

A community-based tourism affinity index: its development and possible use

Andrea Giampiccoli*
Hospitality and Tourism Department (Ritson Campus),
Durban University of Technology,
P. O. Box 1334, Durban, 4000, South Africa
Tel +27 (0)31 373 55 06
Fax +27(0)31 373 55 14
Email: andrea.giampiccoli@gmail.com

and

Oliver Mtapuri
University of KwaZulu Natal
School of Built Environment and Development Studies
College of Humanities, Howard College,
Private Bag X54001, Durban 4000, South Africa
Email: simbaomtapuri@yahoo.com

Corresponding author*

Abstract

Community-Based Tourism needs to be pursued in developing countries given its potential to create jobs, facilitate community empowerment and conservation of the environment. In order to guide this practice, this paper posits a **Community-Based Tourism Affinity Index (CBTAI)** following a number of indexes which have been developed in the sector such as the **Tourism Financial Conditions Index** and the **Tourism Climate Index**. Using secondary data, this paper develops a comprehensive index related to a Community-based Tourism (CBT) venture/project. It is a novel CBTAI based on dominant characteristics inherent in CBT. The CBTAI is somewhat related to the conventional grading system and is meant to assist in 'standardizing' CBT categories in order to curb the misappropriation of the concept of CBT and to contribute to 'the best practice model' of CBT. This paper recommends that the CBTAI should be widely disseminated in the sector. The simplicity of the CBTAI is one of its major attractions.

Keywords: community-based tourism; tourism index; tourism;

Introduction

Tourism is "one of the world's largest industries" which contributes to the social and economic development of many parts of the world (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006; Kayat, Ramli, Mat-Kasim & Abdul-Razak, 2015: 223). As such, tourism is taken as alternative economic development strategy in disadvantaged regions (Spenceley & Meyer, 2012). However, and importantly, problems and negative impacts related to tourism development such as environmental degradation and negative cultural impacts have been also been observed (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006: 1274). Community-based tourism (CBT) has been put forward as a viable answer to the negativity of more conventional mass tourism because of its link to issues of sustainability (Cornelissen, 2005: 18; Le, Weaver & Lawton, 2012: 362). It has also been widely advanced as a strategy for the empowerment of local communities in developing countries (Kayat et al., 2015: 224). It has also been used in international cooperation as a popular approach in tourism

development in those countries (Ellis & Sheridan, 2014: 2). It can be argued that CBT needs to be properly understood and practiced to enhance its potential in developing countries through job creation, community empowerment, increasing productivity and conservation of the environment. These issues seemingly reflect some dissonance regarding the variety of interpretations linked to CBT (Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2014: 1669). Kayat et al., (2015: 24) observe that due to CBT is 'saint-like' nature some parties use the term CBT as a form of marketing 'gimmick' to lure clients into the belief that they are supporting a "good cause-which is to travel responsibly" .

Differently approached, while some authors have associated CBT as part and parcel of sustainable tourism development, Auala (2012: 66; also in Ndlovu, Nyakunu & Auala, 2011) argues in contrast that sustainable tourism development does not adequately address CBT development concerns which blurs its true meaning to an extent that it negates principles of sustainability in tourism development. Auala (2012: 65) observes that CBT appears isolated from mainstream tourism and carries with it an inferiority perception concerning its products which ultimately results in marginal benefits accruing to communities. The inferiority perception could be linked to its informal nature and often it is based on what is available in community and often characterized by fewer facilities. But this does not mean that CBT should be seen as an inferior type of tourism, as each type of tourism has its own place for value addition based on what the tourist is looking for. This paper maintains that CBT should not be associated or linked to (depend upon) mainstream tourism but that it should be accorded the same status as conventional tourism to really be able to claim its rightful and independent position in the tourism market.

These emerging issues provide the fundamental reasons which prompted the writing of this paper. As such, this paper proposes some form of guidelines against which to 'formalize' specific categories of CBT ventures and projects. This is in line with Ellis & Sheridan's (2014: 4) argument that "there is a need to inform a model for best practice of CBT." This paper proposes a Community-Based Tourism Affinity Index (CBTAI) meant to assist in 'standardizing' CBT criteria and categories to firstly, curb the misappropriation of the term and concept of CBT and, secondly, to contribute to 'the best practice model' of CBT. It is not the ambition of CBTAI to purport to be the final and comprehensive index but its crafting is meant to raise awareness on the 'genuine' CBT model as well as for the index to be used for rating CBT ventures/projects. To achieve this aim, the paper, following this introductory section, provides a brief literature review listing the major characteristics of CBT and highlights issues related to tourism indexes in the same section. This is followed by the presentation of the CBTAI which is the major contribution of this paper. The CBTAI relates to actual CBT ventures/projects themselves have affinity (or the degree of divergence from such affinity) to typical characteristics which denote a 'genuine' CBT.

