

The Commons: Puget Sound Journal of Politics

Volume 4
Issue 1 *The Commons Volume 4*

Article 3

May 2023

Tourism and Cultural Commodification in the Polynesian Island-State Economies

Sowmya Kannan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/thecommons>



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), [Political Theory Commons](#), and the [Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kannan, Sowmya (2023) "Tourism and Cultural Commodification in the Polynesian Island-State Economies," *The Commons: Puget Sound Journal of Politics*: Vol. 4: Iss. 1, Article 3.

Available at: <https://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/thecommons/vol4/iss1/3>

This Primary and secondary research papers is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Publications at Sound Ideas. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Commons: Puget Sound Journal of Politics by an authorized editor of Sound Ideas. For more information, please contact soundideas@pugetsound.edu.

TOURISM AND CULTURAL COMMERCIALIZATION IN THE POLYNESIAN ISLAND-STATE ECONOMIES

SOWMYA KANNAN *University of Puget Sound*

For centuries, components of culture from Pacific Island States have been commodified in various forms of media within the cultural tourism industry. In recent years, though these media representations have shifted away from encouraging direct colonial exploitation, cultural tourism efforts still pose complicated questions about the amount of agency Polynesian individuals have how they are represented. While tourism is a significant sector of the economy in Pacific Islands Countries (PICs), it's important to consider whether or not Polynesian people have the economic and social freedoms to influence how they share their culture rather than having it be offered up for colonial consumption. This paper will examine the economic and colonial histories of various PICs in order to understand what role tourism plays in Polynesian Island-State economies. Ultimately, while it significantly contributes to local economies and development work, cultural tourism often fails to offer individuals social and economic agency in sharing cultural elements.

ECONOMIC HISTORY OF POLYNESIA, TOURISM, AND DEVELOPMENT

I. Economic Models Across Polynesian Pacific Island Countries

In order to understand how tourism is contextualized in Polynesian economic systems, one must look back to the economic and colonial history of the Pacific Islands. The geographic and social concept of the "Polynesian Triangle" is one that has been imposed by European ethnographers and colonial powers. The term refers to the Island-States in the Pacific Ocean encompassed between the triangular region of Hawai'i, Rapa Nui (or Easter Island), and Aotearoa (or New Zealand), and includes the major islands of Samoa, the Cook Islands, Tonga, Tokelau, Tuvalu, Wallis and Futuna, Niue, and French Polynesia (Barcham, Schevins, and Overton 2009, 322). Though many of

these islands operate as sovereign countries, they are more often than not still strongly economically linked with their former metropolises. A few notable examples include Hawaii's connection to the United States, Samoa's connection to New Zealand, and French Polynesia's connection to France (Cheer et al. 2017). Regardless of whether or not these metropolises hold former or current colonial authority over Pacific Island Countries (PICs), they are still a powerfully connective channel for the flow of labor, migration, tourism, and capital.

Current economic patterns present in PICs are a result of attempting to shift their economic dependency away from the structures and supports of their metropolises. These colonial relationships have historically granted Polynesians access to welfare and employment opportunities in the industrial sectors of metropolises (Beissel 2019). However, during the 1980s and 1990s, waves of economic restructuring through trade liberalization, deregulation, privatization, and lowered subsidization for private enterprises led to many Polynesian migrants becoming unemployed (Barcham,

Scheyvens, and Overton 2009). These factors have shaped the development of the economic MIRAB model, which states that PIC economies are heavily influenced or sustained by Migration, Remittances, Aid, and Bureaucracy.

Migration and tourism are key features of the MIRAB model and highly impact the types of economic agency that individuals have. The decision to migrate for economic purposes is often one undertaken collectively by “transnational corporations of kin” in order to drive “stock-flow relationships” (Biessel 2019, 49). This refers to the idea that family units (sometimes internationally dispersed) plan to maximize the benefits of resources and remittances through supporting overseas-resident migrant laborers. By having family members work overseas and regularly send remittances, communities are often able to share monetary resources and sustain their communities. One critique of this form of capital flow is that remittances foster dependence on external capital rather than investing in independent means of industry and production (Biessel 2019, 51). However, it’s imperative to remember that PICs hold some economic disadvantages as a result of having a small land area, vulnerable natural resources, low inter-industry linkage, and low geographical proximity to most states (Takahashi 2019).

