage/Osoyoos are shown in Figure 4.4. Together the South Okanagan grows 71% of the province’s wine grapes (BCWI, 2017).

![Unofficial Wine Sub-Regions of the South Okanagan](image)

**Figure 4.4 Unofficial Wine Sub-Regions of the South Okanagan** (Castanet, n.d.)
There are also four official sub-geographic indicators which meet the requirement of the Wines of Marked Quality Regulation related to demonstrating unique climates, soil types and the resulting wine styles in the Okanagan Valley GI all of which are in the South Okanagan Valley: Naramata Bench, Skaha Bench, Okanagan Falls, and Golden Mile Bench. Naramata Bench includes the lands between Penticton Creek and Okanagan Mountain Park on the east side of Okanagan Lake north of Penticton. Skaha Bench stretched south from Penticton and along the eastern shore of Skaha Lake. Okanagan Falls from the south end of Skaha Lake to Vaseux Lake. Golden Mile is the western slope of the valley south of Oliver (BCWI, n.d.-a). A sense of the diversity is given in Figure 4.5 which shows Painted Rock winery and its Skaha Bench vineyard while Figure 4.6. shows the Naramata Bench vineyard landscape.

Figure 4.5 Painted Rock Winery on Skaha Bluff (Trudel, 2018)
In 2017, there was $18.4 billion total tourism revenue in BC, an increase of 41.3% in a decade, and 16 million domestic and 5.6 million international visitors (Destination British Columbia, 2018). The BCWI estimates that more than 1 million of these visitors engage in wine tourism annually (BCWI, 2016). BC wine tourism generated $246 million in revenue in 2015 and employed about 2,615 employees. It is estimated that wine industry tourism generated $206.1 million of indirect and induced revenue and $59.3 million of indirect and induced wages (Rimerman & Eyler, 2017). Tourism is a major contributor to the SO’s regional economy (South Okanagan Regional Growth Strategy, 2017). Accommodation and food services represented 9.67% of the RDOS workforce in 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016d).
The communities of the SO are part of the Thompson Okanagan tourism region, one of six tourism regions in the province. Visitors to the Thompson Okanagan region represent 20% of provincial overnight visitation and 15% of related spending in 2017. The Thompson Okanagan received 3,721,000 overnight visits in 2014 and generated over $1.4 billion in related spending with most visits occurring during the peak summer month of July through September. Domestic overnight travellers, predominately from BC followed by Alberta, accounted for 85% of visitation and 83% of related spending. On average, tourists stayed 3.6 nights and spent $105 per night (DBC, 2017b).

Historically, Okanagan tourism was associated with the region’s warm weather, orchards, and scenic landscape of lakes and mountains. The Okanagan’s “peaches and beaches” continues to offer families an affordable vacation (Poirier & Getz, 2006), but tourism in the SO has evolved as the wine industry has grown. The Okanagan Wine Festival Society was instrumental in developing wine tourism as were the efforts of the Osoyoos Indian Band (OIB) whose initiatives include the ‘Nk’Mip Cellars’ which opened in 2002 and over a thousand vineyard acres (Poirier & Getz, 2006). The vast majority of agritourism activity in the region consists of winery tasting room visits. Carmichel and Senese (2012) describe the current Okanagan tourism as centered around wine and the “rural aesthetic” (p. 169). Schell’s (2015) Gourmet International award-winning cookbook *The Butcher, The Baker, The Wine and Cheese Maker* illustrates how local cuisine has become a significant part of the Okanagan wine country.
experience in the past decade. Wine tourism in the region is mature and would be considered at stage 3 in Carmichael and Senese’s (2012) stage model for wine touring destinations.

Related academic literature in the Okanagan centres around wine (Carmichael & Senese, 2012; Conlin & Rice, 2019; Hira, 2015; Poitras & Donald, 2006; D. Senese et al., 2016; Senese, 2016). Food systems, agriculture, and critical perspectives rarely come up in the wine tourism literature. The region is sometimes mentioned as part of a larger inquiry such as Hashimoto and Telfer’s (2006)’s research on branding regional Canadian food, but the researcher is only aware of one peer reviewed article specifically related to food tourism, culinary tourism or agritourism in the Okanagan, Hjalmarson, Bunn, Cohen, Terbasket, & Gahman's (2015) discussion of migrant workers who “drive the local food economy” (p. 79).

Although the remarkable growth of the wine industry has raised issues about the industry's impact on social, cultural, and environmental resources (Carmichel & Senese, 2012; Senese, 2010), these impacts have not received significant attention.
4.2 Nova Scotia’s Annapolis Valley

The Annapolis Valley (AV) is located in Nova Scotia (NS), one of Canada’s Maritime provinces. NS covers 52,942.27 square kilometres with a total population of 923,598 (Statistics Canada, 2016a). Nova Scotia is considered one of the most rural provinces in Canada (Gibson et al., 2015). Located in the western portion of Nova Scotia’s peninsula, the Annapolis Valley (AV) runs east-west for 130 kilometres from Annapolis Royal in the west to Windsor and the high tides of the Minas Basin in the east. The Annapolis and Cornwallis rivers flow through the valley. Gaspereau Valley, through which the Gaspereau River flows, is nested within the Annapolis Valley (Peters & Pinhey, 2015).

The Mi'kmaq are the founding people of the region. The Mi'kmaq nation has existed in what is now Nova Scotia for thousands of years and remains the main Aboriginal group within the province (George, 2013). Just over 5% of the AV population identified as Aboriginal (Statistics Canada, 2017b). Canada’s first successful European settlement in the area was established by the French in 1605 near the mouth of the Annapolis River. The Acadian decedents of the French colonists were forcefully deported in 1755’s Le Grand Dérangement and their holdings were redistributed to Anglophone colonists predominately New England Planters (Johnston, 2003).
The Annapolis Valley Economic Region’s 2016 population was 123,749 with a 0.1% increase since 2011. Figure 4.7 shows the 3 counties that comprise the Annapolis Valley Economic Region: from west (left) to east (right) these are Annapolis County, Kings County, and Hants County.

Figure 4.7 Annapolis Valley Economic Region, Nova Scotia, Canada
(Statistics Canada, 2017b)

The closest major urban centre to the AV is Halifax. The Halifax metropolitan area has a population of 403,390. Halifax and its international airport are about 70 km and just under a one-hour drive from the eastern end of the AV and 200 km (two-hour drive) to the western end. The region comprises
8367.78 square kilometres and includes Annapolis, Kings, and Hants County census divisions and the towns (listed from east to west) of Windsor, Wolfville, Kentville, Middleton, Berwick, and Annapolis Royal. The Bear River, Cambridge, Glooscap, and Indian Brook Indian reserves are in the AV. Figure 4.8 shows the communities in the AV.

![Figure 4.8 Communities in the AV](Google, 2016)

The population density per square kilometre is 14.8. This ranges considerably between different towns and rural areas. For example, Berwick’s density is 381.3 per square kilometre while Annapolis County Subdivision A is 9.5 per square kilometre. Likewise, growth rates vary. The population of Annapolis County Subdivision B declined 3.3 % between 2011 and 2016 while the town of Kentville’s population increased by 2.9% over the same period (Statistics Canada, 2016b). Table 4.2 shows the population in each area.
Table 4.2 *Census Population Annapolis Valley 2016* (Statistics Canada, 2017b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal District</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hants</td>
<td>22453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hants</td>
<td>15368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapolis Royal</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick</td>
<td>2509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentville</td>
<td>6271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>1832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>3648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfville</td>
<td>4195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Subdivision</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapolis, Subd. A</td>
<td>5866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapolis, Subd. B</td>
<td>4448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapolis, Subd. C</td>
<td>4947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapolis, Subd. D</td>
<td>2991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings, Subd. A</td>
<td>22234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings, Subd. B</td>
<td>11858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings, Subd. C</td>
<td>8093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings, Subd. D</td>
<td>5219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indian Reserve</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear River</td>
<td>1326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Glooscap</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Brook 14 (Indian reserve)</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>123,749</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those aged 65 and over represented 20.91% of the population in the AV which is similar to the provincial average. Most (87.23%) of the AV population described themselves as coming from families that had been in Canada for three of more generations. Only 2.72% identified as a visible minority compared to 6.5 provincially (Statistics Canada, 2017b). The median total income of households in 2015 was $58,135 (Statistics Canada, 2016d).

The climate is relatively mild by maritime standards and the valley is very conducive to agriculture (Conrad, 1980). The 1981 to 2010 Canadian Climate Normals measured at the Kentville weather station, shows a daily average temperature of 7.1 Celsius, with an average maximum temperature of 11.8 and an average minimum of 2.4. Annual precipitation was 1181.2mm (Government of Canada, 2010).

The AV is the most productive agricultural area in Nova Scotia. It was one of the first areas in Canada to export agricultural products (Conrad, 1980; Devanney, 2010) and is known for growing fruit, vegetables, cattle and grains (George, 2013). Grand Pre, located just east of Wolfville on the Bay of Fundy’s Minas Basin has been designated as a UNWTO world heritage site since 2012 because of its agricultural heritage landscape characterized by a dyke and sluice system called aboiteaux which has been collectively maintained for 100s of years (George, 2013).
An approximately eight-kilometer-wide band of fertile soil lies between the North Mountain ridges which protect the valley from the Bay of Fundy and the South mountain ridges which shelter the valley from the worst effects of the Atlantic Ocean. Figure 4.9 shows a view of the Annapolis Valley looking south from the northern mountain ridge.

Figure 4.9 View of the Annapolis Valley from the “Lookoff” (Nova Scotia, May, 12, 2019)

In 2016 there were 1,072 farms in Nova Scotia’s Census Agricultural Region 2 a decline from 1,190 in 2011 (Statistics Canada, 2017a). Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting employed 5.10% of the AV population (Statistics Canada, 2017b). According to the 2016 Canadian Agricultural Census, the most
common farm type was cattle ranching and farming with 216 farms. Fruit and nut tree farming was the second most common farm type with 195 farms. Of these, 63 farms were vineyards for a total of 660 acres (Statistics Canada, n.d.).

Nova Scotia was one of the first areas to cultivate grapes in North America as early as the 1600s, but the modern wine industry is much younger (Peters & Pinhey, 2015; Sears & Weatherbee, 2019). Nova Scotia began producing commercial wine in 1980 when Grand Pre opened in Wolfville followed by Jost winery which opened in 1983 (Macdonald & Hartt, 2014). By 2015, there were almost 150 thousand cases of 100% Canadian Nova Scotia wine sold which generated $16.4 million in winery revenue and employed 131 people with total wages of $3.8 million. Nova Scotia’s climate is at the cooler limit for grape growing, but soil and meso-climates create ideal conditions for traditional method sparkling and aromatic white hybrids such as L’Acadie Blanc, Seyval Blanc, Vidal and New York Muscat. NS wines typically have notable acidity, light, fruity flavours with some minerality (Student & Sears, 2018). Low-tannin red Varietals such as Lucie Kuhlmann, Baco Noir, Marechal Foch, and Leon Millot, ice wines and fruit wines are also produced in NS and there is successful experimentation with vinifera like Chardonnay, Ortega, and Riesling (Winery Association of Nova Scotia, n.d.-b.). Climate change is predicted to expand suitable acreage and varietals (Grallert & Laytte, 2018; Mulligan, 2018; Robicheau et al., 2018). Wine quality and consumer perceptions of Nova Scotia wine have improved
significantly during the last decade with some wines winning prestigious awards (Peters & Pinhey, 2015; Sears & Weatherbee, 2019).

There are now over twenty wineries and 70 grape growers farming 800 vineyard acres (Sears & Weatherbee, 2019). The Annapolis Valley is considered the heart of NS growing wine and viticulture sector. There are thirteen wineries listed as being in the region (Tourism Nova Scotia, n.d.-b) and with 660 acres in vineyard, approximately 82% of the province’s grapes are grown in the region. Figure 4.10 shows a vineyard in the Gaspereau Valley while Figure 4.11 shows the view from a vineyard near Wolfville looking northwest over the Minas Basin.

![Figure 4.10 Gaspereau Vineyards (Tourism Nova Scotia, n.d.-a)](image_url)
Nova Scotia’s tourism revenues were $2.61 billion in 2018 with approximately 2.4 million non-resident overnight visitors. Visitation to Nova Scotia increased by 27% between 2013 and 2018 (Tourism Nova Scotia, n.d.-d).

The Bay of Fundy & Annapolis Valley is one of the 7 NS regions promoted by Tourism Nova Scotia. The region has attracted visitors, particularly visitors interested in heritage tourism since the mid-nineteenth century publication of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s poem, Evangeline: A Tale of Acadie (Colton & Bissix, 2016). Tourism is considered important to the regional economy because another $3.20 is generated in the community for every tourism dollar spent (TIANS, 2017). In August 2019, the Bay of Fundy & Annapolis Valley year-to-date Room Nights Sold was 228,000 ranking second outside Metro Halifax; Cape Breton had 295,000 (Tourism Nova Scotia, 2019b). Accommodation and food...
services provided 5.95% of the region’s employment in 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2017b).

Wine tourism in the province has contributed a great deal to the growth of the industry (Macdonald & Hartt, 2014; Rimerman & Eyler, 2015; Sears & Weatherbee, 2019). An estimated 112,000 tourists visited Nova Scotia wineries in 2015, generating $19.2 million in revenue. Wine tourism employed 208 people paying total wages of approximately $6.8 million. There was also an additional $12.9 million of indirect and induced revenue and $3.7 million of indirect and induced wages generated through wine tourism (Rimerman & Eyler, 2017).

Related academic research is led by work by Sears and Weatherbee (2017, 2018, 2019) at Acadia University exploring connections between tourism, wine industry development, destination branding and regional economic development. Other notable work includes Colton and Bissix’s (2005) analysis of agritourism’s potential in Nova Scotia which found that while authentic agritourism experiences are well-suited to the region, further product development, partnership, communication, government support, marketing, and education and training were required. Wine tourism in the region can be considered at a stage 2 using Carmichael and Senese’s (2012) criteria since there is some network development, joint marketing and tourist movement along an Annapolis Valley wine route.
4.3 Case comparison highlights

Table 4.3 presents a comparison of the Annapolis Valley Economic Region and the Okanagan Similkameen according to variables considered relevant for this research.
Table 4.3 AV and SO Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Region</th>
<th>Land area in km²</th>
<th>Density per km²</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% 65 and older</th>
<th>% Third Generation Canadian or more</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Vineyard acres</th>
<th>Employed in Agriculture</th>
<th>Employed in hospitality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV Economic Region</td>
<td>8,368</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>123,749</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan Similkameen</td>
<td>10,412</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83,022</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>5965</td>
<td>7.57%</td>
<td>9.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rounded to nearest whole number (Statistics Canada, 2016d)
The Annapolis Valley Economic Region has a land area which is 80% that of the Okanagan Similkameen Region District, with 30% more people, so it has a greater density per kilometer though it should be noted that the South Okanagan portion of the RDOS is the most densely populated section of the RDOS. The most obvious demographic differences are that the RDOS is older with 10% more people aged 65 and over, and has 15% fewer residents who have been in Canada for 3 or more generations which was also reflected earlier in the Annapolis Valley’s smaller population who consider themselves visible minorities. The two regions have similar average incomes. However, the percentage of the population employed in the hospitality sector was 60% higher in the RDOS and there was also a higher percentage employed in agriculture, and this is despite wineries being classified as manufacturing under the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). These variables prepare the ground for the interview findings to be meaningfully planted and then to grow into ideas for consideration in the Chapter 8 discussion and recommendations in Chapter 9.
Chapter 5 Findings on understanding and operationalizing rural food tourism and cultural sustainability

The findings from the semi-structured interviews are now presented. Direct quotes are indicated with quotation marks and attributed by participant code. Ellipses are used to indicate omissions within the narrative excerpts. Participants were selected based on their roles within organizations involved in tourism planning, therefore, each participant brought a perspective informed by their own experience. As a result, there were both common themes and points raised by one or only a few participants that are nevertheless very important to gaining a comprehensive understanding of how cultural sustainability is understood and used in rural food tourism. Efforts were made to convey the prevalence of particular qualitative findings. Sometimes this is done using adjectives like few, some, many, most that describe patterns along a frequency continuum. At other times frequency is quantified with the number in parenthesis following a statement indicating the number of respondents who expressed that idea. Table 5.1 gives an overview of key findings about stakeholder understandings of agriculture, food culture, sustainability, wine, tourism and development culture. Commonalities across cases are shaded grey while differences are shown in white.
Table 5.1 Overview of Key Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>South Okanagan</th>
<th>Annapolis Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food culture</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture/rurality central to regional identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food culture as expressed through tourism is described as local, diverse, influenced by Slow Food and wine industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are also other food cultures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in last 5-10 years</td>
<td>Very recent changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>Longer agricultural history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism</strong></td>
<td>Tourism uses food culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism contributes to culture in, for, as sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well-developed wine tourism</td>
<td>Developing wine and drink tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism means to sell cases of wine</td>
<td>A tourism experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability and Food Sovereignty</strong></td>
<td>Individual sustainable values and practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited connection to the term food sovereignty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prioritize local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainability prioritized at the strategic tourism planning level</td>
<td>Sustainability absent at the strategic tourism planning level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expensive land</td>
<td>Affordable land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy</strong></td>
<td>Provincial Tourism Crown Corporation</td>
<td>Provincial Tourism Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farm winery license</td>
<td>Regional and local tourism leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provincial agricultural land preservation policy</td>
<td>Provincial agricultural land preservation policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No dedicated ministry No tourism specific regional or local leadership</td>
<td>No tourism specific regional or local leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal land use policy</td>
<td>Municipal land use policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development culture</strong></td>
<td>Development culture influenced by policy and influences policy</td>
<td>Self-describe as dependent, collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent, stakeholders, consultative</td>
<td>Appreciative approach is more challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appreciative approach is somewhat challenging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In an effort to cope with the expansive and entangled nature of food and cultural sustainability, the findings in this section are organized as follows: first, a general introduction is given to how food culture is understood in each case organized around production, distribution, and consumption. Participants tended to view food culture as applying to the broad Okanagan or Annapolis Valley region while simultaneously believing that each individual community also had its own unique sense of cultural identity distinct from the region as a whole and the other communities within the region. Then understandings of food sovereignty and sustainability are presented by case community. Finally, common food culture concerns are presented.

5.1 South Okanagan food culture

Participants generally described food culture in the Okanagan as young. A typical explanation was that since “People have only been living here for 100 years and there hasn’t been a chance to define or develop a food culture” (A4). Some participants, however, were aware that it was non-Indigenous food culture that was young since Indigenous people have been in the region for thousands of years. Knowledge levels about local Indigenous food culture varied, but Indigenous food culture was considered deeply connected to the land. Indigenous plants like balsam root, soapberries, watercress, Olalla blossom are still foraged in the region. Penticton was an Indigenous trading centre with a
year-round population because food was always available. Hence the name Penticton which means “people always there” (A21). A18 described how First Nations worked with nature to have animals fertilize area for plant growth, Sockeye salmon was mentioned by seven participants as a key element of Indigenous food culture in the region. Sockeye salmon was a deeply meaningful and important food source, but the salmon run was disrupted by the damming along the Columbia River (Harden, 1996). There was a sense that Indigenous food culture in the region was being regenerated. A11 thought it was “stronger than it's probably been for 50-80 years, since the times when the dams went up on the Columbia” (A11). Multiple participants acknowledged that First Nations have long existing food practices that are more sustainable than conventional agriculture. Recognizing and respecting traditional knowledge in the region was considered important.

A typical sense of the region’s early agricultural history after settler contact was that the area was first ranch land, then was planted with fruit trees once irrigation was installed. Orchards were planted with government support to encourage settlers to populate the land. Now many fruit trees have been replaced with grapes. Only a few generations of farming history would be characterized as an old farming family in this context.
5.1.1 Production and distribution

The food culture of the South Okanagan was described as agricultural by most participants. Agricultural production was described as including natural and human elements since agri-food is “made of items that are grown here, from soil that is unique here, by people that live here” (A5). In addition to agricultural production, the agricultural landscape was seen as an inherent part of regional identity. A6 explained, “part of the charm… is that we have so much agricultural land.” The South Okanagan was described as depending on agriculture or at least depending on the perception of agriculture conveyed by an agricultural landscape or vineyards and orchards as a draw, in the same way the lake draws visitors and new residents to the region even though the vast majority of people never use the lake. The areas’ rich agricultural history was described as having “built up related values, knowledge and business skills” (A2). Geographic terms like “terroir” (6) and “sense of place” (5) were used to illustrate agriculture’s cultural significance to how residents identify their place and the products produced.

Many participants commented on agricultural productivity using words like “plentiful” and “bountiful.” Many participants commented on the diversity of agricultural products. From cattle ranches, to fruits like apples, cherries, grapes, peaches, apricots and nectarines, to row vegetables, there was a definite sense that crops were diverse because the region had a variety of growing conditions.
There was even an inland fish farming Arctic Char mentioned 4 times.

Agricultural diversity was seen as a competitive advantage over regions that have monocultures.

An important feature of agricultural production was that it is predominately small-plot agriculture. Having many small farmers was described as “what’s so attractive about us” (A10). There was also a culture of involvement in backyard and community gardening. Being involved in food production was valued as a way to be part of the larger community and a way to educate children about health, nutrition, and social and environmental values. Participants mentioned the whole family being involved in small agrifood businesses in a way that showed this was valued. New farmers were also valued for their contribution to developing and changing local food production. There was a sense that these farmers, who were sometimes motivated to move to the region from Vancouver because of the Okanagan’s relative affordability, were more entrepreneurial and more socially and environmentally conscious. These farmers were choosing to farm “because it’s the right thing to do” (A11).

Agriculture’s potential for negative effects on the environment were acknowledged by some participants. For example, there were concerns that vineyards and orchards have contributed to degradation of natural habitat and that too much fertilizer and spraying has produced negative consequences such as run off to lakes. Water usage was another area of concern. Participants
thought that locals have become more aware and concerned about agricultural issues related to environmental impacts and health.

Wine was discussed as a facet of food culture in every interview. South Okanagan participants viewed vineyards and wineries as central features of their regions. There were diverse grape varietals and wine styles made depending on conditions, from whites like Gewürztraminer in Summerland, to full-bodied reds like Cabernet Sauvignon on the west facing vineyards south of Oliver. The region was considered well-established by Canadian standards, yet it was also described as being in an adolescent stage in the sense that the region was developed but was characterized by interpersonal and political drama. Although wine dominated the food culture conversation in the SO other beverages and beverage producers were mentioned.

The kind of culture being developed for food tourism is one that may not be shared by locals because it is inaccessible or undesirable. The general sense in the South Okanagan was that there was a segment of the local population that wants to support local but there was uncertainty over what percentage of residents would represent. Irrespective of desire to buy local, local wine and food culture participation is expensive in the Okanagan and participants thought that the SO wine, restaurants, and agritourism events were not at a price range that was affordable for many locals. Participants recognized that the high cost of premium Okanagan wine is prohibitive for locals, but A10 argued that this is a
non-issue because locals are not the market for premium wine and many wineries also produce entry level wines at lower prices for those who cannot afford better wine.

Local distribution of both wine and food was predominately to restaurants and through busy farmers’ markets, particularly Penticton’s Farmers’ Market. These settings were “where people who want the food and people who’ve got the food meet” (A10). There was also one mention of community supported agriculture (CSA) in reference to Localmotive a small local produce distribution company (A5). Distributors like Sysco were described as becoming more sensitive to local food culture evidenced by their local test kitchen, local distribution, and respect for seasonal supply issues. However, participants described a disconnect between what is grown in-region and what is available to purchase in grocery stores or eat in typical restaurants. Most of the produce available at local grocery stores was transported into the region. This was attributed to contracts, supply chain, and other variables that drive the product mix. Export was seen as important for certain products. For example, cherry production is export focused, particularly to Asian markets. This international renown was seen to help create and maintain Canada’s food identity.

5.1.2 Consumption

Eating “local” was a characteristic of food culture in the South Okanagan mentioned in every interview. In fact, “local” was the 4th most common word
behind food, tourism, and wine. Participants felt local food culture had improved over the past decade and particularly over the last 3-5 years. This change was described as a cultural shift. Participants thought residents of the SO were starting to understand the “value in getting local food especially if it is grown sustainably” (A6). Local food was valued because it is better for the environment, has a higher nutritional value, is fresher, supports the local economy and connects consumers with producers. In terms of wine consumption, there is a well-developed culture of local consumption to the extent that it was almost taboo to buy non-BC wine. However, the higher cost of BC wine was observed with Cellared in Canada (CIC) wine being laughingly described as a more affordable “localish” alternative (A25). Participants felt lucky to have access to local wineries and observed that some wineries near larger population centres could now stay open in winter because they have developed a local following.

This cultural shift was attributed to both broad societal changes and specific local changes. Society was seen as having become more environmentally and socially aware and better educated about food issues, with these characteristics being particularly pronounced among millennials (5). Generally, participants thought there was growing public interest in local products. These interests were influenced by media like FoodNetwork, popular writers like Michael Pollan, and movements like the 100-mile diet that sprang from Vancouver couple Alisa Smith and J.B MacKinnon’s very popular book.
Slow food (7) was identified as a key cultural influencer and a connector of people with common values, but also as a problematic movement because it was perceived by some to be elitist. It was noted that at the societal level consumer tastes change over time. For example, in the early 80s the taste in the Canadian market in BC was for Schloss Laderheim, a sweet Riesling in pseudo-germanic packaging produced by the Okanagan’s Calona Wines. Changing tastes have dictated changes in wine quality and style because the wine industry has always been market driven.

The changing demographics of the area influenced food culture changes. Buying local is part of the culture of those who retire or buy second homes in the region because one of the reasons they are “moving out of these big urban environments is to be closer to that source of food, become engaged with it and become more familiar with it” (A2). This was echoed by A25 who explained that the new locals are “rich Alberta or Vancouver refugees” who retired early, sold their house and came to live in wine country. The local population is also becoming more culturally diverse which has led to more diverse foods and changing demands.

There was a sense of having a unique wine culture in the region. This was influenced by the availability of local wine and the involvement of local people in the wine industry. Locals have a different relationship with wine than the majority of the country. Particularly in the most agricultural areas of the SO, wine is part of
many local celebrations such as thank you dinners for volunteers and wine events were described as being family friendly and welcoming rather than exclusive. Wine appreciation is a cultural value and working in a wine setting has a significance beyond just being a job. A14 described a front of house job applicant who did not enjoy wine as not being a cultural fit regardless of the resume because employees for whom the job is just a paycheck were “not the kind of culture we want to create.” There used to be an “any food will do with wine attitude” (A27), but an understanding of the connections between wine and local food and confidence in food pairings was described as having improved. For example, bread used to be an acceptable pairing at wine festival tasting, whereas now multi course meals showcasing local food and culinary talents are expected. Participants felt that consumers intuitively know wine and food go together and were looking for food and wine experiences whether wineries understand and capitalize on that interest. Participants felt that the Old World concept of “what grows together goes together” such that Chianti pairs well with tomato-based sauces for example, also applied in their region. Furthermore, regional pairings make experiential sense especially when they are experienced in the places were the food and wine are produced.

Generalizing about food culture was considered challenging because there are multiple food cultures in the region. Food culture’s definition depended on who was asked. Participants reflected on how within their social circle rural
people are connected to their food, but that their own perceptions may be limited. The perspective of “non-local food culture people” would likely be different (A25).

Even though valuing local food was a shared cultural characteristic of most participants and one participant thought was common in the region, participants felt that it was not the only food culture in the region. Some participants described food culture as “quite divided” and “compartmentalized.” One food culture comprised those who care about food and who shop locally with intention. This was often labelled a “foodie culture” and was considered privileged. The wine industry was considered a big driver of this privileged foodie culture. The other food culture lacked an awareness of or understanding of the importance and impact of local food. This food culture as described as a “meat and potatoes” or “traditional.” These were the people who would take monthly trips to Costco or Walmart for groceries. Traditional food culture came from the South Okanagan’s blue-collar history, the less affluent, older demographic and the rural nature of the region.

There were also within region cultural variations by ethnic backgrounds, population densities and physical geographies. For example, wine’s position in local food culture was thought to be partly dependent on the culture of origin; wine is traditionally part of Portuguese culture, whereas most East Indian people tend not to drink alcohol. Another example of regional variations is the level of connection to agriculture ranging based on population density. Generally,
residents of the southernmost parts of the region which are more rural and agricultural seldom purchase produce in season, but either grow their own or are given produce from neighbours, but those in more urbanized parts of the region were exclusively consumers.

There was caution around terms like “Indigenous food” because the term suggests a homogenous group when in fact there is diversity within Bands and similarities and differences between different Okanagan Nations. Furthermore, there were concerns that the desire for Indigenous food may be based on colonial notions of traditional Indigenous food. For example, foods that might be ubiquitously considered Indigenous like bannock, a fried bread, is not traditional food, rather it is “food from a nation that is coming out of oppression and poverty and then we romanticize that” (A19). Non-Indigenous participants who expressed interest in Indigenous food as central to local food culture were referring to plants, harvesting, preparation and knowledge. Bannock was not an example in their interviews.

The relationship between wine and food was seen as complex. Some participants felt that a discussion of wine was in some ways a separate conversation because wine had its own culture. However, wine was also viewed as an agricultural product which was usually consumed with food. Many participants felt that local food culture had improved recently with strong champions, good products, and culinary offerings. Food culture improvements
were often attributed to the wine industry. Participants tended to view the present food culture as rooted in the wine industry which was considered well-established by Canadian standards. Overall, local food culture in the SO was described as being at an experimenting stage as the region works to understand its geography within the context of climate change and within its historical context.

5.1.3 Understandings of food sovereignty

The term food sovereignty was introduced by participants unprompted only twice despite being used several times in the consent form. When asked directly about how they understood food sovereignty, responses ranged from completely unfamiliar to very familiar.

