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Abstract:

Tourism is simultaneously portrayed as a destroyer of culture, undermining social norms and economies, degrading social structures, stripping communities of individuality; and as a saviour of the poor and disadvantaged, providing opportunities and economic benefits, promoting social exchange and enhancing livelihoods. The aim of this paper is to introduce, define and examine the concept of Community Benefit Tourism Initiatives (CBTIs) and identify the range of characteristics that contribute to creating the best possible scenario for a successful, sustainable and responsible CBTI. The paper considers the roles of key stakeholders in CBTIs: government, the private sector, non-governmental organizations and communities. It seeks to identify the critical components of CBTI development, the potential problems associated with CBTIs and some of their possible solutions.
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1. Introduction

Community participation (which can mean a level of control, ownership or influence) in a tourism initiative appears to be closely linked to the derivation of livelihood and other benefits from the initiative to that same community (Murphy, 1985; Scheyvens, 1999; Tosun, 2005; World Wildlife Fund (WWF), 2001). Murphy's book, *Tourism: A Community Approach* (1985) was a catalyst for discussion in this area and provided an important platform for debate and change at a key stage in the development of the tourism industry. At a time when leisure travel was expanding in terms of both visitor numbers and the amount of more easily accessible destinations, the emphasis on considerations such as local initiative, a tourism product being in accord with the community and local benefits being integrated into the principles of tourism planning and management was refreshing and stimulating (Blank, 1989; Haywood, 1988). A community’s sense of ownership, feeling of responsibility and practical involvement in tourism has since been heralded by researchers and practitioners as central to the sustainability of tourism and of great importance to planners, managers and operators (Boyd & Singh, 2003; Campbell, 1999; Mountain Agenda, 1999; Olsen, 1997; Page & Dowling, 2002; Ross & Wall, 1999; United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), 2004a, 2004b). Murphy’s (1985) publication emphasized the necessity for communities to relate tourism development to local needs and formed the basis for numerous later studies on the various relationships between tourism and communities (Richards & Hall, 2000). Peter and Ann Murphy published a sequel to the 1985 volume in 2004, *Strategic Management for Tourism Communities: Bridging the Gap*, which aimed to build on the success of the first book by advocating a more business-orientated approach to tourism that would encourage greater collaboration between stakeholders. The change in focus of the 2004 book, perhaps reflects Peter Murphy’s move from the discipline of Geography to a Faculty of Business and his subsequent work in that the publication approaches the relationship between tourism and communities from the point of view that communities will be better positioned ‘...if they allow their actions to be guided by key business management principles and adopt a strategic management focus.’

Murphy and Murphy (2004) suggest four functions of business management (planning, organizing, leadership...
and controlling) and present a combined business management and collaborative planning model for tourism development. They argue that by adopting the business principles outlined in the book communities will be better placed to develop tourism potential and benefit in the global marketplace. The publication provoked strong reactions and stimulated a significant exchange of views (Murphy, 2007; Prentice, 2007). Prentice (2007) went as far as suggesting that the book was contradictory and uncritical in its presentation of the four functions, and that the model presented for ‘bridging stakeholder gaps’ needed more application and thorough testing before it could be claimed to be a paradigm. Murphy (2007) responded by reasserting that the four key business management functions presented in the book are an artificial division of what should be regarded as a continuous management process. Furthermore, he provided a clarification of the synergies that exist between regular business and community tourism management and that there were four case studies examining the model and its major component parts, ‘bringing depth, reality and credibility to the text’.

Regardless of the strengths and/or weaknesses of Murphy and Murphy’s book (2004), clearly the debates surrounding the relationships between tourism, communities and development have evolved significantly since 1985 and now incorporate the examination of a range of topics such as typologies of participation, development and planning paradigms, tourism management practices, impacts and changes to livelihood assets, the role of stakeholders, and tourism initiative ownership structures (Ashley, 2000; Beeton, 2006; Hall, 2003; Hawkins & Mann, 2007; Mbaia, 2005; Prentice, 1993; Pretty, 1995; Ryan, 2002; Simmons, 1994; Tosun, 2006). The issues relating to the strengthening of communities and their livelihoods through tourism are important and require further analysis; for example, how essential is community participation, ownership or control to the delivery of benefits to the community from a tourism initiative? and what role do other stakeholders play in enhancing and conveying benefits to the community? This paper introduces and examines the concept of Community Benefit Tourism Initiatives (CBTIs) to explore and address these issues.

There are fundamental differences between a CBTI and other types of tourism; one of a CBTI’s defining principles is the transfer of benefits to a community regardless of location, instigation, size, level of wealth, involvement, ownership or control. For example the interpretation and definitions of community ‘based’ tourism centre on the question of ownership, management and/or control of tourism projects (Lea, 1988; Scheyvens, 1999; Suansri, 2003; World Wildlife Fund (WWF), 2001). This is not the case for a CBTI; to distribute benefits to a community, the tourism initiative need not always involve the community in any rights, tenure or control of the project (Ahmad, 2001; Kontogeorgopoulos, 2005; Li, 2006; Nelson, 2000). Ideally, community participation, control or a level of ownership should be aimed for, if only to ensure delivery of the appropriate proportion and type of benefits to the relevant community (Midgley, 1986; Scheyvens, 2002; Tosun & Timothy, 2003; Tosun, 2005). However, involvement of the community may not only prove difficult but may also cause problems in achieving the goal of benefit delivery, aggravating and creating internal conflicts and jealousies, and creating unrealistic expectations (Blackstock, 2005; Murphy, 2003; Tosun, 2000; Weaver, 1998).

Where CBTIs occur they may or may not draw on elements and characteristics of other types of tourism such as Pro-Poor Tourism (PPT) (Ashley, Boyd, & Goodwin, 2000) and Ecotourism (Goodwin, 1996; Page & Dowling, 2002), but CBTI’s aims and objectives lie in the end result for the community. The concept of CBTIs is only similar to the concepts of PPT and community ‘based’ tourism in that a CBTI focuses on delivering livelihood and other benefits as a result of a tourism enterprise. For example, CBTIs are significantly different from PPT in many ways: a CBTI is not exclusive and does not have a narrow focus (i.e. poverty alleviation); CBTIs are concerned with an identified community not just the poor and make no value judgments about who the poor are; CBTIs consider the wider socio-economic context and are designed to convey benefits to the community as a whole not just to a predefined section of society. Whereas PPT predominantly occurs in developing countries or regions such as sub-saharan Africa, CBTIs are appropriate in any country or any region in the world whether it is in the northern or the southern hemisphere.

In addition, the concept of CBTIs and its principles are highly relevant to the management and operation of all tourism initiatives as they emphasize the role of tourism stakeholders (e.g. industry, governments and non-governmental organizations (NGOs)) in managing tourism in its many forms and they take account of, and addresses the needs of communities in all situations and in all environments. In many situations, it may not be sufficient or effective for key tourism stakeholders to consider only particular segments of society such as the poor: tourism can be of benefit to communities at large in all settings and should be considered, where appropriate, in this wider perspective.

