

Cruise tourism and community-based tourism: towards a possible relationship

Sean Jugmohan*

Durban University of Technology, ML Sultan Campus,
Centre for Quality Promotion & Assurance
PO Box 1334, Durban, 4000, South Africa
Tel: +27 (0)31 3735304
Fax: +27(0)31 373 55 14

&

Andrea Giampiccoli

Durban University of Technology,
Department of Hospitality and Tourism
Email: andrea.giampiccoli@gmail.com

*Corresponding author

Abstract

Tourism is a relevant growing industry worldwide and is often regarded as an important development tool. The cruise tourism sector is also an important segment of the tourism industry and is viewed as having positive and negative features. Community-based tourism (CBT) is a relatively new type of tourism and, despite its possible problems and limitations, it has been known to foster community development. In view of the aforementioned issues as a contextual background this paper aims to explore possible collaboration opportunities between cruise tourism and CBT. The paper focuses on a literature review on cruise tourism and CBT. It then explores the possible relationship between the two forms of tourism. A relationship and linkages between cruise tourism and community-based tourism is subsequently proposed. The value of both cruise tourism and CBT on the local disadvantaged section of the population is suggested. Some specific references to the South African context will be proposed in the paper.

Keywords: Community-based tourism; cruise tourism; tourism; South Africa



Source: <http://www.southafrica.to/transport/cruises/Cape-Town/images/20121211/MS-C-Sinfonia-Cape-Town-LARGE.JPG>

Introduction

Data proposes that the tourism sector is growing even in a difficult economic climate, that is, “Despite a global economy in ‘low gear’, demand for international tourism exceeded expectations, with an additional 52 million international tourists travelling internationally in 2013” (UNWTO, 2014:4). In addition, always more destinations see tourism as a tool for economic development (UNWTO, 2014:2). Tourism has been linked to poverty alleviation and “support for tourism as a means of poverty alleviation has grown considerably since 1990” (see Scheyvens, 2007:232 for an analysis on the matter focusing the pro-poor tourism strategy). However, “there is a need for caution as tourism statistics can be interpreted differently depending on what argument you wish to make” (Scheyvens, 2007:232). As such, the assumption that tourism growth fosters poverty alleviation is debated and a study (Saayman, Rossouw & Krugell, 2012:484) on the topic proposes that:

From a policy perspective, it would be important to foster both domestic and foreign tourist arrivals. It must be emphasised that it is not the number of tourists but the amount spent that counts [and] the mere fact that tourism takes place does not imply that the money trickles down to the poor – deliberate action is required.

At the same time, the undesirable impact on the tourism sector needed to be appropriately managed resulting in a search for alternative tourism planning, management and development options (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006: 1274). Therefore, specific policies and actions needed to be devised and managed to enhance the possibility of a positive relationship between tourism development and poverty alleviation and community development. As such, new ideas and possible forms of collaboration between conventional mass tourism and alternative tourism (AT) should be explored (Weaver, 2011).

In view of the aforementioned issues as a contextual background, this paper examines the possible relationship between cruise tourism and community-based tourism (CBT) which relate to a specific form of mass tourism and alternative tourism, respectively. The paper aims to explore possible collaborative opportunities between cruise tourism and CBT towards enhancing positive impacts on poverty alleviation and community development. In view of this aim, the paper will propose a literature review on cruise tourism and CBT matters. The subsequent and major section of the paper will, therefore, explore the possible relationship between the two forms of tourism previously explained. A conclusion will terminate the paper. Some specific references to the South African context will also be proposed.

Literature review

Cruise tourism

Cruise tourism is a relatively new type of tourism which originated in the 1970s in Miami (UNWTO, 2010:XI). Despite its newness, cruise tourism is increasing its relevance within the more general tourism sector. Figures indicate that cruise tourism contributes considerably to worldwide tourism comprising 1.6% of all tourists and 1.9% of the total number of nights (Del Chiappa & Abbate, 2013:1). Furthermore, cruise tourism has witnessed a rapid growth in passenger volume 8% cumulative per year (Rifai, 2010:VII). For example, in South Africa, the National Department of Tourism (NDT) report projected that cruise passenger levels to South Africa will rise from 200,000 to approximately 1,000,000 by 2025 (SA. NDT, 2010:5). More specifically, the KwaZulu-Natal Province of South Africa is seen as having great potential for cruise tourism given its strategic location on the east coast and access to port facilities (Tourism KwaZulu-Natal, 2003a:27).

However, the tourism sector, “like all engines of economic development, has desirable and undesirable features” (Seidl, Giuliano & Pratt, 2006:214). Cruise tourism, as a sub-sector of the tourism

industry, should also be seen as having its own positive and negative features that can promote debate. Similarly, cruise tourism issues related to the environment, sustainability and responsible tourism, have been debated (Ritter & Schafer, 1998; Klein, 2011; Hritz, & Cecil, 2008). Different opinions are present on specific issues, for example, "Conflicting reports on purchasing patterns among cruise tourists..." (Seidl et al., 2006:214).

