

BEYOND RURAL CONTEXTS: COMMUNITY-BASED TOURISM FOR A BETTER LIFE IN THE CITY

Oliver MTAPURI

*School of Built Environment and Development Studies, University of KwaZulu Natal,
South Africa*

ORCID: 0000-0001-7698-9482

Andrea GIAMPICCOLI ¹

Department of Hospitality and Tourism, Durban University of Technology, South Africa

ORCID: 0000-0002-2963-2031

ABSTRACT

Community-based tourism (CBT) is most commonly practiced in rural contexts. We focus on CBT in urban areas and argue that it can be practised in poor urban settings such as slums, favelas and townships. In terms of methodology, this paper is conceptual in nature and its aim is to unpack the framing of CBT in urban settings. Literature on CBT in urban contexts is scarce and negligible. CBT which favours disadvantaged contexts has the potential to improve the quality of life of people and enhance community development. Inequality in urban contexts is growing both between and within countries in both developing and developed economies. Against this backdrop, we explore CBT in urban areas (with a nomenclature community-based urban tourism – CBUT), and is specifically meant for poor, disadvantaged, marginalised urban contexts. We suggest that in CBUT, matters of ‘proximity’; infrastructure; and geography are important enablers of tourism development. We argue that universities have an important role to play through skills development for CBUT. Given the scarcity of literature on CBT in urban areas, we contribute to the notion of community in a CBUT context and to the success factors of a CBUT venture.

Article History

Received 17 February 2020

Revised 10 August 2020

Accepted 10 August 2020

Keywords

Urban area
 Community development
 Universities
 Poverty
 Inequality
 Justice

¹ Address correspondence to Andrea GIAMPICCOLI (PhD), Department of Hospitality and Tourism, Durban University of Technology, SOUTH AFRICA. E-mail: andrea.giampiccoli@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Although community-based tourism (CBT) is most commonly practiced in rural contexts, we see merit in adopting this form of tourism in the urban context as well. Cities are huge attractions for both visitors and local residents on the basis of available amenities and industries, traditions, history, cultures, buildings, artefacts, heritage and so on. Moreover, cities around the world are important tourism destinations (Rifai, 2012,). Being relevant tourism destinations make cities important in their socio-economic relationship with the tourism sector, such that the visit is extraordinary for those who either come to meet relatives and friends or for business or leisure, while creating jobs in the city and impacting the local economy (Rifai, 2012). The things that local people take for granted could turn out to be the things that tourists want to see during their visits. For instance, the vegetable markets, the fish markets, the markets for locally made arts and crafts, the music and dances, the townships steeped in brim-full of cumulative histories of both despair and happiness are part of the assortment of the attractions of modern cities which induce their vivacity.

Community-based tourism is growing and is being practised in both developing and developed countries (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2017a). For Giampiccoli et al. (2016, p. 550) there is no obstacle “to CBT development in various settings. Such development has taken place in both developed and developing environs [...] and can take place in both rural (as it often does) and more urban contexts”. International literature emphasises the practice of CBT as primarily a rural phenomenon in poor countries. However, it can be practiced in both urban and rural areas (Bhartiya & Masoud, 2015; Ndlovu & Rogerson, 2004; Rogerson, 2004a). Thus, a major *raison d’etre* of this article is to expand on this possibility as Mano et al. (2017) note that the number of studies on urban tourism focusing on, for example favelas, has been small. This article intends to contribute to the literature on CBT with specific reference to urban areas or what is called community-based urban tourism (CBUT). This follows the CBT concept and definition by authors such as Leksakundilok & Hirsch, (2008), Suansri (2003), RamsaYaman & Mohd (2004), Kayat (2014) (see also community tourism definitions and principles proposed in this paper). CBUT can be defined as a form of tourism in an urban context (specifically, in poor urban settings) that is controlled, owned and managed by disadvantaged community members for their benefit and in which the visitors are able to learn about local’ culture, traditions and lifestyle, through their lived experience and everyday life. CBUT should be an empowerment tool that ensures holistic development of people and their communities involved and, indirectly, to

the community at large, while prioritizing the disadvantaged members of the community. This opens up a window of opportunity for Universities to undertake engaged scholarship, which entails working with communities and the deployment of expertise and knowhow residing in both sides, in pursuit of finding solutions to pressing societal problems for the mutual benefit of the university and the community. This is linked to current trends which encourage the co-creation and co-production of knowledge.

