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Abstract

Mass tourism development in the Global South is widely celebrated as a major source of jobs and foreign exchange, but it is also widely criticized for creating spatially and economically segregated enclaves that frequently have negative social, cultural, and environmental impacts. There is a large literature that details both the economic advantages and disadvantages of mass tourism development. However, critiques of mass tourism have done little to reorient the nature of the industry, as countries of the Global South such as Jamaica have generally placed much greater emphasis on the economic performance of the industry than on the associated inequalities. The overarching objective of this dissertation is to examine the ways in which mass tourism developments have supported or adversely affected community development, the living conditions of local residents, and the activities of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) and fisherfolk. It approaches this by exploring the onset of mass tourism development in Lucea and Falmouth, two small towns on the north coast of Jamaica, where the industry had a relatively small presence until recent developments. In 2008, the largest resort in the country opened in Lucea, and in 2011, the largest cruise ship-oriented harbour-front development opened in Falmouth, developments that have significantly changed the social, economic, and environmental fabric of these two communities.

The empirical basis of this dissertation centres on qualitative interviews with local residents, owners of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), fisher-folk and enclave employees, which were focused on understanding their perceptions of new opportunities, problems, and challenges, their sense of the planning process, and their responses to the changes that have ensued. Qualitative research is complemented by data from surveys with residents. The ultimate aim is to better understand how local people perceive the costs and benefits associated
with the establishment of mass tourism enclaves in their communities, and what they believe could be improved. One of the principal findings of this research is that the residents of Lucea and Falmouth do not believe that the rapid growth of mass tourism has brought widely dispersed benefits to their communities. Rather, these enclaves are broadly perceived as creating limited economic opportunities, apart from mostly low-paying, menial jobs, while transforming space in a negative way, establishing new forms of social segregation and environmental burdens. By taking local perspectives on mass tourism development seriously, this dissertation seeks to provide insights into how some of the exclusionary impacts could be mitigated and how the social and economic relations between communities and enclaves might be enhanced, at the forefront of which is the need to create more meaningful economic opportunities for the local people.

**Keywords:** Mass tourism; enclave development; social exclusion; inequality; Falmouth; Lucea; Jamaica; the Caribbean
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION: THE IMPORTANCE AND UNEVENESS OF MASS TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

1.1. The Scale and Imbalances of Global Tourism

Tourism is one of the world’s largest economic sectors, and for many countries it is a leading source of employment, foreign investment, and foreign exchange earnings (Kovacevic, 2013; Spenceley and Meyer, 2012). According to the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO, 2016), both global tourism arrivals and revenues are increasing, despite occasional shocks from natural disasters and political instability. In 2014, over 1.1 billion tourists crossed international borders, and international tourist expenditure topped US$1.25 trillion. That same year, the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) estimated that the tourism sector was responsible for over 250 million jobs, including employment by hotels, travel agencies, airlines and other passenger transportation services, restaurants, and leisure facilities (WTTC, 2015). In 2015, international tourist arrivals increased to 1.2 billion, along with a slight increase of international expenditure to US$1.3 trillion (UNWTO, 2016), and the sector was estimated to be responsible for more than 290 million jobs in 2016 (WTTC, 2017). Figure 1.1 indicates the scale of tourism’s contribution to global GDP from 2007 to 2017, including the increase in both direct and indirect contributions, as well as the WTTC’s projection for continuing growth to 2027.
While its economic importance is undeniable, international tourism is also highly volatile, and can pose considerable risks to countries dependent on it. As Novelli et al. (2012: 1446) note, “incidents of terrorism, crime, natural disasters and epidemic outbreaks all negatively impact on place image and pose major challenges to the tourism industry, especially as the global media reinforce such security fears.” The 9/11 terrorist attack in the USA, devastating hurricanes (such as Matthew in 2016 which affected the Caribbean and southern USA), and the outbreak of dangerous viruses (e.g. Ebola in 2015, Zika in 2016) are just some examples of incidents that have affected tourist travel.

The expansion of tourism has been a key component of economic development strategies for many countries (Andergassen and Candela, 2013; Spenceley and Meyer, 2012). In many countries of the Global South where tourism is a major economic sector, governments have consistently sought to craft policies to not only encourage investment and market their destination but to promote positive attitudes and supportive behaviours among local people, such
as through public relations campaigns encouraging them to smile to visitors and public education systems that promote the merits of the industry and teach particular skills (Gmelch, 2003). Yet even where mass tourism creates extensive direct and indirect employment and other economic benefits, many negative outcomes for local communities are now widely recognized. These negative outcomes include: the exacerbation of race and class-based inequalities (for example, restricting access to prime recreational spaces; disproportionately focusing of infrastructure and public space on the interests of visitors); the disproportionate consumption of large volumes of energy and water by visitors; the generation of significant pollution loads from tourist enclaves; the commodification of aspects of local cultures (sometimes premised upon simple caricatures); the marginalization of non-tourism based small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs); the precariousness and seasonality of informal sector opportunities that depend on the sector; and the fact that much of the work in the industry is typified by long hours, low skill, and low wages (Mowforth and Munt, 2016; Anderson, 2011; Kingsbury, 2011; Shaw and Williams, 2002; Taylor, 1993). There is a basic contradiction in the fact that, on the one hand, many destination countries of the Global South are characterized by high levels of poverty and poor quality public infrastructure, while on the other hand they are marketed as problem-free destinations where endless enjoyment can be pursued amidst pristine environments and friendly, welcoming people who are happy to serve (Mowforth and Munt, 2003).

Beyond the obvious desire for relaxation and recreation, participation in mass tourism is also a significant indicator of status in industrialized countries as well as to elites in the Global South; as Shaw and Williams (2002: 211) put it, for many people, to “not to go away is like not possessing a car or a ‘nice’ house.” In addition, some tourists are motivated by a desire to have some exposure to different cultures and environments, which implies that part of the tourism
experience is to gaze on the ‘other’ and to “view a set of different scenes of landscapes or
townscapes which are out of the ordinary” (Urry and Larsen, 2011: 1). Mass tourism in the
Global South is commonly known for the attraction of the so-called ‘3 S’s’ – sun, sea, and sand
(and sometimes a 4th ‘s’, sex) – especially in certain regions like the Pacific and Caribbean
islands and coastal regions of Mexico, Africa, and Southeast Asia. In short, the visitor-host
relationship involves some fundamental imbalances, as people travelling to mass tourism
destinations in the Global South are usually seeking a break from their hectic lives while people
living in destination regions typically face a very different set of challenges, and these
imbalances can contribute to many tensions (Gibson, 2009).

Critical research into mass tourism development in the Global South can help to
understand the uneven impacts and perspectives of community members, and in turn help to craft
policy responses that might enhance benefits and mitigate costs. Also, critical approaches to
tourism research must acknowledge the persistent legacies of historical dynamics of dominance
and oppression, and how these persist in contemporary societies (Sinclair-Maragh and Gursoy,
2015; Gibson, 2009). As I discuss in Chapter 2, the dependency paradigm helps to understand
the implications of mass tourism in the Caribbean because the socio-economic, cultural, and
political processes that prevail in the sector have deep continuities with the region’s long history
of colonialism, dependence on foreign powers, and social exclusion and exploitation.

1.2. The Exclusionary Nature of Mass Tourism in the Global South

Mass tourism is sometimes referred to as enclave or ‘all-inclusive’ tourism, which can be
broadly understood as a model where tourists purchase accommodation, transportation, food,
entertainment, and sometimes arranged tours in a single package, in advance of travel. Typically,
this package gets purchased from a tour operator or travel agent located in the Global North (Pennicook, 2006; Shaw and Williams, 2002), although elites from across the Global South are increasing participants as well. While pre-packaging remains a pillar of mass tourism, some researchers have recently insisted that these should not simply be equated, and that there is a need for a more comprehensive conceptualization of mass tourism. For instance, Vainikka (2014: 819) insists that mass tourism is “socially constructed and personally perceived,” which implies that it can have very different meanings and interpretations for different people. Chapter 2 examines various conceptualizations of mass tourism in greater detail, and concludes that while mass tourism spaces might vary to some degree, they are unified by the economically and socially exclusionary characteristics, which have been likened to ‘sterilized environments’ (Anderson, 2011) and ‘mini-cities’ (Cabezas, 2008), and involve the physical separation of local people from some of their nicest surroundings. This separation reflects the economic and social power imbalance between tourists and local communities, and this disparity is reinforced by the fact that many hotel employees work for long hours at low pay while the major spaces and operators in mass tourism are predominantly owned by either foreign corporations or local elites. Further, as will be developed later, the separation of mass tourism spaces is widely recognized as a significant factor that contributes to the ‘leakage’ of much of the tourist expenditure out of the local economy. The net result is that while mass tourism has been a major source of foreign exchange generation, investment, and employment for some developing countries, critics have argued that it has also contributed to uneven development, serving to draw countries further into an uneven global economic system they have little ability to control (Sinclair-Maragh and Gursoy, 2015; Fletcher, 2011; Brown and Hall, 2008; Weibing and Xingqun, 2006; Mowforth and Munt, 2003; Britton, 1982).
Since roughly the mid-1970s, critical scholars have increasingly drawn attention to the fact that mass tourism does not offer a solution to the social and economic imbalances of the Global South, but rather tends to reproduce them in new ways (Örnberg, 2014; Cárdenas-García, 2013; Mbaiwa, 2011; 2005; Cabezas, 2008; Mowforth and Munt, 2003; Shaw and Williams, 2002; Oppermann and Chon, 1997; Britton, 1982). The problems of dependence on mass tourism are accentuated in small island states, where governments have come to focus much of their economic attention on various indicators of tourism performance, such as hotel occupancy, visitor arrivals, and expenditures, while paying little heed to negative social and environmental impacts (Bojanic and Lo, 2016). As a result, some critics have argued that the widely cited ‘S’s of tourism demand, noted above, are paralleled by a different set of ‘S’s for destinations: subjugation, servility, and subservience (Mowforth and Munt, 2003).

The Caribbean is a region where the dependence on mass tourism is especially great (Hill and Lewis, 2015; McElroy, 2004). Across most of the region, governments have heavily promoted the industry as a primary means of generating foreign exchange (to pay for import bills and re-pay heavy debt burdens), employment, and foreign investment. For instance, in Jamaica, where agriculture has been in steady decades-long decline (Burrell, 2016; Beckford and Campbell, 2013; Weis, 2006; 2004), the attention of the governments (unwavering across rival political parties since the 1970s) has consistently been on promoting tourism growth, routinely emphasizing its economic benefits and paying little regard to the inequalities often associated with the sector (Nunkoo and Ramkissoon 2010; Kennett-Hensel et al. 2010; Thomas-Hope, 2007). According to Pennicook (2006: 31), 1978 marked “the birth of a new era in the local tourist industry – the era of the ‘all-inclusives’,” which ushered in a wave of similar developments across the north coast of Jamaica and the rest of the Caribbean, including the
SuperClubs, Sandals, Riu, and Sunset chains (and more recently, Palladium), and other large enclave resorts such as the Holiday Inn SunSpree Resort and Spa and Moon Palace Jamaica Grande.

As noted earlier, mass tourism enclaves are highly segregated spaces, where tourists are shielded from the local populace and from safety ‘risks’ and potentially offensive sights, smells and sounds (Edensor, 1998). These spaces strive to inhibit unorganized encounters with local people other than employees at resorts and attractions (where the relationship is very controlled) and with the local economy, and in general, function in a way that keeps tourists separate from the host destination’s authentic culture. So while some international tourists are intrigued by the ‘other’ and the novelty of destinations in the Global South, as indicated earlier, the nature of mass tourism does not foster significant immersion in the local culture and most tourists are content to remain in enclave spaces, which have been likened to ‘environmental bubbles’ (Weaver, 2005; Britton, 1982). The notion of a bubble reflects the effort to create a sense of familiarity, safety, and comfort for tourists, and provide access to such things as foreign newspapers and television and Westernized food and hotel amenities. Other typical features of mass tourism enclaves include: high capital investment; in-house retail outlets (which strictly regulate the sale of crafts) and travel guide services.

Cohen (1972) posited that the consumers of mass tourism spaces generally fall into one of two categories: institutionalized tourists and individual mass tourists. Institutionalized tourists are not very adventurous and largely remain in the bubble of the resort, cruise ship, or cruise pier, and typically only venture outside it when travelling around in air-conditioned buses, which amount to a secondary sort of bubble. Individual mass tourists are similar in many ways, except that their vacations are not entirely pre-planned, as they maintain a modest degree of flexibility
to venture further afield and do more activities on their own. Whatever these differences are, enclaves are typified by exclusion, in which local people are perceived and treated as ‘outsiders’ to the bubble (apart from serving as mostly low-wage workers) while tourists (which increasingly also includes domestic elites) are treated as ‘insiders’ (Schmid, 2006).

Another aspect of how mass tourism operates in the Global South is that all-inclusive hotels and cruise ships tend to have pre-established arrangements with larger-scale off-site restaurants, recreational activities, and shopping plazas, with tourists strongly encouraged to patronize allied businesses (Anderson, 2011). In other instances, all-inclusive hotels and cruise lines reward tour companies with commissions for directing tourists to their premises, and vice versa. For example, Royal Caribbean Cruise Lines (RCCL) has strong reciprocal relationships with some of the largest attractions on the north coast of Jamaica such as Dolphin Cove and Chukka Adventure Tours, a subject I explore further in Chapter 4. Social marginalization from mass tourism spaces is another important issue that I examine later, in Chapter 5, which involves such things as barring local people from tourism enclaves with high perimeter walls, security presence, or simply through unaffordably high admission prices. One dramatic indication of the various constraints to access is that over 85% of the local community members surveyed in this research said that they had never set foot in the hotel in Lucea or the cruise-ship pier premises in Falmouth, which are seen in Figure 1.2.
1.3. The Recent Growth of Mass Tourism in Falmouth and Lucea

Jamaica is home to more all-inclusive hotels than any other Caribbean nation, which have been overwhelmingly concentrated along the country’s north coast in major clusters in and around Montego Bay, Negril, and Ocho Rios, as well as dotting various smaller towns in between where much recent growth has been centred. From 2001 to 2011, the room stock contained in small towns on the north coast increased by 3372, and it is projected to continue growing (Jamaica Tourist Board, 2011), as an estimated 1756 more rooms are expected to have been added from 2011 to 2017 alone (Jamaica Tourist Board, 2017). The key players in mass tourism in Jamaica are a combination of transnational corporations, such as Ibero Star Hotels and Resorts and the Palladium Group, and powerful local elites, led by Gordon ‘Butch’ Stewart (of Sandals Resorts) and John Issa (of SuperClubs).

In addition to the growth of hotels, the scale of tourism development along Jamaica’s north coast has also been magnified by a major expansion in cruise ship arrivals, which together raises questions about the overall carrying capacity of the region (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2002). Jamaica now receives more than 20 times the number of tourists as it did in the 1950s,
and one clear indication of the economic importance of the sector can be seen in the fact that total visitor expenditure in 2013 was US$2.25 billion in an island of 3 million people (JTB, 2015), though official statistics do not reflect what proportion of profits is a repatriated or ‘leaked’ to parent companies in the Global North (Wilkinson, 1999).

Falmouth and Lucea are two of the small towns where tourism has recently become the dominant economic activity following the onset of mega-tourism projects. Both towns have relatively small populations which meant that the level of dislocation was less than would have occurred in a more populated region. In 2011, the population of Falmouth was just under 9000, out of a parish population (Trelawny) of around 75,000, while the population of Lucea was just over 7000 out of a parish population (Hanover) of around 70,000 (Statistical Institute of Jamaica, 2012). The total number of households in Falmouth is 2,467 and 25,201 in Trelawny; in Lucea there is 2,403 and 23,759 in Hanover. Both also had the advantage for developers of being equally close to Montego Bay, the unofficial tourism capital of Jamaica, and its international airport (see Figure 1.3) as well as ideal beachfront that make them attractive.

**Figure 1.3. The Location of Lucea and Falmouth in Jamaica**

Source: https://whereinja.wordpress.com/
The mass tourism developments in both Falmouth and Lucea were originally largely welcomed by the local populations with a sense of pride and excitement, and came after decades of discussion and planning. Both national and local planners and many local community members hoped that these large-scale developments would help to address issues of unemployment and the out-migration of young people to more prosperous tourist towns as Montego Bay and Negril, or to North America, where many young Jamaicans now aim to make their future.

Falmouth and Lucea have much in common. Both are small, quaint towns, founded in the eighteenth century under British colonialism, with histories rooted in sugar and slavery. The wealth generated by sugar left behind some notable landmarks, especially in Falmouth which contains many historic Georgian-style buildings (some of which date to early in the town’s inception), as it was a major commercial centre for the import of African slaves and the export of sugar to Britain. Despite their location on the north coast of Jamaica near to Montego Bay, both Lucea and Falmouth had been relatively immune from mass tourism until the construction of the Grand Palladium and the Lady Hamilton Resort and the cruise ship port in Falmouth, and these have come to overshadow and in some cases displace traditional economic activities such as fishing, small craft production, and market activities for the surrounding agricultural communities. In short, the sudden arrival of mass tourism in these communities has brought both opportunities and imbalances which are at the heart of this dissertation.

The Grand Palladium Hotel (see Figure 1.4) in Lucea was a project of the Palladium Hotel Group, a Spanish-based transnational corporation.¹ As noted, it has the biggest capacity of

---

¹ The Palladium Group has developments in a range of sites including Spain (Ibiza, Mallorca, Menorca, Barcelona, Madrid, Valencia, Oviedo, Fuerteventura, Tenerife, Córdoba and Seville), Italy (Sicily),
any resort in Jamaica with a 1000-room capacity, and there are plans to soon add another 900 rooms and an 18-hole championship golf course. The Falmouth Pier is the largest cruise facility in Jamaica and the only one that can berth two mega-ships at a time, including the *Oasis of the Seas* and the *Allure of the Seas*, which can each accommodate nearly 6000 guests. Its construction has not only reconfigured the waterfront (see Figure 1.5) but has also resulted in numerous other changes to the life of the community. The pier has captured global attention, as it was awarded by the *World Travel Awards* as the ‘World’s Leading Tourism Development Project’ in 2011 and 2012.

**Figure 1.4. Aerial Photographs of the Grand Palladium Hotel Property**

Source: Google Earth (2017)

Mexico (in the Mayan and Nayarit Riviera’s), Dominican Republic (Punta Cana and Playa Bávaro), and Brazil (Mata de Sao Joao).
1.4. Research Objectives and Questions

This dissertation seeks to explore the impacts of mass tourism developments in Lucea and Falmouth, focusing on the ways in which these developments have supported or adversely affected the local residents, the activities of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs), fisherfolk and mass tourism employees. To this end, I have focused on how they perceive the opportunities, problems, and challenges associated with these large-scale developments and the responses they have made. To understand the context of these changes, it was also important to assess how the process of tourism development planning unfolded and the extent to which it considered the varying interests of local people.
The following core questions guide this dissertation:

- How do local residents, owners of SMEs, and employees in mass tourism interpret the new opportunities, problems, and challenges associated with large-scale tourism development?

- What actions have local residents, owners of SMEs, and employees in mass tourism spaces taken in response to these opportunities and challenges?

- How do local community members view their role in the planning and decision-making surrounding mass tourism development?

By exploring local perceptions of social, economic, and spatial changes, the ways that people are adapting to the opportunities and challenges associated with the sector, and the dynamics of planning and decision-making, my hope is to contribute to academic debates about the dynamics of tourism development, as well as to help to inform policy planning processes to be responsive to the needs of local residents, service and handicraft SMEs, fisherfolk, and workers in the sector. Falmouth and Lucea were selected as study areas because they both have the primary kinds of mass tourism enclaves in Jamaica and it is important to understand the perspectives of the local people in the context of these different forms of mass tourism spaces, with cruise ship pier-based development in Falmouth and hotel-based development in Lucea.

1.5. Dissertation Outline

The second chapter of this dissertation situates the study with its theoretical framework. The first half of Chapter 2 considers the major themes of this literature, with particular focus on the contributions that researchers have made to understanding the uneven political economic, social, and cultural dynamics of mass tourism. I also explore the problem of dependency that
critical scholars have identified in the Caribbean region and how it came about historically, and draw connections between the region’s history of dependence and the sorts of challenges associated with mass tourism there. In the second half of Chapter 2 I explore the key debates about mass tourism and also seeks to construct a definition that will serve for the basis of my study. Another key concept explored here is enclave tourism, which involves a discussion of how these segregated spaces produce social and economic exclusion as well as contestations over the physical space itself.

Chapter 3 explains the methods used in the research. It begins with a discussion of the preliminary research activities, which included a review of background literature (including news media coverage of these developments) and the recruiting and training of field assistants, followed by a description of and justification for the use of the grounded theory methodological approach for this study. The primary research methods used in this study were depth interviews (local residents, fisherfolk, SME owners, and employees in the mass tourism sector) and semi-structured interviews of key informants (in the Tourism Product Development Company, Urban Development Corporation, Trelawny Parish Council, Hanover Parish Council, and Port Authority of Jamaica). These qualitative methods were complemented by a questionnaire survey of residents of the study areas. The discussion also includes some reflections about the ‘messiness’ of fieldwork, and how I responded to various field-related challenges.

Chapter 4 focuses on one of the key findings of the research: that most of the local residents, SME owners, fisherfolk, and workers employed at the Falmouth Pier and Grand Palladium Hotel believe that the mass tourism development has provided the expected financial benefits. It examines the barriers to the ‘trickle down’ of economic benefits to local communities and the responses of local people to the uneven outcomes, giving special attention to the
experiences and interpretations of those whose livelihoods are connected to the industry. The discussion examines both the similarities and differences in community impacts and responses between Lucea and Falmouth.

Chapter 5 focuses on the social outcomes of mass tourism development in Lucea and Falmouth. Here, I draw on the concept of ‘space purification’ to help interpret the socio-spatial phenomena that emerged from the data. Another major goal was to analyze the key players and mechanisms in the tourism development process, including how the visible and invisible barriers used to control tourism spaces resulted in the marginalization of certain groups of people while promoting the interests of others. The chapter ends by assessing the ways in which local residents and workers in mass tourism are responding to their social and political marginalization, and considers where this might be leading.

Chapter 6 examines how local people view the tourism-induced changes to the coastal and urban environments of Lucea and Falmouth. It gives an overview of the experiences that developing countries such as Jamaica typically face with carrying capacity; that is, balancing large tourist numbers with the resource and infrastructural limits of a given area. It also considers the significant clash of interests between many local people and the governmental agencies and the powerful private-sector actors in mass tourism. This is a major focus of Chapter 6, with the discussion focused around themes of dispossession, dislocation, and inaccessibility, as well as the manner in which local people negotiate conflicts and inconvenience arising from visitor numbers and tourist-oriented infrastructure.

Chapter 7 summarizes the key themes and arguments of the dissertation as a whole. It begins with a reflection on the research process, before reviewing the most important themes that emerged in the empirical evidence. From there, I consider the contribution in relation to literature
in tourism geography, and suggest key issues for assessing how local people interpret the social, economic, cultural, environmental, and political impacts of new developments. I conclude by discussing how my findings and analysis might inform future policy and planning by organizations such as the Jamaica Tourist Board and the Urban Development Corporation.
CHAPTER TWO

POWER, INEQUALITY, AND EXCLUSION IN ENCLAVE TOURISM

2.1. Introduction

This chapter reviews the main bodies of literature informing this dissertation, which centre upon the political economy of tourism development and critical social research into the exclusionary characteristics of mass tourism enclaves. It begins with a discussion of why it is important to take political economy seriously in the study of tourism, something which helped to shift tourism geography from obscurity to relevance in human geography (Gibson, 2009). Second, I discuss how mass tourism has reinforced many of the social, economic and political characteristics of colonialism, using long-established conceptions from dependency theory, which drew attention to deeply entrenched asymmetries of power in which many former colonies of the Global South remained economically and politically dependent on wealthy countries of the Global North far beyond the end of formal colonialism. Third, I delve into the debates and controversies surrounding the notion of sustainable mass tourism, which is advocated as a new goal by some and critiqued as little more than rhetoric by others. This also includes a brief discussion of how the demands associated with mass tourism development place considerable pressures on both the built and marine environments of small island developing countries, which frequently create problems for local residents and non-tourism based livelihoods. Next, attention turns to broader development challenges that the Caribbean region is faced with and how they relate to its history of external political and economic domination. The chapter concludes by considering why the process of reorganizing physical environments for tourist enclaves is entwined with the establishment of unequal economic and social boundaries.
2.2. The Political Economy of Mass Tourism in the Global South

2.2.1. The Nature of Mass Tourism

Mass tourism is widely critiqued in the tourism literature, though there is no consensus on precisely how it is defined. While some studies do not see the need for thorough or detailed conceptual parameters (Andergassen and Candela, 2013; Saufi et al. 2013; Spenceley and Myer, 2012), others have tried (sometimes in fragmented ways) to describe its main features, which include: mass consumption of a place by people (Shaw and Williams, 2002); the construction of highly segregated spaces sometimes referred to as ‘environmental bubbles’ (Cohen, 1972); and, in cases in the Global South, neo-colonial power relations in terms of high degrees of foreign control and race and class hierarchies (Kingsbury, 2011).

Yet while conceptions of mass tourism might vary to some degree (Vainikka, 2014), most accept that one of its dominant forms is packaged holidays with cruise lines and all-inclusive hotels, where all or most guest services (e.g. airport transfers, meals, drinks, snacks, entertainment, sports facilities) along with taxes and gratuities are included in one prepaid package price (Cabezas, 2008; Issa and Jayawardena, 2003). Mass tourism involves the flow of significant numbers of individuals across international borders and involves a significant degree of seasonality, with ‘peaks’ and ‘troughs’, linked to the fact that the motivation to travel to sun, sand, and sea destinations increases during colder seasons in temperate climates (Papatheodorou, 2003; Baysan, 2001; Poon, 1993) – which is why these have been referred to as ‘space-time’ packages (Shaw and Williams, 2002). While mass tourism spaces in the Global South vary, the most popular types are on coastal locations, many of which were once small fishing villages before large-scale tourism was introduced (e.g. Cancun, Mexico; Pattaya, Thailand; and many parts of Caribbean islands, including Jamaica’s north coast).
Mass tourism is a significant aspect of globalization and a powerful reflection of how a range of technological advances – from transportation technologies to the Internet – contribute to the compression of time and space, as travel for vacations has become ever easier, faster, and more convenient. As Cabezas (2008) suggests, information technology has been pivotal in the expansion of all-inclusive packages, both for consumers and for the industry coordinating the logistics. To illustrate the speed and scale of time-space compression in the 20th century, Taylor (1993) notes that it took six hours for Pan Am to transport passengers from Florida to Jamaica in the 1930s, and by the 1950s that was cut roughly in half, and it was subsequently reduced by more than half again in the ensuing decades.

2.2.2. An Introduction to the Problem of Economic Dependency and Mass Tourism

Political economy has become important to the study of mass tourism because the industry not only involves the flow of people but, as one of the world’s largest and fastest growing economic sectors, also involves massive flows of finance, transnational profit-remittance, and various goods and services (Janis, 2014). As a result, Dehorne et al. (2014: 389) suggest that “tourism is not apolitical,” but, on the contrary, is profoundly shaped by historical and contemporary political and economic factors. Contemporary research on the political economy of tourism tends to focus on such things as: global commodity chains (Clancy, 2011; Carty, 2009); governance; foreign direct investments in mass tourism operations (Bramwell, 2011; Cornelissen, 2011); and the unequal access to wealth, power, and resources within destinations of the Global South (Saufi et al. 2014; Janis, 2014; Nelson, 2012; Fletcher, 2011). In a general sense, critical approaches to tourism research are premised on a belief that an understanding of mass tourism cannot be isolated from the wider social and economic systems within which it unfolds (Janis, 2014; Brown and Hall, 2008; Shaw and Williams, 2002; Frank,
1984), which have both commonalities and regional specificities. As early as the 1960s and 1970s, critical scholars began to raise questions about the economic imbalances, environmental problems, and social inequities associated with mass tourism as it was beginning to rapidly expand across parts of the Global South. For some, this led to more radical critiques about foreign domination and oppression, while for others the focus was more on reformist responses, such as calls for more careful management and planning (Gibson, 2009).

Dependency theory was an influential theoretical framework in development studies that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s, geared towards analyzing the enduring economic legacies of imperialism in developing countries. In a broad sense, dependency can be understood as “a process of historical conditioning which alters the internal functioning of economic and social sub-systems within an underdeveloped country” (Britton, 1982: 333). Dependency theorists drew attention to imbalances of power between dominant and dominated regions of the world, stressing that developed or industrialized countries (the ‘core’) tend to economically exploit and politically dominate weaker, developing countries (the ‘periphery’) as they continue to disproportionately advance their own interests, even beyond the period of formal colonialism. Economic exploitation involves the domination of trade and the low prices paid for most of the non-oil primary resources that are extracted (e.g. sugar, coffee, tea, cocoa, rubber, tin, copper, etc.) in relation to the imports that became entrenched in the colonial period, a relation referred to as unequal exchange, which is seen to stifle the basis for internally generated innovation and economic growth. In this, dependency theory was challenging influential Western theories of development in the 1960s which portrayed social evolution and modernization as a more or less universal process, and blamed the underdevelopment of peripheral regions largely on their internal problems such as slowness to cast aside ‘backward’ cultures and practices.
Dependent economic development was seen to be reflected in a number of basic economic characteristics, including: the concentration of exports in a narrow range of products and markets; a high level of foreign control over major sectors (and with it, considerable levels of profit repatriation and dependence on foreign capital and technology); and the overall lack of self-propelled growth and dynamism. The pervasiveness of foreign control over a narrow range of low-value exports was part of why mass tourism came to be seen as an important means of diversification in the Global South, even by some critics of economic dependency. To reluctant supporters, tourism is a sort of necessary evil, an unavoidable means to generate jobs, foreign exchange, and tax revenues, with the trade-off being that it “typically involves labor exploitation, unequal gender relations, cultural destruction, and environmental degradation” (Kingsbury, 2005: 113). In sum, dependency theorists believe that the poverty of the Global South has powerful roots in its history of imperialism and that development of the Global North has been fueled heavily by the wealth extracted from the Global South, in turn contributing to highly uneven forms of development within and between these regions (Frank, 1984).

