

Characteristics and Policies of Community-Based Tourism in the Case of Jamaica

*Andrea Giampiccoli,
Durban University of Technology,*

*Sean Jugmohan,
Durban University of Technology,*

*Oliver Mtapuri,
University of Limpopo*

The aim of the article is to investigate the relationship between relevant Community-based Tourism (CBT) characteristics and the Jamaican Community Tourism Policy and Strategy (CTPS) and to discuss its value in community development. This article makes a contribution towards the understanding of the role of government in the development CBT. It argues that while the Jamaican CTPS has many positive strategies, they seem to be skewed in favor of the well established and market ready Community Tourism Enterprises (CTEs). It argues that such a state of affairs risks increasing the inequality gap between the rich CTEs and the poor ones and the members involved. By inference, it also risks developing 'elite' CTEs. As such, the article also argues that support should be given to all CTEs in the various tiers depending solely on need. The article also posits that it is critically important to develop community tourism partnerships with government ministries and other agencies, the private sector and NGOs for the establishment of standards, assessments, branding, marketing, financing and legal issues and capacity building. The article argues that the forms and modes of capacity building and empowerment which it advocates should make communities independent in the interest of social justice. While Jamaica's CTPS has numerous feasible strategies, it is their prioritization which is highly contestable.

Introduction

The tourism industry has great economic relevance. Globally there have been 1087 million international tourist arrivals to the value of US\$ 1159 billion international tourism receipts (UNWTO, 2014, p. 3). This growth in tourist numbers are “despite the economic difficulties experienced in many parts of the world, emphasizing the strong resilience of tourism” (JTB, 2012, VII). As such, despite ‘occasional shocks’, international tourist arrivals have shown phenomenal growth – from 25 million in 1950 to 1087 million in 2013 (UNWTO, 2014, 2). In Jamaica the tourism sector has also grown consistently over the last 50 years. For example, tourism arrivals were 271,692 in 1962; 670,202 in 1982 and more than doubled to 1,986 000 in 2012 (Vision 2030, 2009; UNWTO, 2014, p. 10). The World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC, 2012) indicates for example, that the travel and tourism sector in Jamaica had a total impact of \$4 billion on Jamaica’s GDP in 2011, such that the contribution of the travel and tourism sector to GDP is greater than other sectors in Jamaica. In 2011, the sector accounted for 280,000 direct, indirect, and induced jobs in Jamaica (WTTC, 2012). The travel and tourism sectors have linkages to the wider economy and support many beneficiaries (WTTC, 2012, p. 17).

Despite these growth trends and the contribution of tourism to the Jamaican economy, the country still experiences high levels of poverty. Thus, while the UNWTO acknowledges that tourism has the potential to alleviate poverty, Jamaica has the challenge of meeting the first goal of the *UN Millenniums Development Goals*, namely, to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger. As such, poverty remains a big challenge for the country (MTE, 2014, p. 2). Income disparities between urban and rural areas are also prevalent, particularly in rural areas experiencing much more acute poverty problems (MTE, 2014, p. 2).

The importance of Community-based tourism (CBT) in the tourism sector has been recognized such that “a community-based approach towards tourism development has been increasingly promoted in many areas” (Islam, Rahman, Iftexhar and Rakkibu, 2013, p. 119; see also Salazar, 2012, p. 10; Sin and Minca, 2014, p. 96). As such, CBT is used as a development strategy as well as in the international cooperation arena (Tasci, Semrad, and Yilmaz, 2013, p. 1). A number of governments at national level (such as Namibia, Colombia, Myanmar) have recognized the value of CBT, it is possible that their

understandings and approaches to CBT may differ, as they acknowledge the need to have a specific policy and strategy related to CBT (MCIT, 2012; MHT, 2012, MTE, 1995). Jamaica has followed the same line by working on a National Community Tourism Policy and Strategy (MTE, 2014). The problem which is being highlighted in this paper relates to the fact that Caribbean tourism is largely associated with the 3Ss model (sand-sea-sun) and the region is the most tourism dependent region in the world, therefore, governments, aid agencies and non-governmental organizations have invested in a range of tourism development activities including community-based tourism to diversify economies, reduce poverty and improve quality of life in the Caribbean [...] However, despite this growth and the millions of dollars invested in developing community-based tourism, little is known about what conditions lead to sustainable and resilient communities and economies (Holladay & Powell, 2013, p. 1188). Evidently, there is a need to overcome this problem to boost the development of tourism in Jamaica as a tool for economic development. Thus, as indicated:

...for Jamaica to achieve “Developed Country” status, as is the goal of the Government’s National Development Plan: Vision 2030, then development of rural areas needs to at least keep pace with development in urban areas. Hence, this [community tourism policy] is aimed at empowering communities to harness the potential of tourism to generate income and sustain livelihoods. Community tourism has the potential to address these issues by harnessing under-utilized human capital, natural resources, and cultural heritage of Jamaica’s economically marginalized rural and urban communities. Empowering communities to undertake community tourism will generate opportunities for sustainable livelihoods, improve their social condition, and celebrate, preserve and rejuvenate their natural and cultural heritage. In addition, it will contribute to poverty alleviation and generate self-sufficiency, self-determination and pride for communities (MTE, 2014, p. 3). Therefore, the aim of this article is to interrogate the relationship between important CBT characteristics found in extant CBT literature and the Jamaican National Community Tourism Policy and Strategy (CTPS) and to unpack the policy’s value to community development. As such, it will reflect on how CBT characteristics are included in the CTPS. This inference is based on the reasoning that the CTPS should guide the CBT sector and that CBT is considered as a tool for community development. This article, will firstly outline some of the major characteristics of CBT such as ownership and

management issues, external support/facilitation, financial resources, capacity and marketing. In addition, the basic concepts of CBT in relation to community development are explored in the first part of the literature review. Thereafter, these characteristics (and the concept of CBT) will be correlated with the National Community Tourism Policy and Strategy of Jamaica and discussed in relation to community development. The intention is to ascertain the extent to which the Jamaica CTPS is advancing community development through tourism.