Moreover the concept of a CBTI, by stressing that it is not essential for a community to be directly involved in tourism management or ownership, gives governments, industry and NGOs the latitude and potential to be able to design and deliver benefits to a community without the ‘baggage’ that can come with community involvement in the decision-making processes. Due to reasons such as management expediency, financial control, legal constraints and simplicity of operation some tourism investors, operators and industry stakeholders may be wary, concerned or even fearful of including a community and its representatives as shareholders or decision makers in a tourism initiative. This apprehension may deter a potentially benevolent tourism stakeholder from directly or
indirectly contributing to the community. Armed with the knowledge and principles of CBTIs stakeholders may be more willing to embrace the activities that can ensure the delivery of appropriate and proportionate benefits to the community. In some cases key stakeholders may not have the skills, the time or the inclination to involve a community in the initiative. Nevertheless, if the community has no involvement in the initiative it does not mean that the community will not benefit.

A primary concern of a CBTI is the action of conveying net livelihood and economic, social and/or environmental benefits to communities and their members’ in a responsible and sustainable manner. These benefits can be said to fall into four broad categories; economic, environmental, socio-cultural and the building of skills and influence (Table 1). These categories are not mutually exclusive and despite the categorizations the benefits and their ‘on-flows’ cross the established boundaries.

The inclusion and involvement of communities in the ownership or planning of a tourism initiative, whilst perhaps building greater appreciation and understanding of the people, their needs and culture, associations with overall sustainability and making the delivery of benefits more likely certainly does not guarantee tangible livelihood and economic gains to the community. Nor is active local participation in a tourism initiative a precondition for benefits reaching communities and local employment and other benefits are at times secured at the expense of local initiation and control (Ahmad, 2001; Dwyer & Edwards, 2000; Kontogeorgopoulos, 2005; Li, 2006; Nelson, 2000). In fact, the result of focusing primarily on institutional structure and community involvement may create complacency on the part of the community and other partners involved in the governance of the initiative including government agencies, the private sector and NGOs. This collective comfort zone created by participation of the community in the processes of the tourism initiative detracts from the most important factor of the community receiving benefits valuable to them collectively and individually.

Potential problems can occur where communities are heavily involved in tourism initiatives. Communities may become subject to external pressures, issues of governance and structure, conflicting stakeholder agendas, jealousies and internal power struggles, and the growth of artificial hierarchies and elites may occur, diminishing or undermining potential benefits to the community (Blackstock, 2005; Kontogeorgopoulos, 2005; Swarbrooke, 1999; Taylor, 1995; Wylie, 1998). Despite this, community involvement in the conceptualization, development, start-up, functioning and day-to-day management of a tourism enterprise will assist the stakeholders (including the community), partners and potential benefactors to identify, understand, appreciate and focus on those areas that are most likely to deliver net benefits to the community (Scheyvens, 2002; Tosun, 2005; Tosun & Timothy, 2003).

Participation of a community in the planning and operational aspects of an initiative or within ownership structures should not be overlooked and communication between all stakeholders is important but these objectives must not be allowed to overshadow or denigrate the goal of benefit conveyance. It should be recognized that a tourism initiative that does not have community ownership or control can also effectively deliver benefits to the community (Ahmad, 2001; Kontogeorgopoulos, 2005; Li, 2006; Murphy, 2003; Nelson, 2000). When the community has little or no involvement in the planning and operation of a tourism initiative, the community may still receive meaningful benefits, as Li (2006) has demonstrated in relation to the Jiuzhaigou Biosphere Reserve of China.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive characteristics and the benefits of CBTIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct employment opportunities (including, administration, guiding, tours and transport, construction, hospitality, management, accommodation shopping, food and beverage outlets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Indirect employment opportunities (including, environmental management, entrepreneurs, other secondary industries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supports the development of multi-sector or mono-sector non-profit enterprises (benefiting/controlled or strongly influenced by communities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides invigoration and development to local economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides alternatives to changing or fading traditional industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increases land values, and thus rates payable to council for community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improves environment (changes in subsistence leading to less degradation of natural resources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourages awareness and appreciation by the community of natural assets and the environment and other resources on which tourism relies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhances management and stewardship of natural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-cultural</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides and stimulates infrastructure development (roads, communications, healthcare, education, public transport, access to drinking water and food supplies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increases safety and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitates workforce development (e.g. rights and conditions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fosters civic pride (in community, culture, heritage, natural resources and infrastructure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mutually beneficial (to all stakeholders in the community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creates opportunities (broadening of idea horizons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotes cultural understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preserves cultural and social heritage and local languages or dialects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supports and preserves local and unique crafts and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creates a sense of well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotes greater cross-institutional understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appreciation of cross-stakeholder goals and agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building of skills and influence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Influencing and enforcing government policy (national, regional and local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Skills enhancement (training; such as administrative, service industry, maintenance, guiding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building capacity collectively and individually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fosters empowerment: gender and community; social, financial, political and psychological</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Some examples of community benefit tourism initiatives

The Jiuzhaigou Biosphere Reserve is a UNESCO World Heritage site and is situated in a valley in the Sichuan province of China. The reserve is rich in natural assets; many plant species exist along with a wide variety of vertebrate species, amphibians, birds and other high levels of biodiversity. There are a multitude of snow-topped peaks while the valley contains waterfalls, colourful primary forests and glaciers. The attractiveness of the rivers and lakes in the area is enhanced by their unique sedimentary geomorphology. The area also benefits from a rich traditional culture that is primarily due to the Tibetans who account for over 80% of the population. In the study, the levels of community participation in tourism development were assessed using questionnaires and the tourism development benefits received by the local community were also assessed using the same household survey. Li (2006) found that whilst there was minimal community involvement in the planning process almost the entire community resident within the reserve had received economic benefits from tourism in a variety of ways; direct employment in the tourism industry, small business ownership or employment in related jobs. Additionally, the survey showed that the community also believed that they had benefited from tourism through an improvement in their natural environment. Li concluded that this improvement had come about as a result of the replacement of traditional means of subsistence farming (causing soil and water loss) and hunting (reducing wildlife populations) with tourism.

Kontogeorgopoulos (2005) argues that community-based ecotourism in South East Thailand is only partially successful and that it requires a number of quid pro quos, amongst which the relinquishing of community power and project instigation is crucial. Kontogeorgopoulos’ study explores the trade-offs that are necessary to provide benefits to communities and one of the key issues highlighted is the derivation of local employment and other benefits at the expense of local initiation and control. Using Thailand’s oldest eco-tourism company, Sea Canoe, as a case study Kontogeorgopoulos illustrates that the company employs between 45 and 60 local people (depending on the season) and pays them well above the national average, diluting the seasonality factor common to tourism-related employment by paying its staff a guaranteed salary every month regardless of how many days (beyond a minimum of 10) are worked. In addition, the company provides health benefits by offering life insurance, disability allowances and full medical coverage, and educational benefits through training in several areas including instruction in non-English languages, guide training, formal classroom and informal on-the-job instruction on the natural history, geology, flora and fauna of southern Thailand. Not only do individuals and their families benefit directly from the tourism initiative but Sea Canoe also contributes to the communities in Phuket and neighbouring provinces by spending over 98% of its costs in these regions through payments to owners of escort boats and transport vans, food purchases and advertising payments to local outlets.