The importance of approaching tourism through the lens of political economy and dependency has been established for decades (Britton, 1982; Perez, 1975). For instance, Perez (1975: 1) drew upon dependency theory to critically examine the rise of mass tourism in the Caribbean, arguing that it was being dominated by investors from industrialized countries “in collaboration with West Indian elites,” with a result that was effectively delivering “the Caribbean archipelago to another regimen of monoculture.” Yet some suggested that the broad field of tourism research as a whole was slow to respond to these critical perspectives and many have actually “become less theoretical altogether” in the course of the 1980s and 1990s (Clancy, 1999: 2), with advocates of mass tourism arguing that it had the potential to improve the
economy in countries of the Global South by providing employment, foreign exchange and infrastructural development. Nevertheless, some dependency-influenced tourism research continued to stress that the industry is organized far “more for the benefit of capitalist tourism generating countries and not self-generating for the host countries” (Khan, 1994: 988), and sought to illustrate the ways that the industry has provided “an important avenue of capitalist accumulation” (Britton 1991: 451).

2.2.3. Dependency and Mass Tourism in the Global South

Some researchers argue that the nature of mass tourism in the Global South reflects a neocolonial continuation of a master-servant relationship, which amounts to “a way of retaining the subordination of the Third World to the First World” (Mowforth and Munt, 2003: 52). There are three broad economic critiques of mass tourism that pervade much of the critical research on the subject. The first is that the ‘multiplier effect’ promised by champions of mass tourism has consistently failed to translate to major, widely dispersed benefits to ‘host’ communities (Spenceley and Meyer, 2012; Mbaiwa, 2005; Britton, 1982; Matthews, 1977). Second, critics argue that mass tourism development routinely fails to alleviate poverty in the communities in which it occurs, and instead tends to reinforce and exacerbate socio-economic disparities. This is because the spaces of mass tourism primarily generate low-wage, low-skill jobs and fail to complement or enhance other livelihoods, or else serve to displace them altogether (Spenceley and Meyer, 2012). Third, critics claim that mass tourism tends to perpetuate dependency on transnational corporations based in the Global North for expertise, high-waged personnel, technology, and a range of imports, as well as on wealthy citizens of the North for tourist expenditures. Because of this recurring failure to generate sufficient and widely-dispersed benefits for host communities, critical scholars have stressed that mass tourism is regularly
associated with social tensions and dissatisfied local residents (Scheyvens, 2011; Pattullo, 2005; Shaw and Williams, 2002; Opperman and Chon, 1997).

According to Mowforth and Munt (2003: 52), mass tourism in the Global South amounts to “an advanced form of ‘post-colonialism’” in that it retains a fundamental subordination to the Global North. From this perspective, subordinate regions can be seen to comprise what Weaver (1988) terms the ‘pleasure periphery’, as they are politically and economically marginalized within the global economic system, and positioned as spaces of leisure for travelers predominantly from the Global North, as well as sites of profits for various corporations such as hotel chains, airlines, and tour companies. Tourists to tropical spaces tend to have certain expectations and pre-conceived imagery of local cultures and environments, including what will be enticing or unique as they search for an authentic experience, a broad set of desires and beliefs that Urry (1996) has famously described as the ‘tourist gaze’.

There have been many cases where local residents have been physically excluded from some of the most beautiful recreational areas of their countries, such as lost access to beaches (Buzinde and Manuel-Navarrete, 2013; Carlisle and Jones, 2012; Nelson, 2012), due to the privatization of these spaces, with profit-seeking actors limiting access through prohibitive prices and increased barriers and security. Cuba was the first major site of mass tourism in the Caribbean, and prior to the Cuban Revolution in 1959 had begun to pioneer early forms of ‘tourism apartheid’, wherein most Cubans except for a small elite were turned away from prestigious beaches and clubs. As a result, the revolutionary government saw this as an important feature of social inequality in the country and immediately sought to transform the industry (Carty, 2009). It was not until the 1990s that tourism in Cuba began rising again in the face of new political economic pressures, and though the government has insisted on partnering with all
foreign investors in the sector, the dramatic growth of all-inclusive resorts has created new
dynamics of social exclusion. As Sidaway (2007: 334) puts it, there has been a partial return to
the past, as “these exclusive spaces are [again] effectively closed to all but a fraction of Cuba’s
population.”

While the Cuban Revolution contributed to the rise of mass tourism in other parts of the
Caribbean, there were also earlier precedents. One notable case is described by Taylor (1993),
who discusses how the privatization of White Sands Beach (now Doctor’s Cave Beach) in
Montego Bay in 1929 led to increased prices and enduring social exclusion in an area that was
once the primary public space where residents swam, but which is to this day a space dominated
by a combination of tourists and wealthy local residents. Another glaring aspect of social
inequality associated with mass tourism relates to how physical space is segregated along racial
and class lines, something which is especially acute in destinations like the Caribbean and can
serve as a constant reminder of the violence and servitude of the colonial past to local residents
and workers (Sinclair-Maragh and Gursoy, 2015; Gibson, 2009; Munt, 1994; Taylor, 1993).
Taylor (1993: 89) suggests that mass tourism in the Caribbean not only reflects but “resuscitates
the dying master-servant culture” in new ways, with tourism spaces serving as sites “of subtle
black-white confrontation.” While overt conflict is rare, the social dynamics between mostly
low-wage hotel workers and privileged tourists is an uneasy one at best (Kingsbury 2011), and
while these simmering tensions do not tend to unfold within the physically segregated enclaves
they are more likely to if and when tourists venture off-site, where things like aggressive hustling
and petty theft are far more common.

These subtle social tensions are further complicated in the Caribbean by the fact that
different classes of hotel workers are often themselves racially stratified (Carty, 2009). To return
to the case of Cuba, Carty (2009) found that the majority of the resorts there today are managed by expatriates (in spite of the government’s co-ownership arrangements) and many do not appreciate the cultural, social, and economic realities of the country. Further, Blacks represent less than 5% of Cuba’s tourism labour force – a much smaller proportion than the national population – and most of these do not even engage directly with tourists (Carty, 2009). Cabezas (2008) describes a similar racial stratification of labour in the Dominican Republic’s tourism industry. Other common problems associated with the nature of employment in mass tourism are long working hours, seasonal variations in employment, and a high staff turnover (ILO, 2012). In the case of Egypt, for instance, high rates of employee turnover reflect the poor conditions that many workers in the industry face, which in turn is seen to have inhibited the growth of hotel development there (El-Said, 2014). A related critique is that most employment in mass tourism offers little opportunity for promotions while trade union activities tend to be scarce or suppressed (Gibson, 2009).

Another significant labour issue stems from the fact that the management of many all-inclusive hotels codifies the behavior of their workers. Kingsbury (2011) details the ways that worker’s behaviour is conditioned by management at a Sandals Resorts chain in Jamaica, such as always having to smile in the presence of guests and being encouraged to sing, and he argues that workers are controlled to such an extent that they can be seen to form part of the consumed tourism product. Kingsbury (2011: 651) also describes the posting of stern messages in worker-only spaces, out of sight from tourists, reminding them to be happy at all times in spite of how much pressure they are under, with slogans such as “remember the steam kettle; though up to its neck in hot waters, it continues to sing.” Under such circumstances where smiles are prescribed, they can be understood as little more than a curtain of happiness that hides the hardships and
frustrations of workers (Gmelch, 2003), while keeping the tourists feeling welcomed in hotels and various sites.

Another well-established aspect of the working conditions in mass tourism is that many jobs are highly gendered. According to the International Labour Organization (ILO, 2001: 74), in general “women occupy the lower levels of the occupational structure in the tourism labor market, with few career development opportunities and low levels of remuneration.” On the supply side, one of the overarching goals of mass tourism operators is to establish a ‘flexible’ labour force, which can contract during low periods and quickly grow during peak seasons, and women disproportionately bear the brunt of this ‘flexibilization’. Some of this is rooted in different work tasks male and female workers tend to be assigned in tourism spaces, which stems from wider societal norms and the projection of household divisions of labour, such that women tend to predominate in roles such as serving meals, working in kitchens, cleaning rooms, and making beds (Shaw and Williams, 2002). Although some women might, for various reasons, view this gendered division of labor in a positive light, such jobs tend to be more poorly paid and more seasonally variable. For instance, in the Dominican Republic, Cabezas (2008) describes how women only earn 68% of what men do in the tourism industry, made worse by the fact that non-managerial tourism wages are below the national average. These concerns are echoed by Duffy et al. (2015), who describe how women regularly have much heavier workloads than men without fair remuneration and make a call for urgent action to reduce the gender inequalities within the industry. Another gendered dimension of mass tourism in the Global South relates to
the sex trade, which is another way that some social interactions are commercialized (Dogan, 1989), though this is beyond the scope of the discussion for the purposes of this dissertation.²

2.2.4. Research on Local Experiences with Mass Tourism

Empirical studies on the feelings and attitudes of local residents towards enclavic tourism development in the Global South have increased in recent years (Meidmand et al., 2017; Figueroa and Rotarou, 2016; Sdrali et al., 2015), but the experiences and perceptions of residents in sites of newly emerging enclaves remain largely unexplored. In cases like Falmouth and Lucea, the recent onset of mass tourism has led to major changes in the social and economic life of the communities, and it is important to understand community perspectives about this transformation as it is unfolding. Because research on mass tourism is typically set in locations where the industry is well-established, there is not the same ability to examine previous aspects of community life that are being lost and modified, including perceptions of changing space.

There is a strong consensus in the literature that resident perceptions and attitudes have a strong effect on tourist experiences and hence the attractiveness of the destination, as well as the fact that local people within host destinations tend to be more welcoming towards tourists and tourism development in general when they have good perceptions of the industry and its contribution to the life of the community. Conversely, when there are widespread negative perceptions towards the tourism industry within host communities, there is evidence that residents tend to be indifferent or outright unwelcoming to the tourists (Garau et al. 2016).

Various experiences of residents have been documented across destinations in the Global South, including cases in Mexico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and other parts of the

² In some parts of the Caribbean, significant numbers of sex workers are men, with nicknames like ‘beach boys’ in Barbados and ‘rent-a-dreads’ in Jamaica, both of which have become part of the tourism product for certain constituencies (Weichselbaumer, 2012; Rhiney, 2012).
Caribbean. In their study on mass tourism development in three Mexican communities (Cancun, Zihutanejo and Litibu), Monterrubio et al. (2017) identify job creation and an overall improvement in the standard of living in the communities as the main benefits highlighted by the local residents, and set these against the major negative impacts identified by local people, including local exclusion from tourist enclaves, displacement of traditional economic activities like fishing and farming by tourism, and increases in the prices of goods and services. In a study of enclave tourism growth in Akumal, Mexico, Buzinde and Manuel-Navarrete (2013) found that the expansion of the industry resulted in the exclusion of local residents from purchasing properties close to the Spanish-owned Bahia Principe Residential and Golf Resorts, as well as from property ownership near the desirable beachfront. Drawing on research with tourism workers who were prohibited by tourism business operators from buying land and building homes too close to the enclaves because of the view of such settlements, they also showed how restrictions were established so as not to disrupt “the imagined pristine touristic space” (Buzinde and Manuel-Navarrete, 2013: 487) that was being advertised overseas to prospective tourists.

Some attempts have been made to examine the level of trust residents of mass tourism spaces have for political actors (Nunkoo and Gursoy, 2017; Nunkoo, 2015), however little is yet known about how local people feel about their involvement, or lack thereof, in the planning process for mass tourism. Another important but under-studied impact of mass tourism development concerns how local people interpret the spatial changes in their communities resulting from mass tourism development; that is, how do things like physical walls and increased security personnel reshape people’s sense of place? This thesis attempts to shed some light on these perceptions of both procedural and spatial exclusion.
Freitag (1994) documents the highly exclusionary nature of tourism space in Luperon, Dominican Republic, arguing that the resort in that community discourages any form of economic or social exchanges with the locals, save for seasonal jobs within the enclave itself. Although the Dominican Republic has six different ports of call for cruise ships, Mexico has even more, and there are numerous cruise ship piers throughout the Caribbean, there has been little research on the responses of local residents to the particular opportunities and the challenges this form of mass tourism generates, which is another reason why the Falmouth case had the potential to add further insights to the existing scholarship.

2.3. Dependent Development in the Caribbean

Contemporary Caribbean societies demonstrate many traits that are a direct legacy of the slave plantation system, which was the main institutional form that European colonization and exploitation took in the region (Sinclair-Maragh and Gursoy, 2015). In his classic book, *Persistent Poverty: Underdevelopment in Plantation Economies of the Third World*, Beckford (1972) theorized that the plantation was a ‘total institution’, in the sense that it cannot be understood as a mere economic system. Rather, he argued, the plantation amounted to a powerful institutional force that comprehensively shaped the politics, culture, and social fabric of the societies where it was a pervasive form of production, and as such, left an extremely durable imprint in a way that transcends economics. Another reflection of this legacy can be seen in the fact that while most of the Caribbean region has been politically independent for at least a half century, the countries of the region (save Cuba) continue to have limited sovereignty over their own economic affairs (Allahar, 2012). This has manifested in the region’s historical and enduring position in the world economic system as producers of cheap raw materials (e.g. sugar,
bananas, coffee) and as a source of cheap labour for light assembly manufacturing and (in the British Caribbean) call centres. Services such as tourism have also consolidated a certain level of financial, technical, and other forms of dependence on the Global North for foreign direct investment, skill-training, management personnel, and a range of imports, including food (Spenceley and Meyer, 2012; Weiping and Xingqun, 2006).

One of the biggest aspects of the contemporary struggle for economic sovereignty in the contemporary Caribbean relates to the deep and wide-ranging influence of the US, economically, politically, and culturally, which in many ways substituted for the waning European control following independence (Thomas, 1988). This new type of hegemony has been strongly influenced by the region’s close proximity to the US, which in 1823 took it upon itself the exclusive right to ‘protect’ the region from outsiders through the Monroe Doctrine (Allahar, 1995). The rise of neoliberalism further deepened the dynamics of ‘dependent development’ in the Caribbean region. Neoliberalism refers to policies that promote laissez-faire economics and erode the sovereignty of nation-states, such as trade and investment liberalization, privatization, and austerity (Slocum, 2006; Harvey 2005). The key multilateral institutions that shaped the neoliberal economic re-structuring in the Caribbean were the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB), and it is widely recognized that the economic policies designed by these institutions had very polarizing effects, exacerbating already severe inequalities (Janis, 2014; Slocum, 2006).

The IMF and WB exerted their influence over economic restructuring in the Caribbean, and indeed throughout most of the Global South, through Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) (see, for example, Oosterbaan, Arku and Asiedu, 2012. For the champions of SAPs, they are seen to have improved the macroeconomic stability in the face of severe debt problems, but
for critics SAPs did little more than perpetuate a cycle of borrowing, further indebtedness, and external policy decision-making, while the policies never resolved the trade imbalances that were at the root of the debt crisis (Meeks, 2007). In Jamaica, the state has wrestled with a “monumental debt service burden” since the 1970s, that consumed as much as two-thirds of the annual government budget, a dynamic which in turn “starves social investment” (Weis, 2004: 483). The latter involves the reduction of support for a range of public services such as health, education, housing, welfare programmes, and food subsidies, the polarizing effect of which is compounded by the implementation of wage freezes geared to fostering competitiveness.

Neoliberal policies profoundly affected the decline of agriculture across much of the Caribbean (Slocum, 2006; Weis, 2004; Thomas, 1988). In Jamaica, neoliberal policies in the 1980s and 1990s had a devastating effect on agricultural production, as the export-oriented plantation sector and the domestically-oriented small farm sector both struggle to compete amidst liberalization, reduced state support, and increasing competition (Weis, 2004). The eastern Caribbean has experienced an even more extreme agricultural decline, as banana farming lost its preferential markets in Europe and went “from riches to rags since the 1990s” (Klak et al., 2011: 34).

Neoliberal policies in the Caribbean did help to build a competitive niche in light manufacturing (Slocum, 2006), like garments and electronics assembly, as well as services like call centres. Key policies here were trade and investment liberalization and the establishment of Export Processing Zones (EPZs), also known as ‘Free Zones’ (in the sense of being free of taxation or labour and environmental regulations). However, these enclaves have experienced booms and busts, with Jamaica’s garment sector a notorious case of a short boom and sudden bust. By far the biggest sector where foreign investment has flowed throughout the Caribbean
has been to tourism, with transnational hotels exhibiting a similar spatial pattern in which little or no linkages are formed or maintained with the rest of the national economy. These economic leakages tend to be highest in the poorest economies and in undiversified small island developing countries (Spenceley and Meyer, 2012; Jayawardena and Ramajeesign, 2003). Leakages of tourist expenditures have been found to be as high as 75% (Spenceley and Meyer, 2012), which occurs through corporations returning profits to foreign headquarters, the payment of salaries to foreign executives, and high import costs for a range of things, such as machinery, equipment, and food.

2.4. Mass Tourism Enclaves: Problems and Prospects

2.4.1. An Overview of Mass Tourism in Jamaica

The rise of tourism in Jamaica actually began in the late 19th century, but the modern tourism sector cannot be seen to have really emerged until after the 1960s, with the increasing access of air travel to North American and European travelers and the increasing promotion by the government of Jamaica after its Independence in 1962. This transition can be understood as going from “class to mass tourism” (Dodman, 2004: 155), considering that the first wave of tourists to the island comprised only a few wealthy Europeans. However, the early growth of the industry in the 1960s largely stopped in the 1970s, as the left-leaning (at the time) Peoples National Party (PNP) was reluctant to promote foreign-oriented mass tourism as a central pillar of the economy. During this period, PNP Prime Minister Michael Manley called instead for increasing self-sufficiency, a focus on the productive economy, and a ‘Jamaicanization’ of the tourism industry. For various reasons, including the political instability, partial attempts to nationalize the tourism industry, and US propaganda that surrounded the 1976 election,
Jamaica’s tourist economy declined dramatically between 1975 and 1977, with visitor arrivals falling by 30% (Chambers and Airey, 2001). However, US tourists soon returned and the sector began to grow again after the PNP took out a series of IMF loans starting in 1977, which signaled the end of its fleeting economic nationalism, including giving up on any plan to partially nationalize the tourism industry. Mass tourism really took off in Jamaica after the 1980 elections, when the Jamaica Labour Party came to power, led by Edward Seaga. In addition to pursuing a heavy dose of IMF and WB-led structural adjustment, the Seaga government was intent on restoring a friendly relationship between Jamaica and the US and placed a major emphasis on tourism expansion – with Seaga himself both a big promoter and individual investor.

Jamaica is an archetypal ‘sun, sea and sand’ destination, characterized by hundreds of miles of attractive white sand beaches; some championship golf courses; hundreds of luxury hotels; themed parks and restaurants; cliff diving and water sports; casino gambling; and cruise ship ports. Jamaica receives most of its total stay-over arrivals from the US (roughly 64%), followed by Canada (roughly 17%) and the United Kingdom (roughly 12%) (CTO, 2015). Although there have been efforts by the Tourism Product Development Company (TPDCo) to diversify the 3 ‘S’s, mass tourism remains the dominant form of tourism in Jamaica (Kingsbury, 2011; Issa and Jayawardena, 2003).

One of the most significant turning points in the country’s tourism development was the establishment of the all-inclusive concept during the 1970s and 1980s, which was spearheaded by Super Clubs and Sandals chains (Kingsbury, 2011), and arose partly due to the social tensions of the times. As indicated, the 1970s were filled with political and economic instability, and the
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3 These attempts include more marketing of nature-based activities such as river rafting, tubing, zip-lining, falls-climbing and marine tours. Also on stream are a number of cultural attractions such as the Bob Marley Museum, the Trench Town Culture Yard, Plantation tours, and the annual Reggae Sumfest music festival.
neoliberal economic restructuring beginning in the late 1970s and deepening in the 1980s led to falling wage levels, deteriorating public services, and a spike in criminal activities, especially those associated with the drug trade. In this context of insecurity, the rise of all-inclusive resorts enabled the tourism sector to grow by responding to the demand of tourists for secure spaces.

Jamaica has experienced consistent increases in international visitor arrivals and expenditure for decades, with only a few bumps. The most notable of these dips came in the wake of the terrorist events of 9-11 in 2001, and a smaller dip in 2010 following a period of intense gang conflicts\(^4\) (see Table 2.1).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Stopover Arrivals</th>
<th>Total Cruise Arrivals</th>
<th>Total Visitor Arrivals</th>
<th>Total Visitor Expenditure (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,225,287</td>
<td>673,690</td>
<td>1,898,977</td>
<td>1,197,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,266,366</td>
<td>865,419</td>
<td>2,131,785</td>
<td>1,209,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,678,905</td>
<td>1,336,994</td>
<td>3,015,899</td>
<td>1,870,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,921,670</td>
<td>909,619</td>
<td>2,831,289</td>
<td>2,001,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2,080,181</td>
<td>1,423,797</td>
<td>3,503,978</td>
<td>2,247,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,123,042</td>
<td>1,568,702</td>
<td>3,691,744</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**2.4.2. Enclaves and Space Production**

Scholars have given increasing attention to the role of the constructs of *place* and *space* in critical conceptualizations of ‘development’ (Sidaway, 2007). In this sub-section, I seek to build a working definition of ‘enclavic’ tourist spaces, as well as to assess the social and economic implications of such spaces within the context of mass tourism development. In much

\(^4\) In the middle of 2010, the US requested the Jamaican government to extradite drug lord and Shower Posse (gang) leader, Christopher, ‘Dudus’ Coke on drug trafficking charges. During this time, the government placed Kingston under a state of emergency after a series of shootings and fire bombings within the city.
of the Global South, tourist enclaves are frequently owned by huge transnational corporations or by domestic elites, who seek to control the nature of the product and capture as much associated revenue as possible by keeping tourists in highly segregated spaces, or what amounts to an ‘environmental bubble’ (Britton, 1982).

This ‘bubble’ can either be an all-inclusive hotel, cruise ship, or contained cruise pier and can be broadly conceptualized as a space “that is in some ways isolated and separated from wider society” (Weaver, 2005: 168). It produces an atmosphere in which locals are perceived and treated as ‘outsiders’ while the tourists and domestic elites are treated as ‘insiders’ (Schmid, 2006). At its most extreme, this socio-spatial segregation can be seen as ‘tourism apartheid’ (Carty, 2009) and ‘mini-cities’ (Cabezas, 2008). Cohen (2004: 38) encapsulates how mass tourism separates tourists from the wider ‘host’ community:

The mass tourist travels in a world of his own, surrounded by, but not integrated in, host society. He meets the representatives of the tourist establishment – hotel managers, tourist agents, guides – but only seldom the natives. For the natives, in turn, the mass tourist is anonymous.

An enclave therefore not only implies physical isolation but also economic and social segregation of the tourist space and tourist from the rest of the social and economic fabric of the destination. For example, in a study of enclave tourism in the Okavango Delta, Botswana, Mbaiwa (2005) concludes that this development has made little contribution to the local economy, stressing that 84.5% of the tourism facilities in Botswana are entirely or partly foreign owned, with much of the revenues remitted to the parent companies in the Global North. These findings are consistent with other critical scholars’ such as Pratt (2015), Anderson (2011), and Brohman (1996), who lament that enclavistic tourism tends to make poor linkages with the rest of the economy and provide mostly menial employment, such that it might be seen as a new type of ‘internal colonialism.’ Critical scholars strongly argue that if mass tourism in the Global South is
to become more equitable then the nation state must spearhead the planning process rather than relying on liberalizing investment and trade to enable foreign corporations.

In sum, it is important to see tourist enclaves as not only physical spaces, but also in relation to social, political, historical and economic processes, and as “a complex web of relations of domination and subordination of solidarity… in the production of neo-capitalist society” (Massey, 1994: 81). As the empirical chapters in this dissertation illustrate, the establishment of mass tourism can lead to significant reconfigurations of space beyond the enclave, which profoundly alter how residents perceive their own place in their community.

2.4.3. Enclaves and Space ‘Purification’

Reference to social exclusion first emerged in the early 1970s, and was initially largely used to describe citizens without social insurance coverage such as the disabled and drug abusers. In the 1980s, the term took on wider connotations of socially disadvantaged status, including those who are unemployed, have low incomes, poor housing, poor health, and suffer from various other problems created by rising social inequality (Miller, 2006). While social exclusion can carry varying associations, for the purposes of this study I take it to mean:

…a situation in which multiple deprivation prevents individuals from participating in important areas of society’s activities. Thus the socially excluded might be unable to find work, take part in leisure activities or actively participate in a society’s politics beyond voting at elections (Haralambos and Holborn, 2000: 291-292).

Some scholars now favour the use of social exclusion over poverty, as the latter tends to be based on a more straightforward measure of material wealth and/or income level, whereas the notion of social exclusion focuses attention “on processes that can lead to a state of prolonged poverty” (Brooks, 2008: 164) thereby broadening the scope for how we think about the most deprived groups in society. Further, because there is a strong linkage between the organization of space
and the structure of social life, it is also important to think in terms of ‘socio-spatial exclusion’, which highlights the importance of space and boundaries in the social controls that regulate the behaviours of people who are marginalized in society (Brooks, 2008).

I believe that it is important to consider the inability to access and afford vacations as a type of socio-spatial exclusion, as deep social inequalities are entwined with the reconfiguration of space and the loss of access to certain areas. This exclusion of some also relates, in turn, to a process of ‘space purification’ for tourists, which can involve increasing control over access by both the state (e.g. police) and the private sector (e.g. fences, security guards). Space purification also involves the tourists themselves, to some degree, as “within these spaces, tourist behaviour is monitored and social pressure is exerted to ensure its compliance with ‘enclavie’ rules” (Jordan, 2008: 295).

The twin processes of social exclusion and space purification mean that enclave tourism sites are typified by significant boundaries and enforcement geared to keeping out the undesirables of society. These “formalized social regulatory regimes” (Jordan, 2008: 295) serve to further reinforce and deepen the marginalization. Police and security guards are a telling hallmark of enclave tourism – and are ever-present around the case study sites in Lucea and Falmouth – needed to keep at bay “the different kind of people who threaten disorder” (Sibley, 1995: 46). This puts enclaves in stark contrast to ‘heterogeneous’ tourist spaces (Oppermann, 1993), such as those that prevail across much of the Global North, which allow for significantly more interaction between tourists and local residents and environments.

Another way of understanding the boundaries associated with space purification is as “conditioning activities and creating opportunities according to the distribution of power in the social system” (Sibley, 1995: 76). This relates to a concept introduced earlier, the tourist bubble,
such as an all-inclusive hotel or a cruise ship or pier, within which are what I call ‘sub-bubbles’ – a dimension of socio-spatial exclusion within enclave tourism that is largely ignored by scholars. One exception, however, is an ethnographic study by Kingsbury (2011), in which he examines what he calls socio-spatial sublimation in one of the Sandals resorts in Jamaica, highlighting how the tourists have the best eating facilities while the hotel workers are separated and confined to a much less attractive and prestigious lunch room. In other words, the workers are disciplined to have limited interaction with tourists outside of their service functions (serving food, waiting tables, cleaning rooms and grounds), and get confined to a ‘sub-bubble’ when it is their mealtime. Additionally, the air-conditioned shuttle buses that mass tourists typically travel on between the hotel or Pier and the attractions, can be considered another type of bubble – “mobile bubbles.”

When cruise ship tourists visit ports their movements are organized to keep them within a familiar tourist bubble of exclusive souvenir shops and restaurants on shore, owned by the cruise ship company, thereby isolating them from the wider local environment (Hall and Tucker, 2004). This was highlighted in a study by Jaakson (2004), who analyzed the movements and activities of cruise-ship passengers in the port of Zihuatanejo in Mexico and found them to be governed by powerful spatial boundaries. Jaakson also stresses that while spaces like cruise ship piers and all-inclusive resorts represent powerful bubbles for tourists, it is important to acknowledge their flipside: profound socio-spatial exclusion for most of the residents of the ‘host’ community.

2.5. Sustainable Mass Tourism in the Global South

Another way that mass tourism is understood to affect local communities is through the degradation of local environments, and risks are often significant when large numbers of visitors
(and associated demands) are situated on small islands and in fragile coastal ecosystems (Peeters, 2012; Mavris, 2011). Further, it is widely recognized that poor planning or inadequate regulations and oversight contribute to environmental problems (Matarrita-Cascante, 2010; Beladi et al. 2009; Pattullo, 2005), such that developers of mass tourism sites are able to externalize “costs through environmental depletion and degradation” (Meeks, 2007: 87).

Over the last two decades or so, critical scholars have drawn attention to the sustainability challenges posed by mass tourism development, and concerns about water, energy, and other resource consumption, and the need to increase efficiency and reduce pollution. Industry leaders have increasingly recognized these issues as well, partly because they bear on operational costs and partly because they affect the long-term beauty and viability of the destination as an attractive place to visit (Juvan and Dolnicar, 2014; Fennell, 2008; Hunter and Shaw, 2007; Buckley, 2003).