In general, "the linkage between cruise and land vacations is still debated upon in the tourism sector" (Zappino, 2005:11). As evidenced in both academic literature and government documents the level of local economic impacts regarding cruise tourism through passengers, crew and cruise line expenses are present (SA. NDT, 2010; Seidl et al., 2006; Seidl, Giuliano, Pratt, Castro, & Majano, 2005; Henthorne, 2000; Parola, Satta, Penco & Persico, 2014). For example, in the context of this debate a research study on cruise tourism in Coast Rica suggests that "Although the total tourism expenditures of cruisers may be similar to other tourists, it appears that the amount of money injected into the local economy per cruise tourist is substantially lower than for other types of tourism" (Seidl et al., 2006:223). On the other hand, and also worth mentioning is the possible relationship of cruise tourism with increase in land-based holidays, a research study on Coast Rica has proposed that, while the impacts of cruise tourism is quite small in comparison with other products, "recent analysis of the Florida-Caribbean Cruise Association showed that this form of travel [cruise tourism] is attracting new markets to the region and encouraging land-based vacations" (Zappino, 2005:11). Possibly, as happens in the analysis of other tourism forms, such as CBT, the judgement of cruise tourism success can be based on an individual's "perspective and expectation" (Kontogeorgopoulos, Churyen, & Duangsaeng, 2013: 2).

It has also been observed that "A cruise ship is an extreme form of a closed bubble" and represents a "physically self-contained, floating entity, there is almost

total isolation of the tourists, except for occasions when the passengers leave the ship for a visit on shore" (Jaakson, 2004:57). In this context, the cruise ship bubble gives security to the tourists while the outside port area/town represents the insecurity and space to avoid (Jaakson, 2004:57). This situation suggests the need to take action to facilitate the improvement of land-based excursion and their perceived image.

This approach could possibly build relationships among tourist and local communities and may encourage return visits to the area. The value of the experience in the destination's excursion for cruise tourism visitors are specifically relevant for the possible returning visitation, specifically "In the case of cruise passengers, the likelihood to return on a land-based vacation may be higher mainly because of the limited time spent onshore, which may increase the possibility of returning in order to experience aspects of the destination having been omitted in the first place" (Andriotis & Agiomirgianakis, 2010:400). Thus, return-visit matters must be kept in high regard and, within the general repeat tourism strategy, specific attention to policy and management should be advanced in a destination (Gabe, Lynch & Mcconnon, 2006:286; Parola et al., 2014).

The experience at each destination is crucial to enhance the chance of return visit and "past experience with a destination increases an individual's intention of revisitation and decreases the intention to avoid risky areas" (Gabe, Lynch & Mcconnon, 2006:282). However, it is also important to keep in consideration that a recent trend in the cruise tourism industry is that a "ship represents in itself the destination, essentially acting as a floating resort (or a theme park) with all the related facilities (bars, restaurants, theatres, casinos, swimming pools, etc.)" (Rodrigue & Notteboom, 2013:33). In addition, cruise liners can propose shore-based excursions that are "entirely owned by subsidiaries of the cruise line" (Rodrigue & Notteboom, 2013:33). In this context, a South African cruise tourism

document (SA. NDT, 2010) related to economic matters in cruise tourism. International experiences and research express that “Cruise liners which are now marketed as “floating resorts” continue to absorb most of passenger spending at the expense of local port communities” (SA. NDT, 2010:62).

Beside the matters of local impact and tourists’ (and often crew) expenditure in ports/destinations that – as mentioned above – are debated in the literature, specific characteristics and matters related to excursions are also relevant. As one of the important elements of the cruise package, the shore excursion cruise companies providing “well-structured excursion proposals [...] enrich the overall service package adding new experiential dimensions” (Parola et al., 2014:54, 55). Excursions have been related to specific tourism markets such as that “The significance of travel expenditure in relation to the different characteristics of tourists (demographic, economic, sociocultural, etc.) is recognized in the current literature on tourism” (Brida, Bukstein, & Garrido, Tealde, 2012:434). It is important, therefore, to target a specific market in relation to each type of cruise and associated excursions. For example, while arguing to keep in consideration the specific case study and cautioning on generalisation, a case study from Cartagena proposes that, to increase the spending patterns of visitors at destinations, the following should be considered: “(i) target younger couples through marketing policies to give an image of Cartagena de Indias as a place adapted to activities appealing to this age group; (ii) increase cruise passengers’ length of stay at the destination by making deals with the cruise companies or by offering free meals of traditional Colombian cuisine so that the visitors do not have to return to the ship for lunch; and (iii) improve shopping opportunities, facilities and variety and communicate these improvements through marketing strategies (especially for jewellery)” (Brida et al., 2012:445; see also Andriotis & Agiomirgianakis, 2010 for a case of cruise excursion in Heraklion, Greece). The

option of ‘traditional Colombian cuisine’ is also considered and could very much establish a link with a CBT entity that supplies such a service.