In order to establish greater economic agency outside the MIRAB model, PICs have attempted to support internal economic industries by investing in the private sector, fortifying domestic policies, and employing financial development strategies (McElroy and Hamma 2010, 36). This is expressed through the PROFIT model, which identifies main sectors of focus for development of capital as People (immigration), natural Resources, Overseas management (diplomatic engagement), and Finance and Transport. Through this model, industries of production and export have developed around goods such as coconut oil, coffee, vanilla, nacre, and phosphate (Dropsy and Montet 2018). However, Polynesia’s protectionist economy is limited through its level of human capital, existing infrastructure, and the quality of existing institutions necessary to establish thriving private sectors. While Polynesian countries ulti-

mately have multiple sources of income and economic connection, tourism remains a primary industry that contributes to development and employment while keeping the small state economics of the Pacific Islands more independent and globally connected (Takahashi 2019, 164).

Islands that primarily specialize in international tourism and relevant development are referred to as SITEs, or “small island tourist economy” destinations. According to McElroy and Hamma, successful SITEs have been recorded to have higher levels of affluence among residents, more developed tourism infrastructure, and an increased potential for long-term profit for developers. Another key component that has been attributed to economically successful SITEs is the way in which many islands identify particular forms of cultural tourism and work to profit off of their history and culture as “unique assets” (McElroy and Hamma 2010, 45). Ultimately, examining the MIRAB, PROFIT, and SITE models together tells the story of how PICs have attempted to break away from colonial control in favor of privatized industries and tourism.

This paper will continue to explore why international tourism has proven to be one of the most lucrative economic sectors associated with strides in development. However, while cultural tourism does promise greater economic development and independence, it has also been identified as a neocolonial pathway for the commodification of Polynesian cultures. Further sections will examine the ways in which tourism can influence agency in both economic systems and the cultural practices of Polynesian communities.

II. Tourism Structures: Labor and Reliance on the Global North

When examining the ways that tourism impacts employment and development, it is useful to classify different forms of tourism in order to understand how each interacts with the economy. One main form of tourism associated with PICs is “diaspora tourism”, where former citizens of persons who hold the nationality of one of the

PICs visit a country to see family and friends. “Domestic tourism” is a closely related concept, and describes when community members engage in tourism of their own country in order to explore areas of different geographies, ethnic majorities, or other factors (Scheyvens 2007). Both forms of tourism hold their own economic, political, social, and environmental development benefits in that domestic and diasporic tourists often contribute material goods and financial assistance (or remittances) to citizens on PICs. These forms of tourism also offer greater potential for stability in the tourism industry as they require little foreign exchange to initiate and are less subject to factors such as seasonality, national security, and economic recession. The wider scope of domestic and diasporic tourism across all parts of the island (rather than regions simply connected to tourism structures established by the global north) also encourages widespread levels of basic infrastructure across island states. This may also function as a stabilizing force for price elasticity generated by fluctuations in international tourism patterns (Kumar et al. 2020). Ultimately, employment and general development experience greater stabilization and investment through channels of domestic and diasporic tourism.

International inbound tourism to PICs operates with greater dependence on structures from the global north and can shape labor markets and patterns of employment with more instability. The hospitality and transportation industries present on PICs generally include chains such as Hilton, the Four Seasons, Virgin Voyages, and Royal Caribbean. These corporations produce the necessary investment and infrastructure for hospitality-based industries in PICs, and can also provide seasonal employment for individuals in the Pacific Islands (Lee and Jeyacheya 2015). However, this does not necessarily entail economic agency or job stability for Polynesian individuals who are employed by these corporations. Though international tourism does often draw external capital into PIC economies, these profits are ultimately repatriated by multinational hospitality corporations based in the global north (Cheer et al. 2018). There is no transfer of wealth from the global north to the

south — rather, the global north profits off of using the Pacific Islands as a site of capital generation.

