COLLECTIVIZING COMMUNICATIVE SPACES FOR COLLABORATION IN RURAL LODGING IN BRAZIL

ESPACIOS COMUNICADORES DE COLECTIVIZACIÓN PARA LA COLABORACIÓN EN ALOJAMIENTO RURAL EN BRASIL

Luciano Torres Tricárico
Universidade do Vale do Itajaí (UNIVALI). Brazil.
tricarico@univali.br

How to cite the article:

ABSTRACT

Collectivization and collaboration are categories essentially studied as a social dimension in urban contexts, despite the spatial dimension of rural realities. Given this reality of scientific studies, the research goal was to demonstrate collectivization for collaboration in rural lodging spaces from Sítio Hortêncio (Florianópolis, state of Santa Catarina, Brazil) as a research object. The research is a qualitative and descriptive study in view of *space* as a communicating empirical object. Bibliography and search in primary and secondary data sources, *in loco* spatial reading, and photographs of the spaces of the research object as support for spatial reading constituted the research procedures and instruments. First, collected data was approached by Semiotic of Peirce, followed by Benjamin Montage Theory. The semiotic and the montage theory presented themselves as unusual as methodological approaches for the Hospitality industry; the rural lodging *space* was an innovative attribute of approach for studies in the Hospitality area; rural lodging spaces revealed possibilities of political actions of collaborative, direct democracy for the empowerment of rural communities in Brazil. Collectivization and collaboration have been explained as urban phenomena. Therefore, the description of rural lodging spaces could legitimize other spaces that are not urban public spaces as support for collectivization and collaboration. The results gave meaning to rural lodging spaces, understood as communicators of collectivization for collaboration in the Brazilian rural territory.

Keywords: space, communicative, collectivization, collaboration, rural lodging, rural area, Brazil, Semiotic, Montage Theory.

RESUMEN

Colectivización y colaboración son categorías esencialmente estudiadas hasta el momento como dimensión social en contextos urbanos, aunque los estudios son posibles desde la dimensión espacial en contextos rurales. Ante esta realidad de los estudios científicos, el objetivo de la investigación fue demostrar la colectivización para la colaboración en espacios de alojamiento rural en el objeto de investigación Cortijo Hortêncio (Florianópolis, Santa Catariana, Brasil). La investigación se caracterizó como cualitativa y descriptiva en vista del *espacio* como objeto empírico comunicador; bibliografía y búsqueda en fuentes de datos primarios y secundarios, lectura espacial *in loco* y fotografías de los espacios del objeto de investigación como soporte para la lectura espacial, constituyeron procedimientos e instrumentos de investigación. Los datos recogidos fueron abordados por la Semiótica peirceana, seguida por la Teoría del Montaje benjaminiana. La Semiótica y la Teoría de Montaje se presentaron como un abordaje metodológico inusual para las áreas de Hospitalidad y Hotelería; el *espacio* de hospedaje rural fue un atributo innovador de abordaje para los estudios en las áreas de Hospitalidad y Hotelería; los espacios de alojamiento rural demostraron posibilidades para acciones políticas de democracia directa colaborativa como posibilidad para el empoderamiento de comunidades rurales. Colectivización y colaboración han sido explicadas como fenómenos urbanos, pero la descripción de espacios de alojamiento rural pudo legitimar otros espacios que no son espacios públicos urbanos como soporte de colectivización para colaboración. Los resultados demostraron espacios de alojamiento rural comunicadores de colectivización para la colaboración en el territorio rural brasileño.

Palabras clave: espacio, comunicador, colectivización, colaboración, alojamiento rural, zona rural, Brasil, Semiótica, Teoría de Montaje.

ESPAÇOS COMUNICANTES DE COLETIVIZAÇÃO PARA COLABORAÇÃO EM ALOJAMENTO RURAL NO BRASIL

RESUMO

Coletivização e colaboração são categorias essencialmente estudadas enquanto dimensão social em contextos urbanos, embora sejam possíveis estudos a partir da dimensão espacial em contextos rurais. Diante dessa realidade de estudos científicos, o objetivo da pesquisa foi demonstrar a coletivização para colaboração em espaços de alojamento rural no Cortijo Hortêncio objeto de pesquisa (Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brasil). A pesquisa caracterizou-se como qualitativa e descritiva tendo em vista o espaço como objeto empírico comunicador; bibliografia e busca em fontes de dados primárias e secundárias, leitura espacial in loco e fotografias dos espaços do objeto de pesquisa como suporte para a leitura espacial constituíram procedimentos e instrumentos de pesquisa. Os dados coletados foram abordados pela Semiótica Peirciana, seguida da Teoria da Montagem Benjaminiana. A Semiótica e a Teoria da Montagem foram apresentadas como uma abordagem metodológica incomum para as áreas de Hospitalidade e Hotelaria; o espaço de hospedagem rural foi um atributo de abordagem inovadora para estudos nas áreas de Hospitalidade e Hotelaria; Os espaços de alojamento rural demonstraram possibilidades de ações políticas de democracia

direta colaborativa como possibilidade de empoderamento das comunidades rurais. A coletivização e a colaboração têm sido explicadas como fenômenos urbanos, mas a descrição dos espaços de alojamento rural poderia legitimar outros espaços que não sejam públicos urbanos como suporte da coletivização para a colaboração. Os resultados demonstraram espaços de alojamento rural que comunicam coletivização para colaboração no território rural brasileiro.

Palavras chave: espaço, comunicador, coletivização, colaboração, alojamento rural, zona rural, Brasil, Semiótica, Teoria da Montagem.

1. INTRODUCTION

Three phenomena that have been little studied together (collectivization, collaboration, and rural lodging spaces in Brazil) were able to give meaning to the innovative character of the research because studies of lodging facilities have been done little by the spatial category of analysis, which is done mainly by the socio-economic orientation of companies (Lashley, 2015), which grounded the research problem.

In another way, the innovative character of the research also lies in the proposition of new methodological "designs" for Hospitality and Hotel Management by using spatial reading (Ferrara, 2005; Ferrara, 2000; Ferrara, 1999), Semiotic of Peirce for *space* (Peirce, 1984), and Benjamin's Montage Theory (Benjamin, 2007); as well as jointly studying collectivization and collaboration in rural lodging spaces in Brazil.

The research assumption emerged with experiences lived in spaces of the research object, which inferred collectivization for collaboration in rural territory, so that collectivization would not only manifest in cities (Pamplona and Carvalho Jr., 2017; Rahmatabadi et al., 2011; Reis & Venâncio, 2019; Swerts, 2017) and virtual social networks (Balula, 2010), as it was concluded that contemporary studies have attributed to urban space the effective place of collectivization (Swerts, 2017; Rahmatabadi et al., 2011), place of "dialogue" (Reis and Venâncio, 2018), and the city as essential support for popular participation (Pamplona and Carvalho Jr., 2017). Thus, the research question arose: can rural lodging spaces in Brazil also give meaning to collectivization for collaboration? To this end, the Sítio Hortêncio was used as a research object, located in the agrarian part of Florianópolis, Santa Catarina (SC), Brazil. As such, the site was described as an empirical phenomenon that contextualizes the Brazilian rural area and the values that influence it. Thus, the object of the study generalized the research results appropriate to qualitative research in Social Sciences and Applied Social Sciences (Marconi and Lakatos, 2017).