Kontogeorgopoulos states that due to the cultural, social and political circumstances of southern Thailand this type of tourism would not have flourished without ownership and control being in the hands of foreign expatriates, known as Farangs, the Thai word for foreigners of European descent. The Farangs instigated much of the tourism in the area and in the main were tourists themselves originally. For Phuket and the surrounding area these foreigners have been essential to the provision of opportunities and benefits to individuals and communities. They are well placed to provide the appropriate experiences to tourists addressing needs, expectations and tastes. Kontogeorgopoulos emphasizes that the Farangs are also better placed to ensure sustainable, responsible tourism avoiding undermining cultural and national issues to which local people would have been more susceptible to such as mafia intimidation, corruption and illegal and unethical operational practices.

Tourism initiatives in the form of two lodges in the Brazilian Amazon have delivered benefits to communities despite the community having no level of ownership or control nor playing any role in planning or decision making. Ariau Amazon Towers and Acajatuba Jungle Lodge are considered to be nature-based lodges they are located in forested areas, have observation towers and the activities conducted from the lodges are carried out in the forest, and on the nearby rivers. They are not considered to be ecotourism operations; however, as they are lacking in their contributions towards conservation, interpretation and community participation (Nelson, 2000). The community of Nossa Senhora de Perpétuo Socorro, with a population of 167, is the largest of five communities located on Acajatuba Lake and receiving tourists twice daily, of groups between 2 and 30 people, is the most frequently visited. Nelson records that the community receive direct economic benefits from sales of handicrafts, food and drinks and also from donations to the health clinic, an earlier study in the area conducted as part of a state survey, SUDAM (1999), showed that the majority of tourists purchased something in the community. On occasion the community also provides guides, for Portuguese speaking tourists only, and the lodges provide employment all be it in unskilled labour positions which are generally low paid, seasonal and short term (Nelson, 2000). In addition, Nelson states that Ariau Amazon Towers sells community handicrafts in the souvenir shop, that both lodges provide diesel fuel to the community and provide transportation and assistance in emergencies. Residents are paid to supply lumber for expansion and restoration of the lodges, although this particular benefit may be considered short-term financial gain but long-term loss in terms of the natural assets of the area.

Some tourism revenue-sharing schemes (TRS) provide examples of benefits from tourism initiatives being
transferred to communities without the community having ownership or control in the tourism initiative. TRS schemes predominantly occur around national parks and protected areas and they centre on development and conservation objectives (Ormsby & Mannle, 2006). TRS schemes aim to deliver economic benefits to the community in terms of a portion of tourism revenue, which is often designed to assist in the building of infrastructure affecting livelihoods such as schools, health clinics and roads, and they aim to engender positive perceptions of conservation and foster pride in the natural environment (Archabald & Naughton-Treves, 2001). While dealing with serious challenges such as the off-set of park creation costs and compensation to farmers losing crops to wildlife TRS has successfully delivered benefits to communities around a number of national parks in different countries including Uganda (Adams & Infeld, 2003; Archabald & Naughton-Treves, 2001), Madagascar (Ormsby & Mannle, 2006) and Rwanda (Rwandan Office of Tourism and National Parks (ORTPN), 2006).

In the case of the Iban and the Dusun communities in Brunei, the results of Ahmad’s (2001) research reveal that ecotourism at two national parks in the Brunei hinterland has been beneficial to the indigenous communities that live in the parks without the involvement of either community. Members of the community have jobs in constructing and maintaining park facilities, as nature guides and as research and survey assistants. They have secured businesses in selling food and souvenirs and providing transport. The communities have also gained markets for local products and benefits from improved roads, electricity and water supplies. The communities have also shared their knowledge with tourists and visiting researchers, stimulating greater awareness and appreciation of their natural and cultural heritage. Ahmad states that this has been achieved without any ownership or control over the tourism initiatives and without the participation of the communities in planning and decision-making processes.

Tourism provides challenges for communities all around the world. When considering a tourism initiative conjoined with a community often the initial reaction of commentators is to conjure up a mental image of a rural environment in a developing country, a small island state or some other far-flung outpost (Mader, n.d.). However tourism’s relationship and its interactions with community are equally relevant and acute in developed countries and urban environments. Over recent years, post-industrial cities in the northern hemisphere and rural areas in developed countries have been experiencing intense economic and social change. Traditional industries have declined and more and more regional governments and authorities have turned to tourism to provide stimulus for regenerative growth and benefits for their communities. This is clearly illustrated by a recent initiative in rural Kent, South East England.

In 2005, the East Kent Partnership commissioned a feasibility study into the development of an East Kent Natural Park (East Kent Partnership, 2005). The study brief required the project team to explore ways in which the natural and built heritage in rural areas of East Kent could have an increased role in the regeneration of the region by developing products to grow the rural tourism market in the area. The consulting project team investigated opportunities for rural tourism development in East Kent and in the process embraced the over-arching principles of ecotourism including that of delivering “…net benefits to local communities, livelihoods and socio-economies sufficient for local residents to value the natural, cultural and historical resources within which they live.” The study formulated and articulated a vision for the East Kent Natural Park: “The enhancement of the rural East Kent environment and the quality of life of communities”. This vision was to be fulfilled by the creation of two geographical areas: a Regeneration Area to include rural tourism development and a marketing area, where rural tourism could deliver significant economic benefits. A Conservation Gain Area which would consist of a wetland creation area. The creation of these two areas would realize the initiative’s vision through: enhanced conservation and environmental improvement; creation of a stronger rural economy and community; increased opportunities for access to the countryside; and promotion of healthy living and improved quality of life for local communities.

The East Kent initiative is an example of a CBTI in the conceptualization and planning phases. The delivery of the project’s vision specifically aims to produce benefits for the community. It aims to “…add value to the local environment, generate meaningful contributions to the local economy and enhance the livelihoods, quality of life and well-being of local communities.” Community ownership or control is neither the priority nor a requirement within this initiative; benefits to the community are of overriding importance.