Jealous argues that CBT should be a way to emancipate disadvantaged communities emanating from a social justice perspective (Jealous, 1998:10). Within this context while such 'abstract' matters such as empowerment and participation are taken as fundamental and necessary for CBT development, these will not be considered in this article. This does not mean that issues of elite control, democratic participation and so on are not relevant, this article is more concerned with the 'measurable' dimensions of CBT. However, issues of empowerment, participation and so on, should be evaluated

and possibly inserted in an updated and revised version of the index or incorporated in the present index informed by insights emerging from future research. The CBTAI presented here is applicable to any sector such as accommodation, guiding, catering, and other tourism services and so on – in the broad tourism sector - CBT, milieu.

Methodology

In terms of methodology, this article was compiled from secondary sources in essentially a desk study which partly (but not exclusively) builds on Mtapuri & Giampiccoli (2014), Mtapuri & Giampiccoli (2013), Zapata, Hall, Lindo & Vanderschaeghe (2011) in an attempt to fill a gap to categorize CBT for practical uses in the tourism sector and market. In order to increase the completeness of the CBTAI, some extensive reference literature was also consulted to achieve that end from various angles. It is also important to bear in mind that some effort was put into making the CBTAI as comprehensive as possible; it bears no mathematical or other complex formula. Since it is generally believed that CBT is usually linked to disadvantaged socio-economic contexts, attempts have been made to make this index as fully understandable and workable as possible for stakeholders especially community members involved in CBT because they are often marginalised. This also is a additional way of embracing communities as full actors in CBT ventures/projects as in CBT community members should always be the ones that control all aspects of the CBT venture. As such, simplicity is one of the strengths of this index. Therefore, this paper is entirely based on a perusal and analysis of secondary information sourced mainly from academic journals. Books and internet sources were also used to inform the formulation of the index. Therefore, this is a theoretical article and further research is appropriate and relevant to test the efficacy of this Index.

Literature Review

In tourism, a number of indexes has been developed and used in the literature in a number of ways. For example there is the *Tourism Financial Conditions Index* (TFCI) which focuses on economic activities related to the tourism industry and offers insights into “predicting the current economic and financial environment for tourism stock index returns” (Chang, Hsu, & McAleer, 2014a: 15); the *Tourism Climate Index* (TCI)¹ that “is a composite indicator that captures the climatic elements most relevant for general tourism activities” and has widely been used around the world (see Fang & Yin, 2015: 184); the *Travel and Tourism Competitiveness Index* (TTCI) which is produced by the World Economic Forum (WEF) and meant “to provide a comprehensive strategic tool for measuring the factors and policies that make it attractive to develop the TandT [travel and tourism] sector in different countries” (Brende & Greenhill, 2013: XIII); and a *Tourism Conditions Index* (TCI) which takes into consideration economic and tourism environments as a whole “to assist in decision making for public and private policy makers” (Chang, Hsu & McAleer, 2014b: 4).

¹ A number of other indexes related to climate have been advanced such as: Tourism Climate Index (TCI), the Beach Comfort Index (BCI), the Climate Index for Tourism (CIT), the Modified Climate Index for Tourism (MCIT) and the Physiologically Equivalent Temperature Index (PET) (Fang and Yin, 2015: 184).

An index of a specific alternative form of tourism such as Adventure Tourism has also been proposed, namely, the *Adventure Tourism Development Index* (ATDI). The ADTI serves to “assesses adventure tourism potential for countries around the world” with the aim to “facilitate environmentally and culturally sustainable adventure tourism policy and planning for the benefit of national and local economies” (ADTI, 2011: 3). The ADTI aims to go beyond financial and economic matters as it is put forward that the ADTI was developed to promote sustainable adventure tourism by informing both entrepreneurs and governments on the products and services which adventure tourism can create and support for the benefit of communities and the environment (ADTI, 2011: 5).

The ADTI is pertinent to this paper because it shows the need to develop indexes which go beyond mere financial and economic matters to include equally important issues of sustainability and community well-being. As such, specific indexes of alternative forms of tourism which take community well-being into account are relevant in this discussion. However, an index related to CBT seems not to be present especially one derived not from a CBT visitor perspective (see Mtapuri, Giampiccoli & Jugmohan, 2015). This is despite the suggestion that CBT is increasing in popularity as a tourism development strategy directed to conservation and social inclusion evidenced by the existence of various CBT programmes present around the world (Baktygulov & Raeva, 2010: 3).