One indication of the increasing attention to interrelated concerns about resources, pollution, and efficiency is the rise of the concept of sustainable mass tourism (Peeters, 2012; Weaver, 2012), though according to Weaver (2012), as yet this largely amounts to a ‘paradigm nudge’ rather than a fundamental paradigm shift. This implies that mass tourism operations like large hotels and cruise ships are increasingly paying attention to things like recycling and energy and water conservation policies in order to mitigate some of the obvious environmental impacts and reduce costs. This has also translated into marketing exercises, as industry-driven accolades (e.g. the Green Globe Award) and certifications that can make various destinations appear more appealing to potential tourists (Priego et al. 2011). Meanwhile, the bigger concerns about the enormous fossil energy consumption and carbon dioxide emissions associated with long-distance vacations have become increasingly pressing, and given these costs (along with inevitable
resource limits) it is reasonable to wonder whether there could ever truly be sustainable environmental practices within mass tourism development.

It is also important to recognize that the impacts of tourism on the environment can vary spatially and temporally (Shaw and Williams, 2002), which is another aspect of their uneven burdens (Chok et al., 2007). The concentration of large numbers of tourists and tourism activities in certain spaces entails large ecological footprints. Put simply, “the demands of mass tourism for natural resources and environmental services are huge” (Thomas-Hope, 2007: 93). As noted, water is one major aspect of this, as mass tourism spaces require large volumes of water for various activities (e.g. swimming, golf courses, and post-beach showers), to an extent that mass tourists are estimated to use six times as much water as local residents on a per capita basis (Pattullo, 2005), which sometimes result in water shortages among local residents. The net result of unsustainable water use in mass tourism spaces, coupled with climate change, is that it can reduce access to water which can in turn become a source of conflict between tourists, tourism businesses, residents and the environment (Hall and Page, 2014). To make matters worse in some areas, such as the Caribbean, the peak tourist season coincides with the dry season, as tourists mainly come during periods of sun not rain.

Another growing problem in coastal areas is the disturbance and destruction of sensitive ecosystems like coral reefs, seagrass meadows, and mangroves, which occurs through dredging, land reclamation, resort and various infrastructure construction, and sewage loads. Coral reefs are both valuable for tourism and at risk from it, as they help to protect the miles of beautiful white sand beaches that tourists love so much and are a major recreational attraction, at the same time as they are widely imperiled by pollution loads (as well as, increasingly, by climate change and in particular ocean acidification). In Jamaica, a World Resources Institute (WRI, 2011)
report warned that further loss of coral reefs could more than double beach erosion rates in the island’s major beach resort towns. Estimates suggest that by 2021, the north coast towns with the highest concentrations of mass tourism spaces would experience the hardest blows as beach erosion rates could increase by more than 50% in Montego Bay, 70% in Ocho Rios, and 100% in Negril over a 10-year period. Further, it is estimated that increased beach erosion could drive between 9000 and 18,000 foreign tourists away from Jamaica each year, costing the country up to US$19 million in lost tourism revenue per year (World Resources Institute, 2011). In Negril, coastal waters suffer from excess nutrients contained in sewage discharged from nearby hotels, and in Falmouth environmentalists criticized the fact that approximately 20 hectares of coral reef and seagrass cover were damaged during the dredging phase of the pier construction (Kenny et al. 2012).

2.6. Conclusions

As mass tourism has grown in scale, increasing critical research has emerged since the 1970s to shed light on a range of problems and imbalances associated with this expansion. Critical scholars have drawn attention to the negative implications of the industry in a wide range of settings. Pervasive problems associated with mass tourism enclaves include: the predominance of low-wage, low-skill jobs (often in highly gendered ways); the magnification of spatial and social disparities; the distortion and commodification of cultures; and the negative environmental impacts such as heavy water demands and nutrient loads that can affect surrounding ecosystems like coral reefs (ultimately undermining an important part of the destination’s pull for tourists). This chapter has also emphasized how the dilemmas posed by mass tourism do not unfold in isolation from wider economic challenges, and central to this was the rise of neoliberal policy prescriptions and the desire for foreign investment and “outwards-oriented neoliberal
development strategies” (Brohman, 1996: 50). This chapter has also stressed how the heavy
dependence upon external actors has important roots in a much older history of colonialism, and
suggested the enduring relevance of the dependency framework to understand the continuities
between historic patterns of resource extraction and contemporary development problems
associated with economies based around a small range of raw materials. This helps to illuminate
why mass tourism was widely promoted as part of efforts to diversity economies, but fails to
resolve deeper development problems. When these problems are viewed together, critical
scholars generally agree that peripheral countries have little power in the short term to transform
the underlying global inequalities associated with the industry, and recognize that it is more
likely that small states are instead more likely to pursue policies to mitigate its most severe social
and environmental problems (Meyer, 2012; Brown and Hall, 2008; Weibing and Xingqun,
2006). Yet even if modest reforms seem more politically and economically plausible, there are
still important questions to be asked about how host populations can benefit in more meaningful
and equitable ways from the industry, and about how people interpret the social and spatial
changes in their communities in order to mitigate the alienating dynamics of mass tourism. In the
next chapter, attention turns to how I set about collecting data on the impacts of mass tourism
development in two Jamaican communities.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODS

3.1. Introduction

The overall goal of the methodology was to acquire knowledge that would help me to understand the perspectives of the local residents, SME operators, fisherfolk and employees in tourism enclaves in both in Lucea and Falmouth on the onset of mass tourism development. The grounded theory was the overarching approach utilized in the research process with specific methods being: interviews, observation and visual analysis, complemented by data from a questionnaire survey. The grounded theory was considered the ideal approach because it involves progressive integration categories of meanings from the data which allowed for theory-building. Although both qualitative and quantitative methods were drawn on, this study is to be considered largely qualitative, complemented by data from the questionnaire survey. The methodological approach does not follow a true mixed methods framework because the study was generally guided by the principles of constructivism and was only complemented by survey in order for greater generalization.

One of the first steps in preparing for fieldwork, and productive interviews and conversations, is to understand the local context (Michaud, 2010), which in my case was aided by the fact that I am from and have lived much of my life on the north coast of Jamaica. There has been a great deal written about the relative value of ‘insiders’ versus ‘outsiders’ doing community-based research, and some of the specific advantages insiders have with respect to research include the fact that they are already immersed in the culture, and therefore have a strong grasp of the local dialect, norms, and social cues, as well as typically being able to locate
and connect to gatekeepers more easily. While I am an insider to the north coast of Jamaica, I did not previously have extensive relations in the communities of Lucea and Falmouth, apart from a few helpful connections with key informants.

After completing my Master’s thesis in 2008 at the University of the West Indies (UWI)-Mona, which focused on the growth of cultural tourism sites in Kingston, Jamaica, I conveyed my recommendations to both government officials and private sector representatives in the hope of informing tourism planning and policy. This research experience helped motivate me to want to do socially significant and policy-relevant research on mass tourism in my home region, and was subsequently augmented by my involvement in the ‘Vernacular Architecture Forum’, a roundtable held in Falmouth in June 2011 that was organized by researchers from the University of Virginia. In addition to stimulating my interest in exploring challenges surrounding mass tourism development on the north coast, participating in this forum also generated some valuable connections with governmental and private sector interests as well as community stakeholders concerned with tourism development in the area, including representatives from the Ministry of Tourism and the Trelawny Parish Council.

As discussed in Chapter 1, the central objective of this research was to understand the perspectives of the local population on the dramatic social and economic transformations associated with the onset of mass tourism, by focusing on two case studies which are fairly new to mass tourism development. To accomplish this, I pursued interview research with local residents, SME owners, fisherfolk, and employees in mass tourist enclaves in the towns of Falmouth and Lucea. As my research unfolded, I was very successful in gaining access to most of the participants I contacted. Although they did not state this, I assume the unwillingness to participate was influenced by the fact that there was considerable tension between management
and the hotel staff during the time of my fieldwork, including demonstrations over wages and working conditions.

This chapter explores my journey from research design to fieldwork and writing up, as well as the ups and downs I experienced along the way. I begin with a chronological description of the research activities before explaining the research approach and data analysis using grounded theory.

3.2. Research Timeline

The initial phase of my fieldwork occurred between February to April 2013, using Montego Bay as a home base. There, I began to review key policy and planning documents, examine news reports about both developments, and map out the local experts I wanted to contact for my initial interviews, and I finalized these plans after receiving clearance from the Non-Medical Research Ethics Board (NMREB) at Western University that spring (Appendix 1). The review of planning documents, news reports, and scholarly literature helped me refine the interview schedules and questionnaires, which had been constructed before passing the NMREB, and ultimately enhanced the actual interview process. As an alumna of UWI-Mona, I had access to their online resources which proved important since many locally-relevant materials were not available at Western University.

Between May and July 2013, I recruited and trained six field assistants and paid multiple reconnaissance visits to the study sites which were useful as they helped to establish an understanding of potential stakeholders and gatekeepers in each of the two study sites. They also helped me and my field assistants get acquainted with the physical layout of the communities and to compare empirical observations with the official maps we had. The field assistants were trained in the area of the administration of the questionnaire surveys; they were not part of the
interviews. Three field assistants were stationed in one study area at a time. During the preliminary community visits, test interviews were conducted with small business operators and residents of both study areas which helped me refine my data collection plans and interview instrument. Additionally, questionnaires were issued to five residents in each of the study areas for feedback, and after these were completed I made minor edits before final printing, so that the instrument was more relevant and appropriate to the social, economic and political settings of the study areas and would be better understood by participants.

After being away from Jamaica for a year and a half between September 2011 to February 2013, these preliminary field activities were essential to re-grounding myself and preparing for the research process, especially because a considerable amount of structural and spatial changes had unfolded over this time (indeed, the transformation in such a short period was remarkable, and also further stoked my interest in the project). Major changes included alterations to the direction of traffic, the opening of some once-pedestrianized areas to traffic, and the construction of new buildings along with the demolition of others. I also re-established affiliations with the Department of Geography and Geology at UWI-Mona. This helped to foster a constructive intellectual dialogue where I could share ideas and emerging findings from my research, and receive helpful feedback from other scholars and practitioners both during the process of data collection and beyond. The primary data collection took place between August 2013 and January 2014, a time frame which was advantageous in helping me to better understand the seasonal variations in the industry and community rhythms from the slower late summer and fall period to the start of the busy winter period. I pursued the qualitative interviews myself, and relied on my research assistants to conduct the surveys.
3.3. Research Approach

Qualitative research methods are at the core of this research, supplemented by data from a questionnaire survey. In-depth interviews were pursued with a purposive sample of town residents, owners of SMEs, fisherfolk, and employees in mass tourism operations, and semi-structured qualitative interviews were pursued with 5 key informants (discussed further below). This was followed by a questionnaire survey that was administered to a random sample of households. Table 3.1 sums up the key sources of data for this study and their respective sample sizes.

Table 3.1. An Overview of Research Participants in the Two Study Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH METHODS</th>
<th>FALMOUTH</th>
<th>LUCEA</th>
<th>TOTAL SAMPLE (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-depth interview (with employees in mass tourism operations, fisherfolk, and owners of small and medium enterprises).</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth interview (with local residents).</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interview (with key informants in the Urban Development Corporation; Trelawny Parish Council; Hanover Parish Council; Tourism Product Development Company; Port Authority of Jamaica)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Survey (with local residents).</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community observation, photography and note-taking (Falmouth and Lucea).</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In my research design, I chose to pursue qualitative interviews first in order to explore some of the major themes in detail, which also allowed me to tweak the survey before administering it, a sequence that was used in a number of other tourism studies (e.g. Rittichainuwat and Rattanaphinanchai 2015; Chhabra 2010; Diedrich and Garcia-Buades 2009; Andereck et al. 2005; Ap and Crompton 1998). I utilized qualitative research methods for two primary reasons. First, qualitative research can help make connections between human perceptions and actions, and shed light on social processes in deeper ways than would be possible through surveys. It can also lead to new insights on the topic under examination, which
might otherwise have been inaccessible and unforeseen, and this can help inform further research, including refining subsequent questionnaire surveys, as occurred in my case (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2010). Second, qualitative research has the potential to provide detail explanation into social phenomenon which quantitative research cannot (Creswell, 1998). One of the ways this capacity is often described is that surveys can provide answers to the ‘what’ and ‘who’ aspects of particular phenomena under study, but qualitative research methods can allow researchers to seek answers into questions about ‘why’ this phenomenon occurs or ‘how’ it plays out. In short, while surveys can have great value in enabling generalizations, qualitative approaches can unveil deeper insights into dynamics of power, social change, exploitation, as well as into people’s perceptions and motivations as they confront social inequalities (Simpson, 2007) – such as the major transformations in public space, livelihoods, and community dynamics wrought by the sudden development of mass tourism. This is a major part of why some are calling for more qualitative research methods to be used in tourism studies, in the belief that surveys often focus on identifying general patterns without sufficient insight into the dynamics underlying those patterns (Rittichainuwat and Rattanaphinanchai, 2015). According to Deery et al. (2012: 65), too much tourism research “tend[s] to provide lists of impacts without a clear understanding of how the perceptions of these impacts were formed.”

While there are various ways to approach qualitative research (Cresswell, 2007), grounded theory provided the best way for me to think about my objectives. One reason for this is that analyzing data throughout the process of collecting it can help to determine when the saturation level is reached (Guthrie et al. 2004; Sandelowski, 1995). Another advantage to this approach is that it encourages the research process to move beyond description and to seek out explanation and generate new research questions and ways of approaching problems (Corbin and
Strauss, 1998; Glaser and Strauss, 1967). The basic approach to grounded theory is summed up by Corbin and Strauss (1998:12) as:

…theory that was derived from data, systematically gathered and analyzed through the research process. In this method, data collection, analysis, and eventual theory stand in close relationship to one another. A researcher does not begin a project with a preconceived theory in mind…

3.3.1. In-depth Interviews

In-depth interviews are widely recognized as the primary means through which researchers can interrogate theories formed during observation, verify knowledge, or further explore multiple meanings behind actions (Gubrium and Holstein, 2001). My goal with in-depth interviews was to examine how different segments of Falmouth and Lucea interpret the process associated with large-scale tourism developments and the changes it has brought to their communities, as well as the nature of their responses. This was also partly motivated by a belief that while popular discussions surrounding tourism are dominated by the industry and allied actors within the state, no other method gives as much voice to ‘invisible people’ to express their perspectives in their own terms (Ortiz, 2001). I also valued the flexibility of this method, as my instruments (see Appendices) ensured that I covered a consistent range of issues while also allowing me to adjust the order in which questions were asked to facilitate the flow of the dialogue and ask additional questions as unanticipated ideas arose from the respondent’s answers (Charmaz, 2006).

The task of sampling in qualitative research is not always straightforward, especially in comparison to quantitative researchers who seek randomness and replicability, where the task is to target people who can provide valuable insights and interpretations based on various things like their vocation or position in the community. In the process of sampling, “qualitative
researchers must rely on (a) past experience and knowledge of the subject matter; and (b) ongoing monitoring during the data-gathering period” (Roller and Lavrakas, 2015: 26-27) to enhance the credibility of the data collection process and collected data.

I determined sampling strategies on the basis of my research aims. The main types of qualitative sampling are convenience, purposive, selective, theoretical, within-case and snowball sampling (Creswell, 2013). Convenience sampling, in essence, means that respondents are selected from a population based on accessibility to the researcher. Convenience sampling is useful in contexts where it is difficult to employ probability sampling techniques. In this research, I adopted convenience sampling to select participants among residents, SME owners, fisherfolk, and employees, because the context of my study sites made it difficult to systematically select the respondents. As well, I was not seeking to draw upon any particular expertise, but rather was concerned with learning from a range of experiences and perspectives held by people from these different vantages. Most respondents were approached at various locations in each study site, such as the fishing villages, town centres and in the vicinity of the community clinics in both towns, in the hope of increasing the diversity of perspectives. But SME operators were approached and interviewed in their places of work.

A general guideline for qualitative research is that the size of the sample of interviewees should hinge on the amount of data needed for the thematic saturation (Elo et al. 2014; Sandelowski, 1995). Nevertheless, a total of 30 to 50 interviews is generally considered an
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5 The working definition of a SME used in this research follows the Jamaica Ministry of Commerce (2013), which is a small business that has between 4-10 employees and/or an annual turnover of over J$10,000,000 but less than J$40,000,000 per year. A medium enterprise is defined as a business having between 11-50 employees and/or an annual turnover that falls between J$40,000,000 and J$150,000,000.
adequate sample for a grounded theory research (Morse, 1994), though for studies with a narrow scope, the saturation can be reached earlier from a smaller sample (Munhall, 2007). For this study, I aimed for a total of 50 interviews, which were pursued roughly equally between the two cases, and as I transcribed the interviews I felt confident that I was able to achieve data saturation. A total of 45 interviews were done: 23 in Falmouth and 22 in Lucea. The interviews were conducted in various places that were convenient to the participants. All key informant interviews took place in their offices, and arranged through special appointments with only one exception. Interviews with residents, SME operators, and employees in mass tourism spaces mostly took place in a nearby restaurant or around the community health centres, and interviews with the fisherfolk took place in the vicinity of the fishing beaches. Participants were given letters of information and their permission received before the start of the interviews. Whereas the key informants were intentionally selected based on the relevance of their organization to tourism and community development, all other interviewees were selected randomly based on willingness and availability. On average, each interview lasted for around 40 minutes.

3.3.2. Key Informant Interviews

I chose to purposively sample government officials for their particular expertise in the planning and implementation of mass tourism development in Falmouth and Lucea. This group of five key informants included officials involved in: the Tourism Product Development Company (TPDCo), an arm of the Ministry of Tourism; the Urban Development Corporation (UDC), which is responsible for infrastructure and community aesthetics; the Port Authority of Jamaica (PAJ), which was a co-participant in the construction of the Falmouth Pier and oversees safety issues surrounding ship-docking; and the Trelawny and Hanover Parish Councils, which have a range of responsibilities with respect to infrastructure planning and management. My goal
with these interviews was not to achieve saturation, given that they there were only five and they came from different institutional vantages, but to gain insights from actors in a range of key agencies. According to Simpson (2007: 190), the process of interviewing local and national planning officials and policy-makers should seek to “identify and assess [their] priorities, needs, goals and requirements,” since they can have considerable influence on tourism planning and policy-making.

I approached this group with semi-structured interviews in order to ensure that I covered the key set of issues I sought their insights on, making reference to the background of the organizations and their roles in mass tourism development (Appendix 5). In particular, I wanted to learn how those in varying levels of government described past and future policy and planning processes surrounding tourism development, the ways they explained the importance of mass tourism, and their perspectives on the associated social and economic challenges and how adverse effects might be mitigated. This set of participants also provided an opportunity to explore the dynamics of decision-making and the extent to which government representatives felt that the concerns of local residents, SME owners, and fisherfolk were taken into account. I circulated letters explaining the purpose of the study and soliciting their participation to these informants in advance of the interview, and followed this up with phone calls and e-mails, and the interviews themselves generally lasted for around 40 minutes each. It may be of concern to some methodology scholars that five key informants are significantly lower than what the usual range of saturation is. Jamaica, being a relatively small country does not have any much wider array of agencies that influence tourism- all the major planning agencies have been included.
3.3.3. Community Observation, Photography, and Note-taking

The use of visual analysis has become increasingly common as a means of inquiry (Hunt, 2014; Rose, 2014; Oldrup and Carstensen, 2012), complimenting field notes, as part of community immersion and day-to-day study of the life of a community. In this research, I made use of photography as a tool of field data collection to compliment my written notes and observations, capturing important aspects of tourism facilities and activities, visible impacts on the local environment, and to illustrate restricted access of local residents to the enclave spaces. Photos were taken on a regular basis and stored digitally in folders that were thematically arranged on the computer. Additionally, photos and figures found in the newspapers and on the Falmouth Pier's and Grand Palladium's website were also collected and used, and I integrated these throughout the results chapters in order to illustrate or amplify key insights from participants and overarching themes.

3.3.4. Questionnaire Surveys

The second phase of my fieldwork involved quantitative data collection. There has been a widespread use of quantitative methods to understand the impacts of tourism on local residents and ‘host’ communities over the past few decades (Kim, Gursoy and Lee, 2006; Choi and Sirakaya, 2005; Jurowski and Gursoy, 2002; Andriotos and Vaghan, 2003; Bescuilides et al. 2002; Akis et al. 1996), but this has been critiqued for analyzing specific impacts without providing in-depth insights into the reasons for residents’ perceptions (Deery et al., 2012). I primarily used surveys to triangulate some of the key themes identified in the qualitative research and to compare basic aspects of household attitudes between the case study sites. Collecting data through the qualitative interviews and community immersion prior to the surveys gave me the opportunity to analyze and identify key themes which could be further fortified by survey data
and compared between sites, and these considerations aided in drafting and finalizing the categories and questions on the survey instrument.

The questionnaire survey was conducted at the household level. Household surveys have become a significant source of data collection on social processes over the last 60 to 70 years (UN, 2005). The sample was collected using a sampling formula derived from Harris and Jarvis (2011), drawing from the 5508 households in the study area (see calculations below). A total of 300 heads of households were surveyed exceeding the minimum calculated sample of 229. The questionnaires were administered face-to-face by interviewers, which ensured a significantly higher response rates and provided a good opportunity to screen question on age. It also had the advantages capturing the emotions and body language of the respondents, as well as allowing for the inclusion of those who are unable to read. The main drawback of this approach is that the presence of the researcher might influence participants' responses, in that they might tend to give what they think are acceptable answers.

The sample size needed for reliable data was calculated using the following formula (Harris and Jarvis, 2011):

$$N = \frac{Z^2(p)(1-p)}{c^2}$$

Where N is the sample size, Z is the confidence level, p is the percentage picking a choice or response, and c is the confidence interval. In this study, a calculation for minimum sample size was calculated with the following values: Z = 1.96 (α = 0.05), p = 0.979 (Falmouth); p = 0.101 (Lucea), c = 0.55 (5.0%).

For Lucea:

$$N=Z^2 \times (p)(1-p)/C^2$$
\[3.842 \times (0.101)(1 - 0.101)/0.55 \times 0.55\]
\[3.842 \times (0.101)(0.899)/0.003\]
\[3.842 \times 0.0908/0.003\]
\[0.349/0.003\]
\[116\]

*N.B. p is the sampling frame expressed as a percentage of the population (total number of households in Lucea as a percentage of the total number of households in Hanover: \(2403/23759 \times 100 = 10.114\%\) or 0.101).*

For Falmouth:

\[N = Z^2 \times (p)(1-p)/C^2\]
\[3.842 \times (0.0979)(1 - 0.0979)/0.55 \times 0.55\]
\[3.842 \times (0.0979)(0.902)/0.003\]
\[3.842 \times 0.0088/0.003\]
\[0.339/0.003\]
\[113\]

*N.B. p is the sampling frame expressed as a percentage of the population (total number of households in Falmouth as a percentage of the total number of households in Falmouth: \(2467/25201 \times 100 = 9.789\%\) or 0.09789).*

Participants were randomly sampled from each of the 9 districts in Falmouth and 15 districts in Lucea in order to gain a broad, comparable picture about the level of satisfaction and disappointment with how mass tourism development has played out in both communities, and the hopes people hold about how it might be improved. I assumed that one household member could articulate the general attitudes of the household unit. The household head was targeted for the survey because I did not want to over-represent the attitudes of certain households by interviewing multiple members. While the notion of a ‘household head’ clearly implies a degree of hierarchical decision-making, my intent here was mainly to allow households to self-select whomever they felt was most authoritative to speak to these issues. Ideally, I wanted to survey every \(K^{th}\) household in a systematic random sampling procedure, but this proved more complex than initially thought, as I realized through field reconnaissance that in many parts of the study
areas houses are haphazardly arranged, especially in Lucea. The process was also complicated by mixed land use within the sub-divisions; for example, commercial buildings are interspersed between residential, and in few cases both kinds of activities happening in one building. In order to reduce bias, I ensured that at least 10 respondents were selected from each government-based delineation within the study areas.

In both study areas, there were more male than female respondents: 64% and 55% of the survey participants were males in Falmouth and Lucea respectively. Most of the survey respondents had lived in the study areas for all or most of their lives. In Lucea, most participants were between 20 and 49 years old, and in Falmouth, most were between 30 and 49. In both towns, the highest number of survey participants were between 30 to 39 years old, most had formal education up to the secondary level (nearly 68% in Lucea and 65% in Falmouth). In both study areas, over half of those surveyed had only 1 to 2 persons living in their households, and 22% of the Lucea residents had someone working in the Grand Palladium and 32% in Falmouth had someone working in the Pier.

Although I sought to generate some comparable data about basic attitudes towards the respective developments, the surveys did include some open-ended questions (7 in total) as illustrated in Appendix 6. The close-ended questions (19 in total) spanned from simple yes/no options to semantic differential and Likert Scale types which required the respondents to rank their perceptions. For such questions, the answers ranged from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree” with the inclusion of a neutral option to account for uncertain responses. The open-ended questions required respondents to explain their thoughts on tourism development and the changes that have come with it. The questionnaire had 3 sections: the first was on the socio-demographics of the respondents; the second captured the feelings of the respondents about mass
tourism before and since its establishment in the respective towns, and the third centred on the residents’ perceptions of the impacts of mass tourism on the environment. The questionnaires were all researcher-administered in order to ensure participant engagement, and survey data were promptly inputted into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

3.4. Methodological Rigour and Trustworthiness of Data

Many qualitative researchers have focused their attention on methodological rigour in the field, ensuing data analysis (Creswell, 2013; Marshall and Rossman, 2011) and various issues concerning the trustworthiness of data (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015; Merriam, 2009) are addressed. According to Corbin and Strauss (1998), qualitative data analysis should be seen as a science because data analysis should follow a consistent, rigorous approach. This involves standardized ways and procedures of reporting findings that aim to enhance the trustworthiness (validity and reliability of data) of the research (Baxter and Eyles, 1997). Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest that the trustworthiness of research involves four main components: credibility, which speaks to assurance in the ‘truth’ of the findings; transferability, that is, illustrating that the findings have applicability in other contexts; dependability, that is, illustrating that the findings are consistent; and confirmability, which is the extent to which the research findings are free from research bias, preferences or interests.

I employed three main strategies to enhance the credibility of my research: triangulation, member checking, and thick description. Table 3.2 summarizes the four basic approaches to triangulation (Denzin, 1970). The key advantage of triangulation is that it looks at the same research questions or phenomenon from more than one data source (Decrop, 1999), and sometimes more than one investigator. As a result, it can reduce methodological and personal biases, and in turn raise the reliability, validity and generalizability of the study.
Table 3.2. Modes of Triangulation Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODE OF TRIANGULATION</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Triangulation (collecting data using various sources)</td>
<td>1. Primary (e.g. interviews); 2. Secondary data sources (e.g. policy documents).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method Triangulation (combining multiple methods)</td>
<td>1. Multiple methods: questionnaire; semi-structured interview (SSI); depth interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Triangulation (use of multiple frameworks to interpret data)</td>
<td>1. Grounded Theory; 2. Critical Constructivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator Triangulation</td>
<td>1. Member checking with interview respondents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summarized from Decrop (1999) and Baxter and Eyles (1997).

Different methods were used to answer the same research questions. The qualitative interviews provided in-depth explanations for research questions focused on local perceptions of the opportunities and challenges that the industry creates. My extensive community immersion was very useful in understanding the daily rhythms of these communities, and for observing dynamics such as the sudden flows of tourists from the enclaves on certain days and where in the town centre they tended to visit, as well as making very evident the places where tourists do not venture and the long slow periods. Various direct quotes taken from the qualitative interviews were used throughout Chapters 4 to 6 in order to highlight key points, and figures showing the most important attitudinal data from the questionnaire surveys were also used to complement the interview data.

As indicated earlier, the aim of qualitative research is not to produce generalizations, but I nevertheless hope that the insights from my research may be relevant in similar settings (transferability), in part because of the detailed description of the data I provide. Confirmability
of findings involves a range of techniques which I made use of, such as member checking, peer
debriefing, and the use of field notes and memos. I conducted member checking within the
various categories of respondents, and discussed the respective interview scripts as well as the
main research findings with each of the key informants and were asked to confirm whether the
interview data was correct. I quickly realized I would not be able to locate all the original
resident respondents, so instead I chose to run the key findings by a few members of the
communities of Lucea and Falmouth, to assess whether these findings resonated with them.
None of these community members were part of the original sample of respondents, so I realize
this is not the same as member-checking, but nevertheless their feedback did provide a degree of
affirmation about the overall findings from both areas. Finally, I debriefed with my research
assistants as well as with UWI-based researchers working in the area, and these discussions
allowed me further insight into whether the key themes I was finding fit with their perceptions.

One way to enhance the dependability of qualitative research, and the consistency of the
data analysis, is through the use of an audit trail (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). As mentioned earlier,
I kept a field notebook in which all key stages of the research study and other research-related
decisions were documented. Additionally, I was conscious that researchers can sometimes
misinterpret what is observed and heard while collecting data, which poses threats to the validity
of the findings and is another reason to pursue respondent validation (Baxter and Eyles, 1997).
My day-to-day observations of various aspects of the communities, such as the pace of business
for SME operators, the interactions between residents and tourists, and the interactions between
residents and police, all complemented my analysis of interview transcripts, and gave me more
confidence in findings as major themes emerged. I took written notes throughout the interview
process, and analyzed the data as I went along, and the interview process continued until
thematic saturation was reached, which is also something that gave me a sense of assurance about the reliability of the data from both study areas. Throughout the process of data analysis, I tried to maintain a reflexive distance from the data, in order to reduce potential researcher bias – by which I mean I tried to always stay conscious of the possible effects that my personal beliefs and biases could have on the research, and recognize that I am trying to make an “interpretation of the interpretation” (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2000: 6).