This article is relevant to current debates and discourses because as it supports the argument that while the community should be the key protagonists of their own development, the role of the government should be seen as fundamental but within the broad framework of facilitative intervention (Butler, 2005, p. 12; see also Rogerson, 2009, p. 36; Sofield, 2003, p. 222). As such, “Community Based Tourism cannot be implemented successfully without the constant and coordinated facilitation by the various governmental bodies. Governments play a critical role through their institutional leadership, guaranteeing stakeholders’ participation. The Governments’ role is also essential in the establishment of regulatory and policy frameworks...” (George, Nedelea and Antony, 2007, p. 11). In addition, government leadership within CBT should make provision for continuous psychological, financial, technical and educational support in various steps of the CBT process (Tasci Semrad, and Yilmaz, 2013, p. 33). It is, therefore, crucial to be elaborate in establishing how government articulates and approaches CBT in its policy and strategy. At the same time George, Nedelea and Antony (2007) argue that there is a lot to learn from CBT in identifying ways in which to link economical, cultural and environmental sustainability to the tourism venture.

Policy and action should promote continuing research through the provision of financial, academic, technical, and dissemination support (George, Nedelea & Antony, 2007, p. 18).

Based on the above information, it is pertinent to investigate the importance and relationship between CBT characteristics and government policy on CBT. Such an investigation will elucidate the parameters and extent that the CBT policy can effectively facilitate CBT towards community development. The Jamaican case study is important as Jamaica has possibly the newest CBT

strategy and policy. Moreover, CBT has been part of Jamaican tourism landscape at least since 1996 (Dixey, 2007, p. 8). Therefore, the Jamaican 2014 CTPS policy and strategy (MTE, 2014) represents a summation of valuable years of experience in CBT, and thus giving valuable insight of a contemporary policy making approach in CBT juxtaposed with CBTs inherent characteristics.

Literature review

At the onset, the relationship between CBT and community development needs to be put forward in order to properly establish the basic reference parameters concerning the purpose and understanding of CBT in relation to community development. Extant literature traces the origins of CBT back to the 1970s in alternative development approaches and that CBT remains within the community-based development approach (about these issues see, for example, Zapata et. al., 2011:2; Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2012, p. 33; Karim, Mohammad & Serafino, 2012, n.p.). In addition, CBT enterprises should also be interpreted as community-based enterprises (CBE) (Calanog, Reyes, and Eugenio, 2012). The alternative development approach encapsulates understandings of community development that are holistic in nature and include issues of empowerment, self-reliance, sustainability and so on (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2012, p. 33; Telfer, 2009, p. 156). Within this context of alternative development, CBT should be specifically understood to relate to marginalised/disadvantaged groups of society (see Tasci, Semrad, and Yilmaz, 2013, pp. 10,12; Jealous, 1998, p. 10) and issues of control of the CBT process and related enterprises are paramount (Telfer and Sharpley, 2008, p. 115). From a disadvantaged community emancipatory perspective, “CBT can offer such communities the chance to move toward greater political self-determination, but *only* if local control is maximized” (Salazar, 2012, p. 12, emphasis in original). For a CBT in a rural context, Höckert, (2009, p. 10) argues that rural community-based tourism should be understood as “a special form of tourism that is taking place in the economically marginalized rural communities” as such should be located within the discourse of alternative and sustainable development which places emphasis on issues of control and ownership by the local communities (Höckert, 2009, p. 20). Despite various interpretations about CBT which have been developed since

the 1980s (Kontogeorgopoulos, Churyen & Duangsaeng, 2014, p. 108), models of CBT continue to be proposed (see for example a new 2014 CBT model in Rakhman, Suganda, Dienaputra and Nirwandar 2014) which suggests that CBT development processes and enterprises (also interpreted as CBE) should remain owned and managed by local community members and this is consistent with several other authors (Suansri, 2003, p. 14; Sproule in Ramsa and Mohd, 2004, p. 584; Manyara & Jones, 2007, p. 637). Summarizing various definitions it is possible to follow what is currently proposed by Tasci, Semrad, and Yilmaz (2013, p. 9; emphasis in original): “*CBT is a tourism that is planned, developed, owned and managed by the community for the community, guided by collective decision-making, responsibility, access, ownership and benefits.*” CBT processes and related enterprises should therefore be controlled, owned and managed by the local community members and this understanding of CBT is adopted in this article as original and an ideal interpretation of CBT.

While autonomous CBT development is ideal, in reality external support/facilitation and partnership are often necessary to nurture a CBT venture in its development process. Many CBT project proposals usually come up with requests for external financial and technical assistance (Gascón, 2013, p. 716). There is a widespread recognition that external entities (private sector, government, NGOs) should have a facilitative role in the CBT development process but should not become direct owners/ managers of the CBT processes and related entities (see on these issues Ramsa & Mohd, 2004, p. 584; Scheyvens, 2002, p. 176; Reid, 2003, p. 135; Wearing and Macdonald, 2002, p. 203; Mtapuri and Giampiccoli, 2013, p. 11; Manyara and Jones, 2007, p. 638). To that end, Zapata (2011) suggests:

The attention and resources of donors, policy-makers, and NGOs should be then better directed to support and stimulate the conditions for a local and endogenous development by providing the necessary resources (e.g. access to money through microcredits, land, ideas, contacts, ownership, influence, knowledge, skills) for the poor to take advantage through local entrepreneurship, to develop and market products, and make linkages with local supply chains” (Zapata, 2011, p. 22).

Government (as any other entity) should therefore approach CBT from the same perspective. In line with this pattern of thinking, Tasci, Croes, Villanueva, (2014, p. 273) argue that local authorities must provide the necessary backstopping to communities in the form of financial, legal and capacity building support especially focusing on those in need instead of making empty promises to them.