However, it should be noted that studies on collectivization in rural space have been found, such as that of Navarrete (2017), who pointed out the reunion of runaway enslaved people in the Sierras de María (Cartagena de Indias, Caribbean) in the 17th century. Nunes (2017) studied agricultural colonies in the Amazon between 1840 and 1880. Studies by León (2017) pointed to collectivization in the Central Valley (Chile). However, it is noteworthy that no scientific work has dealt with collectivization for collaboration in rural lodging spaces.

This paper could be justified given the goal of revealing new collectivization spaces for collaboration, which is necessary for the face of the Latin American nation-state collapse, where different socio-spatial groups lack "other" collaborative civic pacts (Hamburger-Fernández, 2013; Tricárico et al., 2019a; Tricárico et al., 2019b). In this bias, the exploratory colonial heritage of Brazilian history has made an object culture to civic places (Damatta, 1997), allied to the late Brazilian urbanization that took place in an accelerated manner to solve problems of population swelling in the face of the growing industrialization of emerging metropolises, and therefore without due care for public civic spaces (Deák and Schiffer, 2010).

This research was also justified by the condition that collectivization and collaboration may be predictors of consensus (Tricárico et al., 2019a; Tricárico et al., 2019b).

2. OBJECTIVES

In front of all this, the general research propose was to demonstrate the meanings of collectivization for collaboration in rural lodging spaces in Brazil. The following specific objectives were adopted to achieve the general propose:

1) Understand and systematize categories of description and analysis for collectivization and collaboration.

2) Define spatial attributes as support for collectivization and collaboration.

3) Describe spatial attributes of collectivization for collaboration of the research object.

4) Compare description and analysis categories for collectivization and collaboration with spatial attributes of collectivization for collaboration of the research object.

3. METHODS

3.1. Research characteristics

This paper is qualitative and descriptive research since the goal indicated generalization to phenomena of the Brazilian rural space, as well as the interdisciplinarity between phenomena – collectivization, collaboration, and rural lodging spaces – based on results description little interrelated until then (Marconi and Lakatos, 2017).

3.2. Data collection instrument

Initially, bibliometrics was carried out in electronic research portals, which used theme-related keywords in English, Portuguese, and Spanish.

There was a search for academic and scientific papers in university libraries, online research databases, in primary sources (websites, videos, brochures) to contextualize and substantiate the relevance of Sítio Hortêncio as a research object. Then, there was an on-site spatial reading and the use of photographs to represent the *space* (primary source) in and of the site. We have *abduction* (Peirce, 1984) followed by identifying *sign fragments from the past* (Benjamin, 2007) as categories of description in its epistemic approaches. The researcher's repertoire supported this process in choosing pertinent signs to describe the research object based on previous knowledge (Barthes,

1971), while at the same time, the description of the *pre-listed signs fragments* (Benjamin, 2007) was deepened based on bibliographic research of the last twenty years in electronic research databases.

The on-site spatial reading and photographic survey were made on February 20 and 21, 2022.

3.3. Method for describing the collected data

Space was understood with a communicating role of ways of thinking and knowing (Caramella, 2007) and, therefore, *space* is endowed with *plurisignification* (condition inherent to the spatial language), which can provide a diversity of communications and information that unfold *abductive processes* (Peirce, 1984) as first opportunities for discoveries, made from experiences (empirical) in and from the *space* of the object of study (Ferrara, 1999). From there, unthinkable, extraordinary, and not necessarily assertive associations may occur (Ferrara, 2005, p. 31): "(…) associate what we never before thought to associate (…)" (Peirce, 1974, p. 5,168).

Abduction (Peirce, 1984) and Montage Theory (Benjamin, 2007) supported the on-site *space* reading: "The reading (…) of an everyday continuum presents a close methodological and epistemological union between (…) Walter Benjamin and (…) Charles Sanders Pierce, especially his phenomenology (…)" (Ferrara, 2000, p. 127). So the *abduction* (Peirce, 1984) was foreboding for Benjamin's Montage (2007), supporting associations and connections between interrelated "distant" spaces, pretentiously aiming at scientific assertions (Ferrara, 1999).

Montage (Benjamin, 2007) is supported by signs of the past (*sign fragments from the past*) in comparative temporal "discontinuity" but denoting "repetition" of history (Ferrara, 2000). The Montage (Benjamin, 2007) presupposes a reader of spaces and images that recognizes, redeems, and rediscovers the past in the present (Ferrara, 2000), much in function of the reader's repertoire (Barthes, 1971). It is convenient for the researcher to read the past and note *sign fragments from the past* in the present (Benjamin, 2007). That is, initially, the spatial reading will always be possible (*abduction*), being in sign circumstances (Peirce, 1984); therefore, the *space* reading will never be complete (Ferrara, 2005). It is worth pointing out that *sign* is something that "(…) represents something to someone (…)" (Peirce, 1974), Alternatively, as St. Augustine (*apud* Epstein, 2002, p. 17) defined it: sign "(…) makes something different appear in mind (…)".

The ascertainment of *sign fragments from the past* (Benjamin, 2007) in the empirical in and of the space of the research object (Sítio Hortêncio) and the due provision of conclusive unexpected results grounded the descriptive qualitative research, which is a condition befitting the Social Sciences and Applied Social Sciences (Marconi and Lakatos, 2017).

This research also considered a heteronomy from Semiotic as an epistemic approach for the other areas of knowledge, such as Sociology, History, Architecture, and Urbanism (Coopex Unibrasil, 2003), as well as suggests Semiotic for studies in the areas of Hospitality and Hotel Management.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Bibliographic review

4.1.1. Collectivization and *space*

Collectivization is something that is done by an individual and is also done by other individuals with the same objectives and reasons (Rabelo, 2003). Thus, *space* for collectivization is conditioned as real physical support that encloses several individuals with mutual interests; in that regard, agglomeration of people in urban public spaces effectively constitutes a *space* for collectivization (Albuquerque and Días, 2019).

Current sociological research has demonstrated the democratic empowerment of new urban community leadership as an alternative to state power (Hambleton, 2015), and gender research has revealed civic collaboration in cosmopolitan cities (HØy-Petersen et al., 2016). Sociological research has concluded innovative strands in urban ecological activism for urban public policy based on inclusion through family ties (Blok and Meilvang, 2014).

One of the few studies on collectivization in rural territory found that rural settlements of the MST[1] (Movimento Sem Terra) in Brazil could demonstrate collectivization as a factor for strengthening subjective, material, and ethical efficiencies in inclusive or exclusive social situations and overcoming ethical and political conflicts, given the cooperation and solidarity in social arrangements of different groups (Groff et al., 2009).