In Campbelltown, an outer suburb of Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, the local government has sought to solve the problems of urban growth, the conservation of natural resources and at the same time deliver benefits to the local community (Dwyer & Edwards, 2000). The area is 1 h by car or train from Sydney’s Central Business District and has a wealth of natural resources and sites of historical significance. According to Dwyer and Edwards the natural assets of the region; rivers, gorges, bush and landscapes provide the key reasons for tourism in the area. Activities there include camping, bush walking, boating, gliding, rock climbing and horse riding which draw day-trippers and short breakers. Dwyer and Edwards identify and analyse five different types of tourists and highlight the appeal of Campbelltown’s natural assets to different markets. The existing tourism coupled with potential new products offers a range of benefits to the local community including the long-term protection of the natural area. This case study highlights the benefits to the community of local government achieving the correct balance between a tourism initiative, conservation and urban growth without involving
ownership or control by the community. The benefits in this case include: environmental advocacy; integrated resource use; employment in the tourism industry; sourcing of tourism-related goods and services locally and; enhanced linkages between tourism and other local industries. Dwyer and Edwards also identify intercultural appreciation as a benefit to the local community; leading to, among other benefits, the preservation of the historical identity of the region, the retention of the rural character of the region, and the restoration of significant heritage sites and buildings.

Dwyer and Edwards emphasize the importance of bringing together the goals of economic growth, conservation of natural resources and the well-being of the local community. They stress the need for local governments to conduct long-term sustainability planning and put in place effective management strategies that takes account for all forms of resource use.

3. Key stakeholders and their roles in community benefit tourism initiatives

In 1992 at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janiero, it was recognized that the tourism industry could contribute towards development of the community (United Nations, 1992, 1997). Recognition and expansion of this theme has been taken up by organizations including the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Tourism Concern, the Eco-Tourism Society, the Association of Caribbean States, Fair Trade in Tourism South Africa, and by researchers and commentators (Ashley, 2000; Ashley & Jones, 2001; Mowforth & Munt, 1998; Scheyvens, 2002; Shah & Gupta, 2000; Sharples & Telfer, 2002; Singh, Timothy, & Dowling, 2003).

Whether the tourism initiative is located in a developed or a developing country it is argued that the involvement of communities and a significant level of community participation at all stages in the initiative gives stakeholders a better chance to have an influence in shaping community development and to deliver the maximum benefits; it is also argued that community involvement is crucial to the sustainable development of tourism (Campbell, 1999, 2002; Jones, 2005; Murphy, 1985, 1988; Olsen, 1997; Ross & Wall, 1999; Scheyvens, 1999).

Whilst there are various types of community participation in the tourism development process (Arnstein, 1971; Pretty, 1995; Tosun, 2000) and the level and types of resulting benefits may depend on the kinds of participation that take place, community involvement alone is not enough (Ahmad, 2001; Blackstock, 2005; Kontogeorgopoulos, 2005; Li, 2004, 2006) and does not ensure the delivery of benefits. Interaction and communication with the private sector; including investors, developers, planners and managers from outside the community would also seem to be critical to the success of any CBTI (Belsky, 1999; Murphy, 2003; Wearing & MacDonald, 2002). Other key stakeholder groups whose views, opinions and involvement are required at varying levels depending on the nature of the initiative include: the public sector; made up of groups such as national park authorities, national and regional tourism organizations, national, regional and local government agencies (including those with a secondary interest such as health, planning and transport); NGOs including charitable bodies, pressure groups, specific interest groups and conservation groups and; tourists' representative bodies (UNWTO, 2004a, 2004b). Ideally, where feasible, all stakeholders need to be involved at all stages of the development of a CBTI to heighten levels of understanding and appreciation, to enhance the sustainability of the CBTI and the successful delivery of long-term benefits to the community (Masberg & Morales, 1999; Parker, 1999; Yuksel, Bramwell, & Yuksel, 1999).

3.1. The role of governments and their agencies

In developed and developing countries the majority of government agencies around the world have historically, for the most part, taken a back seat in tourism development, seemingly happy to allow the private sector to drive forward the industry in their countries and regions. They have been equally happy to collect taxes from successful operations, providing little or no assistance to struggling initiatives. As a result, benefits derived by communities from tourism have in the past been created and received more by accident than design or in a few cases have been engineered by the more philanthropically minded private tourism businesses or NGOs (Ashley, 1998; Poultney & Spenceley, 2001).

More recently, a range of factors have contributed to government agencies taking greater interest, committing funds and time to collaborative projects and playing a crucial role in the planning, development and management of tourism initiatives. The factors that have help to bring about this step change in governments' approach include: the awareness of the importance of tourism as a global, national and regional socio-economic engine; the potential for tourism to contribute to environmental management and enhancement; the profile of tourism as a tool for international development and regeneration; increased lobbying by industry, NGOs and tourism organizations; and major attitude- and behaviour-changing events such as the "9/11" terrorist attacks (which affected international tourism around the world); foot and mouth disease in the UK in 2001; the collapse of Ansett Airlines in Australia in 2001; and the South East Asian tsunami in 2004.

Governments are now more motivated to play an integral and collaborative role in tourism planning and management and the private sector requires government assistance to ensure the sustainability of tourism. Sustainability issues affecting tourism must be high on the agenda of governments as government agencies have control over a wide range of features that affect the maximization of benefits tourism can deliver to communities. Government
has the ability to influence profoundly the positive and negative socio-economic and environmental effects of tourism. Land-use planning and land management, labour and environmental regulations, skills training and capacity building, the provision of essential infrastructure and social and environmental services including health, safety, waste disposal, energy supply and water provision are all vital components in determining the type and level of benefits derived by communities. The international tourism industry is made up of largely small to medium enterprises (SMEs) and Governments are also able to support tourism through marketing, information services, education, advice (promotional, financial and operational) and through public–private collaborations (Hall, 1999; UNWTO, 1998, 2005).

To achieve communities’ multiple livelihood objectives (Table 1) it is essential that tourism issues should be integrated into all levels of policy (local, regional and national). Government need to remove constraints, create opportunities and foster supportive attitudes throughout all relevant government agencies. Furthermore, policies and legislation should be developed that enable the local people to play a major role in determining their own benefits from tourism. Communities need to be seen as suitable partners of the private sector and governments in tourism development initiatives and governments should also be open to support and collaboration with NGOs (Kalisch, 2001; Yaman & Mohd, 2004). The Declaration from the inaugural Responsible Tourism in Destinations conference in Cape Town (Declaration on Responsible Tourism, Cape Town, & South Africa, 2002) emphasized the importance and responsibility of local authorities in providing benefits for both communities and tourists:

Local authorities have a central role to play in achieving responsible tourism through commitment to supportive policy frameworks and adequate funding. We call upon local authorities and tourism administrations to develop—through multi-stakeholder processes—destination management strategies and responsible tourism guidelines to create better places for host communities and the tourists who visit.

A good example of a government international development agency, a government department and a community working together is the small Suba fishing community (around 100 families) on Olango Island in the Philippines. Fish stocks had been dwindling and fishermen had resorted to dynamite fishing (which was destroying the coral reefs) and cyanide fishing to assure a more adequate catch (United States Agency for International Development (USAID), 2000) Alternatives for earning an income were becoming fewer. The village was without drinking water, electricity, toilet facilities and health services. Average family income was a little over US $1 a day. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) funded the Philippine Department of the Environment and Natural Resources’ Coastal Resource Management Project (CRMP) to conduct a series of workshops for community members recognizing the communities’ objective to create a tourism initiative from the region’s migratory bird flyway. The tourism initiative was launched in 1998 and the community cooperative took over administration of the tour operation and formalized collective ownership of the business in 1999. The Olango Birds and Seascape Tour is now managed by 55 cooperating community families, CRMP continued to provide support until 2000; organizing the community members, installing and implementing operating and financial systems, providing on the job training and marketing support (Kalisch, 2001; USAID, 2000).