Despite the revenues and employment generated by tourism, negative impacts and concerns also reverberate around tourism. Given such a backdrop, CBT is regarded as more appropriate to offset, more broadly, the negative impacts associated with tourism by giving more control of the tourism development process to the local community (Sánchez-Cañizares & Castillo-Canalejo, 2014: 220) and credence to itself. In a similar fashion to tourism, CBT development has also encountered severe problems and remarkable failures in some instances and therefore should not be seen as the only panacea for disadvantaged communities. In that vein, Suansri, (2003: 7) observes that when “carelessly applied, CBT can create problems and even bring disaster upon the community”. Instead when CBT is properly implemented, it can be used as a model for the promotion of community development and conservation (Ellis & Sheridan, 2014: 1). It should be noted that various models of CBT have been proposed (see Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2014: 2 for some reference) but conceptual definitions, practical actions and results related to CBT differ (Dolezal & Burns, 2015: 136) such that the evaluation of CBT success is debatable purely because it is also based on different perspectives of CBT itself (Kontogeorgopoulos, Churyen & Duangsaeng, 2014: 107). It has been noted that the CBT definition can be understood in relation to issues of ownership, and as such it has been noted that in CBT “[m]ost importantly, ambiguity surrounds whether the community actually owns and/or manages the tourism enterprise or facilities, or whether the focus is upon the provision of jobs for local people, or on issues of community involvement in decision-making” (Ndlovu & Rogerson, 2003:125; see also Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2015 for definition issues in relation to community participation).

Despite these uncertainties surrounding CBT, a number of generally common characteristics of CBT can be individuated to an extent that authors (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013 and 2014) attempted to develop a comprehensive model of CBT related to the practical development of the CBT ventures/projects. Zapata et al., (2011) also propose an important ‘double’ model of CBT which is also relevant in this debate and they distinguish their CBT models in relation to the CBT approach used and the

target market to produce the two models, namely, a local tourism market in their CBT bottom-up model; and an international tourism market in their CBT top-down model.

Towards a community-based tourism affinity index (CBTAI)

It is important to mention that the CBTAI is a first indicative attempt in the construction of such an index and this recognizes that more work on it will lead to more detailed index items to reflect the dynamism and evolution of the index in the future. Besides its stand-alone value, the CBTAI could also be used in the grading system for CBT initiatives. In this context, the CBTAI which is posited in this paper can be linked to the conventional tourism grading systems. The CBTAI has two main purposes: firstly, it can be used to categorize CBT initiatives so that governments or other funding agencies and tourism sector institutions/association are able to recognize the status of each CBT initiative for specific support and/or categorization; secondly, to guide the tourism visitors to be able to choose the CBT initiative which they would want to visit based on specific criteria which enable them to be conscious about the 'affinity'(or not) of a CBT venture he/she is planning to visit. In addition CBT associations and networks could also use this index to categorize their associated members.

The writers maintain that the introduction of the CBTAI in the grading system is very relevant for the tourism industry in order to avoid possible misuse and misappropriation of the CBT concept and terms. Moreover, the inclusion of CBTAI (therefore CBT) in the grading system is very much relevant as it is important for CBT grading to be done in a similar fashion to the grading of conventional/mainstream tourism facilities to enhance the image of CBT and define using yardsticks/standards and levels usually applied to the conventional tourism sector. This inclusion should contribute to elevating CBT as mainstream in its own right (see Hamzah & Khalifah, 2009: 2 about mainstreaming CBT). Therefore, this CBTAI is based on the different stages of CBT development as posited by Mtapuri and Giampiccoli (2014); the different types of possible CBT ventures (from Naguran, 1999; Calanog, Reyes & Eugenio, 2012; Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013); the type of tourism market (Zapata et al., 2011) and other CBT characteristics presented in the literature. A number of index items (and sub-items) are presented to comprise a list of items which will be for scoring (or assigning weights). The preliminary set of items shows the possible outcomes based on the various items drawn from Mtapuri and Giampiccoli (2014; also with elements from Zapata et al., 2011) with a special focus on matters of ownership and management (See Table 1 below).

Table 1: CBT development stages CBTAI

Items Number	CBT development	Items	Score
1	Origin	Local (within community)	25
		Local (but outside community)	15
		External to the community	
		Government	15
		Non-Governmental Organisation	10
		Private sector	5
2	Entity involved/facilitator	Community-based Organisations	20
		Government/public entities	15
		Non-Governmental Organizations	10
		Private sector	5
3	Development approach	Bottom-up	20

		Top-down	10
4	Partnership type	Formal	10
		Informal	5
5	Partnership kind	External	15
		Internal	5
6	CBT venture type	Formal	10
		Informal	5
7	Market	Only domestic	10
		Only international	10
		Domestic and international	20
8	Scale	Micro/small scale	10
		Scaling-up	15

Source: Adapted from Mtapuri and Giampiccoli, 2013, p. 7; also from Zapata et al., 2011.