On the other hand, collectivization is understood as an imposition of the state's public power, even with the objective of solving social demands. Thus, we can verify, for example: in the Great Communal House (Tianjin, China) with compulsory collectivist spaces, despite being intimate spaces (Bray, 2005); in the forced collectivization of Hungarian peasants in the early 1960s (Morell, 2012); in the imposed collectivization for Chinese (Hershatter, 2006) and Soviet (Marples, 1991) societies in the 1950s; in collectivization campaigns and the advent of famine in Kazakhstan between the 1930s and 1933s (Volkava, 2012); among other facts that denounced collectivization as a social trauma of class and gender.

It is worth noting that this research used the notion of collectivization as a gathering of people who have interests in common causes (Rabelo, 2003), and, therefore, collectivization was understood as a prediction for collaboration (Tricárico et al., 2019a), as there is in collaboration a predisposition to interpersonal and intergroup transitive communication proper to collaboration (Martsinkovskaya et al., 2018).

4.1.2. Collaboration and collectivization in lodging

The bibliometric instrument and bibliographic reading accused insufficient scientific literature that interrelated the phenomena of lodging facilities, collectivization, and

---

[1] Movimento Sem Terra (MST) is a Brazilian political and social activism focusing on the issues of the rural worker, especially concerning the struggle for agrarian reform in Brazil.

collaboration. Only one work was found regarding the approach between rural lodging facilities and collaboration (Tricárico et al., 2019a).

Collaboration was not a reason for monetized payment for service rendered, but it was a moral obligation and gifted retribution imbued with ethics and generosity that overlapped mercantile relationships (Lashley, 2015; Mauss, 1974; Pimentel, 2009). Therefore, according to Sales and Salles (2010), one must transpose the utilitarian and economic bias of research on collaboration because collaboration, when studied in the light of collectivism, overcomes individual value, as each individual has their identities shared when exposed communally, being the shared gift "contamination" of solidarity (Goudbout and Caillé, 2007).

Hotels throughout history have been able to manifest collectivist and collaborative values when their spaces promoted social interaction, as in the case of Grand Hotels, which, although they were private spaces, behaved as "public spaces" (Walker, 2002).

The collectivist value can be explained by the common motivation among visitors looking for natural and rural destinations, to escape from everyday life in cities in order to socialize, exchange, and learn among different cultures and, above all, experience in nature, the examples of rural tourism, ecotourism, and agritourism (Manzanares and Mateos, 2017). In Brazil, rural tourism activities are being guided by partnerships of cooperation and collaboration networks among farmers and information exchanges with visitors (Pimentel, 2009); for example, rural farming families promote experiences for "urban" guests (Onyx et al., 2007; Pimentel, 2009; Prybylski, 2008; Sales & Salles, 2010). In this sense, Brazilian rural tourism has transformed social processes in terms of physical, human, and institutional capital (Grimm & Sampaio, 2011), and the rural lodging facility (sometimes built in collective effort) is a "binder" of local identities and cultures, notions of community, knowledge exchange between hosts and guests, and awareness of everyday achievements (Brambatti and Nitsche, 2017; Moraes et al., 2017; Onyx et al., 2007).

Grimm and Sampaio (2011) defined Brazilian rural lodging as an enterprise that promotes activities biased by social sharing, especially when it comes to family lodgings: "(…) in lodgings (…) where relationships become closer, more intimate, and authentic (…)" (Maldonado, 2005, p. 8) – signs for collaboration. This Brazilian rural lodging context is linked to CBT (Community-Based Tourism, which strives for social sustainability and, therefore, stimulates social relationships between visitors and hosts (Kruczek et al., 2018; Petrović, 2018) as a possibility for collaboration (Tricárico et al., 2019a).

It is worth noting that the theoretical review for phenomena of rural lodging, collectivization, and collaboration has been "inclined" to essentially social values, despite *space* and even socio-spatial relationships.

4.2. Spaces of Sítio Hortêncio in the light of sign fragments from the past (Benjamin, 2007)

4.2.1. Landscape of the Sertão of Vale do Ribeirão do Peri, landscape framed by a gateway

The predominance of natural spaces at Sítio Hortêncio (Figure 1) emphasizes collectivist and collaborative values (Arama et al., 2019; Tang and Long, 2018).

Figure 1
The landscape of the Sertão of Vale do Ribeirão do Peri (Florianópolis, SC, Brazil) from Sítio Hortêncio and the entrance gateway to the site

Source: Author's archive (2022).

The Brazilian rural territory is essentially a natural space and, as such, it can provide escapism as an interest for many individuals (Rabelo, 2003) because there is a collectivist search for an escape from the hectic daily life in the cities, and social relations of affection can be more tightly knit when they are away from the fast-paced work environment. Community values were exhausted in the urban environment that emerged with the Industrial Revolution, given the more fantastic search for work in cities and the concentration of capital, which also brought new ideologies to life (Bauman, 2001).

Escapism goes back to the need for experiences close to nature in the context of the effectiveness of cities of the First Industrial Revolution. As an example, and as a *sign fragment from the past* (Benjamin, 2007), we can recall the ideal of Baden-Powell (1908) with his scout camps in the middle of nature, where there would be civic preparation for future adults.

Still in the historical context of the cities of the Industrial Revolution, one can think that the idealization of an enjoyed, desired, nostalgic, and even imagined landscape for escapism goes back (Benjamin, 2007) to the nature represented in landscape paintings and still lifes in the rooms of 19th century bourgeois houses, that is, the picture with landscape paintings was a "window" for the enjoyment of escapism since outside the bourgeois house of the 19th century there was an inhospitable, polluted city, with no sanitation (Caramella, 2007).

In yet another way, one can explain the experience amid nature as a *sign fragment from the past* (Benjamin, 2007) as a religious asceticism and sublimation, the gardens of Eden for beyond the grave, the mountaintop to the temple of the Greek acropolis as a metaphor for proximity to the "heavens", staggering of stepping stones in Machu Picchu for sacrifices (Jellicoe and Jellicoe, 1995), among other spaces near nature that

133

supported religious collectivist expressions because individuals group together with typical desires for faith and proselytizing (Martsinkovskaya et al., 2018; Rabelo, 2003).

Nature is framed in Sítio Hortêncio by an entrance gateway/porch (figure 1). So that gate is a *sign fragment from the past* (Benjamin, 2007) because it is a metaphor for a "window" that frames (like a painting) the natural landscape and is the entrance "door" to the site. In other words, the "window" porch gives meaning to the landscape. Window originates from the Latin word *jañuella* (diminutive of *jañua* – entrance door); *jañua* gives origin to the word *January* in honor of the god of "beginnings" *Janus*. The gateway placed there has the opportunity to select the image of nature and the space of the site, distinguishing what is outside and inside, what is imprisoned and what is released when entering the site and indicates a metaphorical crossing ritual from one state to another (Caramella, 2007) – that state of frenetic urban life to the state of escapism next to rural life in the farm (Bauman, 2001).

