

Local food and tourism

An entrepreneurial network approach

Morten Boesen**, *Donna Sundbo and *Jon Sundbo******

* Business Academy Zealand, ** University College Zealand, *** Roskilde University; Denmark

This article investigates the question: Why local food networks succeed or fail in collaborating with local tourism actors to create more tourism based on local food? The article focuses on entrepreneurial local food networks and their collaboration with local tourism actors. Emphasis is on the actions and attitude logics of local food networks and tourism actors, and whether their respective logics fit as a factor to explain why or why not development of local food concepts lead to increased local tourism. Six local food networks and their collaboration with local tourism actors are studied by using observation supplemented with other qualitative methods. Analysis of these networks reveals that successful collaboration is characterised by the food networks and tourism actors having at least one logic in common. The fitting logics that lead to success are primarily celebrity and civic logics, which emphasises the community aspect (i.e., that both parties want to support the local community and brand it). The non-fitting logics that mostly hinder this are dominant market and industry logic, which emphasise egoistic economic gain.

1. Introduction

Both in research and practice there is a continuous search for factors that may increase local tourism. Particularly, factors that local actors can influence are in focus. One such factor is local food by which we mean food that is produced within a limited geographical area and which has characteristics from the terroir of this area or from its production traditions or modern principles (Eriksen 2013; Sundbo 2013). This is connected to local tourism as local food production and handling can be integrated with local tourism (e.g., farmers' shops, farmers' markets, restaurants), and create additional economic activity in and around the destination (Halkier, 2012). Food and wine as a basis for tourism has received increasing attention in research (Hjalager and Richards, 2002; Mossberg and Svensson 2006). Food and gastronomy have been analysed as tourist attraction factors in many projects (e.g., Telfer and Wall, 1996; Hall and Mitchell, 2005). Some research has attempted to explain and understand food tourism by developing new theory (e.g. Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing, 2003; Hall and Sharples, 2008). However, the particular concept of local food has not often been related to tourism (among the few are Tellström et al., 2006; Mossberg and Svensson, 2006; Ljunggren et al., 2010; Holm et al., 2013).

Local food as well as local tourism innovation often is developed in entrepreneurial networks where collaboration is the crucial factor (Telfer and Wall, 1996; Eriksen and Sundbo, 2016). However, we know little about conditions for successful collaboration in tourism networks and particularly network-collaboration between food and tourism actors has not been researched. The research presented in this article addresses this knowledge gap. The analysis in this article aims at investigating the theoretical assumptions that successful exploitation of local food as a factor increasing local tourism depends on fitting logics, i.e. that the entrepreneurial food network's logic (or combination of logics) is the

same as the tourist actors' logic (or combination of logics). This assumption is based on Boltanski and Thévenot's (2006) "orders of worth" framework, which suggests a number of action and attitude logics, to analyse the goals and interests of entrepreneurial local food networks and how these logics fit with local tourism actors' logics. By success of collaboration we mean that at least one common activity between the food networks and at least one local tourist actor has been carried out. In the case studies we look for such incidences. The collaboration can be problematic (Sundbo, 1998; Hjalager, 2010). Different goals and interests, or action and attitude logics, within the entrepreneurial food networks (Johannisson and Mønsted, 1997; Schøtt and Klyver, 2011) and between these networks and tourist actors may explain why such collaboration can be problematic

The theoretical assumption will be investigated via comparative case-based research. Six Danish cases of local food development in entrepreneurial networks and these networks' interaction with local tourism actors are analysed and compared. The comparative analysis aims at finding the logics that lie behind the collaboration or non-collaboration within the entrepreneurial networks and between them and the tourism actors. This result can provide a deeper understanding of the conditions for collaboration – or lack thereof – between the entrepreneurial food networks and tourism actors.

The structure of the article is as follows: First, the theoretical basis for the analyses, entrepreneurial network theory and the theory of the action and attitude logics, will be presented. Then, the method is described. Thereafter, the networks and their collaboration with tourism actors are described. The material is analysed to investigate the theoretical assumption of fitting logics. Finally a conclusion will follow.

2. Theory

In this section we present the theory elements that we need to investigate the theoretical assumption of fitting logics and explain the conditions under which entrepreneurial local food networks can collaborate successfully with local tourism actors. The first element is entrepreneurial networks. The theory "orders of worth" and discussion of how it can be applied to the field of local food and tourism will be the second element.

2.1 Entrepreneurial networks

The local food has been developed by several actors who collaborated in a network. These networks have collaborated with local tourism actors or the latter have been included as members of the networks. These networks are characterised by entrepreneurial activities (Schumpeter, 1934; Shane and Venkataraman, 2000) and may therefore be called entrepreneurial networks.

Entrepreneurial networks are economically functional networks (Johannisson, 1988; Araujo and Easton, 1996; Burt, 2000). The members participate because they gain from it – in this case by getting help for innovation, production, and marketing of local food. They are also social networks in which the social relationships, motives, and mutual attitudes influence and sometimes outdo the rational functions (Granovetter, 1973; Aldrich and Zimmer, 1986; Ulhøi, 2005). The success of entrepreneurial networks is highly dependent on social factors, such as common passion, loyalty, and trust (Johannisson et al., 2002; Johannisson and Mønsted, 1997; Mykletun and Gyimothy, 2010).