Of those South Okanagan participants who were not familiar with the term, many could infer a general meaning by combining food with their understanding of sovereignty. For example, A2 reasoned that since sovereign means controlling that which is within our boundaries, food sovereignty might refer to control over the food that is grown and sold within our boundaries. Some participants who were unfamiliar with food sovereignty thought that it might relate to Slow Food or the 100-mile diet. For a couple participants, food sovereignty had negative connotations that evoked the Quebec sovereignty movement and seemed to be a divisive term that would be used for political reasons to scare, manipulate, influence, instill a sense of urgency.
Other participants were very well-acquainted with the term through their work and personal lives. These participants generally understood food sovereignty as self-selected, self-sustaining food systems. Food sovereignty included cultural aspects not fully captured by the sub-concepts of food security which referred to having enough food, or food self-reliance which referred to sufficient internal food production. Poverty, organics, countering corporate power, protecting and enhancing practices like foraging traditional plants, seed saving, supporting local small producers, sourcing all food within Canada, were mentioned in connection to food sovereignty. The Penticton Indian Band (PIB) was described as having a food sovereignty approach on their lands.

Some of these participants saw the food sovereignty movement as a predominately fear-based reaction to globalization. For example, food sovereignty was viewed as being a reaction to the risks inherent in globalization’s long food supply chains, such as distant events like drought impacting the price of grain locally. There was a sense that trading relationships created vulnerability to external threats. Food sovereignty was seen as a climate change risk mitigation strategy and necessary consideration when “planning for the apocalypse” (A4).

While participants thought that the term food sovereignty implies that a region can produce enough food for ourselves there was confusion about the size of the area being considered. Food sovereignty could be local, regional,
provincial or national in scale, so the question of how sovereign a region is depends on the size of the region we are considering. These concerns about determining boundaries related to concerns about the term local.

The environmental aspects of food sovereignty did not seem to be foremost in conversations. Although the South Okanagan climate allows growing without as much intervention, organic farming does not dominate farming in the region. Organic farming is more part of the neighbouring Similkameen’s Valley’s culture where a few farmers started it and then the community joined in and it attracted broad buy-in. There was general agreement about the need for agricultural practices that respect the land, but participants were not unanimous regarding this necessarily being officially organic because some thought that in certain cases pesticides may be necessary and may produce more nutritious food and not have negative residue. Other related food culture concerns related to the need for better food waste redistribution and for reduced packaging.

There were other nuanced reflections about how food sovereignty could be understood and applied differently. For example, participants raised questions like can one have sovereignty over something you’ve appropriated? Does a culture that believes that the landscape is a public good mean that the products that come out of that landscape are also a public good? (A7). Food sovereignty was not considered a common concern for tourism businesses that would be preoccupied with attracting visitors. While tourism businesses may be
“wanting to do the right thing” and may be interested in local food and supporting local business, they were not thought to tie initiatives like sourcing locally back to food sovereignty (A25). Multiple participants saw traditional corporations and cheap food as a threat to local food culture and sovereignty.

A9 thought “having policy and goals to seek more sovereignty through local, regional or even national means” seems to be more of a concern in BC than other provinces. However, the region was not considered food sovereign because of the region’s reliance on imports and a lack processing capacity, particularly for processing meat. The growth of the wine industry was understood as having both supported and stifled food culture. Many participants felt that wine has helped people value their local landscape. The wine industry also celebrates and creates a market for other local food products and culinary offerings. However, agriculture was seen as being vulnerable to market driven mono-culture. Maintaining agricultural diversity was a priority expressed frequently in the Okanagan (7). Participants described some community ambivalence towards wineries because that agricultural land could be producing food. A10 referenced a t-shirt slogan that read “we’re going to be drunk and hungry in our future if we don’t stop ripping orchards out and putting grapevines in.”
A participant with experience that spanned the entire growth of farm wineries in BC described now being overwhelmed by the number of new wineries. B12 went on to say:

I used to know everybody, anybody in the business, but not anymore and I was just kind of sad to see all the other fruit gone because everything is in the grape vines now and I guess anybody who is somebody has to have a winery… No more apricot orchards…it’s all grapes.

The general sentiment was that South Okanagan needs to be very careful not to turn into a monoculture for a variety of reasons. One reason participants felt it was important to maintain agricultural diversity was environmental. Not being a mono-culture was considered better for the environment because that diversity provides habitat, wildlife corridors, symbiotic pests between crops and therefore less need for pesticide. Mono-cultures were seen as more vulnerable to disease like the spotted wing drosophila. Participants felt that diversity was a risk mitigation strategy akin to “not putting all our eggs in one basket” (A3).

Monoculture erodes local food supply, so was a threat to those valued aspects of local food culture like actually growing food. Mono-culture also threatened food tourism’s sustainability. It was argued that visitors want that agricultural diversity. “Nobody wants to come and just see vineyards” (A15). The landscape is attractive to visitors and locals when it is mixed.

The majority of participants valued letting the market decide which crops were planted. A20 explained, “Farmers have to make money and if growing
grapes is the best way to make money at least they're farming and should we ever get hungry we don’t have to grow grapes.” The South Okanagan’s climate and soil variations and high cherry prices were factors helping maintain agricultural diversity. The SO climate prohibits growing certain crops in certain areas such as planting grapes in frost pockets; where inappropriate crops have been planted a return to more suitable crops has been observed. Cherry orchards have been very profitable of late with good demand for exports and high prices. Several participants predicted that there would eventually be a saturation point where grapes would not be the most profitable crop though it was noted that saturation has been previously predicted and has not yet materialized. The market should be free to decide as long as future agricultural use is not precluded. Land lost to grapes is not lost permanently since it can always go back to food production if needed. In BC, grape growers have felt that to be successful they need to start a winery. However, participants felt that “we don’t need another winery” (A15). The South Okanagan needs to celebrate growers and also needs to celebrate those who grow other foods.

5.1.4 Understandings of sustainability

Sustainability was understood by multiple South Okanagan participants as multidimensional and including economic, environmental, social, and cultural spheres. For example, A6 used the pillars of sustainability in her analysis of local food, explaining that local food systems have economic benefits such as self-
employment opportunities, environmental benefits because of less transportation and social benefits since local food develops relationships between farmers and consumers and a sense of community. Even when participants did not refer to the typical three pillars explicitly, there was a sense that balancing economic considerations with environmental ones was fundamental to their understanding of sustainability. The environmental aspects of sustainability were a priority in the South Okanagan mentioned directly in many interviews. This focus was considered part of the existing culture that prioritize “how our valley continues to nurture its environment” (A28).

Participants thought there were macro trends of increasing awareness about sustainability over the past 5 years because of concerns about overtourism in cities like Venice and Barcelona, and in more rural areas like the Great Barrier Reef and small beach towns. Global destinations are increasingly accessible because of relatively reasonable airline travel costs and the proliferation of technology to plan and book online. These are coupled with the growth of China’s middle-class population. In addition, the focus on destination marketing over destination management has left destinations strategically unprepared to handle tourism’s impacts.

There is a global realization in many industries that there is growing consumer demand for sustainability. There is a strong interest within the tourism industry to understand what they need to do to meet that demand. Change was
seen as the result of industry’s response to consumer demand. In particular, multiple participants commented on millennial consumers driving this change because they value Indigenous culture and environmental stewardship.

Climate change was mentioned multiple times (6). Participants thought that climate change patterns are more obvious in food tourism in the SO than it would be for other industries and in other places because region is heavily dependent on summer season tourism and on agriculture. Fires and floods, and their dramatic impact on the peak tourism seasons in 2017 and 2018 made the environment an urgent, wide-spread priority in the SO. As A28 explained “no amount of creating great experiences will be that great when people are coming to experience a festival and the valley is full of smoke.” The obviousness of environmental changes was thought to make it more likely to motivate locals’ behaviour change.

The Okanagan wine industry was seen as having been a leader in some aspects of sustainability with several examples of wineries like Monte Creek, Burrowing Owl, and Summerhill making sustainability central to their brand. Wineries looking for less impact can press growers to use more environmentally sustainable practices. It was considered very significant that Mission Hill Winery recently announced that they are transitioning all vineyards to organic since Mission Hill is a large, premium, flagship winery. This shows how “someone in a position of influence and leadership is making everyone turn their head” (A25). It
allows other wineries to follow with less risk since they can assume Mission Hill has done viticulture and market research. Sustainability was seen as a key part the South Okanagan’s appeal as a wine region that attracts visitors who want to be part of a sustainable experience.

There were also problematic aspects of the term sustainable which emerged as themes in BC. First, was the sense that the term has become overused and as a result has become both irritating and meaningless. For example, A28 referred to a recent column by the Globe and Mail wine writer Beppi Crosariol’s column about most annoying words, one of which was sustainability. Several participants thought that more precise definitions of what sustainable signifies in a given context, such as water or energy conservation management systems is necessary. It was considered particularly important to be able to quantify sustainability.

A second critique of sustainability examined the concepts’ limitations when referring to degraded resources and destructive practices. Several participants thought sustainable was inadequate since the goal should be to leave the environment in better condition. Regenerative was suggested as a better term because it involved building up farm ecosystems, so that the land will get better every year.

Despite sustainability being a somewhat vague and overused term, participants thought there was increasing awareness of the seriousness of the
environmental situation, especially climate change, and the need for change. There was a sense that there was more interest and openness to these considerations in the last 5 or so years with a growing recognition that there is a business case for sustainable practices such as, operational efficiencies, being able to demand higher price, and being able to attract consumers and staff who value sustainability. Local tourism operators were described as “hungry for a way to do that that still makes sense for their business” (A25). Because as A12 argued, “you can’t talk about sustainability unless they actually make money.”

5.2 Annapolis Valley food culture

In contrast to the South Okanagan, the Annapolis Valley was seen as having a much longer agricultural history having been continuously farmed by Europeans and their descendants since the mid 1600s. Most local residents were described as having grown up in a farming community, often as part of a long-time farming family. Farmers were often described as the descendants of the Planters from New England. The UNESCO World Heritage site designation of Grand Pré was given to illustrate the significance of the unique agricultural practices that shaped the regional landscape. However, agricultural has changed tremendously and livelihoods are increasingly not linked to agriculture in the AV.

The inclusion of the Mi’kmaq in food culture occurred in only 1 interview with the acknowledgement that the area “has been a very well-nourished place
for 400 odd years and thousands of years before that for the Mi’kmaq” (B16). That same participant also included a description of Indigenous plants as part of the bounty of the area saying “and of course you have the wonderful Native types of things berries and herbs and leaves and also the fish.”

5.2.1 Production and distribution

Like the South Okanagan, the Annapolis Valley was described as agricultural. Participants described landscape, people, and product as facets of agriculture. For example, being in the Annapolis Valley meant being “surrounded by this amazing farmland and all of these incredible, hardworking farmers big and small producing all this beautiful product” (B23). Terms like “terroir” (5) and “sense of place” (2) were used to explain the influence of the valley’s geography and the ocean, on local agriculture. The landscape was frequently described as beautiful, with cultivated land being a key reason for that beauty.

The AV was seen as a uniquely productive agricultural region able to produce food that was impossible to grow in other parts of Nova Scotia and Canada. There was a sense that the region was seen by residents, and Nova Scotians, generally as being the “heartland” (3) “breadbasket” (2) “fruitbasket” (1) “hub” (1) of agriculture in the province. There are some large producers of over 1000 acres, but mostly agriculture is small-scale farming and a farmers’ market culture that builds direct connections and relationships between farmers and
consumers. Examples of agricultural products included a very wide variety of fruits and vegetables, such as, asparagus, blueberries, carrots, onions, peppers, tomatoes, blueberries; strawberries potatoes, corn used in polenta, artichokes, herbs, apple orchards, grapes, peach orchards, pear orchards, raspberries, sea buckthorn berries, peanuts, watermelon, hops; nuts like hazelnuts and walnuts; maple syrup; and animal products like dairy, eggs, beef, seafood, and lucrative chicken farming. Participants familiar with both regions thought that the Annapolis Valley was more agriculturally diverse than the South Okanagan.

Apples in particular were seen by many participants (7) as having been a quintessential part of the Annapolis Valley’s economy and identity as “apple mecca of the world” (B13). Apples were a key product, but also an indicator of the traditional role of agriculture and agricultural export as a regional industry. Particular local knowledge had developed as a result, some of which has been maintained. Yet with the decline in international demand for NS apples many orchards have not survived.

Fresh water and ocean fish and seafood were also central to food identity as products for local consumption and export. Again, export has long historical roots. Salted fish from the Gaspereau river used to be traded for rum in the Caribbean. Agriculture and aquaculture exports have grown over the past decade from an export value of 14 million to over 500 million, with particular growth in export to China.
There was awareness of sustainability as it relates to seafood practices and there was growing awareness of environmental issues within agriculture for example concerns with fertilizers washing into tidal rivers, but participants were not sure that these concerns had moved into average farming or tourism practice. Farming was described as mostly conventional, and it was noted that organic practices can be difficult because of humidity. There are several wineries in the Annapolis Valley that use organic or biodynamic practices but this was attributed to personal values rather than a systems-wide, or sectoral approach. Some participants felt that organic practices like farmers reducing fertilizer and pesticide use through crop rotation or use of Clemens grape hoe weeder tractor attachments were increasing. There was uncertainty about organic production values compounded by the fact that small producers who incorporate organic methods may not pursue certification because of the paperwork. In response to the question of whether farmers are observing climate change, there was a sense that farmers were aware of climate change issues, but that there had not been a fundamental shift in agricultural practice as a result. That said, increased consumer interest in sustainability was noted as a trend.

There was a sense that farmers in the Annapolis Valley experiment with crops in response to changing environmental and market conditions. It was also noted that new, young farmers were experimenting with different products and processes. Agricultural production was described as having transitioned from
exclusively apples, to apples and wine, to apples, wine, craft beer, cider, and spirits.

Beverage manufacturing was considered the sub-sector that most differentiates the valley from other regions. Annapolis Valley’s status as an emerging wine region was central to food culture, but other beverages were frequently mentioned: breweries (16), apple cideries (10) distilled spirits (9). The number of new apple cideries and distilleries were described as increasing faster than new wineries and micro-breweries were now even in very small towns.

There were some grapes grown in the Annapolis Valley historically, for example the oldest vineyard planting in NS was planted in Bear River in 1614; however, grape growing and wine making only started to be taken seriously within the last decade or so. The Annapolis Valley was seen as a challenging grape growing climate. The shorter growing season and fewer heat units limited what could be successful grown, whereas the Okanagan’s climate and geography meant a good vineyard could be planted anywhere. Yet, marginal growing conditions in the AV were part of the appeal. As B24 explained:

The challenge of growing grapes and making wine here is what makes our wine so special. It’s not cause it’s easy. Lobster fishing isn’t easy. It’s a lot of hard work…owning a restaurant is not easy…farming is not easy…but people still do it.

Triumph over adversity was part of the larger Nova Scotian story.

Although hybrid grapes like L’Acadie were expected to become increasingly
accepted, there was a trend among quality producers towards attempting to grow more vinifera such as Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, Pinot Munuer, Muscat Ottenel, and Cabernet Franc because these French varieties could sell at higher price-points.

Over the past 10-15 years the Nova Scotian wine industry was seen as having become more serious about quality. Competition from new entrants raised standards. Although the industry is young, it was thought to be developing quite quickly. Sparkling wine was seen as a strategic focus for export targeting niche markets. NS wine has evolved from being deemed a novelty, to being deemed a quality product comparable to international wines. As B17 explained:

It used to be just enough to have NS wine and that’s cool, but always blended with something from outside and in the restaurants, I remember this distinctly it was 04 or 05 I was at a winery meeting trying to get more NS wine onto lists and it was the feeling around the industry that restaurants would never showcase a NS wine by itself. We were thinking about doing tent cards, wines of NS tent cards and the thinking at the time was there had to some room for imports for a tent card on the table so maybe one token NS wine.

A level of professionalism, commitment to quality and passion for wine and grapes is shared by enough wineries that a mutual vision for the industry exists. The local wine industry was described as generally collaborative and the success of the wine industry thus far was also attributed to the group’s efforts. The killing frost of June 2018 saw local wineries sharing resources to problem solve. Wineries are forming co-operative alliances to share equipment so every winery does not have to invest which increases the capacity of industry.
Production was also described as collaborative in other areas of agriculture in the AV with several examples such as annual crop rotation where one farmer organizes a rotation so farmers plant the same crops, but on different parcels. Another anecdote related to an amicable land swap between a farmer who wanted to expand his vineyard and his neighbours.

B12 thought there was more cooperation in NS and more conflict in BC. CSAs (Community supported agriculture) was mentioned more frequently (7) than in BC. B14 noted that collaboration is an extension of “who we are as Maritimers. The winters are very long. You have to be friendly with your neighbours.” The honour system for farm stands with cash boxes at the end of people’s lanes was given multiple times as an example of the level of community trust. The honour system was thought to be effective almost all the time.

Finding agricultural labour locally was considered extremely difficult. It was noted that in previous generations agricultural workers were from NFLD or South Mountain Goalers, but now “the local poor people won’t so we have to import poor people to work on the farms” (B13).

5.2.2 Consumption

Traditional food culture was described as quite conservative with meat and potatoes at home every night being a typical meal and dining out experiences being rare. Participants thought this food culture was based on the
way people lived and the types of work they did. Basic, filling food was functional
to fuel the efforts of manual worker, trades jobs, farmers, and fishers. For
instance, although locals ate seafood they were not considered very adventurous
with seafood. However, NS participants observed recent changes to food culture
largely related to food distribution and consumption. B3 explained that 10
years ago the idea of a restaurant offering local wine and local cheese and meats
was considered strange. At that time, the local farmers’ market was starting but
“none of the restaurants were really working with them it was more the rich
hippies in town would go down and get their bread…the idea of visiting them on a
weekly basis and them invoicing us was really, really tricky and awkward.”

Distribution through farmers’ markets and CSAs is now much more
common. The percentage of food imported into NS has gone from 92% to 85%
over the past ten years (B18). It has been challenging to eat fresh produce in
rural NS without paying a fortune in wintertime, but as a result of consumer
demand, there is more fresh product being retailed in local communities year-
round. Sobey’s, which is a grocery store owned by an Atlantic Canadian family,
was given as an example of a grocery retailer that supports local. There was
also increasing interest in stocking local produce from big-box retailers like
Walmart. Expectations of being able to source local food, food that meet dietary
preferences like gluten-free, and openness to eating unfamiliar foods for
enjoyment were increasing in the Annapolis Valley. It was noted that “the food
culture of the next generation is going to be radically different from the older style
of food culture” (B20). Schools in the Annapolis Valley were credited for having made significant impacts on children’s food culture because they supported a health model of providing food and now offer options like salads and have school gardens.

Restaurant customers are more likely to be asking where their food comes from. Bessie North House (4) a reservation-only set tasting menu restaurant open 2 days a week in Canning was given as evidence of the recent development of food culture in the area since it demonstrates that there is a receptive local audience for 6 and 8 course, $100 meals in a rural setting. Customers include:

People who grew up in the valley but then they went away and they went to school. They did higher education. They had good jobs. They made good money and they came back here and they took over the family property, so they’ve retired here and now they have disposable income and they realize the importance of the garden and planting your own food and growing your own food and that kind of thing. Maybe for a lot of their life they got away from it, but now they’re back at it (B23).

There are also urban customers who express that they love food and want to support Bessie North House’s efforts. These customers tend to be actively involved in local food, such as being CSA members and frequenting farmers’ market. Bessie North House may have a really small niche but it is compatible with sustainable development in its rural environs.
Eating local was highly valued by many participants because it supports the local community. Eating food grown locally was equated with preserving the Annapolis Valley’s agricultural landscape and eating local seafood was equated with preserving local fishing communities. B8 shared Michael Pollen’s idea “that by eating your view, you are preserving your view.” A farmers’ market culture was seen as building direct connections and relationships between farmers and consumers. Seasonal eating was depicted as part of this new food culture based on what was available from farmers through the year though several participants observed that eating locally and seasonally was not actually a new trend, but the way farming families have traditionally consumed. It was noted that the reality of a local, seasonal diet was that farming families often ate very well in the summertime and less well in winter.

As in the South Okanagan, the Slow Food movement (8) was considered instrumental to the development of this locally oriented food culture in the Annapolis Valley because it established a network of like-minded people who valued every person’s “right to eat good, clean food” (B9). Similar issues with the stigma of elitism were raised in the AV. The tone was that Slow Food had served an important function but had run its course.

Participants characterized the Annapolis Valley and Nova Scotia generally as being traditionally a rum and beer drinking culture (8). Historically, wine was typically reserved for special occasions, so there were limited learning
opportunities; however, it was felt that knowledge and the interest in wine has increased especially over the past 5 or so years. Nova Scotians were seen as relatively uneducated about wine, but with an interest in learning more which is partly motivated by the desire to look smart. Young people were perceived as more open to local wine than older people.

Typically, new wine drinkers are drawn to sweeter wines. Nova 7 was described as being intended as an accessible way to attract inexperienced but prospective Nova Scotian wine drinkers. In fact, the rural audience is clear in the wine writer Michael Godel’s (2019) Wine Align assessment of Nova 7 as “Peach, strawberry and juice fruit for the people, …for people in the sticks who don’t, won’t and can’t drink grower’s Champagne” (LCBO, n.d., para. 1). Participants in the AV predicted that consumers’ tastes will evolve beyond really sweet and really aromatic wines as they gain experience. As a comparison, the 2018 vintage of Nova 7 had 60 grams of residual sugar per litre while a 2018 Okanagan vintage of a similar sparkling wine in the Narrative XC Method 2018, has a residual sugar of 22 grams per litre (Okanagan Crush Pad, n.d.).

The wine industry was very well received in the Annapolis Valley and people are quickly learning about wine because of the local industry in what B8 called a “new, blossoming wine culture.” Locals are now more likely to be drinking local wine, serving it to their visitors and being proud of it. Some wineries are noticing growing consumer understanding of NS wines as food wines especially people who have travelled and had opportunities to develop
good palates. Now the average Nova Scotian is interested in drinking NS wine and “will ask for it” (B3).

Along with Nova 7’s success, improved quality and in particular the Tidal Bay (9) appellation have contributed to a positive collective identity for NS wines. Tidal Bay’s appellation branding was considered a great victory because consumers recognize and trust the style and quality of Tidal Bay to the extent that people even have parties around it. Twelve Tides, the Tidal Bay launch event in Halifax grew from 250 tickets in 2018 to 450 tickets in 2019. NS has also received outside endorsement in the form of praise and awards from external bodies such as international awards for traditional method sparkling and wine listings at international restaurants like Gordon Ramsey’s restaurant in London. The international recognition matters to local consumers in the sense Nova Scotia’s were thought to seek external validation.

Where wine strongly dominated the drinking culture in the Okanagan, there was greater interest and availability of local beer, cider and spirits in the Annapolis Valley. The growth in apple cider drinking culture was viewed as a “wonderful historical reversal going on where people are drinking what they drank 150 years ago and selling it in trendy bottles and creating a new sub-set of beverage consumption” (B9).

The drinking culture was increasingly characterized by moderate alcohol consumption. Several participants felt there was less binge drinking which
reflects greater trends related to healthy lifestyles and valuing quality over quantity. In addition, wine is treated differently than other types of alcohol. Wine is often consumed with food and in the company of friends and family. As B6 explained, “people don’t get drunk on wine. They sip wine. They swill beer and spirits.” Increasing wine consumption as part of meals may led to moderation.

Food and drink preferences were slowly changing, but the food culture characterized by people looking for local products and farm to table restaurants represented a small percentage of the population according to participants. In a sense the food culture was somewhat bifurcated. “Foodie” culture was contrasted with a group that was described as persistently preferring to eat at Tim Hortons or at local diners that served fried food. This local food culture was considered typical of rural Nova Scotia and perhaps of other rural areas in that it included unhealthy food and eating habits which contributed to issues with obesity and chronic diseases. Annapolis Valley participants thought local food was only affordable for a minority of residents. “I know there’s a much larger group that just goes and buys whatever they can afford” (B1). Participating in those experiences considered food tourism is for those who can afford to go to the farmers’ market or buy a $20 bottle of wine on their way home from work.

Local was presented as a word “everyone can agree on” (B18), but typically the word took on more nuances over the course of the interview. Local equated most significantly with trustworthiness, as in trusting “where the food
comes from.” Local was associated with food of high quality, more nutritious, that is plant ripened and fresh. Local “feels like they’re supporting their community” and the environment since there is less transport. In response to whether ‘local’ indicates good environmental practices and stewardship, B18 explained that “to some it does, to some it doesn’t.” For example, at the Wolfville Farmers’ Market one participant estimated that about 75% of vendors were organic, no-spray or local. Local was considered the more important consideration. Local could be organic or conventional; it could be a small business or corporate.

Local was mainly a geographic concept, but even then, local was thought to mean all of Atlantic Canada to many respondents though some thought that people in the AV may “say local is the Valley” and even find 20 km away as too far for local (B18). The concept of local was thought to have “been in our vocabulary for quite some time now. Chefs and food business have been using it for a long time… We’re local from the perspective of, we’re driving to the farm and picking up turnips that were harvested that morning. That’s local and that’s seasonal and that’s the best quality stuff you can get…The word local is almost an overused soundbite here.” In practice, it is thought that while the word is common in practice it is not “really embraced” (B23). Clearly, local was only superficially a word “everyone can agree on” since there were such widely varying characteristics many of which would be aligned with the principles of food sovereignty. Over the course of the same participants’ conversation with the researcher, the participant concluded: “I see local needing to go to the next
stage” (B18). Only one participant engagement with any weaknesses of self-reliant economies such as inefficiencies or vulnerabilities. This participant expressed being guided by belief in “selling where you can take advantage of efficiencies and expertise and natural production abilities in certain areas” and in this sense qualified the AV should produce and buy local when above conditions exist (B11). This participant advised examining what the AV is importing and making logical decisions about import substitution.

Participants in the Annapolis Valley observed that their understanding of local food culture was shaped by personal social/economic circumstances which may not reflect the norm. As a result, participants were unsure whether the cultural patterns they observed reflected a larger cultural reality or just their own. Those that spent significant amounts of their childhood on family farms felt that their perspective was very much shaped by their early experiences. These participants felt that they had a closer relationship to food and a deeper respect for farmers than many of their peers. Those working in food, wine or tourism leadership roles were concerned that those with differing opinions may be hesitant to openly express them which further limited the participants’ perspective. As B6 explained, “Most people seem to hold up wineries and vineyards as something they’re proud of. Then again would they tell me if they didn’t?”
5.2.3 Understandings of food sovereignty

Most Annapolis Valley participants were not familiar with the term food sovereignty. Some were aware of the term being used elsewhere, but not in Canadian contexts. B18 defined food sovereignty as food that was safe, secure, local, and culturally relevant to the community. A key aspect of this definition of food sovereignty was that people had power to make decisions about food. This participant apologetically described the need for cultural relevance and power as being “on the touchy feeling side.” No AV participants were aware of food sovereignty concepts being discussed in relation to policies, committees, or programs at a government level, but some thought it was a concept that was discussed in community development and academic contexts. As in the SO, food sovereignty evoked crisis. Food sovereignty was characterized by participants in the AV as being related to food security and resilience such as a food plan for when “shit hits the fan” or “economies contract” (B19).

For those involved in Slow Food, food sovereignty and food security were considered inherent principles of the movement: “Everybody has the right to eat well. Everybody has the right to know where their food comes from. Each and every citizen has the right to eat good, clean food” (B9). In the Annapolis Valley, participants thought that the concept of local resonated more than sovereignty. Often food sovereignty was not specifically discussed, but there was frequent discussion of local food systems.
Agricultural mono-culture was not a common concern in the Annapolis Valley. Geographic constraints like dyke lands only being suitable for field crops inclined participants to think that monoculture is unlikely to be an issue. In addition, participants thought there was a lot of capacity because of fallow agricultural land. Participants generally expressed interest and surprise at the monoculture concerns in BC and did not predict similar levels of wine industry growth in the Annapolis Valley. Although there were a few participants who felt land being converted to grapes warranted discussion. Some of these concerns related to cultural sustainability of historical agricultural practices. For example, people ripping out their apple orchards which were central to the AV’s historical identity, to put in vineyards had some people concerned.

5.2.4 Understandings of sustainability

Multiple participants commented on sustainability not being an area of personal expertise, so they felt they did not have a lot of information on the topic and were hesitant to speak to it. Environmentalism and sustainability were described by some participants as not aligned with the conservative political views in rural Nova Scotia. Several participants interpreted sustainability exclusively as how a business, organization, or sector continues to operate, such as sustaining an agricultural industry.

Participants shared a variety of examples of sustainability-minded organizations operating in the province such as the Halifax based Ecology Action
Centre, and the Atlantic Canada Organic Region Network (ACORN), but participants felt that there were no strong local environmental organizations. B19 could not even imagine the cross-over between business and environmental sustainability concerns that exist in BC such as the South Okanagan participant who is both a Chamber of Commerce board member and serves in a leadership role in a regional sustainability organization.

There were mixed opinions about the Department of Agriculture’s position. B11 argued that food sustainability was a central focus of the Department of Agriculture. However, B9 argued that the Department of Agriculture methods and funding programs were geared towards conventional agriculture. Climate change mitigation and adaptation were being addressed at provincial levels, but climate change issues are not “local news” (B19).

Participants did not think sustainable tourism was emphasized in tourism policy and planning in the province. B19 described frustration that previous suggestions to make sustainability a central part of the NS or AV tourism brand were rebuffed at the strategic board level and that board composition is largely corporate with limited community involvement. There was no discussion of overtourism or the need to manage resources within tourism. B15 gave Tourism Nova Scotia’s social media promotion of #NovaScotiaUnlisted was given as a concerning example of the provincial lack of sensitivity to sustainability issues in tourism. In this Instagram contest participants were encouraged to reveal “Nova
Scotia’s most beautiful hidden gems” (Tourism Nova Scotia, 2019a).

Presumably the campaign was intended to highlight and encourage tourism in less visited areas of the province; however, these “hidden gems” may include sites that are not appropriate to promote as tourism destinations for environmental or cultural reasons. It did not seem that there was awareness of the potential consequences of a campaign like #NovaScotiaUnlisted.

In conclusion, the South Okanagan describes itself as having a food culture that is very driven by its relatively well-established wine industry which has attracted and fostered a foodie culture that prioritizes local products. Sustainability was considered a central value. Indigenous food cultures were quite frequently mentioned as an important aspect of the region’s food identity. The South Okanagan was definitely seen as agricultural with its diverse agriculture and many small farms being key features but, it has a relatively short history of settler agriculture.

