

Between Theory and Practice: A Conceptualization of Community Based Tourism and Community Participation

Andrea Giampiccoli

*Research Associate, Hospitality and Tourism Department,
Durban University of Technology
Durban 4000, South Africa
Email: andrea.giampiccoli@gmail.com*

Oliver Mtapuri

*Professor, Turfloop Graduate School of Leadership,
University of Limpopo, Polokwane, 0787, South Africa.
Email: simbaomtapuri@yahoo.com*

Abstract : Tourism in general and community-based tourism (CBT) in particular is important in the overall development discourse in which political ideology and philosophy have a role to play. This paper, using a thorough desk top research, perused various sources of literature, especially handbooks and manual on CBT, to interrogate how theory and practice inform the conceptualization of Community Based Tourism and community participation. CBT is a form of tourism which emphasises and encourages the involvement of communities in showcasing their culture, artifacts, heritage and environments. Community participation may include running own enterprises as individuals, as collectives and/or with formal partners and may include village visits and tours, participation in village life, cultural tours and so forth.

This paper argues that the degree of participation is informed by the CBT venture type as some venture types work to the advantage of communities while others do not. Notions of control, power, empowerment, decision-making and socio-economic conditions are important in this discourse. Participation approaches should be able to challenge existing power structures if genuine empowerment is to be achieved in previously disadvantaged areas.

The major contribution of this paper is the Community participation and CBT Model Framework which it posits. The framework can be used to locate areas of effective community participation through

'citizen control' by venture type. It informs both policy and practice in modeling CBT ventures which ensure community participation, control, empowerment and community decision-making. While most manuals mostly targeted practitioners, this paper advocates the development of manuals which target communities so that they can initiate, manage and run productive CBT projects.

Key Words: tourism, community development, community participation, power, empowerment.

Introduction

As Tourism is consistently growing globally it can contribute to alleviate poverty, create new jobs and provide opportunities for community development and as such is used as a development tool in many countries including Southern Africa (Baktygulov and Raeva, 2010: 2; Rogerson, 2012: 28). Although tourism cannot be seen as a sector capable of solving all social problems (Mitchell and Asheley, 2010: 136), it is still useful for international cooperation (Lindberg et al., 2001: 508; Lima et al., 2012). Hence, the role of tourism is a part of the development discourse (Hall 2007: 1; Harrison and Schipani, 2007: 84; van der Duim, 2008: 183; Telfer, 2009; Lapeyre, 2010: 757). The presence of the tourism agenda in the development debate has influenced tourism development thoughts and practice such that it "has been used as a development tool, influenced by shifts in the larger theoretical conceptualization of development" (Telfer 2009: 148).

The hegemonic neoliberal system which circumscribed over time the global ideology and associated structural frameworks (Barratt Brown, 1995: 31; Harvey, 2007: 3), also affects and includes tourism (Cleverdon and Kalisch, 2000: 172; Chok et al., 2007: 144; Giampiccoli, 2007). Neth et al. (2008: 4; see also Milne & Ateljevic, 2001: 373) notes that "tourism becomes an exemplar of the expansion of neo-liberalism" with its associated entities and features.

Despite its own limitations, community-based tourism (CBT) is specifically seen as a strategy to contribute to poverty alleviation in developing countries (Spenceley, 2008: 286; Baktygulov and Raeva, 2010: 2) and many such examples are present in developing countries (Nyaupane et al. 2006: 1374; Baktygulov and Raeva, 2010: 2; Pérez, et al. 2010: 67; López-Guzmán et al. 2011: 72; Torres et al. 2011: 302). Many authors recognize the confusion surrounding the definition, concepts and practices of CBT (Ndlovu and Rogerson, 2003: 125; Mayaka et al., 2012: 397). CBT has been critiqued by many based on the "exploitation and colonial cultural dominance models" (Mayaka et al., 2012: 397). Importantly, much confusion on CBT could be

attributed to various tourism forms associated with CBT by the different authors writing on the subject (Mayaka et al., 2012: 398). In addition, some articles (see for examples Manyara and Jones, 2007; Zapata et al., 2011; Giampiccoli and Mtapuri, 2012) which critique the current CBT milieu do so and that they are against CBT *per se* but engage in a critical analysis on the way CBT is implemented and manipulated within the neoliberal/neocolonial ideologies and practices.

The need for community involvement in tourism development is extensively supported in the literature (Okazaki, 2008: 511; Graci, 2012: 65). Nevertheless, as the concepts and practices of CBT are confusing so are the concepts and practices of community participation.

CBT is mostly directed towards fostering development in disadvantaged contexts. To that end, a number of manuals/handbooks on CBT have been produced during the years. Manuals/handbooks for CBT development are seen as more intrinsically linked to practical CBT development (at least surely this should be their aim). Consequently, the aim of this paper is to survey CBT models/venture types (or alternatively, the given definition of CBT) in CBT manuals/handbooks and weighing them against the various participatory typologies. The investigations of CBT venture types in the CBT manuals and handbooks will contribute to assessing how CBT manuals and handbooks are positioning CBT concepts and practices within the various level of community participation. The degree of participation is given by the CBT venture types which are proposed in the manuals (or alternatively the given definition of CBT). This paper makes use, as background, the works of Giampiccoli and Mtapuri (2012), Zapata et. al., (2011) and, partly, Manyara and Jones (2007) as CBT theoretical input to ascertain how at a 'practical' level manuals interpret CBT within development theories.

Literature review

The neoliberal framework is controlling the international milieu of cooperation with its associated western based, technological and bureaucratic characteristics (Deepak, et al., 2009: 139, 147; see also Eade, 2007: 636). Various development activities have compromised rather than promote community development (Peredo and Chrisman, 2006: 311).

Cox (1996: 87, emphasis in original) remarks that "theory is always *for* someone and *for* some purpose" and Hall (1998: 110) notes that politics do impact on tourism development processes. In general, tourism policies in developing countries have followed technocratic strategies of tourism development associated with western-based ideology (Bianchi, 2002: 273). The international neoliberal discourse

present in cooperation does not allow for meaningful community participation and emphasizes results in a short timeframe despite the use of participatory lexicon (Deepak, et al., 2009: 139, 147; see also Eade, 2007: 636). Often in tourism disadvantaged communities are involved in tourism development only in rhetoric (Chock, et al., 2007: 159) and, although movement from rhetoric to action is possible, tourism development remains within a western based understanding (Sammy, 2008: 76).