Visitors that go ashore fall into two categories: those taking ships’ shore excursions, and those who make independent arrangements. The impacts of the former group can be managed, within targets set by government, by state visitor authorities and the port agents who negotiate the range and price of on-shore excursions. The second group of passengers comprises ‘independent travellers’ who do not take organised tours. This latter group comprises those who walk around towns on their own, visiting food and handicraft markets, local restaurants, monuments and museums. These ‘independent travellers’ often travel in small groups and seek to avoid the ‘tourist spots’, thus effectively taking pressure off popular destinations, which are most threatened by large numbers of visitors” and seek to meet local people by going beyond the usual destination provided by the organised shore excursion (Macpherson, 2008:190). However, although with a possible different approach based, for example, on excursion cost and perception of risk, both type of cruise tourists can be interested to meet and participate in the ‘local context’ (Macpherson, 2008:195). As such, CBT entities can participate in the visitor experience. Thus, for example, Macpherson (2008:195) quite extensively shows possible different types of involvement of community level organisations in cruise ship visitor ashore experience. He (Macpherson, 2008:195), for example, suggests that “In locations where passengers are tendered ashore, a range of community groups are routinely offered an opportunity to perform, in rotation, on or near the jetty, and to keep any gifts made to groups by audiences during their performance slot.

Thus, primary school groups, women’s committees, youth and church groups can be allocated time slots in which to raise funds for their various activities” (Macpherson, 2008:195). Other relevant

examples where visitors search for authentic experience “can be provided by a variety of village organisations” and can include “morning tea with the village women’ who provide morning tea demonstrate handicrafts and entertain; ‘fishing with the men of the village’ who take parties to visit village fish traps or netting and then cook and share the fish with them; ‘visit to the village gardens’ in which visitors are shown a range of food and medicinal crops and their uses” (Macpherson, 2008:195). At the same time, “While ‘authentic’, local performance is a high priority for passengers seeking ‘folkloric experiences’, they do not exhaust the range of revenue generating services. Even at more remote locations, where visitors are landed by tender, opportunities for community groups to raise funds from the sale of local craft production” (Macpherson, 2008:195). To note that these excursion are based on the market requirement as “Indeed, many well-travelled passengers prefer to buy objects which have been produced by the seller on the grounds that the profit goes directly to the seller, and that they secure a more ‘authentic’ artefact for which they are prepared to pay higher prices” (Macpherson, 2008:195). Furthermore, it is ironically argued that “Still, passengers often comment, in cruise evaluations, on the shortage of organised opportunities for ‘cultural encounters’, and suggest extending the range” (Macpherson, 2008:196). In this regard, it is noteworthy that, for example, in the KwaZulu-Natal province, a greater percentage (35.1%) of world tourists against, respectively, 18.2% (land arrival) and 20.4% (African air arrival) undertook activities in the cultural, historical and heritage milieu (Tourism KwaZulu-Natal, 2014:6) showing the possibility that especially international cruise ship passengers could be also interested in similar activities. These issues can show that there is an available market for tourists that search for the ‘not conventional’ such as more contact with local people and immerse themselves in the local cultural context.

At the same time, local authorities need to be vigilant and dynamic in their offer to

cruise ship tourism given that – as proposed in a Greek example – “the greatest effect may be upon the local authorities themselves to increase the opportunity of enriching cruise visitors’ experiences by providing a product that fulfils expectations and satisfies incoming travellers” (Andriotis & Agiomirgianakis, 2010:403). In the context of stakeholders’ collaboration, a news article titled *Involving all stakeholders key to success of community-based tourism* also refers to a specific initiative linked to cruise tourism in Oman writing: “laudable is the initiative of Omani women in Khasab who welcome international cruise tourists in the port and introduce them to the Omani hospitality and culture” (Oman Observer, 2014). It is proposed that many of these above cited examples of community involvement in cruise tourism visitor experiences should be seen as a first stage of relationship between cruise tourism and CBT, but certainly more can, and should, be done.