For Asker, Boronyak, Carrard & Paddon, (2010, p. 78), partnerships and networks make good support for CBT initiatives upon which they can scaffold. While partnerships are supported, they should remain outside CBT ventures as ‘temporary’ arrangements to facilitate the empowerment of communities and supporting their self-reliance (Mtapuri and Giampiccoli, 2013, pp. 9, 11). An example of such an arrangement is when “the private sector will bring in the tourists while the community manage their own facilities and activities” (Ramsa & Mohd, 2004, p. 587). This example also illustrates the recognition that marketing and market access is often (if not always) a major challenge in CBT (Forstner, 2004, p. 498; Ndabeni & Rogerson, 2005, p. 139; Ahebwa and van der Duim, 2013, p. 98; Tasci, Semrad, and Yilmaz, 2013, p. 12). Mallya, (2006, p. 184) argues that many community-based ecotourism projects have not succeeded is because of their failure to attract adequate numbers of visitors to be viable principally because “often, assumption made about the marketability of a particular location or experince have been unreralistic and not based on research. As a result, promotional activity has been misdirected”. Therefore, a partnership with external entities can assist the CBT project (Asker, Boronyak, Carrard & Paddon, 2010, p. 70). There are other factors which contribute to the failure of CBT ventures.

Some of the factors which have led to the failure of CBT projects are lack of financial resources and skills/capacity (Tasci, Semrad, and Yilmaz, 2013, p. 12; López-Guzmán, Borges and Hernandez-Merino, 2013, p. 132). Communities usually have low financial resources (Calanog, Reyes, and Eugenio, 2012, p. 187; Denman, 2001, p. 21) and access to credit can be difficult for them (Baktygulov & Raeva, 2010, p. 14). The sustainability of a CBT depends on resources especially finance which locals may not have to improve their infrastructure and develop their ventures into small or medium enterprises. (Tasci, Semrad, and Yilmaz, 2013, p. 34). Consequently, because of difficulties of getting funding, in many cases, financial assistance by external entities is often required in CBT development (see for example

Holladay and Powell, 2013, p. 1194; Mirete Mumm and Tuffin, 2007, p. 54). Another key challenge in CBT is related to capacity. Disadvantaged communities usually lack (or have very little) capacity, therefore, there is always the need to facilitate community capacity building (Aref and Redzuan, 2009, p. 210; Calanog, Reyes, and Eugenio, 2012, p. 187; Tasci, Croes, Villanueva, 2014, p. 273; Mallya, 2006, p. 189; Manyara & Jones, 2007, p. 639; Suansri, 2003, p. 12; López-Guzmán, Sánchez-Cañizares and Pavón, 2011, p. 82). The issue of capacity is crucial because a dearth in social and human capital is a major threat to the success of CBT ventures (Tasci, Semrad, and Yilmaz (2013, p. 32). Stakeholders must address the issue of community capacity building given its importance in ensuring that most of the benefits of a community based tourism venture accrue to the communities themselves” (Subash, 2014, p. 4).

CBT policy in Jamaica

Studies on CBT in Jamaica are available, for example, Taylor, Daye, Kneafsey and Barrett (2014) explore the relevance and exploitation of culture as a CBT strategy and Kennett-Hensel, Sneath and Hensel (2009) investigate managers’ perspectives on the Jamaica ten-year Master Plan in relation to sustainability and effectiveness in succeeding inclusive, community-based development and growth. Importantly the study by Kennett-Hensel, Sneath and Hensel, (2009) concludes that while the objective related to heritage-based tourism and infrastructure development are felt to be properly addressed, deficiencies seem to be present in relation to community-based, inclusive tourism and environmentally sustainable tourism. Lately, the Jamaican tourism sector has grown and increased its relevance, however, the distribution patterns of the benefits from tourism has been uneven and community-based responses to this uneven development patterns are present (Dodman, 2009).

Issues and programs related to CBT in Jamaica are not new and many international donors have contributed in various forms to CBT in the Caribbean and Jamaica (Dixey, 2007, p. 5). For example, in 1993, the Environmental Foundation of Jamaica (EFJ) was established and provided long-term financing for supporting community-based tourism, national parks, botanical gardens and protected areas (Vision 2030, 2009, p. 31) and in 2001

the International Institute for Peace through Tourism conference had its focus on Jamaican community tourism (Dixey, 2007, p. 9). The 2002 Tourism Master Plan had a section specifically dedicated to CBT (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2002, p. 191). CBT definition in 2004 Jamaica Community Tourism handbook (2004) (Chambers in Pantin and Francis, 2005, p. 1; see also Dixey, 2007, p. 5) reads: “Community tourism is both an integrated approach and collaborative tool for the socioeconomic empowerment of communities through the assessment, development and marketing of natural and cultural community resources, which seek to add value to the experiences of local and foreign visitors and simultaneously improve the quality of life of communities.”

Hayle (n.d.) also proposed CBT guidelines in her ‘Guidelines for South Coast Project’ offered by (and accessible from) the University of the West Indies Institute for Hotel and Tourism. The Tourism Product Development Company (TPDCo) the central agency mandated by the Government of Jamaica to promote tourism, also offered a CBT guide to help the implementation of CBT project (TPDCo, no date; see also Pantin and Francis, 2005 for another documents on CBT). The same (TPDCo, n.d.) guide mentions that CBT have been in existence in Jamaica for many years but informally. This same issue is mentioned in the CTPS that the concept of CBT is not new to Jamaica as it has been in existence for several years back at an informal level (MTE, 2014, p. 6). On this premise, it can be argued that the scope for increased formalization of CBT development was available.

The 2009 Vision 2030 for tourism in its strategy mentions the need to “expand and promote tourism-related entrepreneurial and employment opportunities for communities including community-based tourism” and very importantly the Vision 2030 indicates amongst the actions to be taken to fulfil the CBT strategy the need to “Develop policies pertaining to community-based tourism” (Vision 2030, 2009:60). Thus, in line with the objectives of Vision 2030, came the publication of the CTPS in 2014 (MTE, 2014:12). The CTPS comes from the specific context of the tourism industry and socio-economic context in Jamaica, as such

Community tourism development presents Jamaica with a major opportunity to advance its goals of an inclusive tourism sector that contributes to the nation’s economic and social

development. International tourism trends are showing a shift away from ‘sun, sand and sea (3S)’ tourism and toward interactive, experiential tourism. Jamaica has a mosaic of communities that can offer exciting and distinctive natural, heritage and cultural experiences well matched to this experiential market trend. To take advantage of this opportunity, Jamaica commissioned the development of a national Community Tourism Policy and Strategy” (MTE, 2014, V).