From this, it is fundamental to value specific forms of ownership and management status. First of all ownership and management items refers to **control** of the CBT venture. This is considered as a core/fundamental item of the CBTAI and as such, a high value/score/weight should be assigned to this item. Issues of community control, ownership and management in CBT have widely been reported in the literature to surface their importance (see for example Butler & Hinch, 1996 in Sofield, 2003: 87; Johnson, 2010: 151; Kontogeorgopoulos et al., 2014: 108; Telfer & Sharpley, 2008: 115). It can be concluded and summarised that CBT is a type of tourism that “is managed and owned by the community, for the community...” (George, Nedelea & Antony, 2007: 1; see also Amat Ramsa & Mohd, 2004: 587; Leksakundilok & Hirsch, 2008: 218; Sánchez-Cañizares & Castillo-Canalejo, 2014: 221). Table 2 presents in detail the various types and options of the CBT ventures (from Calanog et al., 2012; Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013; Naguran, 1999). Table 2 needs to be read together with Table 1. While partnerships should be considered as either internal or external, thereafter, they should be referred to the various partnership options presented in Table 2. The point system, in this case, will adjust the points presented in both tables, as a high point score in Table 1 (internal partnership) can be adjusted (counterbalanced) by a lower point score in Table 2, for example, in the case of a private partnership with a lease agreement.

Table 2: Ownership in CBTAI

Items	Sub-items	Sub-items	Score	
Full community ownership	Single community-owned structure (eg. Community lodge)	Collective enterprise (eg. Cooperative)	Whole community	25
			A number of community members	25
		Corporation	Whole community	25
			A number of community members	20
	Multiple micro-small Enterprises	Single Proprietorship (single individual/household)	Under an umbrella CBT organisation.	25
			Fully independent	10
Partly community ownership	Partnership	Joint venture between community and private sector	State	15
			Non-governmental organisation	15
			Private sector	10
		Lease agreement	State	10

		between the community and the private sector	Non-governmental organisation	10
			Private sector	5
Outside ownership	External ownership	State		15
		Non-Governmental organisation		10
		Private Business		5

Source: Calanog, Reyes and Eugenio (2012: 302); Naguran (1999: 49); Mtapuri and Giampiccoli (2013: 7).

Table 3, the management table, invokes and uses Table 2, the ownership table because instead of ownership, management is considered. Table 3, therefore, illustrates the CBT management affinity framework.

Table 3: Management in CBTAI

Items	Sub-items	Sub-items	Score	
Full community management	Community managed	Collective enterprise (eg. Cooperative)	Whole community	25
			A number of community members	20
		Corporation	Whole community	25
			A number of community members	20
	Individually management	Single individual/household	Under an umbrella CBT organisation.	25
			Fully independent	10
Partly community management	Partnership in management	Joint venture between community and private sector	State	15
			Non-Governmental organisation	15
			Private sector	10
		Lease agreement between the community and the private sector	State	10
			Non-Governmental organisation	10
			Private sector	5
Outside management	External management	State		15
		Non-Governmental organisation		10
		Private Business		5

Source: Calanog, Reyes and Eugenio (2012: 302); Naguran (1999: 49); Mtapuri and Giampiccoli (2013: 7).

Different scorings which rely on the ownership involvement of the various entities (State, NGOs and Private business) are assigned based on the supposed value that each entity gives to CBT. Thus, “Governments, NGOs or the private sector can all provide information, networking opportunities and capacity building by providing skills training” (Giampiccoli, Saayman & Jugmohan, 2014: 1141). For instance the private sector is considered less relevant to government entities such as a university, thus “Contrasting with the private sector, universities are not profit-oriented entities. Typically, the private sector regards community development as secondary to its *raison d’être* of making a profit” (Giampiccoli, Saayman & Jugmohan, 2014: 1149). “While various external entities, including the private sector, NGOs and government can be the initial facilitators/proposers of a CBT development project, the government should play a central role in CBT development” (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2014: 3). Thus, government entities are more central in CBT while NGOs and the private sector have an indisputable complementary role to play.

The final step in the development of CBTAI is to give a specific value to another two relevant CBT specific characteristics, namely: indirect benefits and marketing. The recognition that CBT ventures/projects should spread their benefits beyond the people directly involved and to include indirect beneficiaries (people not directly involved in the venture/project) by means of, for example, community-wide projects implemented with the revenues from the CBT venture itself has been largely mentioned in the literature (see for example Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013; Ndlovu & Rogerson, 2004: 446; Singh, 2008: 156; Suansri, 2003: 69). Marketing is a key factor in CBT development and often it is a very weak and problematic component in CBT (Forstner, 2004: 498; Hayle, n.d.; Ndabeni & Rogerson, 2005: 139; Timothy, 2002: 161). Thus, the link to external entities is often required in marketing for the CBT ventures in order to enhance their chances of success (CBI, 2015: 30). However, despite difficulties, community members should remain in control of marketing to really enhance CBT, as proposed: “marketing remains a crucial leverage point where community members can influence the balance between business and development goals. Participatory development and management define the integrity of CBT as a concept, but CBT marketing will decide the sustainability of CBT as a development tool’ (Richards, 2005: 2, emphasis in original). As such, the distribution of benefits and marketing need to be inserted as items in the CBTAI. Table 4 shows the value attributable to the marketing and benefits distribution items in the CBTAI.