Community-based tourism

The debate of the actual results of CBT is current. However, CBT is used as a development strategy in developing countries (although CBT is also present in developed countries) and its origin and characteristics are linked to an alternative development approach (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2014). The alternative more holistic approach of CBT recognises that “Benefits from community-based tourism can be a combination of economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits” (Hasan & Islam, 2015:289). The service, products and activities in which CBT entities can be involved are numerous and can include, for example, “home-stay families, community tour guides, craftsmen, performers, community leaders, local restaurants, farmers, and other interesting roles” (Hasan & Islam, 2015:290). Since its origin, various models of CBT have been suggested and elaborated (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2014). At the same time, even if matters related to the model of CBT development “still remain contested” (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2014:2), a number of authors concur that CBT should be owned and managed by

community members (Giampiccoli & Nauright, 2010:53; Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013; Ramsa Yaman & Mohd, 2004:584; George, Nedelea & Antony, 2007:1; Suansri, 2003:14). Along these lines, a more comprehensive definition has been proposed that “CBT is a tourism that is planned, developed, owned and managed by the community for the community, guided by collective decision-making, responsibility, access, ownership and benefits” (Tasci, Semrad, and Yilmaz, 2013:9). As such, it has been proposed that “(o)wnership of the tourism product is necessary for a successful community based tourism product” (Graci, 2012: 68). CBT often needs external facilitation and it is essential that “good business mentoring is provided to the indigenous owners so that they can eventually manage their own enterprise effectively’ (Scheyvens & Russell, 2010:65).

Beside the CBT definition from a community (and supply) perspective, CBT is also specific in relation to its market. As such, from a demand side perspective, it can be proposed that “Community-Based Tourism (CBT) enables tourists to discover local habitats and wildlife, celebrates and respects traditional cultures, rituals, and wisdom” (Ardianto, 2012). As such a key issue in the CBT “programme is that it should aim to allow the visitors to experience the lifestyle of the community as a way for them to learn about the hosts’ traditional culture” (Kayat, 2014:1). The issues proposed above are closely related to the market demand of cruise ship visitors. At the same time, while correctly (as supported by this paper), CBT should not be seen as a short visit (see for example Suansri, 2003:18), it is argued that specific circumstances and specific CBT products and services should also be viewed with a positive approach provided it is circumscribed within the various CBT characteristics, these include: control, ownership and management by community members for their benefits. Cruise tourism passengers usually stay a few hours in a destination. Therefore, it will be difficult to develop ‘long-stay’ with CBT entities – however, in pre- and post-tours, long-stay with CBT entities should

be proposed. Each situation could need *ad hoc* arrangements and could play a positive role in poverty alleviation. The possible link between cruise tourism, as a growing sector, and CBT, as a poverty alleviation and holistic community development approach, should be explored. Collaboration between these two tourism sectors should be investigated to enhance the impact of cruise tourism at destination level, to boost the positive experiences of cruise visitors (therefore, their loyalty of the cruise companies and the possible revisitation of a specific destination) while facilitating and fostering CBT development.

Towards a relationship between cruise tourism and community-based tourism

Cruise tourism can be seen as a mass tourism type and should be proposed as an all-inclusive resort style of tourism (Seidl et al., 2006). On the other hand, CBT, as proposed above, can be associated with the alternative tourism development approach. Contact between CBT and cruise tourism in the literature has been already proposed in various studies specifically investigating perceptions and attitudes of local community towards cruise tourism using matters related to CBT as a background (Brida, Del Chiappa, Meleddu & Pulina, 2012a; Brida, Del Chiappa, Meleddu & Pulina, 2012b; Brida, Riaño & Zapata, 2012; Brida, Riaño & Zapata-Aguirre, 2011; Del Chiappa, 2012). At the same time, from a more general perspective the relationship between mass tourism and alternative tourism forms has been also explored and it has been suggested that:

the deep reciprocal linkages between AT [alternative tourism] and mass tourism suggest that synergy between the two ‘opposing’ ideal types is a longstanding although mostly unrecognized reality. Surely it is appropriate to formally recognize AT and mass tourism as two at least *potentially* synergistic components of a single tourism system and incorporate this principle into the fundamentals of tourism planning and

management for any destination (Weaver, 2011:188).

Within this context, the collaboration/interaction between mass tourism and alternative tourism has been proposed such as in Belize where the need to develop a difficult balance between cruise tourism and ecotourism has been suggested as an important requirement (Center on Ecotourism and Sustainable Development, 2006). Possible relationships and interactions between cruise tourism and CBT have also been already mentioned in the Caribbean context (Clauzel, 2001). Specifically, the St. Lucia Heritage Tourism Programme (SLHTP) “endeavoured not just to develop CBT products but put the whole tourism sector on a more sustainable footing” and its objectives are directed to “facilitate a broader distribution of benefits of existing tourism (cruise ship passengers and stay-over visitors), develop a complementary sub-sector of community-based Heritage Tourism and strengthen linkages between the tourism industry and other local economic sectors (Dixey, 2007:8). In some context, cruise tourism and AT types such as ecotourism are already present and more are encouraged to be developed (Thurau, Seekamp, Carver & Lee, 2015:52). However, specific changes in the organisation and management of the excursion need to be put in place to ensure that profits reach port communities’ members instead of just few actors that have contact with the tourists (Thurau et al., 2015:52). In a case study, the relationship between ecotourism and cruise tourism suggested that, by “targeting marketing efforts toward ecotourists (rather than the conventional tourist), an increase in long-term ecological and economic benefits to local businesses and port communities could be realized” (Thurau et al., 2015:52). Notably, the ecotourism market segment in cruise tourism is expected “to spend more money in port than conventional tourist” (Thurau et al., 2015:52).