The Annapolis Valley increasingly sees itself as being a wine destination and a destination for other beverages like cider, beer, and spirits. A foodie culture has recently developed which prioritizes local food. Sustainability was important at an individual level, but not necessarily as part of mainstream discourse. Indigenous food cultures were not frequently mentioned. The Annapolis Valley has a long agricultural history with many families having farmed in the area for hundreds of years.
One of the most interesting issues to emerge from the interviews was the question of whether winemaking is agricultural and the connected question of whether wine is considered food. Those involved in the SO wine industry thought wine was food “because we have to grow it” (A14) and it is typically consumed with food as part of a meal. Although wine may be perceived as this “really sexy thing,” a vineyard is “just a farm with a fancy name” (A18). These participants considered wineries agricultural and thought that winery owners tended to appreciate local food because they are farmers (A14). They stressed that unlike many other types of alcohol producers such as breweries and distilleries, wineries are bound to the land. The sentiment was similar in the AV. Those involved in AV’s wine industry considered themselves farmers, but thought that how much the farming aspects of wine making were prioritized would depend on the individual winery’s philosophy. The major frost in June 2018 was given as evidence that the wine industry is farming and at “Mother Nature’s mercy” (B14). A recent project which identified food assets in Annapolis County included wine, cider, and other locally manufactured beverages as food assets and considered any crop agriculture, although there was uncertainty about how cannabis would be considered.

This research began by asking participants to describe food culture in their region in order to understand the tangible and intangible aspects of food culture that rural food tourism might work to sustain. Local was the most frequent descriptor for food culture in both regions. Figure 5.1 shows a comparison of the
intensity of some key food culture characteristics of the South Okanagan and Annapolis Valley regions. Longer bars indicate more intensity of the respective food culture characteristic.

![Comparison for Food Culture Characteristics](image)

**Figure 5.1 Comparison of SO and AV Food Cultures**

### 5.3 Operationalizing cultural sustainability through rural food tourism

This section presents findings related to how participants saw food culture used for tourism in their regions. Examples of frequently mentioned and/or particularly illustrative tourism products are given.
5.3.1 Food tourism

Food tourism was described by participants as a marriage of the tangible and intangible because food tourism combines agricultural products (tangible) with experiences (intangible). Participants in both provinces recognized that food tourism in their region reflected general tourism trends. A7 explained that “Food’s been part of tourism always, but I think we have been thinking of it differently since the cultural turn in tourism and the transformative turn in tourism.”

Food is now recognized as an important travel motivator. Participants observed increasing interest in food experiences rooted in particular places from a key tourist segment who value environmental sustainability, authenticity, and wellness. Like other cultural tourists, food tourists tend to spend more than lots of other types of tourists and travel in the shoulder-seasons which makes them an attractive target market. In a world where one can get pretty much everything everywhere because of globalization, the challenge for destinations was seen as establishing a unique food culture worth a journey. The South Okanagan and the Annapolis Valley have rich agricultural histories. Being agricultural would not have historically been a defining feature of food culture since every place was agricultural. The agricultural and rural aspects of both regions have become differentiators because of urbanization. Most major cities have good culinary scenes now, so food is not a strong marketing differentiator, but the rural,
agricultural nature of the SO and the AV make finding culinary amenities a welcome surprise.

Participants used terms like agritourism, wine tourism, food tourism, and culinary tourism to refer to tourism in their region. Some participants shared their opinions about these terms. For example, several participants thought the term culinary sounded snobby and had urban connotations, such as when rural farm products are used in city restaurants. Food tourism sounded more accessible and implied being at the source of the production. Others thought the term culinary tourism was preferable because it sounded more professional and implied a sensory food experience. Wine tourism was thought to draw tourists interested in the experience of tasting wine near its source, so an agricultural aspect is implied though most participants would have recognized wine tourism as distinct from agritourism and would have referred to it as wine tourism.

Participants in both provinces recognized farm winery licensing as having put every winery in the tourism business since direct to consumer sales were the most profitable sale channel because of reduced (NS) or eliminated (BC) remittances to the provincial liquor board.

**South Okanagan**

Originally known for fruit stands and beaches, the Okanagan emerged as a wine destination in the 1990s. The wine tasting rooms and the establishment of wine festivals increased the number of visitors and extended the tourist season
into the fall harvest. The region produces a small quantity of wine by international standards but has the advantage of climate and the natural beauty of the valley, lakes, mountains, and agricultural setting which creates a tourism opportunity for building experiences that pair wine with scenery and importantly add people, thereby creating a meaningful story to attract visitors. Wine tourism was seen as a natural opportunity when the region considered its strengths and limitations. Figure 5.2 shows the wineries in the Okanagan. The area below the dotted line marks the South Okanagan. Individual wineries are marked with a dot and labelled. The map provides a sense of the quantity and concentrated distribution of wineries in the southern part of the Okanagan valley.
The BC wine industry has really been built on the back of visitors because the local market is too small to support the industry. Interestingly, several participants commented on the fact that wineries and winery associations did not
originally see themselves as being part of the tourism industry, but this has shifted because of the importance of cellar door sales as the best revenue source. It was now usually recognized that tourism sustains South Okanagan wineries and the existing wine culture. Participants thought that agriculture is part of tourists’ expectations of authenticity in the region. Tourists want to have the feeling that they are in a farming area. The success of the wine industry and the success of all agriculture in the South Okanagan is dependent on tourism. A13 described the region as having a “tourism dependent agriculture industry.” The focus on wine was considered a more effective way to brand the region than food would be. Or as A9 explained, “if you want to romance an area you don’t go after pig’s head terrine. You go after...waxing poetic about red wine.” The market for tourists who want to go touring farms was thought to be a smaller market than those who would visit wineries. Participants thought agritourism was a harder “sell” to farmers, consumers and tourism marketing organizations. Participants thought that wine was the Okanagan’s defining factor, therefore, wine is the best way to sell the destination to tourists. However, building on the inter-connection between the wine industry and tourism continued to be an opportunity particularly in terms of helping tourists understand the connection between farming and the wine industry.

In the South Okanagan, sustainable tourism development was connected to a perception of cultural fit. The idea of culture fit was raised particularly strongly in the context of tourism development being a fit with the existing
entrepreneurial culture of the Osoyoos Indian Band (OIB). A21 described how early OIB tourism business development in the late 1990s focused on infrastructure, but then responded to people’s interest in culture by developing attractions like the Nk’Mip Cellars Winery, the Nk’Mip Desert Cultural Centre and integrating more Indigenous culture into other tourism projects such as using Indigenous art at the RV park and gas station, and Indigenous dishes in food service.

Positive winery experiences were ones that are “not just belly up to the bar” (A11) but are authentic and educational. Examples included: Culmina’s vineyard centric focus on sharing scientific knowledge about their weather, soil, and light; Bartier Brothers focus on educating in the tasting room about how minerality of the soil is reflected in their wines and their commitment to Portuguese agricultural heritage on their vineyard; Maverick’s organic vineyard featuring bush vines which reflect the owner’s South African heritage. More wineries were offering experiences that include educational components about wine and food pairing from events, to sit down paired tastings, to cooking classes. BC wine tourists were perceived as serious consumers who were willing to spend. Bottle prices are often about $30; it is not atypical for visitors to buy multiple cases and spend thousands of dollars. Tasting fees tended to be lower in BC because of this purchasing pattern.
As mentioned in Chapter 5, participants thought food culture had improved because of wine tourism. There were very limited restaurants in the South Okanagan which served the beach tourism crowd in the pre-wine tourism SO. Wine tourists brought demand for better, higher-end food and ability and willingness to pay which encouraged the development of better food offerings. Many wineries created restaurants because there were not suitable dining options for more discerning wine visitors. Participants strongly felt that “if the wineries hadn’t really stepped up for culinary there wouldn’t be places to eat” (A1) and “we’d still be eating all fast food” (A20).

Participants recognized that tourists were not homogeneous. They knew that despite popular impressions, not everybody who visits the South Okanagan, or sits on boards of tourism planning and marketing organizations goes to wineries and fancy dinners or cares about agritourism and their food’s origin. The majority of tourist time in the region is spent doing other activities such as outdoor recreation like hiking, biking, or beaches. A10 felt visitors to the South Okanagan could be segmented into two approximately equal groups with half of visitors described as “gentle rednecks, non-food, non-wine driven” and the other half described as “urban foodies.” Urban foodies crossed gender and age demographics, but had upper-middle incomes or higher. These tourists sought wine and food experiences such as the winemaker’s dinner at Little Engine Winery on the Naramata Bench shown in Figure 5.3.
In addition to the urban foodie, some participants saw this interest in food tourism emerging across tourist segments. Participants shared various examples of local food tourism that included food and wine at a range of formality levels. Examples that bring together local chefs and local food and drink included events like Joy Road’s long table dinners at God’s Mountain pictured in Figure 5.4, Paisley Notebook’s Sourced dinners which won ‘Culinary Tourism Experience’ category at the Canadian Tourism Awards in 2018, Backyard Farms Chef’s Table, and Hester Creek Winery’s culinary classes. Covert Farms’ signature experience tours which also include a wine tasting component was another frequent example. These types of experiences highlight local farmers and are held in stunning rural landscapes.

Figure 5.3 Preparation for a Winemaker’s Dinner at Little Engine Winery
(Penticton, BC. June 8, 2019)
Farmers’ markets were given as an example of food tourism in the South Okanagan by 23 participants. Farmers’ markets facilitate the customers’ ability to interact with what’s produced and who produces it and were a great source of community pride. The markets also provide new outlets to showcase wine and other beverages. The Penticton Farmers’ Market, shown in Figure 5.5., is the largest market in the South Okanagan and it was considered a better business opportunity for local farmers than a smaller, local market in a smaller community. Penticton Farmers’ Market was seen as quite restrictive about vendors, so the market is dominated by actual farmers rather than other products as seen in some other markets. The municipality was commended for demonstrating their support by closing down the street to traffic each Saturday morning to allow for
vendors to set-up on the street and for pedestrians to enjoy their shopping experience. Farmers’ markets were seen as serving both locals and tourists by providing an opportunity to connect people to the food system including keeping chefs connected to what produce is available for their menus at any given time.

![Figure 5.5 Penticton Farmers’ Market.](Penticton Farmers’ Market, n.d.)

Food events that are intended predominately for locals and events for tourists were sometimes distinct. The Festival of the Grape, pictured in Figure 5.6., is one of Canada’s largest family friendly wine events and draws tourists and locals. Other examples were Party in the Park, an affordable wine event for
the local community at Skaha Lake and Paisley Notebook’s food experiences which are deliberately as affordable as possible. The ONA Salmon release festival was thought to have more to do with local food culture than many of food tourism experiences, but the festival involves mostly locals, especially schools and does not draw many tourists.

![Image](image_url)

**Figure 5.6 The Festival of the Grape in Oliver, BC** (Okanagan Wine Festivals, n.d.)

To summarize, most respondents felt that the current food culture was shaped by the wine industry. Several thought this reflected a common pattern in New World wine regions where wine develops first and drives the development of a complementary food culture. Participants thought the development of the Okanagan wine industry changed the nature of tourism in the region and wine
tourism changed local food culture in terms of consumer tastes and expectations. Winery driven changes also apply to local community composition since the growth of the industry has resulted in the migration of winery owners and staff who want to live in wine country. It was not unusual for participants to refer to particular winery projects with reference to their financial source. The 2000s were noted as the time when those who built winery businesses with sweat equity were replaced by bigger investments from Calgary. Several participants referred to “Asian money” or “Chinese money” as sources of present-day investment. Food tourism was described as being situated where local food culture’s agricultural roots intersect with the global interests of tourists and migrants. The key success factors for wine and food tourism were described as the quality of the tangible product and strong entrepreneurial business skills. Both the quality of wine and food and the depth and breadth of finance, marketing, and leadership skills were thought to have improved over the past 20 years. Participants thought good food tourism created a complete experience which including the natural setting, the sensory act of eating and drinking from a particular place and the social nature of the experience. These themes were common to the examples of best practice participants shared. There was a general sense that there were great things going on, but that the region, especially the most rural parts, were not yet reaching their potential as a food destination. The best tourism experiences were ones that married food experiences to the land and to other aspects of local culture such as music.
Success comes from capitalizing on food identity by linking tourism to the landscape and to the human and environmental history.

**Annapolis Valley**

At the provincial level, Nova Scotian food tourism is centred on seafood. Typical foods that are promoted in tourism marketing are lobster, scallops, and mussels. Several participants gave variations on a statistic about the high percentage of tourists who eat lobster in Nova Scotia. This may be a result of what is marketed shaping demand or tourist demand shaping what is promoted since some participants thought even visitors come looking for typical things and not adventurous dining. Tidal Bay, Nova Scotia’s appellation wine, is marketed with the tagline, “Pairs well with seafood and ocean views” which highlights the connection between wine and the sea and culinary traditions around seafood. This marketing aims to leverage the emotional response people have for Nova Scotia without being cliché.

The agricultural landscape was well-recognized as being an aesthetic that differentiated the AV area from other areas in the province. The region has used its rurality to attract tourists from the Halifax area for romantic B&B weekends and family activities like apple picking, but the central tourism brand for the region during the 20th century was the “Land of Evangeline” based on Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s poem, *Evangeline: A Tale Of Acadie*. Wayfinding and tourism promotions were labelled using this theme. Participants thought that
wine tourism and place marketing strategies based on local food ingredients have helped the area emerge as more than just a historical place where the Acadians were deported. In particular, wine along with other local beverage manufacturing have helped to create a modern identity for the region.

The general sense was that wine tourism was in the early stages of its development. Wine tourism started in the Wolfville area with “some of the wineries opening their doors and having a little shop and having some wine tours and really partnering with each other” (B5). Of the 20 wineries listed by Tourism Nova Scotia, 15 are classified as being in the Bay of Fundy & Annapolis Valley tourism region (Tourism Nova Scotia, n.d.-a) and all but one Wines of Nova Scotia (WANS) member is in the AV.

Figure 5.7. shows in interior of Benjamin Bridge’s tasting room in the Annapolis Valley’s Gaspereaux Valley while Figure 5.8. shows the exterior of the winery and tasting room at Planter’s Ridge winery in Port Williams which is housed in a renovated 155 year-old timber frame barn. Though different in style, both of these wineries demonstrate the investment in tourism infrastructure from the wine industry in the AV. Both of these wineries are within a 10-minute drive of Wolfville.
Figure 5.7 Benjamin Bridge Tasting Room (Taste of Nova Scotia, n.d.)

Figure 5.8 Planter’s Ridge Winery and Tasting Room (Planters Ridge Winery, n.d.)
Visiting wineries (21) was a tourism experience mentioned by almost all participants. Wineries were seen as bringing locals and visitors together over wine and food. Tourists were characterized as openminded, if somewhat surprised by existence of wineries in the Nova Scotia, but once tourists arrive in the Annapolis Valley they “can’t help but understand [they’re] in a wine and food region” (B9). There was a sense that many tourists were relatively inexperienced with wine and appreciated having a good experience rather than an in-depth tutorial. People who were newer to wine were thought to enjoy what they perceive as the luxurious aspects; using a specific glass for each wine poured was popular in the tasting room. Nova Scotia winery visitors typically purchase 1 or 2 bottles of wine which was thought similar to typical winery visitor purchasing in the Okanagan during the 1990 and early 2000s. In NS “visiting a winery is more of an experience” as a result tasting fees may be higher and not refunded with purchase (B17). Tourist spending in NS was described as conservative: “We do consume here, but we’re really quite conservative” (B22).

Other beverage producers like Horton Malt House, Wayfairs, Sea Level Brewing, Barrelling Tide Distillery, and Annapolis Valley Cider also focus on visitors. These businesses were at a scale and size where the owner/operators are typically onsite and accessible to visitors which enables authentic interaction between producers and consumers.
Local food offerings at wineries such as tasting plates, cheeses, and different mustards created a market for local farmers’ products, so much so that participants thought small farms and value-added food could probably sell everything they could grow or make to the restaurant industry that has grown up around the wineries. Participants observed a trend that more and more wineries were offering food and using food trucks if they lack kitchen capacity. Food was considered an important piece in turning a winery into a destination worth several hours of tourists’ time. Wineries were also starting to differentiate based on volume or quality business; experiences were then developed to cater to different tourist types. For example, Lightfoot & Wolfville was described as “playing the long game” (B22) because they have invested in wine and experience quality that is comparable to Okanagan, California, or Australia which is suitable for the more discerning guests. Quality winery visits were ones that included behind the scenes looks at the entire facility and history of the property. This might include unique experiences during harvest like tasting grapes from the sorting table. Whereas Luckett’s Winery, which is pictured in Figure 5.9, has a popular café which welcomes busloads of more traditional tourists who may not be concerned with where the grapes were grow or how the wine was made, but appreciate the view and the novelty of the phone booth in the vineyard.
The Magic Winery Bus was a very frequently mentioned example (14). It is a hop on hop off loop visiting 5 wineries in the Gaspereau Valley. The English-style double decker bus has the capacity for 50 people every hour. The Magic Winery Bus originated from several forward-thinking winery owners at a Town of Wolfville facilitated visioning session on developing as a wine and culinary destination. The initiative was supported by funding from the Wolfville Business Development Corporation, WANS and the Nova Scotia Department of Agriculture. The Magic Winery Bus broke even in year one and has continued to grow since. Although it started as a not-for-profit, the Magic Winery Bus has since incorporated as private businesses, and launched a Niagara version.
Other food tourism was described as being small scale and in the early stages of development. Farm-based experiences included u-picks, corn mazes, farm-stays, and special agricultural events and festivals such as the Apple Blossom Festival. Like the South Okanagan, Annapolis Valley participants frequently gave farmers' markets as an example of food tourism (20). This included weekly or bi-weekly markets with diverse vendors like the Wolfville Farmers’ Market shown in Figure 5.10, stationary farm markets like Noggins or Avery’s, and farm stands at the end of people’s drives where tourists or locals can pay using a honour system sash box. Dabros in the Gaspereau Valley was given as an example of how the farm stand shopping experience was elevated through attention to details like heritage museum decor and folk music.

Figure 5.10 Wolfville Farmers’ Market (Wolfville Farmers’ Market, n.d.)

Starr’s Point loop was given as a very localized example that includes a variety of agritourism experiences. This self-guided loop in Port Williams
includes a brewery, restaurant, distillery, farm, cheese house, organic farm, two wineries and honey. The loop started about 20 years ago as an informal group with a hand drawn map. There is now a more professional map and a website. Starr’s Loop was described as highly authentic because it was the collaborative effort of a small system of business owners. Participants thought efforts would be needed to sustain the community feel and togetherness of the current wine industry culture as the industry grows.

Devour Food Film Festival (11) was another frequent example. Devour is considered a model of combining food, cinema, and other activities; Tourism Nova Scotia named Devour a Signature Event. The festival began as a restaurateur’s economic development effort in the slow season between Summer and Christmas. Inspired by the Slow Food on Film festival in Italy, the festival debuted in 2009 as the Slow Motion Food Film Festival. Organized by the local Slow Food chapter and run by volunteers, the festival screened several impactful documentaries and drama at the Acadia Cinema in Wolfville over a weekend. The initial event was a success, selling 1000 tickets and bringing customers to local restaurants. The bi-annual festival was rebranded in 2013 as Devour which evokes consumption, pleasure, and hedonism. By 2018, 13,000 tickets were sold for Devour Film Festival in Wolfville and there were 15 additional events around the world, most in smaller centres rather than cities. In the past 2 years, Devour has been “grasped by the community as a significant point of pride” (B9). Now half the attendees are from Annapolis Valley and activities of different styles and
costs are offered. For example, the 2019 program includes options like a free party for volunteers, all you can eat chowder for $10, an experiential gleaning tour in keeping with festival's 2019 food waste theme, and $60 food workshops. A long table dinner event is shown in Figure 5.11. Devour Film Fest has influenced the evolving food culture in the AV, especially in terms of people's openness to trying new things.

Figure 5.11 Devour the Food Film Festival event in Wolfville (Devour, n.d.)

Another example of an endeavor bringing together agriculture, processing, and food and drink experiences for locals and tourists is D’Aubin Family Meats. Located in Bridgetown, the multigenerational D’Aubin family started as an abbatoir to serve local producers along with retail butchery. The family business
then added off-site catering and a restaurant and music venue in an old church on the river offering a menu featuring local food, beer, and wine. D’Aubin’s is a highly diversified business with prices and offering suitable to its rural Bridgetown location. B20 thought that “by expanding customers’ choices, D’Aubin’s has changed food tastes in Annapolis County.”

There are several Tourism Nova Scotia developed experiences in the Annapolis Valley. Dining on the Ocean Floor (5) was the most frequently mentioned as an iconic example of experiential food tourism. The experience includes a guided tour of the ocean floor, dinner and a campfire and costs $950 per couple and sold out for the 2019 season in under two minutes. Figure 5.12 shows the dramatic dinner setting in the Bay of Fundy at low-tide.

![Dining on the Ocean Floor](image)

*Figure 5.12 Dining on the Ocean Floor* (Tourism Nova Scotia, n.d.-c)
Both regions are crowded at peak season. In the South Okanagan, participants described activities like festivals and the farmers’ market as being dominated by tourists during peak seasons in ways that made locals choose alternatives. As certain events get bigger and more tourism focused, locals look for smaller alternative events. Even the most prized example of local food culture, Penticton Farmers’ Market, was described by some as being so popular that locals no longer visited in the summer. In the summer, SO locals have to alter routes and transportation because of traffic. Late summer and early fall farm markets, corn mazes, and u-picks in the AV were described as busy especially in terms of traffic volume. B19 referred to Doxey’s (1975) Irritation Index which proposed that residents’ emotional reactions to tourism evolve from euphoria, to apathy, to irritation and then antagonism as the number of tourists increases. This participant thought the AV may be approaching the irritation stage.

5.3.2 Rural food tourism that sustains food culture

**South Okanagan**

South Okanagan participants described a cycle where food tourism incentivized the region to protect food sources and protect the environment where these foods are grown and the agricultural landscape. Food tourism was seen as an incentive for the SO to protect agricultural assets which is important because it makes the SO a desirable place to live and to visit. Sustaining local agriculture depended on farmers being able to make a livelihood, so the
opportunity to use agricultural land in food and wine tourism provided a means for farmers to maintain the environmental, social, and cultural qualities of local agriculture. For example, cideries ensure orchards stay in place and Farmers’ Markets protect food sources and the infrastructure and relationships for local distribution. Even when the growth of the wine industry meant transitioning from orchards to vineyards, the agricultural identity and aesthetic was protected. The objectives of agricultural land conservation were met since the soil could be converted to other crop uses in the future if necessary.

**Annapolis Valley**

Generally, Annapolis Valley participants did not directly comment on using tourism to conserve tangible or intangible assets. One participant commented on how vineyard landscapes are valuable because they are aesthetically pleasing to visitors. It might be inferred that attracting tourists provides a reason to protect the agricultural landscape, but that conclusion was not made overtly in the Annapolis Valley. There was a sense that sustaining agriculture was related to sustaining local rural communities. There was also the need for a balance between sustaining existing community culture and developing community resources in order to sustain the community. The objective of tourism development was to keep “iconic aspects intact while encouraging the kind of growth that will allow us to go forward and not be a ghost town” (B16). Balancing change and sustainability was central to rural economic development that
recognizes heritage as an asset that brings visitors, but also respects existing heritage. The way heritage buildings like the cidery in Kentville, Church Brewery in Wolfville, the refurbished barn that serves as the winery, and tasting room at Planters Ridge were given as positive examples. Even new builds, like the Lightfoot & Wolfville facility, evoke agricultural architecture with a barn-like structure.

Authentic food tourism could only occur in destinations that were developed for locals. B13 explained, “Tourism comes from authenticity, so you need to have authentic places that are reflective of the vibrancy of that community and then tourism comes in afterwards.” Being authentic meant being more than a tourist town. It was important to be “a real working town” not “a twee little tourist town” (B16). Being a real working town meant that there needed to be a mixed-economy with sectors other than tourism contributing. B1 explained that tourists want to visit “a community that’s a neat community, but the only reason it’s a neat community is because people are living and working and being in that place.” Food tourism helps create desirable places for people to live and to work and these in turn create interesting places to visit. Participants felt that authenticity was an important aspect of placemaking, especially in rural communities trying to sustain their economy and population. Both tourists and locals supporting local wineries was seen as an important element of the development of an authentic wine industry.
Food culture needed to extend beyond imagery to actual practice to be authentic. As A9 explained:

I should be able to take you back into the kitchen and show you local. Not just hey here’s our motto, here’s our media glossy, ooh ahh Instagram and everything else, but walk in and see the raw products and explain where the product is from, how it is humanely and sustainably produced and distributed.

Authenticity was related to the destinations’ cultural identity and the need for regions to be themselves rather than emulating other destinations. For example, B3 thought “We just need to be NS and people will come and it’s beautiful and what we have here is unique to us and we need to celebrate it and we need to showcase it and we need to realize the value of what we offer.” Although A22/23 and A17 compared the South Okanagan to other more well-known wine regions such as describing the Okanagan as a mini Sonoma, but these comparisons were made by participants with less intimate involvement with the wine industry and a more superficial understanding.

Participants thought that events and promotional materials should accurately reflect the local population, landscape and food culture. For example, wine related marketing imagery can extend beyond depicting blond, middle-aged women in the same winery and vineyard landscapes to include more diverse people enjoying a variety of experiences. Event line-ups and panels should reflect the people who do the work which includes women and minorities.
Similar interpretations of authenticity were commonly shared by participants in both regions. Participants own memorable food tourism experiences were ones that reflected the respective culture as it was actually lived by locals. Italian villages were a frequent example. Rural food and wine places were authentic “where food is so ingrained in living, in culture, in socializing” (B3). Being authentic was described as necessary for the sustainability of food tourism because tourists want to visit authentic places. The qualities that were thought to be authentic, were those that were attractive to the desired target consumers. When pressed to explain or define the term authentic, common ideas were that what was authentic was unscripted and true to its roots. Most participants are not directly involved in agriculture, so their expectations of authenticity may be based on antiquated, romanticized ideas about what authenticity looks like.

5.3.3 Rural food tourism for sustainability

Economic benefits were the most frequently given example of how food tourism sustains rural places in both regions. Participants did not need to be prompted to offer this benefit. Food tourism was seen as contributing to the sustainability of rural communities because it creates jobs, creates alternative revenue streams, has a multiplier effect, and contributes to the tax base making rural communities viable places to live and work. The Canadian Vintner
Association (2015) study on economic impacts of the wine sector across Canada referred to in the case introductions was given to demonstrate the value of the sector by several participants in both regions. Food tourism in both regions has helped attract and retain rural population.

**South Okanagan**

Communities in the South Okanagan were described as being mutually invested in each other’s success because the communities are so interconnected and a significant percentage of the population is involved in agriculture, tourism, wine, and/or culinary. Some towns defined themselves as “tourist towns” where everyone is affected by tourism. In agricultural communities like those of the SO, “food really drives the character and flavour of a community” (A2) so sustaining food, sustains community and tourism helps build and sustains a sense of community identity. Tourism was described as “a renewable resource as long as you don’t over tourist it” (A1).

Economic development and tourism were considered well-aligned in their activities since tourism focused on attracting outside visitors and supporting local tourism businesses while economic development also looks at supporting local businesses and attracting the right workforce and businesses. In particular, wine tourism was seen as creating demand for other agricultural products. Food and beverage are central to branding the region for visitors and potential residents. Food tourism creates brand ambassadors for wine and food and the destination
which can feed future success. The agricultural lifestyle was considered an important aspect of why other industries like manufacturing and technology establish themselves in the South Okanagan. Other newcomers to the South Okanagan create their own jobs through entrepreneurial activity often centred on food and wine.

The terms “knee deep, waist deep or neck deep” were used to describe possible levels of farmers’ involvement in tourism and the effects on agricultural parts of business (A8). A double economic value was noted since both an agricultural product and tourism experience are sold. A21 gave a personal example of running an orchard that would lose money if its fruit was sold wholesale, but could profit with direct sales to tourists, locals, and restaurants. Direct sales were seen as win-win since the local farmer makes a better margin and the consumer gets fresher produce at a better price. Adding tourism experiences creates additional opportunities for farmers that are trying to diversify for alternate revenue streams.

The South Okanagan’s identity as a wine and food region attracted retirees with diverse backgrounds and interest in community involvement. It also attracted younger people. The youngest BC participant, A18, felt that there were more younger farmers and entrepreneurs in food related businesses moving to the Okanagan. A16, the second youngest participant, felt that “young working
people with families” were the ones setting a positive entrepreneurial tone. This demographic vitality was considered essential to sustaining rural places.

The most economically viable agri-businesses are wine and other alcoholic beverage producers who utilize tourism as the most lucrative sales channel. Wine was described as having margin advantages especially when scaled up whereas other agriculture was high cost and low margin. In the words of A28, “alcohol sells, garlic smells.” Ironically, one of the largest food festivals in North America is the Gilroy Garlic Festival in California. Approximately 100,000 visitors attend this annual festival with an economic impact of $10 million USD (Buczkowska et al., 2014). Wine tourism is the tourism development activity with the most significant spin off and multiplier in terms of economic development in other tangential sectors like accommodation. Wine tourism was established with expanding the shoulder season as a key objective. For example, the Okanagan Wine Festival was established because tourism used to stop at Labour day and later the Spring Wine Festival was added for similar reasons. Wine tourism successfully extended the season with several participants noticing that September may have fewer visitors but they spend more.

**Annapolis Valley**

Food and wine tourism was seen as having significant economic benefits in the Annapolis Valley. As in the South Okanagan, the wine industry led development. Two participants recalled noticing at a 2010 wine event that
discussion centred on winemaking and grape growing but not tourism. Since then there has been further food and wine tourism discussion and development.

Participants explained that rural areas realize the importance of bringing people here. Tourism creates jobs and creates an environment that is attractive for locals and visitors. Those involved in AV tourism recognized their natural agricultural assets and are working to use those assets in tourism development. The return on investment is minimal in traditional farming, so those “who are choosing to stay are looking into going into diversified, or specialty or something different in order to ensure they …can move forward and support their future families” (B5). There were multiple examples of food and agri-drinks activity as alternative revenue streams by economic necessity. For instance, having an AirBnB and lavender maze on a market garden farm, having rental cabins on a property with cattle, or creating farm vacation experiences on orchards.