Our aim is to explore CBT in urban areas, specifically in poor, disadvantaged, marginalised urban contexts and unpack its potential. This is because CBT is generally conceived to be a type of tourism which is related to disadvantaged contexts in pursuit of community development in 'remote, rural, impoverished, marginalized, economically depressed, undeveloped, poor, indigenous, ethnic minority, and people in small towns' (Tasci et al., 2013, p. 10). There is a need to posit a form of CBT beyond the 'usual' rural context and to explore its specificities and opportunities in poor urban contexts, given the paucity of literature on CBT in urban areas. We acknowledge that most CBT studies have been case-based and done in rural, regional or natural areas. This is a conceptual paper based on desktop study in which an array of literature was reviewed involving documents in the public domain from government and non-governmental sources, articles and books. No new primary data were collected. Through inductive reasoning, some theoretical postulations are made based on the material reviewed. In terms of structure, this article is organised as follows: a literature review follows which presents issues related to urban tourism, slums/favela/township tourism, with a transition to CBUT. Thereafter, a section provides some opportunities of CBUT in poor urban contexts. We argue that there are context-specific considerations for urban areas. In that vein, universities are mentioned as key stakeholders through their work in the communities. Thereafter, the article concludes.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Urban tourism is experiencing phenomenal growth, spurred by the growth of cities. At the same time, debate on the role of cities accompanied with the growth of global tourism, as well as, the role of tourism in the protection of the environment and cultural identities of cities emerged (Rifai, 2012). For Olalekan (2014) urban areas are at the centre of the numerous environmental and economic challenges of the 21st century. Cities are important in contributing to the well-being of communities and the tourism sector is an enabler in the realisation of this outcome.

On the American continent, it is noted that a lot of research has been undertaken in the Caribbean and Latin America focusing on non-urban tourism (Dürr & Jaffe, 2012). Similarly, Dürr & Jaffe (2012) are of the view that most of the work has focused on urban inequalities, with little focus on urban tourism per se. Urbanization is a factor that influences the pace and quality of growth of cities. Too fast and unplanned urbanization results in messy and disordered urban sprawl. Both positive and negative impacts can be linked to tourism in urban areas (Galdini, 2007; Pavlic et al., 2013; Shams et al., 2015). Urban tourism is growing and becoming a major tourism sector, thus there is a need to reflect on its effects on communities as well as on local economy, cultures and society (Pavlic et al., 2013). For example, from an Australian perspective, it has been noted that Australia's major cities accounted for about 70% of the population in 2009, and constitute important tourist destinations in their own right, with both positive and negative impacts being experienced by local communities (Edwards et al., 2010).

An interesting form of urban tourism – tourism in poor urban contexts such as slums, townships, favelas – is also growing. For instance, slum tourism has been growing very fast especially in Latin America and Caribbean cities, accompanied by related research (Dürr & Jaffe, 2012) and it has remained a highly debated leisure practice (Frenzel, 2013). Therefore, urban planners in cities must take into account urban tourism given its potential to create jobs and economic opportunities for a lot of people in the tourism and related industries (Rifai, 2012). It can be concluded that rapid urbanisation has its advantages and disadvantages. We argue that urbanisation is good for cities if it is carefully planned by harnessing its advantages, reducing its disadvantages and leveraging urbanity as a tourist ingredient. Pavlic et al. (2013), observe that unplanned and uncontrolled tourism can exert undue pressure on the socio-economic environments in destination cities, thereby further threatening the tourist activities and future city development. Cities are magnets for both local people as well as tourists on the basis of the opportunities they create. These opportunities can be harnessed for the benefit of both tourists and local residents if done in a sustainable way. This implies that current attractions, for both local residents and tourists, must be enhanced (and not impaired).