As such, in 2011 an agreement was signed between the World Bank and the Jamaica Government (within the Jamaica Social Investment Fund context) and the Jamaica Minister said that the overall objective of the policy is to develop a framework to enhance institutional and policy capacity to nurture and develop community-based tourism as a pillar for sustainable growth in Jamaica and asserted that there is a need to diversify the tourism products and expand the ownership base of the tourism product (Brown, 2011).

The issue, therefore, is to unpack how CBT policy and strategy in Jamaica address and reflect these above mentioned matters regarding CBT, specifically to unpack how the Jamaica CTPS reflects the CBT characteristics of ownership, management and facilitation/partnership and how it addresses the crucial challenges in CBT development, namely, marketing/market access, lack of financial resources and capacity at community level.

The CTPS and CBT characteristics

While recognizing the existence of various definitions and the interchange of terms ‘community tourism’ (CT) and ‘community-based tourism’ (CBT) (MTE, 2014, p. 3) the CTPS keys definitions to CBT are two, one on CT and one on community tourism enterprises (CTE) (MTE, 2014, p. 16).

Community Tourism: Community Tourism is the interaction between the host community and visitor which leads to the consumption, sharing and enjoyment of community based experiences, products and services.

Community Tourism Enterprise (CTE):

The following criteria define CTEs:

- i. They are small, medium or micro-enterprises which pursue sustainable tourism and return economic, cultural, social and environment benefits to the communities in which they operate.
- ii. The community in which they operate must be able to influence the decision-making process of the enterprise.
- iii. Ideally, they are owned and operated by the community or one or more community members, either in whole or through joint ventures.
- iv. They promote the local tourism value chain through linkages, where appropriate, to agriculture, arts and crafts, food service and related small businesses in the community. Privately-owned businesses that meet the first two criteria may also qualify as CTEs.

The CT definition seems to be exclusively based on a tourist experience perspective and does not indicate any community social, economic or other developmental perspective of CT which is present in the CTE definition as a 'physical' entity of CBT development. Thus, this article proposes that the two definitions of CT and CTE should ideally be taken together for a more complete definition of CBT. This article is not interested in the host-guest relation related to the CT definition, therefore, considers that the CTPS facilitative approach is correct, as such attention needs to be given to specific issues of ownership, management, partnership, marketing/market access, lack of financial resources and capacity at community level.

The CTPS seems to adopt a facilitative approach where government assists and facilitates in such a way that the community becomes the key protagonist and independent in the implementation of CBT ventures. Caution should be taken in interpreting the roles of the proposed 'operators', as the first goal of the CTPS reads: "Government will facilitate Communities and operators pursuing community tourism business in the planning, management and operations required for business success" (MTE, 2014, p. 18). Facilitative assistance is the approach to be adopted on specific issues such as of marketing and on the formal relationship with external community entity

(MTE, 2014, pp. 14, 18). If properly managed the facilitative method is seen as the proper approach in CBT (see Ramsa & Mohd, 2004, p. 584; Manyara and Jones, 2007, p. 638; Wearing and Macdonalds, 2002, p. 203) in which 'the role of a facilitator is limited to providing proper methods and tools to the people he/she is facilitating in order to make it is easier for them to reach their goals" (Lecup & Nicholson, 2000, p. 11). The facilitator can be any entity (Government, NGOs or private entities) (Mtapuri and Giampiccoli, 2013, p. 5; Guzmán, Sánchez-Cañizares and Pavón, 2011, p. 72).

In the definition of CTE, a few points need to be analyzed. Firstly, CTE are considered as "small, medium or micro-enterprises". While CBT is usually, and especially in its first stages, small, medium or micro-enterprises, it has also been suggested that CBT can be of a bigger scale (see about bigger scale of CBT France, 1997, p. 16; Calanog, Reyes, and Eugenio, 2012; Hamzah & Khalifah, 2009, p. 2; and for large scale Community-based enterprises see Peredo & Chrisman, 2006, p. 316). It has specifically been proposed that "Communities should have the proper organization and financial capability to operate on a limited scale or even full-blown commercial scale" (Jealous, 1998, p. 12).

Control and ownership of the CTE is also very paramount. The fact that the community must have the authority and power to make decisions in the running of the enterprise has a corollary which suggests that the community must also fully own and manage the CTE. Instead, point III of the CTE definition while it recognizes the ideal model of CTE, it gives room to possible joint ventures. Joint ventures and partnerships involving CTE should be carefully balanced. Scheyvens (2002, pp. 191, 194) notes that joint ventures which use community resources are always more popular however he cautions that if the private sector stakeholders have an upper hand in the arrangement, they tend to prioritize their own interests in the agreements. It should be noted that involvement in ownership does not mean equal control of the CTE. Thus, specific support to communities is needed to avoid the chance of the community being exploited. To the largest extent possible, community-based ecotourism (CBET) "...ventures offer much greater opportunities for community empowerment than those in which land is simply leased to an outside operator, or joint ventures in which the community has equity, and therefore shares in profits, but has little power overall" (Scheyvens, 1999, p. 74). Finally, the fact that CTE "promote the local

tourism value chain through linkages” as mention in point IV of the CTE definition is seen positively and appropriate.