Successful new businesses in the Annapolis Valley were often in the food and wine industry. If families with farms want to stay in the AV they are entering the value-added tourism business. The AV is also using wine and food tourism to build the shoulder seasons.

Participants thought that NS was more focused on tourism activity in and of itself as the revenue stream versus tourism as a vehicle to enhance the real revenue of selling wine direct to consumer. The wine industry, along with other beverage manufacturers increases investment in the area, creates local jobs,
and has significant economic impact which creates more viable rural places and a sense of economic optimism. Food tourism creates an environment that can be more successfully marketed as a destination worthy of an extended visit. B16 explained:

Food and wine are reasons why you would like to travel to Annapolis Royal and not just come in for the day and look at the pretty little gardens or the pretty little boardwalk downtown, but to stay in one of our lovely B&B’s and go out to one of our great restaurants with all local food and you can know where your food is coming from.

Locals see the wine industry as a value-added opportunity because vineyards produce more than grapes and wineries produce more than wine. They produce experiences. Multiple participants expressed a sense of optimism and excitement. The general sentiment was captured by B14 who explained that “everybody’s really excited that the wine region is here and it’s created a lot of jobs.” The Annapolis Valley was described as becoming a destination which attracts visitors and also improves local’s access to food and wine experiences. B19 thought “Everyone kind of likes the idea that we live in a destination…I always know that when I have family come visit me that they are going to love it and want to move here.”

Wine may be putting the AV on the map, but the economic development opportunities extend beyond the beverage manufacturing cluster to accommodation and other amenities that develop to support and extend the tourism experience. For example, B23, a restaurateur, described dinner guests
as also staying at a B & B, grocery shopping, visiting wineries and distilleries thereby spreading their money throughout the community. This participant saw their business as “a little piece of the puzzle” that helps attract visitors who spend money in rural Nova Scotia.

As in the South Okanagan, food tourism promotion aligned with business attraction and retention aims in the AV. The Annapolis Valley Chamber of Commerce concentrates their attention on tourism as part of building business in the AV since tourism brings visitors who may decide to become residents. Therefore, from a Chamber of Commerce perspective, tourism is less about the tourism revenue and more about creating awareness for the region and attracting new businesses and residents.

The growth of food and wine tourism has encouraged people who left to pursue further education or employment to return to the AV and invest in property and businesses related to agriculture. This was seen as fulfilling the common desire to return home. Local people were described as being open to these new opportunities and to “getting training to figure out how they can fit in”(B19). Participants shared several examples of young people starting businesses like small tour companies or undertaking further education such as NSCC’s viticulture and enology certificate. Initiatives in food tourism like Founders House in Annapolis Royal are owned and operated by young entrepreneurs and families with young children buying small farms with small scale CSAs. Several
participants felt this pattern was part of a larger demographic trend away from urbanization. One recently sold agricultural property was sold “by a family who ran it until they were ready to retire and it’s been bought by a young family (B16)”. This was interpreted as a sign of optimism about the area. Interestingly, in BC the label “young” was typically applied to those under 50, whereas in the AV “young” referred to people in their twenties to mid-thirties.

There were contradictory views in the Annapolis Valley on whether wineries were predominately being developed by residents or newcomers, a distinction that may relate to food sovereignty concepts linked to power and cultural control. For example, B22 said that with some exceptions, most NS wineries were “home grown.” The food tourism that is developing in the AV was generally seen as a cultural match with the pre-existing culture either because the entrepreneurs were locals or, if they come from elsewhere, their values were consistent with local values. As B20 explained, “This is not a sector which is being imposed on the region. It is entirely of the region on every single level.” The Annapolis Valley’s has an existing tourism network with accommodation infrastructure and restaurants that were much more developed as the wine industry develops which gives wine tourism an existing framework to build from whereas the wineries in the Okanagan had to build restaurants and accommodation.
In contrast, B3 and B13 described winery owners as “come-from-aways.” Participants saw wineries as capital and time intensive, so prospective winery owners needed to be wealthy to start one and weather the extended time line to profitability. Similar issues were described with other types of food tourism which some felt were often endeavours developed by outsiders. For example, the owner/operators of Winegrunt, a wine bar in Windsor, are a husband and wife from BC. They were described as having created a beautiful space, and crafting lovely meals of organic carrots and hand-milled bread, but this was viewed as a foodie culture not native to the AV. “Nobody locally would have done that” (B13).

Most Annapolis Valley participants were extremely positive about the growth of the wine industry and food tourism in their area; however, a few expressed doubts, with the most pronounced uncertainty expressed by B13 about whether wineries and grape growing are agricultural uses that supports rural communities. While this participant felt that the growth of wineries in the region supported tourism, they were skeptical that tourism could be a sustainable platform on which to support a community. B13 went on to explain that wineries and vineyards have “taken a lot of farms that were run by people who were friends with my father and changed them into something that is no longer part of the broader farming community.” Grape growing was considered a departure from traditional agriculture. A whole series of questions were raised about the wine industry’s employment profile, workforce needs, and economic contributions and how these are similar or different from other types of agriculture: “Are they
lending equipment to their neighbours? Are they collaborating around agricultural issues? Who are they catering to? Is the wine industry part of and supporting 4H [a youth non-profit organization often focused on agricultural activities], the Nova Scotia Federation of Agriculture, and the Kings County Federation of Agriculture?” (B13). This participant wondered if winery owners considered themselves farmers and noted that she had not seen winemakers in typical farm attire of “ballcap and rubber boots.”

Annapolis Valley participants described a need to educate residents about the benefit of taking up opportunities in food and wine tourism because some residents do not understand that stories are what “sells the product” and are hesitant to share theirs because they are uncomfortable talking about themselves. There is a tendency to not want to get “too big for your britches” and a “fear of hope” (B13). Multiple participants observed that Nova Scotian’s wait for outside recognition and approval and over-value things like Benjamin Bridge being in Gordon Ramsey’s restaurant. International recognition, for example wine awards, were frequently mentioned. Perhaps this is because it is not polite to brag about your own accomplishments, but repeating an outsider’s evaluation was culturally acceptable.

**Sustaining rural places**

The meaning of rural and the relationships between rural and urban were frequent themes. Comments typically related to whether the region itself was
rural and whether food tourism is a rural activity. For example, A10 explained that they no longer saw the SO as “a true rural community anymore” rather they considered the SO “semi-rural.” This participant went on to explain: “I actually don’t consider us to be a community at all. We’re a collection of communities” some are more or less rural. The participant estimated that 50% of occupants in some of these communities are full or part-time urban migrants and expect some urban amenities and the other 50% are “second or third generation farmers that are hoping to sell their land to a winery so they can retire”

Overlapping and transitional spaces are particularly opportune for food tourism because food and wine blends rural and urban. For example, participants described the rural-urban fringe as the location of agritourism and observed that successful wine destinations are as close urban areas as possible. Small-scale agriculture was dependent on tourism and tourism was dependent on urban tourists. In addition, the interrelationship between rural wineries and urban restaurants have been central to market access.

Participants thought that demand for a certain type of food experience came from more discerning urban wine tourists. The current food culture was shaped by this demand. For example, participants noted that the reason the South Okanagan had quality farm to table restaurants, was because of this urban demand. Therefore, the present foodie culture in the region was considered better than most rural areas because of this urban influence. It was noted that
while the culinary culture has improved across the Okanagan, that improvement is strongest in Kelowna the largest urban centre.

There was consideration of whether wineries were “rural resources.” A7 shared examples of two new urban wineries in the Okanagan making obvious efforts to connect the urban experience to agriculture since “You walk in and there’s pictures of farmers everywhere.” Two NS participants questioned why winery licenses are tied to agriculture and consequently tied to rural places. In terms of licensing that restricts wineries to agricultural land B11 argued that “whatever makes sense to generate wealth makes sense. Why shouldn’t there be a winery outlet in Halifax that’s associated with production in the Valley? Why does there have to be that connection [to the agriculture land] if it’s generating wealth. It doesn’t have negative impact on the environment. It exposes more consumers to a product.”

Interestingly for the study focused on rural tourism in the South Okanagan, Raudz, a farm to table restaurant in downtown Kelowna, was given as an exemplar of rural food tourism multiple times. Participants who shared this example thought Raudz had a deep connection to local food culture because of its strong local procurement program. Participants spoke of feeling “good knowing that what I am eating is from down the road or across the lake” (A25). Raudz is a useful example to illustrate the interconnection between urban and rural. The restaurant is in an urban environment but supports and highlights local
farmers living and working in rural parts of the region. Raudz acts as an initial experience and point of connection between urban diners and food and wine producers further south.

Urban growth was proposed as beneficial to rural areas to the extent that as urban centres like Kelowna grow in population and visitation, more tourists and residents will visit outlying areas of rural food and wine tourism. The close relationship between Kelowna and less densely populated areas of the SO was evident in the significance of Kelowna as a source of within region tourists.

Even with an increase in visitors from Kelowna, the SO was not within a day trip of a major urban centre and therefore was seen as being reliant on out-of-region tourists. A15 referred to a market perception study done 5 years ago in the region’s number 1 market and closest major city, Vancouver, which found that only 22% of Vancouverites knew grapes were grown in Okanagan. Awareness has improved since. Participants thought the SO will always be dependent on tourism, as a consequence, food strategy has to be visitor focused and therefore wine focused since wine is a better tourism driver than food.

Similar themes emerged in the AV. Participants in the AV felt that it was in relationship to Halifax that the rest of NS considers itself rural. There was a rural perception that most funds and decisions are Metro Halifax centric, but proximity to Halifax was also described as an advantage by the majority of participants because it provided a proximate source of visitors and consumers. In the words
of B16: “You’ve got to thank God for Halifax because it is booming and it is an audience for the ‘hinterland’, quote unquote. Without Halifax I think rural NS would have a really hard time.” Rural and urban were seen as interdependent. This interdependence was highlighted by agritourism which depends on urban tourists. The inaugural NS Wine Harvest Festival to be held in 2019 illustrates rural-urban issues. B11 explained the process as being fraught with “many disagreements whether it would be in the Valley or here [Halifax]. We brought experts in to give us their thoughts and ideas.” Ultimately, it was decided that the inaugural 2019 Harvest Festival would be held in Halifax. This was considered a strategic decision that would facilitate connecting with urban consumers. The event would be a communication platform to promote rural areas. The urban location was viewed as a means to reach more consumers. There was an openness to hosting future harvest events in the AV.

Within the AV, participants generally thought Wolfville did development that builds on agriculture and heritage particularly well. Wolfville was seen as distinct from other parts of the AV because it is a university town and because of its location on the eastern end of the Valley. Being about a 1 hour drive from Halifax allowed Wolfville to draw urban visitors. Wolfville was considered more diverse than other parts of the Annapolis Valley, with residents who tended to be more educated, well-travelled, adventurous, and liberal. Acadia’s student population helps maintain year-round businesses in a way other parts of AV are not able to do. It was common observation that the markets, distilleries,
restaurants, wineries, and breweries are concentrated in Eastern AV and Wolfville area with much less development as one drives the additional hour West.

The exception outside of Wolfville would be Annapolis Royal at the far western side of the Valley and about 2.5 hours from Halifax. Annapolis Royal was viewed as having a strong sense of culture and identity which helped their residents speak with a stronger voice than their small population would denote. Several participants felt Annapolis Royal was able to “punch above their weight” in terms of influencing Valley policies than more populous centres in the AV.

Participants in both regions also described how the challenges of rurality, distance, transportation costs, seasonality, and low population density make it hard to support business that depends on locals in rural areas could be turned to their advantage. For example, this distance forced the tourism provider to focus on quality experiences with smaller numbers. The higher visibility in rural communities creates social pressure of not wanting to be embarrassed so there is pressure to deliver quality. Also having a smaller population to draw on means businesses have to always be working for their customers which forces business to remain competitive. Small towns are better able to fully integrate the celebration of local food culture. In addition, rural is attractive because reaching the destination is actually appealing to a lot of people; travel can be a desirable part of the experience. The Devour film festival has been asked to relocate to a
larger city such as Halifax or Toronto, but is committed to hosting its main event in Wolfville because of these rural advantages. Wolfville completely transforms itself as Devour’s host with banners, community volunteers, etc.

Values and priorities about the balance between sustaining existing rural culture and encouraging growth and change varied in both regions. In the South Okanagan, this was exemplified by the tension over the 2018 construction of a new hotel in Oliver between an “old guard” who wanted things to stay the same and a “new guard who favoured growth” (A26). In the Annapolis Valley, B19 described a split in local council, residents, and businesses about re-zoning agricultural land along an old highway corridor just outside Wolfville to allow for development. The participant noticed farm markets with the active involvement of younger generations favoured maintaining agricultural zoning while those without clear succession plans to transition their farms and farm markets to younger generations favoured zoning changes for development.

Wine tourism has been transformative for the South Okanagan but “whether that transformation filters into the rest of the community who aren’t so privileged is a big question” (A7). It is important that development which was intended to serve the community continues to serve the community, so the tone of economic development should be about serving locals not catering to wineries.

Food tourism operators need to attract and retain staff which requires an adequate supply of affordable accommodation and fair wages. Animosity
develops when service people cannot afford a reasonable lifestyle as is the case in Napa Valley, California where there are “full-time tasting room staff living in ghetto apartments in the back suburbs of Napa” (B22). A viable rural community depends on being able to give people a sense of hopefulness about the future which becomes difficult when people cannot afford to buy a home in the community where they grew up. The three participants with experience in both provinces were more aware of gentrification as a future issue in the AV. B19 explained that in the early days of the BC wine industry’s development “it was still relatively affordable for people who were born and raised there and wanted to create a life for themselves and buy a home” but this is no longer the case. B22 described the Okanagan as “tapped out for a certain group of people for various reasons: it’s all planted, it’s all been done, you’ve got to be a tens of million dollar heir to even buy an acre of land, there’s all these consultants no one’s trying anything different.” The participant explained that in BC “You’ll never be able to live in the community you grew up in...You can never live where you come from and I think that’s a really weird concept for me as an Easterner...that’s horrible.”

B19 summed up by saying, “I do feel very, very good about living here because there are neat things happening, but also wonder who is being left out because of this what about young people who want to create their lives here. If those discussion aren’t happening should they be happening? What sort of mechanism should be put in place to support young farmers for example?” B20
wondered that “this industry will grow and the numbers will grow. How is it being equitably shared?”

Overall participants thought it was important to sustain their local food culture because it is a key part of their identity and because authentic food culture is the best foundation for food tourism development that would help them sustain their community. Participants recognized that there were multiple, evolving local food cultures in their region including Indigenous food cultures, colonial agricultures, the wine influenced foodie culture. Participants wondered which of these local food cultures were being sustained through food tourism and who benefited. Finally, participants saw rurality existing along a distance and density continuum. Food tourism was seen to connect rural and urban places.

5.3.4 Culture for sustainable food tourism development

Soini and Dessein (2016) differentiate between culture being used as a resource for development and culture being used to shape development. The findings in this section relate to the way food tourism is developed, promoted, and managed, especially in terms of the respective roles of government, industry and the community.

South Okanagan

In the Okanagan, the planning and development culture was thought to be consultative which ensures one stakeholder group does not dominate. Existing
structures and systems, such as professional associations, research centres like Summerland Research and Development Centre, the BCWGC, economic development organizations, planning groups and sub-committee within cities, towns, regional districts, government agencies, educational community, food security organizations, water related intergovernmental groups, and First Nations Communities were thought to support this process. This consultative process takes longer, but was thought to better protect and sustain core cultural values.

**Annapolis Valley**

The Nova Scotian culture was described as culturally contradictory because on the surface people are very friendly, but underneath they are insular, distrustful and skeptical. Although multiple participants sensed that future success depended on creating an environment that welcomed outside investment, they thought come-from-aways can feel unwelcome, particularly those who are visible minorities because NS is quite racially homogenous. There was a generally cautious attitude towards risk, change, and economic development. As B13 explained: Nova Scotians are “not a hopeful bunch. We sort of think that life is going to swing and take our head off at any time.” Many participants also described a culture of dependency. For example, B3 described Maritime culture as “Not a super industrious society. I say that because I am one, I know. A lot of the big projects you see are done by people who come here and see the opportunity.” B3 continued “The average Nova Scotian is not interested
in making it big and working super hard…they like their friends, they like their time off and they like their comforts.” B3 thought “you can get by in life very easily in NS without doing a lot.” The general impression of most participants was that apart from Wolfville as a university town and Annapolis Royal which is attracting well-off retirees “ordinary people don’t have money here” (B12).

These cultural issues were seen as limiting workforce development in NS. Some locals, particularly those who have never been away and have limited education, were thought to be unfamiliar with service norms. These employees would do things like “calling up and saying ‘I just don’t feel like coming to work today I’ll see you tomorrow, assuming they’ll still have a job” (B16). Ambitious people with strong work ethics left Nova Scotia “what it left behind was a labour force that very much embraces the have-not notion” (B16). These may be “lovely people” but are characterized by things like only wanting to work enough to qualify for EI or only want to work seasonally to have summers off and that type of workforce is “really difficult to build an economy on” (B16). There was “growing awareness among rural Nova Scotians that things that they were comfortably thinking the government was taking care of are no longer quite as true as they imagined, so that comfort is disappearing” (B2). The Ivany Report discussed in detail in the section on policy confronts this cultural issue directly.

Multiple participants described NS as being backward. For example, in a discussion of farm-to-table cuisine having emerged relatively recently in Nova
Scotia, B9 explained: “We were behind the times. NS is always seemingly 5 years behind other jurisdictions when it comes to trends and perhaps policy.” B2 echoed this sense although this participant thought NS was “about thirty years behind everybody else” and B19 described AV as “It’s like going back 50 years in New England where it was rural and it wasn’t really gentrified.” An advantage of Nova Scotia being behind is that they can learn from others’ experience “We can predict. We see trends. We can have a great look at an example of what’s happening somewhere else and know that it might come to us eventually” (B14). Participants thought that trends are eventually accepted in NS but energy spent trying to convince Nova Scotians of the value of things before they are ready was futile.

There were concerns that the AV may not reach its potential because local people resist change, thinking: “This is the way we’ve been. This is the way we’re going to be. We’re not changing” (B14b). B5 thought “Long term residents are concerned with protecting their way of life: slow, quiet, the very rural focused. I think sometimes they might imagine barriers or challenges that don’t necessarily exist, so they would be reluctant to embrace change.” B22 thought that it “takes quite a lot to kick them to the point where they will react against the prevailing opinion or prevailing media or government hype that’s out there.” Even when the community says they want to change and want to grow there is reluctance to that change impacting themselves personally. However, in the words of B5: “I think when entrepreneurs have tried something and it’s worked, they’ve been received
well in those communities. Once somebody gets their foot in and gets started on
that there is acceptance of that change.” Annapolis Valley participants thought
that my research results would find a more receptive audience in NS than BC
because Nova Scotians have greater reverence for outside authority.

5.3.5 Rural food tourism that supports positive cultural change

Participants in both regions described food tourism as contributing to
changing the values and perspectives of locals and tourists in ways that moved
towards a sustainable culture. The South Okanagan and the Annapolis Valley
findings are largely integrated in this section because the responses were so
similar. At the end of the section there are some findings unique to each region.

Food tourism’s potential to transform locals’ perspective was identified by
participants as a benefit. Locals may take the beauty of the agricultural
landscape for granted. They are reminded to appreciate their place when
tourists come to enjoy their landscape, food and wine. Participants in both
provinces thought that external recognition of something makes the people who
are local to it appreciate it more.

Tourism was also seen as a way to encourage locals to get out and
experience their own region. For example, B16 shared the example of when a
new, gourmet ice cream store opened in Annapolis Royal. At first some locals
complained “$4 for a cone! That’s just scandalous.” However, once they ate it
their initial resistance was diminished. Now people from across the region come with their families for ice cream and while they are there might shop at other stores, go to restaurants, or participate in events in AR. Participants in BC and NS thought that food tourism helps people become more open to new experiences and new people. International travellers can open up perspectives for people who may have been isolated in the past. Tourism was a way to help residents embrace change which could support the resiliency of their culture.

Another way food tourism was thought to positively influence culture was by educating key consumers through direct experiences that build relationships over time. Tourism was described as a “give and take” between hosts and guests. Participants described tourism as an opportunity to build relationships. Food tourism facilitated mutual exchange in particular because food is universal. Sharing food and drink puts people at ease and creates comradery. Food tourism plays on cultural interpretations of this shared need, thereby creating an experience with transformational potential.

The transformative potential of food experiences to reconnect people with the natural environment and with other people was seen as a core objective of food tourism. Several participants felt there is often a disconnect in the food system between consumers and producers and between consumers and the land. Food tourism was viewed as a means to build human connections between consumers and producers and connections between consumers and the natural
environment. Ultimately, these deeper connections would transform cultural behaviour. These connections would increase caring about rural places and thereby increase sustainable behaviour such as buying local. A18 described her food tourism initiative as aiming to get people to think in new ways and ultimately to “break little habits one step at a time.” Direct experience could potentially shift consumer behaviour from quantity to quality. B3 shared her grandmother’s saying “quality satisfies” and gave an example to illustrate: “if someone gives you a really lovely strawberry and it’s really tasty and it’s ripe and it’s well grown, that 1 strawberry will satisfy you more than like 7 shitty ones that were not grown well, that were not in season.”

Participants saw these experiential food tourism experiences as a response to the tourist interest in hands-on learning. B18 thought that especially in the “face of understanding climate change” visitors want to feel grounded through hands-on experiences described as being “less in the head more in the heart.” This participant saw tourism as “change-making work” with the potential to advance alternative economic models that meet human needs without destroying the environment. The participant immediately apologized for this being “a bit out there.” Sensory experience was key to transformational tourism, so that people truly understand the quality and input differences between foods like organic cheese and Cracker Barrel. Food tourism could be transformational as in “literally it changes their life, and their shopping habits and their lifestyles” (B3). B3 believed consumer education about why paying more for quality food is
better would change purchasing behaviour since “most people are happy to pay for something once they understand it.”

Participants thought that people need to experience something to value it. Therefore, time and sensory experiences were essential in the transformational learning experiences described. Time with the visitor allows for a much deeper connection than a customer would get just through a typical retail type sale. Several participants had received feedback from participants about “ah ha” moments after hosting food tourism experiences such as farm tours. Food is experienced with multiple senses and these “ah ha” experiences stressed sensory experience like picking and tasting fruit, or walking barefoot in the dirt a visceral, grounding experience which A20 found “makes people feel better.” The visitor learning experience in a farm to table restaurant might begin with attentive listening, but progressed to active questions like “Where did this food come from? Who’s the farmer? Tell me more about what’s going on here?” (B23). In another Annapolis Valley example where livestock farming was integrated with a winery restaurant, some customers expressed discomfort with seeing the meat they are eating for lunch represented in cattle below the vineyard, but B8 described finding it “powerful” to share those connections even when they are uncomfortable.

The education for change theme was a thread through interviews in both provinces. There was a common vision among the majority of participants that
food tourism in rural communities was an opportunity to “not only nourish people, it sounds kind of corny, not only to nourish their belly but to nourish their mind and their soul a little” (B23). The strategy suggested by several participants involved balancing the old and new.

Taproots Farm in the Annapolis Valley was given 11 times as example of an agritourism operator promoting positive culture change. Taproots is an organic farm operated by a family with more than 100 years of experience farming in the Annapolis Valley. The farm includes a CSA, fiber lab, gleaning, community recognition events, open farm days, snow shoeing in the winter, and accommodation. TapRoots was described as having a holistic understanding of sustainability including economic, environment, and social spheres. This community mindedness was attributed to the owners’ leadership and vision. Taproots’ Jamaica Jerk pig roast event was given as a specific example that managed to find the balance between cultural sustainability and cultural change. What B18 called “Balancing the new and the old. Making it approachable but also spinning it a little bit.” Pig roasts and agritourism are familiar to Nova Scotians but this event incorporated organic meat and Jamaican jerk flavour. Jamaican farm workers prepared the food and shared their culture with visitors. An aspect of local food culture which is often marginalized, the knowledge and labour of temporary foreign workers was highlighted and honoured.
Several South Okanagan participants expressed their own desire to learn about food from local Indigenous people. Participants wanted to learn more about foraging, hunting, or how to cook things. Some participants sensed distrust which they thought was understandable. Non-Indigenous participants thought Indigenous food knowledge keepers might think: “what are your reasons, why are you interested in this, how are you going to exploit us” (A3). It was stressed that not every aspect of culture should be public and that there was a fine line between “teaching and providing an experience and exploitation.” Only telling part of the story is disrespectful, but there are things that are not for sharing. Where certain things grow, plants used for medicines, and water sources must be guarded and protected. A19 shared an example about information being shared online about a local spring. This distressed the community who knew from experience that it would be exploited if that knowledge is shared. A21 shared positive examples of how tourists learned about Indigenous culture, history, and politics over the course of food and wine tours hosted by Indigenous guides. The researcher experienced this kind of learning first hand at Joy Road’s Okanagan Nation Alliance (ONA) Sockeye and Wild Foods of the Okanagan dinner shown previously in Figure 5.4. Over dinner, visitors asked ONA guests about differences in political economic stances by different Indigenous groups and learned that Indigenous cultures in Canada are diverse and may have different perspectives.
Chapter 6 Findings on Understanding and using policy to support cultural sustainability in rural food tourism

There are various government departments involved and multi-layered policies affecting everything from tourism, to agriculture, to food and wine production, consumption, and distribution. A thorough review of these complexities is beyond the scope of this research. Here the focus is on those policies most central to cultural sustainability, in the context of rural food tourism development, in the regions under consideration from the perspective of research participants. This section draws on the interviews along with several governmental tourism strategy documents and select policies in an effort to triangulate the policy findings at a high level. The focus is on how participants perceive policy.

Unless the participant was working directly at a policy level, such as serving on a board, policy awareness was low. In addition, policy knowledge was usually constrained to the participant’s niche. For example, those predominately involved with wine knew wine policy, but not tourism, food, or economic development. If a participant worked directly with food systems, they may have been aware of funding available to support projects related to food systems and food security, but not agritourism. When participants were asked about policies that supported food and wine tourism development in their regions, many struggled to come up with examples, sometimes assuming policy must
exist even though they were not aware of it. Regardless of policy knowledge, there was strong interest in policies that would encourage, incentivize, and improve retention for agri-businesses. In addition, it was considered very important that research projects such as this one make policy recommendations, so that there would be application for findings.

In keeping with the appreciative research design, this section presents the policy structures, processes and outcomes participants identified as supporting cultural sustainability in rural food tourism. Several participants immediately flipped the appreciative prompt and said something along the lines of being able to think of policies that discourage or hinder food and wine tourism development, thereby threatening cultural sustainability. As A17 noted it is easier to comment on the negatives when one’s role is focused on improving the business environment. This research is focused on what works, so the findings about what participants thought worked is what is shared in the findings. Where participants shared the negatives, they were usually reframed as future opportunities and included in Chapter eight. For instance, the concern about the heavy focus on tourism marketing is presented as the need to balance tourism promotion and development mandates.

A description of how participants understood and used food tourism policy to support cultural sustainability is organized into several sections beginning with how participants understood policy and planning structures related to cultural
sustainability in food and wine tourism from international through local levels. The focus is on tourism policy structures at different scales, but there is also some description of agriculture, wine, and rural economic development policy structures as they relate to food tourism development. The section concludes with a description of several specific policies frequently mentioned by participants.

6.1 International

Setting a vision for sustainable tourism at an international level was attributed to the UNWTO three times in BC, but was not mentioned in NS. There were also references to the United Nation’s SDGs within wine industry and tourism policy contexts in BC, but not in NS.

6.2 Federal

Several BC participants referred to the federal Ministry of Tourism, Official Languages and La Francophonie developing a new federal strategy which will have sustainability at heart. This strategy, *Creating Middle Class Jobs: A Federal Tourism Growth Strategy*, was released part-way through the field research interviews in May 2019. In *Creating Middle Class Jobs: A Federal Tourism Growth Strategy* (Innovation Science and Economic Development Canada, 2019) Minister Joly actually uses one of Tourism Nova Scotia’s signature experiences, dining on the ocean floor in the Bay of Fundy, as an
example in her opening message. The strategy pays particular attention to rural tourism’s potential as “a viable and sustainable sector…to transform communities facing economic difficulties, especially resource-dependent and single industry towns and cities” (p.5). Several examples of rural communities revitalized through tourism such as Fogo Island’s Inn were given.

The new federal Canadian Experience fund ($58.5 million over two years) is part of the 2019 federal tourism strategy. The fund is intended to help develop attractions outside major cities and build Canada’s reputation as a country that “offers a taste of the world, with a wide variety of wine, spirits and other highly regarded homegrown and locally sourced products” (p.20). The Canadian Experiences Fund will invest in tourism development such as culinary trails, Indigenous food experiences, food festivals and farmers’ markets, breweries, wineries, farms, and fisheries. Both the Annapolis Valley and the South Okanagan received funding from the Canadian Experiences fund in 2019 (Boyd, 2019a; SaltWire Network, 2019) An Economic Strategy Table dedicated to tourism was also created which puts tourism in the company of other industries like Advanced Manufacturing, Digital Industries, Agri-Food, Health/Bio-sciences, Clean Technology, and Resources of the Future where business leaders are already participating in collaboration with the federal government.

The Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency ACOA was raised multiple times in Nova Scotia (8) and ACOA’s investments in wine and wine research
were significant. The equivalent to ACOA in BC, Western Economic Diversification Canada (WD) was not raised in BC despite the fact that WD funded the wine identity research spearheaded by UBC Okanagan and involving wine industry leaders (Buschert et al., 2018).

6.3 Provincial

Table 6.1 shows organizations working in the field of food tourism planning, marketing and management in the South Okanagan and the Annapolis Valley from provincial through to destination levels. Provincially, British Columbia has a dedicated Minister for Tourism, Arts and Culture as well as Destination BC, a provincial Crown corporation that operates as a DMO for destination marketing. The BC Wine Institute is involved in some wine and food tourism strategic planning and marketing. There is an active tourism industry association. There is a regional DMO as well as destination level DMOs and winery associations serving the South Okanagan.