Table 4: Benefits and marketing in CBTAI

Items	Sub-items	Value
Benefits distribution	Only direct benefits	5
	Both direct and indirect benefits	15
Marketing	Community controlled	15
	Externally controlled	5

The distribution of the benefits can be evaluated by verifying the level of benefits which accrue to people who are not directly involved in the CBT venture. As mentioned earlier, the CBTAI can be used in the ‘grading’ system of CBT ventures following the surfacing of a need for a specific criterion for rating/grading CBT ventures (ECIAfrica Consulting, 2006: viii). However, the CBTAI and the conventional rating system should remain separate as they have different purposes. It is also possible that some of the main features associated with a conventional rating system such as the level of basic infrastructure could serve as a complement to the CBTAI and be ‘extra’ value to the CBTAI.

Lack of infrastructure has been noted in CBT (Nyaupane, Morais & Dowler, 2006: 1374) and this problem can be specifically acute in remote and/or poor areas. Therefore, the remaining issues to consider are concerned with the availability or lack and types of infrastructure and facilities. This issue is closely related to the conventional grading system in the ‘conventional’ tourism sector. Consequently, it can also be excluded from the CBTAI while it is already more related to the ‘conventional’ grading system. Therefore, while it is still possible to consider these issues with regard to the CBTAI, this

paper maintains that infrastructure does matter as it serves to enlarge and complete the CBTAI in a more comprehensive and detailed manner. This paper argues that some specific basic issues related to infrastructure are relevant in the index and can serve as a bridge between the CBTAI and the conventional grading system. The value of infrastructure will not be included in the CBTAI itself but will serve to provide an extra item which enables increasing or decreasing the scores obtained in the CBTAI system (for example, adding a square root to the symbol of the CBTAI affinity level, without changing the CBTAI level itself). Table 4 illustrates items related to basic infrastructure:

Table 5: Example of basic infrastructure

Items	Sub-items	Value ($\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{}}}$)
Infrastructure	Access road	
	Electricity	
	Water	
	Internet	
	Toilet	
	Shower	
Legend: $\sqrt{}$ - present but poor = 5 $\sqrt{\sqrt{}}$ - acceptable = 10 $\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{}}}$ - good = 15		

CBTAI = Total of Table 1+ Total of Table 2 + Total of Table 3 + Total of Table 4

The final outcome of CBTAI is a summation of the various points obtained from the various items in the previous 4 tables (Tables 1, 2, 3, 4), with the possible (but not compulsory) inclusion of the sum obtained in Table 5 as an 'extra' items. Table 6 shows the possible levels of the CBTAI which can materialize. The 'extra' items will simply be based on the average of square roots and which could be 1, 2 or 3 square root.

Table 6: CBTAI

Broad CBT Category	CBT Affinity Level	Value (Sum tables 1, 2, 3, 4)	'extra' value ($\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{}}}$)
Full CBT (Must at least include full ownership and/or management by the community)	Excellent	171 and above	
	Good	151 – 170 points	
	Fair	131 – 150 points	
	Poor	At least 130 points	
Partial CBT	Excellent	111 – 129 points	
	Good	91 – 110 points	
	Fair	71 – 90 points	
	Poor	51 – 70 points	
Unfilled CBT		50 or less points	

Total CBTAI		
--------------------	--	--

While the points system gives the general level of the CBTAI, some conditions have to be met besides the score obtained. As such no CBTAI could attain the **Full CBT status** if the community is not, at least the full owner and/or manager of the CBT venture. This therefore excludes the Fully independent item and Fully independent (in Tables 2 and 3) means being a stand-alone venture with no links to any CBT umbrella structure, or other association of CBT or a community structure with control over it – it is really a private business run independently by a community member/household. Therefore, to gain its Full CBT status, it needs to reach the necessary score through the other various items. Fully independent status alone is necessary but not sufficient to achieve Full CBT status. This is because wide ownership and management (control) are seen as a fundamental condition in CBT.