We make an important digression here. Cities are growing and so are disparities. Some people live in leafy suburbs of urban cities enjoying better services and accessing greater economic opportunities while others stay in slums. Thus, “the world’s one billion African, Asian and Latin American slum dwellers, are more likely to die earlier, experience more

hunger and disease, attain less education and have fewer chances of employment than those urban residents that do not reside in a slum [...] Globally, the slum population is set to grow at the rate of 27 million per year in the period 2000–2020” (UNDP/UNFPA, UNICEF & WFP, 2009, p. 1). Urban poverty is also increasing faster than rural poverty as people feeding into this growth are people who cannot enter the formal labour market to the extent that unemployment and under-employment are symptomatic of the urban landscape (UNDP/UNFPA, UNICEF & WFP, 2009). Growth in urban poverty is not just a developing world matter. Urban poverty is also a growing and concerning issue in the developed world. As such, inequality and poverty are a dual problem that must be taken seriously in both developed and developing urban contexts as a ‘universal concern’, because a majority (66%) of the world population lives in cities where the gap between the rich and poor is widening in emerging and developing countries (United Nations Human Settlements Programme [UN-Habitat], 2016). Additionally, in developed countries, many cities are experiencing gross intra-urban inequality, accompanied by pockets of private wealth, deteriorating infrastructure and diminishing chances for social mobility, resulting in heightened tensions between ethnic, racial and religious groups, including immigrants, violence, as well as, challenges of waste management and environment (UN-Habitat, 2016). Growth of cities has come with attendant problems related to the provisioning of social services, as well as, concentrations of people, many of whom are unemployed and some are under-employed. Such a scenario gives rise to crime and other social ills associated with extemporaneous human concentrations. Inequality breeds disunity, discontinuities, continuities and unities within the communities as new people come in and some leave.

Inequality is at its peak in the last 30 years as the gap between the rich and poor is yawning in most countries (UN-Habitat, 2016). In US, for example, “New York City is a microcosm of America’s rising economic inequality [and it] has become the capital of inequality” (UN-Habitat, 2016, p. 19) with poverty reaching the suburbs in the USA (Murphy & Allard, 2015). Change and restructuring of urban contexts has had its consequences in the same period to the extent that developed countries witnessed major industrial restructuring because of trade liberalization, the fall of communism and the emergence of Asian economies, coupled with de-industrialisation and the ascendance of the services sector in primate conurbations (UN-Habitat, 2016). A shift from traditional manufacturing has led to the rise of tourism as a strategy for local economic development and urban regeneration, as a consequence of global economic restructuring

(Rogerson, 2004b). Common problems of widening inequality and industrial restructuring, which urban areas in developed countries face, serve to underline the relevance of this article to both developed and developing countries. New changes, new technologies, and new 'lives', new opportunities, and new inequalities are part of the evolving and non-static landscape of experience – the human experience.

In this context, urban tourism has a lot of potential as well as challenges. For instance, it can provide the impetus to develop urban destinations which are competitive, by improving places as visiting areas which are ecologically, economically, environmentally, politically and socially sustainable (Pavlic et al., 2013). This emphasises the fact that urban tourism needs to be carefully developed and managed. As expressed by the Secretary-General of the UNWTP who said;

“Managing urban tourism, however, is no simple task. As metropolitan areas expand rapidly, both the public and private sector face radical changes, as well as significant opportunities. Sustainably managing increasing tourist numbers amid a constantly changing city landscape while ensuring the city is developed to respond to the needs of both visitors and local communities is key.” (Rifai, 2012, p. 4)

It is paramount to safeguard the basis upon which urban tourism is built and prevent any negative impacts by developing a tourism which is steeped in sustainable development principles (Pavlic et al., 2013). With growth of tourism and strong sentiments for urban regeneration there is an impetus towards ensuring cultural integrity, environmental sustainability and community participation to achieve a locally-grounded tourism and new management practices in such a way that, as cities get revitalised, tourism should be used as a tool for community development (Galdini, 2007).