3.2. The role of non-governmental organizations

NGOs have numerous positive roles to play in the delivery of benefits to communities through tourism initiatives; these roles range from investment and equity holding in projects to capacity building, advocacy, campaigning and consultancy (Kalisch, 2001). The inclusion of NGOs as one of many stakeholders in the processes and management of tourism initiatives can bring about more sustainable and prolonged benefits to communities (Jamal & Getz, 1995; Murphy, 1998).

NGOs have a vital role to play in building civil accountability, consultancy, providing full-spectrum alliances (increasing networking, resource sharing and ‘deep engagement’) (Jepson, 2005). In addition they may take responsibility for conducting important research, providing funds for consultants, taking up equity, building capacity within the community and triggering skills transfer opportunities. It is often the case that the roles of NGOs and governments in providing benefits for communities overlap, for example when considering capacity building and skills transfer both stakeholders can and should contribute, working together to ensure the best outcome for the individuals and community as a whole (see Fig. 1).

An example of government agencies collaborating with an NGO and communities and addressing issues of regulations and policy to facilitate benefits to the communities through tourism is illustrated in the Trophy Hunting Project in Bar Valley, Pakistan (Yaman & Mohd, 2004). Local and federal rulings which banned hunting were relaxed and permits for ibex hunting were issued to allow visiting hunt tourists. The three village communities in the Bar Valley receive revenue collected from natural resource conservation (provided by government agencies until the project generates its own income) and the revenue generated from the trophy hunting is shared between the communities and the government (75% and 25% respectively). The initiative is managed by a committee consisting of representatives of the three villages comprising of five hunters and five non-hunters. The project was technically and financially supported by the World Wildlife Fund.
The potential for negative effects and zero benefits, however, also lies in misguided and ill-judged collaboration between stakeholders, and conflicts between different stakeholders and their sometimes contradictory agendas and are not uncommon (Hall, 1999; Kalisch, 2001; Li, 2004). NGOs have often been criticized when involved in tourism initiatives for their lack of transparency, lack of commitment and excessive focus on self-promotion. (Mader, n.d.)

Participants in ‘NGOs in Tourism and Conservation Conference’ discussed the pros and cons of the NGOs work in the field. According to Planeta.com there was a lot of frustration with the NGOs’ lack of transparency, and, perhaps worse, lack of commitment. Planeta.com’s online event which took place in October and November 2002 was co-sponsored by ECOCLUB-com, the International Centre for Ecotourism Research, the Latin America Bureau, Mexicanwave, the Rainforest Alliance, Sustainable Sources and Travelmole. One comment that seemed to capture the mood was:

Furthering ecotourism development seemed to be a tangential goal at best. Fund-raising and cultivating donors were the main objectives (Mader, n.d.)

There has also been concern about the role that NGOs can play in determining product quality requirements, the socio-economic realities of the community and a lack of industry knowledge and marketability (Ashton, 2001). At times the experience gained by NGOs in this area has been at the expense of community-focused tourism projects; Mader (n.d.) cites from the on-line NGO conference in 2002 on planeta.com that at least three such projects failed in two years. On the other hand in recent years international NGOs have been building up knowledge and experience in the setting up and operation of tourism initiatives designed to deliver benefits to communities; WWF, Farm Africa, Oxfam, CAA Australia and IFAT

| GOVERNMENTS  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(National, Regional and Local)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour and environmental regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use planning and land management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Frameworks and legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of essential infrastructure inc. roads and communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information services and professional advice; promotional financial and operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of social and environmental services inc. health, education, safety, waste disposal, energy and water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing ‘bottom-up’ processes; assisting access and communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building civil accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NON GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(International, National and Local)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full spectrum alliances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills training and capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding, incentives, investment and equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative tourism initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and training from global practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting ethical trade and corporate accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Potential roles of government and non-governmental organizations in determining the type and the levels of benefits derived by communities as a result of tourism initiatives.
have all not only embarked on capacity-building support and community development initiatives involving tourism but have actually taken equity and invested in CBTIs (Kalisch 2001). Many more NGOs including the Tearfund, ACTSA, Friends of Conservation, the International Alliance of Indigenous Peoples, Survival and Voluntary Service Overseas have also been involved in research, advocacy and campaigning for tourism-related projects.

3.3. The role of the private sector

In 2002 through the Declaration developed at the inaugural conference on Responsible Tourism in Cape Town, South Africa, the delegates stated:

We call upon tourism enterprises and trade associations in originating markets and in destinations to adopt a responsible approach, to commit to specific responsible practices, and to report progress in a transparent and auditable way, and where appropriate to use this for market advantage. Corporate businesses can assist by providing markets, capacity building, mentoring and micro-financing support for small, medium and micro enterprises.

This statement illustrates some of the various roles the private sector can play in providing benefits to communities as a result of tourism initiatives. The private sector seems to recognize the issues of sustainability, and to recognize the importance of the community as a stakeholder in the paradigm of successful tourism, with the more aware operators and investors understanding something about the needs and requirements of the community (Schevvens, 2002; Swarbrooke, 1999; UNWTO, 2005). The private sector is more sensitive to the market than any other stakeholder; this is of course not surprising as private sector stakeholders are interested in financial stability, remuneration and economic sustainability. The support and cooperation of the local community is frequently integral to those objectives and the path by which to achieve commercial and economic goals may often involve the preservation of essential natural assets, fundamental to the tourism product, and the maintenance of good positioning, product quality requirements, operations and cooperation of the local community is frequently limited by their geographical location (decision makers located far from the tourism destination), their lack of time and lack of interest in local communities, and in the communities’ needs and requirements (Swarbrooke, 1999; Timothy, 2002; Timothy & Ioannides, 2002). Smaller enterprises may, notionally, have the ability, interest and spatial positioning to be more sensitive to community needs and objectives; however, they also have constraints in terms of their focus on short-term survival and a lack of resources (time, labour and finance).

Currently there seems to be a growing interest, understanding and appreciation within the industry of the importance of supporting communities, assisting in their development and maintaining their individuality; a range of industry associations, product distributors and private sector initiatives now exist that include community priorities amongst their objectives, such as: Association of Independent Tour Operators (AITO); repsonibletravel.-com; the Travel Foundation; the Federation of Tour Operators; TUI’s Environmental Unit, Thomson Holiday Code). These developments seem in some part to have been encouraged by the growth in eco-tourism, nature tourism, adventure tourism, cultural tourism and other related niche segments around the world (UNWTO, 2004a, 2004b). Other influences on the private sector’s changing stance include pressure from NGOs (such as WWF and Tourism Concern) and industry bodies such as the UNWTO (Global Code of Ethics). The potential roles available to the private sector and the tourism industry in the delivery of benefits to communities are now also better known (see Fig. 2) and ‘responsible’ tourism has become the vogue. In essence a combination of conscience, pressure (legislative and lobbyist), necessity and a desire for capturing a maturing and growing market seems to have resulted in more of the private sector’s attention being focused on communities, their needs and the impacts of tourism on their livelihoods.