I sought to ensure the rigour of my quantitative data collection in a number of ways, beginning with the use of a dry run survey in the preliminary phase of the fieldwork, which enabled me to produce more relevant and better worded questions. Additionally, as noted, my decision to conduct the qualitative research first, was partly motivated by a desire to crystallize key themes for the questionnaire to examine. I trained my research assistants in how to ask questions and properly record responses. The data were double-checked before and after they were inputted into SPSS to ensure that the correct codes were assigned to the correct variables.

3.5. Data Analysis

In a grounded theory approach, there is a dynamic interaction between data collection, data analysis, and theory generation, called analytical induction (Hesse-Biber, 2006). This process is illustrated in Figure 3.1, which highlights how building new ideas from new data throughout the entire process becomes an important part of the process of analysis, as these new ideas are then used to explore and analyze other pieces of data (Hesse-Biber, 2006). Typically, the analysis starts right with the beginning of data collection (Corbin and Strauss, 1990) since there is an ‘emergence of meaning’ from the data, and this is an approach that I followed, which included continually highlighting themes in my field notebook from both interviews and daily
observations. In short, I engaged in an ongoing process of collecting and then analysing and then collecting more data, what is described as “moving from order to disorder in a continuous cycle” in the pursuit of a more confident understanding of my research questions (Hesse-Biber, 2006: 320).

**Figure 3.1. The Iterative Process in Data Analysis**

![Diagram of the iterative process in data analysis](image)

Adapted from Hesse-Biber and Leavey (2006: 348); Hesse-Biber (2010: 320)

I audio-recorded 33 of the 45 interviews which were then transcribed verbatim and analyzed as quickly as possible (somewhere between a few hours to a few days) after each interview in order to ensure that I caught nuances that could have been overlooked if I had waited longer. The remaining 12 interviews, who declined to be audio-recorded, were manually recorded in a field notebook. During the interviews, I also took detailed notes about the participants’ non-verbal expressions and communication, as well as possible changes that needed to be made for the next interviews. In order to ensure accuracy, I listened to each recorded interview as often as required and then cross-checked with the transcripts to identify any possible errors. After the field notes and transcriptions were thoroughly read, I coded the data based on the key themes that were developed throughout the iterative process.
Another significant aspect of grounded theory analysis is to engage in continual comparative analysis. I did this by comparing my findings across the various participants, both within and between groups, in order to identify similarities and differences in the emerging findings. This technique involves the process of “bringing together components or fragments of ideas or experiences, which often are meaningless when viewed alone” (Leininger, 1985: 60), and involves reviewing the responses given during data collection on a number of occasions, and checking for meaning (Mason et al., 2010; Maykut and Morehouse, 1995). SPSS was a useful tool in organizing bulky quantitative data into basic statistics as well as clear illustrations in graphs, charts, and tables.

3.6. Practical Considerations

I concur with Michaud (2010) that textbooks can never fully prepare scholars for field research, and detailed plans can never anticipate all of the obstacles that might arise. As discussed earlier, in many ways I could be described as an ‘insider’ for this researcher, as a life-long resident of the north coast of Jamaica and sharing the same race of the vast majority of Jamaicans. However, there were times I felt like neither an ‘outsider’ nor ‘insider’ in the field, but rather like I occupied a unique position of ‘betweeness’ (Zhao, 2017; Katz, 1994), I think because some participants and various community members may have viewed me as a privileged, foreign-educated individual.

My attention to safety in the field was enhanced by a workshop hosted at Western a few months before I started fieldwork, and security issues were of concern not only for me but also my field assistants. There were a few informal settlements within Falmouth and Lucea where we did not feel safe conducting fieldwork, but we were careful to travel in groups in such situations.
and pursue research before night-time, and thankfully the data collection was free of any serious incidents. The worst confrontations were a few instances where people who were not part of the sample demanded money from us for studying their community, but their requests were simply ignored and we were eventually left alone.

In addition to safety concerns, I was also cognisant that my presence as a local-born but foreign-affiliated researcher inherently affects the dynamics of the research and the ways that some people may have interacted with me (Horwood and Moon, 2002). The one environment where I felt the most social friction in my fieldwork was the craft markets in both study areas. They seemed to me to be the least trusting and most suspicious spaces, which is probably not unique to my experience as Cohen and Arieli (2011) have referred to these spaces as a ‘conflict environment’. This sense of distrust with researchers among people who feel oppressed by the economic system is not hard to understand, as there is good reason why many might perceive research as being irrelevant to resolving their experiences of social exclusion and inequality. In my experience as a Masters student interviewing craft market vendors in Kingston in 2007 I experienced similar tensions, which I felt owed to vendors’ sense that nothing changes for them after they are interviewed. This has also contributed to my enduring hope to pursue research that might make some difference to the inequalities that pervade mass tourism development.

3.7. Conclusion

This chapter discussed the practical dimensions of the research process and the underlying basis for key decisions about data collection. The overarching framework utilized was qualitative but was supplemented by a quantitative survey of residents from both study areas. The main challenge I contended with during the fieldwork was navigating my ‘insider’/
‘outsider’ status, which I did not anticipate even though I was exposed to the concept prior to fieldwork. In the next chapter, attention turns to the exclusionary economic spaces and practices associated with mass tourism development.
CHAPTER FOUR

EXCLUSIONARY ECONOMIC SPACES AND PRACTICES

4.1. Introduction

Increasing the flow of tourists into poor countries and strengthening the links between the industry and other aspects of local economies is widely touted as an important means to economic development (Biddulph, 2015; Brown and Hall, 2008). However, there are many hidden costs to mass tourism development which are of growing concern in countries such as Jamaica, which have become heavily dependent on the industry for income and employment. The most frequently cited concern is the inequitable distribution of economic benefits within the communities and countries that host tourist destinations (Sinclair-Maragh and Gursoy, 2015), a dynamic that cannot be separated from the need to understand the unequal power relationships between local and global stakeholders (Mowforth and Munt, 2016). For even though mass tourism occurs in specific spaces with a degree of local characteristics, it is also inherently influenced by global-scale actors, in particular international capitalists seeking opportunities for sustained growth and profitability in tourist destinations of the Global South (Mowforth and Munt, 2016; Sinclair-Maragh and Gursoy, 2015; Sreekumar and Parayil, 2010). As Britton (1982: 331) rightly observes, “when a Third World country uses tourism as a development strategy, it becomes enmeshed in a global system over which it has little control.”

Mass tourism development in Jamaica continues to reflect many aspects of the country’s long history of colonialism, which was the basis for its integration into the world economy. Although tourism generates over US$2 billion in earnings per year and directly supports over 90,000 jobs in Jamaica (WTTC, 2016), the overall economic benefits of the industry are not well disbursed among the local population (Sreekumar and Parayil, 2010). In this chapter, I assess
how mass tourism in Falmouth and Lucea, has produced exclusionary economic dynamics in the local economies, drawing upon the narratives of various community members, as well as exploring how people from different vantages are coping with emerging challenges. Broadly speaking, all three research questions are addressed in this chapter but with a focus on the economic dimensions of each.

4.2. Hopes and Disappointments about Economic Benefits

An important aspect of the growing interest in critical tourism research has involved attention to the perceptions of local residents of tourism development (Nunkoo, Gursoy and Ramkissoon, 2013; Gursoy and Rutherford, 2004; Fredline and Faulkner, 2000). The basic premise here is that local residents are obviously important stakeholders in tourism development and without their broad-based inclusion, economically and politically, tourism development cannot begin to approach sustainability (Nunkoo and Gursoy, 2016).

My research clearly indicated that there was initial optimism about tourism development among residents. The results from the surveys show that 85% of Lucea residents (see Figure 4.1) were broadly hopeful about the social and economic implications when they first heard about plans to construct the Grand Palladium Hotel, whereas only 1% indicated they were pessimistic from the outset.
Lucea residents specifically identified hopes about improved employment prospects within a town that has had limited economic diversity and job opportunities, both through the initial construction of the country’s largest hotel (Figure 4.2) and subsequently in providing ensuing services. This initial enthusiasm was encapsulated by a female resident in her 20s, who stated that: “new buildings equals more businesses, and the more businesses, the more employment!”

So while critical researchers are wary of the fact that tourism investment is first and foremost about securing profitability rather than creating meaningful jobs and economic opportunities for the local population (Mowforth and Munt, 2016), it is nevertheless important to recognize that many local people do view investments in a positive light, at least initially.
However, compared to Lucea, the proportion of residents in Falmouth that expressed initial hopefulness about the potential social and economic impact of tourism development were relatively less (63% as shown in Figure 4.3), in part, because of past unfulfilled promises from the national and local government about four major development projects in the local area.
These unfulfilled promises include: the Harmony Cove Development, a joint venture between the Government of Jamaica and a Bahamian company (Tavistock Group) to construct an assortment of championship golf courses, accommodations, a casino and shopping facilities on 2350 acres of oceanfront lands (initially promised for 2009); a Spanish luxury hotel (promised since 2005); the re-development of the Hampden Wharf into a major commercial centre including duty-free shopping malls, a museum and a concert hall (promised since 2004); and underdevelopment of economic opportunities associated with the town's hosting of the ICC Cricket World Cup held in 2007 (McFarlane, 2011). With respect to the latter, US$30 million was spent on building one of the venues for the event, the Trelawny Stadium, which was earmarked to become a hub for sports tourism but it has instead become a proverbial ‘white elephant’ that is seldom used and has an unclear future. In the words of one life-long male resident of Falmouth in his 30s: “When I was 15 years old people were saying that, that [development] won't happen…it [development] has been coming for years...most Falmouth persons [residents] were caught by surprise [with the establishment of the Cruise Pier].”

The participant’s main argument was that Falmouth residents started to believe the establishment of mass tourism in the town only after there were visible signs of construction at the Pier. Similarly, the representative of the Trelawny Parish Council interviewed, explained that: “Even though they [planners] tried to get Falmouth ready it was only after the building of the Pier started that people believed...they had just stopped believing!”

There was also some difference in the feelings of residents between the two towns towards mass tourism now that these major developments have been established. In Falmouth, where there was less optimism to begin with, only 42% (see Figure 4.4) of sampled participants were on the positive end of the spectrum of attitudes about the impacts of the Pier (either
‘hopeful’ or ‘optimistic’). In Lucea, where participants overwhelmingly expressed initial optimism, only 50% still held positive expectations as the development has played out (see Figure 4.5), as the overall enthusiasm about the prospects of mass tourism has dropped considerably among the residents.

Figure 4.4: Expressed Optimism about the Potential Impacts of Mass Tourism in Falmouth, Post-development

Figure 4.5: Expressed Optimism about the Potential Impacts of Mass Tourism in Lucea, Post-development
Compared to Falmouth, the relatively greater sense of optimism in Lucea can be at least partly explained by the proposed plans by the Grand Palladium to add 1000 rooms to the existing capacity in the coming years. The construction of additional hotel rooms is projected to create 3000 extra jobs, and in interviews many Lucea residents expressed a belief that there is still a good chance that this would enhance employment prospects.

Meanwhile, in Falmouth, the dissatisfaction over the impacts of the Pier has received national media attention, including a February 20, 2014 article in the *Jamaica Observer* which noted that: “three years after the historic town of Falmouth began welcoming cruise passengers, the Trelawny business community as well as residents, are expressing disappointment at the level of economic activity that is being generated.” A primary reason for this dissatisfaction is that while some new jobs have been created, mainly on the Pier itself, most of the benefits have gone to the larger, foreign entities (a subject I will return to later in this chapter).

Many Falmouth residents share the belief that tourists arriving at the Pier are deliberately discouraged from visiting the town centre, resulting in the poor circulation of benefits to the SMEs on the outskirts of the Pier. This phenomenon identified by Falmouth residents is a common feature of mass tourism development, and parallels Freitag’s (1994) research in the case study of Luperon, Dominican Republic, which had little experience with tourism prior to the establishment of a large-scale enclave. In Luperon, Freitag found that there was poor integration between the new enclave resort and the already existing economic activities, and the author stresses that the enclave resort made deliberate efforts to reduce interaction between the tourists and the wider community in order to concentrate the expenditure of the tourists and thereby increase profits. Similarly, Mbaiwa (2005) shows how the development of enclave tourism in the Okavango Delta, Botswana was dominated by foreign interests, and was pursued in a way that
showed little concern with integrating the existing activities and SMEs of surrounding communities.

4.3. Circulation of Economic Benefits

In 2004, the Ministry of Tourism in Jamaica developed the *Master Plan for Sustainable Tourism Development*. The plan sought to make further growth of the sector more ‘sustainable’ by paying greater attention to the overall visitor experience, the interests of host communities, and environmental conditions. Yet while these broad goals were set out in advance of the Falmouth and Lucea development, there seems to have been very little done to improve the polarization of economic benefits in the hands of a few elites and foreign investors. Instead, successive governments of Jamaica have consistently focused on increasing the number of tourists who come to Jamaica, and the aggregate income that the industry generates, rather than how it is distributed. This focus on tourist numbers and expenditures was expressed clearly during the interviews by a high-ranking representative from the Tourism Product Development Company (TPDCo): “It is always important to ensure that we have the numbers – as another minister would say, ‘getting heads to beds.’ We have the beds, so bringing the 'mass' here will always benefit us. We have the rooms, so why keep them empty? Furthermore we need the foreign exchange.”

One significant caveat to this focus on numbers relates to the fact, noted in Chapter 2, that most goods and services are already paid for before arrival at mass tourism destinations, which greatly limits the flow of revenues to local economies beyond the enclave (Vainikka, 2014; Singh and Wright, 2011), and even those items that are not pre-paid for can be easily found on the hotel property, cruise ship, or highly controlled Pier space, thereby eliminating the need to spend time and money outside the enclaves. For instance, the Grand Palladium provides
the sorts of amenities associated with all-inclusives, such as breakfast, lunch, dinner, a 24-hour snack bar, water sports and other recreational activities, as well as having its own salon, spa, craft shop, and jewellery store (Table 4.1). Cruise ships similarly offer various activities, services, and goods, and once passengers arrive at the Falmouth Pier they are met with over 200 shops which supply a wide array of things such as: climbing shoes for waterfalls; bars; sit-down and fast-food restaurants; jewellery stores; craft and art shops; and clothing boutiques (Table 4.1). This design clearly limits the need for the tourists to leave the compound, and in turn their expenditure within the local economy (Anderson, 2011; Cabezas, 2008; Mbaiwa; 2005), which is a well-established barrier to pro-poor tourism (Goodwin, 2009; Scheyvens, 2007). One lifelong male resident in his 40s who explained that the Pier is discouraging the tourists from entering the town centre noted that "a tourist was overheard telling someone 'but this place [Falmouth town centre] is nice! How is it they told me not to come here?' Royal Caribbean is controlling the [movements of the] tourists because they want to bus [them] out to Ochie [Ocho Rios]."

Table 4.1: List of Basic Goods and Services in Case Study Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grand Palladium Hotel</th>
<th>Cruise Pier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inside the Enclave</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outside the Enclave</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Sports</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Vending</td>
<td>Craft Vending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdressing</td>
<td>Fruit Vending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massaging</td>
<td>Internet Cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Guards</td>
<td>Fashion Boutique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Sculpting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Coordination</td>
<td>Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Keeping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another element of the design of both the Grand Palladium and the Falmouth Pier that reduces the need for tourists to go outside is the presence of duty-free shopping; these are not only tax-free spaces but contain specific products (e.g. jewellery, perfumes, crystals and liquor) of a greater diversity and quality than those in shops outside the enclaves. This design strategy was not lost on research participants, who consistently noted that tourists are generally encouraged not to venture outside of the perimeters of the enclaves, echoing Mbaiwa’s (2005) assessment of ‘internal colonialism’ in enclave tourism in Botswana. One Falmouth male resident in his 40s expressed disappointment that “the tourists are just not coming into the town [centre]. I know a man who owns the restaurant at Albert George [a plaza in the town centre]...he told me he had to convert his cook shop from one catering to tourists to one that caters for Jamaicans because tourists are just not coming into the town.” This same respondent also observed that “the Royal Caribbean Cruise Line went into the town [prior to the establishment of tourism] and promised the people that tourists will be coming, but [then] they are telling the tourists not to go in the town.” As stressed in Chapter 2, both the structure of enclaves and its relation to tourist movements and expenditures contributes to social tensions and discontent within host communities (Telfer and Sharples, 2015; Scheyvens, 2011; Pattullo, 2005; Shaw and Williams, 2002; Opperman and Chon, 1997).

In spite of the magnitude of the tourism developments in Falmouth and Lucea, only a minority of residents surveyed indicated that they or members of their households ever benefitted from the industry: in Falmouth, only 32% and in Lucea, only 25% (Figure 4.6). These benefits were largely in the form of direct employment within the enclaves, though a small number indicated indirect benefits through retail employment and petty trade (e.g. craft items, clothing and food). The local residents who gained direct employment within enclaves were mostly
through jobs such as wait staff, security guards, drivers, store attendants, and cleaners. In the surveys, town residents identified international hotel and cruise line owners as the primary beneficiaries of the new developments, followed by Jamaicans who owned shops within both enclaves. One Falmouth resident summed up a widespread view very well, noting that “here in Falmouth, I don’t think we are getting the real benefit from it [mass tourism], because it’s normally people out of town [foreign business operators] who come in and get all the benefits.”

Figure 4.6: Perceived Benefits from Mass Tourism

Another resident in her 30s echoed a common perception that the retail environment is organized in a way that is not very accessible to most local vendors: “The in-bond [duty-free] shops gain more. Out on the streets you will find some days are good for the sellers...they [planners] need to organize something better for the craft vendors so that everybody gets a little benefit.”

In sum, while tourist numbers into Falmouth and Lucea have clearly increased, most residents do not believe that much of this growth is reaching either the formal or informal sectors beyond the enclaves, such as craft, clothing and food vending. So while government plans had flagged the problem of the inequitable distribution of benefits from tourism development, early
indications from Falmouth and Lucea are that old exclusionary patterns are still evident. While few respondents expressed open hostility towards mass tourism, a thread of disappointment ran through the interviews, and if the benefits do not begin to flow to the local population in more significant and consistent ways, then it is likely that the residents will soon start to “display negative attitudes towards tourism, thereby opposing such development” (Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2010: 44).

4.4. Outflow of Benefits and Tourists to Neighbouring Towns

The local residents, SME operators, and informal vendors were not the only ones who complained of not receiving sufficient benefits from the new mega-developments. Officials in the local Parish Councils (the lowest level of regional governance in Jamaica) also lamented that they were yet to see significant revenue increases in taxes generated by the new developments, with the tax revenues flowing mainly to the national government, though it still falls upon the Parish governments to provide support to the tourism industry. The representative of the Trelawny Parish Council I spoke with explained that while other stakeholders such as the Tourism Enhancement Funds (TEFs) and the Port Authority of Jamaica (PAJ) were benefitting from mass tourism in far more significant ways, the Council, which was one of the key actors in the planning process, was not. In fact, the representative claimed that the Trelawny Parish Council was yet to see any economic gains whatsoever:

There is no spin off, there is basically no head tax being handed over – nothing is being gained [at this level of government]. It’s only the trickle that we get! The PAJ… gets a head tax off each tourist that comes to the port of call which is passed on to the TEF, but Falmouth itself doesn’t get any of the money. The only form of revenue was the building fee which was charged when they were building the Pier or if a tourist comes in the town and spends, then they pay the General Consumption Tax. The Parish Council itself doesn’t get any money but yet we are still expected to keep the town clean and repair the drains because the tourist doesn’t want to see the filth!
The Trelawny Parish Council representative also noted that there are now more drains to clean and more cleaners to pay since the establishment of mass tourism, but with the same budgetary allocation from the national government, and suggested that Parish Councils should lobby for more substantial allocations from the tourism revenues from the government of Jamaica. Despite my searching, I was unable to uncover whether there were any agreements for the distribution of benefits from the Pier to the Parish Council. All tourists to the island pay a head tax, which ranges from US$2 for cruise-ship passengers to US$20 for stopovers, but the Council representative stressed that the local government gets none of this money while the expansion of tourism causes its expenses to rise:

In essence, the same budget pre-tourism has now been made to accommodate tourism-related maintenance in the town, [which now occurs] at a more frequent pace. So there is now more often maintenance and now a wider geographical area to be maintained [because of the expansion of infrastructure to new areas]…there are even now more street cleaners and workers to pay. So now there are more things to be taken care of with the same amount of revenue!

Another problem that was commonly noted by respondents in both study areas was the matter of leakages. As discussed in Chapter 2, the leakage of tourism expenditures out of developing countries has been found to be as high as 75% (Meyer, 2007; Benevides, 2001), owing especially to heavy imports and profit remittance to foreign companies' home countries, which in turn reduces the ‘multiplier effect’ (Spenceley and Meyer, 2012). In Falmouth and Lucea, the phenomenon of leakages through imports and profit remittances, and the reduced multiplier effect, are further compounded by the fact that when tourists to these towns do leave the enclave of the resort or Pier they often gravitate to neighbouring tourist towns such as Montego Bay and Ocho Rios, which therefore reap the benefits. A major issue raised by the participants was that both Falmouth and Lucea are too small and limited to reap greater economic rewards from tourist expenditures, as they are not seen to possess a sufficient range of
attractions outside the enclaves. Although there is no statistical evidence about the level of leakage from Falmouth and Lucea, or how it compares in relation to larger sites like Montego Bay and Ocho Rios, this suggestion by participants that smaller sites fare worse than larger sites in terms of relative tourist expenditures would seem plausible, but this issue would require a deeper investigation.

According to a Security Manager at the Falmouth Pier, there are 5000 to 6000 passengers and 2000 crew members on each vessel that docks in Falmouth, which places roughly 10,000 to 12,000 passengers and 4000 crew members on cusp of the Pier on days when two ships port. However, personnel at the security gate estimated during the interviews that only about 1000 tourists typically leave the cruise Pier to visit the Water Square area (Figure 4.7) on the busiest ship day (pointing to the log book as the basis of this claim), and my observations confirmed that it is only a relatively small minority of who venture beyond the Pier independently, with most instead boarding tour buses headed for other attractions further afield. The Security Manager at the Pier indicated that “most of the tourists that come to Falmouth are bused out back to Ocho Rios, because…most of the tourist attractions are actually in Ocho Rios. Some will go to Good Hope Estate in Trelawny but a significant amount will go to Montego Bay and a few will go to Negril.”
This contrasts with initial claims by Royal Caribbean Cruise Line that suggested passengers would be encouraged to walk beyond the Pier and into the town of Falmouth itself. One Falmouth businessman expressed his belief that tourists were being actively discouraged from going beyond the Pier, insisting that “Royal Caribbean Cruise Line promised thousands per day in the Water Square area, but this is not happening! They instead are telling people [tourists] not to come into the town.” Many other participants expressed a similar belief, and offered different ideas as to why this might be the case, with the most common being that the cruise line is wary of tourists facing security concerns and the fear of harassment beyond the Pier.

Obviously, the people who are most adversely impacted by this movement and the associated leakage are the small-scale vendors and SME operators. A female SME operator in her 70s, who had spent all her life in Falmouth, expressed her frustration with the busing of tourists beyond the Pier: “Whenever the tourists get off the ships, they go to Ocho Rios and they go to Mo-Bay. We only see them whenever they get back [to Falmouth] to board the ship and
that’s not nice.” Her explanation for this movement echoes a point made above, remarking that “Falmouth lacks entertainment” and sufficient other attractions and activities for tourists beyond the Pier. Another vendor in her 70s also lamented about the situation and claimed that Falmouth “needs a beach” to have any hope of ebbing this movement, “because without a beach, the tourists will continue to go to Montego Bay and Ocho Rios.”

The small-scale vendors I spoke with in Lucea expressed similar concerns to those in Falmouth about the lack of sufficient activities for tourists to keep them in the town if they venture beyond the resort. Lucea vendors indicated that they largely only see tourists beyond the enclave when they are on route to or from Negril or the Sangster International Airport in Montego Bay. A tour bus operator in his 50s, who is affiliated with the Jamaica Union of Travelers Association (JUTA), expressed his frustration that: “The hotel does not promote recreation in the [Lucea] area. Everything that happens, happens on the outskirts. We [implying JUTA] promote the hotel and then it’s like they try to have the guests into a prison.” Further, the operator suggested that this strong separation does not actually even sit well with all of the tourists, stating that “I have guests who have gotten really boisterous over that!” The bus operator identified that generally, many tourists have been disappointed that little opportunity is provided for them to have authentic interaction with the local culture and people of the wider host community while staying at the hotel.

On most days throughout my field research there were virtually no tourists to be found in the main shopping district of Lucea, even though it is a very short distance from the Grand Palladium (Figure 4.8). One female vendor in her 50s emphatically summed up the views of the Lucea vendors I spoke with, noting that tourists simply “are not coming here!” and that the rise in tourist arrivals in the Grand Palladium has “barely” affected the market at all: “You may see a
few walking in the town once in a while…[but] they are always going in or coming out of a
vehicle. Only very few you’ll see in the market area. It’s not like Mo-bay or Ochie [Ocho Rios]
or Negril where tourists just walk [freely within the towns].” Another small-scale craft vendor,
who entered the craft business not long after the opening of the Grand Palladium, explained that
most of the people who purchase craft items in the Lucea market are returning Jamaican ex-pats
who want to take Jamaican gifts with them. Because few tourists have arrived at the market, even
the vendors aiming to attract them continue to maintain stocks of items that appeal to the local
population, from clothing to school bags. A number of SME operators in Lucea noted how they
benefit more from local shoppers on Jamaica Day (a day of national celebrations that falls in
February or March), who usually purchase items including Jamaican-themed clothing and
memorabilia, than they do from Spring Break, a time of peak tourist arrivals that happens around
the same time.

Figure 4.8. A Section of the Town Centre of Lucea (Located approx. 1.5 miles from Grand
Palladium. The picture shows part of the busy square on a normal weekday)

Source: Author’s image
4.5. Physical and Economic Barriers to Enclaves

As discussed in Section 4.2, enclave tourism tends to be poorly integrated with host communities (Freitag, 1994), and this was clearly reflected in the perspectives of respondents, who consistently described how the primary beneficiaries of the new developments were the hotel and cruise ship owners. Beyond these dominant players, respondents widely noted that the local businesses benefitting the most tended to be those large enough to invest in marketing their goods or services to the tourists and, in the case of Falmouth, those able to afford space within the Pier. In the words of one male Falmouth resident in his 30s:

Tourists are now being kept to the persons who rent the places on the wharf. Because I don’t know if they sign a contract with the wharf, for the wharf to provide them with the inflow of tourists so that they can make the money to pay the wharf or what… but the tourists are not being educated in the right way… so persons on the other side of the wharf will struggle to earn something.

These ‘persons on the other side’ being referred to here are the SMEs and small-scale vendors located outside the security of the Pier. This clearly reflects what Manuel-Navarrete (2015: 509) calls enclave tourism boundaries, to mark those tourism spaces that are “carefully staged and designed, regulated, planned, commoditized and privatized.” This physical separation between the Pier and the rest of the community is depicted with the yellow line in Figure 4.9, which indicates the boundary between the ‘insiders’ within the Pier, who have the access to all of the tourists getting off the cruise ship, and the ‘outsiders’ who only have access to the small minority of cruise ship tourists who set out beyond the Pier. In addition to setting limits on who can sell to the large majority of tourists who stay confined within the Pier, this boundary is also economically exclusionary in the sense that most Falmouth residents cannot enter the Pier, thereby limiting social interactions as well as economic exchanges.
Figure 4.9: Physical Barriers to Economic Exchanges in Falmouth

This economic barrier – or what might be seen as a ‘core-periphery’ retail environment – is governed by rules and regulations established by a combination of actors, including the cruise industry, national planners, and local officials. In light of this stark division, and the large disparity in access to tourists, it is not surprising that the vendors on the Pier expressed much greater satisfaction about their sales than did the SMEs owners and small-scale vendors on the periphery. For instance, one of the two coconut vendors on the Pier explained to me that the cost of accessing the space was worth it, noting that “although business is slow sometimes and even
though I have to pay a fee of US$30 per day, I am thankful for the opportunity to be allowed on the Pier to sell.” In contrast, those on the periphery typically complained about their distance from the ships and the tourists. Many Falmouth respondents expressed disappointment that majority of the spaces on the Pier are foreign-owned (while the few souvenir and jewellery stores located at the Grand Palladium were also foreign-owned, this was not perceived as a major disappointment by Lucea residents, perhaps because there are not typically many retail spaces in all-inclusive resorts).

Another concern noted by many Falmouth respondents stems from how the Port Authority of Jamaica (PAJ) selected the spaces on the Pier for local vendors, with terms lasting as long as three years rather than rotating more regularly, and some expressed frustration about what they saw as a biased and unfair process of selection. Pratt (2015: 150) argues that the healthy distribution of economic benefits from tourism heavily depends on good governance, noting that: “corruption and parochialism, lack of institutional accountability and failure to plan and implement policies have dampened the potential for tourism to benefit the small islands.” While I do not have evidence to suggest that corruption is at work in the allocation of spaces on the Pier, it was clear that many on the periphery felt there was at the very least insufficient transparency in terms of how decisions were made that bear significantly on the distribution of benefits.

In addition to the lack of transparency in decision-making, the exclusionary character of the retail environments in both the Pier and the Grand Palladium also stems from the relatively high cost of renting a space. As noted above, renting a space on the Pier costs around US$30 per day, which translates to US$700 per month. Even the PAJ representative I spoke with acknowledged this point, noting that this rental cost makes it unaffordable to most small-scale
vendors. The photograph in Figure 4.10 powerfully visualizes what I believe can be understood as the 3 tiers of tourism on the Falmouth Pier, which involve a steep gradient in the amount of tourist revenues. Tier 1 is the cruise ships, which absorb the vast majority of tourist expenditures. Tier 2 is the formal Pier, which contains over 200 shops in fixed built environments; as indicated, foreign-owned businesses predominate, but there are some spaces for local merchants. Tier 3 are the smaller-scale merchants, in much less durable structures. In sum, there is a clear hierarchy in the structure of the Falmouth Pier, which reflects one of the distinguishing features of enclave tourism: how clear boundaries between spaces and activities can shape access and interactions in both direct and indirect ways.