There is no dedicated tourism ministry in Nova Scotia though the crown corporation Tourism Nova Scotia is a provincial DMO which reports to the Department of Business. There is a well-established provincial organization, Taste of Nova Scotia, that focuses on marketing local food in the province to both residents and visitors. The Winery Association of Nova Scotia is beginning to engage in wine tourism related activity. As in BC, there is an active tourism
industry association. At the regional level and destination levels, the Annapolis Valley does not have a DMO or winery associations.

**Table 6.1 Tourism Organizations in each Case Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Provincial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>Tourism DMO</td>
<td>Wine Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Tourism DMO</td>
<td>Wine Assoc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the differences in the structure of tourism between the two cases likely relates to the fact that British Columbia is geographically a much larger province with a larger tourism industry with hundreds of wineries, so requires active organization and associations at the regional and destination level to manage how food tourism is used for sustainability. Other differences in development culture and its effect on structure, policy, and process were also revealed in the interviews and are described in further detail in this chapter.

**BC Governmental/Quasi-governmental**

The BC Ministry of Tourism, Arts and Culture was established in 2017 after a change in provincial government from a long-standing Liberal majority to a NDP/Green coalition. The role of the Ministry of Tourism is to act as facilitator and champion for tourism issues by communicating issues raised by stakeholders, bringing together other Ministries on the issue, and communicating
Having a dedicated Minister for tourism was viewed positively as this has not always been the case in BC. Generally, participants thought policy should be considered holistically, and there should be inter-ministry collaboration. Labour force development was used to illustrate the need for an all of government approach across ministries and at all governance levels from provincial education mandates to federal policy on immigration. There was some optimism that inter-ministerial collaboration is increasing in BC under the current NDP government.


The strategy was described as a result of a year-long planning process. A fundamental aspect of which is the Minister’s Tourism Engagement Council (MTEC). The Council was established in June 2018 with an open call for participants. Twenty-five council members were selected from more than 90 applicants representing different regions and the tourism sector resulting in a diverse Council. A strategy draft was tested and validated by stakeholders who provided feedback. The MTEC will continue to work on determining the next stages of implementation and discussions with regional DMOs are planned.
There are three strategic pillars in *Welcoming visitors - Benefiting locals - Working together: A strategic framework for tourism in British Columbia 2019–2021*:

1. Supporting people and communities
2. Sustainably growing the visitor economy
3. Respecting nature and the environment

The concept of sustainable tourism is mentioned more than a dozen times in the 32-page plan in various contexts. For example, referring to the “long-term sustainability of B.C.’s outdoor recreation experiences including BC Parks and provincial recreation sites and trails” (p. 7) or the need for “Balancing growth with sustainability to respect and protect our natural environment, as well as the social and cultural authenticity of our communities and natural spaces” (p. 7). Agritourism and rural tourism are specific priorities because they support extending visitation beyond peak seasons and to address regional disparities in tourist activity. Equity is of central concern and sociocultural factors are embedded in the vision.

*Welcoming visitors - Benefiting locals - Working together: A strategic framework for tourism in British Columbia 2019–2021* (Province of British Columbia, 2019) is a significant contrast with its predecessor: *Gaining the Edge: BC Minister’s Tourism strategy 2015-2018* (Province of British Columbia, 2015). That plan had no mention of sustainability issues and an absence of awareness about the environment in which tourism occurs and depends. The environment and sustainability are exclusively used in a business sense such as “Enhancing
Competitiveness and Sustainability: strategic investments to remove barriers and support tourism growth” (p. 18) or the objective of creating “an environment that allows small business to flourish” (p. 9).

Destination BC (DBC) was established in 2012 as a crown corporation. DBC reports to the BC Ministry of Tourism, Arts and Culture. DBC’s mandate comes from the provincial Ministry and the Ministry is active in strategic development and implementation, and service planning. DBC provides funding to regional DMOs and has developed 20 sub plans for the province which include parts of the South Okanagan such as a tourism plan for the Hwy 3 Corridor. DBC is also working on 6 related regional level plans.

The purpose of DBC is described as ensuring BC’s tourism industry increases market share (Destination BC Corp. Act, n.d.). In 2014, DBC adopted the “Playing to Win” framework to guide the development of their first strategic plan. The 2017/18-2019/2020 corporate plan continues that theme (DBC, 2017a). For example, determining a “winning aspiration” and the subsection “HOW WE WILL WIN.” The strategy is structured around competition and the term “competitive” appears 16 times. The DBC Corporate Strategy 2017/18-2019/20 does not mention sustainability.
Annapolis Valley Governmental/Quasi-governmental

The most significant provincial policy discussed by Annapolis Valley participants was the 2014 provincial government report officially named *Now or Never: An urgent call to action for Nova Scotians* (Ivany et al., 2014), but commonly referred to as the Ivany Report after Ray Ivany, who had been President of Acadia University in Wolfville, and was the Chair of the Nova Scotia Commission on Building Our New Economy Chair which prepared the report.

The Ivany Report’s basic message was threefold:

1. Yes, there is a crisis, and it does threaten the basic economic and demographic viability of our province, most dramatically in our rural regions;

2. We are not doomed to permanent have-not status: in an improving macroeconomic climate, driven by expanding global trade, Nova Scotia has the assets, opportunities, institutional capacities and human capital to turn around its current outlook and build a much more positive future;

3. While the continuing retreat of the federal government from a regional development role and fiscal weakness at the provincial level are serious constraints, the single most significant impediment to change and renewal is the lack of a shared vision and commitment to economic growth and renewal across our province and among our key institutions and stakeholder communities (Commissioner’s Forward).

B13 summarized the message as: “Things have got to change. Suck it up and deal.” The Ivany report was considered the “collective diagnosis” while the follow-up report, *We Choose Now* was described as “the prescription” (B16) *We Choose Now* and the related *Field Guide and the Atlantic Growth Strategy* were
only raised in one interview; the focus was on the diagnosis of what ails Nova Scotians. The Ivany report was considered critical to economic development strategy at the provincial level including setting the goal of increasing tourism revenue from $2 billion tourism to $4 billion by 2024.

There is not currently a Tourism Minister in Nova Scotia. Tourism leadership in Nova Scotia went from being a well-funded government department in rural and economic development to an arms-length special operating agency and then in 2015 became the crown corporation Tourism Nova Scotia (TNS). There was also other restructuring related to rural development, culture, and tourism at around this time; the Department of Economic and Rural Development and Tourism became the Department of Business while a Communities, Culture and Heritage Department was established to promote and sustain Nova Scotian cultural heritage. TNS develops its business plan for the year which is then vetted by the Minister of Business. According to the 2015 Tourism Nova Scotia Act, Tourism Nova Scotia’s objectives are:

A. achieve tourism growth in the Province and maximize the value of tourism to the economy of the Province;
B. develop and implement a long-term strategy for tourism to drive sustainable tourism in the Province that delivers growth and profitability in the tourism sector, provides economic benefit to the Province and is consistent with the Province’s strategic priorities;
C. communicate and collaborate with communities, private industry and the tourism industry in the Province; and
D. exercise and perform the functions and duties conferred on it by this Act and the regulations or as may be required to meet the terms of the current outcomes agreement, the business
plan of the Corporation and the strategic plan of the Corporation (Tourism Nova Scotia Act, 2016).

Participants perceived the creation of TNS as a crown corporation as a dramatic shift. B6 thought the change indicated that tourism had become “more of a financial thing, so rather than doing tourism development, their policies were shifted to simply doing marketing. It actually didn’t have development dollars i.e. building product, building inventory, supporting innovative ideas. They simply were meant to promote and market what was there.” The establishment of TNS as a crown corporation was thought to create the independence needed to meet Ivany targets because it would be impossible to double revenue using the status quo structure. Key government tourism leaders felt that the best approach was to pick places and business that are going to succeed and promote them rather than equally distribute tourism marketing resources throughout the province.

There were concerns that a picking-the-winners approach would be perceived as unfair, therefore the provincial government decided to use a crown corporation structure to give the tourism sector the autonomy and distance to make radical decisions to grow revenue that might be more painful politically.

Achieving the Ivany goal requires visitors who stay longer and spend more. Since visitors who travel for wine and food do both, wine and food tourism were described as increasingly a priority for TNS. There was a sense that AV had become more valued as a tourism region where previously attention seemed focused on other parts of the province such as Halifax and Cape Breton. Food
tourism, particularly in rural areas that could use economic development, was identified as one of the pillars for tourism growth at the provincial level although this was not the perception of all participants.

Driving export revenue, Tourism Nova Scotia’s current strategic plan (Tourism Nova Scotia, 2017), targets the Ivany Report goal of $4 billion in tourism revenues by 2024. The plan is growth centric, with the term growth used 69 times in the 48-page document. When the word sustainability is used, it generally referred to the sustainability of the tourism industry itself in terms of its continued growth and profitability. Importantly, this growth supports the provincial government’s intention to pursue inclusive economic growth. One targeted Explorer Quotient® for product development and marketing is Cultural Explorers who are described as making “efforts to be ethical consumers, and appreciate environmentally and socially responsible options” (p. 21).

It is a strategic priority at the provincial level in both provinces to spread economic opportunities equitably across the province including rural areas. In BC, international tourists presently target Vancouver, Victoria, and Whistler, but since the main tourism product is nature, rural BC has the potential to drawn more of these tourists. BC is a massive province with small, scattered rural communities which is a challenge for moving tourists through rural parts of the province, but this geographic scale is also an attraction and associated experiences like grizzlies, fishing, and the outdoors were seen as key to the BC
brand. Planning corridors are part of encouraging tourists to explore; some of these corridor plans specifically include culinary, food, and wine.

**Industry Associations**

Both provinces have tourism industry associations. The Tourism Industry Association of British Columbia (TIABC) and Tourism Industry Association of Nova Scotia (TIANS) represent tourism industry interests to government. Both provinces also have wine industry associations, the British Columbia Wine Institute (BCWI) and the Winery Association of Nova Scotia (WANS), which have varying levels of involvement with tourism planning. Nova Scotia also has a provincial non-profit called Taste dedicated to promoting food and drink produced in Nova Scotia to residents and visitors. The respective winery associations and the Taste organization were discussed in detail by participants, so those are described in this section.

BCWI has been designated responsible for coordinating culinary tourism strategy development. The BCWI’s *Wine BC 2030: British Columbia Wine Industry Long-term strategic plan* which was released in 2019 is the wine industry’s first long-term strategic plan (Artemis Group, 2019). *Wine BC 2030* has “Advancing Sustainability” as one of its 5 pillars. The plan states:

> Bringing sustainability to the forefront clearly aligns the wine industry with the cultural values of the province as a whole, establishing a commitment to support sustainability principles beyond those relating to viticulture and enology. The pillar
represents an intention to continue to pursue a “triple bottom line” philosophy in every practice – from farming to hospitality to education to communication. This strategic pillar moves sustainability out from the sole purview of viticulturalists and recognizes that in order to succeed in a meaningful way it will require a multi-disciplinary approach for the long-term (p. 20).

The strategy approaches sustainability holistically at micro and macro scales.

Tactics include working towards meeting UN SDG goals such as climate action, clean water and sanitation, and gender equity.

WANS is involved in all aspects related to the development of the Nova Scotian wine industry. Wine and beverage business development efforts to date have been internationally focused export. Certain projects may be of a tourism nature, but this is not a specific focus. WANS has a membership of 12 of the 22 wineries in NS. The major advantages of WANS membership were participating in the Tidal Bay program being included on the NS wine map which only includes members, opportunities to be included in shows and events. There is a WANS strategy, but it is not available to the public.

Taste of Nova Scotia (7) was an oft mentioned example of an organization that brings together local food and beverage with tourism. Described as “a province-wide celebration of local food” (B24), Taste of NS is a registered non-profit, membership-based marketing association working with all sectors of the food and beverage industry to develop culinary tourism. Taste of NS helps educate locals and visitors about what local actually means and which businesses meet that criteria. Taste of NS was seen as making a big difference
because it acts as an industry hub that works across all levels. There are over 200 members in one of 2 categories: producer/processor or restaurant. Taste of Nova Scotia produces an annual print and online culinary guide and partners with Destination NS on the 3 provincial culinary trails: Good Cheer, Chowder, and Lobster. B3 explained, “anyone who is doing anything remotely well or trying to are Taste of NS members, and are part of that network.” Taste of NS was described as a very important link between agriculture and tourism in the province. For example, while the Department of Agriculture did not usually partner with Tourism NS, Taste of NS partnered with both the Department of Agriculture and Tourism NS.

6.4 Regional

Regional level tourism strategy plays a significant role in the South Okanagan. The Thompson Okanagan Tourism Association (TOTA) is one of 6 regional tourism areas in BC. The TOTA region is comprised of 9 areas which face common issues and challenges. The SO is one of these 9 areas. TOTA currently operates with a stakeholder model. All business and communities with tourism interests throughout the region are considered stakeholders. TOTA’s role is to connect and facilitate between stakeholders in the region including local DMOs. The goal is to respect authenticity and diversity within the region while maintaining unified messaging and marketing. Its current activity was described as being about 60% product, industry, and destination development, and 40%
marketing. Multiple participants thought this regional tourism management and marketing allowed for broader, regional consideration of strategy.

TOTA’s 2012-2022 strategic plan *Embracing our potential: How do we create an exceptional visitor experience…a partnership approach* is as a process document that provides guidance “in developing a successful year-round destination and an industry that creates jobs; supports community development; and adheres to the underlying principles of economic, environmental, social and cultural sustainability” (p. 4). From the strategy’s title to the tactics, *Embracing our Potential* reflects an appreciative approach to collaboratively developing regional tourism. Sustainability was identified as a social and cultural priority during the research and consultation, so the plan focusses on sustainability. The term sustainability or sustainable development is used 19 times in 48 pages (TOTA, 2012).

Food is a key theme of the plan because of market demand. TOTA was part of formalizing Thompson Okanagan Slow Food Tourism. Tourism development and marketing in this thematic area leverages regional attributes like the climate, agricultural landscape with orchards, vineyards, and wineries, and growing regional cuisine which are the essence of regional identity. The selection of the “Enriching local flavours” theme was thought to align well with national level promotional strategies. The benefits of the theme were as follows:
Unique al fresco vineyard dinners, winemaker dinners, and restaurants in spectacular settings that celebrate and promote local flavours create a strong sense of ‘romance’ and intimacy’ for the destination. Highlighting local flavours through Canadian cuisine, Aboriginal cuisine and the rich diversity of ethnic culinary traditions within the region, and building on the burgeoning demand for a ‘field to table’ experience are areas where the Thompson Okanagan region can truly excel. At the same time, the linkages that are being developed between tourism and the associated agricultural sectors and the growing interest in purchasing local produce through farmers’ markets and gate-side stalls, are highly instrumental in spreading the economic benefits of tourism (TOTA, 2012, p. 29).

TOTA’s strategy is also notable for its consultative approach. The process was guided by a Steering Committee which included Indigenous, federal and provincial tourism entities, representatives from key tourism sectors in rural and urban areas, higher education, economic development, and the TOTA Board. The widespread consultation included five sub-regional workshops involving 180 stakeholders and follow-up discussions and workshops such as one focused on opportunities for the development of Aboriginal cultural tourism. Further consultation and feedback followed the presentation of the draft strategy in a variety of settings from over 30 community meetings to local government conferences to tourism conferences. The plan was then endorsed by all of the tourism agencies representing the region’s 90 communities.

South Okanagan participants also shared a variety of other examples of policy that supported cultural sustainability through rural food tourism. The Provincial Regional Economic manager has a scope that enables pulling people
together, such as facilitating a grassroots regional economic development group. Areas related to tourism development in the South Okanagan like agriculture, sustainability, climate action, and environmental issues were often considered the responsibility of municipal or regional planning departments which were credited for their systems mindset. Tourism, Events, Arts & Culture was a designated priority cluster in the 2019 – 2022 Terms of Reference Economic Development and Prosperity Advisory Committee in Penticton. There is also a new economic development partnership organization of 14 plus stakeholder groups convened by City of Penticton. A5 explained that it took 4 meetings for value to emerge, such as beginning to find commonalities and collaborating outside the larger meeting. There was some optimism that these conversations will ease historical tensions. A5 argued that “economic development does not belong to just one organization, everybody does it.” Cooperation was considered critical to addressing economic development because individual staff resources were limited.

While federal and provincial support for agriculture and farmers was felt to be common across Canada, A13 thought that “the focus on local food production and the system to enhance the local food connections is much more prominent here.” Food culture awareness was thought to be quite developed even at the institutional level. For example, the Regional District of the South Okanagan Similkameen (RDOS) recently provided $50,000 toward a bioregional food system research project which is atypical.
There was no regional tourism association comparable to TOTA at the
regional level in the Annapolis Valley. Nova Scotia used to have regional tourism
marketing organizations, but those ended in 2014. While some regions, such as
the South Shore, have since developed their own association, the AV did not.
The AV Chamber of Commerce has pursued marketing dollars from
municipalities and TNS to promote tourism in the region. The Chamber did a
“Simply Extraordinary” campaign a few years ago aiming to brand the Annapolis
Valley as a wine and food destination. In Spring 2019, there was a Chamber
FRP for marketing and brand development in the region.

Nova Scotia has 6 Regional Enterprise Networks (REN) which are the
provincially mandated coordinated structure for economic development at the
regional level. The Valley REN’s region extends from Windsor to Annapolis
Royal. Participation is voluntary; not all municipalities participate.

Annapolis Royal was described as having been successful with
community based economic development initiatives related to food culture.
Engagement and empowerment were considered keys to this success which
could be replicable actions for policy makers in other jurisdictions. Annapolis
Royal has had successive leadership, elected and staff, who included and
collaborated with the local community. This has created a culture that expects
that community concerns and ideas are heard, so that if community concerns
were dismissed, “they talk about it because that’s not the way we do business
here” (B16). There was also tacit permission for community members to act. Being empowered to act was seen as a hallmark of true community engagement. Another lesson from Annapolis Royal is the fact that town policy is guided by a strong vision about the town’s history and its future development. Creating this vision was a time-consuming community-based process that went through multiple revisions, but establishing that vision was essential to creating municipal policy that actually worked for the community. In addition, the private foundational lender, Annapolis Investments in Rural Opportunity (AIRO, 2017) has very successfully supported the development of a variety of food and tourism related ventures in Annapolis County and has an excellent qualitative report on the economic future of Annapolis Royal and its surrounding community which note similar patterns to those observed in this research. Regional level tourism and connections with wine industry also typically fall to municipal planning departments. There was no formal tourism strategy at the regional level, but B20 noted that the absence of a formal strategy does not mean that informal strategy does not exist in practice.

Local post-secondary institutions were considered important to the development of food and wine tourism. Education and training in NS includes the Cool Climate Wine and Viticulture certificate at Nova Scotia Community College (NSCC) which includes a teaching vineyard and winery, and a campus restaurant. Supporting research and lab services such as the Acadia Laboratory for Agri-Food and Beverage at Acadia University were seen as part of putting
“foundational structures in place to see our industry grow” (B11). Okanagan College (OC) was mentioned for their role in developing related skills. While the University of British Columbia (UBC) was seen as involved in related research. There were positive examples of inter-organizational collaboration between various universities and colleges regionally, nationally, and internationally.

6.5 Destination

There are two DMO’s serving the South Okanagan region: Travel Penticton and Destination Osoyoos. DMOs in the SO market tourism in their community and have a role lobbying local government, representing tourism business interests, and communicating with the media. The local Chamber of Commerce works on some tourism marketing activity in SO communities without DMOs.

The municipalities of Penticton and Osoyoos within the SO region collect a Municipal and Regional District Tax (MRDT) of 2-3% which is applied to hotel accommodation and administered by the provincial government via municipalities. These funds have been restricted to marketing regional tourism to out of region markets. However, in 2018 a provincial budget notation allowed a portion of MRDT to be used for affordable housing. Reallocating some MRDT budget to affordable housing initiatives would depend on support from the local municipal government, the local hotel association, and the local DMO. There
have also been recent changes as vacation rental policies have been developed. New agreements with vacation rentals such as AirBnb allow local governments to direct the entire MRDT collected towards affordable housing. Participants were not aware of reallocation of MDRT towards affordable housing being actioned and there were some concerns about whether affordable housing was the responsibility of the accommodation sector. Additional funding comes from the Resort Municipality Initiative (RMI) in BC. This provides additional funding linked to MRDT to support 14 resort communities who were heavily dependent on tourism to help with infrastructure, one of which is Osoyoos. Tourism marketing also receives a small amount of funding from the municipality and from the RDOS.

In BC, there are also sub-regional winery marketing associations; Corkscrew Drive, Naramata Bench, Okanagan Falls, and Oliver and Osoyoos Winery associations in the South Okanagan plan events and market and promote their member wineries. There are neither sub-regional winery associations or destination level DMOs in the Annapolis Valley though there are several seasonal visitors centres.

6.6 Agricultural land use policy

Agricultural land use policy was central to sustaining food culture in the South Okanagan and the Annapolis Valley. The Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR)
was by far the most frequently cited policy by BC participants when they were asked about policies that support food tourism in the region (15). The Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) and its ALR policy and related processes were discussed with various levels of depth depending on the participants’ areas of expertise, but overall, participants were generally supportive of the ALR as a policy that protects agriculture. ALR refers to the land that has been designated agricultural at the provincial level. It restricts where development can occur and is a unique type of province-wide legislation which is quite stringent because BC has a small amount of agricultural land. The fact that wineries are considered farm use under this policy has been critical. Several participants attributed the wine industry’s success to ALR policy. For example, A1 doubted there would be a wine industry in BC today without the ALR and thought that SO land would have become housing as in Sonoma without the ALR protection. Participants observed that ALR keeps the land in agriculture which affords the region future opportunities to change crops in response to market demand.

ALR restrictions on non-farm uses such as tasting rooms, restaurants and accommodation limits development of wineries’ tourism product. This was considered appropriate when tourism uses put pressure on agricultural land and may be at a scale that is inappropriate to the rural landscape. For example, there is currently a very large $300 million-dollar winery project under construction in the South Okanagan, see Figure 6.1, which had its application for additional non-farm uses that included a 529 square meter fine dining restaurant,
a 450 square meter banquet facility, a VIP lounge and three patios spaces
denied by the ALC (Boyd, 2019b).

![Image](image_url)

Figure 6.1 *Phantom Creek Estate in Oliver, BC* (BCWI, n.d.-c)

Participants thought that the ALR should reflect present environmental,
social, economic, and technological conditions. It was noted that there has been
recent stakeholder engagement to revitalize the ALR and new regulations have
been released which include restriction on second homes intended to curb
vacation rentals which A13 hoped would not negatively impacts workforce
housing.

Local governments have a critical advocacy role when higher level ALC
policy that is meant to solve certain problems have negative side-effects at the
local level. For example, rules and regulation developed with more urban
interface contexts in mind may need to be adapted to rural environments, or
more appropriately zone land that is classified as part of the ALR but is not really
suitable for growing and would be better used for other purposes.
As in BC, preserving agricultural land for future crop use was a priority in NS. There is no binding agricultural land use policy in NS, but there are statements of provincial interest on agriculture. County and municipal plans need to adhere to these provincial statements and have done so in various ways depending on their circumstances since pressure on agricultural land varied by community. For example, Kentville extended services outside the town boundary resulting in the rapidly growing community of North Kentville which encroaches on agricultural land. Wolfville refused to extend services outside the town boundary so they have not experienced the same pressure. Berwick is surrounded by quality agricultural land, but experiences less development pressure because it is further west. Kings County has experienced development pressure and has put effort into creating an agricultural land reserve. B13 described King’s agricultural preservation policy as “some of the strongest in Canada and some of the first.” B23 was fully supportive of Kings County “moving towards stricter by-laws to protect agricultural land, so that people can’t split them up and build a sub-division.” There was limited discussion of agricultural land use policy in Annapolis County which was described as more agricultural, less populous and less likely to experience development pressure because it is further from the Halifax metropolitan area. Overall agricultural land use and policy to protect agricultural land were considered issues where there were unsettled points of view.
Zoning and land use by-laws can be hurdles for food tourism businesses operating in agricultural areas. There was a general sense that provincial governments in the Maritimes favoured development because of a history of economic atrophy, so that if there was an economic development opportunity in a rural area the sentiment was described as, “Please let them do it. Don’t put planning in the way” (B1). B7 echoed this sentiment, but B23, a rural restauranteur, explained that although the approval process was time consuming, it was important that “careful and calculated” processes were in place to protect the farm land and manage growth.

The demographic reality is that farmers in both regions are aging and therefore seeking returns on their investment in agricultural land. In the Annapolis Valley selling farmland for residential development was the way “to set themselves up for retirement if they’re not able to pass it on or have someone take it over” (B19). Participants expressed empathy for the circumstances of aging farmers coupled with concerns about farm land loss. In the SO, most farmers cannot sell their land for development because its ALR designation limits the land to agricultural use, but agricultural land in the Okanagan sold for an average of $97,903 per acre in 2018 (FCC, 2018), so farmers were able to get a return on their investment without farm land loss.
6.7 Wine policy

Participants in BC and NS recognized the uniqueness of farmgate winery licensing and related policy that allows wineries to bring together wine and food and sell product and experiences directly to consumers. The BC Liquor Distribution Board (BCLBD) outlines the land-based winery policy (BCLBD, n.d.); The Nova Scotia Liquor Commission (NSLC) outlines the farm winery requirements based on the 2007 Nova Scotia Farm Winery Policy (Nova Scotia Department of Agriculture, 2007).

These policies were viewed as instrumental to the viability of small, family wineries that sustained agricultural communities. By-passing distribution through the respective provincial liquor distribution board was perceived as fair given that farm wineries make a direct investment in agricultural land unlike commercial alcohol producers. Changing policies related to alcohol, Nova Scotia has dry communities where a plebiscite is required to establish a winery, reflect and influence cultural norms around alcohol and may provide useful when predicting cultural and policy change related to cannabis.

The NS government was described as very supportive of the wine industry’s development. The wine industry was seen as having the political clout to effectively influence government policy. The main source of funding mentioned by participants in the Annapolis Valley was the Vineyard Development and
Expansion program (2014-2019) aimed at helping to establish vineyards and increase their capacity with activities such as planting vineyards and purchasing specialized vineyard and winery equipment. The program was influenced by industry, so it is preferential to existing wineries in the sense that funding is targeted to supporting the growth of existing vineyards and wineries (B17). Funding programs for the wine sector also included specific support accessible to cooperatives to purchase shared equipment. B14b thought tourism must be part of the rational for the government’s support for the wine industry because “it’s not the few bottles of wine that I’m going to sell here…it’s not that $50 that are going to make an economy grow. It’s the tourism factor because of the multiplier.”

Tourism’s contribution to economic development was seen as significant even though this is not stated explicitly in wine industry development policy contexts.

Wine quality standards were seen as a way to formalize, regulate, and sustain quality grape growing and wine making culture. Earlier NS wines used a lot of imported juice and were of questionable quality. These NS wines were a novelty, so they sold out regardless of quality. This sent the wrong message to early winery owners who were not motivated to improve wine quality since their product was selling. As a consequence, “they keep doing the same thing every year and they didn’t learn or the learning process is very slow” (B14). Some wineries were still producing wine that some participants felt was poor quality due to winemaking decisions such as those about chaptalization (adding sugar) or vinicultural decisions such as those related to grape ripening. For example,
getting riper grapes necessitates letting grapes hang later into the fall and netting to prevent birds from eating ripening grapes. Some growers were thought to be hesitant to invest in buying nets and related labour costs so they were in effect letting the birds decide when to pick. Perhaps some people making still wine are emulating practices of those making sparkling without recognizing that the styles have different requirements. Poor decisions were attributed to the fact that the Annapolis Valley is a new wine region and people are still learning; however, there were concerns even one poor wine reflected poorly on the entire industry in the minds of consumers.

Wine quality policy was connected to material authenticity since policy and regulation is set up to ensure producers adhere to the truth about their product. There were concerns about products claiming to be local when they were not, or more subtly imitating methods or packaging in a way that could be misinterpreted. For example, in BC some of the big wineries used imported wine with labels that looked similar to the Vintners’ Quality Alliance (VQA) labels and there have continued to be issues with consumer deception with wine that is Cellared in Canada. In NS, Benjamin Bridge’s Nova 7 was incorrectly understood by some as being traditional method sparkling. Consumer education was considered important to ensuring consumers can distinguish between products and there is demand for authentic products.
Although a significant portion of the BC wine industry does not currently participate in the Vintner’s Quality Alliance, the VQA was very instrumental to the industry’s development. The VQA disallowed faulted wines through lab and panel testing while continuing to respect stylistic differences. By defining clear standards, the VQA also helped put a stop to a variety of practices driving bins of grapes driven up to the top of the Mountain at Apex to freeze for ice wine.

There are no quality standards similar to VQA in NS, but there are requirements for labelling. Wine labelled “Wines of NS” must contain 100% NS grapes while wines labelled “NS Wine” must contain 85% NS grapes. Some participants felt NS wine quality would benefit from established quality standards, while others felt wine quality standards in NS premature. Regardless, NS has a wine quality standards committee actively working on quality standards which were described as being in its final stages although details could not be provided to the researcher at this time.

Appellation designations are another method to assure cultural authenticity in wine regions. BC and NS have approached appellation designations differently. In BC, appellations are based on geographic indicators based on grape origin. Whereas in NS, the appellation is based on a particular wine blend named Tidal Bay. Tidal Bay originated in 2006-2007 when Peter Gamble, the author of VQA, proposed the idea of creating a unique appellation using the varieties that grow well in NS to make a light, aromatic white with the
acidity to pair well with NS seafood. There are set requirements to use the Tidal Bay designation. Tidal Bay must use 100% NS grapes selected from allowed hybrid and vinifera varieties adjusted as grape production changes. Standards are also set for acidity level, and there are unwritten standards about pricing in the $20-22 range. NS participants perceived Tidal Bay as having been extremely successful way to market grapes like L’Acadie Blanc that were unmarketable since these varieties were unfamiliar to visitors. NS participants identified Tidal Bay’s connection to NS food as central to its success.