The control of CBT is an important matter which informs how benefits are distributed as well as the type and scale of tourism development (Telfer and Sharpley, 2008: 115; Johnson 2010: 151). As rooted in alternative development approaches (Karim et al., 2012: 15; see also Telfer, 2009: 156) CBT should be seen as working towards empowerment, self-reliance and holistic community development (see Giampiccoli and Mtapuri, 2012). The conceptualization of CBT has shifted and become more heterogeneous being influenced by neoliberal milieu (Giampiccoli and Mtapuri, 2012). As such, CBT lost its transformative intent (Pleumarom 2002: 586; Beeton 2006: 50). The control of CBT is about redistribution of power, resources and benefits in the tourism sector. CBT, as an alternative (if not contrary) to neoliberal approaches proposes that tourism development should be controlled by the community. Control is the main issue, as such “the factor of control is a key one in any discussion of development and tourism is no exception to this rule. Whoever has the control can generally determine such critical factors as the scale, speed, and nature of development” (Butler and Hinch, 1996 in Sofield, 2003: 87). Mowforth and Munt (1998: 113) argue that “control is the same whether it refers to mass tourism or any of the new forms of tourism.”

The idea of participation is supported by everyone but when interpreted by the have-nots as a power redistributive measure, the general consensus dissipates (Arnstein, 1969: 216). The fact remains that citizen participation is synonymous with citizen power and its redistribution (Arnstein, 1969). In this sense community participation can be interpreted “as an instrument of empowerment” especially in relation to the disadvantaged groups in society (Samuel in Guaraldo Choguill, 1996: 432). Participation is a politically based matter which needs to consider “who is involved, how, and on whose terms” and, by the same token, participation can be re-formulated from political to technical issues (White, 1996: 14). Ultimately, participation can serve the end of the hegemonic entity(ies) as “incorporation, rather than exclusion, is often the best means of control” (White, 1996: 7).

Peredo and Chrisman (2006: 315, emphasis in original) state: “community-based enterprises (CBEs) are owned, managed, and

governed *by the people*, rather than by government or some smaller group of individuals *on behalf* of the people. They are governed rather than govern.” Johnson (2010: 151) argues that CBT differs from top-down development because of the need for community input and control of the development process. It follows that CBT should be owned and managed by the community to meet their needs (Giampiccoli and Nauright, 2010: 53; Sproule in Ramsa and Mohd, 2004: 584). Manyara and Jones (2007: 637) define community-based enterprise (CBE) as a sustainable, community-based tourism project to support conservation with community participation in which they enjoy the fruits of their efforts. They assert that CBEs in tourism should focus on three main issues: community-ownership; community involvement in development and management; and spreading the benefits to community members. Consequently, CBT should remain under the full control of the community to be effective CBT (Mtapuri and Giampiccoli, 2013: 12).

Mayaka, et al., (2012) arguing on the various conceptualization of CBT, identify a conceptual model based on three dimensions, namely: ‘participation’, ‘power and control’, and ‘outcomes’. While concluding that CBT is an alternative approach to mass tourism, Mayaka, et al., (2012: 400, emphasis in original) define CBT based on the three dimensions as tourism in a community which enhances community *participation* to provide desired outcomes and wherein members exert *power* and *control* taking into account socio-cultural, political, economic, environmental and other factors.

However, nebulous and vague concepts are present on CBT practices and various models of CBT abound (for some examples see: Pinel 1999; Forstner, 2004; Okazaki; 2008; Simpson, 2008; Harris, 2009; Honggang et al., 2009; Baktygulov and Raeva, 2010; Zapata et. al., 2011; Giampiccoli and Mtapuri, 2012; Mtapuri and Giampiccoli, 2013). In trying to put aside the definitional matter, it has been suggested that the test lies in the degree of control and the distribution of the benefits which must reside in destination communities (Trejos and Chiang 2009: 374; see also Trejos and Matarrita-Cascante 2010: 159). This definition which proposes ‘high degree of control’ remains general such that the participation needs have to be interrogated for a fair characterization.

Understanding of CBT is very much linked to issues of control, management, jobs for local people, community involvement and decision-making (Ndlovu and Rogerson, 2003: 125). Naguran (1999: 50) provide the following CBT types of ventures based on a study in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa: community owned venture; a partnership between the community and the state; lease agreement between the community and the private sector; and joint ventures between

community and private sector. Spenceley (2008: 287) proposes another characterization of CBT, namely, located within a community (e.g. on communal land, or with community benefits such as lease fees); or owned by one or more community members (i.e. for the benefit of one or more community members); or managed by community members (i.e. community members could influence the decision-making process of the enterprise). The Naguran (1999: 50) and Spenceley (2008: 287) examples indicate the various possible types of community participation in CBT in which the concepts lean towards more private sector involvement and related partnerships. This shift can be noticed, to be more extreme in global and local documents, in which local communities remain excluded from control in favor of the private sector. As such, it has been proposed that *“community-based tourism, which provides access to ethnic groups and the natural and cultural assets of which they are custodians”* could be a vehicle, for private investment in Africa given appropriate policies (Christie and Crompton, 2001: 37). These different approaches to CBT have allowed external entities to take advantage of self-interpretations of CBT for their own benefit at detriment of community development (Giampiccoli and Mtapuri, 2012: 39). These types of community participation in CBT ventures show the great variety of practices applied to the concept of CBT. Three main approaches can be proposed:

- CBT enterprise fully owned and managed by the community (external entities may have a supportive/facilitative role but not become owner/manager - in whole or in part - in any way of the CBT venture);
- Community in full control of the CBT venture and decides to involve an external partner (different types of agreements are possible which in turn will determine the balance of control – ownership/management – of the CBT enterprise);
- External entity (usually from the private sector) to the community which decides to involve the community as a partner (different types of agreements are possible which will in turn also determine the balance of control – ownership/management – of the CBT enterprise).