The notion that multinational hospitality and tourism corporations have extractive and profit-based interactions with PICs is further solidified by the way in which they provide unstable employment, encourage structural dependency on the global north, and reshape available opportunities in PIC markets. Beyond the issue of seasonality, international inbound tourism in PICs is highly impacted by political instability, crime and security, travel restrictions, as well as ethnic and social conflict (Kumar et al. 2020, 1033). This, coupled with the lack of diversification of the economy in PICs, can create unstable employment conditions for those who have primarily shifted their skills and labor to fit the demand for services surrounding tourism. As PICs remain geographically removed and have little existing investment in extractive resource industries or manufacturing sectors, much of the demand for labor becomes centered around providing goods and services for the tourist economy (Cheer et al. 2018). One example of the way that the diversification of labor and skills have shifted for Pacific Islanders is the rise of the “night-time economy”, where large hospitality corporations have created pressure for small and local establishments to shift towards operating at night to provide arts, entertainment, and leisure opportunities for tourists (Lee et al. 2014, 215). Thus, the international tourism industry is largely economically controlled by the global north and does not provide economic agency for Pacific Islanders by creating a structural dependence on transnational tourism corporations and by reducing the diversification of PIC economies.

III. Tourism as a Tool of Development

Despite the ways in which tourism from transnational corporations in the global north often removes economic agency from Polynesian communities, some argue that this relationship results

in tourism that leads to positive development and infrastructure for PICs. As noted in the previous section on Polynesia's economic history, the flows of capital and investment in development efforts are largely linked to PICs by metropole powers or source markets. New Zealand and China both have played significant roles in encouraging the development of both infrastructure and industry for countries across Polynesia.

China's investment in infrastructure and bilateral relations with PICs has been exemplified through their Belt and Road Initiative. For Polynesian countries, this has involved creating direct flights to various Pacific Islands, simplifying tourist visas, and adjusting tariff policies. Additionally, this initiative has strengthened trade relations giving PICs a channel to export fishery products, forest products, minerals, and energy resources. China's strong industrial advantage meets the need in PICs for imported mechanical and electrical products, textiles, light industrial products, and chemical or medical materials. This bilateral relationship has also been fortified by China giving PICs non-repayable or low-interest loans (He et al. 2020), which has directly been invested in development projects of public infrastructure, utilities, health programs, and education initiatives (Cheer et al. 2018). There has been some critique, however, of Chinese developmental aid and investment in that projects sometimes operate with low levels of transparency, local community engagement, and environmental protection standards (Cheer et al. 2018, 446). Future policy recommendations center on further improving cultural education and collaboration with locals in order to increase tourism activity and strengthen bilateral relations (He et al. 2020).

Ultimately, the ways in which tourism interacts with development and employment illuminates what structural avenues Pacific Islanders have to establish economic independence. While much of the tourism industry promotes a reliance on corporations from the global north, some initiatives that involve directly investing in necessary infrastructure and development programs more directly benefit individual Polynesians and their economy. Programs working to establish a di-

verse economy that promotes trade and greater structural independence for PICs provide greater economic agency, and are essential to continue investing in and exploring.

CULTURAL TOURISM PATHWAYS: POLYNESIAN NARRATIVES OF PEOPLE, PARADISE, AND POWER

One of the most well-known representations of Polynesian culture in popular media today can be found in Disney's 2016 film *Moana*. The film's production and release were particularly notable not only in that they represented various elements of Polynesian cultures, but in that Disney had boasted directly of prioritizing the agency of Polynesian and Pacific Island storytellers, composers, and community members. As a corporate media giant, Disney held great influence in the presentation of Polynesian culture and geography on a global stage. This leaves us to consider the implications of the particular representation that Disney has produced, commodified, and distributed, particularly in the context of historical and contemporary issues of colonization and agency in Polynesia.

The following sections will explore the links between power structures, cultural tourism, and economic agency across Polynesia. A central theme that is explored throughout a variety of literature on the subject is the question of who has agency in how elements of Polynesian culture are represented on a globally. Holding Pacific Islander identity is not necessarily an indication of how one might feel about the representation in *Moana*; some members who were part of the movie's production through the Oceanic Story Trust argue that they felt they held a social responsibility to be part of the production. Though they had to assert and defend the ways in which they were to be appropriately represented in the film, there was still

a significant and generally empowering impact on cultural identity, addressing dynamics of inter-generationality, patriarchal structures, and gender. However, other Polynesian scholars have argued that the way in which Disney commodified elements of Polynesian culture through the production of *Moana* and the distribution of associated merchandising have removed the agency of Polynesian voices and have had a homogenizing effect of producing the image of “happy” and content Indigenous Pacific Islanders. This image largely obscures the ongoing colonial forces and dynamics that have shaped history and exert various layers of control over the economies, social structures, and daily lives of those who are native to the Polynesian Islands. Complex layers of identity in terms of race, positionality, gender, and individual history shape the conversation around the representational politics in *Moana*.