Historically, porches have been made as spaces of ritualistic religious representation to enter sacred places, as with tabernacles and oratories, and were, therefore, guarded to allow only chosen people to pass through (Laurence & Newsome, 2012). Laurance and Newsome (2012) argue that individuals are visually affected by porches because they lead the eye to something that is to be made visible and meaningful. No wonder the Arc de Triomphe in Paris is strategically defined as a "symbolic" entrance into a new city of the French Revolution, made by the ideals of Napoleon III with Baron de Haussmann as its executor (Caramella, 2007).

4.2.2. Organic garden

Sítio Hortêncio's organic garden (figure 2) is a place of collectivization for learning and training guests and visitors who have a common interest (Martsinkovskaya et al., 2018; Rabelo, 2003) in producing and eating organic vegetables, constituting information exchange imbued by collaboration (Tricárico et al., 2019a). In addition, the garden promotes the production, commercialization, and subsistence of the farm (K. S. de Souza, personal communication, February 21, 2022).

Figure 2
Organic garden, Sítio Hortêncio

Source: Author's archive (2022).

Organic gardening can be traced back to (Benjamin, 2007) pre-industrial and artisanal agricultural manufacturing activities that required collaborative collective work to handle production, despite proper mechanization of agricultural practices. Such pre-industrial agricultural production mode placed the worker actively participating in all production phases. Because of this, the importance of others' work was respected and

recognized, unfolding awareness of the social role of everyone's work (Rosenthal, 2005).

4.2.3. Pet nurseries

Pet nurseries (figure 3) use fauna as their motto because in describing a *sign fragment from the past* (Benjamin, 2007), it was observed that domestication of animals already occurred in the early days of European colonization in South America when indigenous people adopted sociable dog breeds despite disobedient, solitary wandering dog breeds that were unwilling for group insertion (Clutton-Brock, 1977). So, early practices for domesticating animals were established by their inherent ability to collectivize, which transfers to human behaviors (Clutton-Brock, 1977; Kirk, 2019) in a kind of metaphor of the referential animal social structure for social organization among humans (Gasparini et al., 2008).

Figure 3
Pet nurseries, Sítio Hortêncio

Source: Author's archive (2022).

Pet nurseries are intended for visiting children at the farm, where collectivization takes place between children and in the interaction of children with pets; such collectivization is accentuated because studies have shown psychological improvement upon possession of and contact with domestic animals (Enders-Slegers and Hediger, 2019; Janssens et al., 2020), because there are emotional exchanges between humans and animals, especially since individuals can learn from animal behavior, transferable and welcomed as human behavior as well (Clutton-Brock, 1977; Kirk, 2019). Thus, ethical principles in animal care are passed on to individuals, and the division of tasks in animal care may denote collaboration among caregivers (Palmer et al., 2022).

4.2.4. Balconies

When looking back through history at *sign fragments from the past* (Benjamin, 2007) of balconies, one can notice their spatial capacity as a place between public life (street) and private life (home). Balconies can manifest themselves as urban public spaces (Brandão & Moreira, 2017; Brown et al., 2010), and, in this way, balconies are capable of collectivization when welcoming residents, neighbors, and visitors. Under this perspective, balconies ritualize social-spatial situations when there is a possible entry of "strangers" into the private space of the home, which is often not prepared for proper hospitality (Heathcote, 2012). At the same time, they socially select what is convenient or not (Maragno and Coch, 2017), so that balconies carry an "aura" of "public space" when it has collectivization (Brandão and Moreira, 2017; Brown et al., 2010).

Balconies support daily tasks when there are home repairs, cleaning, children's play, and gardening, among other activities that promote collective experiences among family members, neighbors, and friends; giving meaning to community life and even a safe environment for walkers in the streets (Brown et al., 2010). However, balconies do not impose conviviality between individuals but are ready to promote collectivization and collaboration even in socio-political and cultural-civic contexts (Brown et al., 2010). Balconies were classrooms during the North American population explosion; they symbolized home and even nation for North Americans because they transgressed the imposition of English settler building models (Heathcote, 2012). Since colonization, they have existed in Brazilian homes (Maragno and Coch, 2017), and they are present in almost every human settlement (Heathcote, 2012).

Balconies at Sítio Hortêncio (figure 4) can promote collectivization and timely collaboration between hosts, visitors, and guests, extending as a training factor. Especially at night, balconies are spaces for people to gather (K. S. de Souza, personal communication, February 21, 2022) and, as such, can extend activities that took place in daylight, even if night talks are guided by more rhythmic dialogues, joy, music, and dances, that strengthen more affective bonds denoted by conversations about marriage, kinship, deities, myths, legends, about an imaginary and supernatural world, as opposed to morning and afternoon talks guided by concerns of economic production, human survival, and political problems (Wiessner, 2014).

Figure 4
Balconies at Sítio Hortêncio

Source: Author's archive (2022)

4.2.5. Kitchen: eating at the table and cooking on the wood stove

The kitchens of Sítio Hortêncio (figure 5) can be described as a remake (Benjamin, 2007) of the Brazilian colonial kitchen because there is a common characteristic between them of being open kitchens to the outside environment, a fact that is found in the indigenous women of Colonial Brazil the habit of cooking outside the buildings, due to the heat generated by the fire in the closed environment inside the buildings (Lemos, 1976).

136

Figure 5
Kitchens, dining tables, and stoves at Sítio Hortêncio

Source: Author's archive (2022).

Dining tables in the kitchen means the collectivization of people with a common interest in food (Rabelo, 2003) and makes the Brazilian kitchen a historically constructed place (Benjamin, 2007) for collective fellowship between the family and between the family and intimate visitors (Lemos, 1976). So, collective meals can describe acts that involve food as a time lived in a non-solitary way – a gathering of ingredients and spices, cooking the food, eating, and even the siesta –, going back (Benjamin, 2007) to the advent of eating as a motto for socialization, which can accentuate social codes that indicate with "whom" and "how" food is shared, and denote borders and collective achievements. The advent of food can also establish collaborative relations (Carneiro, 2005).

Maffesoli (2002) pointed out that when one eats in a group, communication is made possible, as individuals are put in common, resulting in mutual information predictive of collaboration: "(…) the meal is a fundamentally social act, insofar as it offers its partners an impressive experience of social relations, solidly determining cohesion, momentarily making impositions and unevenness disappear (…)" (Maffesoli, 2002, p. 132). The collective meal can emerge conflicts as rituals of "theatricalized" insults – food plating, what to eat, how to handle cutlery, how to serve – at the same time as they are diligent "balance" they "are indications of a symbolic exchange that tries to escape the domination of power or the various "must and be" (Maffesoli, 2002).