However, all constructive CBT points in the CTE definition seem to collapse in relation to CBT when point IV of the CTE definition mentions that “Privately-owned businesses that meet the first two criteria may also qualify as CTEs” that is “They are small, medium or micro-enterprises which pursue sustainable tourism and return economic, cultural, social and environment benefits to the communities in which they operate” and “The community in which they operate must be able to influence the decision-making process of the enterprise.” These parameters which recognize CTE seem to greatly distance CTE with its original and ideal understandings. These parameters of understanding also seem to shift CBT towards neoliberalism in which the CTE reaches the level of a ‘typical’ private enterprise because of size as well as because the community can obtain some benefits and have some kind of influence in terms of decision making. The benefits and the decision making power which the communities retain have to be seen especially if the community is not properly supported, it often gets small symbolic benefits (Scheyvens 2002, p. 191). The transition from being fully owned and managed, to a private sector based (as much as within some specific parameters) into partnership models shows an alignment with neoliberal global policy which is quite distant from alternative development approaches (see Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2012). This suggests that fundamentally, there exists a need for proper facilitative structures to empower the community to fully own and manage their CTE or, if involved with external entities, to be equipped to avoid exploitation of any kind and have an equal footing in terms of power relations with external entities.

The literature reviewed shows that marketing, lack of financial resources as well inadequate capacity at community level as three of the main obstacles to successful CBT development. It stands to reason that facilitation in these three matters should be pursued. The CTPS recognized in various points that marketing is a problem area (MTE, 2014, pp. 9, 10). In addition, absence of specific marketing programs for CTE hamstrung their operations and it was noted that the (JTB) did not have any any marketing programs designed for community tourism but two of their programs were making a profound difference on community tourism (MTE, 2014, p. 7). The marketing and facilitative approach of the CTPS seem directed towards two main issues,

namely, facilitation and integration. This twofold approach seems to be clearly articulated in the first goal of the CTPS whose ambition is “marketing channels for community tourism will be facilitated and integrated with the networks of main stream tourism marketing methods” (MTE, 2014:18). The integration strategy essentially meant integrating CBT within the national marketing programs (MTE, 2014, p. 18).

The CTPS rightly recognizes financial and capacity weaknesses (and their possible linkages) at community level in relation to CBT when stating that “Community members require significant capacity building and training, technical support and financial assistance to successfully develop community tourism” (MTE, 2014, p. 9) and most of the identified CTEs did not have enough “financial literacy and accounting skills” (MTE, 2014, p. 10). In addition, it is also generally recognized that the nature and structure of many CTEs makes accessing bank credit as well as the Tourism Enhancement Fund or donor grants difficult (MTE, 2014, p. 10). Thus, the CTPS addresses the lack of financial resources and capacity in various ways. The Government of Jamaica facilitates the sourcing and financing of CTEs in various ways in order to create financing tools for the implementation of community tourism (see MTE, 2014, p.19). It also provides a list of agencies which can be give input/advice on financial matters (MTE, 2014, p. 28). The CTPS recognizes the opportunities that CBT can have in capacity building beyond the strict tourism skills by proposing that designing and developing tourism training programs for capacity building infused with life-long skills is imperative in the support to the development of tourism (MTE, 2014, p.10). Furthermore, the CTPS appears to be targeting the poorest and also ensuring the provision of basic literacy, numeracy and life-long skills” (MTE, 2014, p. 24). This is largely in accordance with what capacity building in CBT development should imply, that capacity building should cover beyond the strict tourism skills but serve to improve the general livelihoods skill/capacity of the people involved (see on similar lines Mitchell and Ashely, 2010, p. 23; SNV, 2007, p. 14; Hainsworth, 2009, p. 113; Ross & Wall, 1999, p. 129). The final aim of capacity building in CBT is for the community to be independent. The CTPS recognizes this one of the outcomes of its initiatives is to “build capacity at the community level to own, manage and deliver high quality visitor experiences and added value to the tourism sector” (MTE, 2014. p. 22). In fact “One of the key differences between community-based tourism and other forms of tourism is the focus on empowering the local community to run their own tourism businesses”

(SNV 2007, p. 14). The issue is to assess first and then build capacity in various sectors in terms of CTPS document (MTE, 2014, p. VII, 19, 20, 21, 23, 34, 35). With regard to finance, it lists a number of agencies which can be give input/advice on capacity and training on financial matters (MTE, 2014, p. 28).

One of the main strategies in the CTPS which is also related to issues of finance and capacity, is the collaborative approaches amongst different tourism stakeholders. Thus, it deems it necessary to develop community tourism partnerships with government ministries, agencies as well as the domestic and international tourism industry, actors from the private sector and NGOs for standards setting, assessments, branding and marketing methods, legal issues, financing instruments as well as capacity building to ensure effective implementation of the program (MTE, 2014, p.19, see also page 27). In addition, the CTPS seems to recognize the different needs of the various communities and as such it proposes to “*Prepare a ‘Community Tourism Action Plan’*” for each community or existing product on the basis of a comprehensive assessment of community readiness and a community tourism product, “such an action plan would include appropriate product development and support action plans for each CTE, a capacity building plan for each community, and benefits and empowerment plans for each community” (MTE, 2014, p. 21). These issues are important and valuable as needs (and wishes) of each community are heterogeneous.

It needs to be noted that support is not the same for all types of CTE. In fact, the CTPS distinguishes three tiers of CTEs (see table 1). The reason given by the CTPS behind the classification of CTE is that “Without market-driven, viable products, community tourism development will ultimately fail. Therefore, the framework for implementation is based on an export, market ready classification system that will guide the delivery of assistance and support” (MTE, 2014, VII). While market readiness is surely important, it is also important to underline the reason behind the development of CBT itself. CBT “primarily utilizes marginalized sectors of society to attain social justice and equity” (Jealous, 1998, p. 10). As such, this articles argues that support should be given to all the three proposed tiers of CTE, however, it should be proportional to the need. In accordance with this, it is here proposed that greater support/facilitation should be given to tier 3 and decreasing to tiers 2 and thereafter 1. It is recognized that specific preconditions such as ‘baseline’ capacity should be present. CTPS proposes capacity building in tiers 3, but

skewed approach seem to be possible risking to increase the gap between various levels of CTE. For example, tiers 3 that “may be visitor ready” is excluded from marketing seems to be total arguing that there should be no marketing at this level. The same could be said also for financing issues.