However, the relationship between cruise tourism and AT types, such as ecotourism despite increasing in number are still rare

and “Evidence of efforts to support and encourage indigenous culture or support for the local economy through purchase of local produce (other than relatively low value craft items) is minimal” (Johnson, 2006:49). Contradiction and limitations are also proposed in the relationship between cruise tourism, such as control by international private tourism stakeholders, while more community-oriented tourism needs to be promoted (see Zappino, 2005:5). Therefore, the need is to devise and manage more options to link cruise tourism with local context based on changing market characteristics of cruise tourism that seem directed towards seeking exotic experiences such as local wildlife and culture (Vos, 2004:215). Examples are, however, present in the Caribbean region showing linkages between cruise tourism and CBT (Dixey, 2007), in CBT entities, for example, the Giraudel/Eggleston Flower Group Inc., Dominica, the Anse La Raye Seafood Friday (ALRSF), Saint Lucia and the Roxborough Estate Visitor Services Cooperative, Republic of Trinidad and Tobago.

Various considerations need to be kept in mind when proposing possible collaboration between cruise tourism and CBT. For example, it is important to attempt to use a port as a base instead of only as a port of call as research showed that “a port/community earns about ten times more from a ship that uses it as a base than from one that simply visits it as a port of call [...] However, to serve as a base or a cruise liner destination, the city needs to offer more than just the basic infrastructure” (Vos, 2004:214). In the case of South Africa it has been suggested such basics exists for developing itself as a cruise liner destination (Vos, 2004:214). The difference of relevance between type of port has again been mentioned by advancing the “local multipliers will be higher for terminal (home) ports for cruise ships than for ports that simple entertain day visitor from the ship” (Seidl et al., 2006:217). Compared to ports of call, homeports “have more opportunities to generate direct and indirect jobs” (Brida,

Pulina, Riaño & Zapata-Aguirre, 2012:136). However, at the same time, while exotic ports have been seen as a main attraction for tourists, “increasingly marketing campaign focus on the board amenities available to cruisers” (Seidl, et al., 2006:217). Thus, keeping in mind matters related to excursions and the shift towards a ‘floating resort’, the link between cruise tourism and CBT should devise collaboration on both excursions and on board activities and services/products.

Possible collaborative strategies for Cruise tourism and Community-based Tourism

In South Africa, the link between the relevance of the cruise tourism sector and the need for tourism to benefit all South Africans seems be understood in what was expressed by the Government in its 2013/14 Yearbook in the tourism section related to cruise tourism when writing:

The department aims to help position the tourism sector in such a manner that its economic benefits become a reality for all South Africans. It is exploring ways to ensure that South Africa increases its global competitiveness by identifying and developing niche markets. The department works closely with the cruise line industry to ensure that packages and excursions are developed and that passengers are encouraged to visit the country’s shores, enjoy what it has to offer and inspire other travellers to visit South Africa (Government Communication and Information System, 2014:388).

A possible strategy to enhance KZN’s position in cruise tourism proposed that “KZN is also well-placed to act as a re-provisioning port for the east African coast. An added attraction is that re-provisioning usually takes at least 2 days, thus paving the way for longer shore excursions for the cruise tourists. It should be kept in mind that some 85% of the passengers are ‘destination sampling’ with a view to returning for longer periods at a later stage” (Tourism KwaZulu-Natal, 2003:5). Excursions associated with possible re-visitation are seen as

important aspects in the development of the cruise tourism sector.

While limitations and weaknesses need to be addressed accordingly (Vos, 2004), specific changes in the cruise tourism sectors, such as the positive geographical position of South Africa and the change in cruise tourism market, have led to advance that “the South African cities of Cape Town and Durban have a variety of attractions, services and facilities to offer the over-stimulated cruise liner passenger who is looking for something new and unusual. Not only are these cities affordable destinations for most cruise liners, but those who are seeking the ‘wilderness’, or the ‘tribal ethnicity, culture and heritage’ of Africa can do so without losing touch with the comfort and familiarity of the West” (Vos, 2004:215). Thus, cruise passengers that are looking for more exotic attractions (*the ‘wilderness’, or the ‘tribal ethnicity, culture and heritage’*) could very much visit CBT entities and, thereafter, return to their comfort in the cruise ship. While this should not be seen as an ideal situation for – and in some respect contradict the aim of – CBT (CBT should be of longer stay – see CBI, 2009; Suansri, 2003:18), it should be seen as an initial stage of collaboration where, eventually, occasion for more strong (and long-term) collaboration between CBT and the cruise tourism sector could be devised.