Within urban tourism, tourism in specific poor/disadvantaged/marginalised urban contexts such as slums, favelas, townships is taking place in many parts of the world today. For example, slum tourism operations “are executed, *inter alia*, in the poor areas of Manila (Philippines), Jakarta (Indonesia), Cairo (Egypt), Buenos Aires (Argentina), Nairobi (Kenya), Mazatlán (Mexico), Bangkok (Thailand) and Windhoek (Namibia)” (Steinbrink, 2012, p. 214). The global reach and diversity of slum tourism is today acknowledged as important for local economic development. Marginalised urban spaces around the world are becoming commodified such that slumming has become widespread in Europe, North America as well as in cities of the Global South (Dürr & Jaffe, 2012). It is

now difficult to define a 'typical' slum tour as tour operators target premium tours as well as low-budget backpackers with limited participation of local residents – for instance, township tours in South Africa are themed around apartheid politics; and favela tours (in Brazil) have a unique erotic flavor implying that they are context specific (Dürr & Jaffe, 2012). Slum tours are part of the urban tourism industry as part of a standard repertoire in Johannesburg and Cape Town; and favelas in Rio de Janeiro representing a 'must do' in those cities, with figures showing that about 300,000 tourists participate in slum tours in Cape Town and about 40,000 in Rio de Janeiro per annum (Steinbrink, 2012). The crucial point is how CBT evolved from rural context into urban tourism form? Understanding urban dynamics and suggesting CBT as a remedy for urban poverty requires taking a closer look to context-specific conditions. We admit that favela in Brazil and township tourism in South Africa are context-specific and therefore defy generalisations. Each is unique in its own right. For instance, township tourism in Soweto, Johannesburg, relies on the pull effect of iconic names like Nelson Mandela and the Archbishop Desmond Tutu who are both Nobel Prize laureates and both lived on Vilakazi Street, around which most of its township tourism activities are clustered. This gives this area its own historic dynamic linked to South Africa's pre-independence struggles for liberation and a unique tourism flavour around the Nobel Prize laureates.

The actual value-add of slum tourism in fostering and facilitating community development and poverty alleviation is debated. On one hand, slum tourism is considered voyeuristic and bad, while on the other, it is taken as a strategy to assist in community development. Thus, Frenzel (2013) notes that some critics consider slum tourism as unhealthy, while its proponents argue that it is good for poverty alleviation. Those who view it as bad, claim that such visits to poverty-stricken townships, can be likened to watching animals in a zoo (Nxumalo, 2003). While slum tourism promoters are of the view that it provides income, jobs and other non-material benefits as a development strategy, its critics highlight the limits of tourism to alleviate poverty and as a strategy for development (Frenzel, 2013).

Tourism itself is undergoing a process of transformation. Examples of this transformation include notions of volunteer, ethical and other forms of tourism taken to represent 'responsible tourism' which are considered amenable to development and fighting global inequalities (Dürr & Jaffe, 2012). Equally, the debates continue in terms of beneficiaries and benefactors – who gets the lion's share of the spoils and financial returns

emanating from tourism. We accept that CBT in urban contexts needs to be approached with care as its impacts are harder to be observed by virtue of scale, which is the case with rural areas as a panoply of diverse factors such as (in)formality, the spatial spread of enterprises (diffused and clustered), variegated nature of the activities and regulatory frameworks at play in such setting.

CBT aligns with alternative tourism approaches which emphasise holistic community development by fundamentally dissociating itself from neoliberalism and pursuing the goals of equity, social justice, empowerment and sustainable development in disadvantaged communities (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016). Fairness and equity in practice and commerce, community service and all human endeavours are a compulsion that if satisfied globally, better communities and a better society are possible to achieve. They have to be engendered, learned, engrained and ignited in all societies for holistic development to take place. We define community as a group of people with a shared attachment and commitment to a common cause.

The origins of CBT can be traced back to the new participatory and empowerment development approaches that occurred in development discourses of the 1970s (Bhartiya & Masoud, 2015). In this context, CBT emerged in response to the debilitating impacts of traditional mass tourism to extend to gastronomy, local cultures and traditional handicrafts (Bhartiya & Masoud, 2015). Indeed, many models of CBT have been proposed (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2016). Some features and principles of CBT are fundamental and are related to local control/ownership of the CBT venture and development process, the relationship with disadvantaged segments of society; a strong alignment to issues of empowerment, social justice, self-reliance and so on. We also embrace the idea that cultural/educational policies should be addressed in participatory urban governance involving planning and community engagements.