It is also possible to describe the kitchen as a past symbolic fragment (Benjamin, 2007) because it is the domain of fire, which is why it means the domain of cooking, one of the conditions distinguishing human beings from irrational animals. The fire was the motto for group feeding since prehistoric times that not only met biological needs but could affectively bring together people who socialized around fires, despite the use of fire for defense against ferocious animals or as heating (García, 2009; Radcliffe-Brown, 1922). Collectivization around the fire (in campfires or stoves) could transform the human condition by creating spaces for a collective understanding of adversity and encouraging coexistence by signifying mutual security (Radcliffe-Brown, 1922).

5. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSION

5.1. Results discussion

The study object (Sítio Hortêncio) has spaces predominantly built with nature (either built or *in natura*), Sertão do Vale do Ribeirão do Peri, organic garden, and pet nurseries, which stimulate and spatially support the collective desire in common (Martsinkovskaya et al., 2018; Rabelo, 2003) for escapism. Collaboration can occur in these processes of collectivization for escapism (Tricárico et al., 2019a), especially since collectivization that unfolds into collaboration effectively takes place in natural spaces (Arama et al., 2019; Tang and Long, 2018).

The organic garden space sustains collective use for the common goal (Martsinkovskaya et al., 2018; Rabelo, 2003) in learning how to undertake the field of organic agricultural production or for the common interest and concerns in healthy food. Likewise, processes made by communications and information (Maffesoli, 2002) are guided by contents that transfer mutual collaboration (Tricárico et al., 2019a).

Balcony spaces and open kitchen spaces may not be intended for pre-established common interests (Martsinkovskaya et al., 2018; Rabelo, 2003), but when they host several individuals, simultaneously one suggests dialogues that present common content (Maffesoli, 2002) with collaborative value.

In general, the listed spaces described in the research object reveal the ability to gather visitors, guests, hosts, tourists, and local people, among many others, which is then based on notions of community, which can be enhanced by comparing and contributing experiences among different people, consolidating the place (Bauman, 2001). In this sense, Milton Santos (2000) has demonstrated that community must surpass only individuals from the locality, mainly because the notion of community is established by solidary relationships of the subject with the place, whether this subject lives in the place or not. Thus, collectivization and collaboration in lodging facilities can be remembered by different people (Decker, 2009) and disseminate the culture of socialization beyond the local community: "When he returned to his country, he was happy to tell the signs of kindness he had received; and the memory was perpetuated in the family (…)" (Montadon, 2003, p. 133).

Collectivization and collaboration have been explained as urban phenomena (Albuquerque and Días, 2019; Blok and Meilvang, 2014; Hambleton, 2015; HØy-Petersen et al., 2016), and, therefore, the description of rural lodging spaces could legitimize other spaces that are not urban public spaces as support for collectivization and collaboration (Domblás, 2015; Reca, 2004; Rahmatabadi, 2011; Soltani, 2018). Such a finding is a matter of contemporary interest within the Brazilian socio-political context, which needs spatial support that assists collectivization for collaborative, direct democracy actions (Bouchard and Wike, 2022; Pereira, 1977). Mainly because, in Brazil, there are manifestations of techno-bureaucracy that, with its experts, ignore the opinion of "others" (Pereira, 1977).

In terms of critical social debate, by taking the socio-spatial dialectic (Lefebvre, 1991; Soja, 1993) used to study spaces in rural lodging facilities, one could expose the

significant role of *space* in the face of social phenomena (Cunningham, 2013; Lindström and Öqvist, 2013; Maximov, 2016; Moreira et al., 2018; Richards and Larson, 1989; Theimann, 2016).

There is research that has exposed manifestations of collectivization and collaboration within the rural territory and rural tourism contexts (Groff et al., 2009; Manzanares and Mateos, 2017; Onyx et al., 2007; Pimentel, 2009; Prybylski, 2008; Sales and Salles, 2010). However, they are researches focused on social bias and do not have the space of a rural lodging facility as an object. Dialectically, by having the qualitative and descriptive study of the space of rural lodging, it was demonstrated that social notions of collaboration must extrapolate business values (Goudbout and Caillé, 2007; Lashley, 2015; Mauss, 1974; Pimentel, 2009; Sales e Salles, 2010), as seen in talks about healthy eating in the organic garden and kitchens, and talks manifested in balconies and kitchen that are not preconceived with the intent of collaboration but become motivators of collaboration.

5.2. Conclusion

It was understood that the research objective was achieved, while it should be considered that there was an unusual approach to themes, phenomena, assumption, and object when treated together; and, in this case, the use of qualitative and descriptive research methodology was appropriate, combining the space object as a categorical approach to the description of phenomena, which, on the other hand, adopts the *space* as a contributing attribute in the critical social debate (Lefebvre, 1991; Soja, 1993). In this sense, it is worth noting that the space of rural lodging was an innovative approach for studies in the areas of Hospitality and Hotel Management. At the same time, Semiotic and Montage Theory also presented themselves as unusual in the areas of Hospitality and Hotel Management.

For future studies, we suggest the application of the methodology developed here to other Brazilian rural lodging spaces within the dialectical-socio-spatial debate (Lefebvre, 1991; Soja, 1993). For example, social tension or conflict, as a manifestation that excels in collectivization and collaboration in urban contexts, can be described in its peculiarities of collectivization and collaboration in rural contexts because in both urban and rural settings, social tension and conflict can unfold social sustainability (Eizenberg and Jabareen, 2017; Govindan et al., 2021).

We conclude that rural lodgings can enhance collaborative political actions for direct democracy, contributing to the empowerment of rural communities still subjugated by *coronelismo*[2], rural oligarchies, and landowner's privileges (Prado Jr., 1997). Within this context, rural society becomes more apt to make use of collectivization and collaboration (Ali and Kaur, 2021; McGuinn et al., 2020), while social agents are needed to implement a collectivization and collaboration culture (Bai et al., 2019; Moshood et al., 2022), and *space* can also be envisioned as an agent. In this sense, it

---

[2] In Brazil, coronelismo is a complex system regarding power structures. The colonels were landowners who exercised political dominance and coerced their subordinates to vote for their candidates, thus remaining in power.

is worth noting that studies have shown a lack of understanding of collectivization and collaboration as policy drivers (L'Aoustet and Griffet, 2004).

Regarding the practical application, it should be noted that socio-spatial studies for rural areas can contribute to prognoses, understanding, and new propositions for problems of depopulation, migration of the rural population to the city, and economic impoverishment of the rural territory (Tuero, 2016), even if rural tourism presents itself as a solution (Tuero, 2016), added to rural lodgings as part of the rural tourism supply chain.

By concluding that collectivization and collaboration are not particularly manifested in urban contexts, the practical contribution of this paper is to adopt spatial signs of the rural territory (of rural lodging), imbued with collectivization and collaboration, that can be "translated" to urban spaces.