Following an analysis of various CBT approaches within development theories and in relation to community development, Giampiccoli and Mtapuri (2012: 36) propose three main CBT typologies where “CBT represents the original concept of community-based tourism within the alternative development approaches. CBPT [community-based partnership tourism] occupies an intermediate position. CT [community tourism] is completely inside the neo-liberal framework and opposite to the CBT principle.” Zapata et al (2011) differentiate between

top-down and bottom-up models of CBT but lament that CBT has become “a top-down development model” (Zapata, et al., 2011: 3). Within the neo-liberal framework Zapata et al. (2011) argue that bottom-up models provide local ownership in various aspects such as marketing and management such that external entities are not needed because the community has developed the CBT project to suit their capacities and networks (Zapata et al., 2011: 742). Zapata et al. (2011: 743) also note that that top-down models promote participation without community control in which external mediators are in charge of management, accounting and marketing of the venture (Zapata, et al., 2011: 743). Manyara and Jones (2007) seem to suggest two different models of CBT, one which is dependent on external actors in terms of resources (a neo-colonial model which is similar to top-down model in Zapata et al., 2011; and CT and mostly CBPT models as in Giampiccoli and Mtapuri, 2012) and another which is community centered (similar to the bottom-up model by Zapata et al, 2011; and CBT model in Giampiccoli and Mtapuri, 2012). Manyara and Jones (2007: 642) argue that current models of CBT “reinforces a neo-colonial model” with its associated characteristics such as heavy foreign ownership and increased dependency albeit with little contribution to poverty reduction. Manyara and Jones (2007), instead, advocate for a CBE which prioritises community needs, promotes community empowerment, independence, transparency, and develops local capacity to lead.

Due to the lack of common understandings of CBT, the concept lacks a generally accepted operationalization approach (Trejos and Matarrita-Cascante 2010: 159). The proper operationalisation of CBT development is fundamental in contributing to positive outcomes in CBT projects because with careless application, CBT can be disastrous for communities (Suansri, 2003: 7).

Similar to CBT, a variety of participatory concepts and practices also exist, as rightly suggested by Tosun (2005: 334) that both in theory and practice “there is no standardized community participation or involvement procedure” (see also Tosun, 1999: 114 on the confusion of the term community participation). Tosun (1999: 114) further argues that it is easy to call tourism community based with community participation without unpacking the concept of participation. Mitchell and Eagle, (2001: 6) warn that placing participation into typologies is difficult because of other factors at play such as property ownership, role of the elite and the government, economic leakages and sources of power and so forth. Instead, they propose examining the socioeconomic factors as important determinants for ensuring participation and decision making.

This paper argues that CBT (in its original alternative development approach) is a specific form of community participation which upholds empowerment and control of tourism facilities by communities including the structures of decision-making. This paper attempts to juxtapose socio-economic issues of the ownership structures of tourism facilities (the CBT ventures) against participatory typologies to evaluate the level of empowerment which such ownership/management places on the community. It is notable that having a stake in a CBT venture does not necessarily translate into its control (Sinclair, 1992 in Scheyvens 2002). This paper argues that it is the CBT venture type (or CBT definition) which is the key characteristic in either contributing or not to community participation. CBT definitions and venture types are a harbinger in the determination of the level of community participation. As such, it is argued that while ownership does not guarantee control, it is almost utopian to have control without stake in ownership of the venture. The ownership structure therefore is a fundamental precondition in fostering community participation in CBT. As such it is possible to achieve community participation in projects only if local elites and foreign ownership of land does not scuttle this participation through manipulation and relegating it to pseudo participation (Tosun, 2005: 336).

There is a difference between participation and facilitation. Facilitation is regarded as a proper strategy to foster CBT for community development (Giampiccoli and Mtapuri, 2012). Various typologies (or approaches) to participation have been advanced (Arnstein, 1969; Pimbert and Pretty, 1995; Guaraldo Choguill, 1996; White, 1996; Tosun, 1999). In Arnstein's (1969) approach, eight levels of citizen participation is posted (see table for all participatory typologies and CBT models) ranging from manipulation to citizen control. At the level of citizen control, the community has "degree of power (or control) which guarantees that participants or residents can govern a program or an institution, be in full charge of policy and managerial aspects, and be able to negotiate the conditions under which "outsiders" may change them" (Arnstein, 1969: 223). This level of participation is the one which can closely be associated with CBT as it will have its ambition to ensure that the facilities and structures are controlled by community members. Arnstein's (1969: 222) 'Delegated power' is also associated with CBT as it entails "citizens achieving dominant decision-making authority over a particular plan or program". In that vein, community members attain control of the CBT development process as who communities under the two types of participation of 'Self-mobilization' and 'Interactive participation' as proposed by Pimbert and Pretty (1995: 31). Self-mobilization seems closely linked to CBT

approach as "People participate by taking initiatives independent of external institutions to change systems" (Pimbert and Pretty, 1995:31).

Formulations by Pimbert and Pretty (1995: 31) do not challenge existing power structures which is fundamental in CBT in order to dismantle unequal power relations (see also Giampiccoli and Hayward Kalis, 2012: 176). 'Interactive participation' proposes that citizens should "take control over local decisions, and so people have a stake in maintaining structures or practices" (Pimbert and Pretty, 1995: 31). Empowerment is included in the 'self-mobilization' and 'Interactive participation' typologies (Pimbert and Pretty, 1995: 35). 'Interactive participation' resembles Arnstein (1969: 222) type of 'Delegated power' in its relation to CBT. Guaraldo Choguill (1996) propose a ladder of community participation specifically designed for developing countries which recognizes the need for a proactive government towards promoting community participation. She proposes 'Empowerment' and 'Partnership' as two important levels in her participation ladder (Guaraldo Choguill, 1996). However, Guaraldo Choguill (1996) at the bottom of the ladder proposes 'Self-management' as a way to react to government's disregard for community needs but viewed as positive community participation (even if forced by government deficiencies). Guaraldo Choguill argues further that even if successful, it cannot be considered positive because communities fail to achieve political empowerment as they lose control of the political milieu (Guaraldo Choguill, 1996: 443).

White (1996) presents four levels of participation but the 'Transformative' level is closer to CBT as it involves empowerment and transformative action towards social injustice. Tosun's (1999) typology of community participation has 'Spontaneous participation' which promotes CBT development characterized by 'spontaneous participation: "Bottom-up; active participation; direct participation; participation in whole process of development including decision making, implementation, shoring benefit and evaluating; authentic participation; coproduction; self planning; wide participation; social participation."' Bass et al., (1995; no page) propose placing 'Self-mobilization' at the top to the ladder of community participation meaning that "People participate by taking initiatives independently of external institutions to change systems. They develop contacts with external institutions for resources and technical advice they need, but retain control over how resources are used" (Bass et al., 1995; 68). As in case of Pimbert and Pretty (1995: 31), this typology also does not challenge existing power structures. We associate 'Self-Mobilization' with CBT. The only form of community participation which breaks existing inequality in the structures of power is when participation processes are endogenous

to the community (Mitchell and Eagles, 2001: 5; see also Mowforth and Munt, 1998: 240). Novelli and Gebhardt, (2007: 449) observe that involvement in developing countries can be realized at the lower rungs of the ladder. To ascertain this matter further, an analysis is done of the CBT manual/handbooks and definitions including CBT ventures types and linking them to specific levels of community participation.