Entrepreneurial networks are here understood as systems of relations in which one or several entrepreneurs belong intentionally (Birley, 1985; Jones et al., 1997; Hoang and Antoncic, 2003; Slotte-Koch and Coviello, 2010). Not all members of the network need to be entrepreneurs, but one or more should be, and the network as a whole should act entrepreneurially. The entrepreneurial networks are here understood as local ones that exist within a local community (Fletcher and Watson, 2006; Eriksen and Sundbo, 2016).

2.2 Action and attitude logics

The theoretical framework is based on the theory of action and attitude logics presented in the “orders of worth” framework which is closely related to institutional theory and both of them aim at explaining what underpins different kinds of social actions, coordination and organizations. Institutional theory suggests that people’s actions are formed or determined by one dominant logic putting either the institutions (Friedland and Alford, 1991) or the actor in the centre of the analysis (Thornton and Ocasio, 2008). The “orders of worth” framework, however, differs from institutional theory on two important aspects. First of all it explicitly focuses on how actors deal with conflict situations over time. Secondly, it provides a more pluralistic and dynamic analytical framework for analysing collaboration between different actors. It insists that action and coordination is a process of actors applying a wide range of different and competing logics and not just a result of one dominant logic (Cloutier and Langley, 2013). Following this, people’s actions are not formed or determined by one dominant logic or force. Instead, a plurality of logics co-exist which people can mobilise and combine during disputes (Blokker, 2011). Furthermore, people are able to adjust their behaviour to circumstances and thereby shift between and combine logics depending on the concrete situation they encounter (Boltanski and Thévenot, 1999). When analysing coordination between actors we found this more pluralistic and dynamic perspective on social action more useful as it better captures the friction, tensions and compromises between the logics applied by actors when attempting to coordinate their actions.

In their “orders of worth” framework, Boltanski and Thévenot (2006) found that when confronted with critical situations, people draw on six logics in order to justify their actions. Each logic relies on a set of principles that are used as basis for qualifying the appropriateness of actions and attitudes by the involved actors. A set of components such as a higher common principle (the basic underlying idea of the common good), a state of worthiness (the measure of worth), etc. are associated with each logic. An overview of the logics, characteristics, and components of them is provided in table 1 inspired by Boltanski and Thevenot (1999).

Table 1 Overview of the six logics and their components

Logic	Higher common principle	State of worthiness
Inspired	Creativity	Passionate Spontaneous
Domestic	Generation Hierarchy	Discreet Trustworthy Honest
Celebrity	Recognition	Reputed Visible
Civic	General will	Unitary

Market	Competition	Official Desirable Value
Industrial	Efficiency Performance	Functional Reliable

Boltanski and Thevenot (1999) notice that the six logics they have identified is not a universal number. They accept that additional logics can be brought into play by actors involved with other disputes than those types of disputes that they have studied. Subsequently scholars have identified additional logics supplementing the original ones (Boesen, 2015; Boltanski and Chiapello, 2005; Haugseth, 2012; Silber, 2011; Thevenot et al., 2000). We, however, in this article find no empirical basis for including further logics.

This “orders of worth” framework has been widely used within food studies as an analytical framework for examining coordination between various food companies collaborating for instance in global value chains (Ponte and Gibbon, 2005) and alternative food networks (Goodman et al., 2014). In this article, the “orders of worth” framework is used as analytical framework for explaining how collaborating food entrepreneurs and tourist actors coordinate their actions, or not, and under which circumstances this leads to an increase in food tourism initiatives. By applying the framework, the logics that local food entrepreneurs and tourist actors respectively orient their behaviour toward, can be identified as well as the friction, conflicts, and compromises between those logics (Jagd, 2011). Hence, the framework can help us explain why some collaboration efforts fail where others succeed. The former will result from the actors’ failure to make a compromise between contradictory logics. The latter is the consequence of the actors’ capability to share logics or bridge divergent logics. Following this, the actors’ capability to deal with divergent logics becomes central in explaining why some collaboration attempts succeed while others fail.

In the analysis of the cases, this framework helps identify which logics the network food entrepreneurs and tourist actors orient their behaviour toward. Additionally, it can explain why some succeed in their collaboration efforts to increase local food tourism where others fail.

3. Method

3.1 Overall method

Our methodological approach is a multiple case study (Yin 1994) with emphasis on observation. Entrepreneurial networks are complex social units, which interact with the greater local community (Schøtt and Klyver 2011). This calls for methods that can reveal this complexity, which case studies can. Further, pilot investigations using interviews showed that network members’ indication of their motives for action and attitudes, for example stated in interviews or surveys, are not always reliable. This indicated that direct observation in situations where network members interacted in decision processes would give a more reliable answer to the research question. Case studies with observation as the main method can fulfil that demand.

We did not select a holistic case study approach since we wanted to investigate only a part of the life of the entrepreneurial networks, namely how they interact with local tourism

actors. We have been led into a comparative multiple case approach because of doubt about the validity of the first single case study, which was *Gourmet Bornholm*. That network and community might be a special case. To get results that are more analytically general, we decided to include more cases to test the first results (predicting similar results, or literal replication, cf. Yin 1994). We chose three cases, *Taste of Northern Zealand*, *Taste of Funen* and *Cultivator*, which were networks similar to *Gourmet Bornholm*, but placed in different geographic environments. Finally we selected two networks (*Lammefjorden Vegetable Guild* and *Præstø Food Market*) that were different in their network structure and business tasks to investigate how much the character of the network means for how much the action and attitude logic theory can explain of local food based tourism development (expecting contrasting results, a theoretical replication cf. Yin 1994). These cases were all chosen according to certain criteria. They must have food members and tourism members and collaboration between them. Furthermore, the formal frame of the research project imposed geographical restrictions limiting cases to eastern Denmark.