The lack of studies that have jointly dealt with the phenomena of collectivization, collaboration, and rural lodging in Brazil, addressed by space as a description, was a limitation of the research. However, this limitation also brought an innovative character to the study.

6. REFERENCES

Albuquerque, M. C. B., & Días, D. M. dos (2019). O direito à cidade nos interstícios do espaço público: parklets para que e para quem? *Revista de Direito da Cidade*, *11*(3), 347-375. http://10.12957/rdc.2019.38408

Ali, S. S., & Kaur, R. (2021). Effectiveness of corporate social responsibility (CSR) in implementation of social sustainability in warehousing of developing countries: A hybrid approach. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *324*(15), 129154. http://10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.129154

Arama, F., Solgib, E., & Holdenb, G. (2019). The role of green spaces in increasing social interactions in neighborhoods with periodic markets. *Habitat International*, *84*, 24-32. http://10.1016/j.habitatint.2018.12.004

Baden-Powell, R. (1908). *Scouting for boys*. (w.p.).

Bai, C., Kusi-Sarpong, S., Ahmadi, H. B., & Sarkis, J. (2019). Social sustainable supplier evaluation and selection: a group decision-support approach. *International Journal of Production Research*, *57*(22), 7046-7067. http://10.1080/00207543.2019.1574042

Balula, L. (2010). Espaço público e criatividade urbana: a dinâmica dos lugares em três bairros culturais. *Cidades – Comunidades e Territórios, CET – Centro de Estudos Territoriais*, *20*(21), 43-58. http://10071/3454

Barthes, R. (1971). *Elementos de Semiologia*. Cultrix.

Bauman, Z. (2001). *Modernidade líquida*. Jorge Zahar.

Benjamin, W. (2007). *Passagens*. Editora da UFMG, Imprensa Oficial de São Paulo.

Blok, A., & Meilvang, M. L. (2014). Picturing urban green attachments: civic activists moving between familiar and public engagements in the city. *Sociology*, *49*(1), 19-37. https://10.1177/0038038514532038

Bouchard, L. M., & Wike, T. L. (2022). Good as gone: narratives of rural youth who intend to leave their communities. *Rural Society*. https://10.1080/10371656.2022.2084584

Brambatti, L. E., & Nitsche, L. (2017). Associativism and Community Participation. The Case of Caminhos de Guajuvira Rural Route, Araucária-PR, Brazil. *Revista Rosa dos Ventos - Turismo e Hospitalidade*, *10*(1), 71-84. https://10.18226/21789061.v10i1p71

Brandão, H. C. L., & Moreira, Â. (2017). *A varanda como espaço privado e espaço público no ambiente da casa*. Arquitextos. http://www.vitruvius.com.br/revistas/read/arquitextos/09.102/95

Bray, D. (2005). *Social Space and Governance in Urban China*. Stanford University Press.

Brown, B., Burton, J., & Sweaney, A. (2010). Neighbors, households, and front porches: new urbanist community toll or mere nostalgia? *Environment and Behavior*, *30*(5), 579-600. https://10.1177/001391659803000501

Caramella, E. (2007). A janela como moldura de espacialidades. In: Ferrara, L. d' A. (Org.), *Espaços comunicantes*, 221-232. AnnaBlume.

Carneiro, H. (2007). Comida e sociedade: significados sociais na história da alimentação. *Revista Histórica: Questão e Debates*, 42, 71-80. https://revistas.ufpr.br/historia/article/view/4640/3800

Clutton-Brock, J. (1977). Man-made dogs. *Science*, *197*(4.311), 1.340-1.342. https://10.1126/science.197.4311.1340

Coopex Unibrasil (2003). Conversa com Décio Pignatari. *Cadernos da Escola de Comunicação*, *1*(1), 11-19.

Cunningham, J. (2013). Georg Simmel's Spatial Sociology and Tutoring Centers as Cultural Spaces. *The Learning Assistance Review*, *18*(2). https://bit.ly/3VBxV2C

Damatta, R. (1997). *A casa e a rua*. Rocco.

Deák, C., & Schiffer, S. R. (2010). *O processo de urbanização no Brasil.* Edusp.

Decker, K. (2009). A experiência do local como fator de concorrência à internacionalização. In: Furtado, S., & Sogayar, R. (Orgs.), *Hospitalidade: um relacionamento global de conhecimentos e atitudes* (s.p.). LCTE Editora.

Domblás, U. (2015). Structural Studies, Repairs and Maintenance of Heritage Architecture XIV. *WIT Transactions on The Built Environment*, 153, 841-851. https://10.2495/STR150691

141

Enders-Slegers, M-J., & Hediger, K. (2019). Pet Ownership and Human-Animal Interaction in an Aging Population: Rewards and Challenges. *Anthrozoös*, *32*(2), 255-265. https://10.1080/08927936.2019.1569907 www.l

Eizenberg, E., & Jabareen, Y. (2017). Social Sustainability: A New Conceptual Framework. *Sustainability*, *9*(68), 1-16. https://10.3390/su9010068

Epstein, I. (2002). *O Signo*. Ática.

Ferrara, L. d´A. (1999). *Olhar Periférico*. Edusp.

Ferrara, L. d´A. (2000). *Os significados urbanos*. Edusp, FAPESP.

Ferrara, L. d´A. (2005). *Leitura sem palavras*. Ática.

García, J. L. (2009). Antropología de la alimentación: perspectivas, desorientación contemporânea y agenda de futuro. In: Garrido, A. (Org.), *Comida y cultura: nuevos estúdios de cultura alimentaria* (s.p.). Universidad de Córdoba.

Gasparini, T. F., Rodrígues, T. B., Nogueira-Ferreira, F. H. (2008). Correlação entre aspectos da organização social das abelhas sem ferrão (Meliponinae) e da espécie humana utilizada em educação ambiental. *Arquivos do Mudi*, *12*(1), 15-22.

Goudbout, J. T., & Caillé, A. (2007). *L'esprit du don*. Poche.