Community-Based Tourism Manuals/Handbooks and Community Participation

Problems related to CBT approaches stem from implementing strategies (Sakata and Prideaux, 2013: 882). Since the end of the 1990s, a number of manuals/handbooks related to CBT has been produced. These manuals propose a variety of typologies of CBT ventures, among other issues. A list of such manuals/handbooks is here presented:

- Community Based Sustainable Tourism. A Handbook (Urquico 1998);
- Community-Based Tourism for Conservation and Development: A Resource Kit (The Mountain Institute 2000);
- Guidelines for community-based ecotourism Development (Denman 2001);
- Community-based Tourism for Conservation and Development a training manual (Jain and Triraganon 2003);
- Community Based Tourism Handbook (Suansri 2003);
- Training Manual for Community-based Tourism (Häusler and Strasdas 2003);
- Handbook on Community Based Tourism “How to Develop and Sustain CBT” (Hamzah and Khalifah 2009);
- Effective community based tourism: a best practice manual (Asker et al. 2010);
- Making Ecotourism Work. A Manual on Establishing Community-based Ecotourism Enterprise (CBEE) in the Philippines (Calanog et al. 2012);
- Competing with the best: good practices in community-based tourism in the Caribbean (Dixey n.d.);

Most of the manuals/handbooks (see Table 1) seems directed to project implementing staff external to communities. While the external facilitators can considered as a relevant target audience of the CBT manuals/handbook, priority, however, should be given to the communities themselves who should be the principal target. Community or community-based entities present within the community should be targeted and the manuals should be written or differently modeled to

cater for communities in such a way as to suit their understanding and capacities in terms of literacy levels. As such, the target audience should shift towards community-based agents as compared to external actors.

Table 1
Manuals/Handbooks and their purpose (To be place here)

Manuals/ handbooks	Purpose
Urquico (1998)	This Community Based Sustainable Tourism (CBST) Handbook is a practical guide for civil society organizations and other community-based formations on how they could set-up, manage and market a CBST project and how to utilize and redistribute the income generated (Urquico, 1998:xii).
The Mountain Institute (2000)	This <i>Resource Kit for Community-based Tourism for Conservation and Development</i> serves as a guide for planners and field-based staff to design, implement and manage Community-based Tourism (The Mountain Institute, 2000:i)
Denman (2001)	These guidelines identify some general principles, and highlight some practical considerations for community-based ecotourism. They seek to provide a reference point for field project staff, and to encourage a consistent approach [...] Although the guidelines are primarily intended for use within WWF, they may also be of value to partner organisations and other agencies...(Denman, 2001:1).
Jain and Triraganon (2003)	The main purpose of this manual is to provide training or facilitation guidelines for individuals, organizations or institutions that have an interest in building knowledge, skills, and experience of field workers either by using CBT Development or the Appreciative Participatory Planning and Action (APPA) approach. The training activities contained in this manual are designed to help participants develop the understanding and basic skills necessary in order to apply the concepts of Community-based Tourism development effectively and efficiently. The training sessions in this manual have been widely tested and used with a range of target audiences including mid-level staff, NGOs, academics, and community groups at national and international level (Jain and Triraganon, 2003:2).
Suansri (2003)	This CBT Handbook communicates the direct experiences of CBT practitioners working in the field, particularly, practitioners and developers of CBT.

Häusler and Strasdas (2003)	The target group of this manual are mainly field-based professionals who work with communities or tourism organizations to plan for and develop community-based tourism as a tool for achieving conservation and community development objectives. Professionals may be government staff from the departments of tourism, protected areas, forestry, conservation, or community development; local government or community leaders; members of non-government organisations (NGOs); representatives of the private sector (e.g. tour operators, hotel/lodge owners, or guides); or community development and conservation project staff (Häusler and Strasdas, 2003:2).
Hamzah and Khalifah (2009)	The Handbook on Community Based Tourism: “How to Develop and Sustain CBT” is the main output of the study and is designed to provide guidance for tourism/rural planners, NGOs, industry players and CBT organisations in deciding whether tourism could work for a particular community and if it is feasible, how to participate in the tourism industry and sustain it over the long term (Hamzah and Khalifah, 2009:vi).
Asker <i>et al.</i> (2010)	This manual provides guidance on the issues to be addressed when developing Community Based Tourism (CBT) activities managed by local communities in regional and rural areas. It highlights the practical considerations when planning for and implementing CBT drawing on the experience of CBT activities internationally. It gives particular attention to the potential form and challenges in developing thermal tourism. The overall objective of this manual is to increase awareness in APEC economies of the opportunities for CBT as a vehicle for social, economic and environmental development. It integrates the general principles of good practice in sustainable tourism and community development, which focus on actual, local community needs. It aims to give guidance on CBT process and practice that facilitate protection of natural and socio-cultural resources and improve the welfare of local people, while enhancing monetary gains and market access (Asker <i>et al.</i> 2010:9).
Calanog <i>et al.</i> (2012)	The intended users of this manual are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The local people and concerned stakeholders who are interested in venturing into Community Based Ecotourism Enterprise (CBEE), • Local private entrepreneurs who wish to invest in a CBEE; • Local Government Units (LGUs) who will regulate the enterprise at the local level, and who may be also interested to engage in this enterprise or partner with other institutions in establishing the CBEE in their locality;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) who will partner or assist the community in undertaking the CBEE, particularly in the advocacy and conservation activities; • Private corporations who can provide the capital or investment or be a partner with the local community in this enterprise; • Researchers who use the CBEE in undertaking scientific investigation or generation of technologies and relevant information necessary in making the CBEE a viable and sustainable enterprise; • The academe who may assist in the information, education, and education (IEC) and related advocacy activities; • Policy makers who will formulate the necessary legislation, policies and rules and regulation to make the CBEE a workable enterprise; and • Funding agencies that will provide funding or similar technical assistance to the local community in building the CBEE. (Calanog <i>et al.</i>, 2012:17, emphasis in original).
Dixey (n.d.)	This publication is not exhaustive but aims to help guide and inspire you to better practice. I encourage practitioners and policy-makers to use this resource to put local people back in the picture and truly make a difference to the region (Vanderpool-Wallace in Dixey, n.d.:viii). The manual should assist member countries and other interest groups to adopt and adapt strategies to enhance community-based tourism and the sustainability of the tourism industry in the region (Dixey, n.d:1).