Following a logic of comparison of multiple case data, we analyse the food network-tourism actor collaborations within different tourism areas and make a comparison of the cases within each area. Thereby we can find and discuss the similarities and variations in the logics that we theoretically assume to be an explaining factor of the collaboration.

3.2 The cases

The selected food networks and their collaboration with tourism actors are briefly described below.

Gourmet Bornholm (GB) has 14 members and is primarily a sales and marketing organisation and an innovative environment for the members. GB is situated in the island of Bornholm. GB has in the period of our case studies had internal conflicts and members have been expelled. These conflicts, however, had only to do with internal food marketing issues and did not influence GB's relation to tourist actors. GB has become a central player in marketing Bornholm as a tourist area.

The Taste of Northern Zealand (ToNZ) has 40 members; mostly small food producers (vegetables, honey, meat, beer, etc.) but also a few tourist companies, such as restaurants and local tourist attractions. ToNZ is a sales, marketing and innovative organisation just as GB, but situated in a suburban district just outside Copenhagen. The network collaborates with local attractions such as Kronborg Castle; they participate in local markets and festivals; and they arrange tours for travelers from cruise ships.

The Taste of Funen (ToF) (in Southern Funen) has 50 members including food producers, brewers, farm shops, restaurants, and other passionate foodies. ToF is a sales, marketing and innovative organisation just as ToNZ and situated in the greater island Funen. The network collaborates with tourism actors when organising the annual food festival, Culinary Southern Funen, and with local attractions such as Egeskov Castle. They also arrange tours and sightseeing. They strive to get local restaurants to use local food on their menus.

Cultivator is an association with 30 members including food producers, restaurants, farm shops, and producers of arts and crafts. Cultivator is a sales, marketing and innovative organisation and situated in the small island Møn. The network has a close collaboration with local food markets and festivals, such as Culinary Rosenfeldt. Getting local restaurants to use more local ingredients is also a central concern.

Lammefjorden Vegetable Guild (LVG) in North-West Zealand has 40 members primarily producing vegetables. This network is a sales and distribution network organised as a company. LVG has attempted to involve a local gastronomy-based castle-hotel (Dragsholm) in development of local food concepts. LVG has cooperated with the tourist organisation about marketing the area's landscape as a UNESCO Heritage Site and with an amusement park.

Præstø Food Market (PFM) is a local food store in Zealand that carries a wide range of food products from local suppliers, and thus constitutes a network for distributing and consuming local food. PFM was founded by one entrepreneur and involves a dozen of food providers, employed managers and sales personnel, volunteers and other local actors. PFM collaborates with a local gastronomy-hotel (Frederiksminde) to attract tourists.

3.3 Data collection

The data have been collected from 2010 to 2014. The main method used to study the local food entrepreneurial network was participant observation (Spradley, 1980; Veal, 2011). Through observation the logics of the actors can be discerned in the statements, actions, and interaction that reveal the reasoning and argumentation in situ and in the moment. The observations were conducted in different network settings such as network meetings, board meetings and workshops involving actors from the food networks, as well as internal and external tourism actors. The roles of the researchers have varied from a passive observer of board meetings to a more active and facilitating role in relation to the workshops. Both types of researcher roles provided access to the interactions and conflicts between the food and tourism actors. We are aware that an active and facilitating researcher role might influence the logics and collaboration of the networks. However, we have attempted to interpret the data material as the network's own and original action and attitude orientation; further the facilitating role has been to support the development of network's own orientation. Thus, we have in our interpretation sought to minimise the possible effect of the more active researcher role in some cases.

The main method of observation was supplemented with content analysis of documents that included meeting minutes, annual statements by the heads of the network, marketing material, web sites, and e-mails. In addition, qualitative in-depth semi-structured interviews were also used. The interviews were conducted with respondents selected by judgmental sampling using the criteria that they should be centrally placed in the network or be central local tourism actors.

The empirical foundation consists of six networks of producers of local food in Denmark. The networks were selected by purposive sampling using the criteria that they are producing food sold as "local" in some form or another and therefore have been successful in creating local food concepts, and that they have interaction with local tourism actors.

Knowledge about the entrepreneurial food networks' collaboration with local tourism actors – concrete common activities – has been procured from the data material about the food networks. Information about the tourist actors' logics (action and attitude orientation) has been procured from this material and data from the tourist actors. The data about the local tourist actors were: Observations (in meetings or in the actors' physical places), brief interviews (focused on the collaboration and logic aspects), documentary material (written material from the tourist actors, local media and web sites), and in one case a survey to

visitors. In table 2 we list the tourist actors that we have investigated and which tourism area they belong to. Four tourism areas are represented: 1. Food markets and festivals, 2. Accommodation, 3. Attractions, 4. Tours and sightseeing.

Data collection was conducted as described in table 2.