Table №1. *Community Tourism Enterprises Product Tiers. (MTE, 2014, pp. VII, 31).*

Product Tier	Description	Market Readiness Level
<p>Tier 1: Export Market Ready</p>	<p>These are tourism products that operate at international industry standard levels, and have the knowledge, systems and finances in place needed to work through travel trade distribution sales channels. This Tier focuses on assisting the market ready products to increase business and enhance their operations.</p> <p>The Tier 1 support programs focus on facilitating and mentoring the CTEs to operate and market viable businesses. The programs areas include: 1) product standards; 2) international tourism product development and packaging; 3) international tourism marketing, and; 4) strategic partnerships. Tier 2 and 3 training programs also are applied as required.</p> <p>Only CTEs that are operating at this highest level of readiness would be fully integrated in marketing programs aimed at the overseas and travel trade markets.</p>	<p>Export Ready + Market Ready + Visitor Ready</p>
<p>Tier 2: Market Ready</p>	<p>This Tier’s community tourism product operates legally and has reached the basic level of readiness to welcome visitors, but there may be shortfalls in meeting inter-national industry standards, and hospitality/ service/marketing levels. The Tier focuses on building participation and success in the tourism industry by communities and community</p>	<p>Market Ready + Visitor Ready</p>

	<p>members as community tourism operators and employees.</p> <p>The Tier 2 support programs fulfil the developmental needs of CTEs in the areas of: 1) tourism and business planning; 2) tourism and cultural hospitality skills; 3) export ready product development; 4) tourism management and operations; 5) financing, and; 6) tourism marketing. In addition, Tier 3 training programs also are applied as required.</p> <p>The support programs for this stage aim to assist products to reach the export ready stage. CTEs operating at this level would be able to participate in marketing programs for local and regional markets, but not programs for overseas markets or the travel trade. The majority of existing CTEs are in this stage of development.</p>	
<p>Tier 3: Start-Up Product Stage</p>	<p>In this tier the community tourism product is in the planning and start-up mode or basically undeveloped but there is an interest in pursuing tourism as an economic development activity. This Tier builds awareness, initiates planning and develops the capacity of communities, businesses and individuals to enter the tourism sector.</p> <p>The awareness programs provide communities with understanding of tourism benefits, opportunities and challenges for their economic, social and cultural development. The planning programs include preparing community tourism inventories, capacity building programs for this stage include literacy, numeracy and life skills. No marketing initiatives would be applied at this level.</p>	<p>May be Visitor Ready, or a community or community member with a product concept</p>

This state of affairs seems to also suggest that within the CTPS (MTE, 2014, p. 42) priority was going to be given to communities and CTEs “in regions where readiness and access to markets is highest and in which early successes can be achieved” in order to achieve some quick wins. The CTPS rightly mentions that community tourism can address these issues by tapping into under-utilized human capital, physical and natural resources as well as the cultural heritage of the country’s economically disadvantaged urban and rural communities (MTE, 2014, p. 3). In addition, the CTPS recognizes that many enterprises identified as CTEs were running as informal businesses and did not have the requisite financial literacy and accounting skills (MTE, 2014, p. 10). Thus, importantly, this article argues that the potential of CTE (and associated community development of its members) could be much more profound in tier 3 than tiers 1 and 2 in reducing poverty if most of CTEs are in tier 3 and, arguably, CTE in tier 3 can be linked to the most disadvantaged groups in society as they largely represent CTEs which are informal in nature. It is noteworthy that the informality of tier 3 CTE does not represent inferiority but could effectively be exploited with great impact because the issue regarding formality and/or informality of CBT development presents various positive and negative qualities in both circumstances (see Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, forthcoming). The overall positive CTPS of Jamaica is possibly obscured by its arguably skewed trend which gives more comprehensive facilitative support to already established and market ready CTE in Tiers 1 and 2 instead of decisively prioritizing facilitative support to the most underprivileged sectors of society (and CTE) in line with CBT approach. This should be done in order to avoid the production of ‘elite’ CTE (or CBT project) and increasing gap between CTEs and the members associated with them. This is not to say that CTEs in tiers 1 and 2 do not deserve assistance or that the CTPS does not have a facilitative support strategy for CTE in tier 3, but that tiers 3 should receive more and comprehensive assistance if the aim is to assist the most disadvantaged groups in society to better their livelihoods.

Conclusion

This article reviewed the CTPS of Jamaica and correlated the relevant understandings and challenges related to CBT. The aim of the article was to investigate the relationship between relevant CBT characteristics available in the extant CBT literature with the Jamaican CTPS and to discuss its value in relation to community development. The article contributes to understanding the role of government in CBT and how government can proactively approach and direct CBT development. The article argues that while the Jamaican CTPS has numerous positive points and strategies, it seems to tackle these (points and strategies) in arguably reverse priority order of support. That is, priority is not given to the more marginalized and poor CTE, but to already established and ready for market CTE. This state of affairs has the inherent risk of increasing the inequality gap between the rich and poor CTEs and their associated members with potential to develop 'elite' CTEs with the concomitant increase in the gap between the rich and the poor. The article concludes that while the CTPS has numerous strategic development issues which are proposed and assessed, it is the prioritization of the interventions which is warped and possibly mismatching with the CBT fundamental points of providing facilitation to the marginalized and poor members of society in pursuit of social justice as a CBT ambition.

Despite the shortcomings and deviations from the optimal route and approach related to CBT development, Jamaica (together with a few other countries such as Namibia, Colombia, Myanmar), need to be credited for their effort in recognizing the need for a specific CBT strategy. This is still a gravel road but it is an apt recognition of the fact that CBT road has been opened. It is obvious that while facilitation is advocated in this article, it should also be practically implemented to make a positive contribution to CBT development. This because, as already stated '[w]hile the rhetoric suggests that there is much support for CBET [community-based ecotourism] ventures, in practice it is difficult to find good examples of this' (Scheyvens, 2002, p. 72). The need is to avoid the 'implementation gap' between policy and results (Sofield, 2003, p. 191).