**Figure 4.10. Visualizing the Levels of Financial Benefits on the Falmouth Pier**
[Level 1: Cruise ships; Level 2: over 200 shops; Level 3: Vendors].

Another aspect of the exclusionary character of tourism promotion relates to the uneven marketing that play out on the Pier and within the Grand Palladium. All of the posters,
pamphlets, brochures, and displays are geared to promoting major attractions such as: Jamaica Zipline Canopy Tours (located in Hanover); Dolphin Cove (Ocho Rios); Chukka Adventure Tours and Braco Adventure Tours (in Hanover, Trelawny and Ocho Rios). There is a symbiotic relation between the major attractions and the cruise ship industry, as many major attractions will pay a sizable commission (up to 40% of the entrance fee) to the cruise ships for the passengers they direct there.

The exclusionary economic dynamics discussed in this section present many challenges for local planners and residents, if the potential economic benefits are to be more broadly distributed. While these start with the powerful segregation of space, some participants also flagged other challenges, including a lack of product differentiation among the craft vendors of both study areas and the challenge for small-scale vendors outside the Pier and the Grand Palladium to deal with debit and credit cards, which compounds their disadvantage since many tourists do not walk with much cash.

Many participants indicated that they have expressed complaints to the Parish Council and the UDC, and hopes that different levels of government could take steps to reduce leakages. One potential means of widening tourist expenditure in Falmouth (floated by the Ministry of Tourism in 2014) is for the government to support construction of a complex at the Hampden Wharf (Ministry of Tourism, 2014), an area that adjoins the Pier, in order to provide an additional space for craft vendors and a range of entertainment facilities. While this would help respond to some of the concerns raised by Falmouth participants, as of 2017 this has yet to materialize.
4.6. Working Conditions within the Enclaves

Sinclair-Maragh and Gursoy (2015: 144) note that “tourism is considered to be a form of imperialism” by some scholars, and the growing focus on the associated inequalities has translated to the fact that tourism researchers are paying increasing attention to the poor conditions that many workers experience in mass tourism. In Jamaica, as across much of the Global South, one of the overarching dimensions of inequality relates to the dominance of the foreign investors and tour operators and extremely powerful local elites, as with Sandals and Superclubs, while the vast majority of employment in the sector is low skill, low wage, insecure and seasonally variable, and with limited opportunities for mobility.

While this was not a major focus of my research, I did attempt to interview some employees in both enclaves, and those who I spoke with expressed dissatisfaction with their wages, concerns that have also appeared in various newspaper reports, especially of the Grand Palladium workers. For example, one of the publications in the Western Mirror in 2014 carried the headline, “Grand Palladium Workers Stage Protest” (see Figure 4.11). The employees I spoke with at the Falmouth Pier and in the Grand Palladium were earning around the national minimum wage, which for an eight-hour day amounts to under US$10. The demonstration covered in the local newspaper ran a photo with the caption “a number of workers employed to the Grand Palladium/Lady Hamilton Resort in Lucea, Hanover, who armed themselves with placards on Thursday morning, lashed out at several cases of injustice at the hotel” (Western Mirror, 2014).

A female worker in her 20s, who has worked over five years at the Grand Palladium, described her sense of the injustice of workers’ pay this way: “They can do better. That hotel makes a lot of money. When the owner [located in Spain] says we should get a 30% raise, they
give us what they feel like. They take the rest for themselves. The other day we got 3% when we were supposed to get 22%!”

**Figure 4.11: Newspaper Headline, February 7, 2014**

![Image of workers protesting at Grand Palladium]

**Source: Western Mirror**

Although there are obvious challenges in comparing wage levels between countries, especially given vast differences in the cost of living, the workers at the Grand Palladium I spoke with did express their sense of feeling undervalued in relation to their counterparts working at the other sites of the chain they are part of, Fiesta Hotels, and their assumption that others doing the same jobs get much better compensation. This echoes Manuel-Navarrete (2015: 510), who examined working conditions in enclave tourism in Mexico and described how “workers endure pitifully low wages, difficult living conditions, little job security, as well as the negative psychological effects of becoming marginalized in one’s own land.”

One of my recurring observations throughout my fieldwork was that the majority of the jobs on the Pier were people like cleaners and store clerks, and based on conversations it was
evident that many were unmarried women with children and that many only work two or three days per week. This observation resonates with critical tourism research, which has emphasized how women tend to occupy a disproportionate share of the low-wage, part-time, seasonally-variable, and menial jobs in the sector (Shaw and Williams, 2002). This is concerning for the obvious gender inequality, which is magnified further in Jamaica by the fact that many families are female-headed without contributions from male members. The Planning Institute and the Statistical Institute of Jamaica (2012) estimate that nearly half (47.1%) of all households in Jamaica are headed by females.

In my conversations with employees, many also lamented their perception that there is little to no room for upward mobility within the sector, especially for local residents. Yet despite the frustrations they expressed, the employees I spoke with nevertheless all indicated that they want to keep their jobs, as finding other employment would be very difficult since there are few other opportunities in the region. One participant, a female in her 20s, explained the barriers to organizing within the Grand Palladium, stressing that “we have nobody to represent us and if we try to join any union we can lose our job and there is no union because they want to have their own way of doing stuff,” although she did indicate there is a staff association. The same participant also pointed out the minimal benefits that workers receive, noting that: “the hotel has contracts with business places like Courts [a furniture store] and [some] hardware stores so you get discounts – little discounts. They have insurance too but only if you are dead you get to benefit. Some hotels have their own health card but not this one!”

Other respondents also echoed the view that it is unjust for the Grand Palladium to impede unionization, save for a sanctioned internal staff association that has no collective negotiating power, and indicated that about the absence of health and other kinds of benefits is a
source of financial stress and dissatisfaction. This concern about poor benefits is a pervasive one, and it is disturbing to note that approximately 84% of workers in the Jamaican accommodation subsector have no pension arrangements, which means that most workers will retire without a pension plan (McNeil, 2013).

The general feeling conveyed throughout my discussions with hotel workers at the Grand Palladium was that the Jamaican government has failed to promote and protect their rights and interests. The visible indications of mounting frustration among wait-staff and maintenance workers, including some demonstrations at the main gate of the hotel are likely to recur if there are no satisfactory intervention from the relevant authorities.

4.7. The Perceptions and Responses of Fisherfolk to Tourism Development

Throughout my interviews with fishermen in both Falmouth and Lucea, the overriding concern expressed was that the expansion of mass tourism facilities coupled with what they deem to be unfavourable regulation of their activity has resulted in declining profitability of fishing. As indicated in Chapter 1, fishing was traditionally one of the main economic activities of Falmouth and Lucea, and fisherfolk feel that both the private developers and municipal planners have paid little heed to their concerns, both before and since the construction of the Pier and the Grand Palladium hotel, and how these developments have reshaped their environments.

One of the most obvious changes was the forcible relocation of the fisherfolk in Falmouth from their original location on Seaboard Street, which began two years before the construction of the Pier, as this was the exact spot that the cruise ships now dock. The new dock for the Falmouth fisherfolk was relocated to Rodney Street, about 1 km from its original location (Figure 4.12), which created inconveniences for the traditional clientele of the fisherfolk, as they
now have to travel slightly further to purchase fish. While 1 km might not seem like a significant additional distance, the fisherfolk pointed out that it does amount to a significant inconvenience for their customers, especially those who do not have a vehicle – costing them more time and money in transit compared to the original location which was a short walk from the town centre. One response to this changed environment is that some fisherfolk now hire men on bicycles to go to the Water Square area to locate potential buyers for fish, as one means of reducing spoilage.

**Figure 4.12: Previous and Current Locations of Falmouth Fishing Area**

[Map showing previous and current locations of Falmouth Fishing Area]

Source: Google Earth (modified by author)

It is notable that the relocation of the Falmouth fishing port did involve the construction of a J$9 million facility by the government, comprising two buildings with rest rooms and storage space. However, the Falmouth fishermen complained that this site has been without running water for over two years (I will return to some of the frustrations associated with this relocation and space in Chapter 5).

Another major concern expressed by the fisherfolk is their perception that they used to get a greater quantity and better quality of fish (especially the ‘butter’ and ‘parrot’ varieties)
prior to the construction of the Pier, which damaged the reef through blasting and dredging and disturbed vital fish breeding grounds. Fisherfolk also described now having to go further out at sea to fish, due to the changes in the environment, and how this results in greater fuel costs and more time at sea. Yet in spite of these higher costs, fisherfolk lamented that the unit prices for fish have not risen commensurably. This not only affects the fishermen but also the other livelihoods that are connected to fishing, such as those who clean the catch, other vendors who do not fish themselves, and those who cook the fish.

Fishing has been so disrupted in Falmouth that many fisherfolk openly questioned its future viability as a livelihood for local residents. During the interviews, one male fisherman in his 50s, who has been fishing in the town for over 23 years, commented that the future “looks dim. The population of fish in Falmouth is decreasing! Since the construction of the wharf, we have not seen the fish again. In one day you could find 38 lbs of fish from 7 a.m. to 12 noon but now you can’t even find 10 lbs of fish from 7 a.m. to 12 noon.”

The fisherfolk of Lucea described some of the same challenges as did those of Falmouth, especially noting how they have been forced to move to new areas to a degree that has negatively affected their livelihoods. One of them explained how they face new barriers to accessing certain parts of the coast, noting that: “Tourism changes a lot of things…fishermen leave from here and they can’t even pull up over there [pointing at the nearby hotel waters]. You…[used to be able to] take up small picnic trips to go over there but now you can’t do that.” This participant also gave another example to highlight the restrictive changes, noting that prior to the hotel development a family of six could pay US$15 to travel across the harbour, but now neither the fishermen’s boats nor the local residents are allowed near to the Grand Palladium beach waters (issues I will pick up further in Chapter 6). Some of the fisherfolk believe that many tourists
would actually be interested in fishing trips with local guides, but they see little to no chance of this becoming a reality given how the restrictions on their movement limit any interactions. One difference between the fisherfolk experience with mass tourism development between Falmouth and Lucea is that whereas some tourists do visit the new fishing area of Falmouth to take pictures, purchase sea shells, or have a meal, virtually no tourists stop by the fishing beach in Lucea, which is likely due to the environmental pollution plaguing Lucea. This issue has been regularly featured in the national newspapers (Table 4.2), yet little or nothing has been done to address the problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>HEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 4, 2016</td>
<td>&quot;Eyesore of the Week&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2014</td>
<td>&quot;Stakeholders complain about ... mess in Lucea&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 13, 2014</td>
<td>&quot;Pollution Alert! improper plastic disposal at critical level&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2, 2013</td>
<td>&quot;Filthy! Garbage woes continue to plague western Jamaica&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 19, 2003</td>
<td>&quot;Unhealthy state of drains irks Lucea residents&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fishermen I spoke with (some of whom have been fishing for over 30 years in the Lucea Harbour), consistently noted how they had initially expected to reap some economic benefits after the Grand Palladium opened, hoping to either be involved in recreational activities (e.g. providing boat rides or serving as fishing guides) or increase their sale of fish. Neither has materialized, and the fishermen are well aware that the hotel imports most of its food supply. Making matters worse, several fishermen specifically indicated that they noticed that the quality of the harbour water has decreased since the hotel construction, though they could not explain why. Like the Falmouth fishermen, those in Lucea described having to travel a longer distance at
sea to catch fish now than in the past, which is forcing them to spend not only more time but also more money on fuel to generate the same catch as before. A number of fishermen lamented how their earnings have been hurt by the fact that the price of oil has risen faster than the price of fish.

4.8. Conclusion

This chapter focused on the economic dynamics of the mass tourism developments in Lucea and Falmouth, revealing similar economic challenges. There was an overarching sense among research participants that the lion’s share of the profits generated from the new mass tourism developments first goes to foreign-owned corporations, and secondarily to local elites, while the locally-owned SMEs and smaller-scale vendors were left with mere ‘trickles’ of benefits, while fishermen described receiving no benefit at all. This situation has left many local residents, vendors, and fishermen resentful against these new developments, as they see little prospect that this will change and that poorer people will ever benefit from the hotel or the Pier in meaningful ways, beyond those who are able to secure low-wage jobs. I also explored the role of the all-inclusiveness of the Pier and hotel in the sense that it severely limits the need for spending in the wider local economy. On-going ‘leakages’ of the tourist dollar to nearby, more established resort towns and the low wages, paucity in benefits and rights amongst enclave employees are other dimensions that were covered. The next chapter extends the discussion of exclusion from the story of uneven economic benefits to community perceptions about the social and political segregation engendered by the development of these mass tourism spaces.
5.1. Introduction

Enjoyment is at the heart of tourism, as it is the most basic thing that tourists expect. At ‘sun, sand, and sea’ all-inclusive resorts, leisure tends to centre around a combination of beaches, pools, bars, and restaurants, and activities like sun-bathing, swimming, eating, drinking and partying. However, while these activities might seem innocuous, the critical literature on tourism has problematized how these activities are organized within these spaces in various ways, and their social, cultural, and environmental implications. One of the most consistent critiques is that these spaces tend to create stark physical barriers which exclude and restrict the movement and activities of local populations. Additionally, these spaces have also been widely critiqued for introducing or exacerbating unequal gender relations, interrupting everyday life, creating tensions between ‘guests’ and ‘hosts’, leading to extensive dispossession and disempowerment (Mowforth and Munt, 2015; Kingsbury, 2011). Another overriding theme in the critical tourism literature is that social inequalities should be understood within the larger context of global inequalities and uneven power relations.

In this chapter, I critically examine the exclusionary socio-cultural outcomes and uneven power relations of mass tourism development in Falmouth and Lucea. My focus here is largely on the implications of these kinds of exclusion on local people and how they have responded to such challenges. The fundamental argument is that the mass tourism developments in Falmouth and Lucea have not brought significant gains in the eyes of most people in these communities, and the economic gains associated with the investment, infrastructure, and tourist expenditures
need to be weighed against the significant social concerns expressed by residents, foremost is the weaker sense of belonging that many feel within their own communities. This diminished sense of community relates to the increasing socio-spatial exclusion that has resulted from dramatic changes in how space is differentiated and regulated, with new spaces designed to privilege tourists and a small number of vendors and keep most local people out.

5.2. Separation and Social Control

5.2.1. ‘Purification’ and the Visible and Invisible Control of Tourism Spaces

As discussed in Chapter 2, mass tourism spaces in the Global South are typically marked by the social segregation between ‘guests’ and ‘host’ communities, which is often conveyed through images and discourses that seek to promote the safety and tranquility of the tourist experience – which is underlain (explicitly or implicitly) by a sense of fear and insecurity; that is, that tourists need contained spaces in order to truly relax and enjoy their experience. This imagery and discourse is projected by the various interests which monopolise power and control in the tourism landscape, led by the resorts and private sector but also involving governments (Brooks, 2008). The basic goal of social segregation is to ‘purify’ the space for tourists by keeping out ‘undesirables’. As Del Casino et al. (2011) argue, some groups become marginalized by the social control measures needed to enforce this ‘purity’, which include the regulation of the local people’s behaviour and movement. A common hallmark of the restriction of local people’s movement is the presence of guardians (Sibley, 1995), which include the Jamaican Constabulary Force (JCF), specialized Tourist Courtesy Corps (popularly called the ‘bowl hats’, and discussed further below), and private security guards. These measures are justified by some stakeholders as necessary for tourists' safety and convenience, which can be seen as an effort to put a positive
spin on efforts to contain fears about crime, drugs, and aggressive hustling, which Jamaica has a reputation for.

As part of the efforts to keep enclave spaces exclusive, various new boundaries have been created in Falmouth and Lucea to separate the local population from tourists. These barriers serve to reshape local environments in ways that interfere with the everyday lives of local residents. This reshaping of local environments is one aspect of social exclusion, which I view as a dynamic process of partially or wholly shutting out local people from the social, economic, political and cultural systems of their community (Walker and Walker, 1997). In both study areas, many of the local residents — particularly non-tourist business operators, excluded craft vendors, and fishermen — expressed frustration that being physically shut out from new tourist spaces meant that they were also excluded from possible social and economic benefits. One dramatic finding that speaks to the segregation of these new spaces of mass tourism – and indicates to the tactics used to regulate access – is that well over 90% of the surveyed residents in both Falmouth and Lucea had never actually been within the Falmouth Pier and the Grand Palladium. The small minority of respondents who had gained access to the Grand Palladium and the Falmouth Pier had largely done so because they were attending special events or meetings. In addition to the denial of access to the recreational beaches associated with these spaces, local people are largely restricted from patronizing restaurants and shops located on these properties by a combination of physical barriers, security personnel, and the basic inability to afford the commercial activities within these spaces. The presence of a gate and perimeter wall is the starkest physical expression of exclusion and how access to these spaces is regulated.

The combination of physical boundaries, and heavy security presence (both inside and immediately outside these spaces) are a major reason why many respondents described feeling
unwelcome in or near these tourist spaces, with some going so far as to refer to these tourist enclaves as foreign lands. Some respondents described the cruise pier as ‘Little Miami’ because of how difficult it is to access, regardless of how close it is to their homes and businesses. A stark contradiction appears at the entrance of the Pier, as a sign states ‘Welcome, Historic Falmouth Jamaica’, seemingly creating an impression of inclusion, while nearby there is a ‘Restricted Area’ sign accompanied by a ‘no human allowed’ symbol (Figure 5.1). Further, restriction signs were not only placed at the main entrance but also at various intervals along the front wall of the Pier.

**Figure 5.1. Signs Posted at the Gate of the Falmouth Cruise**

![Signs at the Gate of the Falmouth Cruise](source: Author’s Fieldwork)
While the signs do not explicitly state that local people are prohibited, the signs are strongly symptomatic of how space has been encoded by a range of discursive cues. The fact that these signs face the direction from which local pedestrians and motorists would enter was noted by some respondents, who described their clear sense that the signs are directed at them. When asked about the accessibility of the Pier to the local population, the Security Supervisor at the Port Authority of Jamaica described the intent of this coding in a more nuanced way:

What we are saying to people is that we do have a very soft approach when it comes to people coming to our gates and wanting to use our facility...so we don’t just lock out people but we don’t just open our arms.

For many respondents, access to the Pier and the Grand Palladium is an ongoing source of frustration. In the case of the Pier, there are standard security protocols which the cruise ships have established in conjunction with the Port Authority of Jamaica, and many Falmouth respondents described how this is inherently unfair, in that they deserve the same opportunity to access the space as the tourists do, even if they have much less ability to purchase various items. One male resident in his 30s, who has spent all his life in the town, described his frustration this way:

With the night life… I heard that Margaritaville [popular entertainment spot in tourist towns such as Montego Bay; one is also on the Pier] is over there but we, the locals don’t have access so we still have to go to Montego Bay. We need access. That's one of the major disappointments - no access!

The Port Authority of Jamaica has the responsibility to ensure that standards and procedures at all ports in Jamaica are maintained in accordance with the International Maritime Organizations/International Ship and Port Facility Security (IMO/ISPS) Code, which includes ensuring that each person shows a valid identification and that all vehicles entering the property
are searched at the entrance. However, even when they have sufficient identification, some
described how they were barred from entry unless they were related to or were friends with
employees at the Pier, in which case, special arrangements were made with the security guards
for entry. This differential exclusion is an important aspect of the separation between the local
population and tourist environments, and how space is reconfigured and social distance is
accentuated.

**Figure 5.2: Perceptions on the Desirability of Segregating Tourists in Lucea**
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**Figure 5.3. Perceptions on the Desirability of Segregating Tourists in Falmouth**
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Much like the mechanisms for social segregation evident at the Falmouth Pier, the Grand Palladium is guarded and securely walled off around its perimeter, forming part of what has been termed Jamaican tourism’s landscape of defense (Gold and Revill, 2001). While some respondents recognized the need to give guests a strong sense of security and enjoyment during their stay, one male respondent in his 30s noted that it would also be considerate to “have a system in place to allow residents greater access,” giving the example that it would be nice to have access to something like “having some ice cream with the kids on a Sunday.” Regular users of the nearby marine environment, especially fisherfolk, have also been adversely affected by the hotel boundaries. In interviews, a number of Lucea fisherfolk complained that they were not allowed to go too close to the tourists who use the water for recreational activities, and expressed frustration about how new spatial boundaries have cut off their access to marine areas that they previously had access to.

In addition to physical barriers, increased security personnel is another factor establishing social distance between tourists and the people of Falmouth and Lucea. This is especially evident in Falmouth, where a strong security presence can be consistently observed on cruise-ship docking days when the ratio of tourist to locals increases significantly, and is less evident in Lucea. While the Palladium has considerable security, the presence of police and security personnel is not as significant in the community because tourists hardly ever go into the city centre. Some participants explained that their biggest frustration about the nature of mass tourism development is the creation of barriers which make it nearly impossible to interact or socialize with tourists. However, others lamented that whenever they approach a tourist, even if simply to greet them, they tend to be immediately approached by either police officers or security guards.
In short, the various guardians surrounding the Falmouth and Lucea enclaves are central to ensuring that the physical walls remain impermeable (Sibley, 1995).

Yet it is also worth noting that not everyone sees the increased security personnel in an entirely negative light, as some respondents noted feeling safer now than before. One female resident of Falmouth in her 40s expressed feeling grateful knowing that the town is more secure than before tourism, even if it is only a side effect of the primary objective, “it’s like they are more protecting the tourists than the residents and [but] we are all humans so all of us should be protected.”

The most common response to this situation, indicated by many respondents, was to avoid talking to tourists altogether, even if the visitors ask for simple directions. The social barriers associated with the presence of the guardians may be described as a pseudo-legal buffers since they are not formally inscribed into legal frameworks, and normal, everyday interactions are impeded without clear justification. The ambiguity of anti-harassment laws further exacerbates the social distance between local residents and tourists.

The way that the state has sought to control space in the interests of tourist’s safety has also facilitated ongoing tensions between security personnel and some vendors and tour and taxi operators, who are inhibited from certain areas though their livelihood depends on direct and multiplier impacts of the tourism sector.

5.2.2. Fear and Distrust between Local Residents and Security Presence

Jamaica has had a long history of disharmony and distrust between the police and local residents, along with one of the highest rates of crime per capita in the world (Morris and Maguire, 2015). At its worst, these problems involve police killing citizens and vice versa, which
has cultivated a culture of fear of the police among some Jamaicans. This complicates the security dynamics noted in the previous section.

As indicated, people in Falmouth are fearful of socially engaging with the tourists, especially those residents vending or using the city centre on ship days when there is a heavy and very conspicuous presence of security agents, including both the JCF and the Tourist Courtesy Corps. The Tourist Security Corps programme was instituted in 2009 by the Tourism Product Development Company (TPDCo) and a private security firm called Marksman, in response to complaints about visitor harassment. The Tourist Security Corps have a range of tasks, including benign things like providing information and direction to visitors and local residents on various subjects including location of attractions, restaurants and places of interest, advising visitors on accurate transportation fees to and from any part of the island. But there is also a harder (yet somewhat ambiguous) edge to their job description, as TPDCo’s Executive Director indicated during an interview, noting that Tourist Corps are also responsible for “keeping a close watch on characters, who could be a source of problems to visitors and who are likely to create an undesirable image for Jamaica.” Some respondents see this as the primary purpose of the Tourist Corps, as one male respondent in his 30s noted that on ship days, “you don’t get that opportunity to approach a tourist in a friendly way. [Once] you move toward a tourist, a [tourist] police moves toward you.”

The fear of arrest and harassment by Tourist Corps has created a situation, as discussed, where locals are discouraged from engaging with tourists, which may be interpreted by tourists as being rude or unfriendly. Residents and SME operators interviewed indicated that people are regularly harassed by the security personnel, with many recalling instances where people were confronted for just being friendly with the tourists. Some respondents also connected this
disciplining of social interactions to a view that their rights to freedom of speech and movement were being unfairly restricted, as well as contributing to a general sense of anxiety, as some explained they feel nervous and annoyed whenever the police watch them too closely. A woman in her 40s who had lived in Falmouth all her life explained that she felt safer walking in the town prior to the development of tourist sites than she does now, attributing this to the increased police presence and her fear that walking close to tourists could get her arrested on harassment charges.

In an interview with a representative of the Tourist Courtesy Corps this discipline was attributed to a sense that many local people are so desperate for any opportunity to make money off the tourists that it leads to some deceptive and aggressive hustling that can damage the tourist product:

Ship days are so hectic! We have to deal with pimps, craft vendors and bus drivers and to see to it that tourists are not harassed. Most residents are looking for a quick sale and this is not good for the tourists. They trick them…they even give [sell] them blank CDs [instead of CDs with reggae music].

When asked to define harassment, this representative said it entails efforts “to force tourists to buy stuff and soliciting money from them,” and this perception frames the sense of why tourists need to be protected from potential harassment. However, the vigilance of the JCF and Tourist Courtesy Corps does not only impede a potential tourist harasser but also formal workers such as the licensed taxi drivers and bus operators whose success is reliant on having conversations with tourists. For instance, a male taxi driver in his 50s pointed out how difficult it is to attract passengers on ship days, noting that “Police and white cap [courtesy corps] don’t want you to talk to the tourists. And we were qualified by TPDCo to communicate with them.”

Some bus and taxi operators indicated a fear that they run the risk of detention or harassment from simply negotiating prices, and described this as unfair treatment for a sector that should be benefitting from the new tourist developments. One very notable expression of
frustration with the tourism authorities occurred on December 10, 2013, when tour bus drivers in Falmouth staged an organized protest in the vicinity of the Pier with placards expressing anger over perceived injustices meted out by the security forces in the town on ship days. For some respondents, the ways that the JCF and Tourist Courtesy Corps affect space, especially in Falmouth, is one of the biggest frustrations with the changes to the community.

These findings strongly contrast with the goals of the Master Plan for Sustainable Tourism Development discussed in Chapter 4. It seems clear that the social and economic sustainability of the new tourist development is being undermined by the tensions between local security authorities and residents in general, including even some groups who might have been expected to benefit. In sum, many respondents described how their rights and sense of place are negatively affected by the efforts to establish a positive perception of place by tourists, with the areas immediately outside the enclaves the primary spatial context for this tension and intense social segregation. The social tensions on the margins of the enclaves also play out within the enclaves for those employed at the Pier and the Grand Palladium, who face power inequalities and social marginalization in different ways (Brooks, 2008).

5.3. The Purification of Space within Enclaves

The purification of space does not only take place on the outside of the tourist enclaves but also within its confines, which can be understood at two basic levels. The first level is the tension between low-paid service workers and wealthy tourists (Kingsbury, 2011; Gibson, 2009; Taylor, 1993). While some might envisage that physical isolation of enclaves from the rest of society would reduce the racial and class tensions between the tourists (predominantly Caucasian) and the local people, others view the separation of tourists from the wider society and in these enclaves as a reflection – and magnification – of past and present inequalities. According
to Taylor (1993: 89), these spaces can “resuscitate the dying master-servant culture [thereby becoming] areas of subtle black-white confrontation.” Within many enclaves, the continuity of colonial racial and class differences between the tourists and the ‘hosts’, as well as between the enclave owners (both foreign corporations and local elites) and the mostly low-paid employees, form a significant part of the plantation tourism landscape that Weaver (1988) theorizes. These spaces can also be seen to be marked by the constant negotiation of ideas about class, gender, and life itself (Minca, 2009). One clear manifestation of this is that the management of many all-inclusives discipline the behaviour of their workers through codes of ethics such as having to smile in the presence of guests. Thus, the simple act of smiling can be seen as a deceptive and subliminal act (Kingsbury, 2011; Mowforth and Munt, 2003). As Kingsbury (2011: 656) puts it, the smile therefore “deceitfully conceals the dirty secrets of socio-economic hardship,” as well as the undignified treatment of the workers on the job.

The second major way that the purification of space plays out within enclaves relates to efforts to manage ethnic friction and gender-related discrimination. The stratification of labour by race is a dominant feature of tourism development within the Caribbean (Carty, 2009). As Mbaiwa (2005: 165) indicated, “in enclave tourism, citizens and local people usually hold poor and unskilled jobs, such as maids, waiters and waitresses, kitchen help, bell-hops, ground keepers and security guards, while management and better paying positions are held by expatriates.” Even in cases where training is provided within the enclave, there tends to be extremely limited upward mobility for most employees.

The lack of mobility is a sore point at the Grand Palladium Hotel. Although the hotel provides training and upgrading courses, respondents indicated that it is common for local employees to be stuck at the same low-level job for years, while foreign workers are known to
hold the most strategic positions and have the most room for upward mobility. For instance, one female Palladium employee in her 20s lamented that after helping to train workers from Spain, she was subsequently passed over for promotion by them: “Jamaicans normally don’t get the bigger positions. In fact, I trained a few of the Spaniards that come down and they ended up being my directors.”

Another source of frustration expressed by some respondents is their view that local people who hold managerial positions have a greater risk of losing their jobs for trivial reasons, which they described as being deliberately orchestrated to create vacancies for foreign workers. The plight of workers is further weakened because they are barred from forming or joining any form of union, with dismissal as the penalty for any organizing efforts. One female worker in her 20s explained her sense of the barriers to forming a workers’ union as: “They are gradually getting rid of Jamaicans from their managerial positions and bringing in the Spaniards instead. Because we are not part of a union, they get away with it. They fired a Jamaican manager and took a Spaniard.” She also noted that “a pregnant lady got fired because they found out she called the union” about the prospect of unionization at the Palladium.