While external facilitation is still useful in the process of cross pollination of ideas, the manuals should have a stronger orientation towards community members in enhancing their capacities and understandings of CBT directly not through external agents. If external actors are needed they usually should already be prepared enough for CBT. As ‘specialists’ they may not to be in such dire need of a training manual on CBT. Thus, while external facilitation can be required and often welcomed by communities, CBT should be an autonomous community decision for development and not an externally planned derivation with external facilitation in a ‘temporary’ timeframe (see Mtapuri and Giampiccoli, 2013). Some CBT handbooks confess to being for ‘outsider’ CBT practitioners to empower and capacitate communities so that they can run CBT ventures themselves (Suansri, 2003: 7).

CBT development happens within specific participatory boundaries which enhance or impair community involvement. As such following and expanding on Novelli and Gebhardt (2007: 448) the idea of

comparison of participatory typologies, the table below proposes a comparison framework which articulates various participatory typologies and two selected CBT models (See Table 2). It gives an indication of the possible degrees of alignment of community participation typologies proposed by various authors with two CBT models found in literature.

It seems evident based on Giampiccoli and Mtapuri's (2012) CBT typology and Zapata et al., (2011) bottom-up models can be associated with the various community participation typologies at the top of the table. The shaded areas and bold characters at the top in Tables 2 and 3 indicate the convergence to CBT's original aims. Importantly, while there is some degree of parallelism (in both Table 2 and Table 3 which we call Community participation and CBT model Framework) this should not be taken as rigid or fixed as a variety of forms can take place on a case by case basis. Thus, they should be taken as indicative parallelism between community participation typologies and CBT venture models. In the tables, the shaded areas at the top are associated with inclinations towards CBT development with the bold section enhancing the positive association between the type of community participation related to CBT development. The shaded areas at the bottom should be associated with a top-down and/or exploitative CBT development approach. While the 'white' or unshaded area is not ideal and therefore not associated to proper CBT development. However, as a middle (compromise) position, each specific circumstance or type of agreement will determine the level of participation in the benefits of CBT development.

Table 2. Community participation and CBT model Framework (here)

Participation typologies			Community control/empowerment		CBT models/typologies					
Arnstein (1969)	Degrees of citizen power	Citizen control	White (1996)	Guaraldo Choguill, (1996)	Tosun (1999)	Bass et al (1995)	Bottom-up CBT			
		Delegated power						Empowerment	Spontaneous	Self-mobilization
		Partnership						Partnership		
Degrees of tokenism	Nonparticipation	Placation	Representative	Conciliation	Induced	Functional Participation	CBT			
		Consultation	Instrumental	Dissimulation				Participation for material incentives		
		Informing		Diplomacy					Participation by consultation	
Therapy	Manipulation	Participation in Information Giving	Nominal	Conspiracy	Coercive	Passive Participation	CBPT			
				Self-management				Neglect Reflection	Manipulative participation	
				External control/dismPOWERment		Divergence towards Top-down CBT				

Table 2. Community participation and CBT model Framework. Source: Arnstein (1969:215); Pimbert & Pretty (1995:30); Tosun (1999:118); Novelli & Gebhardt (2007:448); Calanog et al. (2012:213); Giampiccoli & Mtapuri (2012:9, 11); Zapata et al., (2011), White (1996); Guaraldo Choguill, 1996; White, 1996); Zapata et al., (2011).

Table 3. CBT Ventures models. Community participation and CBT models (here)

Manuals CBT ventures models/types (also from CBT definitions)						CBT models/typologies			
(Urquico 1998)	The Mountain Institute (2000) and Jainand Triraganon (2003)	Denman (2001)	Suansri (2003)	Häusler and Strasdas (2003)*	Asker et al. (2010)	Calanog et al. (2012)	Dixey (n.d.)	Giampiccoli and Mtapuri (2012)	Zapata et al. (2011)
Community level approach eg. Co-operative	Participation in decision-making and management	Communally owned and run enterprises.	CBT... It is managed and owned by the community for the community	The whole community is involved in the project	100% community owned and operated	Community-based	A collaborative approach to tourism in which community members exercise control through active participation in appraisal, management and/or ownership (whole or in part) of enterprises	CBT	Bottom-up CBT
Individual/Family level approach	Participation in implementation and operations	Local individuals selling products to visitors directly or through tourism businesses		Parts of the community or families are involved in the project		Cooperative			
	Participation in sharing economic benefits					Organization			
						Community			
						Family-based Enterprise			
									Divergence towards
								Community control/empowerment	CBPT

		Individuals, with links to the broader community, running their own small tourism businesses.		Venture between the community or some of its members and business partner/s	Joint venture arrangement	The Local Government Unit (LGU)	that delivers net socio-economic benefits to community members [...]		
	Participation in planning	Private tourism businesses (internally or externally owned) concession fee/share of profit				Academe-based.	[...] this encompass both tourism activities in a community and goods and services supplied to the tourism industry by one or more community members		
Private investment (initial stages!)		Private tourism businesses employing local people				Non-government organization (NGO)-Private Sector Partnership		External control/dismempowerment	Top-down CBT
						Private Business Private Sector Concessions			CT

Source: Urquico (1998); The Mountain Institute (2000) ; Jain and Triraganon (2003); Denman (2001); Suansri (2003); Häusler and Strasdas (2003); Asker et al. (2010); Calanog et al. (2012); Dixey (n.d.), Giampiccoli and Mtapuri (2012); Zapata et al., (2011).

Giampiccoli and Mtapuri (2012) CT model and Zapata et al., (2011) top-down model can be closely associated with the bottom level of community participation typologies (the shaded area at the bottom representing the greater divergence from original aim of CBT). The CBPT typology proposed in Giampiccoli and Mtapuri (2012) remains in the middle of the scale of community participation where the degree of convergence with CBT's original objectives will depend on specific agreements and partnership types between the community and the external entity(ies).