The private sector may be best placed to identify opportunities, realize the potential of a destination, drive
forward the development of product and adopt a range of highly effective responsibilities to communities. The facilitation of the transfer of benefits, though, also lies with government. Governments have a responsibility to foster and establish an enabling environment for the delivery of benefits to communities in order to minimize risk to communities and encourage investment. In addition, where appropriate, a milieu may be created by government agencies that will allow the development of fair and equitable partnerships between local communities and private operators.

Consultation, coordination, partnership and collaboration between the public sector, the private sector and communities may lead to cosy feelings of inclusiveness, but what is actually happening in the process? Who is involved and who is left out of decision making? (Hall, 1999) Is the community really benefiting from the end result of the tourism initiative and if not why not? Are benefits being measured and monitored? These questions are relevant to all stakeholders and ought not to be asked only by communities but by all collaborators in the tourism initiative. Checks and balances should be established in order to ensure transparency, inclusiveness and enable a meaningful and robust monitoring system. After monitoring, thorough evaluation must take place followed by a decision-making procedure to refine and enhance the processes by which benefits are to be derived by the community.

4. Problems and solutions for CBTIs

Change generated by tourism is multifaceted. Tourism initiatives do possess the potential to bring benefits to communities (Ashley, Roe, & Goodwin, 2001; Mowforth & Munt, 1998; Murphy, 1985). The same enterprises can also present problems within a community, threaten its stability and harmony, and trigger a range of other factors which menace the economic, environmental and socio-cultural
sustainability of the community (Butler & Hinch, 1996; Fagence, 2003; Krippendorf, 1987; Swarbrooke, 1999; Young, 1973).

Negative impacts and adverse change as a result of community benefit tourism can take many forms and manifest themselves through social, economic, environmental and/or political factors (MacLeod, 2004). Attitudes and actions of controlling stakeholders can be interpreted as neo-colonialism; other negative impacts include environmental degradation, destruction of traditional social structures, alteration of local identity, beliefs, values and politics, adverse shifts in power, the growth of unwanted secondary industries and other sectors, the instigation of negative attitudes to the environment, the world, foreigners and women, and the commencement of unknown and potentially detrimental business and employment structures (MacLeod, 2004). A selection of these and other problems associated with CBTTs are illustrated in Table 3 along with possible solutions to the problems.

Should a tourism initiative start to deliver benefits to a community, these very benefits may generate problems; jealousies can be created concerning wealth and assets and conflicts of territory both within a community and between communities. A community rarely acts as a single unified entity and seldom speaks with one voice, and when a community becomes involved in a tourism initiative internal division may occur as a result (Belsky, 1999; Swarbrooke, 1999). These divisions foster potentially destructive individual viewpoints and specific interest groups, and lead professionals to over-value their own abilities and importance and under-value those of the community, sometimes leading to the creation of possessive hierarchies or elites. These factors may serve to create a silent majority undermining the initiative’s ability to deliver effective benefits to the community at large. These conflicts inevitably tend to draw in other stakeholders and partners and disrupt the operation of an initiative, particularly when employees are drawn from the warring community (Taylor, 1995; Wyllie, 1998). To address these problems, processes such as structured and regular communication channels and participatory approaches could be put into place to ensure that the views and opinions of the community are elicited and taken into account. These processes can also contribute to the cultivation of greater understanding and appreciation of the community by other stakeholders.

Power, both relative and absolute, is an enormous issue for communities involved in and affected by tourism initiatives (Hall, 2003; Scheyvens, 2002). Considering the number of actors potentially involved and collaborating in a CBTT, this comes as no surprise but understanding the issues does not make overcoming the problems associated with politics and power struggles and the exercising of power any easier (Belsky, 1999; Hall, 1999). Day-to-day struggles exist within the community itself concerned with establishing and re-establishing hierarchies, decision makers and the recipients of benefits. The power wielded by national, regional and local government can be exercised deliberately or unknowingly to over-rule community decisions and priorities. Governments may also make decisions and decide policy that can adversely affect potential benefits that the community might receive from the tourism initiative. The balancing of power between stakeholders’ will be difficult to achieve, however, using communication mechanisms, implementing awareness raising campaigns and attempting to involve all stakeholders at all stages of the development and operation of the tourism initiative are possible ways to nullify some of the potential problems (Beeton, 2006; Li, 2004; Scheyvens, 2002; Swarbrooke, 1999). The various powers and influences of stakeholders, collaborators, partners, competitors and external organizations such as NGOs, tourism associations, along with other sectors and industries affects the tourism initiative and hence the community (Shah & Gupta, 2000). In addition to these quite tangible effects, there is also the more nebulous power of the market and the tourism industry to take into account (Li, 2004; Scheyvens, 2002; Swarbrooke, 1999). Another set of stakeholders who hold power and influence are key property owners and decision makers on land who may live outside the local area. As a result, they may not fully understand or care about local needs or concerns and the decisions they make from their position of power could therefore be at odds with the needs and desires of the community (Dwyer & Edwards, 2000).

Fagence (2003) identified a range of potentially negative socio-cultural changes associated with tourism initiatives affecting communities, specifically singling out changes to economic, social and cultural factors at family and community level. Fagence describes the ‘demonstration effect’ which results in members of the host community/family units adopting tourists’ traits and behaviour including desire for foreign and imported goods, ‘cultural prostitution’ and the gradual homogenization of the host culture. Along with these broad cultural and community effects, Fagence (2003) summarizes influences on families including changes in roles and responsibilities within the family unit (Shah & Gupta, 2000). The wider-ranging effects of these and other socio-cultural changes in the community as a result of a tourism initiative may be increased or changed levels and types of criminality, standards of behaviour and increased hostility to tourists.