What is important is that the CBTAI can serve to ‘institutionally’ verify the level of CBT affinity through specific categories such as ownership, management, distribution of benefits and type of venture. In this respect, this is useful to overcome the ‘confusion’ on defining CBT and helps to avoid the misuse of CBT as a concept by people/companies for their own benefit. In the context of this article the level of CBT affinity will indicate, for example, the level of needed support or it can be taken as a requirement level for specific funding and/or other form of assistance. In addition, the CBTAI can help in tourist decision making processes on the best tourism provider who they can use based on the visitor intention in relation to CBT. In the case of South Africa, the CBTAI should be tested and presented together with the requirement proposed by the Tourism Grading Council of South Africa (Tourism Grading Council of South Africa, online) which quite comprehensively proposes various requirements which each tourism facility such as a hotel and guest house should have. While it is beyond the scope of this paper, it is proposed that CBT ventures should also have their specific ‘conventional’ style of grading system specifically constructed for other tourism/hospitality facilities and service categories.

Operationalisation of CBTAI

For the sake of illustration we introduce two hypothetical CBT projects one “CBT well calibrated”/“CBT well endowed” with all typical characteristics of CBT and the other, which we shall call “CBT poorly calibrated”/“CBT poorly endowed”. Table 7 shows point scoring system for these two projects. The “CBT well endowed” venture originated within the local community; has Government support; has the backing of a Community Based Organisation; it is a product of a bottom-up approach; has a formal partnership which is externally based; is itself a formally registered venture serving both local and domestic markets; and is scaling up.

Table7: CBT development stages CBTAI

Items Number	CBT development	Items	Score	CBT Poorly endowed	CBT Well endowed
1	Origin	Local (within community)	25		25
		Local (but outside community)	15	15	
		External to the community Government	15		

		Non-Governmental Organisation	10		
		Private sector	5		
2	Entity involved/facilitator	Community-based Organisations	20		20
		Government/public entities	15		
		Non-Governmental Organizations	10		
		Private sector	5	5	
3	Development approach	Bottom-up	20		20
		Top-down	10	10	
4	Partnership type	Formal	10		10
		Informal	5	5	
5	Partnership kind	External	15		15
		Internal	5	5	
6	CBT venture type	Formal	10		10
		Informal	5	5	
7	Market	Only domestic	10	10	
		Only international	10		
		Domestic and international	20		20
8	Scale	Micro/small scale	10	10	
		Scaling-up	15		15
Total				65	135

Source: Adapted from Mtapuri and Giampiccoli (2013); also from Zapata *et al.*, (2011)

The maximum possible score that a CBT venture can obtain based on these characteristics is 135 with a minimum of 65. For a venture to be considered to be CBT endowed, it should therefore strive to score 135 points on the basis of these characteristics. The other tables follow similar principles such as each item assuming a single value and the summation of the scores to give the total value/score. While various entities could score the CBTI, an independent entity would be more appropriate should take charge of this responsibility. In the case of South Africa, the proposed South Africa CBT organization (see Giampiccoli, Saayman & Jugmohan, 2014) could be considered as the appropriate entity accredited with the implementation and management of the CBTI.

Conclusion

This article proposes a CBTAI to counteract possible misuse of the CBT term and concept through marketing gimmicks by actors involved in the tourism sectors. In addition, the CBTAI can be of use to standardize CBT institutionally and help to direct possible government (or other entities') support to CBT based on level of affinity to CBT. The CBTAI could, help tourist in decision making in instances where they have to choose whether or not to use a specific CBT venture. The process of making such choices is predicated on available information which the CBTAI holds. This is one of the reasons which prompted the compilation of this paper in order to avoid that marketing gimmick on CBT which serves to "attract consumer who are then made to believe that they are supporting a good cause-which is to travel responsibly" (Kayat *et al.*, 2015: 224). As such, this paper recommends that the CBTAI should be visible and publicized as much as possible by various tourism institutional and tourism sectors entities to inform visitors for informed decisions. Based on what others are saying in literature concerning indexes and in an attempt to achieve comprehensiveness in covering as

many facets as possible related to a CBT venture/project, this paper presents a novel CBTAI following the dominant characteristics of a CBT venture/project itself. The CBTAI is slightly linked to the conventional grading system by means of basic infrastructure requirements. This link remains but is not compulsory and just serves to give the 'extra' dimension (for a more comprehensive index) of the status of a CBT venture in relation to possible institutional support or visitor requirements.

The CBTAI presented in this article is by no means definitive and exhaustive in the elements it covers, but it serves as a starting point to open up a discussion and conversation regarding CBT indexes which are relevant in the implementation, management and judgement of CBT ventures. While specific items, such as symbols or logos can be changed (for examples stars could be associated with various levels of the CBTAI and the square roots symbol could be changed) and categories can certainly be revised and improved on an ongoing basis as knowledge and expertise on CBT evolves, this paper's aim was to start to introduce the CBTAI as an instrument towards the possible standardization of CBT based on specific characteristics of CBT. Different historical and socio-economic contexts will however determine the possible changes to ensue based on each context circumstances. This paper posited a CBTAI, which is its major contribution.