Hamzah and Khalifah (2009) seem not to categorize 'standardized' models of CBT ventures (even if they reflect on some of them on specific cases) they seem to interpret CBT ventures as owned and managed by the community with possible external partnership with various actors as a facilitators, marketers or other support. Their CBT approach seems to be in line with the original understanding of CBT. In addition, the Netherland Development Organization (SNV) and University of Hawaii (UoH) have published *A Toolkit for Monitoring and Managing Community-Based Tourism* aimed at providing information to establish a monitoring programme for CBT. (Twining-Ward *et al.* 2007:8). Twining-Ward *et al.* provide a definition, which proffers various approaches to CBT ventures, it seems to place CBT within the pro-poor tourism milieu:

Community-based tourism (CBT) is a type of sustainable tourism that promotes pro-poor strategies in a community setting. [...] There are a number of different models for CBT projects. Some are run and operated by one or more entrepreneurial families who employ other community members and in this way spread economic benefits to the community at large. Others may be managed and operated by a village cooperative or community group, perhaps with the support of a donor agency or NGO. Often CBT projects develop a system for redistributing tourism income to the community through education or health projects (Twining-Ward *et al.* 2007: 9).

It should be noted that the Netherlands Development Organisation (SNV) is part of a group of key tourism donors which has now adopted the concept of PPT strategies in tourism development instead of CBT (van der Duim, 2008:179, 185). Similarly, Dixey (n.d. 4) in the manual 'Competing with the best: good practices in community-based tourism in the Caribbean' proposes that CBT is "form of tourism that falls under the umbrella of the leading paradigms of pro-poor tourism (PPT), responsible tourism and sustainable tourism." The opposite should be, instead, proposed. Karim, Mohammad and Serafino, (2012) argues that for affectiveness the PPT must be part of a larger community-based development strategy. As much some issues highlighted in

Toolkit for Monitoring and Managing Community-Based Tourism (Twining-Ward *et al.* 2007: 8) can certainly be associated with CBT, the underlying principle within the postulated PPT approach reduces and deflates its alternative development angle as PPT has been associated with neoliberal approaches (Harrison, 2008).

Community outcomes

In sum, the Community Based Tourism which this paper advocates should promote self-reliance, self-planning, self-management, be transformative, re-distributive, empowering, holistic, developmental, enhancing individual and community capacities, participatory, with opportunities for co-production, community decision making, job creation, control and involvement, the attainment of social justice and the re-mediation of both power and resources.

Noteworthy is that the CBT venture typologies proposed in the manuals are many with great dissonance. For example the typologies presented in Denman (2003: 11) clearly seem to represent the case of the extreme from 'Communally owned and run enterprises' (associated with CBT) to 'Private tourism businesses employing local people' (very divergent from CBT). While Denman (2003:10, 11) argues that he appreciates as critical the involvement of community in such ventures, he also embraces the private sector investment "within a structure which enables the community to benefit, and have decision-making power over the level and nature of tourism in its area."

Partnership is one of the buzz-words of the current development discourses (Gosovic, 2000: 450). However, partnerships are not impossible but very rarely succeed because they are based on specific attitudes and levels of trust amongst the parties involved (de Beer & Marais, 2005: 56; Thomas and Brooks, 2003: 17). Partnership agreements remain often within specific structures of power, thus as suggested by Scheyvens (2002: 191) whoever has more power such as the private sector, will negotiate in its favour such that communities will only receive token benefits.

The level of community participation in a CBT venture can vary depending on various factors, Asker et al. (2010: 19, 23) rightly observe that the organisational structure can hint at the level of control the community commands in the CBT venture. It has also been observed that some ventures which masquerade as CBT are actually owned by private capital. While this legal structure is becoming commonplace, it is very difficult to align it with the key components for best practice of CBT (Asker et al., 2010: 19, 27).

While there is growing interest in the host-guest relationship aspect of Community Based Sustainable Tourism (CBST), implying the need for an external facilitator on CBST projects, the handbooks on CBST (Urquico, 1998) seem not to provide clear models of CBST ventures (if not only the one proposed in the Table 3). From the handbook, it is possible to advance the community-based approach in CBST as for disadvantaged people, tinged with elements of social justice and redistribution, however with possible private sector investment in accommodation, transport and tour operations if communities cannot invest in these operations (Jealous, 1998: 2, 10, 12, 30, 88). Private sector investment seeks returns on investment, sometimes with a short term horizon, which negates long-term development of the CBST project and the involved community(ies).

Conclusion

This paper examined various CBT types of ventures as well as various approaches to participation in order to weigh and assess models and approaches which provide greater benefits to communities. On reflection, the assessment reveals that a variety of CBT venture models take CBT as embracing mostly all tourism development approaches and including community owned and managed ventures as much as private investment. As a result, the degree of discrepancy is extreme. While some reflect the conceptual and practical aims of CBT, others slide with various levels of intensity from CBT understandings by shifting towards more neoliberal/private investor oriented approaches, often using partnership as a strategic tool towards this shift.

References

- Arnstein, S. R. 1969. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35 (4): 216-224.
- Asker, S., L. Boronyak, N. Carrard and M. Paddon. 2010. *Effective community based tourism: a best practice manual*. Toowong: Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre.
- Baktygulov, S and R. Raeva. 2010. *Creating Value for All: Community-Based Tourism*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.
- Barratt-Brown, M. 1995. *Models in political economy*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Bass, S., B. Dalal-Clayton and J. Pretty. 1995. *Participation in Strategies for Sustainable Development. Environmental Planning Issues*. London: Environmental Planning Group International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Beeton, S. 2006. *Community development through tourism*. Collingwood: Landlinks Press.