Table 2 Data from the entrepreneurial local food networks and tourism actors (*tourism areas and actors in italic*)

Name of network and the tourism areas and actors	Observations	Interviews	Documents
Gourmet Bornholm (GB)	10 network meetings; 8 innovation workshops	3 with producers and coordinator	Brochures, web sites
<i>1. Food markets and festivals: - Promotion event on a ship</i>	Observation of the event	The organiser	Survey to the visitors
<i>3. Attractions: - Public tourist promotion organisation - Amusement park</i>	Observations (5 meetings) Observation on place	Interview	Web site
Taste of Northern Zealand (ToNZ)	3 network meetings; 5 board meetings and 1 general assembly	1 with the founder	Minutes; marketing material; e-mails
<i>1. Food markets and festivals: - Food markets organisers and historical attractions</i>	Observation from meetings		E-mails
<i>4. Tours and sightseeing: - Public tourist promotion organisation</i>	Observations and informal conversations		E-mails
Taste of Funen (ToF)	1 network meeting; 1 general assembly	1 with the head of the board	Marketing material; e-mails
<i>1. Food markets and festivals: - Food festival and market organise</i>		1 interview	E-mails
Cultivator	5 board meetings; 1 network meeting; 1 general assembly	1 with the head of the board	Marketing material; meeting minutes; annual statements; e-mails
<i>1. Food markets and festivals: - Food festival and market organiser</i>		1 interview	
<i>2. Accommodation: - Hotels and restaurants</i>	Observations and informal interviews from meetings		

<i>4. Tours and sightseeing:</i>			
<i>- Organiser of food tours</i>		1 interview	
Lammefjorden Vegetable Guild (LVG)	5 innovation workshops with the network members and tourism actors; 3 board meetings	2 with tourism actor	Minutes; web sites
<i>2. Accommodation:</i>			
<i>- Gourmet hotel-restaurant</i>		Brief interview	
<i>3. Attractions:</i>			
<i>- Public tourist promotion organisation</i>	Observations (3 meetings) and field notes		Minutes
<i>- Amusement park</i>		Brief interview	Web site
<i>4. Tours and sightseeing:</i>			
<i>- Public tourist promotion organisation</i>	Observations (3 meetings) and field notes		Minutes
Præstø Food Market (PFM)	2 innovation workshops	1 with one member	Web sites
<i>2. Accommodation:</i>			
<i>- Gourmet hotel-restaurant</i>	Observation (1 meeting) and field notes		

3.4 Data analysis

In the analysis, the relation between food producer networks and tourism is structured after the four tourism areas in which the collaboration between the food networks and tourism actors take part. In each section, the logics of the food network actors and the tourism actors are described, and their interaction and compatibility are analysed. The emphasis of the analysis is on the degree of success in collaboration between the food network and tourism actors to create activities that attract tourists and how success or non-success can be understood from fit or non-fit of different logics.

As the aim in this article is not a direct interpersonal analysis, interviewees and informants have not been named by alias or real name. Rather, quotes and description of informants' behaviour (for example in meetings) are stated as illustrative examples of an overall network logic.

4. Analysis

The structure of the analysis of the four tourism areas is as follows. First, the logics that are dominating the food networks and the tourism actors respectively will be identified. Secondly, the interactions and compatibility of the identified logics will be discussed as well as the degree to which the actors succeed or fail in their collaborative efforts. Finally we will in a summary section discuss across the cases what can explain differences in success of collaboration.

4.1 Tourism area 1: Food markets and festivals

The data material reveals that five of the studied networks are involved with food markets and festivals and that the actors from these networks use two different combinations of logics to support their participation in such activities.

The first combination of logics was found in the Cultivator, ToF and LVG and GBcases and is dominated by a *civic* logic supplemented by a *celebrity* logic. The civic logic is apparent when the actors justify participation in local food markets with references to their contribution to the development and support of the common good of the local community of the network's geographical origins. Additionally, attending markets and festivals are seen as a branding platform by the networks, showing that the celebrity logic is central. For these networks the combination of the two logics seems like a strong alliance dominating, for example, the actors' attention to this area associated with the market logic, such as the profitability involved with attending markets. For example, this combination of a civic and a celebrity logic can be seen in this quote from a discussion about food market participation at a board meeting: "*It (market participation red.) is good publicity for the whole area. It has a branding value. You know... So that we can make visible what we are capable of in our municipality*".

In another network (ToNZ) the *market* logic is dominating. Using terms such as cost benefit analysis and business case, the food actors carefully choose and attend those markets and festivals with a potentially high economic outcome. Typically, food companies are paying a fee for having a stand on a market. However, actors in these food networks dominated by the market logic insist that they should receive a fee just for their appearance and the entertainment value of their presence. This can be exemplified by a quote from an e-mail from the board to the members: "*They have agreed to pay a fee for having 10 of our members to participate*". On a board meeting this is supported by the chairman of the board: "*On behalf of the network I have made it clear that ToNZ should be paid for participating in markets*".

The organisers of food markets and festivals are typically local tourism actors either employed by the local municipality or through a project based on resources from the public regional development and business promotion system. The organisers apply a combination of the *celebrity* and *civic* logic, arguing that local food markets and festivals will help branding the region. This will attract tourists, companies, and residents and thereby contribute to an increase in the wellbeing and common good of the local society.

The above analysis reveals that some of the networks apply the same combination of logics as the tourism actors when it comes to the organisation and participation in markets and festivals. The mobilisation of the identical logics for supporting this activity makes it much easier, smooth, and unchallenged for them to collaborate around markets and festivals, resulting in the development of several markets and festivals. This can be seen as a criterion for success. The collaboration between ToNZ and the tourism actors is more difficult due to conflicting logics. The food network often rejects offers from tourism actors about participation in markets because the profitability for the food actors is not taken into account. What the tourism actors offer based on the civic and celebrity logic simply does not fit the food actors' expectations..