CBT has immense potential to bring about community development and transformation as it is an innovative institutional development approach in which control of tourism development and ventures is retained by the communities (Yong, 2016). Community-based tourism involves projects which are owned, managed and under the control of local communities (Petrovic & Bieliková, 2015). It can be facilitated by external people or agents, who should hand it over to communities after providing training and infrastructure to local people (Bhartiya & Masoud, 2015). It can be surmised that CBT can result in both community development and

empowerment as well as reconfiguring community structures to be more equitable and democratic (Kayat & Zainuddin, 2016).

CBT should be measured for effectiveness by the manner and extent to which it develops and empowers local communities and not external parties (Kaur et al., 2016). Odeku and Meyer (2014) also argue that universities have a role to play in this milieu as catalysts for socio-economic transformation, by providing the necessary skills and techniques that improve the quality of life of communities surrounding them.

The key tenets of CBT are that ventures must be controlled, owned and managed by the disadvantaged community members in order to facilitate empowerment, social justice, equity, self-reliance and so on. Revenues from these ventures must benefit the individual operator and the community with benefit streams being financial and non-financial (involving training and education on matters of the environment, management and so on) (Kayat & Zainuddin, 2016). CBT has its own drivers and challenges. Important drivers for CBT include access to markets, commercial sustainability, conducive policy frameworks and implementation support (Hussin & Kunjuraman, 2014). The other key characteristic of CBT includes the venture being an indigenous effort steeped in local culture, aimed at individual and community-wide well-being; with a long-term perspective (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016). The challenges which many CBT ventures face include: marketing/market access, economic viability, low community financial resources, low local capacity, lack of infrastructure (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016). The success of CBTs rests upon partnerships and collaborations, attractive products made in the community, a community that is coherent, with ownership and control of ventures embedded in communities, good market research, transparency and demand-driven offerings and a system of monitoring and evaluation (Kayat & Zainuddin, 2016). Other fundamental principles of CBT which are encapsulated in a CBT-related E's model include (from a host's perspective): endogenous, environment, education, empowerment, equity, evolving: enduring, entrepreneurship, ethical, externalities – and from a visitor's perspective: exclusive, experience, enjoyment, ethnic (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2017b).

While there is rarity in CBTs in urban areas as much as there are in rural contexts, CBT in urban contexts are present such as in Brazil Favelas (de Oliveira Rezende, 2014; Frenzel, 2013; Mano et al., 2017) and in South African township (Ndlovu et al., 2017). In South Africa, the Government issued the *Operational guidelines for community-based tourism in South Africa*.

The Guidelines properly articulate how to establish and run CBT ventures in both urban and rural areas on a viable path (National Department of Tourism, 2016). Thus, CBT can be proposed in urban settings. Table 1 shows elements related to Community based Urban Tourism (CBUT) such as characteristics and common problems.

Table 1. *CBUT elements*

<p>Rationales for and Definition of CBUT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City consists of communities; • The dynamics and livability of city depends very much on its communities; • Urban Tourism should benefit urban communities; • Urban communities provide variety of uniqueness and activities • The sustainability of urban tourism depends very much on its communities; • People/tourists want to live close to nature and experience an authentic way of life – deepening the meaning of life; • CBUT would also encourage ‘greater variation’ and ‘local flavour’ of tourism industry. <p>Source: CBUT (n.d., p. 3).</p>
<p>Common Characteristics of CBUT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small scale; • Utilizing local resources; • Benefits going to individuals or households in the community; • Collective benefits; • Community owned and management enterprises; • Community enterprises within a broader co-operative. <p>Source: CBUT (n.d., p, 7).</p>
<p>Problems commonly faced by CBUT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor market access and poor governance; • Weak social capital - internal conflicts within community; • Community institutional and managerial capacity is weak; • Competition from mass tourism industry; • Inadequate support from government agencies and donors. <p>Source: CBUT (n.d, p. 11)</p>

One of the criteria for CBUT evaluation is ‘scaling up’ (by increasing in quantity and quality) (CBUT, n.d.). The scaling-up is very important as a way to shift the tourism sector towards realising local control and benefit. It can be argued that, while CBUT is usually intended for disadvantaged urban areas, similar opportunities should be extended to generally poor (or less poor) urban areas in order to embed the control of tourism in the hands of local actors in local contexts.