It is important to note that the barriers to unionization is not a region-wide phenomenon. For instance, in Barbados the Barbados Workers Union helps negotiate the wage levels for hotel workers on a nation-wide basis (Alleyne et al., 2006). Respondents not only feared for how they could defend their rights without a union, but also lamented that they have no pension or health plans while their Spanish counterparts enjoy substantial social benefits, such as access to staff housing and vehicles. The same female worker in her 20s explained her sense that Spaniards will come for only six weeks of training and end up with a good position, and “get to eat at any restaurant [at the hotel] they want and also from the buffet line,” and “can carry their family”
into the hotel on day passes. She contrasted this to the Black Jamaican staff, who cannot “be caught in line with even a glass of water,” and cannot bring their families in on day passes. Further, she stressed that staff dynamics are highly segregated, noting that “the Spaniards are never caught eating with us.”

Some respondents did note that the racial divide at the hotel was made more complex by the presence of Mexican workers, who they saw as receiving similar treatment as the local employees, and as similarly excluded by the Spanish, which they attributed to the fact that Mexicans are not Caucasian and therefore lower in the racial hierarchy. Yet in spite of their similar status between Mexicans and Jamaicans, there is limited interracial mingling between them.

Similar racialized tensions were evident at the Falmouth Pier, as the local employees there also complained that simple courtesies have become a chore. Some respondents even indicated how their Caucasian managers or supervisors were so disrespectful that they even ignored simple greetings, causing them to feel belittled and disrespected in their own country, which clearly threatens the overall tourist product, as many studies have emphasized the importance of showing respect to employees of hotels in order to boost their morale and in turn their quality of service to guests (El-Said, 2014; Kusluvan et al., 2010; Tenbrunsel et al., 2010; Dutton, 2003). As El-Said (2014: 213-214) puts it, good service depends on hotel employees perceiving that they are “accepted, appreciated, recognized, esteemed, considered, valued and treated with dignity from their managers, supervisors, co-workers, and other employees in the hotel regardless of their age, gender, religion, nationality, culture and degree of experience” in contrast to widespread complaints from workers about “being undervalued, unappreciated, not recognized, respected, or rewarded on a par with their efforts.” Thus, the serious morale
problems conveyed in interviews with workers would also seem to damage the overall tourism product. Yet in spite of frustrations, participants noted a sense of resignation with their situation, citing the difficulty in securing employment elsewhere as the main reason why they and other employees endure such conditions.

Another problem within the enclaves relates to the gendered division of labour. This is not, of course, unique to tourism, as women generally occupy the lower levels of employment in many sectors than men, and possess fewer career development opportunities (ILO, 2001), but it is a widely noted aspect of the inequalities associated with mass tourism. One aspect of this is the widespread view by employers that women are more predisposed to low-paying and insecure working conditions.

One way this gender inequality plays out in the Grand Palladium is that a woman may be fired if she gets pregnant more than twice, while female workers in the duty-free shops at the Falmouth Pier must go without maternity pay. Multiple female participants described having been explicitly told that there was no guarantee they would remain employed in the enclaves if they become pregnant. One female worker in her early 20s at the Pier, who is the mother of an infant child, explained that:

My employers don’t want us to have children. When I was going for the interview, I was told to tell her I have no kids, because she wouldn’t hire me [otherwise] and when I got the job, she kept telling us not to have children ‘cause [because] they don’t pay maternity and you won’t have a job to come back to!

This gender inequality has serious implications for women in the tourism industry, especially in light of the fact that over 47% of all households in Jamaica are female headed in the permanent absence of a partner (Statistical Institute of Jamaica, 2012). This clearly calls into question the ability of mass tourism to help promote gender equality and empower women, which should be a pillar of development (UNDP, 2016).
5.4. Disempowerment and Dispossession

Mass tourism oftentimes creates disempowerment amongst the most voiceless and disadvantaged in the Global South (Han et al. 2014). The concept of disempowerment is aptly explained as:

the failure of certain groups to maintain and utilize their rights to access shared social resources due to the influence of external factors, and can be divided into three categories: (1) community disempowerment, in which a disadvantaged group is less able than others to access essential resources; (2) political disempowerment, in which a disadvantaged group is restricted from pursuing a definite political agenda or from expressing itself; and (3) psychological disempowerment, in which they are made to feel worthless, and passively succumb to authority and internalize their grievances (Han et al. 2014: 718).

Jamaica, like many destinations of the Global South, is marked by a history of economic and political struggle to keep foreigners from exploiting its resources (Sinclair-Maragh and Gursoy, 2015). This phenomenon adds momentum to the polarization of benefits in the hands of a few powerful tourism players and a simultaneous disempowerment and dispossession of the local people. Subsequent to the polarization process is the creation of fears, resentment, stress, impoverishment and overall social and economic exclusion among local residents. In this segment of my discussion, I present specific case studies of locals’ experiences with the commodification of their spaces and cultures, as mass tourism expands.

5.4.1. Psychological Disempowerment: Loss of Civic Pride

Although the establishment of mass tourism spaces has raised the visibility of what were previously sleepy fishing villages, the residents of both Falmouth and Lucea have experienced erosion of their civic pride. The participants of the study in Lucea lamented that tourism has robbed them of their true value as a people causing them to feel disrespected and walked over. As one female resident in her 20s exclaimed during the interview, “we are always left out of
everything! Water, light [electricity] – everything! If we don't demonstrate [protest], we won't be included in anything!”

These problems play out in various ways. Firstly, the residents were yet to understand why the hotel continuously employed what seemed like a significant number of staff from parishes other than Hanover when so many Hanoverians have been seeking employment there with little success. Secondly, the neighbouring parish of Westmoreland was chosen as the official location of the popular resort town, Negril despite the fact that the town is geographically located in both parishes with its 7-mile long Negril Beach spanning both Westmoreland and Hanover. Thirdly, they were disgruntled that Dolphin Cove has a Negril address on its signboard when in reality it is located in Sandy Bay in Hanover (see Figure 5.4). One female resident in her 20s suggested that “I think it should be changed to Dolphin Cove Hanover or Dolphin Cove Lucea,” which encapsulates a common sentiment shared by nearly every Lucea respondent. Added to these concerns is the fact that the Grand Palladium also has Montego Bay as part of its address on its website (see Figure 5.5), yet it is physically located in Hanover. One disgruntled resident suggested that the parish must be called ‘Hand-me-over’ instead of Hanover, since there is scant regard for the people living there.
While it is impossible to gauge, I developed a general sense that there was more civic pride surrounding the mass tourism development among the residents of Falmouth than their Lucea counterparts, though this has likely waned since the establishment of the Pier. Many
participants described how there was an initial sense of excitement and great expectations about their once quiet town becoming a major cruise port, and some noted the widespread pride about the volume of media attention that surrounded the official Opening Day of the Pier on March 22, 2011. During this time, Falmouth residents initially had the opportunity to interact with the first batch of cruise tourists in the Water Square which became a zone of convergence for local people and tourists. However, this interactive space and dynamic was very short-lived, and the associated excitement and pride, was dislodged over time by serious fear of engaging with tourists, as discussed earlier in Section 5.2. By the time my fieldwork concluded, my interviews and time in Falmouth left me with a strong belief that most people feel little pride in the Pier and largely do not see themselves as part of the tourism development process, which among other things has serious implications for the quality of the tourism product.

5.4.2. Community Disempowerment: Loss of Recreational and Dwelling Places

In the broadest sense, community disempowerment occurs when “a disadvantaged group is less able than others to access essential resources” (Han et al. 2014: 718). One recurring way that participants in both study areas described feeling disempowered and dispossessed related to their lost access to certain spaces, which is a common phenomenon in destinations of the Global South when large areas of land get devoted to mass tourism projects. Oftentimes, there are conflicts between powerful private interests, planning authorities, and local people who occupy or access the spaces sought for tourism development. These can involve fundamentally different conceptions of place: for the tourism industry and allied government planners, land is often seen as mere property, whereas to the local people it can places where important parts of their lives have been spent. As Agnew (2005) suggests, place is not only about a physical location but rather refers to how physical settings are shaped by social relationships and individual
experiences, which often involves strong emotional attachments. The loss of access to the Bamboo Beach in Lucea and the relocation of the residents of the Dump Community in Falmouth are clear examples of dispossession and the loss of place can play out with mass tourism development.

Some scholars argue that privatized beaches are not mere physical spaces but should be understood as landscapes of power; instead of being conceived as national treasures which local people have free access to, they get dominated by wealthy foreigners and local elites (Carlisle and Jones, 2012). This reflects how, as discussed in chapter 2, local residents are regularly alienated from some of the most beautiful areas of their countries through the process of mass tourism development (Snyder et al., 2015; Kingsbury, 2011; Mbaiwa, 2011; Sebastian and Rajagopalan, 2009; Taylor, 1993). This was clearly evident in Lucea, where many participants complained that they have been displaced from their best and most conveniently-located beach, Bamboo Beach, since the construction of the Grand Palladium (see Figure 5.6).

Figure 5.6: View of a Section of Grand Palladium’s Privatized Beach Space

Source: Grand Palladium
The establishment of the cruise ship pier in Falmouth also alienated many local residents from commonly used beachfront, as well as involving a more dramatic dispossessions. The construction of the Pier involved the forceful relocation of over 160 households from land they occupied for many years in an adjacent informal settlement called Dump. In 2011, the residents of Dump were relocated to a more formal settlement called Hague Settlement (Figure 5.7), roughly two miles away from their original location near the town centre. Although residents were given adequate notice, not everyone complied with the directive and whether they were willing to move or not, all of the properties were destroyed by bulldozers.

**Figure 5.7: View of Hague Settlement**

The disruption of forced relocation was made worse by serious deficiencies at the new location, including the absence of the most basic amenities. Even though the Housing Agency installed some infrastructure such as roads and fire hydrants, people were forced to move before taps had running water, which had still not arrived by the time of my fieldwork (Figures 5.8). Further,
many parts of the road network were in deplorable conditions, with one result being that taxi drivers were charging higher than normal fares.

Figure 5.8: Infrastructure inequalities: Unpaved Roads and Lack of water pipes

![Image: Unpaved Roads and Lack of water pipes](image)

Source: Author’s Fieldwork

The participants I spoke with in Hague Settlement consistently contrasted their new lives with the ones they had at Dump, noting that they did not have to worry much about taking taxis because of its central location.

5.5. Participation in Decision-Making

Participation in decision-making and development planning by members of a local community goes beyond their right to vote in a political election (Tosun, 2005) and is vital to achieving a more equitable tourism industry. Local people’s participation in tourism development relates to both their involvement in ongoing decision-making processes and to the ultimate distribution of the benefits from the industry (Michael et al. 2013; Marzuki, Hay and James, 2012; Nault and Stapleton, 2011; Tosun, 2005; 2000; Timothy, 1999; Havel, 1996).

However, as indicated in Chapter 2, the power structure in Jamaica as in many other countries in
the Global South, is highly skewed, and most local residents have no place in decision-making and do not reap significant benefits (Jordan et al. 2015; Jamal and Camargo, 2014; Lee and Hampton, 2015).

Unequal power can be seen as a barrier to participation in decision-making and as such, it is important to understand the specific mechanisms used by governmental agencies to include or exclude local people in planning processes. Michael (2013) proposes five categories to assess the quality of participation in decision-making processes: (1) participants are representatives of the wider community, (2) membership is balanced, (3) participation comes early in the decision-making process, (4) face-to-face discussion between the public and agency representatives occur, and (5) the agency is committed to the participatory process and responsive to public input. These criteria cannot be seen to have been met in Falmouth and Lucea, even though the government attempted to promote community participation through the formation of Parish Development Committees (PDCs) in 2007. The committees, guided by the motto, “Let the Voice of the People Prevail,” were given the specific objective of ensuring that the local masses are involved in policy and planning-related matters in their respective parishes, mainly through town hall meetings.

However, in interviews respondents consistently expressed that the voices of the community could not be heard through the PDCs, which related to the limited actual power of this local branch of government and has been made worse by the fact that both the Trelawny and Hanover PDCs have been inactive since 2013. Insufficient resources including the absence of office space and member latency were cited as major challenges by a past secretary of the Hanover chapter. Such problems are a reflection of the polarized nature of tourism decision-making, which lies predominantly in the hands of powerful private sector actions and a few...
planning agencies. More than 80% of those surveyed in both study areas indicated that they feel totally powerless in the tourism decision-making process (see Figure 5.9). Further, in interviews many participants described how they feel they were not adequately informed about initial plans for tourism development in their towns in the first place, let alone being allowed to participate in the decision-making. As a female Lucea resident in her 30s argued that “expressing your concern is one thing, they doing something about it is another. Little people like me don't have a voice, it's only the big money people.”

Figure 5.9: Perceptions of How Community Power Influence Tourism Decision-making

In opposition to the views of the residents, the representative of TPDCo explained that a number of stakeholder meetings were advertised and held within Falmouth prior to the establishment and at the start of the Pier construction. He maintained that there were many instances of sensitization:

A lot of sensitization took place with the business community and the residents. Stakeholder meetings were held on a regular basis and they were informed as to what would have happened. As to whether they took it serious is another matter because I think people were still of the view that this [mass tourism development] would never have
happened and this is some of the reason why they didn’t change what they do in their business].

The UDC representative made a similar justification, insisting that: “a massive sensitization campaign was done before [the construction of the Pier]. It pretty much gave an overview of the scope of the development which started in 2010 until 2011. It spoke to expected benefits and how to tap into opportunities coming to Falmouth – this is how expectations were immensely raised.”

While some participants did express an appreciation that these meetings were held in their towns, most were critical about the degree of participation and dialogue these involved, and many inferred that they were mainly a mere medium of informing the people of the decisions for development that had already been taken. In the words of one male Falmouth resident in his 30s, “they [major decision-makers] did not really incorporate anyone and that’s what is destroying this country – the bigger heads go and make plans by themselves.” Further, although these meetings were usually advertised in the local newspapers and via community notice boards, the TPC representative suggested that many residents were either not effectively reached via these outlets or they disregarded the information, and she pointed out that only a few people actually turned up to the many meetings that were convened in the Water Square area.
5.6. Conclusions

Any sort of community development can result in varying combinations of empowerment or disempowerment (Toomey, 2011), and in many countries of the Global South, mass tourism development has been associated with increasing social exclusion for the majority, as was clearly reflected in my research in Falmouth and Lucea. As Kingsbury (2005) argues, tourism development cannot be viewed as merely innocent enjoyment. An examination of mass tourism development in the study areas has contributed to social and political exclusion in and around the enclaves. It is clear that there is an emergence of a new form of colonialism- one in which many of the traits of colonialism and the plantation society is finding its way back into the fabric of the Jamaican economy and society. Unless the various social and political challenges as well as the reduction or loss of civic pride and social exclusion are addressed, many members of the local population of the study areas will continue to feel like foreigners in their own country.
In the next chapter, attention turns to the changes in the built environment stemming from mass tourism development, how this affects the surrounding environment and community life, and how people have contested this.
CHAPTER SIX

ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES AND CONTESTATIONS OVER SPACE

6.1. Introduction

In general, tourism-related activities have the potential to create opportunities for environmental conservation, beautification and the preservation of historical buildings. However, mass tourism oftentimes consumes resources and creates waste and burdens for the host environment (Beladi et al. 2009). In particular, the industry and its associated activities create environmental challenges such as land and water pollution, disruption of habitats, deforestation, coral reef destruction, reduction in bio-diversity as well as conflicts over space access and use. As a result, tourism host communities often struggle with how to balance tourist numbers and the carrying capacities of their environments. This concern has motivated a growing number of studies centred on the use of the Ecological Footprint (EF) as a tool to analyze such environmental costs of tourism to host destinations (e.g. Chen and Hu, 2015; Xiao, 2011; Dolnicar, 2010; Castellani and Sala, 2008; Hunter and Shaw, 2007; Gössling, 2002).

In this chapter, the primary focus is on the perceptions of the local population and representatives of key planning agencies such as the Parish Councils on issues involving mass tourism and associated environmental changes in Falmouth and Lucea. The chapter also discusses the ways in which contestation over environmental access and use have contributed to growing socio-economic problems amongst the coastal residents and business communities. Finally, the chapter seeks to understand the response of the local population to the benefits and challenges of mass tourism development in the two towns.
6.2. Environmental Decision-making, Changes, and Contestations over Space

6.2.1. Perceptions of Mass Tourism Impacts on Natural Environment

Although mass tourism development has brought some economic benefits to Falmouth and Lucea, one of the biggest costs of this has been the negative impacts on the physical environment of both towns. The small size of the towns and the ecologically-sensitive coastal and marine environments means that huge developments like the Falmouth Pier and the Grand Palladium Hotel pose great risks in construction and in the ensuing human activity and wastes. In the surveys, 61% of Lucea residents and 64% of Falmouth respondents agreed or strongly agreed that mass tourism has minimal adverse impacts on the environment, while only about a quarter of respondents disagreed (Figures 6.1 and 6.2). In the interviews, however, some respondents described negative environmental outcomes. For instance, a male lifelong resident of Falmouth in his 40s noted changes in the natural environment which he believes to be connected to the construction of the Pier. When asked whether mass tourism has had minimal impacts on the environment he replied:

No sir! It has had a huge impact. When I was growing up and it rains, within no time the town would be dry again [no flooding issues] because of the quality drainage system the English built to take away the water. But since the establishment of tourism the place becomes flooded whenever it rains...One of the problems is that Tharpe St.'s drain has been re-designed to be a little higher during the time they were constructing the Pier...it used to drain water to the sea but now around Trelawny St. area is flooded.
According to the representative from the Trelawny Parish Council (TPC), Falmouth used to have “one of the healthiest harbours and coral reefs in Jamaica...because they were undisturbed for many years.” However, the construction of the Pier culminated in the largest
coral reef re-location exercise in the history of the island. During the construction process, between August 2009 and April 2010, about 150,000 organisms were relocated from the marine waters that were needed for the construction of the Pier (Kenny et al. 2012), creating waves of concerns amongst local environmental activists. It is therefore clear that mass tourism is not only a powerful force of displacing people from their habitats (as discussed at length in Chapters 4 and 5) but also flora and fauna.

Local environmental activists and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) such as the Jamaica Environmental Trust (JET) and Jamaican Environmental Advocacy Network (JEAN) have all expressed concerns in the media about the construction of the Grand Palladium and other mega-hotels on sites that have been identified as habitats for various species of endemic plants and animals. These groups publicly opposed the construction of the Grand Palladium, as well as many other mega-hotels such as the Gran Bahia Principe, another Spanish-owned hotel. A *Gleaner Jamaica* article in 2007 indicates how mass tourism development had emerged “on the environmental front burden,” as organizations challenged the Government:

…to monitor the construction of large hotels on the north coast...environmental groups stepped up pressure to get hotels to conform to regulations and building requirements to safeguard against harm to the sensitive marine environment where most of these hotels have been situated. Subsequent Government probe showed that the Grand Palladium Hotel in Point, Hanover, was negligent in many respects [Jamaica Gleaner, 2007: 1].

Despite the concerns of the environmental activists, the representatives from the Grand Palladium and the TPC believed that the impacts of the Pier and hotel construction on the environment were controlled. In light of this belief, the representative of the TPC specifically stated that the adverse effects of the over six-month-long dredging and land reclamation on the marine environment were minimal. When asked whether there were any negative impacts of the construction process on the natural environment, the representative of TPC replied:
Not that I am aware of, because we were there as one of the monitoring bodies, along with NEPA and Health [Department]...NEPA had a representative there on site...if something [adverse] was happening [to the marine environment] they would have halted the project.

Overall the representative was satisfied about the effort taken to preserve the marine environment and organisms throughout the dredging of the Pier. The main concern expressed involves the effects of sedimentation – primarily the accumulation of murky waters - on nearby tourist attraction, Glistening Waters. The Glistening Waters (also called the Luminous Lagoon) is a naturally occurring attraction, as the water lights up as it is agitated. The TPC representative explained that to the best of her knowledge, the sedimentation affected the visibility of the glow of the organisms that cause the water to light up:

Do you know of the Glistening Waters down the road, where the water would glisten at nights? Am not sure if it’s up and running [since the construction of the Falmouth Pier] because of the whole disturbance by the dredging process.

The area of the Grand Palladium was also a habitat for endemic birds before any construction started, as noted in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) published by the Government of Jamaica (NEPA, 2005). The report also indicates that prior to the construction, the quality of the coastal waters in the vicinity of the site was excellent, based on laboratory tests. However, there is no clear indication as to what the water quality or biodiversity of the area is currently like. The management of the Grand Palladium has taken some measures to reduce damage to the natural environment including hiring an environmental company to monitor the health of the coral reef in the area. During the interviews, a male representative of the Grand Palladium explained that, in the event that there is any sign of disturbance, the “coral reef will be relocated to safer parts of the waters.” To date, however, the extent of relocation of corals in the waters surrounding the hotel is unclear. It is in the best interest of tourist entities to preserve the coral reefs and other aspects on the natural environment on which the quality of beaches highly depends.
However, environmental conservation remains a sore point in many tourist areas and is often viewed by some developers as the proverbial necessary evil that is a potential gateway to economic prosperity within destinations. This sentiment is succinctly expressed in the EIA for Grand Palladium:

The removal of vegetation and ecological habitats is unavoidable and is the main trade-off to be made against the economic benefits to be derived from project [i.e. the construction of the Grand Palladium] implementation (NEPA, 2005: VI).

The one thing that was made clear from the survey of residents, however, was that the vast majority of them have not seen any such economic benefits. The representative from the Grand Palladium argued a similar line, stating that: “In any area that development takes place, there has to be destruction of some amount of the environment.” Considering that the economic benefits of mass tourism have been way below the people’s expectations, as detailed in Chapter 4, the trade-off between environmental costs and possible economic prosperity has been an unfair one.

Another area of concern for critical tourism scholars is that of maintaining fair decision-making within host communities.

6.2.2. Asymmetrical Decision-making in Environmental Planning

It must be understood that environmental change does not occur in isolation from social power but when the two come together, they can even exacerbate environmental challenges (Cole, 2014). The domination of decision-making by the more powerful players in mass tourism influences the regulations and actions that result in environmental changes. In turn, these changes have influenced the perceptions and attitudes of the local population towards mass tourism development. Generally, if the environmental changes are positive, the local people will have a greater feeling of belonging and an overall welcoming attitude towards tourists and
tourism activities. However, if the environmental changes are adverse, the people may display an unwelcoming attitude towards the industry.

When asked specifically about their involvement in the environmental planning process, some interviewees again expressed feeling largely excluded. In words of one Falmouth male resident in his 40s: “I don't think the people were much involved. We are getting an after reaction from the residents...who [are] saying we can't damage the environment in the name of development, because if the people were aware that the reefs were going to be damaged we would have opposed it [mass tourism development].” Participatory planning would have been a more appropriate approach to environmental decision-making but the planning agencies in Jamaica, like many other countries of the Caribbean, have “achieved [their planning objectives] through a top-down development process” (Dodman, 2008: 30). As detailed in Chapter 5, the key players in the decision-making process oftentimes make decisions to suit their own economic interests and not necessarily those of the local population which is contrary to the philosophies of participatory planning that agencies such as the Urban Development Corporation (UDC) outline in their mission statements. On their website and also in the interview with a representative of the company, it was communicated that one of the objectives of the agency is to work in partnership with the local communities.

Likewise, the representative from the Hanover Parish Council (HPC), highlighted that one of the ongoing ways in which the people of Lucea are incorporated in decision-making is through the use of a signage on properties which have applied to the HPC for construction permits. Shortly after the Grand Palladium applied for a permit for construction, a sign was erected at the gate to notify the community members of plans to start the project. The HPC
representative explained that the community members were given the opportunity to object to the
construction of the Grand Palladium during the period of time that the sign was posted for:

Prior to the actual construction, they would have community meetings to get feedback…the hotel
itself went out to get that feedback. When you are doing a construction, the Council [HPC] gives
you a notice that must be put on the property prior to the construction, giving 14 days to the
general public to make any justifiable objection to whatever you are planning to build there.

It was not clear as to whether there were any objections or how they were handled. But overall,
this signage did not seem like an effective way of involving the local people in the decision-
making process. Fieldwork evidence suggests that some residents did not take note of it or did
not feel that their objection would have made a difference in the plans for the development. For
instance, a female resident of Lucea in her 30s was clear that her community was never seriously
sensitized or incorporated in the decision-making process:

No! We only heard that a hotel was going to be built… [However] we saw the zinc [perimeter]
fencing [before the start of construction]. But I don’t know if they put up any sign anywhere.

6.2.3. Loss of Land and Strain on Livelihoods from Mass Tourism

One of the common consequences of mass tourism involves the forceful removal of local
people from land either through official orders or redevelopment projects in local areas (Cohen,
2011), as mentioned in Chapter 5. In interviews, the fishermen I spoke with described their clear
sense that mass tourism development has damaged the environments they depend on. Many
residents indicated that since the start of mass tourism, they and the respective Parish Councils
have been at loggerheads over boundary demarcation, marine access and the consequences of
these challenges for their livelihoods. For example, one Falmouth fisherman in his 30s explained
the unfair treatment he and his peers received from the Parish Council:

The way the people [Parish Council] attacked us was not the right and proper way! Our places
were demolished – even concrete structures and we haven’t gotten anything [compensation],
anything at all!
The fishermen in Falmouth were not only disgruntled that they were relocated to an undesired location (Figure 6.3) in the coastal zone along Rodney Street but also that they were told by the local authorities to stay at least a mile from the Pier waters. Specifically, the fishermen were told that their fish pots or boats would be ceased or destroyed if they are found within a mile of the Pier waters. A fisherman in his 70s, who has been fishing for over 30 years in Falmouth, summarized the struggles of his peers:

Fishermen were told to stay one mile from the harbour! On an ordinary day, we might go and check on our buoys, only to find them [the water police] cut off the rope! This happened just two weeks ago. We lobbied for meetings with the authority for them to clarify where the real boundary is, but nothing so far.

The fishermen recounted several instances when fish nets and pots were cut and destroyed by the PAJ/RCCL’s water police, estimating material cost at US$62 for each time they are damaged, which puts a strain on their financial resources to replace them. Based on the interviews, it is clear that the needs of the developers and external investors take precedence over the local people’s, despite the early signs of exclusion and inconvenience that such developments were creating.
While the fishermen in Lucea did not experience a physical relocation, they did have serious concerns over access to the water zones that had previously served as their fishing place before the construction of the Grand Palladium Hotel (Figure 6.4). One fishermen in his 50s stated, with frustration, that: “[mass] tourism doesn't complement the fishing industry…the hotel industry just doesn't support fishing”, which effectively captures the general feeling of displacement and anger amongst the majority of the fishermen there.
According to the fishermen, the hotel security guards have consistently instructed them to stay clear of the shoreline running parallel to the hotel’s property (see the invisible boundary in Figure 6.4). One fisherman in his 50s described it:

Everything is blocked off now, everything! People used to come from all around and use the beach. [But] tourism changes a lot of things…fishermen leave from here and they can’t even pull up over there [pointing at the nearby hotel waters]. You could take up small picnic trips to go over there [pointing to the spot formerly called Bamboo Beach] but now you can’t do that.

A representative from the Grand Palladium Hotel tried to justify why the fishermen are kept out of the hotel’s waters, noting that “if fishermen and other local residents come to this area, they would have to do so legally. We have security personnel who patrol the area…the fishermen have no legal access to the property.”

Unlike the Falmouth fishing area where buoys have been placed in the water to mark the border of the Pier’s waters, there was nothing in the Lucea harbour to demarcate the exact
boundary. When asked about the absence of a physical marker to identify the border beyond which fishermen do not have access, the Grand Palladium representative replied:

There’s no need for a physical demarcation as hotels are not meant to share their facility with the community. This is a hotel and all our beaches are owned by the hotel. They weren’t intended to be shared with fishermen.

Jamaica presents an anomalous case in which local residents are barred from beaches on hotel properties as in other Caribbean countries such as Barbados and the Bahamas, all hotel beaches are public. Jamaica’s approach to beach access is unique and the reasons are discussed further in Section 6.3 of this chapter.

One commonality between the fishermen of Falmouth and Lucea is that they complained about the longer journey they have to make offshore in order to locate any significant catch. This has been the case since they were verbally told by the respective enclaves to stay clear of the properties’ waters. To-date, there is no written expression of such regulations to the fishermen in the study areas. Another challenge experienced by the fishermen from both towns involves the disturbances of the coral reefs – by the dredging process – where the fishes breed and live. The disturbance, they believed, has resulted in the migration of fishes further offshore. The Fishermen in Falmouth particularly complained about the disturbance in the marine environment which resulted from the construction of the Pier. In the words of the President of the Falmouth Fishermen's Association, a fisherman in his 60s with many years of experience: “Dredging disturbed coral reef and the feeding area for the fish. Because of this, the fish have gone further out which means more gas has to be used to go further out to fish.” Similarly, another Falmouth fisherman in his 50s, with over 23 years experience, lamented that the fish population of Falmouth waters is rapidly decreasing, which has serious implications for the future of fishing in Falmouth.
Not only have the Falmouth fishermen been struggling to navigate these challenges but also the new struggles which arose from being at the new location. They indicated during the interviews that the new location has no working sanitation facilities such as toilets and they were still at loggerheads with the Parish Council over the ownership of the coastal land which they presently occupy. At the time of the fieldwork, the fishermen in both study areas were engaged in negotiation with planning authorities for better treatment. One disgruntled fisherman in his 30s indicated that he and his peers are yet to receive compensation money that was said to be released by the PAJ for them to re-start their fishing business at the new location: “We heard that the PAJ gave the Parish Council big money to give to us who were relocated but until now we haven’t received any! This is the only building remaining from the demolition… and we were the ones who brought it from up there.”