This chapter will examine how these images and narratives have been shaped, packaged, and distributed to be made profitable. Through an in-depth study on one of the most prominent media representations of various Polynesian cultures, this paper reveals that the construction of narratives greatly impacts structures of power and agency in the dynamics of cultural tourism across PICs.

I. Storytelling and Identity in *Moana*

Various entities play influential roles in how Polynesian culture is represented, both inside and outside of film production. Within the production of the film, these entities included members of the Oceanic Story Trust, Polynesian musical composers, as well as white members of Disney’s production team. In merchandising and tourism sectors, actors might include members of the Disney corporation that operate in various sectors of clothing, books, children’s toys, and more. Finally, in considering larger representations of the Pacific Islands and the historical and contemporary lasting impacts of colonialism, debates involve a myriad of Polynesian scholars, inhabitants of the Pacific Islands, and Disney executives who

work in the tourism industry. Each of these entities plays a central role in determining whether or not *Moana* allows Polynesian creators to have agency over the image that is presented of Polynesia. Additionally, some of these entities are responsible for the direct commodification of these cultures, leaving profound economic and social scars within the community.

Examining the ways in which *Moana*’s production and narrative creation either honors Polynesian culture or commodifies it allows us to take a deeper look at the way that these narratives have tangible impacts on systems and individuals. First, in order to ensure that the creation and production of *Moana* remained authentic and culturally informed, Disney worked with the Oceanic Story Trust, a group of Indigenous and Polynesian community members who contributed in various ways to support film production (Ketekiri Tamaira 2018). This collaboration came after years of severe criticism for movies such as *Mulan*, *Lilo and Stitch*, and *Coco*, which all received backlash for cultural commodification and Westernizing narratives for the white consumer (Anjirbag 2019, 151). Thus, the Oceanic Story Trust was created, consisting of individuals of various occupations, identities, and Polynesian backgrounds. Some individuals who were part of this group argue that Indigenous agency is an important part of contributing to the way large corporations might choose to represent them (Ketekiri Tamaira, 2018). Others note that simply having Indigenous contributors to a film does not guarantee agency or render it a form of storytelling that is authentic to various cultures (Yoshinaga 2019, 188). Collaboration on Disney’s *Moana* is very much considered extraction of labor and commodification of cultural elements in this case.

The way agency is determined in the process of film production further relates to elements of colonial representation and resistance in popular narratives. Scholar Michelle Anya Anjirbag is among many who suggest that rather than ‘showcasing’ and educating about culture, Disney particularly profits off of “exoticizing” cultures as a media giant that is deeply “rooted in American capitalist culture” (2019, 152). This is evident

through several elements of the film, including accreditation and colonial storytelling processes. For example, though some of the tracks in *Moana* include lyrics in Samoan and incorporate elements of Polynesian sound, the tracks were ultimately wrapped in Western beats and left the contemporary Polynesian musical group Te Vaka under the shadow of notable white producers and musicians (Armstrong 2018). Disney also notably espouses Western values with a colonial three-act story structure that thrives upon Indigenous cultural knowledge (Yoshinaga 2019, 189-196). Themes of complex racialized and gendered dynamics between characters like *Moana* and Maui are minimized (199). With scenes confronting mythological creatures, the Western emphasis on violence, combat, and victory ousts values of spirituality (200-201). Anjirbag suggests that this falls within the pattern of corporations like Disney positioning themselves towards an “American, Caucasian, cis-gendered, straight, Anglo, Christian, able-bodied” audience (among many other identities that hold hegemonic and exclusionary power) (Anjirbag 2018, 1-2). One historical example includes China’s backlash against Disney’s release of *Mulan*, as many felt that the film subverts and ignores traditionally Chinese values, removes the historical context of Chinese history, and presents a deeply commodified and corrupted view of Orientalized stereotypes (5). Ultimately, despite having great influence and intentions to establish cultural agency, Disney’s patterns of social and corporate representation seem to have left *Moana* in a space that does not improve cross-cultural relations, and instead aggravates it.