As with most tourism initiatives and the industry at large, CBTTs tend to be SMEs (UNWTO, 2004a, 2004b). In situations where the CBTT, being an SME, is coupled with some of the stakeholders of the initiative being new to the industry two key issues are liable to arise: lack of market knowledge and lack of operational and marketing budget. If the project stakeholders driving the initiative are development agencies or NGOs, this may not assist in resolving these issues. These types of organizations are also notoriously ill-equipped to deal with product quality requirements, and the promotion of tourism initiatives (Ashton, 2001; Mader, n.d.).
The marketing of destinations and initiatives that focus on the importance of community benefits as a means to increase visitation is an area for possible further development, thereby increasing economic sustainability of the initiative and the benefits derived by the community (Roe et al., 2002). Whilst the internet may represent one opportunity for marketing and selling the product (e.g. responsibletravel.com), the more traditional travel agent route should continue to play an integral part in the initiatives’ marketing strategy and distribution network. Great effort and a considerable amount of time must usually be allowed (often a minimum of 18 months to 2 years) to secure inclusion and exposure in international ‘wholesale’ tour operators/travel agents’ brochures. The stakeholders must be focused not only on the initiative, the community benefits and the product; information becomes outdated quickly and it is important that the new sales and product information is communicated to agents and promoters in good time for it to be of use. Prices need to be provided to agents/tour operators at least a season (or 1 year) in advance in order for sales agents to be able to load them onto their sales systems, disseminate the information to other agents and promote them to travellers planning their vacation up to a year before they intend to travel. Packages and prices must make allowance for commission levels and the nuances of protecting agents’ position in the marketplace, such as established distribution networks, should be allowed for along with raising of awareness in these ‘sellers’ (Ashley & Jones, 2001; Roe et al., 2002).

In order to attract the attention of agents and tour operators, who are key avenues for sales, it is essential to have the capacity to deal with forward bookings and have a stable regularity of guaranteed departures; it is often the case that a departure once or twice a week or a lack of guaranteed departures will lead to the agent not ‘brochuring’ the product. An agent ‘brochuring’, promoting and selling a product provided by a CBTI cannot countenance last minute cancellation of departures due to lack of numbers or tour guides not turning up.

To overcome barriers and provide truly sustainable benefits to a community through a tourism initiative, appropriate management structures must be implemented and safeguards need to be put in place. No single ownership structure or partnership will fit all scenarios or destinations; in some cases a rigid financial and legal structure may be required, in others more flexibility may be needed (Poultney & Spenceley, 2001). To ensure that people’s rights and responsibilities are not infringed upon and to allow those members of the community who wish to do so to continue to pursue their traditional links with land and resources traditional skills should be enhanced not eroded and a tourism initiative needs to complement rather than conflict with the livelihood strategies of individual residents (Ashley & Roe, 1998). Communication is a vital element at all stages of development and operation of a CBTI. During the establishment and negotiation phase, open communication is necessary to create trust and to ensure that agreements match the expectations of all parties. This communication and facility for the community and its individual members to express their views, needs and desires should be maintained throughout the life of the initiative by using structured channels of communication and encouraging regular participatory events. Much is made of benefits of gender empowerment and all other aspects of community empowerment (social, financial, political and psychological) (Li, 2004; Scheyvens, 1999). Empowerment has a role to play not only as an outcome of a CBTI but also as a component to be embraced prior to and during the set-up phase of an initiative.

Whilst the community and its successful receipt of benefits presents itself as being of paramount importance, the priorities and objectives of other collaborators and stakeholders in the initiative should not be forgotten. In the development and also in the ultimate and ongoing operation of CBTIs, the differing cultural and philosophical perspectives of the variety of stakeholders and community actors may at times seem overwhelming. These differences are not insurmountable and the importance of a collective understanding and appreciation of commercial issues, political influences, cultural mores, social structures and community priorities is critical to fostering an environment for a successful CBTI (Scheyvens, 2002). Coupled with this is the significance of an appreciation and tolerance of the agenda and priorities of other stakeholders including those outcomes particular to NGOs and those characterized by governments and the private sector.

Improving data collection and analyses of CBTIs and their socio-economic impact on the regions, communities and the private sector involved will assist greatly in initiatives’ propensity to deliver the most appropriate benefits. Improved accessibility to such data will then be important to spread understanding and knowledge of critical factors in delivering benefits to communities. An enhanced knowledge of issues of policy and governance and how to influence relevant policies will also contribute to the ability of a CBTI to provide benefits. In addition, where government provides structural incentives and these incentives are supported by pragmatic and audited industry accreditation systems, which assist in defining quality operators and initiatives, the chances of successful and sustainable CBTIs will be increased.

5. Conclusion and implications

This paper has introduced, defined and examined the concept of CBTIs in the context of a range of characteristics and considered the roles of government, the private sector, community and NGOs. It has sought to establish the critical components of CBTI development, the potential problems associated with CBTIs and some of their possible solutions. The discussion has rested upon the importance of delivering benefits to communities and how this can be achieved through creating the best possible scenario for a successful, sustainable and responsible CBTI.
CBTIs are equally relevant in developed and developing countries. The critical factors for successful CBTIs are not the location of the initiatives, the instigators, the types of ownership structure, size, nor the level of wealth, involvement, ownership or control of the community, nor is it the type of tourism. For a tourism enterprise to be classed as a CBTI, it must conform to the following: that one of the primary objectives of the initiative must be the derivation of livelihood and other economic, social and/or environmental benefits to the community and its members. These net community benefits must be attempted and achieved in a responsible and sustainable manner and should outweigh any potential costs to that same community (the ‘community’ is so defined by the stakeholders involved in the tourism initiative). Success depends on an increase in net benefits delivered to the associated community and its members as a result of the tourism initiative. The longevity and sustainability of these benefits is paramount. It is not enough for key stakeholders to consider exclusive segments of society such as the poor, tourism can be of benefit to communities at large in all settings and it is the responsibility of researchers, practitioners, policy makers and stakeholders to continually strive to raise the level of awareness of tourism’s potential for communities and thereby to contribute to raising the standards of tourism practice.

Case studies such as the communities of Nossa Senhora de Perpetuo Socorro in Brazil (Nelson, 2000), the Iban and the Dusun communities in Brunei (Ahmad, 2001), Sea Canoe, Thailand (Kontogeorgopoulos, 2005), Campbelltown, Australia (Dwyer & Edwards, 2000) and Jiuzhaigou Biosphere Reserve, China (Li, 2006) highlight that community participation, ownership or control does not need to play a significant role in the decision-making processes of a tourism initiative for benefits to flow to the community. Benefits occur for communities not only in the form of employment as workers or as small business operators; these enterprises resulted in more than just economic benefits and included livelihood enhancements, social and environmental benefits. However, whilst establishing that benefits can be derived by communities from tourism initiatives in which they have no involvement, it is not clear whether the appropriate, correct or most effective benefits are derived by the relevant community. Mechanisms seem to be required to try to ensure that the right proportion of benefits will be given to communities and local people. When attempting to ensure that the most appropriate benefits in relevant proportions are delivered to the community it is desirable and valuable to include the community in decision-making processes that link the development and operation of the tourism initiative to the distribution of benefits (Midgley, 1986; Mowforth & Munt, 1998; Scheyvens, 2002; Tosun & Timothy, 2003; Tosun, 2005).