There were different opinions on the government’s very engaged role in encouraging the growth of the NS wine sector. The case of the provincial development agency Perennia Food and Agriculture Inc.’s investment in a for-hire bottling line as an alternative to booking a line that comes from Quebec illustrates the differences of opinion on government involvement. Some participants thought the Perennia bottling line was more equitable because it gave all wineries equal access to the bottling line. Other participants thought that the bottling line investment was wasteful and infrequently used because it was not the correct equipment and staff were not properly trained. These participants argued that government spending on the wine industry was not always helpful to the wine industry. For example, B7 explained that “there is just so much money being thrown around right now [on grape and wine industries] that it’s becoming a bit of a contentious issue among producers.” B22 thought the government should “let us organically grow. You can’t project things. You have to see how they
actually develop on the ground.” Policy was seen as having potential to negatively influence development by inhibiting growth or promoting it in unsustainable ways. For example, incentives encouraged apple orchards to be replaced by vines and now there is increased demand for apples because of growth in cideries. These participants felt that too much money was flowing to people who were not serious about the wine industry; these farmers made decisions based on government incentives rather than making objective business decisions and taking initiative; B22 described a pattern of making business planning in NS “around hand-outs from the provincial government” and thought this pattern undermined confidence and independence. Successful wineries were those who invested their own assets rather than being motivated by government programs. Alternatively, B17 thought “the government’s done a really good job.” This participant felt consulted during the policy making process and felt able to provide perspective that helped the government make funding decisions logical with production needs.”

The perception was that while the BC wine industry had political influence there was no “perpetual tap of golden free money pouring down on the fields and vineyards and infrastructure” (B22). B12, who also had experience in both provinces, described their experience developing an early farm gate winery in BC as characterized by the freedom to “try whatever I want to try” since the participant did it with their own money and not with government money.” The Wine Festival Society was given as another BC example of a not-for-profit model.
intentionally and proudly independent of public sector funding. The most extreme example of distaste for drawing on public dollars came from A27 who equated asking for government grants to “lining up at the pig trough.”

Different philosophical approaches underlie the provincial policies. Participants perceived NS’s approach as more paternalistic whereas BCs is more laissez faire. BC winery owners have the reputation of being anti-government which can be as extreme as assuming anyone who works in any level of government is a crook and untrustworthy (Whittall, 2019).

These approaches to the role of government policy reflect cultural differences in the provinces and also contribute to the sustainability of those political cultures. There was substantial discussion in Nova Scotia regarding existing provincial cultural attitudes and values impeding economic growth. There was a distinct cultural story in NS and although participants acknowledged this cultural story was based on stereotypes. B13 thought that these stereotypes become true because Nova Scotian’s believe them. NS was described as a have-not province with economic difficulties being particularly pronounced in rural NS where “a lot of women and men have worked really hard and got very little” (A13).

In NS politics were described as being based on direct, personal political relationships. Nova Scotians were described as having been politically active in local, regional, municipal, county, and provincial level politics hundreds of years,
whereas BC had a shorter history of settler politicking. In addition, NS is smaller which facilitates personal connections. The culture of decentralized debate and decision making in NS was responsive to local circumstances, but also allowed for the subjective application of the land use principles that are swayed by the power and personalities involved in the debate. For example, B22 described a case where a local resident was successful with changes to agricultural land-use restrictions. This person was professional, politically savvy, and integrated in the community and in the end the County agreed to the proposed changes “because he pushed them.” Politics impacts how things get done and how quickly. B22 described this political culture as something “we all know, it’s not a secret, that road will not get repaired or paved [because] there’s a politician that lives down at the end of it and he’s in the wrong party, so they’ll never, even though there’s literally 5 tourism friendly businesses on that road.” Backscratching was considered just the cost of doing business in NS and B22 thought this attitude would hold true in other parts of Atlantic Canada. It was considered advantageous to the developing wine industry that the current premier is from the AV region (6). In the words of B6, “the other thing wineries have going for them right now is that our Premier is from rural NS further down the valley and so he sees the need for agriculture in a way maybe an urban Premier might not.” The Premier being from AV gave participants a sense that “he values this area” (B5).

The perceived political motivations for rural economic development in the Annapolis Valley due to the current Premier being from and representing an
Annapolis Valley riding echo the political influence of Bill Bennett, BC’s premier from 1975-1986, who was from the Okanagan. Development culture is one where attention follows political interests, so politicians with rural connections may influence policy that is favourable to cultural sustainability rural areas.
Chapter 7 Findings on the future of rural food tourism and cultural sustainability

The forward-looking nature of questions 5 and 6 essentially asked participants to provide analysis and recommendations for culturally sustainable rural food tourism. There were a variety of areas related to food tourism that were identified by participants as opportunities for future growth and development. South Okanagan and Annapolis Valley findings are generally integrated because themes were similar in both regions.

7.1 Product

Participants predicted that food tourism will continue to grow in tandem with increasing interest in local food systems. There is potential to develop more tourism for visitors who want experiences that bring them closer to the farm and understanding where their food comes from. B23 explained “coming down to the Valley for a daytrip, picking some pumpkins, grabbing some apples, visiting a winery and coming to a restaurant like us. That’s going to be the future of what’s happening down here.” There was particular interest in engaging visitors around heritage plantings like traditional peach and apple varieties. Several participants thought there may be further opportunities related to cannabis tourism, but that presently there was considerable uncertainty.
Participants expressed awareness that tourism brought risks to cultural sustainability when tourists were not respectful of the local community. Although tourists may bring in a lot of money, they can have a negative effect on the community if they “treat the Okanagan like it’s a toy, something to play with” (A2). Targeted marketing and strategic pricing were recommended as a strategy to attract tourists who would be respectful of the region not just consume the landscape. Food tourism was seen as sustainable because it attracts tourists “who care about the earth” (A14). In BC, one purpose of introducing tasting fees was to eliminate disrespectful tourists such as “groups of girls on a stagette that just want to get shit faced and don’t care what they’re drinking” (A17). The AV experienced some similar issues with behaviour like “chugging distilled product in the bathroom, people falling down” in the Magic Winery Bus’s early years (B17). Raising the price from $10 to $40 has filtered out that tourist type with the exception of some bachelorettes. Targeting rural tourism development towards food tourists was seen as a way to support cultural sustainability because this tourist type stays longer, spends more, and is less disruptive because they share the host communities’ values.

Many participants commented on the opportunities for continued growth in experiential tourism. Attention to the conjunction of the tangible food product, and an intangible experience was needed to meet tourists’ expectations. B14a describe offering a harvest experience for wine club members that played to this interest:
You are making them work for the day. We don’t do any of that anymore, we hire out all of these jobs so now we want real and genuine experiences, so in a way you feel a little bit bad for trying to make, not fake value, but trying to put value on something, calling it an experience…but this is what they want so just give them what they want.

The physical, seasonal labour that may have been a chore historically, had become something for which urban visitors were willing to pay. In particular, Millennials were seen as valuing and being willing to spend on these experiences, so it was expected that more tourism experiences like this would be developed in the future.

In the tasting room setting, A15 thought experiential tourism resulted in longer, more in-depth tasting experience which led to better sales because consumers “buy into it literally.” A19 also provided an economic argument for this approach: Creating meaningful, deeper tourism experiences would help establish a “connection to the land here and the people here that would result in repeat visits and positive word of mouth”.

Participants saw opportunities to better connect local wine and food in tourism experiences that provide a sense of place and connect visitors to the terroir. B15 argued that “we should never be serving wine without some kind of food” because together they better create that sense of place. A growing appreciation for the relationship between wine and food, was noted. For instance, more chefs were applying for wine education scholarships through the Les Dames D’Escoffier. Participants thought tourists were looking for food and
wine pairing with any food not just high-end fancy food. Although integrating wine and food tourism made intuitive sense, in practice participants understood the challenges of communicating across agricultural sectors.

Collaboratively packaging food tourism with other types of tourism, such as outdoor activities like skiing, hiking, biking, and making that packaging easy for consumers with suggested itineraries was considered a way to further develop tourism that can sustain rural agricultural communities in the South Okanagan and Annapolis Valley. NS already has a variety of food and drink trails, but in the SO trails have been exclusively wine focused until recently. A2 predicted there will be more beer trails and farm trails in the future. Food tourism can also better showcase musicians, artists, storytellers, and theatre people. Some wineries were already hosting these kinds of cultural events and exhibitions and more could follow. Examples of collaboration across industries were given in both settings. There is a need to continue to build connections between hotels and resorts and agritourism providers such as farmers speaking at hotel dinners, hotel chefs coming to farms, so that guests have something to do and therefore stay longer. Diverse entertainment and recreation were considered characteristic of successful tourist destinations, regardless of their main focus.

Most participants in the AV viewed climate change as creating new agricultural opportunities notwithstanding concerns about extreme weather
events like the 2018 June frost and the potential for a rising sea level which could affect low lying areas if dykes were not properly fortified. Warmer, longer seasons in the last 10 years support growing more vinifera along with other crops like kale that never grew in the region previously. In addition, other wine regions that previously grew certain vinifera may become too hot, driving businesses to relocate to NS. For example, Pinot Noir may not grow in Oregon in 20 years and Champagne may be too warm to retain acidity for sparkling wines. More heat units coupled with good moisture will create new growing opportunities which is creating excitement about future possibilities. Food culture is expected to change as a result of these climactic changes.

Participants in the SO were conscious of climate change’s impacts on which varietals would be successful, but there was less optimism about these new opportunities possibly because as a more mature region there was a higher likelihood that what is currently planted will no longer be suitable to a changing climate although there have been some plantings within the region in areas that would have been considered marginal because of their altitude, such as in Garnett Valley. Vineyard plantings are also increasing in other parts of BC as the climate changes which might threaten the Okanagan’s position as BC’s primary wine tourism destination.

Diverse business types and sizes should be promoted. In BC, there has been dramatic growth in the number of wineries and vineyards. A balanced
business environment needs a variety of other tourism, food production, and agricultural businesses. The South Okanagan needs to be defined, branded and marketed with more than wine. In the Annapolis Valley, most tourism business are run by hobbyists who are lifestyle motivated. These small-scale businesses are part of a sustainable rural economy, but do not create enough employment on their own. B5 argued that “anybody in the world can get a 3-acre farm and live sustainably and get off the grid if you want to do that, but that's not a sustainable business model.” More mid-scale food and tourism businesses were needed and government support should be targeted at those businesses. In NS, there are currently about 1000 vineyard acres. None of the Nova Scotia participants predicted dramatic growth like that experienced in the Okanagan. Growing to 5000 vineyard acres within the next 15 years was considered reasonable, but participants did not describe a future where many growers converted to wineries because growers had good contracts. Established wineries may grow bigger partly due to policy incentives like the vineyard development and expansion program described earlier which favoured established wineries.

7.2 Purpose

Chapter 5 demonstrated that food tourism was highly valued for its contributions to communities in the South Okanagan and the Annapolis Valley.
Food tourism’s economic contribution to rural communities was considered its central purpose. However, participants in both regions saw future opportunities for food tourism to serve broader purposes that would benefit locals, visitors, and the environment.

Food tourism can re-connect people to their food and to each other. The power of food tourism to bring people together in transformative ways that reconnect people with food systems and with each other was something participants recognized as having unrealized potential. Future tourism development could more purposefully provide social and cultural benefits though educational food experiences since sensory experiences that included touch, feel, and taste are effective ways to learn.

Having a food and wine focused post-secondary education was seen as a common feature of destinations with international reputations. A food and wine education centre for higher learning which also welcomes visitors was described as being desperately needed in the Okanagan. Participants thought this should bring enology, viticulture, and culinary education together under one roof and also include agricultural education. There was optimism over several related funding applications that were in progress in the South Okanagan Valley: a food innovation centre, a Technology Access Centre, and a Centre of Excellence for Wine. A Beverage Technology Access Centre was approved in 2019 and renovations to create a lab and related offices in an existing space adjacent to
Okanagan College’s BC Wine Information Centre Sensory Centre on the Penticton campus was completed in Fall 2019.

A proposed Culinary Tourism Centre (CTC) has been proposed in Wolfville to strengthen the local and regional economy by supporting AV culinary and beverage sectors. The CTC would facilitate the development of new food and beverage products through a culinary incubation kitchen, business mentorship and would provide specialized cooking and pairing workshops, multi-functional rental space, and an informational and interactive food and drink exhibit. None of the AV participants raised the 2019 CTC Request for Proposals in interviews although the subject was raised in an interview with a national participant. Participants discussed the need for more education amongst decision makers and the general community about the local food system and the difficulties local farmers confront.

In BC, Indigenous food tourism was seen as an opportunity area which could potentially contribute towards reconciliation since food, plants, and connecting to the land are part of the healing process. Tourism needs “respect for Indigenous ways of knowing” which reflect the values of sustainability. This can include using traditional food knowledge in tourism. Several South Okanagan participants observed that Indigenous small businesses were contributing to the tourism experience in more than token ways. This was an improvement over the recent past; Even 5 years ago a tourist might see
moccasins made in China or native art made by non-Indigenous people. Non-Indigenous participants were particularly interested in learning more about foraging and sockeye salmon. The political aspects of Indigenous food need to be understood in tourism contexts. A21 explained “Farm to table is marketed as an Okanagan experience in that the land allows you to grow exceptional food, but it’s disconnected from cultural considerations and historical context.” Farm to table is actually an Indigenous practice although it is not typically marketed that way. Some of the historical experiences raised in interviews included the fact that “No one would hire native people, so the grandparents’ generation had to travel as itinerant agricultural workers to US for work” and “It was against the law to drink if you were a native and many elder have been in jail for that” (A21).

Culture is learned through interaction. If tourism staff are trained to explain how the 'talking points' relate to their own story then each can present their own story in ways that personalize political and historical contexts for tourists, so that tourism increases understanding and contributes to reconciliation.

Rural food tourism may support cultural change in production, distribution, and consumption, but strategic efforts at larger scales could be more effective consumption change-makers than small scale type efforts like transformational tourism experiences. The key from B11’s perspective was getting products to consumers, so an effective approach would involve bringing big retailers in to be interviewed with the Minister to talk about ways to pursue local food distribution in NS.
7.3 Process

Terms like “community-based” and “community-benefit” were used by participants in both provinces to describe tourism with direct social and economic benefits to the host community. Participants stressed that tourism is for residents and should be developed by creating communities people want to live in. There should not be a disparity between luxurious wineries and declining town centres such as in Oliver in the South Okanagan, the self-declared “Wine Capital of Canada”, which has many empty storefronts and is in critical need of revitalization. Many participants in both regions expressed a sentiment similar to B14 who thought that tourism has to be “about the resident first as opposed to about the industry first.” Inclusive planning and governance were required to meet community benefit outcomes. Although it was understood that defining stakeholders broadly introduced additional planning challenges, there was a sense that this was essential because tourism impacts everybody. Achieving food tourism’s greater purposes in the South Okanagan and Annapolis Valley requires planning processes that are genuinely consultative and governance that is representative. However, consultation is sometimes about “how do we get done what we want to do anyway and how do we just get through the consultation period” (A12). The status quo continues unless governance structures and processes change. A board full of “yes people” was thought to perpetuate the
current situation. Influence needed to extend to people with a variety of diverse opinions. Board participation also provides a bigger picture learning opportunity that should be accessible to a broad cross-section of stakeholders with more inclusive boards providing even better learning about diverse perspectives. The need for these systemic changes was especially salient for First Nations. Where tourism’s purpose and process are not community centred, tourism has failed to be successful over the long term and has had the worst impact, such as in the case of the cruise ship industry.

Connectivity between First Nations and municipalities as tourism is developed and marketed was identified as a priority in BC. This applied at all governance levels. For example, clear communication and collaboration between the town of Osoyoos and the OIB, and between Destination BC and Indigenous Tourism BC is important. A2 explained the need to build relationships and connections “between our communities and theirs” but then immediately self-corrected to describe the Okanagan as “one community.”

In the Annapolis Valley a few participants mentioned Indigenous food in the context of historical food culture, but generally Indigenous related themes occurred much less frequently. Sometimes the interviewer prompted and received responses like: “Honestly, people are just really unsure in this and we’re not very progressive” (B1). B13 thought “there’s not a great connection between the Mi’kmaq and the non-Mi’kmaq except maybe in the academic world.”
Principles of inclusiveness in planning have been adopted, so the opportunity is to have planning actually reflect these principles. Increased sensitivity to inclusion and collaboration were noted. The history of colonialism and residential schools make productive conversations challenging, but the process needs to find ways to establish trust so that non-Mi'kmaq are not afraid of being criticized for saying the wrong thing and Mi'kmaq are not afraid of being exploited.

In the words of A1, “tourism doesn't just happen [well] because we are in these beautiful areas.” Many participants argued that tourism promotion, development, and management mandates at destination, provincial, and national levels should be balanced and strategically aligned to ensure culturally sustainable food tourism development in rural regions. C2 advised that half of marketing dollars be shifted to product development. Destination management was not thought to have yet been addressed holistically as an industry because the attention has been on driving revenue. A myopic focus makes “everybody loses sight of what the bigger picture is outside the doors of whatever business they’re running” (A12), but sustainability depends on product development and destination management, including a long-term strategic approach to infrastructure development and collaboration within and between different ministries, sectors and policy scales. Official community plans should integrate agriculture instead of having separate agricultural plans. Making agriculture more central to community planning would help people understand that protecting agricultural land is a community value.
South Okanagan participants thought that most places in BC recognize tourism management as a government responsibility because tourism impacts so broadly and is BC’s biggest industry. Tourism management is not formally organized in Nova Scotia. Annapolis Valley is at an earlier stage in its development as a wine and food tourism region. Participants in Nova Scotia thought community discussions about the growth of the wine industry, and sustainable tourism growth and tourism management in agricultural communities should happen at this stage. There is interest in finding efficient and effective ways to manage tourism on a regional basis to fill the gap left by the dissolution of Destination Southwest Nova Scotia Association.

Key individuals establish and maintain connections and relationships in the region through their participation in advisory and planning committees. These active individuals remind us “who we are, what our core values are, why we want to live here, what’s important” (A2). In other words, they have an important role in cultural sustainability. Yet, participants thought that policy makers and tourism organizations need to take the time to find and speak with a variety of local food and wine people, especially farmers. Tourism planning should include stakeholders across related sectors and at different scales because innovation comes from bringing different people together. A variety of social justice issues related to temporary foreign agricultural workers were raised. Participants thought foreign agricultural workers should be considered part of the team, as
individual people, not referred to collectively as “the Mexicans” or “the Jamaicans” as is typical.

Membership and board structure were also areas to consider within both provincial winery associations. Several Nova Scotia participants shared their analysis of membership composition in WANS. For example, B22 thought that although WANS membership is just over half the province’s wineries, the membership was representative of the leading businesses. Likewise, B10 felt it was more important to have the right people “inside the tent” than all the people. Of BC’s 369 wineries, 174 were BCWI members as of February 2020 (BCWI, 2020). Several BC participants argued that the BCWI board structure should be such that large wineries do not dominate because these corporate wineries may have different policy priorities than the more numerous small wineries especially considering the largest wineries also produce CIC wine. Creating governance structures to balance power and to give entities that have a stake but are currently excluded from BCWI voting membership, such as agritourism operators or restaurants, a voice in decision making were future opportunities.

Participants did not think there would be easy or immediate solutions to complex issues, but Annapolis Valley participants in particular had suggestions for methods and organizations that could contribute to culturally sustainable tourism development. Community mapping was suggested as a process that could facilitate an on-going conversation that builds on asset mapping. The
crown corporation Develop Nova Scotia was suggested as a possible organization to pull together this planning process because Develop Nova Scotia is “moving out into rural issues and really interested in how place-making and rural development go together. They see place making as a vehicle to do economic development” (B13). Nova Scotia’s Centre for Local Prosperity, the Tamarack Institute and the McConnell Foundation were given as valuable information sources for collaborative strategies that may be effective when developing tourism. Developing tourism to answer the question “how do we attract more visitors?” may look very different than tourism developed to answer the question “how do we manage tourism for the maximum community benefit?” Several NS participants argued that asking different kinds of foundational questions may lead to consideration of alternative economic models that would not be considered otherwise such as Raworth’s (2017) doughnut economics which was introduced in the Chapter 2 literature review. Other than one mention of co-operatives as a possibility worth further exploration and one out-of-region CSA as a positive example, there was no discussion of alternative economic models in BC although this may be a result of who participated. The sample was not large enough to conclude that there is no interest in these alternatives within food tourism in BC.

Learning from other wine and food regions is particularly valuable as the industry develops. This learning comes in several forms: in-migrations, returnees, and travel and case studies like this one. People who move to NS bring their
broad experience with them and influence others’ taste and behaviour. Travelling and living away gave Nova Scotians experience with wine and food benchmarks and a better appreciation of what makes Nova Scotian products special. Established wine regions like the Okanagan were useful reference points for accurate self-appraisal since learning from others’ experience was a valuable way of gaining perspective, ideas, and windows into possible future circumstances. The NS wine industry’s “period of experimentation has been shorter than many others” because of this willingness to learn from others (B7).

There was keen interest from Nova Scotians in how issues like food security, and equity have been addressed as the Okanagan developed as a wine tourism destination. Comparative case studies were thought to help facilitate a more global perspective and lessons on how other people may have approached similar problems. Several NS participants thought that although some people envision the AV wine tourism developing to the size of regions in BC and Ontario, it is unlikely that AV would see that level of wine tourism development because the AV is limited by its rurality and the small population of NS which has less than 1 million people. There was some discussion amongst NS participants about parallels between the South Okanagan as 1-hour drive from Kelowna and AV as 1 hour from Halifax. The perception from some was that the Okanagan was more populous and with higher per capita income than even Halifax.
Participants in the Annapolis Valley and the South Okanagan Valley expressed optimism about their future as food (predominately wine) tourism destinations. This optimism was based on past success and recent improvements. Although the wine tourism industry in BC could be considered mature (Senese et al., 2012), there was the sense that this is just the beginning of what is possible. South Okanagan participants saw diverse possibilities for purposeful food tourism that is more deeply connected to the local environment and culture. This vision was reflected in interviews and in strategic directions provided particularly by TOTA and the BC Ministry of Tourism, Arts and Culture. Annapolis Valley participants expressed enthusiastic excitement about food tourism’s momentum and the potential to “keep building this into the Nova Scotian culture” (B14). The challenge will be balancing the goals and objectives of the community in its entirety with different and diverse groups within the community and to build relationships and have patience with each other and the process.
Chapter 8 Discussion

The overarching goal of this comparative case study was to investigate the relationships between cultural sustainability and rural food tourism by asking how rural tourism stakeholders understand these concepts, mobilize the interrelationships, and to what purpose. A better understanding of the relationships between food tourism and cultural sustainability will support the resilience of rural communities’ food cultures and capitalize on the potential of rural food tourism to contribute to cultural sustainability. Findings can contribute to more precise definitions or robust analytical frameworks for the concepts of cultural sustainability. The findings can also be applied by rural communities concerned about supporting cultural sustainability through rural food tourism development by furthering understanding and improvement in the formal and informal mechanisms and tools by which rural communities organize themselves to achieve economic, environmental, political, and social-cultural objectives.

This research explored six questions:

1. How are the concepts of cultural sustainability and food sovereignty understood?
2. How is rural tourism used to support the sustainability of local food culture?
3. How is local food culture used in rural tourism?
4. How do rural tourism stakeholders understand and use policy to support food sovereignty and cultural sustainability?
5. How might rural tourism be used to support cultural sustainability and food sovereignty in the future?
6. How might food culture be used to support rural tourism in the future?
Chapters 5 through 7 presented the research findings. Chapter 5 covered the findings related to research question one, two and three on how stakeholders understand and mobilize the concepts of cultural sustainable and food sovereignty in rural food tourism. Chapter 6 covered the findings related to research question four regarding how stakeholders view related policy. Chapter 7 presented the findings related to research question five and six on the future potential of food tourism. These findings are now discussed using the cultural sustainability framework presented by Soini and Dessein (2016) with questions 2-6 linked to the most relevant representation of cultural sustainability. Integrated case findings are discussed, with the exception of the final section of 8.3 Culture as sustainability where there were significant differences related to tourism policy, planning and governance in each provincial context.

8.1 Culture in Sustainability: Discussing the nature of food culture

The first question asked how participants understood the concepts of cultural sustainability and food sovereignty. Participants understood cultural sustainability in their rural tourism context in all three ways described by Soini and Dessein (2016): culture in sustainability, culture for sustainability, and culture as sustainability. Culture in sustainability is where tourism is a means to conserve tangible and intangible cultural capital; culture for sustainability, where culture is a resource for rural development and a way to shape development
processes; and ultimately, culture as sustainability, where tourism is a vehicle to facilitate a fundamental and transformative paradigm shift towards a sustainable culture.

The World Food Travel Association (WFTA) “considers unique local, Indigenous and historical food and drink as cultural assets worthy of preservation and protection” (Berno, Devlin, et al., 2014, p. 311). Tourism development processes engage with culture in sustainability when tourism conserves, maintains, and preserves these cultural assets. Participants valued food culture intrinsically and saw tourism as a means to sustain that cultural capital which is reflected by Culture in Sustainability

Figure 8.1 shows culture in sustainability as it was understood by participants in the South Okanagan and Annapolis Valley. The culture pillar is enlarged to show the main ways the sustaining tangible and intangible food culture was understood. Most importantly, participants thought sustaining food culture depended on sustaining agricultural land. The ALR in British Columbia and the provincial guidelines and municipal land-use policies in Nova Scotia were central to culture in sustainability. Food tourism development incentivized sustaining knowledge about local food production. Wine culture was formalized and sustained through quality standards and appellation designations. Some participants engaged with the complexity of terms like local and authenticity.
The first food cultures of the South Okanagan and the Annapolis Valley are those of the Syilx and Mi’kmaq people respectively.

South Okanagan participants were aware of and interested in living Indigenous food culture in their region as described by Jeannette Armstrong (2007), a Syilx elder in the South Okanagan:

In terms of being Syilx, I think that’s one of the things that I really clearly think about when talking about culture and sustainability and the practice of that. Our people knew how to do that. They still practice it. I’m a harvester, all my family are hunters and gatherers. Traditional people continuously practice that. It’s not something that was culture it is a culture.
Present day Indigenous food culture was not raised in the Annapolis Valley. It is not clear whether this omission reflects a less active Indigenous food culture in the Annapolis Valley, or the particular participants who participated.

The food culture in the South Okanagan and the Annapolis Valley most frequently described by participants was agricultural. The agricultural landscape and the farming families who produced plentiful and diverse food products were central aspects of identity in both regions. These agricultural characteristics of food culture were almost indistinguishable between the regions. In some ways the food culture described by participants in both BC and Nova Scotia was not only an actual food culture rooted in a particular time and place, but a mythical rural food culture that was a-temporal and a-spatial. Food culture rural food seemed to represent “an uncontaminated Eden which transcends time and place” (Boniface, 2003, p. 44) which reflected a nostalgic longing that Lowenthal (1985) claims expresses the sense of modern malaise in an increasingly globalized world.

Food was a way both communities engaged with a “socially constructed version of the past” (Everett, 2016, p. 45) and a socially constructed version of the present where local was a defining attribute of what participants considered an authentic food culture. As found in previous research (Allen et al., 2003; Hinrichs, 2003; Sims, 2009), participants in this study recognized that food culture was not homogeneous in their region. At least two main food cultures
were observed, often distinguished by the food culture’s relationship with local products and people. The more local food culture, sometimes described as a “foodie” culture was generally the culture participants wanted to sustain.

Participants in both Annapolis and South Okanagan equated agriculture with their food culture. The place of the wine industry within food and agriculture was somewhat ambiguous. Wine making is considered an approved agricultural activity from a BC Agricultural Land Commission perspective and the Farm Gate winery policies in both provinces also designate wineries as agricultural. Wine is considered agri-food by the national Canadian Vintners Association which stresses the industry’s agricultural foundation when communicating with government on policy. Wineries are, however classified as part of the manufacturing sector in federal level employment statistics and wine is grouped with “sin tax” products like tobacco in some policy and seen as distinct from other food by some members of the general community. In Kwantlen Polytechnic University’s (KPU) Okanagan Bioregional food system project, wine is not considered food. Hansen et al. (2019) explain their project’s rationale:

Wine grape production and wine making is a significant agricultural activity in the Okanagan bioregion (particularly in the RDOS). The wine sector also contributes significantly to the regional identity and economic vitality of the Okanagan. As a result, many stakeholders discussed the need to better understand the impacts of the wine sector on agriculture more broadly, and on food self-reliance in the bioregion. There was also significant discussion in the Okanagan-Similkameen (where the majority of the region’s wineries are located) about the rationale to exclude wine, as a non-food product, from food self-reliance analysis in the bioregion.
For the purpose of this study, wine (as a value added agricultural product) is not included in food self-reliance calculations because it is not a food product per se, and is not included in the Canada Food Guide. However, as a significant production and land use sector, wine grape growing will be evaluated based on the use and allocation of resources required to support the sector relative to increased bioregional food production conferring increased bioregional food self-reliance (p. 25).

Whether wine is considered food is historically and culturally contextual. In other cultures wine may be considered food, as it seems to be considered in France for example (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, n.d.). Wine was not fully integrated with food culture in either case region.

In one sense, local was understood by participants as spatially/physically determined by territory-based criteria like distance, administrative boundaries, or geographic features such as a river, or valley. In another sense, local was understood as a moral stance and cultural value. The moral understanding of local reflects earlier research conducted by Foster (2018) in rural NS. Foster’s (2018) focus group participants also saw buying local as an ethic choice that was morally right. It followed that personally not buying local was wrong and induced guilt and/or shame; those who did not buy local were judged. Foster found a “hint of morality about connection to community, the seasons, the earth, where food comes from—and perhaps the notion that being a good citizen (one goal of education) involves orienting oneself to preferring the taste of something grown locally” (Foster, 2018, p. 77).
There was an overarching sense that participants were analyzing food culture in a normative sense. There was a good local food culture, and a bad, or perhaps just not as good, food culture. Participants almost unanimously implied that their own production, distribution and/or consumption was the good variety of food culture. Local food consumption acted as virtue signaling about identity. This attitude echoes the old joke Pinker (2018) relates in *Enlightenment Now: The case for reason, science, humanism, and progress*:

A soapbox orator addresses a crowd on the glories of communism: “Come the revolution, everyone will eat strawberries and cream!” A man at the front whimpers, “But I don’t like strawberries and cream.” The speaker thunders, “Come the revolution, you will like strawberries and cream!” (p. 248).