The explanation of the food networks' approach and action towards local tourism actors concerning using food markets and festivals is similar in four of the cases where civic and celebrity logics are dominating. This reflects that these networks are very grounded in the local community and want to promote the community, including local tourism, besides

of their own products. ToNZ is different as the market logic is dominating, which may reflect the close distance to the big city Copenhagen.

4.2 Tourism area 2: Accommodation

In most of the networks (Cultivator, ToNZ, GB, and ToF) the efforts of having a close collaboration with local hotels and restaurants are based on the *celebrity* logic. Being a supplier of the ingredients that restaurants and hotels put into their meals is seen as a platform for increasing the knowledge and awareness about those products. The profitability associated with the market logic is only indirectly linked to these activities as the collaboration with hotels and restaurants in itself does not lead directly to increased profit due to small volumes and high logistical costs. The friction between the celebrity and market logic is supported by a quote from a board meeting: “*Of course we can sell something, but it is even more important that we can profile our products through the restaurants*”. Hence, the celebrity logic is dominating in most of the networks when approaching local hotels and restaurants.

In another network (LVG) the ruling logics have traditionally been the *industrial* and *market* logic as most of the network’s activities have been focused around the mass consumer markets. However, forces within and outside the network have pushed them in a new and more inspirational direction aimed at developing new and more specialised and innovative products aimed at, for example, local hotels and restaurants. Hence, the network is characterised by an inner conflict between traditional large-scale food producers based on the industrial logic and some innovative and more entrepreneurial producers oriented around the *inspired* logic.

PFM has a clear *market* logic as it wants to create a local food market alternative to supermarkets. PFM collaborates with a local gourmet hotel (Frederiksminde) to sell the local products and promote Præstø as a tourist area. PFM thus also, but in a lesser degree, is driven by a *celebrity* logic.

Most of the hotels and restaurants (e.g., Gourmet Farm and Holberggaard) that the networks relate to are driven by the *industrial* logic. They emphasise the importance of having one distributor where they can place their order and the security of having only one supplier. It is important for them to plan in advance and that their suppliers deliver fresh products every morning at the agreed time. For other more entrepreneurial hotels and restaurants (such as Dragsholm Castle and Hotel Frederiksminde) it is important to offer meals and dishes based on new and innovative locally produced ingredients. Partly because of the originality and uniqueness (*inspired* logic) and partly for contributing to the development of the local brand and thereby attract more tourists and customers (*celebrity* logic). The managing director of hotel Frederiksminde for example tells that “*I have become director of this hotel, which is owned by an expatriate Dane, to create a high-class hotel with a gourmet restaurant. It should be a unique place*”.

In the first group of networks the collaboration efforts with hotels and restaurants fail due to divergent logics. The fact that restaurants should place their orders several places is not in accordance with their wishes of getting easy access to the food products. Being a supplier for restaurants is not directly linked to an increase in the profit for the food actors. Therefore, it is too expensive for the food actors to develop and run a logistical system that can support the restaurants’ industrial demands. This problem is considered in an interview with the chairman of the LVG board: “*This is our biggest problem right now. It is to get the size and the volume so that we can supply the restaurants*”. The purpose of the

food actors for collaborating with restaurants is branding (*celebrity logic*), but the outcome is not in line with the costs involved. The consequence is that the conflict between the industrial and celebrity logic among restaurants, hotels, and food actors acts as a barrier for the successful development of this food tourism activity.

We see that four of the six networks operate from logics that do not fit with innovative tourism actors' logic – inspired (innovation oriented) and celebrity (communicating the innovative food and tourism products and activities). The two different networks, LVG and PFM, are more successful due to the tourist actors being innovative.

4.3 Tourism area 3: Attractions

In this study we have defined attractions as created activities such as amusement parks, museums and town architecture, as well as nature (cf. Lew, 1987; Swarbrooke, 1995). We have not found intense collaboration between the food networks and local attractions, but in two of the cases, LVG and GB, some interaction has taken place:

LVG has invited the local tourist organisation and the municipality to participate in development of new local food concepts that can be connected with local tourist attractions. These tourist actors lead a project aiming to make the local area a UNESCO Heritage Site, and they wanted to include routes to local food producers as part of visit to the area. GB has attempted to get the attractions on Bornholm interested in marketing the local food. Some attractions have responded, but only few of the cases became successful with the attractions marketing and selling local food.

LVG was in the period we observed dominated by three sets of logics among its different members (as described above); on one hand an *industrial* and *market* logic and on the other an *inspired* logic. These two sets of logics created tensions in the network between the entrepreneurial, development-oriented members (inspired logic) and those who wanted to maintain the bulk production (industrial and market logic). The former group further especially expressed a *celebrity* logic, which matched the public tourism actors.

GB was in relation to attractions dominated by *civic* and *celebrity* logics, but also a *market* logic because the network saw attractions as primarily a marketing channel. This market logic was to some degree in contrast to the civic logic, which was inner-directed in the network (seeing the members as a social network community and members of the surrounding local community).

The few private attractions that LVG and GB was reported interacting with were explained to be dominated by an *industrial* logic understood as they were very focused on sure and high profit with low investments and preferred fast food and had little interest in marketing local food. The coordinator of GB explains that "*the local family attraction was only interested in serving cheap fast food and not in presenting local products*". Even though LVG had an industrial logic, this fit of logic with attractions did not lead to any contact because LVG was oriented toward supermarkets as a sales channel and the attraction studies towards procuring pre-prepared industrial food.