Another way to understand if individuals have established agency through their work is to examine the ways that the *Moana* universe is represented outside of production. During the premiere of the film, Ocean Story Trust’s Ketekiri Tamaira described the powerful impact of being able to see herself and her daughter so visibly represented on the screen, both culturally and socially (2018). Though this representation is crucial in some ways, it might also call forth discussions about the way that “Polyface” is commodified for capitalistic purposes. The image of

brown bodies is paired with classic images of ‘paradise’ that are unmarred by colonial forces of violence or extraction (Gonzalez 2009). In the Disney franchise, this might look like the “brown-skin cosplay” of Maui’s sacred tattoos on Halloween costumes, or the myriad of *Moana*-themed children’s books, dolls, and makeup that all espouse Western values and representations of culture. This is also attached to the idea of content Indigenous populations that are unimpacted by colonial violence within spaces of land that are under contemporary colonial rule. To have Indigenous Polynesian individuals contributing to the creation of a story that represents elements of their culture is an undeniably important part of their representation. However, wrapping these in the politics of white, Western, and colonial values in order to profit off a modification of one’s culture obscures many of these original intentions. A largely colonial narrative of Polynesia may be presented to the world — however, the question of who holds agency in this can be further explored through Polynesia’s past, present, and even future.

II. Ideas of Paradise and Colonialism

Disney’s largely Western narratives of representation directly manifest in the commodification of Indigenous Polynesian bodies, culture, and land. The dominant narrative that surrounds Polynesia, ideas of paradise, and peaceful Indigenous people is one that directly obscures the historical and contemporary processes of colonization. As discussed in the previous section, Disney presents a specially curated Westernized image of *Moana*’s island of Motunui and its people. In many ways, Disney’s representation of Polynesia comes from the “imperial gaze”, and renders the Pacific Islands as a space of peace, nostalgia, and environmental naturalism (Alexeyeff and Kihara, 2018). One central space this can be observed in is during the musical sequence “Where You Are”, in which Motunui’s villagers praise the lush environment, rich culture, and strong community found

on their island. The song has been criticized for the way in which it seems to portray a sense of “native innocence”, which is part of the harmful narrative placed upon Indigenous people that they have plentiful resources and possess a healthy, symbiotic relationship with nature (Alexeyeff and Kihara 2018). The issue with this portrayal is that it ignores the historical and contemporary process of colonialism, leading to narratives that spur harmful forms of extraction.

The concept of “paradise” and “anti-paradise” can be used to understand how settler colonialism becomes visible in Disney’s narrative around the island of Motunui. In the scene that follows the song “Where You Are”, the audience sees *Moana* contending with an ecological collapse of her island. Dr. Mārata Ketekiri Tamaira, member of the Oceanic Story Trust, notes that this deconstruction of paradise (or “anti-paradise”) with the diseased crops and overfished waters could be a metaphor for settler colonialism (2018). The film’s narrative does reflect the contemporary climate crisis faced by PICs, as Island societies face some of the most brutal consequences of increasing temperatures, rising sea levels, increased rainfalls, and long dry spells (Latai-Niusulu, Binns, and Nel 2019). While some members of the trust identified this as a positive representation of existing issues, others argued that depicting environmental depletion without any relation to settler colonialism furthered harmful narratives and assumptions that the Western world might hold about contemporary colonialism (Sturma 1999). Ultimately, while representation of contemporary narratives and issues is valued, it can be harmful to discount the actions of colonial powers in creating economic and environmental imbalances.