References

ADTI (2011). Adventure Tourism Development Index 2011 Report. The George Washington University (GW), The Adventure Travel Trade Association (ATTA) and Vital Wave Consulting. Retrieved 21 February 2015 from http://www.adventuretravel.biz/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/atdi_2011_report.pdf

Amat Ramsa, Y. & 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.

Auala, S. (2012). Local residents' perceptions of community-based tourism (CBT) at Twyfelfontein Uibasen conservancy in Namibia. *Journal for development and leadership*, 1(1), 63-74.

Baktygulov, S., & Raeva, R. (2010). *Creating Value for All: Community-Based Tourism*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.

Brende, B., & Greenhill, R. (2013). Preface. In J. Blanke and T. Chiesa (Eds.), *The Travel and Tourism Competitiveness Report 2013. Reducing Barriers to Economic Growth and Job Creation* (pp. XIII-XIV). Insight Report. Geneva: World Economic Forum. Retrieved 21 February 2015 from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_TT_Competitiveness_Report_2013.pdf

Calanog, L. A., Reyes, D. P. T., & Eugenio, V. F. (2012). *Making ecotourism work. A manual on establishing community-based Ecotourism enterprise (CBEE) in the Philippines*. Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) Philippines, Makati City.

CBI (2015). *Tailored intelligence study Community Based Tourism (CBT) in Bolivia Towards increased European market access*. Netherlands: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands CBI - Centre for the promotion of imports from developing countries. Retrieved 12 November 2015 from <https://www.cbi.eu/sites/default/files/tailored-information-community-based-tourism-europe-to-bolivia-tourism-2015.pdf>

Chang, C-L., Hsu, H-K., & McAleer, M. (2014a). *A Tourism Financial Conditions Index*. Working Paper nº 1420 Instituto Complutense de Análisis Económico. Universidad Complutense Madrid. Retrieved 21 February 2015 from <http://eprints.ucm.es/26305/1/1420.pdf>

Chang, C-L., Hsu, H-K., & McAleer, M. (2014b). *A Tourism Conditions Index*. Working Paper No. 3/2014. Department of Economics and Finance, College of Business and Economics, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand. Retrieved 21 February 2015 from <http://www.econ.canterbury.ac.nz/RePEc/cbt/econwp/1403.pdf>

Choi, H. C., & Sirakaya, E. (2006). Sustainability indicators for managing community tourism. *Tourism Management* 27, 1274-1289.

Cornelissen, S. (2005). *The Global Tourism System: Governance, Development and Lessons from South Africa*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Dolezal, C., & Burns, P. M. (2015). ABCD to CBT: asset-based community development's potential for community-based tourism. *Development in Practice*, 25(1), 133-142

ECIAfrica (2006). *Trade and Industry Chamber Fund for Research into Industrial Development, Growth and Equity (FRIDGE). Community/routes tourism sector study: executive summary*. Johannesburg: ECIAfrica Consulting.

Ellis, S., & Sheridan, L. (2014). The role of resident perceptions in achieving effective community-based tourism for least developed countries. *Anatolia – An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2014.939202>

Fang, Y., & Yin, J. (2015). National Assessment of Climate Resources for Tourism Seasonality in China Using the Tourism Climate Index. *Atmosphere*, 6, 183-194.

Forstner, K. (2004). Community Ventures and Access to Markets: The Role of Intermediaries in Marketing Rural Tourism Products. *Development Policy Review*, 22 (5), 497-514.

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. & Mtapuri, O. (2015). Between Theory and Practice: A Conceptualization of Community Based Tourism and Community Participation. *Loyola Journal of Social Sciences*, XXIX(1):27-52.

Giampiccoli, A., Saayman, M. & Jugmohan, S. (2014). Developing community-based tourism in South Africa: Addressing the missing link. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 20 (3:2), 1139-1161.

Giampiccoli, A., & Saayman, M. (2014). A Conceptualisation of Alternative Forms of Tourism in Relation to Community Development. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5 (27), 1667-1677.

Hamzah, A., & Khalifah, Z. (2009). *Handbook on community based tourism 'How to develop and sustain CBT*. Kuala Lumpur: Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Secretariat.

Hayle, C. (n.d.) *Ensuring Market Realism and Effective Promotion*. Retrieved 21 February 2015 from <http://isis.uwimona.edu.jm/jct/aboutct/products.htm>

Jealous, V. (1998). 'The Philippine perspective, criteria & goal for each NGO/PO/Community.' In: C. T. Urquico (ed.). *Community based Sustainable Tourism. A handbook*, Quezon City: Accessing Support Service and Entrepreneurial Technology, Inc., 8-12.