The public tourism actors and the tourism organisations were involved in marketing and even sales of local food products from the network (GB) in Bornholm. Both parties have a *celebrity* logic, which is the basis for the collaboration. The interaction between LVG and the public tourism actors was not so successful, partly because the industrial logic was dominant in LVG and hindered the entrepreneurs in LVG in developing new food-based

tourism activities in relation to the landscape tourism plans. The tourist actors had a celebrity logic.

The failure of collaboration between food networks and tourism actors had two different causes in these two cases. LVG has as a sales and distribution company (besides a social and innovative network) no objective interest in supporting local attractions, which would not be demanders of LVG's basic bulk products. GB has an interest in collaboration with local attractions, and the missing success might be explained with the scepticism and social tensions in the local culture.

4.4 Tourism area 4: Tours and sightseeing

The tourism actors can be the local tourist office (Visit Northern Zealand) working together with ToNZ providing guided tours during holiday seasons, a newspaper (a premium club for subscribers of the newspaper) working together with ToF offering wine-enthusiastic members exclusive visits to wine farmers, or event managers on a cruise ship working together with Cultivator offering guided tours for passengers when mooring at Copenhagen harbour. Additionally, the local tourist organisation in Lammefjorden has organised several tours to the area for Danish and foreign food journalists. LVG was one of the places that these journalists visited.

Having visitors at the production site is something most of the food actors appreciate. However, the data material reveals two different ways the food actors cope with having visitors. Some food actors are welcoming in their attitude toward visitors and have a hard time demanding a fee for the time and resources spent on being at the disposal of the visitors. They are very much oriented toward the *domestic* logic of having good manners, being trustworthy, and welcoming guests. Other food actors apply the *market* logic as they are more business-minded as they demand a fee for providing the service for tourists.

The tourism actors apply a combination of a *celebrity* and a *market* logic. They are concerned with attracting tourists through these tours as a branding activity.

The collaboration between tourism actors and the food actors driven by the *domestic* logic often fails. The domestic-oriented food producers dislike the attempts made by the tourism actors to professionalise and commercialise such activities. Some members of ToNZ, who are the least business-growth and most hobby-oriented ones, expressed such a domestic logic. The latter prefer the informal atmosphere of guests just dropping by now and then (when it is convenient for the food producer), and they do not like the idea of making a profit out of it. The collaboration between the more business-minded food actors (e.g. LVG) and the tourism actors is much more successful due to comparable logics. It has resulted in several activities increasing the attractiveness of the area and providing both the food and the tourism actors with a profit.

The differences in the success of collaborating with tour and sightseeing operators may not be explained by the differences between the local tourism organisations. The area where LVG is situated (Odsherred) has a dynamic and active local tourism promotion organisation and tourism manager. The area is a huge tourism area (with a large concentration of summer houses) and enhancing tourism is a very central part of the municipality's policy. The municipality to which Møn belongs does not have the same focus on tourism or a strong tourism organisation, and the tourism organisations in greater Copenhagen focus on other geographical parts than Northern Zealand.

4.5 Summary of logics and logic fittings

The success and non-success of collaboration – i.e., whether local food tourism activities have been established, and whether the logics of the food networks and the tourism actors fit – is summarised in tables 3 and 4. Each of the food network to a certain degree operates from different logics in the different tourism areas thus it is necessary to summarise the collaborations and logics fittings within each tourism area.

Table 3 Successful collaborations between food networks and tourism actors

Tourism areas	Case	Food networks' logic	Tourism actors' logic	Is there fitting logics?
1. Food markets and festivals	Cultivator, GB, ToF	Celebrity, civic	Celebrity, civic	Yes
2. Accommodation	LVG	Industrial, market, inspired	Celebrity, inspired Celebrity, inspired	Yes
3. Attractions	PFM	Market, celebrity		Yes
	GB (with public tourism actors) LVG (part of LVG* with public tourism actors)	Civic, celebrity, market Industrial, market, inspired, celebrity	Celebrity, market Celebrity	Yes Yes
4. Tours and sightseeing	Cultivator, ToF, LVG	Market	Celebrity, market	Yes

* The most entrepreneurial, development oriented members of LVG

Table 4 Non-successful collaborations between food networks and tourism actors

Tourism areas	Case	Food networks' logic	Tourism actors' logic	Is there fitting logics?
1. Food markets and festivals	ToNZ	Market	Celebrity, civic	No
2. Accommodation	Cultivator	Celebrity	Industrial	No
3. Attractions	LVG (with private tourism actors)	Industrial, market, inspired	Industrial	Yes
	GB (with private tourism actors)	Civic, celebrity, market	Industrial	No
4. Tours and sightseeing	ToNZ (part of ToNZ*)	Domestic	Celebrity, market	No

* The most domestic oriented members of ToNZ

Most entrepreneurial food networks expressed a combination of logics. Some, (although fewer) tourism actors did the same. The successful cases of collaboration (cf. table 3) are characterised by the food networks and the tourism actors not having completely identical logics or combinations of logics, but there is at least one logic in common for each of them. The success depends on whether both parties attempt to find a common denominator and emphasise the common logic.