Govindan, K., Shaw, M., & Majumdar, A. (2021). Social sustainability tensions in multi-tier supply chain: A systematic literature review towards conceptual framework development. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *279*(10), 123075. http://10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.123075

Grimm, I. J., & Sampaio, C. (2011). Turismo de base comunitária: convivencialidade e conservação ambiental. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências* Ambientais, 19, 57-68. https://rbciamb.com.br/Publicacoes_RBCIAMB/article/view/362

Groff, A., Maheirie, K., & Prim, L. (2009). The experience of collectivization in a MST (Landless People's Movement) land reform settlement. *Revista de Psicologia Política*, *9*(17), 113-128. https://bit.ly/3VGuwQc

Hambleton, R. (2015). Power, place and new civic leadership. *Local Economy*, *30*(2), 167-172. http://10.1177/0269094215570563

Hamburger-Fernández, Á. A. (2013). Human development and quality of life in Latin America: public space and citizenship in ethical perspective. *Revista Latinoamericana de Bioética*, *13*(2), 32-47. http://10.18359/rlbi.593

Heathcote, E. (2012). *Between two worlds. A porch acts as an interface between the public and private realms*. Financial Times. https://on.ft.com/3FdRqHF

Hershatter, G. (2006). *The Gender of Memory: Rural Women and Collectivization in 1950s China*. Annals of Colloquium Series of the Program in Agrarian Studies Yale University. https://www.ucpress.edu/book/9780520282490/the-gender-of-memory

Høy-Petersen, N., Woodward, I., & Skrbis, Z. (2016). Gender Performance and Cosmopolitan Practice: Exploring gendered frames of openness and hospitality. *The Sociological Review*, *64*(4), 970-986. http://10.1111/1467-954X.12390

Janssens, M., Eshuis, J., Peeters, S., Lataster, J., Reijnders, J., Enders-Slegers, M-J., & Jacobs, N. (2020). The Pet-Effect in Daily Life: An Experience Sampling Study on Emotional Wellbeing in Pet Owners. *Anthrozoös*, *33*(4), 579-588. http://10.1080/08927936.2020.1771061

Jellicoe, G., & Jellicoe, S. (1995). *El paisaje del hombre*. Gustavo Gili.

Kirk, C. P. (2019). Dogs have masters, cats have staff: Consumers' psychological ownership and their economic valuation of pets. *Journal of Business Research*, 99, 306-318. http://10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.02.057

Kruczek, Z., Kruczek, M., & Szromek R. (2018). Possibilities of Using the Tourism Area Life Cycle Model to Understand and Provide Sustainable Solution for Tourism Development in the Antarctic Region. *Sustainability*, *10*(1), 89. http://10.3390/su10010089

L'Aoustet, O., & Griffet, J. (2004). Sharing Public Space Youth Experience and Socialization in Marseille's Borely Park. *Space & Culture*, *7*(2), 173-187. http://10.1177/1206331203254041

Lashley, C. (2015). Hospitalidade e hospitalidade. *Revista Hospitalidade*, *12*(número especial), 70-92. https://www.revhosp.org/hospitalidade/article/view/566

Laurence, R., & Newsome, D. J. (2012). *Rome, Ostia, Pompeii: Movement and Space*. Oxford University Press.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Wiley.

Lemos, C. (1976). *Cozinhas etc*. Perspectiva.

León, E. A. (2017). Habitar la orilla de los lugares colectivos y la estructura de la ruralidad en el Valle Central de Chile: una revisión de tipos y casos. *Revista Arquitecturas del Sur*, *35*(1), 56-65. http://10.22320/07196466.2017.35.051.06

Lindström, L., & Öqvist, A. (2013). Assessing the Meeting Places of Youth for Citizenship and Socialization. *International J. Soc. Sci. & Education*, *3*(2), 446-462. https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:986088/FULLTEXT01.pdf

Maffesoli, M. (2002). Mesa espaço de comunicação. In: Dias, C. M. de M. (Org.). *Hospitalidade: reflexões e perspectivas*. Editora Manole.

Maldonado, C. (2005). *Pautas metodológicas para el análisis de experiencias de turismo comunitário*. Serie Red de Turismo Sostenible Comunitario para América Latina (REDTURS), Oficina Internacional del Trabajo.

Manzanares, A. F. A., & Mateos, H. M. S. (2017). El acesso a los destinos rurales: uma perspectiva para la planificación territorial del turismo em uma región de interior

(Castilla-la-Mancha). *Cuadernos de Turismo*, 40, 251-272. https://revistas.um.es/turismo/article/view/309691

Maragno, G. V., & Coch, H. (2017). *O desenho da varanda e sua repercussão ambiental na arquitetura das casas brasileiras*. Prezi. https://bit.ly/3Fej3jI

Marconi, M. de A., & Lakatos, E. M. (2017). *Fundamentos de metodologia científica*. Atlas.

Marples, D. R. (1991). Toward a Thematic Approach to the Collectivization Campaign in the Soviet West (1948-56). *Canadian Slavonic Papers/Revue Canadienne*, *33*(3/4), 285-300. https://doi.org/10.1080/00085006.1991.11091966

Martsinkovskaya, T., Chumicheva, I., & Khuzeeva, G. (2018). Socialization in Multicultural Space: Determinations and Conditions. *Universal Journal of Psychology*, *6*(2), 60-66. http://10.13189/ujp.2018.060203

Mauss, M. (1974). *Ensaio sobre a dádiva. Forma e razão da troca nas sociedades arcaicas*. Edusp.

Maximov, N. G. (2016). *The impact of socialization on collaborative group work: a ritual perspective* [thesis submitted to the Faculty of the University of North Carolina in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Anthropology, University of North Carolina]. ProQUEST LCC. https://bit.ly/3hbMWJG

McGuinn, J., Fries-Tersch, E., Jones, M., Crepaldi, C., Masso, M., Kadarik, I., Lodovici, M. S., Drufuca, S., Gancheva, M., & Geny, B. (2020). *Social Sustainability - Concepts and Benchmarks*. Policy Department for Economic, Scientific and Quality of Life Policies; European Parliament.

Montadon, A. (2003). Hospitalidade ontem e hoje. In: Dencker, A. & Bueno, M. S. (Orgs.), *Hospitalidade: cenários e oportunidades* (s.p). Pioneira Thomson Learning.

Moraes, E. A., Irving, M. A., Santos, J. S. C., Santos, H. Q., & Pinto, M. C. (2017). Redes de turismo de base comunitária: reflexões no contexto latino-americano. *Revista Brasileira de Ecoturismo*, *9*(6), 612-623.

Moreira, C. S. da C., Casotti, L. M., & Campos, R. D. (2018). Consumer socialization in adulthood: challenges and directions for research. *Cad. EPABE.BR*, *16*(1), 119-134. http://10.1590/1679-395157008

Morell, I. A. (2012). Collectivization and the transfer of soft capital in two life stories from Hungary. *Ager - Revista de Estudios sobre Despoblación y Desarrollo Rural*, 13, 125-153. https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/296/29624436005.pdf

Moshood, T. D., Nawanir, G., & Mahmud, F. (2022). Sustainability of biodegradable plastics: a review on social, economic, and environmental factors. *Critical Reviews in Biotechnology*, *42*(6), 892-912. http://10.1080/07388551.2021.1973954

Navarrete, M. C. (2017). Formas sociales organizativas en los palenques de las Sierras de María, siglo XVII. *Historia y Espacio*, *13*(48), 19-44. http://10.25100/hye.v13i48.4688

Nunes, F. A. (2017). Direitos de propriedade, agricultura e controle social: representações oficiais sobre aldeamentos de índios e colônias agrícolas da Amazônia, décadas de 1840-1880. *Historia agraria: revista de agricultura e historia rural*, 71, 79-107.