- Bianchi, R. V. 2002. 'Toward a new political economy of global tourism.' In: R. Sharpley, and D. J. Telfer (eds). *Tourism and development concepts and issues* (265–299). Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Calanog, L. A., D.P.T. Reyes and V.F. Eugenio. 2012. *Making ecotourism work. A manual on establishing community-based Ecotourism enterprise (CBEE) in the Philippines*. Makati City: Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) Philippines.
- Chok, S., J. Macbeth and C. Warren. 2007. "Tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation: A critical analysis of 'Pro-Poor Tourism' and implications for sustainability." *Current Issues in Tourism* 10 (2-3): 144-165.
- Christie, I. T. and D. E. Crompton, 2001. *Tourism in Africa. African Region Working Paper Series No. 12*. Washington D.C: World Bank.
- Cleverdon, R. and A. Kalisch. 2000. "Fair Trade in tourism." *International Journal of Tourism Research*. 2: 171-187.
- Cox, R. W. 1996. 'Social forces, states and world orders: beyond international relation theory'. In: R.W. Cox, and T.J. Sinclair (eds). *Approach to World Order* (85-123). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press'
- de Beer F.and M. Marais. 2005. "Rural communities, the natural environment and development –some challenges, some successes". *Community Development Journal* 40 (1): 50-61.
- Deepak S., M. Hamlin Zuniga, N. Shrestha, M. Yama and V.F. Gomes. 2009. International aid seen from the South. In *Global Health and Development Assistance Rights, Ideologies and Deceit*. 3rd Report of the Italian Global Health Watch, pp. Pisa: ETS. Available at http://www.cuamm.org/en/images/stories/mediciconlafrica/educazione/core_activities/information_communication/report_global_health.pdf Accessed on 23 August 2011.
- Denman, R. 2001. *Guidelines for community-based ecotourism development*. Gland: WWF International.
- Dixey, L. M. n.d. *Competing with the best: good practices in community-based tourism in the Caribbean*. St. Michael, Barbados: Caribbean Tourism Organization.
- Eade D. 2007. "Capacity building: who builds whose capacities?" *Development in Practice* 17(4-5): 630-639.
- Forstner, K. 2004. "Community ventures and access to markets: the role of intermediaries in marketing rural tourism products." *Development Policy Review* 22 (5): 497-514.
- Giampiccoli, A., and J. Nauright. 2010. "Problems and Prospects for Community-based Tourism in the New South Africa: The 2010 FIFA World Cup and Beyond." *African Historical Review* 42 (1): 42-62.
- Giampiccoli, A. 2007. 'Hegemony, Globalization and Tourism Policies in Developing Countries.' In: P. M. Burns and M. Novelli (eds). *Hegemony, Globalization and Tourism* (175-191). Oxford: Pergamon Publishers.

- Giampiccoli, A. and O. Mtapuri. 2012. "Community-based tourism: an exploration of the concept(s) from a political perspective." *Tourism Review International* 16: 29-43.
- Gosovic, B. 2000. "Global intellectual hegemony and the international development agenda." *International Social Science Journal* 52(166): 447-456.
- Graci, S. R. 2012. "Putting Community Based Tourism into Practice: The Case of the Cree Village Ecododge in Moose Factory, Ontario." *Téoros* 1 (Special Issue): 65-70.
- Guaraldo-Choguill, M. B. 1996. "A Ladder of Community Participation for Underdeveloped Countries." *Habitat International* 20(3): 431-444.
- Hall, M. C. 1998. *Tourism and Politics Policy, Power and Place*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hall, M. C. 2007. 'Pro-poor tourism: do 'tourism exchange benefit primary the countries of the south?' In: M.C. Hall (ed). *Pro-poor tourism: who benefits? Perspective on tourism and poverty reduction 1-7*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Hamzah, A. and Z. Khalifah. 2009. *Handbook on community based tourism "How to develop and sustain CBT"*. Kuala Lumpur: Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Secretariat.
- Harris-Roger, W. 2009. "Tourism in Bario, Sarawak, Malaysia: A Case Study of Pro-poor Community-based Tourism Integrated into Community Development." *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research* 14 (2): 125-135.
- Harrison, D. and S. Schipani. 2007. "Lao Tourism and Poverty Alleviation: Community-Based Tourism and the Private Sector." *Current Issues in Tourism* 10 (2-3): 194-230.
- Harvey, D. 2007. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Häusler, N. and W. Strasdas. 2003. *Training manual for community-based tourism*. Zschortau: InWEnt - Capacity Building International.
- Honggang, X. U., T. Sofield and B.A.O. Jigang. 2009. 'Community tourism in Asia: an introduction.' In: B.A.O. Jigang (ed). *Tourism and community development. Asian practices* (1-17). Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
- Jain, N. and R. Triraganon. 2003. *Community-based tourism for conservation and development a training manual*. Washington D.C: The Mountain Institute and The Regional Community Forestry Training Center.
- Jealous, V. 1998. 'The Philippine perspective, criteria & goal for each NGO/PO/Community.' In: C. T. Urquico (ed.). *Community based Sustainable Tourism. A handbook* (8-12). Quezon City: Accessing Support Service and Entrepreneurial Technology, Inc.
- Johnson, P. A. 2010. "Realizing rural community based tourism development: prospects for social-economy enterprises." *Journal of Rural and Community Development* 5 (1/2): 150-162.

- Karim R., F. Mohammad and L. Serafino. 2012. Integrating pro-poor tourism activities in a community-based idea of development: the case of the district of Hunza-Neger, Pakistan. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Tourism and Leisure (ICTL) 2012 July 9-12, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Lapeyre, R. 2010. "Community-based tourism as a sustainable solution to maximise impacts locally? The Tiseb Conservancy case, Namibia." *Development Southern Africa* 27 (5): 757-772.
- Lima, S, C. S. García Gómez, D. Gómez López, and E. Eusébio. 2012. "El Turismo como una estrategia para el mundo en desarrollo: el Programa UNWTO. Volunteers, PASOS." *Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural* 10(3): 303-314.
- Lindberg, K., A., D. Molstad, D. Hawkins and W. Jamieson. 2001. "International development Assistance in Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research* 28(2): 508-511.
- López-Guzmán, T., S. Sánchez-Cañizares. and V. Pavón. 2011. "Community-based tourism in developing countries: a case study." *Tourismos: an International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism* 6 (1): 69-84.
- Manyara, G. and E. Jones. 2007. "Community-based Tourism Enterprises Development in Kenya: An Exploration of Their Potential as Avenues of Poverty Reduction." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 15 (6): 628-644.
- Mayaka, M. A., G. Croy and S. Mayson. 2012. *Community-based tourism: common conceptualisation or disagreement? Book of Proceedings The New golden Age of tourism and hospitality*. Melbourne: Melbourne Convention and Exhibition centre.
- Milne, S. and I. Ateljevic, 2001. "Tourism, economic development and the global-local nexus: theory embracing complexity." *Tourism Geographies* 3(4): 369-393.
- Mitchell R. E. and P. F. J. Eagles. 2001. "An Integrative Approach to Tourism: Lessons from the Andes of Peru." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 9(1): 4-28.
- Mitchell, J. and C. Ashley. 2010. *Tourism and poverty reduction. Pathways to prosperity*. London: Earthscan.
- Mowforth, M. and I. Munt, 1998. *Tourism and Sustainability New Tourism in the Third World*. London: Routledge.
- Mtapuri, O. and A. Giampiccoli. 2013. "Interrogating the role of the state and nonstate actors in community-based tourism ventures: toward a model for spreading the benefits to the wider community." *South African Geographical Journal* 95(1): 1-15.
- Naguran, R. 1999. 'Community based tourism in Kwazulu Natal: Some Conceptual Issues.' In: D. Ried (ed). *Ecotourism Development in Eastern and Southern Africa* (39-57). Toronto: University of Guelph.
- Ndlovu, N. and C.M. Rogerson. 2003. "Rural local economic development through community-based tourism: the Mehlooding hiking and horse trail, Eastern Cape, South Africa." *Africa Insight* 33: 124-129.