Overall, the fishermen raised serious concerns that they are largely excluded from decision-making, a phenomenon that is not unique to Jamaica but also plays out in other coastal areas of the Global South. Gray (2016), for instance in her study on knowledge integration in a marine protected area in Belize, concludes that the experiences and knowledge of fishermen are not significantly accounted for in the decision-making process. It is largely for this reason that the support of the fishermen of Falmouth and Lucea for mass tourism is fading. According to them, several meetings have previously taken place between the fishermen and Parish Councils and the Ministry of Fisheries but none has addressed these concerns. Among others, they cited the inability of fishermen to stand up to the authorities during the implementation of the new regulations, and disunity among the fishermen as contributing factors to the fruitlessness of previous meetings. Therefore, the fishermen were also at fault for the burdens that mass tourism
has created for them. In the opinion of the President of the Falmouth Fishermen's Association greater cohesion among the fishermen might have resulted in a more favourable outcome:

The fishermen weren’t brave enough to stand up to the authorities. The unity was absent amongst fisherfolk. Even to call a meeting they still sat and played dominoes or even went home for the day. Everyone is pulling in different directions!

6.3. Beach Inaccessibility

Existing studies have identified difficulties faced by local residents in accessing tourist-designated areas in host communities. For instance, Freitag’s (1994) study of the south coast of the Dominican Republic revealed that while the best beaches of Boca Chica have been closed to local residents, tourists had easy access to them. Similarly, Buzinde and Manuel-Navarrete’s (2013) study on mass tourism development in Akumal Pueblo, located in Mexican state of Quintana Roo, found that an increase in beachfront tourism properties resulted in serious reduction of local residents’ access to public beaches.

In Jamaica, beaches play a significant role in the recreational lives of the local people. By and large, there was free access to almost all beaches prior to tourism development, however, since the emergence of mega-hotels along the north coast of the island, many of the island’s beaches have been sold out to foreigners or local elites who own and operate hotels and guest houses (Miller, 2006). There are 275 beaches associated with such guest houses and 60 bathing beaches with hotels while there are only 87 recreational beaches available to the public for bathing. Put differently, only 25% of all beaches on the island are available for public use. Beach access has become quite a controversial and complex issue and is inconsistent with the Ministry of Land and Environment's original intention of allowing the island’s “beaches to be enjoyed by all” (Minister of Land and Environment November, 2002: vii).
More than 60 years after the first Commission of Inquiry was conducted into the issue of beach access, “many Jamaicans have [still] been effectively excluded from the island’s best beaches” (Miller, 2006: 39). The main challenge to be considered here is that Jamaica has had a history of economic and political dominance by more economically advanced countries of the Global North and today they are manifesting through elite dominance in tourism ownership. Moreover, there is the issue of a lax approach to environmental regulations to protect the public’s interests and needs.

It was evident during the interviews that in both Falmouth and Lucea, the local residents’ access to coastal areas has become limited over time. In an addendum to the EIA done by NEPA before the start of the hotel, the Grand Palladium explicitly promised that one of the beaches on property would be made available for the public’s use:

The beach on the eastern property line will be open to the public at all times. Access to this beach will be from the main road and will offer clear and unobstructed access to the sea (stated by Grand Palladium in ESTECH, 2004: 8).

However, more than a decade since this promise was made, there is nothing to indicate that the hotel is willing to allow local access to its beaches, as the representative of the Palladium hotel acknowledged: “With the beach, there isn’t much access to the locals.” To date, the local residents expressed that there has been little to no opportunity to jog, swim, play or socialize at beaches. For instance, one female respondent in her 30s from Lucea identified a challenge that mass tourism has created for her and her family: “when I was younger I used to go over there...there used to be turtles laying eggs in the sand but it’s probably destroyed by now. You know, the hotel is now constructed [so] you cannot go over there again.” This respondent also recounted the days when she and her friends and family were able to socialize at the Bamboo Beach but the construction of the Grand Palladium Hotel has now made the area inaccessible to
residents. Currently, signs have been implemented in turtle nesting areas in order to sensitize the users of the beach about the presence of the turtles and their eggs, along with regular educational campaigns amongst the members of staff. The Grand Palladium representative highlighted their efforts in this regard:

We do have an environmental programme here… we educate the various departments, primarily those in maintenance because they work on the ground and would likely be the first in contact with the turtles… we educate them on what can be done to prevent harm to the turtles and also why they come to our beaches to nest.

Lucea participants consistently lamented that there is now only one beach in the entire town that is available for the local people to use, as the others are either privatized or are run-down. Interviewees also indicated that there is another one located in a nearby community called Hopewell which some Lucea residents also use. But some find it inconvenient to travel much further to use a public beach which is sometimes overcrowded, a matter explained by a female resident in her 30s: “Now the residents have nowhere to go or find some crammed, little beaches. There is a little beach at the Watson Taylor Park but when you go there you can’t find any space!”

Another female resident of Lucea in her 30s similarly expressed disappointment that mass tourism development has interrupted use of the Bamboo Beach, as she reflected:

People used to go there and camp and cook. It was deserted, but there was a little road before the highway was built. It’s the area where the Fiesta hotel [Grand Palladium] is now. Fiesta takes up a lot of space... we [her community members] used to do [overnight] camping there. It used to be good because we used to cook and run races there.

In Falmouth, though some access has been lost, there is still more access to beaches such as Burwood Beach, though some participants did express concerns about safety and hygiene there, as it is widely considered sub-standard and unsafe due to a spate of reported robbery and
vehicular vandalism (further confirmed in an informal interview with a detective at the Falmouth Police Station).

6.4. Disparity in Town-cleaning and Beautification Efforts

Aesthetic appeal is very important to creating town pride and encouraging tourists to use the town. Falmouth and Lucea have both undergone infrastructural and aesthetical upgrades since the introduction of mass tourism. However, these were much more pronounced in Falmouth than Lucea where most of the respondents said they are satisfied with the environmental restoration efforts, including the re-painting of buildings and the mounting of signboards that tourism has brought. In the words of a lifelong Falmouth resident in his 30s:

The town was badly in need of development so the wharf [Pier] came and added to it. The town has been newly renovated so the town is more uplifted [enhanced]. A large section of the town was pure old buildings but now there is a shopping area. And now you can hang out in the town; you couldn't do that at first.

Another male Falmouth resident, also in his 30s, similarly attributed the renewal of the town to mass tourism and was thankful that the town is becoming more modernized:

Since the inception of the Pier, it gives the town a face-lift. There are now many clubs and restaurants. Before, there wasn’t much nightlife entertainment but now there are many. Also there are many more businesses. Even pizza is now available in Falmouth, residents don’t have to go to Mo-bay anymore.

Almost all zinc fences in Falmouth’s town centre were removed in time for the official opening of the Pier in March 2011. Since then, there has been ongoing maintenance of the initial beautification efforts. Other upgrades have included street re-surfacing; drain cleaning and general washing down of the area; planting of palm trees and the rehabilitation of infrastructure. Also, a number of institutional buildings such as the post office and court house have been
refurbished, giving the town an overall facelift and a significant momentum in efforts to preserve the town’s architectural heritage.

Although some refurbishing started from as early as 2007, the efforts were not finalized until the official opening of the Pier. The plans for the preservation of the town’s Georgian style architecture has been a major planning objective for agencies such as the Jamaica National Heritage Trust (JNHT) and the Ministry of Tourism (MOT). For instance, Section 5.1 of the MOT’s National Community Tourism Policy and Strategy (MOT, 2015) identified tourism as a sector to “protect and promote the protection of natural and cultural heritage” in Jamaica. As part of the efforts to enhance and preserve the historical buildings in the town of Falmouth, numerous signboards have been erected, each giving an overview of the history of the building or site that it is erected on. One Falmouth resident in his 30s described how he didn’t see a conflict between the heritage conservation and tourism, indicating his belief that “tourists are very educated about the history of the town. Even you as a by-stander on the street will pick up bits and pieces of the history.”

Falmouth residents expressed appreciation for the aesthetic improvements that the industry has brought to their town as half of the sample of those surveyed felt that the town was “somewhat ugly” and “very ugly” before the inception of mass tourism, but since then, only just over 10% felt that way. Participants were particularly happy with the street cleaning efforts. According to a female resident in her 40s: “There used to be garbage everywhere, especially on a Wednesday and Thursday. But now [since mass tourism] you have 3-5 [garbage] trucks running per day, every day and now you have a lot of workers sweeping the streets.” Another Falmouth resident, a male in his 30s, shared a similar sentiment: “the cleanliness of the town is a major improvement because before tourism, you had days of garbage on the streets and persons
urinating on the streets and people throwing garbage everywhere but now you have a garbage bin everywhere. Whether persons use them or not, they’re provided.”

Yet despite their general satisfaction with the overall cleanliness, many of the research participants in Falmouth expressed displeasure with the nature of the distribution of physical upgrades in the town. Specifically, key upgrades such as landscape beautification, pedestrian crossings and signage creation were mostly concentrated within a 200m radius of the Falmouth Pier. In the words of the UDC representative, “there is a lot of work to be done but the Historic District [i.e. the section of the town that is designated an official historic site by the Jamaica National Heritage Trust] is a priority.” Additionally, residents were disappointed that the facilities on the Pier were significantly more modernized than those in the town square. In this regard, many expressed concerns about the deplorable state of the water fountain in Water Square vis-à-vis the Pier’s (Figures 6.5A and 6.5B). At the time of my fieldwork, the Water Square fountain was without water, to the disappointment of all respondents.

Fig. 6.5a: Fountain Located on Pier           Fig. 6.5b. Fountain Located in Town Centre

Unlike Falmouth, the residents and business owners in Lucea broadly expressed dissatisfaction with the impacts of mass tourism on the built environment. Nearly 50% of the
residents surveyed felt that their town was polluted and unattractive before the emergence of mass tourism. An even greater number of residents (70%) believed that the town is unattractive since the introduction of mass tourism. The broad consensus was that tourism has brought little upgrade to the town’s infrastructure and aesthetics. Among the ongoing issues cited by residents are the unreliability of garbage truck services, the uncovered garbage containers as well as the clogging of drains from piles of garbage and subsequent flooding. A SME owner in her 30s lamented that:

The gutters are filled with garbage. Like really?! They need to do something about the garbage! During the rainy season, sometimes garbage backup and sometimes the bridge floods over. As a business owner, I don’t like the environment round the fish market because it has too much garbage.

Residents and vendors lamented about the lack of action despite repeated trips to the Parish Council and several written letters to Members of Parliament. As well, many complained about deep seated corruption among the local government representatives, as one female resident and independent vendor in her 50s expressed:

We have made several complaints to the individuals at the Parish Council and they promised to intervene. Even the bins (garbage receptacle) I tried complaining about several times. They promised several times that they would intervene [but] everybody is looking for some extra money on the side (bribe). I am telling you the truth, if you can tip them, they will work – I am telling you!

Another SME operator in Lucea expressed a sense of his disappointment that tourism has not brought the kinds of changes he had been anticipating: “I would say it has given, let’s say only a 10% change in terms of facelift. Some of the buildings have been painted and are looking a bit better [but] I would say I am not satisfied with the [overall] infrastructural changes in the towns.”

Part of the beautification in Lucea that occurred during my fieldwork was painting of the Lucea market, which surrounded 50th anniversary of Independence in Jamaica. As the HPC representative put it, this celebration contributed more to general beautification than the Grand
Palladium: “Much of the sprucing up in the town itself was a result of the Jamaica 50th celebrations in 2012, as persons were pushing for that sort of beautification. The then minister of Local Government wanted the markets to be in Jamaican colours so that they are easily identifiable.”

But from the perspective of other planning agencies, significant beautification and maintenance work has been done in Lucea since the establishment of the Grand Palladium. According to a TPDCo representative, significant efforts have been made to clean up the town and improve its sanitation condition:

The major drains in the town were done by us recently to help alleviate the flooding and constant maintenance of area. We have also played a role in beautifying the roadway (landscaping) in and around the town. If you notice, coming out of Fiesta [another name for Grand Palladium] and other areas- we are always doing bushing and cleaning- ensuring that there is a pleasing aesthetics.

But many participants critiqued this effort, indicating their belief that these cleaning and beautification projects have been largely restricted to roadways closest to the Grand Palladium while the rest of the town has been largely ignored.

The town of Lucea is below sea level, and has consistently experienced flooding. Along with the town’s poor sanitation, the constant stench of garbage has been of grave concern to the local residents. The pile up of garbage in various sections of the town centre and the heavily polluted fishing beach are the primary sources of stench. In 2014, a local newspaper dated September 26th, with the headline “A Dirty Town”, painted the following picture about the town’s garbage and sanitation condition:

The Hanover parish capital, Lucea, boasts one of the most beautiful vistas looking out at its harbour; but… the sea of garbage extends much further left, into the fishing beach nearby. Some of the garbage was rotting, suggesting that it had been there for an extended period of time [The Western Mirror, 2014: 1].
In both towns, the food market was surrounded by garbage at the time of the fieldwork (see Figure 6.6) and blocked drains were evident. The general sentiment was that the government values the needs of the tourists more than the local residents. Many residents and vendors indicated that for years they have lobbied for upgrades and proper sanitary facilities and regular garbage pickups but without any success. Apart from the stench from garbage, there were complaints about the smell of human excreta. A female vendor in her 50s gave a vivid description of this situation in Lucea, noting with frustration that: “the entire place smells like pee! Out there is so stink! When you go further to where the cars are parked [pointing to the public transportation centre], you can hardly breathe!”

**Figure 6.6: Polluted spaces in Non-tourist Parts of the Towns**

Source: Fieldwork  
Source: Fieldwork
6.5. Disruption in Routine Activities

One common consequence of mass tourism is that it disrupts the day-to-day activities of local residents, but this was not a serious issue in Lucea since there is hardly any tourist or tourist activity in the town centre. In Falmouth, on the contrary, where much of the commercial activities take place in the Water Square area, there is regular congestion in the busy town centre, made much worse by the construction of the Pier. The new demand for space in the Falmouth town centre has created inconveniences for the wider population of road users and local shoppers.

The congestion from tour buses, the bus drivers and other tourism workers has made routine errands such as banking and buying gas at stations more of a hassle for local residents on ship days, with one male resident in his 40s noting that “it's harder to do business in every single way...it's harder to move around now. Falmouth used to be a sleepy town but now it's wide awake!” The pace of life in Falmouth is disturbed especially on Wednesdays when people from other parts of Jamaica come to the ‘Bend Down’ Market. The ‘Bend Down Market’ is known as a place where there are bargain prices on items of clothing, shoes, household supplies as well as ground produce. The site of the 'Bend Down' is just around the corner from the Pier and is also where the regular farmers' market is held on weekends, but some residents expressed worries that plans are in place for its relocation to a more spacious spot on Market Street which is further from the town centre, which some fear would result in additional transportation costs to get there. One female respondent in her 40s explained that: “If we have to go there [the proposed location for the market], we would have to drive [take a taxi]...it is only convenient for those living in the central part of the town.”
One of the sources of distress for the local population is increased difficulty in locating taxies and buses to get home and to work. This issue came into existence since the relocation of their bus stops from Water Square which is now a pedestrianized area. There are 2 basic complications to this problem. Firstly, many of the new bus stops are further away from the Water Square area in the town centre. Secondly, numerous taxi and bus drivers are unwilling to utilize the newly designated bus stops and taxi stands because they are further from the major thoroughfare. This challenge is summed up by the UDC representative:

The pedestrianization of the Water Square has posed general inconvenience. Water Square used to be the hub of transportation for anywhere outside of Falmouth - now they are scattered all over the place even though they are supposed to be concentrated in the provided transportation centre but there is resistance from the bus and taxi operators who spend most of their days running from the police and the police spend most of their days chasing them and the patrons who spend most of their days moving from one section to the next.

The UDC representative also highlighted that parking is a huge problem on ship-days because the tour buses and taxies take up much of the parking in the town. In the words of a male Falmouth resident in his 30s: “Traffic flow has changed drastically. There are lots of one ways now and there is also the pedestrianization of water square, which is good! But it's harder to get a taxi now.” Added to traffic challenges, most of the buildings in Falmouth are not wheelchair accessible nor are there designated riding lanes for cyclists or even sidewalks. Considering that Falmouth is an eighteenth century-designed town which was not originally planned for high volume vehicular traffic, the roadways within the town centre are narrow with limited room for expansion.

6.6. Cobbler Walkways: Opportunity or Challenge?

Sibley (1995: 76) concludes that the built environment is an integral component in the production of social life which conditions movements and activities “according to the distribution of power in the socio-spatial system.” Some local residents did not welcome the
constructed brick walkways (see Figure 6.7) from the Falmouth Pier to the Water Square because it is believed to be an avenue of indirectly manipulating the movements of the cruise tourists. This alleged manipulation is said to be coming from the powerful tourism entities on the cruise ships and the enterprises on the Pier. There were other residents, however, who appreciated the installation of these cobbler walkways because they can help the tourists to have a greater sense of direction, with the hope that they would stay closer to the Pier and not get lost. According to one male resident in his 30s:

They [the tourists] are not really instructed to go to Thorpe St. They are just instructed to stay on the bricks…once they stay on the bricks they can just walk right around to get back to the wharf. The bricks are actually designed to show the linkage from the wharf to that area. Anywhere you see the bricks that the designated area for tourists to walk so you don’t see a lot of tourists far outside [of these walkways], you might see one and two and you have the tour guides that walk with them.

One of the outcomes of the brick walkway project is that the few tourists, who actually leave the ship to enter the town on foot, are hardly motivated to venture beyond where the cobblestones are absent, which was detailed in Chapter 4.

Figure 6.7: Brick Work on Part of Roadway, Falmouth

Source: Fieldwork
6.7. The Reverse Gaze

One of the earliest writings of how the environment is perceived by tourists came from Urry, who coined the now famous notion of the ‘tourist gaze’ (Urry and Larsen, 2011; Urry, 1996), the essence of which is that many tourists are continually searching for authentic cultures and environments, which they tend to view through an ethnocentric lens. But as my research progressed, I came to sense that there is also another ‘gaze’ at work in mass tourism: that of the local populations towards the tourist destinations in their communities, which can include a longing for access— the reverse gaze. When these expectations are unmet, there is a great sense of disappointment and sometimes feelings of neglect among the local people. Gazing, from the vantage point of the local people towards the tourists and tourism spaces, remains a largely unexplored area of tourism studies, with a few exceptions. For instance, Maoz (2006: 22) suggests that both a tourist and a local gaze within tourist destinations of the Global South are simultaneously unfolding, “affecting and feeding each other,” and culminating in what she calls the mutual gaze. What makes the reverse gaze an even more noteworthy phenomenon worthy of further study is the fact that the locals’ gaze goes beyond perceptions of and attitudes toward the tourists themselves but also involves the residents’ expectations of tourism planners, the planning process, and enclave tourism on a whole.

In both Falmouth and Lucea, the residents had expectations of what development should look like in their environments. Mainly, they expected their towns to be equipped with modern facilities that have been established in resort towns such as Montego Bay, Negril, and Ocho Rios. Largely, these needs have been unmet, creating a sense of disappointment among the residents. Many respondents indicated that they have been looking forward to the establishment of a Margaritaville – a pub and entertainment spot – in the town. As one Lucea resident and independent vendor explained: “Margaritaville is present in the other [major] resort areas [but]
Lucea is lacking in this area. Negril has the Rick’s Café and the sunset... all the other places [resort towns] have all sorts of activities but here in Lucea, we are left behind!”

In Falmouth, the issue of accessing premier attractions is complicated by the fact that there is a Margaritaville, but it is located on the Pier itself and not in the town – so it constitutes a highly exclusionary space. Because of its inaccessibility to those outside the enclave, one male resident lamented that: “I heard that Margaritaville is over there but we the locals don’t have access to it, so we still have to go to [the Margaritaville in] Montego Bay. We need access… that is a major concern, we need access!”

The residents also expressed the desire to have major fast-food chains such as Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC) or Burger King in the towns. In the words of one Falmouth in his 30s, “one major thing I would want is a KFC! I think it would give an extra boost.” The residents also desire modern shopping malls as well as a more organized space for the craft vendors. In bigger tourist destination towns such as Montego Bay, there are craft markets. One Lucea resident in her 20s stated her belief that the community needs: “a craft market. I think the tourists would really like that. People on the side of the road...sometimes police seize their goods! [And] this is probably why the tourists prefer to go to Negril or Mo-bay, they need more organized facilities!”

Likewise, another Falmouth resident in her 50s suggested that: “The only thing that needs to be changed is that the craft vendors need to get somewhere more organized.” Although The Ministry of Tourism has promised Falmouth a craft market this particular promise was not fulfilled up to the time of the fieldwork.
6.8. Conclusion

The relationship between mass tourism development and the environment is a complex one. This complexity tends to be more pronounced in SIDs such as Jamaica since the natural resources that tourists and tourist activities require are in relatively narrow supply. Although mass tourism development has created opportunities for the preservation of cultural sites as well as contributing to some aspects of town beautification, these benefits were concentrated in the immediate environs of the Grand Palladium and the Pier, while other parts of the towns have been left with little to no attention. Another important aspect of the uneven development associated with mass tourism that is clearly evident in Falmouth and Lucea is the exclusion of local residents from some of the most beautiful parts of the coastal areas and fisherfolk from key inshore areas, which has created serious concerns for both broad community well-being and has compromised small-scale fishing livelihoods.
CHAPTER SEVEN
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

7.1. Returning to where I began

This chapter briefly summarizes the key findings and arguments of the dissertation before providing some recommendations, and concludes by considering its limitations and areas for future research. To reflect on the contribution of this research, I start by returning to my initial motivations, which were rooted in my prolonged exposure to mass tourism development on Jamaica’s north coast, and my lived knowledge of the broad array of experiences, apprehensions, and expectations held by both average citizens and tourism employees. This lived experience from my youth was augmented by my studies at UWI: as a field research assistant in 2006; through my Master’s research on tourism in Kingston in 2007-8; and by attending a critical presentation given by concerned tourism researchers and popular local environmental activists about a series of detrimental environmental and social impacts associated with the mushrooming of mega-hotels on the island's north-coast. After my time at UWI, I became further exposed to growing concerns about these developments through my work as a college lecturer in Montego Bay teaching courses on tourism and through my involvement in a report and panel on the Falmouth Pier development. But perhaps the single most significant spark for me to pursue a PhD came from watching a critical documentary about mass tourism development entitled Jamaica for Sale (Figueroa, 2006) which gives a devastating account of the exclusionary character of the industry from the perspective of many Jamaican citizens from beaches and their coastal homes. Together, these experiences inspired me to want to simultaneously learn more about the effects of mass tourism on the towns of Lucea and Falmouth, and conduct research that
might help to shed light on both problems and ways to improve. My greatest hope now, just as when I began, is that my findings and recommendations will be considered by the relevant planners in government and in the private sector, and might make some contribution to understanding why so many feel disaffected by mass tourism development and why changes are needed if the industry is to ever be understood in a more positive light by local people.

7.2. Exclusionary Development in Falmouth and Lucea

The overarching objective of this dissertation was to critically examine the perspectives and responses of local residents, owners of SMEs, fisherfolk, and tourism employees to the mass tourism developments in Lucea and Falmouth, and how they perceive the ensuing opportunities, problems, and challenges. The prevailing theme that ran throughout my research was a sense of exclusion and marginalization in the communities, as participants provided a series of explanations why they feel that the onset mass tourism development in their towns has not brought widely-distributed economic benefits or served the interests of the majority of the community. Many local residents described how they have been inconvenienced by changes to their community, made worse by the fact that they have had limited involvement in decision-making processes and widespread sense that their interests are secondary. Other major concerns were that the new developments have provided few benefits to most small and medium-sized enterprises, fisherfolk have lost access to parts of the marine environment, and most of the work is low-paid and insecure, with limited opportunities to advance or voice concerns and women especially subject to poor treatment.

The problems that participants in Falmouth and Lucea described are very similar to those that have been discussed in critical tourism research for decades, recurring throughout many host
communities in the Global South. As elsewhere, the primary way that the residents of Lucea and Falmouth have been included in mass tourism development is through their employment in menial positions within the Grand Palladium and Falmouth Pier, and the indirect spin-offs have been limited, from taxi-drivers to informal activities such as handicraft and fruit vending.

One of the most jarring physical changes in Lucea and Falmouth is the privatization of a significant part of each community’s beachfront, which is a major feature of mass tourism in Jamaica and many parts of the Global South, and as discussed in Chapter 6, this lost access to some of the most beautiful and desirable recreational spaces is a key factor in the social exclusion described by local residents. Of the participants who are employed within either enclave, many indicated dissatisfaction with their wage levels, job security, and prospects for advancement, with the positives (such as recognizing their jobs provide them the opportunity to meet new people every day) generally paling in comparison. This unhappiness further relates to perceptions that the hotel and businesses on the Pier are making huge profits and are therefore capable of paying better wages and providing some benefits. A number of participants expressed concerns about the lack of sick pay and maternity leave, and female participants regularly pointed out their belief that wage levels are marked by serious gender inequalities. Taken together, there are many reasons why participants expressed pessimism about the future of mass tourism development in their towns, and see little prospect that local people will ever see any significant economic benefits from the industry or that their concerns will be taken into account in future policy and planning.
7.3. Scholarly Contributions

Many studies have been conducted on established resort towns but very few studies have been conducted on newly emerging towns to mass tourism development and how large-scale development impacts the production of space within a community, and how this transformation is perceived by local residents. This study contributes to critical tourism studies in various ways. At the broadest level, it sheds light on how the enclave spaces of mass tourism influence the lived experiences of the local residents, such as contributing to the loss of some public space and establishing new forms of physical and social segregation. So while mass tourism development can be a source of pride for some, it can also change residents’ perspectives of their community in negative ways, and establish a sense of alienation. My research was concerned with the uneven relations that occur both within and beyond the enclave walls, and draws attention to how cruise ship piers can serve to remake space and transform coastal communities on a considerable scale, which is an underappreciated subject in the tourism literature. The Falmouth Pier is one of the largest ports of call in the entire Caribbean, and though it brings thousands of visitors to the community on a daily basis, my research illustrates clearly that this model of tourism development has not brought widely dispersed opportunities to the community.

Another novel empirical contribution to the scholarly literature on tourism was to draw attention to the perspectives of local fisherfolk and SME operators on tourism development, and the disruption they have faced. The spatial and economic disruptions were especially marked with fisherfolk. Unfortunately, this is not uncommon, as there are various cases where fishing villages (e.g. Sayulita in Mexico, Bayahibe in the Dominican Republic) in the Global South have been displaced by tourism developments, but their experiences are not widely explored in the literature. My research has shown that how the livelihoods of fisherfolk have been seriously
disrupted, as their access to space – both on land and in the water – has been negatively impacted, despite promises to relocate them in fair ways. Also, while many assume that SME operators are poised to benefit from mass tourism development, my research illustrates how the opportunities generated are highly constrained. Studies on residents’ perceptions of tourism development have been mostly conducted through the lens of the Social Exchange Theory, which is a basic framework for understanding the costs and benefits of tourism development within communities (e.g. Nunkoo, 2016; Sinclair-Maragh et al. 2015; Andereck, 2005), and my research points to the need to take the reconfiguration of space into account in future assessments of costs and benefits.

Another central contribution of this research is to provide insights into the experiences of workers within the largest hotel in Jamaica and within the island’s largest Pier. My research can be seen to build on, and connect to, some previous research done on the social inequalities that workers experience in Jamaican enclaves, especially that of Kingsbury (2011; 2005) who has focused on Sandals Resort in Negril, and I have drawn particular attention to the gendered inequalities of work in these spaces as well as some of the barriers addressing them, especially the lack of unionization. Cohen (1972) very famously conceptualized the “tourist bubble”, and in Chapter 2 I suggested that there is a need to recognize a “sub-bubble” within enclaves; that is, an exclusionary zone that is intended to relegate workers out of sight of tourists as much as possible when they are not in their service-mode. This “sub-bubble” can also entail class, racial, and gender hierarchies, and was evident in my research, especially at the Grand Palladium.

It has been almost three decades since Urry (1990) introduced the ground-breaking concept of “The Tourist Gaze,” and while this has been invoked by tourism scholars countless times, there has been scholarly attention to what might be considered to be the “Local Gaze” or
“The Reverse Gaze”. Sroypetch (2016) and Maoz (2006) have come the closest to pioneering such knowledge, and my research can also be seen to augment this focus, extending their attention to how local people view the tourists to suggest that we also need to consider how local people view the enclave spaces – along with the other spatial changes they induce in the community. In this regard, my work sheds some new light on the expectations that local people have for improvements to the built environment, from basic infrastructure and beautification to demands for more modern shopping facilities and eating places, and perhaps most of all to have greater access to the enclaves and break down the segregation of space that has emerged.

7.4. Some Ways Forward for Mass Tourism Development in Jamaica

My research design was explicitly oriented towards listening to local people affected by mass tourism development, and learning about perspectives that have long been marginal or gone entirely ignored in the planning process. I hope that listening seriously to their voice can inform some recommendations that Jamaica’s tourism policy-makers and planners should take into account. One of the foremost concerns expressed by respondents relates to the stark segregation of space associated with both the Pier and the Grand Palladium, and any hopes of reducing the prevailing sense of social exclusion and economic inequity about these developments in the communities demands finding ways to reduce the barriers, both in the built environment and in the invisible barriers most face in accessing spin-off economic opportunities (which is often referred to in the tourism literature with reference to the multiplier effect). In order for tourism expenditure to benefit to host communities more the tourists themselves should also be encouraged to enter the town centres. But for this to happen they need more reasons to do so and, as discussed in Chapter 6, many participants noted their belief that there are not sufficient attractions for the tourists in Falmouth and Lucea beyond the borders of the enclaves. There was
a widespread belief that if new compelling attractions could be built within the towns themselves tourists would be more likely to walk there rather than having to take excursions in neighbouring resort areas such as Ocho Rios and Montego Bay.