The unsuccessful cases of collaboration (cf. table 4) are generally characterised by no logic being in common. One exception is LVG with private tourism actors within the attraction area. The attraction in this case is an amusement park. Although both parties operate from an industrial logic, they address different parts of the supply chain: LGV approaches delivering raw vegetables as bulk products to supermarkets and wholesalers. The amusement park wants semi-prepared vegetables (such as cut up potatoes ready for putting into the deep-fryer).

We have also observed that different logics within each food network can be an impediment for collaboration with local tourism actors. A combination of logics may work well within a food network, i.e. that the network is not characterised by internal tensions or conflicts and collaborates successfully with local tourism actors. This is for example the case of PFM, which both carries out a market logic by selling own products in a shop and in collaboration with the local gourmet hotel-restaurant emphasises a celebrity logic in promoting the local food that the hotel-restaurant uses in their menu. A combination of logics within a food network may, however, also lead to internal tensions such as within LVG where two groups want to develop the network in different directions. The internal tension in LVG did not hinder collaboration with this hotel, but the collaboration was less intense and probably with less effect on local tourism than it could have been if there had not been this internal tension within LVG.

The fitting logics that lead to success are primarily *celebrity* and *civic* logics, which emphasise the community aspect (i.e., that both parties want to support the local community). The non-fitting logics that most strongly hinder such success are if one of the parties has a dominant *market* or *industry* logic, which emphasise egoistic economic gain. Both parties (entrepreneurial food networks and tourism actors) might have an industrial logic without success in collaboration if they have different production or delivery line policies (such as approaching different parts of the supply chain as in LVG).

6. Conclusion

Overall, the analysis has supported our theoretical assumption that fitting logics between local entrepreneurial food networks and local tourist actors will increase the probability of successful collaboration and thus the exploitation of local food as a factor that can increase local tourism. The analysis has demonstrated that generally, development of local food tourism activities is successful when at least one of the logics of the food networks and of the tourism actors is fitting and not successful if no logics fit. We have observed one exception for non-successful collaboration. This exception, however, can be explained if we dig a step deeper than just the action and attitude logic and look at the functional interest, e.g. which part of a supply chain each party approaches; in this case (LVG), the

overlapping industrial logics were for the food network directed towards the retail market while for the tourist actors it was directed towards pre-preparing food industries.

Combinations of logics within an entrepreneurial local food network are often no impediment for collaboration with local tourism actors if just one logic is fitting. However, it can be if the combination leads to internal tensions within the food entrepreneur network.

To a large degree, these results confirm the general results from community and local entrepreneurial network studies (Frankenberg, 1966; Westlund and Bolton, 2003; Spilling, 2011), namely that local tensions often are a barrier to social and business development, but these tensions can be overcome if the parties find a common congruence formula (which in this case is fitting of action and attitude logics).

This research has also demonstrated that Boltanski and Thevenot's (2006) theory tool of logics can be useful to characterise and thus understand collaborations within a community, and thus to systematise and communicate scientifically about them. The tool may also be useful to practitioners in understanding which attitude and actions orientation leads to cooperation.

References

- Aldrich H. & Zimmer C. (1986) Entrepreneurship through social networks. In D. Sexton and R. Smilor (eds.) *The Art and Science of Entrepreneurship* (pp. 3-23). New York: Ballinger.
- Araujo, L. & Easton, G. (1996). Networks in socioeconomic systems: a critical review. In: Iacobucci, D. (ed.), *Networks in Marketing*, (pp. 63–107). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Birley S. (1985). The role of networks in the entrepreneurial process. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 1(1), 107-117.
- Blokker, P. (2011). Pragmatic sociology: Theoretical evolution and empirical application. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 14(3), 251–261.
- Boesen, M. (2015). *Marketing in Strategic Food Networks*. Doctoral dissertation. Roskilde: Roskilde University
- Boltanski, L., & Thevenot, L. (1999). The Sociology of Critical Capacity. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 2(3), 359–377.
- Boltanski, L., and L. Thévenot (2006). *On justification: economies of worth*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Burt, R. (2000). The Network Entrepreneur. In Swedberg, R. (ed.), *Entrepreneurship* (pp. 281-307). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cavicchi, A. & Santini, C. (2014). *Food and Wine Events in Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Christopher, M., Payne, A., & Ballantyne, D. (2011). *Relationship Marketing: Creating Stakeholder Value*. London: Routledge.
- Cloutier, C. (2009). *Managing opportunity, managing power and managing difference: how nonprofits strategically manage their relations with funders*. Montréal: HEC.
- Cloutier, C., & Langley, A. (2013). The Logic of Institutional Logics: Insights From French Pragmatist Sociology. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, XX(X), 1–21
- Croce, E. & Perri, G. (2010). *Food and Wine Tourism*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Eriksen S. N. (2013) Defining local food: constructing a new taxonomy – three domains of proximity. *Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica*, Section B - Soil & Plant Science, 63(1), 47-55.
- Eriksen, S.N. & Sundbo, J. (2016). Drivers and barriers to the development of local food networks in Denmark. *European Urban and Regional Studies* (forthcoming).