It’s imperative to note that the process of colonial extraction in Polynesia is very much presently ongoing at the hands of large corporations and their associated systems of control. Polynesia presently exists as a highly autonomous region of French overseas territory (Lawson 2017). It currently operates as a Non-Self-Governing-Territory, and is the center of debates about what it means to truly decolonize socially, economically, and legally (Gonschor 2013). One particular place in

which the nuance of these debates is illuminated is in the case of Hawai’i, which many simultaneously define as a US state as well as a Polynesian island (though it does not remain under French control). Forces such as a high military presence, the history of the sugar plantation economy, and the presence of the Mormon church have all enacted various changes upon Indigenous ways of existence in Hawai’i, leading to cultural commodification for the sake of tourism. *Moana* and other narratives of ‘Polynesian Paradise’ create an image of “soft primitivism” for the Indigenous people of the Polynesian islands and draw attention away from the deeply colonial forces at work. Disney’s narratives can play a role in covering up these colonial histories of Western exploitation by portraying these islands as sites of paradise under the facade created of Western representation (Gonzalez 2009). This narrative is further built out in the format of theme parks, hotels, and other sites of cultural tourism (Tamaira 2016).

Ultimately, the ways in which Disney influences the narratives surrounding Polynesia in terms of its people, environment, and culture can have deeply tangible impacts on the world’s understanding of its colonial past and present. This essay will continue to further how these representations connect to cultural tourism and economic agency.

III. Connections between Colonial Narratives and Economic Agency

Thus far, an in-depth case study of representation in *Moana* has revealed the depth of value in uplifting Indigenous perspectives and respecting modes of narrative production when sharing elements of culture. Media production companies have the power to influence the way that Western imagination interprets contemporary Polynesian narratives and struggles with colonial powers. While many corporations do attempt to incorporate the values and connections of Indigenous Pacific Islanders, it’s important to consider cases in which economic conditions do not permit Polynesian culture to be shared in a way that is authentic. Tourism can often function as a neo-

colonial form of cultural commodification, rather than representation. It operates on the lack of economic agency Pacific Islanders possess and continues to capitalize upon selling versions of Polynesian culture that are shaped and packaged for popular Western media.

The connections between neocolonialism, cultural commodification, and cultural tourism are all linked through the way that popular media shapes and influences Indigenous Polynesian individuals to act. A prime example is the reality show *Survivor*, which very clearly paints Indigenous populations as uncivilized. Despite the clear degradation of Polynesian culture, Indigenous Lelepa communities often participate in the show because it's a means of procuring quick cash. Media productions are also deeply connected to the real estate industry, as realtors auction off sites of production. Thus, land ownership and stewardship passes from Polynesian communities to those who retain most of the profit from tourism endeavors established in these spaces (McDonnell 2018). In island states that don't have particularly strong privatized industries or trade relations, Indigenous communities hold little economic agency in choosing how they might sustain their communities. Here, communities are not offered a choice of how they will seek to represent their culture. Instead, colonial histories and neocolonial representations leave them with few options of how they will share their culture while cultivating economic stability and growth.

CONCLUSION

This paper has traced the economic histories of Polynesia in order to understand the ways in which current PICs engage in cultural tourism. As a result of colonial extraction and policies, Pacific Island States have utilized a variety of approaches in order to develop economic independence. The previous sections explore why the SITEs model is so widely utilized across Polynesian states. Though tourism is associated with higher inflows of capital and larger strides in development, cul-

tural tourism does not always offer individuals the greatest social or economic agency in how they present their cultures. When Western media corporations have sought to represent Polynesian narratives, they have often contributed to creating neocolonial pathways of representation. Though Polynesian individuals do have some power in influencing the narratives they engage with, the historical lack of economic power and a structural dependence on the tourism industry limit their true agency.

REFERENCES

- Alexeyeff, Kalissa, and Siobhan McDonnell. "Whose Paradise? Encounter, Exchange, and Exploitation." *The Contemporary Pacific* 30, no. 2 (2018): 269–295.
- Alexeyeff, Kalissa, and Yuki Kihara. "Polyface in Paradise: Exploring the Politics of Race, Gender, and Place." *The Contemporary Pacific* 30, no. 2 (2018): 329–353.
- A. Marata Tamaira. "Native Realities in an Imaginary World: Contemporary Kanaka Maoli Art at Aulani, A Disney Resort & Spa." In *Touring Pacific Cultures*, 167–. ANU Press, 2016.
- Anjirbag, Michelle. "*Mulan* and *Moana*: Embedded Coloniality and the Search for Authenticity in Disney Animated Film." *Social sciences (Basel)* 7, no. 11 (2018): 230–.
- Anjirbag, Michelle. 2020. "Reforming Borders of the Imagination: Diversity, Adaptation, Transmediation, and Incorporation in the Global Disney Film Landscape." *Jeunesse: Young People, Texts, Cultures* 11 (February). <https://doi.org/10.1353/jeu.2019.0021>.
- Armstrong, Robin. "Time to Face the Music: Musical Colonization and Appropriation in Disney's *Moana*." *Social sciences (Basel)* 7, no. 7 (2018): 113–.
- Barcham, Manuhua, Regina Scheyvens, and John Overton. "New Polynesian Triangle: Rethinking Polynesian Migration and Devel-