Through the examination of CBTIs positive characteristics and benefits (Table 1), the evaluation of possible problems and their potential solutions (Table 2) and the analyses of selected case studies, a portfolio of fundamental components of a CBTI can be derived (Table 3). Certainly, an integrated approach is vital and as the community is in the best position to know its own needs and desires, its involvement is required at some level. Despite this, it is important to note that while viewed as potentially constructive, conducive to providing benefits and useful in ensuring the appropriate distribution of proportionate benefits community ownership or control does not feature in the fundamental group of components. Perhaps perversely, it is feasible that potential benefits to communities can be diminished or undermined where communities are heavily involved in tourism initiatives (Kontogeorgopoulos, 2005; Wylie, 1998). Communities may become subject to external pressures, issues of governance and structure, conflicting stakeholder agendas, jealousies and internal power struggles can be exacerbated or created, and the growth of artificial hierarchies and elites may occur (Blackstock, 2005; Swarbrooke, 1999; Taylor, 1995). Whereas a vital key to a successful CBTI is interaction, including regular communication, engagement, linkages and commitment within and between stakeholders (including the community), community ownership or control is not.

5.1. Management implications and the future of CBTIs

The concept of CBTIs, and the use of the term and its principles are highly relevant to the management and operation of all tourism initiatives as they assist in clarifying the necessity to take account of and address the needs of communities in all situations and in all environments around the world, regardless of the level of community ownership, control or formal involvement in the initiative. Management implications of CBTIs also lie in the potential roles to be played by key stakeholders in tourism initiatives (Figs. 1 and 2) and the consideration that these stakeholders give to those roles and to the community when applying the principles of a CBTI.

All stakeholders should be aware of each other’s goals and objectives and their potential roles and responsibilities (Figs. 1 and 2). When considering the role of stakeholders, regular liaison and communication between and within the stakeholder groups seems essential. When all stakeholders, including Government, communities, private sector and NGOs, contribute in a conversant, supportive, ethical and accountable manner, it is possible to create a dynamic nurturing environment which will foster and cultivate the crucial components of ‘best practice’ (Hall, 1999; Jamal & Getz, 1995; Scheyvens, 1999; Tosun, 2000). This situation is vital in contributing to the achievement of a range of benefits for communities associated with tourism including economic development, enhanced livelihoods and well-being, environmental enrichment and sustainable community development.

For the private sector, governments and NGOs when developing and managing tourism in its many forms
involvement of the community may not only prove difficult in terms of operational and management practicalities, financial control and legal issues but may also cause problems in achieving the goal of benefit delivery to the community due to inherent complexities as described in Sections 1–4 of this paper (Blackstock, 2005; Murphy, 2003; Tosun, 2000; Weaver, 1998). The trepidation of stakeholders regarding community involvement should not, however, stop investors, NGOs and governments from striving to ensure that the community receives benefits from the tourism initiative. Even if these stakeholders do not have the time, inclination or skills to involve the community in the tourism initiative using the concept of CBTIs, they may still plan, prepare and deliver tangible benefits to communities. Moreover, a CBTI should not be used as an excuse to exclude the community from the initiative but as a framework with which to ensure better results and benefits for the community. Equipped with an understanding of CBTIs and their principles stakeholders may be more willing to embrace the activities that can ensure the delivery of appropriate and proportionate benefits to the community.

Further research is required into the relationship between tourism and development (Beeton, 2006; Colantonio & Potter, 2006; Hawkins & Mann, 2007; Ioannides, 2006; Scheyvens, 2002; Simpson, 2008; Telfer, 2002). Examinations into the role of communities in tourism initiatives in developed and developing countries, how they derive benefits and what the most appropriate benefits are for different communities are integral to this need. Additional case studies should be conducted in a range of geographical areas and with communities that are experiencing a variety of tourism initiatives over varying life cycles; different ownership structures, types of product and sizes of operation should be examined. A coherent analytical framework with which to assess impacts and benefits should be used in order to achieve standardization and comparability across the studies. Wherever possible

Table 2
10 possible problems associated with community benefit tourism initiatives and some possible solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBLEMS</th>
<th>STAKEHOLDERS WHO MAY BE PART OF THE PROBLEM</th>
<th>POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Attitudes, actions and accusations of neo-colonialism</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of understanding of community needs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lack of awareness about the industry and knowledge of market</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lack of funds</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Disparate opinions within stakeholder group</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Silent majority exists within the stakeholder group</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the actions of individual stakeholders and the roles that they play in different initiatives should be evaluated; investigation into the strategies that they are currently using to liaise with communities is required along with any activities being conducted to transfer benefits to communities. These studies should ideally be carried out on a long-term or periodic basis so that the effects of different strategies, impacts and benefits can be established and assessed more accurately.  

The implementation of a series of case studies assessing the impacts and benefits of tourism initiatives on communities and investigating various aspects of CBTIs and their stakeholders will also provide opportunities to examine other areas for the further development of CBTIs. One important area for development is the design and testing of mechanisms with which to determine the most appropriate and effective benefits for a community and how these benefits can be delivered in a proportionate manner. If structured correctly, participatory work with communities could link with the case study assessment process and be used to assist in the development of these mechanisms. Clearly sequenced, replicable, discussion focused and progressive techniques should be used such as ‘H’ diagrams (Guy & Inglis, 1999), likes, dislikes and changes preference rankings, asset mapping and historical mapping (Ashley & Hussein, 1999; Chambers, 2002; Guy, Fuller, & Pletsch, 2002; Kerka, 2003; Mayoux, 2001; Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI)/UNDP, 1998). This approach, coupled with a series of key informant semi-structured interviews and a short, highly focused household survey (De Vaus, 2001) should assist in the identification of specific areas for community benefit and how to deliver those benefits appropriately and effectively (Simpson, 2008).

CBTIs provide a concept by which the private sector, governments and NGOs can deliver a range of livelihood and other benefits to communities without, necessarily, carrying the potential baggage of significant community ownership or involvement. Another important area of CBTI development therefore, is the introduction of the concepts and practicalities of CBTIs to private investors, existing tourism operators, NGOs and government bodies; an education and awareness raising process should be undertaken to present the concepts and management implications to these stakeholders. Case studies presenting best practice and strategy documents outlining the roles and activities for different stakeholder groups could be presented in regional forums with emphasis placed on the opportunities for all tourism businesses and stakeholders to benefit communities in all situations and environments. Other topics, linked to the development of CBTIs, to be addressed in the forums should include evolving tourism management strategies, corporate social responsibility issues, potential benefits to tourism businesses of benefiting communities, the responsibilities of civil society and government bodies in policy making, the implementation of policy, stakeholder collaboration and communication (Ashley & Haysom, 2006; Hall, 2000; Murphy & Murphy, 2004; Ryan, 2002; Tosun, 2006).

Changes in the business and management of tourism and in the roles and activities of stakeholders are required to embrace the complexities and multifarious issues of delivering benefits to communities. More studies are needed to illustrate how CBTIs work in practice in a variety of contexts and how the right proportion and most effective benefits can be delivered to the relevant community. Further research into the fundamental components for best practice in CBTIs and testing of these components in order to improve theory development in this area is required. Furthermore, the development of mechanisms to determine proportionate and appropriate benefits will be necessary to link research to policy and to practice with the aim of maximizing the benefits from tourism and the effectiveness of those benefits to communities around the world.
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