- Everett, S. & Aitchison, C. (2008). The Role of Food Tourism in Sustaining Regional Identity: A Case Study of Cornwall, South West England. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16, 150-167.
- Frankenberg, R. (1966). *Communities in Britain*. Harmondsworth (UK): Penguin.
- Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.). *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis* (pp. 232–263). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goodrick, E., & Reay, T. (2011). Constellations of Institutional Logics. *Work and Occupations*, 38 (3), 372–416
- Goodman, D., DuPuis, M. & Goodman, M.K. (Eds.), 2014. *Alternative Food Networks: Knowledge, Practice and Politics*. Routledge, London
- Granovetter, M. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 1360–1380.
- Halkier, H. (2012). Local Food for International Tourists Explorative Studies of Perceptions of Networking and Interactions in two Holiday Home Destinations in North Jutland, Denmark. DELRAPPORT 3 Fremtidens feriehus og feriehusområde. Published online: http://vbn.aau.dk/files/71041596/fremtidensferiehus_delrapport_3.pdf, accessed July 18 2013.
- Hall, C. M. & Mitchell, R. 2005. Gastronomic tourism: Comparing food and wine tourism experiences. In: Novelli, M. (ed.) *Niche tourism: Contemporary issues, trends and cases* (pp. 73-88). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hall, C. M. & Sharples, L. (eds.) (2008). *Food and Wine Festivals and Events around the World*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hjalager, A. M. (2010). A review of innovation research in tourism. *Tourism management*. 31(1), 1-12.
- Hjalager, A.-M. & Richards, G. (2002). *Tourism and gastronomy*. London: Routledge.
- Hoang H. and Antoncic B. (2003). Network-based research in entrepreneurship – A critical review. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(2), 165-87.
- Holm, J. L., M.B. Pedersen & S. Sørensen (2013). Experiencing organic farms and food by regional tourism innovation. *Acta Agriculture Scandinavica, Sektion B – Soil & Plant Science*, 63(Supplement 1), 85 -93.
- Jagd, S. (2011). Pragmatic sociology and competing orders of worth in organizations. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 14(3), 343–359.
- Johannisson B. (1988). Business formation – a network approach. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 4(3-4), 83–99.
- Johannisson B. & Mønsted M. (1997). Contextualizing entrepreneurial networking. The case of Scandinavia. *International Studies of Management and Organisations*, 27(3), 109–136.
- Johannisson B., Ramirez-Pasillas M., & Karlsson G. (2002). The institutional embeddedness of local inter-firm networks: a leverage for business creation. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 14(4), 297–315.
- Jones, C., Hesterly, W.S., & Borgatti, S.P. (1997). A general theory of network governance: exchange conditions and social mechanisms. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(4), 911–945.
- Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing* (2003). Special issue: Wine, Food and Tourism Marketing, 14(3/4).

- Lawrence, T. B., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2011). *Institutional Work*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lew, A.A. (1987). A framework of topurist attraction research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(4), 147-153.
- Ljunggren, E., Markowska, M., Mynttinen, S., Samuelson, R., Sæmundsson, R., Virtanen, M. & Wiklund, J. (2010). *EXPLORE – EXPeriencing LOcal food Resources in the Nordic countries*. Report. Oslo: Nordic Innovation Centre.
- Mesny, A., & Mailhot, C. (2007). The Difficult Search for Compromises in a Canadian Industry / University Partnership. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 32(2), 203-226.
- Mossberg, L. & Svensson, I. (2006). *Boken om Måltidsturism i Västra Götaland*. Göteborg: Västsvenska Turistrådet.
- Mykletun R. & Gyimothy S. (2010). Beyond the renaissance of the traditional Voss sheep's head meal: Tradition, culinary art, scariness and entrepreneurship. *Tourism Management*, 31(3): 434-46.
- OECD (2012). *Food and the tourism experience: The Korea workshop, OECD studies on tourism*. Paris, OECD.
- Petrini, C. (2001). *Slow Food: The Case for Taste*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ponte, S. & Gibbon, P., 2005. Quality standards, conventions and the governance of global valuechains. *Econ. Soc.* 34 (1), 1-31
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1934). *The theory of economic development*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Schøtt, T. & K. Klyver (2011). How social network structure shapes entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 1(1), 3-22.
- Shane, S. & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217–226.
- Slotte-Koch, S. & Coviello, N. (2010), Entrepreneurship Research on Network processes: A Review and Ways Forward. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(1), 31-57.
- Spilling O. (2011). Mobilising the entrepreneurial potential in local community development. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 23(1-2), 23-35.
- Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston
- Sundbo, D. I. C. (2013) Local food – the social construction of a concept. *Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica*, Section B - Soil & Plant Science, 63(1), 66-77
- Sundbo, J. (1998). *The Organisation of Innovation in Services*. Copenhagen: Roskilde University Press
- Swarbrooke, J. (1995). *The Development and Management of Visitor Attractions*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Telfer, D. J. & Wall, G. (1996). Linkages between Tourism and Food Production. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23, 635-653.
- Tellström, R., Gustafsson, I-B., & Mossberg, L. (2006). Consuming heritage: the use of local food culture in branding. *Place Branding*, 2(2), 130-143.
- Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional Logics. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby & K. Sahlin-Andersson (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (pp. 99–129). Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore: Sage.
- Ulhøi, J. (2005). The social dimensions of entrepreneurship. *Technovation*, 25, 939-946.
- Ulijn J., Aaltio I., Guerra G. and Uhlener, L. (2011). Cooperation and team-work in technology start-ups: reflected in some Italian, British, Dutch and German findings. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 14(1), 100-126.
- Veal, A.J. (2011). *Research Methods for Leisure and Tourism – A Practical Guide*, 4th ed.

Harlow: Pearson Education

Westlund, H. and Bolton, R. (2003). Local social capital and entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 21(2), 77-113.

Yin, R. (1994). *Case Study Design*, Thousand Oaks: Sage