In CBT those community members not directly involved in CBT ventures should also derive some benefits from it (Bhartiya & Masoud, 2015). While this can be achieved with ease in rural contexts, especially in small rural villages, entailing the involvement of all (or most of) the local

population (especially the disadvantaged sections), in an urban context it would be unrealistic. It is therefore, our proposition that specific urban spaces such as a specific road/street, a group of few roads/streets, or a small neighbourhood or city area, should become the unit (the 'rural small village') upon which the concepts and model of CBT should be built, thus leaning towards a community-based diffused tourism (CBDT) model (see Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2020). In this context, it is important to take into account "the stakeholders sense of place, or place attachment, i.e. how the residents feel about their community and also what they do in that community such as how they engage visitors, each other, and natural resources" (Lindström & Larson, 2016, p. 73). The link and contextualisation in the local setting is fundamental. In the case of Soweto in South Africa, the stakeholders include the owners of spaza shops (informal traders in groceries and cultural objects and artefacts); owners of Bed and Breakfast facilities, restaurants and cafes, who receive domestic visitors, foreign fully independent travellers and at times business travellers attending Meetings, Incentives, Conferences and Events (MICE); the local Municipalities and the Provincial and Central Government; and banks and related financial intermediaries. Travellers are interested in the township experience and the history of the country, while owners of enterprises and Government agencies are interested in incomes, jobs and the environment.

From a study of CBT in Favela, it is noted that communities seek political empowerment in their own terms of desire and expectations to preserve the well-being of their places led by themselves (Mano et al., 2017). In the same context, the role of government is critical in terms of policies and concrete actions as this proved decisive in Rio's favelas such that "the presence of the State is still crucial and irreplaceable" (Mano et al., 2017, p. 432). Of equal importance is the active involvement of the residents themselves – without them, not much can be achieved (de Oliveira Rezende, 2014). In South Africa "Township tours are mostly offered by businesses in 'white' ownership, which also retains most of the profits" such that not much wealth is retained in the communities as most of it benefits the white owners/entrepreneurs (Frenzel, 2013, p. 123).

It is evident that CBUT is very complex. Specific poor urban locations can enhance CBUT development. An example of a CBT in a poor complicated urban area is Tepito in Mexico City. The area of Tepito, is "a cluster of some 25 streets in the heart of Mexico City, is known as a *barrio bravo*, a crime-ridden, low-income neighbourhood where street vendors sell stolen goods (*fayuca*) at bargain prices" (Dürr & Jaffe, 2012, p. 115). The touristification of Tepito:

“increases the tensions between state actors, who oppose the Tepito tours, and the local residents. The community-based Tepito tours challenge official policies and city planning. They can be read as a strategy of resistance: as the municipal government is incapable or unwilling to help alter Tepito’s reputation, certain residents take action themselves, using tourism as a means to advance their goals by representing and performing a more favourable image to a global audience. However, tourism also entrenches previously existing conflicts between leading figures in this district as not all locals benefit in the same way from these activities” (Dürr & Jaffe, 2012, p. 116).

In this context it can be argued that the manner in which a CBT venture is configured and implemented, can predict its chances of success (Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2017). It is the methods and techniques of implementation which are at the heart of the success or failure of the ventures (Sakata & Prideaux, 2013). It is important to assure proper implementation of CBT because if “it is not properly facilitated, it can inflict profound damage on communities instead of serving as a development tool for which it is intended” (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013, p. 1). We align with Giampiccoli and Saayman (2017) that a CBT venture is successful when majority ownership and control rests with the local players in the communities and we add the following elements: a CBT venture is successful when owners can live off their venture with some degree of comfort; they can pay off their debt to external entities; pay for their day-to-day running and recurring expenses; paying themselves and their staff consistently; and being able to generate some profit/surplus funds on which to pay their taxes and levies to government and its agencies, year in, year out. In this case, success is equivalent to sustainability in which size does not matter (with a caveat that a CBT venture should not inflict harm on other human beings and the environment). A CBT should be able to self-fund, run and expand as an ongoing concern.