As a case in point, the insertion of CBT entities in pre- and post-tours in cruise packages which, as proposed, “have also become a very attractive holiday option” (Vos, 2004:215). Cape Town and Durban can offer such package tours and some game lodges are already involved in this package tour (Vos, 2004:215). CBT entities could be very much an added attraction in pre- or post- tours. A specific document indicates that cruise tourism visitors that stop-over in Richards Bay in (KwaZulu-Natal South Africa) “are all interested in seeing wildlife and culture” but because of the size of these groups “they are currently taken to larger establishments, such as Hluhluwe-Umfolozi and Shakaland” (Hlongwa &

Associates, 2003:20). Interestingly, the same report mentions CBT by stating, for example, that CBT can offer opportunities to include previously disadvantaged communities in various tourism sectors, for example, "With some basic training they can become outstanding tour guides" (Hlongwa & Associates, 2003:21). Consequently, the collaboration of cruise tourism with CBT could be achievable with proper facilitation and planning.

The need is, therefore, to devise possible forms of collaboration between cruise tourism and CBT. This collaboration is also justified and supported by the suggestion that CBT development usually needs specific external facilitation (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2014). The cruise industry, with its resources, could act as facilitators in specific CBT projects that could be seen as a potential attraction for its cruise tourist market. This collaboration should not indicate (or lead to) the control of the supposedly most resourceful type of tourism involved over the other – i.e., cruise tourism over CBT – but, for both sides to benefit, the two types of tourism should maintain their distinction and independency. While cruise tourism and CBT relationship should be seen in a progressive way to enhance their association and collaboration towards eventually become a part of the same tourism structure (meaning perpetually working intrinsically together within their own distinctiveness and independency), a number of possible initial collaborative approaches are proposed. The following main groups of collaboration are advanced:

1. *Short-term excursions*: in this collaboration, day (or few hours) excursions could be directed towards the usage of CBT entities such as CBT food outlet, CBT art and craft shop and so on. This collaboration is minimal but could, however, be of relevance to the CBT entities and, at the same time, form the base on which to build a more comprehensive and long-standing form of collaboration;
2. *Pre- or post- CBT tours*: this collaboration entails the longer stay of

the visitors in CBT entities such as a CBT accommodation or the regular usage of a CBT food outlet for various days. This form of collaboration is seen as more lucrative for the CBT entities compared to the previous collaboration form; and

3. *On board CBT*: in this case, a small space or kiosk could be given to a specific CBT art and craft group to sell their merchandise directly to the clients. Specific performances (such as dance or music) could be also executed on board while the ship is docked.

The cruise liner could increase its portfolio of attractions within the same parameter of direction of the changing tourism market, thus increasing its appeal to the possible customers. Specific collaboration and facilitation of the cruise companies should include quality standard and other relevant matters that can influence the visitor experience. At the same time, while the above examples are guidelines of possible forms of collaboration between cruise tourism and CBT, more ideas should be continuously sought for involving participants in, and/or knowledgeable of, both types of tourism to enhance the chance to find new solutions.

Conclusion

The relevance that cruise tourism can have on destination matters can increase as "The global demand for cruises is likely to see further growth given the increasing level of cruise participation of customers from various age groups, background and regions" (Rodrigue & Notteboom, 2013: 42). Considering literature in cruise tourism and CBT, the paper has proposed possible types of collaboration between the cruise tourism industry and CBT respectively, as a possible co-operative of mass tourism and AT forms. Specific market trends in tourism and in the cruise tourism sector, in particular, are seen as an influential substratum upon which to build the possible collaboration. The search by cruise tourism visitors of local cultures and authentic experiences enhances the possible link with CBT

entities as a supplier that are inherently belonging to CBT entities. It follows that three possible collaboration forms have been suggested both ashore and on board. Each collaboration strategy must be seen as a starting point upon which to build more long-lasting collaborations. Specific circumstances can influence the form of collaboration that is each time devised. This paper intends to contribute to the debate about the relationship between mass and alternative tourism forms (Weaver, 2011) by stimulating thought in this regard and proposes the specific debate of collaboration between cruise tourism and CBT aimed at local community development and poverty alleviation should begin in earnest.