Onyx, J., Edwards, M., & Bullen, P. (2007). The Intersection of Social Capital and Power: An Application to Rural Communities. *Rural Society*, 17, 55-75. https://doi.org/10.5172/rsj.351.17.3.215

Palmer, A., Skidmore, T., & Anderson, A. (2022). When research animals become pets and pets become research animals: care, death, and animal classification. *Social and Cultural Geography*, ahead-of-print, 1-19. http://10.1080/14649365.2022.2073465

Pamplona, D. A., & Carvalho Jr., M. R. de (2017). As cidades e a participação democrática: possíveis inovações na política urbana brasileira no pós-1988. *Revista de Direito da Cidade*, *9*(1), 78-101. http://10.12957/rdc.2017.25764

Peirce, C. S. (1974). *La ciencia de la Semiótica*. Nueva Visión.

Peirce, C. S. (1984). *Semiótica e Filosofia*. Cultrix.

Pereira, L. C. B. (1977). *A sociedade estatal e a tecnoburocracia*. Editora Brasiliense.

Petrovic´, M. D., Vujko, A., Gajic´, T., Vukovic´, B. D., Radovanovic´, M., Jovanovic´, J. M., & Vukovic´ N. (2018). Tourism as an Approach to Sustainable Rural Development in Post-Socialist Countries: A Comparative Study of Serbia and Slovenia. *Sustainability*, *10*(1), 54. http://10.3390/su10010054

Pimentel, A. B. (2009). Dádiva e hospitalidade no sistema de hospedagem domiciliar. In: Bartholo, R., Sansolo, D. G., & Burszty, I. (Orgs.), *Turismo de Base Comunitária diversidade de olhares e experiências brasileiras*, 76-91. Editora Letra e Imagem.

Prado Jr., C. (1997). *Formação do Brasil contemporâneo*. Brasiliense.

Prybylski, I. M. (2008).*Hospitalidade sob o olhar do hóspede nos espaços do hotel* [dissertação de mestrado, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Turismo Universidade de Caxias do Sul]. Repositório da UCS. https://repositorio.ucs.br/xmlui/handle/11338/447?show=full

Rabelo, D. C. (2003). *Comunicação e mobilização social na Agenda 21 local*. Edufes, Facitec.

Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. (1922). *The Andaman islanders: a study in social anthropology*. Oxford University Press.

Rahmatabadi, S., Zamankhani, J. S., & Yazdani, S. (2011). Urban design, socialization, and quality of life. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, *5*(12), 210-214. http://www.ajbasweb.com/old/ajbas/2011/December-2011/210-214.pdf

Reca, Y. G. (2004). Foro cívico por la convivencia: una experiencia participative en Rivas Vaciamadrid. *Psychosocial Intervention*, *13*(3), 373-382. https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/1798/Resumenes/Abstract_179817830006_2.pdf

Reis, É. V. B., & Venâncio, S. R. (2018). Cidade: espaço de diálogo e desenvolvimento humano. *Revista Direito da Cidade*, *10*(2), 690-727. http://10.12957/rdc.2018.30667

Richards, M. H., & Larson, R. (1989). The Life Space and Socialization of the Self: Sex Differences in the Young Adolescent. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *18*(6), 617-626. http://047-2891/89/1200-0617506.00/0

Rosenthal, T. (2005). The Arts and Crafts Movement and J.R.R. Tolkien: Middle-Earth's. *Imagery and Philosophy*, *11*(15), 1-14. https://ansereg.com/ArtsandCraftsandTolkien.pdf

Sales, G. A. F., & Salles, M. R. R. (2010). A dádiva no turismo comunitário: constituição de vínculos sociais por colaboração solidária. *Turismo & Sociedade*, *3*(2), 162-184. http://dx.doi.org/10.5380/tes.v3i2.19629

Santos, M. (2000). *Por uma outra globalização*. Record.

Soja, E. (1993). *Geografias pós-modernas: a reafirmação do espaço na Teoria Social Crítica.* Jorge Zahar.

Soltani, B. (2018). Academic socialization as the production and negotiation of social space. *Linguistics and Education*, 45, 20-30. http://10.1016/j.linged.2018.03.003

Swerts, T. (2017). Creating space for citizenship: the liminal politics of undocumented activism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 41, 379-395. http://10.1111/1468-2427.12480

Tang, J., & Long, Y. (2018). Measuring visual quality of street space and its temporal variation: Methodology and its application in the Hutong area in Beijing. *Landscape and Urban Planning Landscape and Urban Planning*, 191, 1034362. http://10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.09.015

Tricárico, L. T., Pires, P. dos S., & Walkowsky, M. da C. (2019a). Spaces for Collaborative Arrangements as Social Sustainability in Rural Accommodation in Brazil: Pouso dos Paula. *Sustanability*, *1*(12), 3236. http://10.3390/su11123236

Tricárico, L. T., Pires, P. dos S., & Walkowsky, M. da C. (2019b). Rural accommodation as a sign of space for consensus: Hospedaria Montanha Beija-Flor Dourado, Morretes (PR-Brazil). *Rural Society*, *28*(3), 212-225. http://10.1080/10371656.2020.1726038

146

Tuero, E. A. del V. (2016). *El turismo rural en España: análisis de la evolución del modelo de desarrollo y perspectivas futuras* [tesis de doctorado, Universidade de Vigo]. Dialnet. https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/tesis?codigo=124481

Theimann, M. (2016). School as a space of socialization and prevention. *European Journal of Criminology*, *13*(1), 67-91. http://10.1177/1477370815597254

Volkava, E. (2012). *The Kazakh Famine of 1930-33 and the Politics of History in the Post-Soviet Space*. Annals of Kennan Institute, Supported Research Scholar. https://bit.ly/3VWrVBk

Walker, J. R. (2002). *Introdução à Hospitalidade*. Manole.

Wiessner, P. (2014). Embers of society: Firelight talk among Ju/'hoain Bushman. *Procesdings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *111*(39), 14027-14035. http://10.1073/pnas.1404212111

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS, FUNDING AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

AUTHOR

Luciano Torres Tricárico

Coordinator of the Postgraduate Program in Tourism and Hospitality at the Universidade do Vale do Itajaí, Professor and Researcher of the Postgraduate Program in Tourism and Hospitality and the Postgraduate Program in Environmental Science and Technology at the Universidade do Vale do Itajaí; Professor of the Architecture and Urbanism Program at the Universidade do Vale do Itajaí; Productivity Researcher in the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq), Brazil; Leader of the Tourism, Hospitality, and Gastronomy Research Group linked to CNPq; Institutional Director of the Associação Nacional de Pesquisa e Pós-graduação em Turismo (ANPTUR); Professor of the

Specialization Course in Interior Architecture and Design: Project and Professional Performance; Ad Hoc Reviewer of national and international journals.

Orcid ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3307-8229

Google Scholar: https://scholar.google.com.br/citations?view_op=new_articles&hl=pt-BR&imq=Luciano+Torres+Tricarico#

Scopus: https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=6507922313