DISCUSSION

Enhancing CBUT for Community Development

CBT has some common underlying principles (as mentioned above), such as, indigenous control and ownership of the CBT venture, a clear CBT development process, the pre-eminence of local culture, individual and community wide well-being (involving direct and indirect beneficiaries). This article presented matters specifically related to CBUT, which it considers important as each local context has its own specific characteristics.

As such, three main categories or concepts are here proposed: 'proximity', infrastructure and geography.

In any poor urban area, whatever the level of poverty and socio-economic marginalisation, there is the advantage to be physically close, or even within the city or urban conurbation as compared to a far small rural village. Thus, a CBUT venture or project can have 'easy' spatial access (from a distance/physical perspective) to various entities and institutions such as municipal offices, universities, tourism offices, or funding institutions/organisations that could be approached for assistance. Being close to such entities is very important because CBT ventures usually need external assistance (facilitation), especially in their initial stages.

Importantly, the closeness/proximity (or being within) the city allows the CBUT venture spatial access to the tourism market. Most tourists go to or arrive at cities at first contact. Major airports, railway and bus stations are located within urban areas. Therefore, CBUT ventures need their own transport to ferry their visitors from place to place. The proximity to the main source of the tourism markets can certainly facilitate greater contact. This can be augmented by the larger network of contacts that people in urban contexts usually command. As such, living in urban areas gives a huge comparative advantage to establish expansive contacts as compared to a far-away rural village. All of this can assist the CBT venture to have more opportunities and work more independently to attract and manage visitors. While proximity provides to the CBUT business an opportunity to work independently, external assistance for it remains important especially in the initial stages of the CBUT operations. Other human and financial resources are needed to allow the execution of an independent strategy which proximity enables. We add caveat that proximity to markets does not in itself ensure access to those markets. The facilitative role of Governments and its agencies is needed to promulgate rules and regulations that support market entry by these CBUT ventures.

We argue that the second important category relates to infrastructure such as roads, internet networks, water and electricity. The absence of such infrastructures in many rural areas can be a reality. Poor urban areas usually have all or some of them in different conditions. This does not imply that slums or favelas have proper and sufficient infrastructure. They usually may not have, but their infrastructure may be better as compared to a small rural village. Infrastructure in poor urban contexts is variegated but opens up new possibilities than in marginalised rural contexts. In the urban context, the possibility to have internet, electricity and roads is high and can

facilitate operators of the CBUT ventures to network and bring tourists, as they fully establish themselves as legitimate businesses.

A third aspect to consider relates to the geographical location of the possible CBT venture. Urban space is usually vast and at times porous but remains part of the greater city or conurbation. This implies that a CBT venture should establish its own boundaries within that space. As the CBUT project grows, boundaries can change. Therefore, it is advisable to start within a specific geographical area based on social parameters or a focus on shared attachment/commitment. This implies that the complexity of the community is particularly important to consider in urban contexts. It may be difficult to properly demarcate in urban context a specific area which has its own identity, shows its own specific character, that is different from other surroundings, especially where people 'feel they belong'. While it may change based on the type of venture or project as either being accommodation or a tour service, it needs differentiated geographies to enhance its appeal. We argue that a CBUT venture should be formed around specific urban spaces such as a specific road/street, a group of few roads/streets, or small neighbourhoods or city area. Scaling-up is possible with a focus on specific urban spots which can be associated with a place's own history or other specific aspects in areas where people 'feel they belong'. The aspect of belonging engenders some connection to place which in turn strengthens the tourist proposition when offered to visitors.

These proposed aspects relevant to CBUT development suggest that it is possible to exploit 'proximity' and infrastructure to start ventures within communities. As such, external facilitation and support should be directed towards capacitating and funding CBUT projects based on context-specific needs. For example, if a slum enjoys internet connectivity, it will be ideal to enhance the capacity of people to use the internet for the benefit of the CBUT and their own personal development beyond tourism. The CBUT project becomes a space for education and learning. Technical and business skills are important for community development in the same way as they are necessary for commerce and business.