References

- Andriotis, K. & Agiomirgianakis, G. (2010). Cruise Visitors' Experience in a Mediterranean Port of Call. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 12(4): 390-404.
- Ardianto, E. (2012). Dimensions of community-based tourism. A case study of surf community in Bali, Indonesia. *Journal of Tourism Research*, 5(B). <http://www.jotr.eu/index.php/tourism-management/56-indonesia> [01 March 2015].
- Brida, J. G., Bukstein, D., Garrido, N. & Tealde, E. (2012). Cruise passengers' expenditure in the Caribbean port of call of Cartagena de Indias: a cross-section data analysis. *Tourism Economics*, 18 (2): 431-447.
- Brida, J. G., Riaño, E. & Zapata-Aguirre, S. (2011). Residents' attitudes and perceptions towards cruise tourism development: A case study of Cartagena de Indias (Colombia). *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 11(3): 181-196.
- Brida, J. G., Bukstein, D. & Tealde, E. (2013). Exploring cruise ship passenger spending patterns in two Uruguayan ports of call. *Current Issues in Tourism*. DOI:10.1080/13683500.2013.861391.
- Brida, J. G., Riaño, E. & Zapata, S. (2012). Residents' perceptions toward cruise tourism impacts on a community: a factor and cluster analysis. *Cuadernos de Turismo*, 29, 263-266.
- Brida, J., Del Chiappa, G., Meleddu, M. & Pulina, M. (2012a). The perceptions of an island community towards cruise tourism: A factor analysis. *Tourism*, 60(1):29-42.
- Brida, J., Del Chiappa, G., Meleddu, M. & Pulina, M. (2012b). A Comparison of Residents' Perceptions in Two Cruise Ports in the Mediterranean Sea. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, DOI: 10.1002/jtr.1915.
- Brida, J., Pulina, M., Riaño, E. & Zapata Aguirre, S. (2012). Cruise passengers' experience embarking in a Caribbean home port. The case study of Cartagena de Indias. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 55, 135-145.
- CBI, 2009. Long haul tourism cbi product survey: the EU market for community-based tourism. Long-haul tourism. The EU market for community-based tourism. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands CBI - Centre for the Promotion of Imports from developing countries.
- Center on Ecotourism and Sustainable Development (2006). Cruise Tourism in Belize: Perceptions of Economic, Social & Environmental Impact. Washington: Center on Ecotourism and Sustainable Development.
- Choi, H. C., & Sirakaya, E. (2006). Sustainability indicators for managing community tourism. *Tourism Management*, 27, 1274-1289.
- Clauzel, S. (2001). Community-based tourism policy in the Windward Islands. Paper prepared for a Seminar on policy requirements from community-based tourism in the Windward Islands, St. Lucia, West Indies, November 2001. CANARI.
- Del Chaippa, G. (2012). Community Integration. Case of Costa Smeralda, Italy.

In Eduardo Fayos-solà (ed.) *Knowledge Management in Tourism: Policy and Governance Applications (Bridging Tourism Theory and Practice*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited: 243-263.

Del Chiappa, G. & Abbate, T. (2013). Island cruise tourism development: a resident's perspective in the context of Italy. *Current Issues in Tourism*. DOI: 10.1080/13683500.2013.854751.

Dixey, L. M. (2007) Competing with the best: good practices in community-based tourism in the Caribbean. St. Michael, Barbados: Caribbean Tourism Organization. <http://www.onecaribbean.org/content/files/GoodPracticesCBTUK.pdf> [10 April 2015].

Gabe, T. M., Lynch, C. P. & McConnon, J. C. (2006). Likelihood of Cruise Ship Passenger Return to a Visited Port: The Case of Bar Harbor, Maine. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44, 281-287.

George, B.P., Nedelea, A., & Antony, M. (2007). The business of community based tourism: a multi-stakeholder approach. *Journal of tourism research, Tourism Issues*, 3, 1-19.

Giampiccoli, A. and Nauright, J. 2010. Problems and Prospects for Community-based Tourism in the New South Africa: The 2010 FIFA World Cup and Beyond. *African Historical Review*, 42(1): 42-62.

Government Communication and Information System (2014). South Africa Yearbook 2013/14. <http://www.gcis.gov.za/sites/www.gcis.gov.za/files/docs/resourcecentre/yearbook/2013-4Tourism.pdf> [9 April 2015].

Graci, S. R. (2012). Putting Community Based Tourism into Practice: The Case of the Cree Village Ec lodge in Moose Factory, Ontario. *TÉOROS, Special Issue*, 65-70.

Hasan, S. R. & Islam, M. S. (2015). Exploring Bandarban through trekking trails: a new horizon for Community-based

tourism development. *European Scientific Journal*, 11 (5): 286-299.

Henthorne, T. L. (2000). An Analysis of Expenditures by Cruise Ship Passengers in Jamaica. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38, 246-250.

Hlongwa, M. & Associates (2003). Umkhanyakude District Municipality: Local Economic Development Initiative. Haley Sharpe Southern Africa (Pty) Ltd and Institute of Natural Resources.

Hritz, N. & Cecil, A. K. (2008). Investigating the Sustainability of Cruise Tourism: A Case Study of Key West, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16 (2): 168-181.

Jaakson, R. (2004). Beyond the tourist bubble? Cruiseship Passengers in Port. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(1): 44–60.

Johnson, D. (2006). Providing Ecotourism Excursions for Cruise Passengers: *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14 (1): 43-54.

Kayat, K. (2014). Community-Based Rural Tourism: A Proposed Sustainability Framework. SHS Web of Conferences, 12, 1-7. DOI: 10.1051/shsconf/20141201010.

