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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.
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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 Ashely, 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/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 Ramso 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; Harris, 2009; Honggang et al., 2009; Baktygulov and Raeva, 2010; Zapata et. al., 2011; Giampiccoli and Mtapuri, 2012; Mtpauri 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 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 to-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 CBT 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);
- 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuals/Handbooks</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urquico (1998)</td>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mountain Institute (2000)</td>
<td>This Resource Kit for Community-based Tourism for Conservation and Development serves as a guide for planners and field-based staff to design, implement and manage Community-based Tourism (The Mountain Institute, 2000:i).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denman (2001)</td>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jain and Triraganon (2003)</td>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suansri (2003)</td>
<td>This CBT Handbook communicates the direct experiences of CBT practitioners working in the field, particularly, practitioners and developers of CBT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Häusler and Strasdas (2003)</td>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamzah and Khalifah (2009)</td>
<td>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:v).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asker et al. (2010)</td>
<td>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 et al. 2010:9).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Calanog et al. (2012) | The intended users of this manual are:  
- **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; |

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... |
A 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 and Zapata et al., (2011), CBT 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), 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation typologies</th>
<th>CBT models/typologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen control</td>
<td>Bottom-up CBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of citizen power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-mobilization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Incentives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation by Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Information Giving</td>
<td>CBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conspiracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect Rejection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulative participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonparticipation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Information Giving</td>
<td>CBPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conspiracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community level approach</th>
<th>Participation in decision-making and management</th>
<th>CBT ventures models/types (also from CBT definitions)</th>
<th>Community participation and CBT models (here)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community control/empowerment</td>
<td>Commmunally owned and run enterprises.</td>
<td>CBT... It is managed and owned by the community for the community</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in sharing economic benefits</td>
<td>Parts of the community or families are involved in the project</td>
<td>100% community owned and operated</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/Family level approach</td>
<td>Participation in implementation and operations</td>
<td>Participating individuals selling products to visitors directly or through tourism businesses</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in sharing economic benefits</td>
<td>Parts of the community or families are involved in the project</td>
<td>Community-owned and run enterprises</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family-based Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in planning</td>
<td>Individuals, with links to the broader community, running their own small tourism businesses.</td>
<td>Private tourism businesses (internally or externally owned) concession fee/share of profit</td>
<td>Corporate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private investment (initial stages!)</td>
<td>Joint venture arrangement</td>
<td>The Local Government Unit (LGU)</td>
<td>Bottom-up CBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academe-based.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-government organization (NGO)-Private Sector Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>that delivers net socio-economic benefits to community members [...] this encompass both tourism activities in a community and goods and services supplied to the tourism industry by one or more community members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private Business Private Sector Concessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External control/disempowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down CBT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 specifics 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 (2203:10, 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.
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