Even though some investments have been made outside of the enclaves to enhance the attractiveness of the towns, from roads to painting buildings, there is still significant work to be done in order to improve the parts of the towns which have been ignored. Also, as part of efforts to draw more tourists to the towns themselves, it would be helpful to have interactive displays in both Lucea and Falmouth Squares, which would help tourists appreciate aspects of the local history and culture (incidentally, there is a model for this in the display that was present in March 2011 for the grand opening of the Pier, but it was not a permanent fixture). However, as discussed in Chapter 5, the challenge of improving social and economic interactions between tourists and local people and small businesses is seriously complicated by a countervailing dynamic: the increasing securitization surrounding the enclaves which undoubtedly perpetuates fear on both sides: for tourists, fear of exploring and interacting, and for locals, fears of interacting with the tourists. This leads to a crucial question: is the increasing security presence a self-destructive cycle that is stifling the prospect of building better relationships between ‘guests’ and ‘hosts’? If so, there is a need for serious engagement between the government, resort owners and managers, and local communities in Jamaica to discuss this dilemma and forge solutions.

Clearly, finding ways to enhance the economic linkages between local SMEs and the enclaves is an important aspect of improving local perceptions of these spaces. There are some small precedents for this, such as the fact that the cruise ships have begun to purchase a small amount of vegetables from farmers on the periphery of Falmouth, and there are other possibilities that can be explored, such as sightseeing tours of the surrounding landscape and
heritage sites, especially considering the rich architectural history of both towns, the painful but compelling attraction of former slave plantations, and the beauty of the interior landscape, especially the rugged Cockpit Country. The attraction of the Cockpit Country will be enhanced for some by the fact that it is home to the world-famous Usain Bolt, who is from the small village of Sherwood Content just 25 minutes from Falmouth Town. In short, there are many ways that tourist dollars that now stay mainly within the enclave (or go to sites in Montego Bay, Ocho Rios, or Negril) could start to flow better to peripheral communities.

Tourism planning in Jamaica is rife with challenges and power imbalances, and it seems clear that the only way that governments, resorts, and cruise ships will begin to listen to community perspectives is if varied local interests can begin to forge stronger alliances and communicate with shared voices. This cannot come from outside, but it will take organic leadership to build dialogue between groups such as SME owners, fisherfolk associations, the craft vendors association in Lucea, the Parish Development Committees, the Chambers of Commerce, and residents who feel disaffected by the changes to their communities.

It would be an even bigger challenge to draw in employees of enclaves into these conversations. For employees in mass tourism enclaves, the matter of unionization seems extremely pressing, as there are glaring workplace injustices that need to be confronted. Some of them gender-based, such as the fact that female employees are more at risk of losing their jobs for such reasons as pregnancy or exceeding the enclave-prescribed maximum number of children a woman can have while employed at the hotel. But however stark these labour problems might appear from outside, again any resolution will hinge on leadership emerging within tourism workers to build unions that can provide better representation, and can defend and extend their rights through collective bargaining.
7.5. Limitations of the Study and Areas for Future Research

Throughout my fieldwork I regularly found my position of ‘betweenness’ (Zhao, 2017; Katz, 1994) difficult to manage because while I am Jamaican and immersed in the island’s culture, I was also clearly thought of by some research participants to be a privileged, foreign-educated individual who could not truly relate to their day-to-day struggles. Initially, I was even explicitly asked by a few participants (and other local residents) whether I was living overseas because they said they could detect a slight foreign accent. Another related experience was that a few seemingly unemployed local men tried to solicit money from me much as they would from tourists. Finally, even though I was familiar with both Falmouth and Lucea, upon my return to Jamaica I was struck by the scope of several changes in the town’s respective landscapes. Thus, despite having only been away in Canada for two years prior to the start of my fieldwork, there were a number of factors that made me feel like I was somewhere between an ‘insider’ and an ‘outsider’ to these communities.

Throughout my time in Falmouth and Lucea, I was repeatedly reminded of the regular warning given to field researchers that the process can be complicated and unpredictable (Michaud 2010), and the challenge of adjusting to my sense of ‘betweenness’ was the biggest part of this, as I underestimated in spite of having previously encountered it in my preparation in qualitative research methods. This experience forced me to be highly conscious of the way I spoke and interacted with participants, and should highlight to other young scholars that even brief time spent in a foreign country can affect one’s mannerisms and ultimately the dynamics of communication in the field and that overcoming betweenness in establishing rapport with participants starts from recognizing it.
Ultimately, I hope that my research generated valuable insights into the perceptions and experiences of the onset of mass tourism into two towns, and most of all the reasons why people are disappointed about the nature of this development. But I also recognize that as much as I value the insights and experiences of local people and believe they warrant the attention of scholars and policy makers in Jamaica and beyond, my emphasis on qualitative research means that I cannot make claims about my research findings being generalizable and applicable to other geographical locations.

Most of all, I believe that my research raises insights into the expectations and frustrations of local people in the early stages of encountering mass tourism development. In addition to policy implications noted above, this raises a series of questions for future research. For me, one of the most important lines of inquiry that grew out of my research relates to the gender inequality of work within mass tourism enclaves, as well as the gender dimension of labour struggles. As indicated in Chapter 5, research on the experiences of workers within the spaces of mass tourism is growing in a general sense, but research into the barriers to labour organizing in the Jamaican context is limited, and might also benefit from comparative assessments with places like Barbados and the Bahamas where labour unions are more prevalent in the tourism sector.

Ultimately, the core themes identified in this research in Falmouth and Lucea largely aligns with the critical literature on mass tourism, which has long stressed that increasing foreign expenditures do not equate with broad-based community development, with many local interests neglected in the reshaping of landscapes and economic benefits and costs distributed in highly unequal ways. Yet while clearly another critical voice in itself will do little to diminish Jamaica’s heavy dependence on the industry, I do hope the community-level perspectives I have focused on
might have some small place in a growing critique, and that a deepening and broadening understanding of the industry might one day contribute to changes in the interests of host communities.
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**Study Investigator’s Name:** Shenika McFarlane-Morris

I have read the information/consent document, have had the nature of the study explained to me and I agree to participate. All questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

Participant’s Name (please print): ____________________________________________

Participant’s Signature: ____________________________________________________

Date: ______________________________________________________________________

Person Obtaining Informed Consent (please print): _____________________________

Signature: __________________________________________________________________

Date: ______________________________________________________________________

**OR**

**Request for oral consent:**

Having been told the reasons and nature of this study, do you agree to participate?

Yes □ No □
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Date: _______/_______/_______

COMBINED LETTER OF INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM
FOR INTERVIEWS (Small and Medium Business Operators, Fisherfolk and Residents)

Project Title: Community Development and Enclave Tourism on Jamaica’s North Coast

Dr. Tony Weis (Research Supervisor)
Shenika McFarlane-Morris (Student Researcher)

UWO Letterhead
To be read to Participants

Invitation to participate

You are being invited to participate in the research project identified above which is being conducted by Shenika McFarlane-Morris from the University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada because you may be able to provide some information that will enable the researcher to better understand the impacts of tourism and local responses to such. This research is being co-ordinated by Dr. Tony Weis, Associate Professor, the University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada.

Purpose of this letter

The primary purpose of this letter is to provide you with information required for you to make an informed decision as it pertains to participating in this research.

Purpose of this study

The broad aim of this study is to understand how enclave tourism, also called mass tourism, (the kind of tourism wherein tourists and tourism facilities are spatially separated from the local population) influences small towns on the north coast of Jamaica. This is partly why both
Falmouth and Lucea have been selected as case studies. The project hopes to convey whether there are any lessons for Falmouth which is very new to such developments, based on the experience of Lucea which has been introduced to enclave tourism around a decade ago.

**Inclusion Criteria**

Individuals who are eligible to participate in this study must be 18 years old or older on their last birthday and have residency in the study areas.

**Study Procedures**

Participants will be asked to contribute to depth interviews. During these conversations, you will be asked to share your views, perceptions, and experiences on the matter of the rapid growth of enclave tourism in your town. We are interested in the impacts that tourism has had on you, your household, business, community and town. We are also interested in the ways in which you have adapted in response to any change that the industry might have brought about at the household, community and town levels. Additionally, we will ask questions regarding factors that affect your perceptions. If it is fine with you, we will like to tape record the interview. Taping ensures that your views are accurately recorded, and it allows the interviewer to focus on what you are saying. If you agree to participate, it should take no more than 90 minutes of your time. All interviews will be done in your work or home environment. A total of 90 persons will be interviewed.

**Possible risks**

There are no foreseeable risks to participating in this research. If you feel uncomfortable at any moment, you have the right to refuse answering questions, request that interviews not be recorded, and completely disengage from interviews without any due risk.

**Possible Benefits**

You may not directly benefit from participating in this study but information gathered may provide benefits to society as a whole which include:

1. The creation of more inclusion of locals in the industry by the creation of stronger economic linkages between enclave tourism and the livelihoods of the residents. It is also hoped that the project will result in the creation of more 'inclusive' recreational and shopping spaces for the local residents.
2. The project of itself is a means for the voice of the lay people to be heard. It is hoped that this will place a momentum on the level of governance and participation of the local residents in decision-making (more collaborative planning).

3. Enclave tourism has introduced many changes to the urban centres of the study areas. It is therefore hoped that the findings of this research will shed light on the most pressing challenges these developments have brought to the users of the urban environment and by extension, that the relevant authorities such as the Parish Councils and Urban Planning Corporation (UDC) will devise feasible means of reducing such challenges and of fortifying the opportunities that exist.

4. We will provide a summary of the research findings to relevant government and non-governmental organizations so that it can be used to inform initiatives aimed at enhancing the benefits of enclave tourism and equitable distribution of such.

**Compensation**

There will be no compensation for your participation in this study.

**Voluntary Participation**

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate, refuse to answer any questions or withdraw from the study at any time with any adverse implications.

**Confidentiality**

You will not be identified by name. Instead, you and your household will be identified by a coding system. This coding system will be used to identify you in our data files. All data collected will remain confidential and accessible only to the investigators of this study. If the results are published, your name will not be used. If you choose to withdraw from this study, your data will be removed and destroyed from our database.

**Contacts for further information**

You may keep this letter of information for your records. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject you may contact: Director of the Office of Research Ethics, University of Western Ontario. The student researcher and his research supervisor can be contacted at the following addresses:

Dr. Tony Weis  
Associate Professor  
The University of Western Ontario

Shenika McFarlane-Morris
**Publication**

If the results of the study are published, your name will not be used. If you would like to receive a copy of any potential study results, please provide your name and contact number on a piece of paper separate from the Consent Form.

*This letter is yours to keep for future reference.*
**Project Title:** Community Development and Enclave Tourism on Jamaica’s North Coast

**Study Investigator’s Name:** Shenika McFarlane-Morris

I have read the information/consent document, have had the nature of the study explained to me and I agree to participate. All questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

Participant’s Name (please print): ________________________________

Participant’s Signature: _________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________________________

Person Obtaining Informed Consent (please print): ____________________

Signature: _____________________________________________________

Date: _________________________________________________________

OR

**Request for oral consent:**

Having been told the reasons and nature of this study, do you agree to participate?

Yes □ No □
COMBINED LETTER OF INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM
FOR QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

Project Title: Community Development and Enclave Tourism on Jamaica’s North Coast

Dr. Tony Weis (Research Supervisor)
Shenika McFarlane-Morris (Student Researcher)

To be read to Participants

Invitation to participate
You are being invited to participate in the research project identified above which is being conducted by Shenika McFarlane-Morris from the University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada because you may be able to provide some information that will enable the researcher to better understand the impacts of tourism and local responses to such. This research is being co-ordinated by Dr. Tony Weis, Associate Professor, the University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada.

Purpose of this letter
The primary purpose of this letter is to provide you with information required for you to make an informed decision as it pertains to participating in this research.

Purpose of this study
The broad aim of this study is to understand how enclave tourism, also called mass tourism, (the kind of tourism wherein tourists and tourism facilities are spatially separated from the local
population) influences small towns on the north coast of Jamaica. This is partly why both Falmouth and Lucea have been selected as case studies. The project hopes to convey whether there are any lessons for Falmouth which is very new to such developments, based on the experience of Lucea which has been introduced to enclave tourism around a decade ago.

**Inclusion Criteria**

Individuals who are eligible to participate in this study must be 18 years old or older on their last birthday and have residency in the study areas.

**Study Procedures**

Participants (household heads) will be asked to contribute to household questionnaire surveys via researcher-administered interviews. During these conversations, you will be asked to share your views, perceptions, and experiences on the matter of the rapid growth of enclave tourism in your town. We are interested in the impacts that tourism has had on you, your household, community and town. We are also interested in the ways in which you and your household have adapted in response to any change that the industry might have brought about at the household, community and town levels. Additionally, we will ask questions regarding factors that affect your perceptions. It should take no more than 90 minutes of your time. All surveys will be done in your home environment. A total of 300 persons will be surveyed.

**Possible risks**

There are no foreseeable risks to participating in this research. If you feel uncomfortable at any moment, you have the right to refuse answering questions, request that interviews not be recorded, and completely disengage from interviews and focus group discussions without any due risk.

**Possible Benefits**

You may not directly benefit from participating in this study but information gathered may provide benefits to society as a whole which include:

1. The creation of more inclusion of locals in the industry by the creation of stronger economic linkages between enclave tourism and the livelihoods of the residents. It is also hoped that the project will result in the creation of more 'inclusive' recreational and shopping spaces for the local residents.
2. The project of itself is a means for the voice of the lay people to be heard. It is hoped that this will place a momentum on the level of governance and participation of the local residents in decision-making (more collaborative planning).

3. Enclave tourism has introduced many changes to the urban centres of the study areas. It is therefore hoped that the findings of this research will shed light on the most pressing challenges these developments have brought to the users of the urban environment and by extension, that the relevant authorities such as the Parish Councils and Urban Planning Corporation (UDC) will devise feasible means of reducing such challenges and of fortifying the opportunities that exist.

4. We will provide a summary of the research findings to relevant government and non-governmental organizations so that it can be used to inform initiatives aimed at enhancing the benefits of enclave tourism and equitable distribution of such.

**Compensation**

You will not be compensated for your participation in this research.

**Voluntary Participation**

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate, refuse to answer any questions or withdraw from the study at any time with any adverse implications.

**Confidentiality**

You will not be identified by name. Instead, you and your household will be identified by a coding system. This coding system will be used to identify you in our data files. All data collected will remain confidential and accessible only to the investigators of this study. If the results are published, your name will not be used. If you choose to withdraw from this study, your data will be removed and destroyed from our database.

**Contacts for further information**

You may keep this letter of information for your records. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject you may contact: Director of the Office of Research Ethics, University of Western Ontario. The student researcher and his research supervisor can be contacted at the following addresses:

Dr. Tony Weis  
Associate Professor  
The University of Western Ontario

194
Shenika McFarlane-Morris  
PhD Student Department of Geography Department of  
The University of Western Ontario  

**Publication**  
If the results of the study are published, your name will not be used. If you would like to receive a copy of any potential study results, please provide your name and contact number on a piece of paper separate from the Consent Form.  

*This letter is yours to keep for future reference.*
Project Title: Community Development and Enclave Tourism on Jamaica’s North Coast

Study Investigator’s Name: Shenika McFarlane-Morris

I have read the information/consent document, have had the nature of the study explained to me and I agree to participate. All questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

Participant’s Name (please print): ________________________________

Participant’s Signature: ____________________________________________

Date: ____________________________________________________________

Person Obtaining Informed Consent (please print): ______________________

Signature: _________________________________________________________

Date: _____________________________________________________________

OR

Request for oral consent:
Having been told the reasons and nature of this study, do you agree to participate?
Yes □ No □
APPENDIX 5
In-depth Interview Guide for Key Informants

**Aim:** The aims of these interviews include: to gather information on the roles and responsibilities of key governmental and private organizations in mass tourism development. I am especially interested in learning about the planning and policy efforts of these key players as it concerns huge tourism development projects in the study areas e.g. what is the nature of their immediate and future planning priorities to maximize the benefits and reduce the challenges that the industry creates? How did they go about planning for mass tourism development? In their assessment, how inclusive was this planning (i.e. to what extent were residents of Lucea and Falmouth included in the planning)?

**Participants:** representatives from the Jamaica Tourist Board (JTB); the Ministry of Tourism; the Urban Development Corporation (UDC); the Trelawny Chamber of Commerce; the Hanover Chamber of Commerce; Jamaica National Heritage Trust; Falmouth Heritage Renewal; the Port Authority of Jamaica (PAJ) and the Tourism Product Development Company (TPDCo) and the Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ).

**Research Discussion Questions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>MAIN QUESTIONS</th>
<th>PROBING QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>1. What was/were the rationale(s) for the establishment of your organization?</td>
<td>1. Has these objectives changed overtime?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. What are the goals/objectives of the organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td>1. What specific roles does your organization play in the development of mass tourism?</td>
<td>1. What roles do you perform?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Mass Tourism</td>
<td>1. Explain to me the importance of mass tourism in the development of Jamaica?</td>
<td>1. Its importance vis-a-vis other types of tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impacts</td>
<td>1. How would you assess the positive impacts of mass tourism?</td>
<td>1. In general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. In Lucea and Falmouth</td>
<td>2. Economic; social; cultural and environmental implications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impacts</td>
<td>2. How would you assess the positive</td>
<td>1. In general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. In Falmouth and Lucea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Process</td>
<td>1. Do you believe that local residents and business owners</td>
<td>1. If yes, please explain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should be involved in tourism planning?</td>
<td>2. What steps, if any, did your organization take in order to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ensure that planning was inclusive before and during mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tourism development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. What are your thoughts on the effectiveness of these steps?</td>
<td>3. What are your thoughts on the effectiveness of these steps?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable Distribution</td>
<td>1. What are your policies/plans to increase the benefits</td>
<td>1. Any specific examples?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Benefits</td>
<td>of mass tourism and to enhance the equity in distribution of</td>
<td>2. Are there any challenges that your organization faces in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>such benefits among local residents and businesses?</td>
<td>materializing these plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. If yes, how does your organization mitigate against such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drawbacks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigating against</td>
<td>1. What are your policies/plans to minimize the challenges</td>
<td>1. Any specific examples?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>that enclave tourism creates for local residents and</td>
<td>2. Are there any challenges that your organization faces in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>businesses?</td>
<td>materializing these plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. If yes, how does your organization mitigate against such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drawbacks?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 6

In-depth Interview Guide for Residents, fisherfolk and Small and Medium Sized business operators in Lucea and Falmouth

General questions:

- How do owners of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), employees in mass tourism and residents interpret the new opportunities and challenges associated with large-scale tourism development?

- What actions have owners of SMEs, employees in mass tourism and residents taken in response to these opportunities and challenges?

- How do owners of SMEs, employees in mass tourism and residents view their place in the planning process in the development of mass tourism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>MAIN QUESTIONS</th>
<th>PROBING QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>2. How long have you lived in this town?</td>
<td>1. Did you ever imagine that this town would ‘host’ mass tourism?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Benefits   | 3. Generally, do you believe that mass tourism has created any benefits? | 1. What are the economic benefits? (Any specific examples?)
|            |                 | 2. What are the social benefits? (Any specific examples?)
|            |                 | 3. What are the cultural benefits? (any specific examples?)
<p>|            |                 | 4. What are the environmental benefits (any specific examples?)? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Drawbacks</strong></th>
<th><strong>Response Mechanisms</strong></th>
<th><strong>Inclusion in Planning</strong></th>
<th><strong>Way Forward</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. What kind of challenges has mass tourism activities created for:  
   a. You?  
   b. Your household?  
   c. Your livelihood?  
   4. Any social challenges?  
   5. Any economic challenges?  
   6. Any environmental issues?  
   7. Has it adversely affected your way of life?  
| 1. What would you say about your response to these adverse effects?  
   1. In what ways have you responded to the effects of mass tourism? (Any specific examples?)  
   2. In what ways have your Member of Parliament responded to these adverse effects? (Any specific examples?)  
   3. Who else has responded?  
| 2. What is your opinion on the involvement of local residents and business owners were involved in the planning process leading up to the implementation of mass tourism?  
   4. Were you or anyone you know consulted during the start of these developments? (Any workshops, community or staff meetings etc.?)  
   5. How do you feel about being included or excluded from the planning process?  
| 1. What would you like to see moving forward?  
   2. If yes, please explain.  

4. Do they fit your expectations?  
5. Do you believe that these are the kinds of expectations that residents expected from tourism activities in the town?  

5. What are your thoughts on these benefits?
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Community Development and Mass Tourism on Jamaica’s North Coast

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

GENERAL INFORMATION

Location: □ Falmouth □ Lucea Name of community-

__________________

Distance from ‘core’ tourism activities____ km

Respondent’s Numerical ID________

Name of Interviewer______________________________

Date of Interview____________ Time of Interview: □□:□□ □ a.m. □ p.m.

Outcome of Interview: □ Completed

□ Postponed

□ Head of household not at home

□ Refused

Results Entered into SPSS □
Instructions to Interviewer:

1. Before the Household Survey (HS), be sure to check all equipment and be sure you have enough tapes and batteries. Be sure microphone switch is on. However, do not turn on recorder unless respondent consent is granted.
2. Record the interviewer’s numerical code on the tape (i.e. state the interview number this will be).
3. Conduct the interview in a place where other people will not be within earshot.

Introduction and Study Information:

1. My name is: ___________________________________________________________
2. USE INFORMED CONSENT FORMS TO EXPLAIN THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND REQUEST CONSENT.
3. Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview.
4. If it is fine with you, I would like to tape record the interview. Taping ensures that your views are accurately recorded, and it allows me to focus on what you are saying. Is that okay with you? Please be informed that the tape recorder can be turned off at any point during our conversation.

N.B. Interviews will be conducted on a face-to-face basis; questions will be asked and recorded by the interviewer.
Check the options that apply.

SECTION 1: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION, DEMOGRAPHICS AND SOCIAL DYNAMICS

1. Gender of Household Head □ Male □ Female

2. How old are you?

□ Under 20 □ 20-29 □ 30-39 □ 40-49 □ 50-59 □ 60-69 □ 70 and over

3. What is your highest level of education?

□ Primary □ Secondary □ Tertiary □ Other___________ □ No formal Education

4. What are you involved in for a living?

□ Fishing □ Livestock/Poultry □ Trade/Small Business □ Government Officer □ Student
□ Other________ (please specify) □ Unemployed

5. How many people reside in your household?

□ 0 □ 1-2 □ 3-4 □ 5-6 □ 7-8 □ 9-10 □ >10

6a. What is your highest level of education? ____________________________

b. What is the highest level of education among the other members of this household? __________________

SECTION 2: RESIDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPACTS OF ENCLAVE TOURISM

7a. How many years have you lived in this town?

□ 0 □ 1-2 □ 3-4 □ 5-6 □ 7-8 □ 9-10 □ >10

b. Where did you previously live (if applicable)?

__________________________________________________________

8a. I am going to ask about how you felt initially, then how your feelings changed. When you first heard that large scale tourism was coming to your town, how did you feel? Please respond quickly based on your first impression:
b. Have these feelings indicated in item 8a changed since the introduction and growth of enclave tourism in your town?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

c. If yes, how do you feel now about tourism planning and activities in your town?

The feelings are the same.

d. Do you believe that the local residents of your town have been adequately informed about tourism development plans, planning and progress?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

(please explain).

e. Do you believe that your ideas and desires have been taken into account during the progress of enclave tourism in your town?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

The local residents have been adequately informed about tourism development plans.

9. a. Who do you believe benefit the most from tourism development in your town?

[ ] Communities__________________ (you may specify)

[ ] Large Businesses
b. Please explain the reason for the answer given: ________________________________________________________________

10a. Have you or anyone in your household ever benefited from the large-scale tourism development in your town?

☐ Yes ☐ No

b. What is the nature of this benefit? _______________________________________________

c. Are you or anyone in your household directly or indirectly employed in large-scale tourism?

☐ Yes ☐ No

11. What kind of benefits has enclave tourism development brought to your community? (Please select those that apply):

☐ Tourism provides worthwhile job opportunities for community members
☐ Tourism helps preserve the cultural identity of my community
☐ Tourism development improves appearance of my community
☐ Tourism development increases the quality of life in an area
☐ Better infrastructure (e.g. roads, power and water supply)

Other __________________________________________________________ (please specify)

☐ No known benefit

12. What do you think can be done to increase the benefits of the industry to your household?

__________________________________________________________________________

13. What are the negative things that you have noticed about large scale tourism development in your community?

☐ Tourism development increases the amount of crime and vandalism
☐ Tourism results in more litter
☐ Tourism development increases the traffic problems
Tension between residents and tourists
Overcrowded because of tourists
Tourism results in an increase in the cost of living
Other (please specify)
No known negative effect

14 a. Who do you think bear most of the negative things associated with enclave tourism development?
Communities (you may specify)
Large Businesses
Small/Medium Businesses
Fisherfolk
Commuters
Cruise ship/hotel
Government
Other (please specify)

b. Please explain the reason for the answer given:

15. What do you think can be done to reduce the negative impacts of tourism?

16. Has any of the following tried to tackle any of the negative impacts of large scale tourism?
You? Yes No
Your household? Yes No
Member of Parliament? Yes No
Citizen’s Association? Yes No
Community group (e.g. Youth Club or church)? Yes No
Worker’s Unions or Associations? □ Yes □ No

Government? □ Yes □ No

Other (specify): ________________________________

17. Tell me the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

a. “Tourists should be kept within a separate space from the local residents”
   □ Strongly Agree □ Agree □ Neutral □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree

b. “Large-scale tourism has created more economic opportunities than costs for the households and communities in this town”
   □ Strongly Agree □ Agree □ Neutral □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree

c. “Large-scale tourism has created more social opportunities than costs for the households and communities in this town”
   □ Strongly Agree □ Agree □ Neutral □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree

d. “Large-scale tourism has minimal impacts on the natural environment”
   □ Strongly Agree □ Agree □ Neutral □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree

e. “Large-scale tourism is good for the urban environment (town area)”
   □ Strongly Agree □ Agree □ Neutral □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree

f. “Large-scale tourism goes well with the culture and heritage buildings and artefacts of this town”
   □ Strongly Agree □ Agree □ Neutral □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree
g. “Large-scale tourism is good for the small businesses and livelihood activities in this town”

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

h. “I have high expectations of large scale tourism development for the future”

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

i. “I support large-scale tourism development in my town”

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

j. “I would prefer another type of tourism development in my town”

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

k. “Large scale tourism holds great promise for my community’s future”

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

l. “Large scale tourism holds great promise for my town’s future”

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

m. “Large scale tourism holds great promise for the future generations of residents in this town”

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

18. How do you view enclave tourism compared to other types of tourism in Jamaica?

19. How often do you utilize the town centre?

☐ Frequently  ☐ Now and again  ☐ Almost never  ☐ Never

20a. What kinds of changes have enclave tourism brought to the built environment of your town?
b. How do you find these changes?

- “The urban area is more aesthetically appealing since enclave tourism” ☐ Yes ☐ No
- “There are more recreational areas that local residents can use” ☐ Yes ☐ No
- “There is less recreational areas that local residents can use” ☐ Yes ☐ No
- The urban area is: [ ] Cleaner [ ] More littered
- “There is more security presence” ☐ Yes ☐ No
- “Restoration of historic buildings” ☐ Yes ☐ No
- The town is more organized (more user friendly) for: [ ] Pedestrians [ ] Motorists
- “The town is more congested” ☐ Yes ☐ No
- “Easier to access route taxies and buses” ☐ Yes ☐ No
- “Goods and services have become”: [ ] Cheaper ☐ Yes ☐ No

Other (please specify)___________________________________________________________________________

21. Please indicate how much you accept the following aspects of enclave tourism:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very Acceptable</th>
<th>Quite Acceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Slightly Acceptable</th>
<th>Not Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant increases in the total number of tourists visiting the town.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases in the migration of people from other parts of the island.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in access to beaches and other areas of land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to vehicular traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to pedestrian traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Indicate how you felt about the urban environment BEFORE the START of large scale commercial tourism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Very Clean</th>
<th>Somewhat clean</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Dirty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Welcomed</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Ugly</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Happy</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Indicate how you feel about the urban environment **SINCE** the introduction of large-scale tourism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( ) Very Clean</th>
<th>( ) Somewhat clean</th>
<th>( ) Unsure</th>
<th>( ) Dirty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( ) Very Good</td>
<td>( ) Somewhat good</td>
<td>( ) Unsure</td>
<td>( ) Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Very Welcomed</td>
<td>( ) Somewhat welcomed</td>
<td>( ) Unsure</td>
<td>( ) Unwelcomed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Very Ugly</td>
<td>( ) Somewhat ugly</td>
<td>( ) Unsure</td>
<td>( ) Pretty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Very Happy</td>
<td>( ) Somewhat happy</td>
<td>( ) Unsure</td>
<td>( ) Unhappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Very Safe</td>
<td>( ) Somewhat Safe</td>
<td>( ) Unsure</td>
<td>( ) Unsafe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Who do you think can make the biggest difference in solving these environmental problems?

- [ ] Individuals
- [ ] Government
- [ ] School / community groups
- [ ] Other ________________ (please specify)
- [ ] Nobody – can’t be solved

25. Do you feel that you have the power to influence tourism decision-making?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

26 a. What avenues have the government and private organization’s representatives taken to ensure that you are part of the decision-making process for tourism in the town?

______________________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________________

b. Do you feel that community residents have a voice in concluding which tourism impacts are acceptable?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

______________________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________________

(Please explain).

Thank you!
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