Klein, R.A. (2011). Responsible Cruise Tourism: Issues of Cruise Tourism and Sustainability. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 18, 107–116.

Kontogeorgopoulos, N., Churyen, A., & Duangsaeng, V. (2013). Tourism success factors in community-based tourism in Thailand: the role of luck, external support, and local leadership. *Tourism Planning & Development*, doi:10.1080/21568316.2013.852991.

Macpherson, C. (2008). Golden goose or Trojan horse? Cruise ship tourism in Pacific development. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 49 (2):185–197.

Mtapuri, O., & Giampiccoli, A. (2013). Interrogating the role of the state and non-

state actors in community-based tourism ventures: Toward a model for spreading the benefits to the wider community. *South African Geographical Journal*, 95(1):1–15.

Mtapuri, O., & Giampiccoli, A. (2014). Towards a comprehensive model of community-based tourism development. *South African Geographical Journal*, DOI:10.1080/03736245.2014.977813.

Oman Observer (2014). Involving all stakeholders key to success of community-based tourism. <http://omanobserver.om/involving-all-stakeholders-key-to-success-of-community-based-tourism/> [12 April 2015].

Parola, F., Satta, G., Penco, L. & Persico, L. (2014). Destination satisfaction and cruiser behaviour: The moderating effect of excursion package. *Research in Transportation Business & Management*, 13, 53–64.

Ramsa Yaman, A. and Mohd, A. 2004 Community-based Ecotourism: A New proposition for Sustainable Development and Environmental Conservation in Malaysia. *Journal of Applied Science* 4(4):583-589.

Rifai, T. (2010). Preface. In UNWTO (ed.) *Cruise Tourism. Current Situation and Trends*, (p. VII). Madrid: World Tourism organisation.

Ritter, W. & Schafer, C. (1998) Cruise-Tourism, *Tourism Recreation Research*, 23(1): 65-71.

Rodrigue, J-P. & Notteboom, T. (2013). The geography of cruises: Itineraries, not destinations. *Applied Geography*, 38, 31-42.

Saayman, M., Rossouw, R., & Krugell, W. (2012). The impact of tourism on poverty in South Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 29(3): 462-487.

Scheyvens R (2007): Exploring the Tourism-Poverty Nexus. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(2-3): 231-254.

Scheyvens, R. & Russell, M. (2010). *Sharing the Riches of Tourism Summary Report – Fiji*. Massey University. Retrieved 1 July 2015 from https://www.aid.govt.nz/webfm_send/314

Seidl, A., Giuliano, F. & Pratt, L. (2006). Cruise tourism and community economic development in Central America and the Caribbean: the case of Coast Rica. *PASOS Revista de Tourism y Patrimonio Cultural*, 4(2): 213-224.

Seidl, A., Giuliano, F., Pratt, L., Castro, R. & Majano, A. M. (2005). Cruise Tourism and Community Economics in Central America and the Caribbean: The Case of Costa Rica. CEN 664. 2015 from <http://www.incae.edu/EN/clacds/publicaciones/pdf/cen664.pdf> [12 April 2015].

South Africa. National Department of Tourism. (2010). *South Africa cruise tourism: Prospects, benefits and strategies*. Final report November 2010. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Suansri, P. (2003). *Community based tourism handbook*. Bangkok: Responsible Ecological Social Tour (REST).

Tasci, A. D. S., Semrad, K. J. and Yilmaz, S. S. 2013. Community based tourism finding the equilibrium in comcec context: Setting the Pathway for the Future. Ankara: COMCEC Coordination Office.

Thurau, B., Seekamp, E., Carver, A. D. & Lee, J. G. (2015). Should Cruise Ports Market Ecotourism? A Comparative Analysis of Passenger Spending Expectations within the Panama Canal Watershed. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 17, 45–53.

Tourism KwaZulu-Natal (2003a). *KwaZulu-Natal's Cruise Tourism Industry*. Tourism KwaZulu-Natal Occasional Paper No.8.

Tourism KwaZulu-Natal (2003b). *KwaZulu-Natal tourism authority. Annual report 2012/13*. Durban: Tourism KwaZulu Natal.

Tourism KwaZulu-Natal (2014). Statistics of our tourism sector 2014. Durban: Tourism KwaZulu-Natal.

UNWTO (2010). Cruise Tourism. Current Situation and Trends. Madrid: World Tourism organisation.

UNWTO (2014). UNWTO. Tourism Highlights. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.

Vos, K. (2004). Starlight Cruises. In Bennet, A. & George, R. (eds.), *South*

African Travel and tourism Cases. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers: 211-220.

Weaver, D. (2011). Small can be beautiful too – and complimentary: towards mass/alternative tourism synergy. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 36(2): 186-189.

Zappino, V. (2005). Caribbean Tourism and development: An overview. Discussion Paper No. 65. European Centre for Development Policy Management, Maastricht.