- opment in the Pacific.” *Asia Pacific viewpoint* 50, no. 3 (2009): 322–337.
- Beissel, Adam S. “Transnational Corporations of Football Kin: Migration, Labor Flow, and the American Samoa MIRAB Economy.” *Journal of sport and social issues* 44, no. 1 (2020): 47–69.
- Cheer, Joseph M., Stephen Pratt, Denis Tolkach, Anthony Bailey, Semisi Taumoepeau, and Apisalome Movono. “Tourism in Pacific Island Countries: A Status Quo Round-Up.” *Asia & the Pacific policy studies* 5, no. 3 (2018): 442–461.
- Dropsy, Vincent, and Christian Montet. “Economic Growth and Productivity in French Polynesia: A Long-Term Analysis.” *Economie & statistique* 499, no. 499s (2018): 5–27.
- Gonschor, Lorenz. “Mai Te Hau Roma Ra Te Huru: The Illusion of ‘Autonomy’ and the Ongoing Struggle for Decolonization in French Polynesia.” *The Contemporary Pacific* 25, no. 2 (2013): 259–296.
- Gonzalez, Vernadette V. “Consuming ‘Polynesia’: Visual Spectacles of Native Bodies in Hawaiian Tourism.” In *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, 33:191–216. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2009.
- Kumar, Nikeel, Ronald Ravinesh Kumar, Arvind Patel, Syed Jawad Hussain Shahzad, and Peter Josef Stauvermann. “Modelling Inbound International Tourism Demand in Small Pacific Island Countries.” *Applied economics* 52, no. 10 (2020): 1031–1047.
- Latai-Niusulu, Anita, Tony Binns, and Etienne Nel. “Climate Change and Community Resilience in Samoa.” *Singapore journal of tropical geography* 41, no. 1 (2020): 40–60.
- Lee, Donna, Mark Hampton, and Julia Jeyacheya. “The Political Economy of Precarious Work in the Tourism Industry in Small Island Developing States.” *Review of international political economy: RIPE* 22, no. 1 (2015): 194–223.
- McDonnell, Siobhan. “Selling ‘Sites of Desire’: Paradise in Reality Television, Tourism, and Real Estate Promotion in Vanuatu.” *The Contemporary Pacific* 30, no. 2 (2018): 413–436.
- McElroy, Jerome L, and Perri E Hamma. “SITES Revisited: Socioeconomic and Demographic Contours of Small Island Tourist Economies.” *Asia Pacific viewpoint* 51, no. 1 (2010): 36–46.
- Payeras, Claudia Sierra. n.d. “‘Consider the Coconut’: A Critical Analysis of the Tree of Life’s Fruit in Disney’s *Moana*.”
- Scheyvens, Regina. “Poor Cousins No More: Valuing the Development Potential of Domestic and Diaspora Tourism.” *Progress in development studies* 7, no. 4 (2007): 307–325.
- Sturma, Michael. “Packaging Polynesia’s Image.” *Annals of tourism research* 26, no. 3 (1999): 712–715.
- Takahashi, Kantaro. “Tourism Demand and Migration Nexus in Small Island Developing States (SIDS): Applying the Tourism Demand Model in the Pacific Region.” *Island studies journal* 14, no. 1 (2019): 163–174.
- Tamaira, A Marata Ketekiri, and Dionne Fonoti. “Beyond Paradise? Retelling Pacific Stories in Disney’s *Moana*.” *The Contemporary Pacific* 30, no. 2 (2018): 297–327.
- Ye, Fang, Jaepil Park, ChunLin Li, and Yixiong He. “The Relationship Between China-South Pacific Island Countries Tourism and Trade in the Context of the Belt and Road Initiative.” *Island studies journal* 15, no. 2 (2020): 73–91.