It is of utmost importance to continuously review and correct shortcomings and deviations from the approach and goals for alignment with CBT development. It will take time to see the outcome of the Jamaican CTPS on the

ground and further research on this matters will be required to investigate and understand what else matters in contributing to successful CBT development, especially in relation to the benefits which must accrue to the most disadvantaged groups in society (of which is what CBT entails).

References

- Ahebwa, W. M. & van der Duim, R. (2013). Conservation, Livelihoods, and Tourism: A Case Study of the Buhoma-Mukono Community-Based Tourism Project in Uganda. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 31(3), 96-114.
- Aref, F. & Redzuan, M. (2009). Community Leaders' Perceptions toward Tourism Impacts and Level of Community Capacity Building in Tourism Development. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 2(3), 208-213.
- Asker, S., Boronyak, L., Carrard, N. & Paddon, M. (2010). *Effective community based tourism: a best practice manual*. APEC Tourism Working Group. Griffith University: Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre.
- Baktygulov, S. & Raeva, R. (2010). *Creating Value for All: Community-Based Tourism*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.
- Brown, I. (2011). Greater support coming for some community-based tourism projects. *Jamaica Observer*. Available at: http://www.jamaica-observer.com/news/Greater-support-coming-for-some-community-based-tourism-projects_8270434 (15 July 2014).
- Butler, G. (2005). Sustainable communities: the important role of local government in building social capital. 2nd Future of Australia's Country Towns Conference, Bendigo, 11,12,13 July, 2005. Published on-line by the Centre for Sustainable Regional Communities, La Trobe University. Accessed at: <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/csrc/fact2/refereed/butler.pdf> (21 November 2011).
- Calanog, L. A., Reyes, D.P.T. & Eugenio V. F. (2012). *Making Ecotourism Work. A Manual on Establishing Community-based Ecotourism Enterprise (CBEE) in the Philippines*. Philippines office: Japan International Cooperation Agency.

- Commonwealth Secretariat. (2002). *Master Plan for Sustainable Tourism Development*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Denman, R. (2001). *Guidelines for community-based ecotourism development*. Gland: WWF International.
- Dixey, L. M. (2007). *Competing with the best: good practices in community-based tourism in the Caribbean*. St. Michael, Barbados: Caribbean Tourism Organization.
- Dodman, D. (2009). Globalization, tourism and local living conditions on Jamaica's north coast. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 30, 204-219.
- 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.
- France L. (1997). Introduction. *The Earthscan Reader in Sustainable Tourism*. Ed. L. France, Earthscan Publ. Ltd, London: 1-22.
- Gascón, J. (2013). The limitations of community-based tourism as an instrument of development cooperation: the value of the Social Vocation of the Territory concept. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(5), 716-731.
- George, B. P., Nedelea, A. & Antony, M. (2007). The business of community based tourism: a multi-stakeholder approach. *Tourism Issues*, 3, 1-19. Available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1267159> (15 July 2014).
- Giampiccoli, A. & Mtapuri, O. (2012). Community-Based Tourism: An Exploration of the Concept(s) from a Political Perspective. *Tourism Review International* 16(1):29-43.
- Giampiccoli, A. & Mtapuri, O. (Forthcoming). Towards a comprehensive model of community-based tourism. *South African Geographical Journal*.
- Hainsworth, D. (2009). Community Tourism and Broad-based Local Development: The Case of Doi Village, Thua Then province, Vietnam. In Jigang B. A. O. (ed.), *Tourism and community development. Asian Practices*. Madrid: World Tourism organization, 121-134.
- Hamzah, A. & Khalifah, Z. (2009). Handbook on Community Based Tourism "How to Develop and Sustain CBT". Singapore: Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Secretariat.

- Hayle, C. (n.d.). Principles of Community Tourism. Accessed at: <http://www.mona.uwi.edu/jct/aboutct/index.htm> (15 July 2014).
- Höckert, E. (2009). *Sociocultural Sustainability of Rural Community-Based Tourism. Case Study of Local Participation in Fair Trade Coffee Trail, Nicaragua*. Rovaniemi: Lapland University Press.
- Holladay, P. J. & Powell, R. B. (2013). Resident perceptions of social–ecological resilience and the sustainability of community-based tourism development in the Commonwealth of Dominica. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(8), 1188-1211.
- Islam M. W., Rahman, M. M., Iftekhar, M. S. & Rakkibu, M. G. (2013). Can community-based tourism facilitate conservation of the Bangladesh Sundarbans? *Journal of Ecotourism*, 12(2), 119-129.
- Jealous, V. (1998). CBST: The Philippine perspective, criteria & goal for each NGO/PO/Community. In C. T. Urquico (Ed.), *Community based Sustainable Tourism. A handbook*. Quezon City: Accessing Support Service and Entrepreneurial Technology, Inc.
- JTB (Jamaica Tourism Board), (2012). Annual Travel Statistics 2012. Research & Market Intelligence Unit Marketing Department, Jamaica Tourist Board, Kingston, Jamaica.
- Karim, R., Mohammad, F. & Serafino, L. (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 Bangkok, Thailand. July 9-12, 2012*. www.ictlconference.com
- Kennett-Hensel, P. A., Sneath, J. Z. & Hensel, P. J. (2010). Developing sustainable tourism: managers' assessment of Jamaica's ten-year master plan. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4(2), 143-155.
- Kontogeorgopoulos, N., Churyen, A. & Duangsaeng, V. (2014). Tourism Success Factors in Community-Based Tourism in Thailand: The Role of Luck, External Support, and Local Leadership. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 11(1), 106-124.