- Neth, B., S.O. Rith and B. Knerr. 2008. Global environmental governance and politics of ecotourism: case study of Cambodia. Paper presented at the 12th EADI General Conference . Global Governance for Sustainable Development. The Need for Policy Coherence and New Partnership. 24-28 June, Geneva.
- Novelli, M. and K. Gebhardt. 2007. "Community based tourism in Namibia: 'Reality Show' or 'Window Dressing'?" *Current Issues in Tourism* 10 (5): 443-479.
- Nyaupane, G. P., D.B. Morais. and L. Dowler. 2006. "The role of community involvement and number/type of visitors on tourism impacts: A controlled comparison of Annapurna, Nepal and Northwest Yunnan, China." *Tourism Management* 27: 1373-1385.
- Okazaki E., 2008. "A Community-Based Tourism Model: Its Conception and Use." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 16(5): 511-529.
- Peredo A M and J.J. Chrisman. 2006." Toward a theory of community-based enterprise." *Academy of Management Review* 31(2): 309-328.
- Pérez, F. J., O.D. Barrera, A.V. Peláez. and G. Lorío. 2010. *Turismo Rural Comunitario Como Alternativa de educación de la Pobreza Rural en Centroamérica*. Managua, Nicaragua: Edificio Nitlapan Campus de la UCA.
- Pimbert, M. P. and J.N. Pretty. 1995. Parks, People and Professionals: Putting 'Participation' into Protected Area Management. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development International Institute for Environment and Development World Wide Fund For Nature. Discussion Paper No 57, February 1995. UNRISD, Geneva.
- Pinel, D. P. 1999. 'Create a good fit: A community-based tourism planning model.' In: M.L. Miller, J. Auyong, and N.P. Hadley (eds). *Proceedings of International Symposium on Coastal and Marine Tourism Vancouver* (277-286). Available: <http://nsgl.gso.uri.edu/washu/washuw99003/28-Pinel.pdf> Accessed on 22 May 2012.
- Pleumarom, A. 2002. Community-Based Ecotourism: Miracle or Menace? Paper presented at the International Year of Ecotourism Regional Conference on Community-Based Ecotourism in Southeast Asia. Chiang Mai, Thailand.
- Ramsa, Y. A. and A. Mohd, 2004. "Community-based Ecotourism: A New proposition for Sustainable Development and Environmental Conservation in Malaysia." *Journal of Applied Science* 4(4): 583-589.
- Rogerson, C. M. 2012. "The Tourism–Development Nexus in sub-Saharan Africa Progress and Prospects." *Africa Insight* 42(2): 28-45.
- Sakata, H. and B. Prideaux. 2013. "An alternative approach to community-based ecotourism: a bottom-up locally initiated non-monetised project in Papua New Guinea." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 21(6): 880-899.
- Sammy, J. 2008. 'Examples of effective techniques for enhancing community understanding of tourism.' In: G. Moscardo (ed). *Building*

- community capacity for tourism development* (75-85). Wallingford: CAB International.
- Scheyvens, R. 2002. *Tourism for development. Empowering community*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Simpson, M. C. 2008. "Community benefit tourism initiatives—A conceptual oxymoron?" *Tourism Management* 29: 1-18.
- Sofield, T. H. B. 2003. *Empowerment for sustainable tourism development*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Spenceley, A. 2008. 'Local impacts of community-based tourism in Southern Africa.' In: A. Spenceley (ed). *Responsible tourism. Critical issues for conservation and development* 285-304. London: Earthscan.
- Suansri, P. 2003. *Community Based Tourism Handbook*. Bangkok: Responsible Ecological Social Tour-REST.
- Telfer, D. J. 2009. 'Development studies and tourism.' In: T. Jamal and M. Robinson (eds). *The SAGE handbook of tourism studies* (146-165). London: SAGE Publication.
- Telfer, D. J. and R. Sharpley. 2008. *Tourism and development in the Developing World*. London: Routledge.
- The Mountain Institute, 2000. *Community-based tourism for conservation and development: a resource kit*. Washington D.C.: The Mountain Institute.
- Thomas, N. and S. Brooks. 2003. "Ecotourism for Community Development: Environmental Partnerships and the Il Ngwesi Ecotourism project, Northern Kenya." *Africa Insight* 33(1/2): 9-17.
- Torres, R. M., P. Skillicorn and V. Nelson. 2011. "Community Corporate Joint Ventures: An Alternative Model for Pro-Poor Tourism Development." *Tourism Planning & Development* 8 (3): 297-316.
- Tosun, C. 1999: "Towards a Typology of Community Participation in the Tourism Development Process." *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research* 10 (2): 113-134.
- Tosun, C. 2005. "Stages in the emergence of a participatory tourism development approach in the Developing World." *Geoforum* 36: 333-352.
- Trejos, B. and L.H.N. Chiang. 2009. "Local economic linkages to community-based tourism in rural Costa Rica." *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 30: 373-387.
- Trejos, B. and D. Matarrita-Cascante. 2010. "Theoretical approximations to community-based tourism: case studies from Costa Rica." *e-Review of Tourism Research* 8 (6): 157-178.
- Twining-Ward, L., W. Jamieson, S. Noakes and S. Day. 2007. *A toolkit for monitoring and managing community-based tourism*. Ha Noi and Oahu: SNV Netherlands Development Organisation and University of Hawaii.
- Urquico, C. T. 1998. *Community based sustainable tourism. A handbook*. Quezon City: Accessing Support Service and Entrepreneurial Technology, Inc.

- van der Duim, R. 2008. 'Exploring pro-poor tourism research: The state of the art.' In: H. de Haan, and R. van der Duim (eds). *Landscape, leisure and tourism, Socio-spatial studies in experiences, practices and policies* (179-198). Delf: Eburon Academic Publishers.
- White S. C. 1996. "Depoliticising development: The uses and abuses of participation." *Development in Practice* 6(1): 6-15.
- Zapata, M. J., M.C. Hall, P. Lindo and M. Vanderschaeghe. 2011. "Can community-based tourism contribute to development and poverty alleviation? Lessons from Nicaragua." *Current Issues in Tourism* 14 (8): 725-749.