Johnson, P. A. (2010). Realizing Rural Community Based Tourism Development: Prospects for Social-Economy Enterprises. *Journal of Rural and Community Development* 5 (1/2), 150–162.

Kayat, K., Ramli, R., Mat-Kasim, M., & Abdul-Razak, R. (2015). Community-based rural tourism as a sustainable development alternative: an analysis with special reference to the community-based rural homestay programmes in Malaysia. In S. M. Radzi, N. Sumarjan, C. T. Chick, M. S. M. Zahari, Z. Mohi, M. F. S. Bakhtiar, & F. I. Anuar (Eds.), *Theory and Practice in Hospitality and Tourism Research*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 223-227.

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 and Development*, 11(1), 106-124.

Le, T.-A., Weaver, D. & Lawton, L. (2012). *Factors influencing the performance of community-based tourism in the semi-periphery of Viet Nam: A resident perspective from Ta Van Village*. Paper presented at the The new Golden Age of Tourism and Hospitality, Melbourne Convention and Exhibition Centre.

Leksakundilok, A., & Hirsch, P (2008). Community-based tourism in Thailand. In J. Connell and B. Rugendyke (Eds.), *Tourism at the grassroot. Villagers and visitors in the Asia-Pacific*, London: Routledge, 214-235.

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

Mtapuri, Oliver & Giampiccoli, Andrea (2013). Interrogating the role of the state and nonstate actors in community-based tourism ventures: Toward a model for spreading the benefits to the wider community. *South African Geographical Journal*, 95 (1), 1-15.

Mtapuri, O., Giampiccoli, A. & Jugmohan, S. (2015). Community-based tourism affinity index: a visitor's approach. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 4 (2):1-13.

Naguran, R. (1999). Community based tourism in Kwazulu Natal: Some Conceptual Issues. In D. Ried (Ed.), *Ecotourism Development in Eastern and Southern Africa* (pp. 39-57). University of Guelph, Canada.

Ndabeni, L., & Rogerson, C. M. (2005). Entrepreneurship in rural tourism: the challenges of South Africa's Wild Coast. *Africa Insight*, 35 (4), 130-141.

Ndlovu, J. Nyakunu, E., & Auala, S. (2011). Community Based Tourism in Twyfelfontein Conservancy: Exploring Local Community's Involvement. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Systems*, 4 (2), 38-46.

Ndlovu, N., & Rogerson, C. M. (2004). The local economic impacts of rural community-based tourism in Eastern Cape. In C. M. Rogerson and G. Visser (Eds.), *Tourism and development issues in contemporary South Africa*, Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa, 436-451.

Nyaupane, G. P, Morais, D. B., & Dowler, L. (2006). The role of community involvement and number/type of visitors on tourism impacts: A controlled comparison of Annapurna, Nepal and Northwest Yunnan, China. *Tourism Management*, 27, 1373-1385.

Richards, P. (2005). *Community Based Tourism Marketing Training*. CHARM-REST Partnership: Promoting Network of Community-Based Tourism (CBT) for Coastal Resources Management. European Union – Thailand Cooperation project Coastal Habitats and Resources Management (CHARM) THA/RELEX/2000/0050

Sánchez-Cañizares, S. M., & Castillo-Canalejo, A.M. (2014). Community-based island tourism: the case of Boa Vista in Cape Verde. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 8 (2), 219-233.

Singh, L. K. (2008). *Ecology, Environment and Tourism*. ESHA Books: Delhi.

Sofield, T.H.B. (2003). *Empowerment for sustainable tourism development*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Spenceley, A., & Meyer, D. (2012). Tourism and poverty reduction: theory and practice in less economically developed countries. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20 (3), 297-317.

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

Suryia K. (2010). *Impact of Community-based Tourism in a Village Economy in Thailand: An analysis with VCGE model*. Paper presented at EcoMod2010 Conference. July 7, 2010 - July 10, 2010. Istanbul. Retrieved 21 February 2015 from <http://ecomod.net/sites/default/files/document-conference/ecomod2010/1302.pdf>

Telfer, D.J., & Sharpley, R. (2008). *Tourism and Development in the Developing World*. London: Routledge.

Timothy, D. (2002) Tourism and community development issues. In R. Sharpley and D. J. Telfer (Eds.), *Tourism and Development Concepts and Issues* 135-178. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Tourism Grading Council of South Africa. (n.d). online. Retrieved 21 February 2015 from <http://www.tourismgrading.co.za/>

Zapata, M. J., Hall, M. C., Lindo, P., & Vanderschaeghe, M (2011). Can community-based tourism contribute to development and poverty alleviation? Lessons from Nicaragua. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(8), 725-749.