- Koster, R. L. P. (2007). An evaluation of community-based tourism development: how theory intersects with practice. *Praires Perspective*, 10, 67-88.
- Lecup, I. & Nicholson, K. (2000). Community-based tree and forest product enterprises Market Analysis and Development. *Booklet A. Users' guide to the field manual*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- López-Guzmán, T. Sánchez-Cañizares, S. & Pavón, V. (2011). Community-based tourism in developing countries: a case study. *Tourismos: an international multidisciplinary journal of tourism*, 6(1):69-84.
- López-Guzmán, T., Borges, O., & Hernandez-Merino, M. (2013). Analysis of community-based tourism in Cape Verde. A study on the island of São Vicente. *Anatolia*, 24(2), 129-143.
- Mallya, A. (2006). *Ecotourism and the community participation*. Delhi: Authorspress.
- Manyara, G. & Jones, E. (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.
- MCIT (Ministro de Comercio, Industria y Turismo). (2012). *Lineamientos De Política Para El Desarrollo Del Turismo Comunitario En Colombia*. Ministro de Comercio, Industria y Turismo, Colombia.
- MET (Ministry of Environment And Tourism). (1995) *Promotion of community based tourism*. Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Namibia.
- MHT (Ministry of Hotels and Tourism) (2013). Policy on Community Involvement in Tourism (CIT). Ministry of Hotels and Tourism, Myanmar.
- Mirete Mumm, M & Tuffin W. (2007). The Ahka Experience: the First Community-Based Tourism Public-Private Partnership in the Lao PDR. *Juth Pakai*, 9, 52-66.
- Mitchell, J., & Ashley, C. (2010). *Tourism and poverty reduction: Pathways to prosperity*. Earthscan.
- Mtapuri, O. & Giampiccoli, A. (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.

- MTE (Ministry of Tourism And Entertainment). (2014). Towards a National community tourism Policy & strategy. Green Paper No. 2/14. Prepared by Small Planet Consulting. Ministry of Tourism And Entertainment, Kingston, Jamaica.
- Ndabeni, L & Rogerson, C M. (2005). Entrepreneurship in rural tourism: the challenges of South Africa's Wild Coast. *Africa Insight*, 35(4), 130-141.
- Pantin, D.A. & Francis, J. (2005). Community based sustainable tourism. Annex A, Appendix 3, of the Final Technical Report of project R8325. St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago: UWI-SEDU. 7pp. Available at: http://www.nrsp.org.uk/database/output_view.asp?outputID=2762 (15 July 2014).
- Peredo, A. & Chrisman, J. (2006). Toward a theory of community-based enterprise. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2), 309-328.
- Ramsa, Y. A. & Mohd, A. (2004). Community-based Ecotourism: A New proposition for Sustainable Development and Environmental Conservation in Malaysia. *Journal of Applied Science*, 4(4), 583-589.
- Reid, D. (2003). *Tourism, globalisation and development. Responsible tourism planning*. London: Pluto Press.
- Rogerson C. (2009) Local economic development and and tourism planning in Africa: evidence from route tourism in South Africa. In P. Hottola (ed.), *Tourism strategies and local response in Southern Africa*. Wallingford: CAB International, 27-40.
- Ross, S. & Wall, G. (1999). Ecotourism: towards congruence between theory and practice. *Tourism Management* 20, 123-132.
- Salazar, N. (2012). Community-based cultural tourism: issues, threats and opportunities. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(1), 9-22.
- Scheyvens, R, (1999). *The potential for ecotourism to facilitate the empowerment of local communities in Southern Africa. A summary report using selected case studies*. New Zealand: Massey University.
- Scheyvens, R. (2002). *Tourism for Development Empowering Community*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.

- Sin, H. L. & Minca, C. (2014). Touring responsibility: The trouble with 'going local' in community-based tourism in Thailand. *Geoforum* 51, 96-106.
- SNV - Netherlands Development Organisation and University of Hawaii, School of Travel Industry Management. (2007). A Toolkit for Monitoring and Managing Community-based Tourism. SNV and University of Hawaii.
- Sofield T. (2003). *Empowerment for sustainable tourism development*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Suansri, P. (2003). *Community Based Tourism Handbook*. Bangkok: Responsible Ecological Social Tour (REST).
- Subash, T. (2014). Homestays – An Instrument for Community Based Tourism Development in Kerala. *Tactful Management Research Journal*, 2(7), 1-4.
- Tasci, A, Semrad, K. & Yilmaz, S. (2013). Community based tourism finding the equilibrium in comcec context: Setting the Pathway for the Future. Ankara: COMCEC Coordination Office.
- Tasci, D., Croes, R., & Villanueva, J. (2014). Rise and fall of community-based tourism – facilitators, inhibitors and outcomes. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 6(3), 261-276.
- Taylor, E., Daye, M., Kneafsey, M. & Barrett, H. (2014). Exploring cultural connectedness in the sustainability of rural community tourism development in Jamaica. PASOS. *Revista de Turism y Patrimonio Cultural*, 12(3), 525-538.
- Telfer, D. & Sharpley R. (2008). *Tourism and Development in the Developing World*. London: Routledge.
- Telfer, D. (2009). Development studies and tourism. In Jamal, T. and Robison, M. eds. *The SAGE handbook of tourism studies*. London: SAGE Publications, 146-165.
- TPDCo. (n.d.). Community-Based Tourism Development. Accessed at: <http://www.tpdco.org/dynaweb.dti?dynasection=tourismenhancement&dynapage=commbased> (15 July 2014).
- UNWTO - World Tourism Organisation. (2014). *Tourism Highlights, 2014 Edition*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization (UNWTO).
- Vision 2030. (2009). *Vision 2030 Jamaica. Tourism Sector Plan, 2009-2030*. Tourism Task Force, Government of Jamaica.

- Wearing, S. & McDonald, M. (2002). The Development of Community-based Tourism: Re-thinking the Relationship between Tour Operators and Development Agents as Intermediaries in Rural and Isolated Area Communities. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 10(3), 191-206.
- WTTC (World Travel and Tourism Council). (2012). Jamaica How does Travel & Tourism compare to other sectors? Summary of Findings, April 2012.
- Zapata, M., Hall, C., Lindo, P., and Vanderschaegh, M. (2011). Can community-based tourism contribute to development and poverty alleviation? Lessons from Nicaragua. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(8), 725–749.