The purpose of development which Pinker endorses is not one that dictates people’s choices, but one which enlarges people’s options and enables them to decide on strawberries and cream if they choose. There was a sense that if more people shared participants’ tastes it would be “better.” If everyone bought local it would lose its power as cultural marker and be a less effective tool for branding and marketing (Yeoman & McMahon-Beatte, 2016). This side-effect was not discussed.

Although the term food sovereignty did not resonate for most participants, the principles described by Chaifetz & Jagger (2014) : food for people, value for food providers, local food systems, local decision-making, knowledge and skill-building, and work with nature were evident to varying degrees in participants’
responses. Many participants supported the right to food for all people and some recognized that not having access to sufficient, healthy, and culturally appropriate food could relate to systematic issues like class and race. Participants valued local food systems and thought farmers should be able to make a fair livelihood from agriculture. The issues of local access to and control of land, water, and agricultural resources generally referred to participants’ opinions that land use policies should be determined locally, although the provincial ALC and ALR were well-respected in BC. The idea of using agroecological methods that maximize the contribution of ecosystems and improve resilience and adaptation was raised more frequently in BC than NS.

Culture in sustainability relies on a balance between continuity and change because “any useful set of social values has to encourage both change (why else include creativity, imagination and innovation?) and respect for difference and diversity (tolerance, compassion and inclusion)” (Hawkes, 2001, p.7). This involves, among other factors, balancing existing culture with innovation contributed by younger people as many participants referenced, and a balancing newcomers and resident businesses in rural communities (Bosworth and Farrell 2011). Balancing cultural change and cultural sustainability also involves “cultural-informed assessments” of new technologies, such as new farming methods (Dessein, et al., 2015). Annapolis Valley participants tried to think through how desirable aspects of culture might be sustained while others changed. B3 explained that “celebrating ourselves doesn’t mean that we lose
our humility. There’s something really special about being humble, but we can be humble without being self-deprecating. And you can be proud without being boastful or egotistical."

This balance between change and continuity was central to understandings of cultural sustainability. In fact, culture change was necessary for sustainability given that there are aspects of local, authentic culture that should not be sustained. Foster (2018) describes exclusion and intolerance as the shadow side of the local-first values that often characterize rural culture. Most critically, food has been used as a tool of colonial oppression. Traditional food ways have been sabotaged by loss of land access and intentional assimilation like Residential Schools (Jeannette Armstrong, 2007; Food Secure Canada, 2015b; ONA, n.d.). Diet-related chronic diseases like diabetes and “a loss of “the taste” for country foods” are among the cultural effects. Food sovereignty is foundational to the Okanagan Nation Alliance (ONA) which is involved in traditional food initiatives to sustain their food systems in the face of ongoing challenges. An on-going dialogue between the ONA and the Slow Food Thompson Okanagan Convivium and the collaborative Slow Fish Okanagan Sockeye program point to the future possibilities for culture in sustainability. Becoming comfortable with change and uncertainty as facets of sustainability requires:

a fundamental shift in thinking and perspective from assuming that the world is in a steady state and can be preserved as it is, by
focusing on preventing and controlling change, to a recognition of
cchange being the rule rather than the exception, and thereby
concentrating on managing the capacity in complex adaptive
social–ecological systems to live with change and shape change
(Berkes et al., 2003, p. 378).

Participants understood that a culture’s sustainability depends on its
capacity to incorporate change while remaining authentic.

### 8.2 Culture for Sustainability: Discussing how culture is used for sustainability

Questions 2 and 3 relate to the relationship between food culture and
tourism in terms of how rural tourism is used to support the sustainability of local
food culture and how local food culture is used in rural tourism, so it is suitable to
consider these questions together as both relate to culture for sustainability.

Culture for sustainability was the most common representation of cultural
sustainability in this research since rural tourism is a common strategy to sustain
rural regions.

Figure 8.2 shows participants’ understanding of how food culture is used
for the sustainability of rural communities. Food tourism makes contributions to
each pillar which then reinforces and sustains the food culture. Food tourism can
be used to attract and retain residents, build a sense of community identity, pride,
and optimism, thereby contributing to the sustainability of rural societies. Food
tourism can contribute to the environment because when well-managed it is less
damaging to natural resources than many other industries and it provides a
compelling reason to sustain the natural landscape upon which tourism depends.
The primary benefits of food tourism identified by participants were economic which corroborates the benefits identified by Berno et al. (2014), Buschert et al. (2018), Croce and Perri (2017) and du Cros and McKercher (2015). While other types of rural tourism activity can create a homogeneous economy by driving out other economic activities, food and wine tourism interacts with and complements other sectors like agriculture and wine production and can strengthen and enhance rural culture and production (Croce & Perri, 2017). Diversification through tourism offers family farms revenue opportunities which help facilitate their economic survival which is important since family farms are often seen as central to rural communities’ cultural identity (Everett, 2016). Using
food culture in tourism development demonstrates cultural resiliency, as changes are made to ensure the food culture and the rural community continue. Food tourism helps develop and sustain regional identity and attractive, viable rural communities (Croce & Perri, 2017; Everett, 2016; Hall et al., 2003).

When tourism developments incorporate traditional food culture, there can be positive outcomes on both culture in and culture for sustainability through the conservation of traditional agricultural and food practices and biodiversity (UNWTO, 2012). Participants recognized this reinforcing relationship with the exchange shown in the two-directional “tourism” arrows in Figure 8.2, which indicate that food culture is used in tourism to sustain the economy, environment and society and that this creates a feedback loop which sustains food culture.

Culture for sustainability also includes how development itself is culturally embedded, so the fourth research question explored how culture informs public policy related to food tourism in rural communities by asking how participants understood and used policy to support food sovereignty and cultural sustainability. Culture for sustainability is reflected in the role of government, organizational structures, planning process, and policies in sustainable tourism. Culture was seen as a way of life that influenced how development happened and is shown in Figure 8.2 by the small two-directional arrows extending from development culture towards the arrows representing tourism activity. Cultural
values and attitudes were seen as both shaping and being shaped by policy in all areas.

Community cultural values and local conditions inform rural tourism decision making processes in the culture for sustainability representation as communities explore their “historical past and its contemporary cultural diversity together encouraged by the planning process” (Young, 2008, p. 27). Culture for sustainability reveals the tensions in sustainable development between the concepts of freedom in diversity and sharedness in community (Theobald & Siskar, 2010). As Young (2008) asks: “How is it possible to develop a workable system to increase the authentic integration of culture in planning able to produce beneficial outcomes regardless of the value conflicts of a postmodern world of cultural diversity?” (p. 5). Those in favour of diversity are concerned that “advocates of community will harbor narrow-minded views or fundamentalist moralism, whereas many spokespersons for community worry that advocates of diversity will render society devoid of solidarity or a clearly defined sense of the common good” (Theobald & Siskar, 2010, p. 199). The resolution of this tension requires a culture which values democratic discourse while simultaneously continuing the search for a common good as the foundation to local identity and political community (Friedmann, 1987).

The most striking findings about culture for sustainability came from Annapolis Valley participants who tended to portray their province’s economic
culture as deleterious. The negative attitude about NS development culture was not anticipated and the researcher was not sure how to interpret it. Did participants actually believe these negative characteristics about their culture?

The researcher began to ask Annapolis Valley participants for their reflections about the provincial culture that so many participants were describing as unambitious, excessively conservative and cautious. Being questioned tended to result in Nova Scotians being negative about being negative, but at least it got participants to consider whether these negative traits are true. For example, B24 expressed a common Nova Scotian sentiment: “we do not recognize to the level that we should the gem that we have.” B16 similarly said, “We have no appreciation of our assets.” Nova Scotians described themselves as undervaluing their innate skills and talents. When questioned, it seemed that the issue was not that these negative traits are fact, but that Nova Scotians are not culturally inclined to notice and speak about what is positive in their own culture. This makes asset-based community development challenging because Nova Scotians find it hard to answer questions about what makes them special or proud although they can recognize assets elsewhere. This pattern of not seeing or believing in the strengths was thought to be particularly pronounced in rural areas. The 2017 Annapolis Invests in Rural Opportunity (AIRO) report also observed perceptions incongruent with fact. Their community members described Annapolis Royal as “old” and dominated by “retirees” but the demographic reality is otherwise (Du Plessis et al., 2001). The report’s authors
hypothesized that this impression may have been based on a variety of factors such as retirees have more time to be active in the community as volunteers and to be out and about around town during the day. Another reason AIRO research participants incorrectly characterize their community as old may be that rural aging would likely be an issue of concern, and negative issues are more ‘sticky’ (Baumeister et al., 2001; Heath & Heath, 2012). Community members may disproportionately notice and remember facts which concern them which does create an unbalanced perception of reality that appreciative approaches can help equalize.

Perhaps because rural places are frequently approached with “a pathological form of inquiry” (Catherwood & Pollak, 2019, p. 5) especially in the research tradition which discusses the distinctive characteristics of Atlantic Canadian economies (Mitchell & Shannon, 2018; Sinclair et al., n.d.). This narrative has the power to infiltrate development culture because it determines how history is interpreted, how the present is decided and what future possibilities are considered (Catherwood & Pollak, 2019).

Foster (2018) provides a brief review of regional development in Canada which provides some useful context for this discussion. The federal government uses policies like equalization payments to correct provincial imbalances, but the provinces have been increasingly supposed to demonstrate their own efforts to grow their economies. The Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) established
in the 1960s resourced basic economic infrastructure and tried to attract large business to depressed regions. When new research demonstrated that more economic growth came from small and mid-sized businesses, regional development refocused on creating condition conducive environments for small and medium enterprises rather than offering direct government involvement. This reflected the “neo-conservative” view that government should get out of business (Savoie, 2006).

The dominant economic development vision, such as that expressed in the Ivany report (2014) continues to advocate a corporate employment model targeted towards export (Foster, 2018). Growth-centric rural economic development makes rural sustainability contingent on economic growth. In addition, while increasing exports and reducing imports can both help balance trade deficits, most official attention is focused on export development (Shuman, 2017). The opportunity for an economy to essentially gain new money by reducing imports through greater local production receives limited attention in the literature although it was so highly stressed by participants as a means to sustain rural food culture and community. There are alternatives to the traditional economic development belief that “the only way of growing an economy is to bring new money into it, and the only way of attracting new money is through the sale or exchange of exports” (UNESCO, 2014, p. 7).
Various scholars have challenged the prevailing “rural culture as growth impediment” narrative through a focus on class politics and disadvantageous government policy (Foster, 2018). The are many ways that rural places actually function well. Irrespective of the slips into repeating the “rural culture as growth impediment” narrative, the appreciative approach pushed participants to consider what worked. Rural economic narratives also include success stories of livelihoods shaped by individual independence and community interdependence (Catherwood & Pollak, 2019), but that part of the truth is less frequently told because of the conventional problem-based approach.

One notably positive aspect of development culture in Nova Scotia the researcher observed was a collective, community-minded tone which was exemplified for example in the long-standing success of the multi-sectoral Taste of Nova Scotia. Rural cooperatives and social enterprise organizations were valued in NS as exemplified in the popularity of CSAs. Rural NS economies include patterns of production and consumption, such as barter and exchange in the grey economy, which are incongruent with a capitalist wage-labour narrative (Foster, 2018). For example, Gibson et al. (2015) note that the NS provincial volunteer rate is higher than the national average perhaps indicating successful community interdependence. These rural livelihoods may show self-sufficiency and independence in ways that perplex policymakers who see capitalism’s “full development” as the only way to sustain rural communities (Foster, 2018). The attitudes, values, and behaviors that are framed in the dominant economic
development discourse as impediments to development, can be reframed as enabling a more comprehensive type of sustainable development that includes social, cultural and environmental aspects.

This research took an appreciative approach which recognized constructivist, simultaneity, poetic, anticipatory, and positive principles (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). As such, how participants’ stories reflect and/or create culture was considered significant. An appreciative approach begins “from situated wisdom about the practices that are already rational to rural people and might be effective in maintaining rural habitats, it could support right-sized strategies that enable rural communities to stay viable rather than pressuring them to grow, export, and be competitive” (Foster, 2018, p. 81). A rural economic development story with alternative definitions of success would tell a more positive story, but even a rural development story that used traditional measures of success should tell a more positive story given, for example, that the statistics show that the Annapolis Valley is significantly younger and no poorer than the South Okanagan (Statistics Canada, 2016d, 2017b). The appreciative approach to question design and analysis facilitated a greater focus on these successes. There was a distinct tone of optimism in the Annapolis Valley which participants thought was well-supported by evidence. Nova Scotians may be in the midst of cultural shift in how they self-identify.
In the South Okanagan, there were no comments related to the characteristics of BC culture. This relates at least in part to the emic positionality of the research. The researcher did, however, have some opportunity to solicit impressions of cultural differences from Nova Scotian participants with experience in both provinces. B22 compared BC to the “wild west” and felt that the BC attitude is “can do, get’er done” and “let’s just do it. I don’t need the government to say I can do it.” British Columbians were thought to be more independent and willing to form their own opinion. Annapolis Valley participants also thought the wine industry in the South Okanagan was less cooperative and more prone to conflict. Whittall (2019) characterizes BC’s intellectual culture as intuitive, self-sufficient, and reactionary. He attributes this to a culture built by the province’s first European settlers being trappers, miners, and loggers. The BC wine industry tends to value hands-on experience over academic learning.

Buschert et al. (2018) found that while skilled at telling their individual stories, a transition from individual identity to shared cultural identity is needed in the BC wine industry. South Okanagan participants in this research were cognizant that with authenticity comes a shared cultural identity. Food culture cannot be authentic unless it goes beyond being the culture of the wine industry and becomes a regional identity that includes food, agriculture, Indigenous culture, hosts and guests, and goes beyond the dominate self-centred narrative of “Here’s my winery. Here’s my wine. Let me tell you about me, me, me” (A15).
Using rural food tourism for community sustainability needs to reflect and serve the community inclusively.

8.3 Culture as Sustainability: Discussing transformative rural food tourism

The final questions explored possibilities by asking how rural tourism could be used to support cultural sustainability and food sovereignty in the future and how food culture could be used to support rural tourism in the future. There was strong interest in making tourism more purposeful. Future tourism was described with characteristics in common with Horlings’ (2016) relational approach to sustainable place-shaping practice. Rural food tourism can connect visitors and residents to place, and thereby more fully activate food tourism’s transformative power for culture as sustainability.

Culture as sustainability is evident in food tourism experiences that seek to simultaneously protect tangible and intangible culture, rural community livelihood, and promote transformational learning related to cultural values and practices that sustain biodiversity and ecological processes. Participants in the South Okanagan and the Annapolis Valley saw potential for rural food tourism that transforms local and visitor perspectives and ultimately leads to and reflects a food culture and a development culture with values, attitudes and behaviours in keeping with the principles of food sovereignty.
Figure 8.4 shows how participants conceptualized food tourism as a change agent.

Culture as sustainability in rural tourism goes beyond mainstream conceptualizations of tourism as a product or method to create jobs and develop economies. Rather than being solely a means to commodify culture, rural tourism can be a means of “transforming tourists and culturising commerce” (Lloyd et al., 2015, p. 1). Food tourism that reflects culture as sustainability moves towards dissolution of boundaries between consumption and production and between
host and guest reflects the push towards integrated, contextualized tourism experiences (Richards, 2015). This is reminiscent of Mair and Reid's (2007) envision tourism development characterized by inviting “outsiders to be part of the culture and artistic endeavors that are already valued, celebrated, and protected by community members; not as potential consumers, but as interested participants” (p. 47). Food tourism was seen by participants as one way to explore the rural-urban linkages and the geographic interdependencies of holistic food policy development identified in the literature (Blay-Palmer, Renting, & Dubbeling, 2015; Cavaliere, 2017; Moragues-Faus & Marsden, 2017).

Interdisciplinary approaches to policy and research were appreciated. A significant minority of participants in both provinces, but most obviously in BC, saw the need for new, transformative policies which reflect culture as sustainability such as stakeholder boards and Indigenous collaboration.

The following examples from other researchers support participants’ emphasis on social connections and the time required to transform these connections into meaningful relationships. For example, Jamal et al.’s (2010) interviews with locals involved in Cozumel, Mexico found that equity mattered in interpersonal relationships. Tourists who stayed for several days were perceived as being “genuinely interested in getting to know and spend time with the locals, learning about island food traditions for example. The tourists-resident exchange here is not merely a commodified relationship, but one of equitable, cross-cultural and social exchange” (p. 273). World Food Travel Association’s (2019) report on
the state of the food travel industry predicted an increase in home-based experiences such as dining at local resident’s homes over the next 1-2 years.

Markedly, the social meaning making and community building aspects are mostly absent in the wine tourism literature with the exception of Quintal, Thomas, and Phau’s (2015) discussion of service staff and Bruwer and Gross’ (2017) inclusion of employees and locals in their seven point scale of the winescape construct. However, participants’ vision of future wine and food tourism was centred on connection to place and people and using food tourism to meet objectives related to culture as sustainability which often focused on transformational, educational food tourism experiences which could reconnect locals and visitors with food systems and each other. The characteristics participants described were often those of well-being like community and identity (Daly, 1973 as cited in Meadows et al., 1998). Ultimately food tourism could change the way people’s values and behaviours, so food culture, was being used for cultural change.

It is not clear why these more purposeful or transformational aspects were evident in this research, but are not prevalent in wine tourism research. There are a variety of possibilities. It could be that these particular participants had a unique perspective. It could be because these types of transformational tourism ideas are quite recent and have not yet been captured in academic work. It could be that the appreciative research design affected the type of responses.
It could be that the discourse may be different in this case study because rather than studying wine tourism in isolation, this research examined a broader cultural sustainability context where questions about food culture and tourism prompted alternative impressions.

Linguistic framing is a foundational aspect of cultural sustainability (Bianchi, 2017; Duxbury & Jeannotte, 2012; Mariola, 2005; Redclift, 2005). Frameworks for expression and communication do more than just express the way we think, “they shape the way we think and act” (Duxbury & Jeannotte, 2012, p. 5) as demonstrated in Mariola’s (2005) study of the rhetorical change evident when comparing recent debates on farmland preservation within traditional agricultural discourse. Therefore, this discussion returns with closer attention to the cultural narratives and language structures used by participants and evident in tourism policy.

Rural food tourism’s role in transformational cultural change was depicted by participants and is generally shown in the literature as part of the green economy (Stone et al., 2019). The green economy is a neoliberal conceptualization, so market-based mechanisms like individual consumption are considered the most effective and efficient change agents and are presented as an alternative to collective organization for policy change (Alkon, 2012). For example, Berno, et al. (2014) suggest “responsible” tourism where an individual takes responsibility for their own food and drink purchase decisions. Responsible
tourism may be a better alternative than sustainable food tourism since there are practices that ought not be sustained, but should instead change. This perspective acknowledges the need for cultural change, but places the responsibility for that change on the individual. As does the focus on individual tourism entrepreneurs as the means to inspire changes in economic and business behavior (Andrews, 2008; Ateljevic & Doorne, 2000; King et al., 2014; Verplanken & Wood, 2006). At a time generally characterized by political disengagement, individual consumption has become the political act (Andrews, 2008).

Critical consumers have demanded more sustainable food and tourism practices and there have been successes such as alternative consumption movements having influenced business in areas like increased organic produce. However,

Individuals participate in the green economy not as equal citizens, but as consumers with unequal access to wealth and products and as producers with unequal access to capital and markets. Those with greater economic resources have greater influence…Those promoting the green economy sometimes concede that accessibility is a problem but do not recognize how their promotion of the green economy, which is fundamentally a market-oriented approach to social change, has undercut some of their more radical visions (Alkon, 2012, p. 10).

When the green economy is given as an alternative to policy reform and collective organization it conceals these power differentials and the difficult trade-offs that must be addressed for a genuinely sustainable culture (Blay-Palmer et al., 2015; Moragues-Faus & Marsden, 2017).
Most participants focused on behavioural approaches to cultural change for sustainability framed using the dominant attitude, behaviour and choice paradigm. According to this paradigm, “people could and would act differently if only they knew what damage they were doing” (Southerton et al., 2004, p. 4), but many participants also recognized that individual choices are not made in isolation but within a culture with its attendant norms and values and status signifiers. These participants were aware of aspects of rural community sustainability such as equity and their ideas sometimes reflected the principles of despite the term food sovereignty not being a cultural fit.

Numerous participants were aware that existing socio-technical systems of food and tourism provision constrain choices. Culture as sustainability requires behavioural change by individual tourists and hosts along with deep-seated changes in our systems of production and consumption. Cultural change depends both on individual actions, such as participating in agritourism experiences and buying local food, and on the ability to mobilize individual action into collective enterprises, like changes to tourism and agriculture policy, that alter the basic structures of the system thereby fostering more individual actions (Bramwell & Lane, 2013; Higham et al., 2013; Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen & McGee, 2013).

The most significant differences between the cases related to cultural sustainability in public policy, tourism planning and governance. Culture as
sustainability in the South Okanagan tourism reflected some characteristics of culture as sustainability such as more holistic policies and governance processes.

In BC, sustainability permeated Ministerial and regional tourism strategy and was also evident in the wine industry’s recent plan. This policy shift was largely attributed to political and philosophical changes and to the key leadership of TOTA. This finding supports the argument in the literature that leadership matters. As Hall (2011) contends:

For paradigm shifts to be sustained, the promotion of sympathetic individuals to key positions within government agencies, changes in the composition of advisory bodies and the development of new sets of institutional arrangements are necessary (p. 657).

Sustainability considerations were largely absent in food tourism strategy in NS. While individuals cared about sustainability and seemed to join together with like-minded others on a variety of inspiring food and tourism related developments, it did not seem acceptable to discuss sustainability within provincial tourism or economic development contexts beyond perhaps a cursory mention. The policy discourse was bound by unspoken rules and practices that regulated what could be said which is similar to the dynamic observed in Foucault’s (1971) discussion of discursive formations.

The tourism planning discourse in British Columbia was described as having dramatically shifted. Prioritizing sustainable tourism in the South
Okanagan is the result of influences at local, regional, and provincial scales. Examining how sustainability became a priority in the South Okanagan reveals several aspects described by Soini and Dessein (2016) as characteristic of culture as sustainability such as new policy sectors and modes of governance.

This sustainability “turn” as one participant described it, is officially captured in the BC Ministry of Tourism Arts and Culture’s 2019 Strategy presented earlier. The current NDP minority government has an agreement with the Green party and these parties share a common approach to sustainability. The NDP/Green Coalition has different philosophical and ideological foundations than the Liberal administration that was in power from 2001-2017. The current government was described as recognizing the economy’s importance, but being more concerned with social factors such as accessibility for tourists and tourism labour force development than the long-running Liberal government. Participants thought the addition of a sustainability lens is part of the evolution of the industry and society.

TOTA has taken a central role in sustainability with its long-term strategic work and has won several international awards recognizing this leadership, such as the North America’s Responsible Tourism Award from the World Travel Awards in 2019 and the Tourism for Tomorrow Destination Award from the WTTC in 2018 (TOTA, n.d.). This sustainability focus started with TOTA’s 10-year strategy. Plan development was systematic and extensive, qualities of a
synergistic tourism strategy (Hall, 2008). This included researching strategies and reports from comparable destinations.

TOTA’s vision is growth oriented, but it seems to be a qualitatively determined growth as opposed to exclusively quantitative:

The Thompson Okanagan will be a highly successful year-round destination, with a strong and attractive image that is clearly differentiated from its competitors. The region will be well known for the authenticity and quality of its tourism offers, and the cultural and environmental richness and diversity of the areas within it. The industry will be recognized for its commitment to work together to strengthen tourism for the benefit of all (TOTA, 2012, p.8).

Destination sustainability certification was a best practice identified in the TOTA strategy. After a global search of sustainable destination certification bodies, TOTA selected Biosphere because of its alignment with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals and the United Nations World Tourism Organization.

Biosphere Destination Certification was described as an aspirational beacon because seeking destination certification influenced other practices and requires demonstration of continuous progress. For example, TOTA is currently working on visitor sustainability pledge which is not meant to be a burdensome list of rules for tourism, but meant to create a tone that sustainable practices improve tourists’ experience. TOTA encourages other tourism businesses to become Biosphere committed as an initial step. Supporting businesses with
education and training over time as the tourism industry moves to more ambitious sustainability goals. Participants were familiar with TOTA certified biosphere destination and saw sustainable agriculture, agritourism and collaborating with Indigenous peoples as key aspects.

Critically, TOTA prioritizing sustainability and that theme being taken up by the BCWI and TIANS gave the BC government permission to make a sustainability a priority. Governments were described as not typically leading, but following and inclined to follow industry priorities over those of the general public. Industry leadership reduced the risk of the provincial government looking like “tree huggers” and “bleeding hearts” because industry is proving that this make economic sense. The tide change towards sustainability rippled from local business to upper levels of government through industry associations.

TOTA’s shift from paid membership to a stakeholder model was considered pivotal to the shift towards sustainability because it opened up the membership to smaller business for whom the previous membership fee would have been prohibitive. The board’s composition and operation changed as a result of moving to a stakeholder model. Previously the board had been largely composed of DMOs vying for their budget share, but the new structure prohibits DMOs from executive roles and facilitates grassroots business participation. TOTA current elected Chair is Frank Antoine, an Indigenous man from Chase
who is the cultural coordinator for the Quaaout Lodge. This position would have been unlikely under the old structure.

A stakeholder approach affected the way strategy was developed since consultation needed to be more inclusive. TOTA’s goal to develop the sector respectfully and in concert with the residents in a legitimate way; meeting with Indigenous communities with “mouth shut, ears open” was emphasized. Building and maintaining relationships and trust were central to the process. Collaborative approaches were needed because the competition is international. This represented a cultural change to tourism’s business culture. The meta-governance characteristics of culture as sustainability were emerging in BC with participants aware of what Jessop (2009) describes as “the governance of governance.”

BC participants reflected on the cultural change within the tourism industry. It was important 10 years ago to demonstrate economic impact of tourism to the region. Tourism needed to “speak the language of the day which was the numbers” to gain the respect accorded to other industries. However, now that the economic contributions have been established, the region can “transcend that dialogue” (A12). For example, the indicators for success can move from ‘heads in beds’ and dollars to indicators like increasing the number of women working in senior roles across the region, water usage going down, or wetland restoration. The Liberal’s *Gaining the Edge* provincial tourism strategy
for 2016-2018 (Province of British Columbia, 2015) was described as appropriate to its time in the sense that it achieved its objective of tourism growth. The new plan, *Welcoming Visitors – Benefitting Locals* (Province of British Columbia, 2019) looks at how to build on that success asking “What else is needed to capitalize on opportunities?”

Some people are “still talking in the old way” (A12), but the evolution towards culture as sustainability is in progress. This evolution was repeatedly attributed to leadership. Individual tourism businesses that were interested in sustainability needed leadership to create the cohesiveness and energy of a movement. TOTA’s leadership gave the grassroots what they were asking for and lead them. A25 compared the impact of TOTA’s leadership to developing a sustainability strategy with an individual company: if it’s just the “green team people…it never goes anywhere” but, when a CEO is at a meeting “shit happens.”

Most recently there has even been a noticeable shift in federal attention to tourism, sustainability, food, and rural communities. The process and outcome of the latest federal tourism strategy *Creating Middle Class Jobs* (2019) reveals the seeds of change (Horlings, 2016) in process and in outcome. The federal tourism strategy used engagement processes in each province and territory to establish national priorities. The strategy’s language is firmly entrenched in a competitive, growth-oriented battle metaphor. For example, Canadian tourism is described as
“falling behind as other countries ramp up their efforts to compete in what is an increasingly crowded field. We need to stand out from the crowd and fight harder for our fair share of the international market” (Innovation Science and Economic Development Canada, 2019, p. 20). Significantly, however, it is “our fair share” of growth and the growth now has a specific purpose: middle-class jobs. A concern for what is a fair share reveals that equity matters on a global scale as does a fair distribution of tourism’s benefits across Canada through job creation in rural areas. It also focuses on tourism outside the major cities and outside the peak season challenges. Referring to Wilks (2010), Duxbury and Jeannette (2012) explain that basic metaphors for consumption in Western society relate to destruction or eating, and are rarely presented in terms of values like sharing or fairness, so this is a notable difference.

Faith in unlimited economic growth is actually quite recent and there are sustainable development alternatives which are agnostic about growth (Raworth, 2017). The fact that the term “fair share” is used several times in Creating Middle Class Jobs (2019) may indicate that the discourse, and the culture it reveals, is shifting. Meadows’ (2008) identified paradigm shifts as one of the most effective ways to leverage change, so the emergence of sustainability as an acceptable paradigm within tourism policy circles is significant. If “culture change occurs not when people argue well but when they speak differently” (Princen, 2010, p. 60), there is reason for optimism that a shared culture of sustainability is evolving.
Chapter 9 Conclusion

Rural food tourism has the potential to help sustain tangible and intangible culture, sustain the economic viability, environment and well-being of rural communities, and facilitate transformational learning for a shared “culture of sustainability.” This research explored how rural tourism stakeholders conceptualize and mobilize food culture for cultural sustainability in two Canadian rural tourism settings.

In this research, Soini and Dessein's (2016) conceptual framework served as a guide to explore rural wine and food tourism and cultural sustainability in all its dimensions because the framework differentiates and integrates the different meanings of culture and sustainability, thereby allowing a more comprehensive understanding and clearer communication about what is being sustained and why. The culture in, for, and as sustainability conceptual framework was compared to data sets generated in the interviews, documents, academic literature and participant observation thereby constructing a fuller picture of the concept of cultural sustainability within the case communities of the South Okanagan, BC and the Annapolis Valley, NS. Critical perspectives like food sovereignty highlighted “the interrelationships between power, values, norms and interests” (Hall, 2011, p. 665) in the food tourism case regions, while an appreciative approach was used to keep the focus aspirational.
9.1 Recommendations

Given what we have learned, what could we do next? Recommendations were determined by considering the limitations in Chapter 3, findings in Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7 and the discussion in Chapter 8 in relation to the appreciative principles articulated by Hammond (2013) which guided this research:

- In every society, organization, or group something works.
- What we focus on becomes our reality.
- Reality is created in the moment, and there are multiple realities.
- The act of asking questions of an organization or group influences the group in some way.
- People have more confidence and comfort to journey to the future (the unknown) when they carry forward parts of the past (the known).
- If we carry parts of the past forward, they should be what is best about the past.
- It is important to value differences.
- The language we use creates our reality.

The objective of this chapter is to “evoke and facilitate action on the part of readers” (Lincoln & Guba, 2012, p.6) with suggestions related to explicitly engaging with the idea and implications of local, the transformative potential of tourism, appreciative inquiry, and an appreciative research paradigm, cross-case learning, and future research that takes comparative, appreciative and reflective approaches.

The limitations raised in Chapter 3, researcher positionality, the cultural sustainability framework, the positivity bias inherent to appreciative approaches,
and issues related to community participation, are never ‘resolved’ in this research, but that ambiguity creates valuable openness for ongoing negotiation and reconstruction. The recommended actions largely serve to involve participants or other readers in analysis of the researcher-identified themes as a way to more critically examine the findings.

9.1.1 Explicit dialogue on local

The concept of local should be interrogated from cultivation, through to production, distribution and consumption (Everett, 2016; Gössling et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2015). Localization must be more than an end in itself (Carrigan et al., 2017). Attention to power whether those power discrepancies are determined spatially, culturally, socially, or economically (Grossman, 2013) is vital. The principles of food sovereignty: food for people, value for and to food providers, protecting local food systems, local access and decision-making, sharing best knowledge and skills and working with nature to support ecosystems (Chaifetz & Jagger, 2014) could provide a starting place for discussion that would “take local to the next level” as B18 wanted. The various meanings and implications of related frequently used terms such as authenticity also need to be collectively examined.

Scharber and Dancs (2015) advise attention to clearly setting the values and goals that define a “better” food system so that progress toward that better food system can be monitored. The extent that local is likely to correlate with
economic, environmental, and social welfare goals could then be assessed (Scharber & Dancs, 2016) because local is not necessarily better for the environment if conventional agricultural practices are used. Efforts to quantify “buy local” such as the 10% strategy suggested by Shuman (2017) in *Prosperity Through Self-Reliance The Economic Value of Import Replacement In Atlantic Canada & How to Achieve It* are needed. Additionally, challenges to localism such as those presented by Desrocher (2016) need to be considered in order to make conceptualizations of sustaining local food culture more robust. Desrochers (2016) argues in favour of the efficiencies of the modern food system’s competitive geographic advantages, economies of scale, and technological improvements in transportation and food preservation. Desrochers (2016) maintains that “the policy recommendations put forward by local food activists can only deliver a world in which poverty, environmental damage, food insecurity, and diseases are much more prevalent than is presently the case—in other words, the true world of yesterday as opposed to the romanticized view of the past so common among locavores” (p. 233). Engaging with these arguments will be critical.

In both regions, there was a need for open dialogue about the freeness of trade, the openness of markets, the responsibility beyond the immediate locale, and environmental effects. It may be “some distance is inescapable,” so the challenge will be determining “what is ‘culturally appropriate’ and might be permissible within a food sovereignty paradigm and what is not” (Edelman, 2014,
Engaging with the benefits of trade as well as the determents is a more realistic approach to localism in food production, distribution and consumption. Place-based politics need to go beyond localism (Harris, 2010). This includes recognizing the interdependence of local and global places and the interdependence of local and global people. Carbon emissions from air travel are oft neglected in food tourism literature (Hall et al., 2013) and should be discussed, as should the ironies of tourism being an export dependent on bringing visitors out of their own local which also went untouched in the interviews.

Creed (2006) maintains that “community is about collectivity and exclusion; an in-group must define itself in reference to an out-group” (as cited in Alkon, 2012, p. 98). Probing how communities decide which local people count as locals is another area for reflection since local is implicitly or explicitly determined by race, class, and gender (Alkon, 2012). For example, Alkon (2012) found that the literature related to local and organic food frequently omits foreign agricultural workers from conception of local culture which farmers’ markets create. Both regions depend on temporary foreign agricultural workers. The Okanagan for example, expects almost 4,500 seasonal workers in 2020 with 80% of participants in the Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program returning annually (Britton, 2020). How does local food culture include and reflect this and what are the social justice issues? What are the implications to food sovereignty if agricultural workers are predominately from outside the region? The wine
country lifestyle tends to attract people and capital from outside the region. This pattern was subject to dispute in the Annapolis Valley, but is well established in the South Okanagan. As Whittall (2019) notes, the Okanagan is “filled with wine shop stories about owners who left careers in geology, medicine, law, accounting, engineering, or finance” (p. 161). Wineries in the Okanagan are 80% owned by migrants and almost 70% of those migrants are international (Senese et al., 2016, p. 5). If capital and labour are not local, is what is produced local?

Place is where culture and environment come together, so place holds the potential for thinking that can integrate and balance the concepts of difference and relationship, so that the concepts are not essentializing or universalizing. This does not mean advocating one world thinking since people live in specific places not in the world generally (Geertz, Feld, & Basso, 1996). However, it does mean “acknowledging that we live on one world” (Gruenewald, & Smith, 2014, p. 148). In this sense, there are local and global places, and South Okanagan and Annapolis Valley residents live in both.

The relationships between wine and food tourism were complex. The place of the wine industry in local cultural identity, and in food tourism needs to be examined. Most participants considered wineries agricultural, but valued diverse agricultural production which was central to their agricultural identity and worthy of sustaining. Are regions dominated by wineries and vineyards still agricultural communities? If local agriculture becomes a monoculture has food
culture been sustained? Participants thought that the wine industry had shaped the current food culture. If the wine industry is in the tourism sector, then is the current foodie culture a product of tourism rather than a foundation for tourism? A variety of other questions related to authentic culture in New World wine regions found in the literature were also reflected in this research. For example, Senese et al, (2012) found that many Okanagan wineries developed during that post-NAFTA period used place names, images and architecture that evoked Old World rural romanticism of family-run estates. If winery architecture and vinifera varietals are European, can they be authentic to the South Okanagan or the Annapolis Valley? Are vinifera grape varieties which replace Indigenous and hybrid varieties authentic?

Participants advocated food tourism that reconnected visitors to local food. However, there is a risk that visitors are “not being asked to reconnect to context – to soil, to work and labour, to history, or to place – but to self-interest and personal appetite” (Delind, 2006, p. 279). The reconnection is superficial and ultimately unsatisfying if it only applies to product as happens when the concept of local is “rooted in location rather than place” (Johnson et al, 2016, p. 6). The South Okanagan and the Annapolis Valley can look to develop food tourism that connects people to a local context fully explored in all of its diverse complexity.
9.1.2 Transformative potential

The concept of transformation is used in two interconnected ways in this section: to refer to transformational/transformative learning experiences which occur through appreciative inquiry and through tourism, and to refer to transformational/transformative research paradigms. The idea of the transformative learning experience is inspired by theories within the field of adult education where transformative learning is known “as the process of using a prior interpretation to construe a new or revised interpretation of the meaning of one’s experience in order to guide future action” (Mezirow, 1996, p. 162 in Taylor, 2007, p. 173). A disorienting dilemma which can be sudden or gradual, critical reflection, and rational dialogue/action are central aspects of the transformative learning process. Transformation may take the form of altered worldviews and behaviors (Cranton, 2016; Taylor, 2007).

Transformational tourism

As mentioned in the literature review, transformational tourism has emerged as an alternative to mass tourism. As editor of two compilations on transformational tourism, Yvette Reisinger (2013, 2015) maintains that if tourism is developed properly it can contribute to human transformation, growth and development. Reisinger (2013) argues that the principles of Mezirow’s transformational learning theory can be applied to tourism.
Several academics explore this transformational potential within agri-food contexts. In Johnson, Schnakenberg, and Perdue’s (2016) study on farm tours as a form of place-based sustainability education, visitors perceived the farm-tours as learning experiences that altered their perspective and intended behavior in relation to sustainability and agri-food systems. Deville and Wearing (2013) examine transformational tourism related to visitors who stay and work on organic farms through the Willing Workers on Organic Farms (WWOOF) organization. Sigala (2020) explores the transformational power of wine tourism in South Australia.

The growing interest in tourism’s transformational potential is also evident in industry and public spheres. The Transformational Travel Council (TTC) was founded in 2016 as an international association of businesses and organizations with a shared understanding of “the powerful and delicate environmental, cultural, social and emotional impact tourism has on the individual traveler as well as the destination” (The Transformational Travel Council, n.d.). Transformational travel was named one of the top trends for 2020 by the Evening Standard (Hampson, 2019). The transformational aspects of food tourism are considered a key opportunity by the World Food Travel Association (2019).

Likewise, participants in this research envisioned a type of food tourism which encouraged adults to take on new perspectives in order to gain a deeper
understanding of the world. This reflects transformational learning processes of reconstructing and reinterpreting experiences (Taylor, 2007). Several unique qualities of rural food tourism have particular potential to foster transformative cultural change. As a bridge between agricultural and cultural tourism, food tourism already treats the environment as constituent of culture which corresponds with culture as sustainability. Food tourism’s holistic nature is evident in the importance of the concept of terroir which unites human interventions with the physical qualities of a place (Unwin, 2012). Food experiences are sensory; paying attention to how food and drink smells and tastes puts people back in their own bodies. It can be a kind of “disciplined deepening of attention” (ODELL, 2020, p. 119). As a form of cultural tourism, food and wine tourism attracts people who tend to be open to new experiences, and who seek learning opportunities in their travels (Croce & Perri, 2017; Richards & Wilson, 2007). The wine and food tourist’s relationship to the physical environment is stronger than in many other forms of tourism (Croce & Perri, 2017) which creates significant opportunities for the tourism industry to use the cultural, social and environmental consciousness of a new travel market to promote culture as sustainability. The transformative potential of food experiences to reconnect people with the natural environment and with other people was seen by participants as central aspects of food tourism experiences in the culturally sustainable future.
**Appreciative Inquiry**

Although the researcher-directed design of this investigation limited the transformative learning potential of an appreciative approach, the semi-structured individual interviews gave participants the time and space to notice and appreciate their respective food cultures, and how principles of food sovereignty and cultural sustainability were related to rural tourism. The findings could be used to launch community dialogue about cultural sustainability in wine regions as part of a community-driven appreciative inquiry planning process that more closely respects appreciative inquiry’s (AI) participatory 5D cycle of define, discover, dream, design and deliver which Hammond (2013) describes as “a cycle of learning” (p. 26). An appreciative inquiry process can help communities identify the aspects of their food culture and/or development culture which they want to sustain and determine how they will achieve this. This research confirmed that there is room within appreciative approaches for nuanced emotions, ambiguous social situations, and diverse understandings of what is positive (Reed, 2007; Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2010).

In particular, the design stage of appreciative inquiry has culturally transformative potential as the group creates provocative prepositions about the “ideal state of circumstances that will foster the environment to do more of what works” (Hammond, 2013, p. 34). Hammond sees creating provocative propositions at the design stage as a key step of transformational change.
because “the idea behind the group creation of propositions is to move from individual will to group will” (p. 38). This transition from individual motivation to group motivation could be interpreted as a transformation of individual values to broader cultural values, an identified area for future development in the BC wine industry (Buschert et al., 2018). AI may be a path to transformation at individual and cultural levels along the lines Scott (2003) found in her social constructivist approach to transformative change where transformation co-emerges in the learner and the setting (as cited in Taylor, 2007), but it will be critical to recognize that while the concept of community participation has become increasingly popular within development and policy contexts, without decision-making power, community participation can become a commodified token (Bodorkós., & Pataki, 2009). Participatory practice is a form of power with “entangled, highly variable and contingent” effects (Kindon et al., 2007, p. 19) that must be considered.

Appreciative approaches facilitate transformative learning through a focus on success and the application of reflective, rational processes to the analysis of this success. It is uncomfortable to think about things in different ways, so this positive focus is a disorienting dilemma, but this discomfort is the path to transformational learning (Cranton, 2016).

A critique of transformational learning theory is that it reflects a Western bias with its focus on the individual as the unit of analysis and limited attention to the cultural contexts that shape learning (Cranton, 2016). Consequently, the
appreciative perspective that transformative learning is not an individual process is significant. AI reflects an ecological view like that espoused by O'Sullivan (2003) which views transformative learning as a personal, but connected process. Cranton (2016) explains that understanding we are part of the whole is central to O'Sullivan's perspective on transformative learning that aims to create a “planetary community that holds together without collapsing and obliterating diversity” (p. 38). Horlings (2016) argues that re-appreciation of place is particularly relevant in the context of societal transformation toward sustainability. The re-appreciation of the “perceptions, meanings and values attached to place, processes of sense-making and how actors take the lead in appreciating places” (p. 35) is a central transformative place-shaping process. Because transformation within the place-based development framework involves intentional efforts to create a “better” situation, transformation has a normative nature which can lead to ethical concerns about how the “better” situation is determined and who benefits (Horling, 2016). Appreciative inquiry can facilitate engagement with questions related to who has the power to determine and enforce what constitutes culture for a place, and how that culture is used.

Appreciative inquiry may be a way to move towards culture as sustainability through ongoing planning which focuses development on the best of what already is so that “people have more confidence and comfort to journey to the future (the unknown) when they carry forward parts of the past (the known)” (Hammond, 2013, p.15). Appreciative inquiry in rural food tourism
settings is a way to facilitate transformation towards culture as sustainability by sustaining the best aspects of the existing culture in particular places.

**Transformative Paradigm**

Paradigm change is one of the most effective, and challenging, leverage points for transformational systems change (Meadows, 2008). Under the currently dominant planning paradigm, “we are obsessed with learning from our mistakes” (Hammond, 2013, p. 7). Appreciative inquiry operates from a different paradigm than problem-based approaches, as evidenced by the principles upon which AI is founded: the simultaneity principle, the poetic principle, the anticipatory principle and the positive principle (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005, p. 50). Watkins and Cooperrider (2000) call Appreciative Inquiry a “transformative paradigm” which quite interestingly, is the term Mertens (2015) uses to replace the term critical paradigm used to describe research using neo-marxist, postcolonial/Indigenous, queer theory. An appreciative inquiry is not necessarily incompatible with critical paradigms since both are transformational.

Mertens’ (2008) transformational research paradigm can bring a useful awareness to an appreciative approach with the potential to deconstruct power structures without altering the positive nature. The transformative research paradigm facilitates a richer understanding of cultural sustainability assessed by how it furthers social justice and human rights. Ascher’s (2010) framework for acting to preserve or change cultural patterns in the face of globalization is useful
here since the framework applies increasing human dignity as the normative principle. This means that “cultural practices and beliefs which disadvantage, oppress or humiliate” (Ascher & Heffron, 2010, p. 234) ought to change while those that aim to increase human dignity ought to be sustained. Understanding the social, cultural, historical, political and economic and environmental context (Messerschmidt, 2008), careful attention to language, recognizing bias (Grant & Humphries, 2006) and attention to scale (Kindon et al., 2007) are also imperative for appreciative approaches that aim to be transformative.

9.1.3 Cross-case learning

Comparative case analysis provides opportunities for participants to learn from other contexts in a process of “place-conscious and place-responsive teaching, sharing and learning” (Dessein et al., 2015, p. 32). Examples of similarities and differences facilitate the drawing of inferences by readers in both case regions, as well as readers who can use this case research metaphorically to explore synergies and tensions with their own regions (Lincoln & Guba, 2012).

There are several lessons that the Annapolis Valley could glean from the South Okanagan given the South Okanagan’s more developed wine tourism. One lesson relates to the wine sector’s growth. Those involved in the BC wine sector did not predict it would grow as large, or as quickly as it did (Whittall, 2019). Similarly, most participants in the Annapolis Valley found it hard to imagine dramatic growth in wine and food tourism. However, that level of growth
is not far-fetched given the actual proximity of potential visitors from the United States and the expanding interest in food tourism. The extremely reasonable real estate costs may make the region a very desirable destination for lifestyle migrants, remote workers and retirees. Getting to a stage where cultural sustainability is a pressing concern because of gentrification or monoculture is possible, but there is not a development culture centered around sustainability at present. As several Annapolis Valley participants argued, now really is the time to have inclusive discussions about how and why food tourism develops.

The importance of planning and policy starting with the right questions was stressed by participants. Some of the foundational questions suggested were whether local farmers are considered an essential service, whether sustaining an agricultural industry is important and whether the wine industry can sustain a vibrant farming community. These were considered very political questions with significant policy implications. The rush for economic development should not preclude these important discussions. B13 elaborated:

I just don’t understand how it all works together and what the implications of it and if anybody’s really thought it through… What I would love to see is somebody start to ask these questions.

As the role of civil society actors like policy entrepreneurs and food champions expand, there is the need to promote broad rural inclusion so radical voices and people with different racial, educational, economic, and cultural backgrounds are included (Smith & Stirling, 2007). Light needs to be shone on “who controls the
selection of participants in decision-making processes and whose voices count” (Stirling, 2014, p. 84). Such vigilance needs to be maintained and corrective measures built into the process and the system to ensure poor quality policy does not emerge due to misdirection or misinformation.

Sustainable development through multi-stakeholder networks is a common governance theme in the fields of agriculture and rural studies, place branding and place marketing and food tourism (Buschert et al., 2018; Gibson et al., 2015; Rinaldi, 2017; UNWTO, 2019). TOTA’s transition to a stakeholder model is an example of how changing the structure can change the outcome since the more inclusive board has helped the culture of tourism become more sustainable in BC. Culture as sustainability represents a radical change, therefore, it requires a change in power dynamics if it is to be materially and substantively transformative (Moragues-Faus & Morgan, 2015). Tourism planning in BC is beginning to reflect holistic policy approaches and modes of governance characteristic of culture as sustainability. The prevalence of sustainability in BC’s rural food tourism discourse can give ‘permission’ to NS to consider sustainability issues.

The Annapolis Valley also has lessons to teach, even though they do not always see this in themselves. The South Okanagan, if they can borrow some of the Annapolis Valley’s humility, can learn from collaborative initiatives in Nova Scotia, such as the intentional social benefits of TapRoots farm and festivals like
Devour, the work of Taste of Nova Scotia and the programming at Nova Scotia Community College. Taste of Nova Scotia is an exemplary model for collaborative marketing at the provincial level that brings the multifaceted aspects of food culture together. Instead of the wine industry being separate from farmers, restaurants, and other drinks, all of these aspects are integrated under the Taste of Nova Scotia umbrella. The Nova Scotian food experience is then marketed to locals and tourists. This model creates opportunities for collaboration in product development and promotion that might not surface without the interconnections Taste of Nova Scotia fosters. Similarly, TapRoots farm and Devour leverage connections for the benefit of rural communities and tourists. The Devour Food Festival in Wolfville brings together different tourism niches like film, culinary, and agritourism, to create an inclusive experience for locals and visitors. TapRoots brings together organic agriculture, a wide-variety of valued added products, accommodation, and farm events. Both Devour and TapRoots are notable for their successful efforts to scale-up. Devour has more than a dozen revenue generating satellite events, and TapRoots operates a mid-size business. Education was highly valued in the Annapolis Valley. B5 was “astounded” that Okanagan College does not have a similar base funded program despite being a much more well-established region. The tourism program at NSCC is also much more developed than the Okanagan’s. Collective industry and community support for post-secondary programs was a strength in Nova Scotia.
British Columbians were noted for their independent streak which supports a culture of entrepreneurial risk-taking, but also maybe presents some challenges in terms of cooperating towards larger goals. Perhaps the “way we do things around here” has led to the wine industry seeing itself as quite separate from food and from the local community. There is a real opportunity now to connect and collaborate, to approach wine as one part of food culture and ensure food tourism broadly benefits the community. BCs leadership in the area of sustainable tourism shows that there is a shared sustainability culture in the South Okanagan on which to build.

Common objectives and learning possibilities are revealed when conversations extend beyond sectoral or regional silos. Sectors that are more mature, like wine, can help emerging sectors like cannabis anticipate and plan for sustainable tourism. Likewise, regions with more extensive tourism development can help emerging regions. There are opportunities to learn from comparative processes which bring people together within and across regions.

9.1.4 Future research

The recommendations for future research pertain to both what is studied and how it is studied. Transformative food tourism is the topic in need of further investigation and comparative, appreciative and reflective research processes are suggested.
Tourism’s role in facilitating transformational cultural change for local and global sustainability requires further study (Coghlan & Gooch, 2011; Reisinger, 2013, 2015; Morgan, 2010; Pritchard & Morgan, 2013; Johnson, Schnakenberg, & Perdue, 2016; Lloyd et al., 2015). Tourism is not inherently transformative and there is not a strong foundation of explicitly politicizing tourism or encouraging tourists to move from their visitor experiencing to reflective thinking and action (Pritchard and Morgan, 2013). Conditions conducive to transformation can be created through travel and tourism, however, so future research can examine factors which are conducive to transformational learning. For example, engaging with ‘other’ cultures and places can be a disorienting dilemma. Opportunities to reflect and discuss may be present in ways that are not typical in tourists’ home lives (Morgan, 2010; Reisinger, 2013). How can tourists become more than passive consumers isolated from real engagement with their destination? When travel is undertaken with a specific purpose, for example, to learn organic farming, or to learn a language, transformation is more likely since the motivation for development and growth exist (Biallas, 2002). How can a destination attract these motivated tourists? How can the connection result in impactful change for visitors and residents?

Stone and Duffy (2015) reviewed the peer-reviewed literature in travel and tourism that relates to transformational education. Informal learning, such as the types of tourism experiences SO and AV participants described, were identified as an area for future research. Stone and Duffy (2015) also recommend research
connecting transformational learning theory with other educational and tourism frameworks such as Pritchard’s (2011) hopeful tourism. Various cultural, social, environmental and personal factors also influence travellers’ transformation (Reisinger, 2013). The role of context and culture are stressed as important, if overlooked research areas within the transformational learning field (Taylor, 2007). Further study is required to design food tourism experiences to effectively meet the objectives of transformational learning for culture as sustainability. Finally, supportive planning and policy are impetuses and response to cultural change, but more research is needed to understand the conditions and process within the context of cultural sustainability.

Applying Soini and Dessein’s (2016) framework may allow for a deeper understanding of how ideas about culture, development, nature and society are transformed and how changes precipitated by rural food tourism might be developed into a shared culture as sustainability. Future research applying culture *in, for, as* sustainability should highlight the politics, power relationships and social struggle involved in rural tourism and cultural sustainability (George et al. 2009) and facilitate engagement with questions related to who has the power to determine and enforce what constitutes culture for a place, and how that culture is used. Applying a critical perspective to future research will be important to balance what otherwise might be a romanticized consideration of rural food and wine tourism’s contribution to transformational learning and cultural change for sustainability.
Cultural differences have implications for how tourism planning and development is approached. Calza et al.’s (2018) research showed that cultural differences among 17 European countries studied explain the different attitudes of rural residents towards entrepreneurial tourism development. Cross-cultural comparisons of sustainability in the wine industry found that perceptions about sustainability and sustainable behaviour varied among countries (Montella, 2017). Differences seemed to relate to the intensity of association, institution, policy-maker involvement and the general cultural approach to green issues (Gilinsky et al., 2015) with some countries’ wine regions having embraced sustainable development since their initial phases (Gammack, 2006). The wine regions that promote a green image are more likely to draw tourists with ethical and environmental priorities, which then justifies and maintains a sustainable approach to winemaking and tourism (Santini et al., 2013). The literature on within-country cultural differences is limited, but this research indicates that the cultural traits of Annapolis Valley and the South Okanagan likely differ by characteristics such as, power distance, individualism/collectivism, masculinity/femininity, uncertainty avoidance and long-term/short-term orientation (Hofstede, 1983). Future comparative case studies are essential to examine these differences and the policy implications.

Finally, future research processes need to create time and space for researchers and participants to be deeply reflective. Bramwell et al. (2017) advise researchers that they must “reflect upon their own research and their own
actions with regard to how they may affect change” (p. 7). The researcher’s impression was that participants also valued the chance to reflect. Sometimes a participant would start with one perspective and alter their thinking over the course of the interview as they explored concepts in more depth by thinking out loud. Research can provide a time and space for busy people to think about big ideas, and connect them to their practice in ways that build a sustainable culture. The addition of focus groups and/or other action research methods would create even more opportunities for transformative learning. Future research can more fully incorporate the participatory aspects of appreciative inquiry.

9.2 Contribution

This research investigated cultural sustainability in two wine tourism regions, but “as with much of tourism, what is interesting about our subject is how it can be used as a way to study wider issues” (Bramwell, et al., 2017, p. 6). Beyond the specifics of food tourism in the case communities, or even the field of sustainable tourism, this research is relevant to wider issues and audiences who share a common interest in cultural sustainability. The COST Action "Investigating Cultural Sustainability" (2011-2015) project concluded with suggestions for refining and operationalizing the proposed conceptual approaches. This research used Soini and Dessein’s (2016) framework for cultural sustainability as an analytical tool to explore the relationship between rural food tourism and cultural sustainability in different provincial contexts,
thereby testing the value of the framework for understanding how cultural sustainability is understood outside of academic contexts. Collecting and comparatively analyzing real world settings demonstrated that the conceptual framework has practical value as a way of understanding culture in, for and as sustainability in communities.

This research brought tourism stakeholder’s perspective to the broader discussion of culture’s place in sustainable development at the intersection of food and mobilities. The culture in, for, and as sustainability framework provided a conceptual structure for theorizing about tourism’s role in food sovereignty and facilitating transformational cultural change for local and global sustainability. The cultural aspects of tourism policy adds another dimension to work by other scholars examining the power relations, motivations, and challenges of the food tourism policy environment relating to social, economic, and environmental sustainability (De Jong & Varley, 2017; Everett, 2019b; Everett & Slocum, 2013; George et al., 2009; Hall, 2008; Sims, 2009).

Using an appreciative approach created space for participants to notice their culture, especially to notice the cultural values and beliefs that shape development policies and processes. The appreciative approach felt uncomfortable, especially in Nova Scotia, and sometimes the participants’ responses and the researcher’s analysis slipped back into well-worn problem-based narratives. However, being asked to give positive examples, to notice
what works, encouraged participants and the researcher to consider aspects of the truth that may have otherwise been neglected. Appreciative approaches are a way to transcend path dependent cultural thinking patterns because as Cooperrider and Whitney (2005) explain “collective strengths do more than perform—*they transform*” (p. 2, emphasis original).

This research has been directly useful in the case regions, particularly in BC because of existing personal connections. For example, a BC participant has called several times with follow up questions in preparation for a grant application and then to plan for a local culinary trail after receiving the grant. The researcher has been able to suggest suitable resources and good practice examples gleaned from NS. Another BC community member, who was aware of, but did not participate in the research, followed up on a brief discussion of preliminary findings in order to share these impressions with provincial and federal leaders. The Director, Tourism Branch Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada expressed interest in the results as did the Provincial Director of Planning in Nova Scotia. Preliminary findings were presented at the BC Studies Conference, May 2019 and the Atlantic Planners and Canadian Rural Revitalization Conferences in October 2019 and a policy brief on rural food sovereignty was prepared for the RPLC and a conceptual article on cultural sustainability and rural food tourism will be published in Tourism Analysis in 2020. A brief summary of the research findings written in plain language will also be distributed to participants.
9.3 In Closing

This comparative case study investigated the relationships between cultural sustainability and rural food tourism from the perspective of rural tourism stakeholders in two Canadian wine regions, British Columbia’s South Okanagan and Nova Scotia’s Annapolis Valley. Participants saw the relationships between cultural sustainability and rural food tourism in all three ways described by Soini and Dessein (2016): culture *in* sustainability where food tourism is a means to conserve tangible and intangible food culture, culture *for* sustainability where food culture is a resource for rural tourism development that sustains communities, and culture is a way to shape development processes; and ultimately, culture *as* sustainability, where rural food tourism is a catalyst to facilitate a fundamental paradigm shift towards a more sustainable culture which reflected many of the principles of food sovereignty. Participants in both regions understood their food culture and agricultural community as part of and interacting with larger urban and global contexts. They understood food tourism as creating transformative learning opportunities for individual visitors and hosts, and as a place-shaping practice that encourages societal transformation toward sustainability.

Participants’ understandings of rural food tourism and cultural sustainability are subjective answers to the questions of which culture is being sustained and for whom. Recognition and further exploration of the
consequences of privileging certain versions of reality is necessary to engage with the complexities, tensions and power dynamics reflected in this research.

This is one story. There are other rural food tourism stories of course, stories of cultural commodification, appropriation, assimilation, and conflict where a political economy dominated by neoliberal policies exacerbates inequalities and destroys the environment. I see these stories when I review the literature, when I look at my research findings and because I have lived them. However, here, I shared a rural food tourism and culture sustainability story in an appreciative way that encourages an openness to future processes which will help people see the other stories for themselves. From design to final product, this research resonates with the appreciate paradigm I have used.
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Appendices

Appendix A – Semi-Structured Interview Questions

Study Name: Investigating the relationships between food sovereignty, cultural sustainability and rural tourism

(Research Ethics Board Number: 18-10-018)

Researchers:

Dr. Wayne Caldwell, Professor
Danielle Robinson, PhD Student

Interview Questions:

Interviewer and interviewee introduce themselves

Review of consent form

Interviewer responds to any questions the interviewee may have

1. Tell me about your role in your organization?

Prompts: involvement with tourism planning and policy such as, committee work, lobby, strategic planning, follow set policies, develop legislation?

2. Tell me about local food culture in your region.
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3. What aspects of local food culture would you like to keep? Why?

4. What aspects of local food culture would you like to change? Why?

5. What does food sovereignty mean to you?

6. How is local food culture used in tourism offerings in your region?
   Prompts: Resource for development in different types of agritourism (farm stands, on-farm classes, tours, festivals, dinners, tastings, etc.), add-on in other types of tourism, landscape, procurement

7. What are the benefits of using local food culture in tourism?
   Prompts: social, cultural, economic, environmental

8. Who (individuals/organizations) do you consider food tourism stakeholders in your region?

9. Tell me about organizations/programs/initiatives/policies that support local food tourism in your region?
   Prompts: By local, regional, provincial, national, international government, quasi-government and non-government organizations? Process to determine, administer and evaluate?

10. Tell me about a rural place that does food tourism well.
    Prompts: Where? What’s working? Why - economic, social/political, cultural, environmental conditions?

11. Is there anything you feel I have missed or anything you would like to add?