Extending Opportunities in Urban CBT Development

Many universities in the world are located in urban areas, however their relationship with the urban local context is complex and certainly a subject of debate around the role of the university regarding community engagement. This is exemplified in the book, *University Engagement with Socially Excluded Communities* (Benneworth, 2013).

A city such as London has many universities, to the extent that UNWTO notes that with 43 universities, London has the largest concentration of Higher Education Institutions in Europe (UNWTO, 2012). In the US more than half of the universities are city-based “Yet urban universities have not typically been the most agreeable neighbours. At best, their involvement with adjacent communities has been intermittent and inconsistent” (Rodin, 2007, p.3). Thus, from a US perspective – but arguably valuable to note across the globe –Universities and urban colleges should be involved in finding solutions to societal problems because these problems are also their own. These problems include crime, poverty and deteriorating infrastructure and so on (Rodin, 2007). Recently Universities are including community engagement as one of their core academic missions to the extent that their work in communities is like an extension of their campus, as they provide volunteers, assisting local schools and improving infrastructure in local communities (Smith, 2014). It is important to emphasise that university community engagement projects or university-community partnerships should not be hijacked by the elite in communities (see Boyle & Silver, 2005).

It is important for universities to be more active in poor urban contexts. The case of Chennai in India is pertinent here in which slums were found to be lacking in many amenities, with more than 2,000 termed ‘notified’ and several hundred considered ‘objectionable’ and threatened with eviction (Vasanthakumaran et al., 2012). In this context, Vasanthakumaran et al. (2012, p. 99) explain the stakeholders involved and the modes of execution of a project:

“The project involved a broad range of actors from the academic field (Department of Geography, University of Madras, Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University), civil society (e.g. EXNORA International) as well as the public sector (Corporation of Chennai). The project aimed at helping the community to self-organize to resolve its own problems and to assess the outcomes of the community self-organizing to resolve their own problems. We have taken a participatory pathway and public-private partnership as promising pathways in development and governance of the city slums” (Vasanthakumaran, et al., 2012, p. 99).

The relationship between universities and tourism/CBT has been noted (Giampiccoli et al., 2014). This involvement by Universities can take various forms. For example, universities have been involved in producing manuals and handbooks for CBT such as the Tourism Planning Research Group at the Faculty of Built Environment of the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia -which prepared a CBT handbook titled: *“How to Develop and Sustain CBT”* (Hamzah & Khalifah, 2009). CBT in Vietnam has seen a joint

effort emerging between the University and local communities. The Capilano University, Hanoi Open University has partnered with Sapa's ethnic minority communities to build the capacity of small business operators, local villages, and other tourism stakeholders (CBT Vietnam, n.d.). In this context, the fact that public universities are government institutions, they can play an active role in providing support based on the skills and expertise in fields such as marketing, business management and tourism and for the mere fact that they are already located in the communities in which they operate - guaranteeing a long-term relationship (Giampiccoli et al., 2014). Just as in a context of CBT, empowerment, social justice and self-reliance, are important and there is a similarity with the role of university community engagement in pursuit of the same objectives. In this context, university community engagement must move from being charity to adopting a social justice and empowering approach, as "charity work that it is not guided by social justice values will reproduce unjust structures and fail in the long run to stem the tide of injustice. If the service activity is not empowering the recipients, it further alienates those in need by separating them from their place in society" (Marullo & Edwards, 2000, p. 910).

The involvement of universities in their immediate surroundings, their 'poor backyards', is not just desirable, but an important duty which university should pursue. Universities have a vast array of expertise and resources and should involve themselves in various ways in CBT projects to facilitate its development in disadvantaged urban contexts within their communities. This does not mean that universities should not participate in rural contexts, but this is just to emphasise that the geographical closeness/proximity of the university and the surrounding poor urban contexts can facilitate logistical access and regular contact which opens up the possibility of having a long-term, sustained and close relationship with the community. In this context, the University can be particularly important in monitoring projects in the long-term. "The process of taking regular measurements of something, normally using indicators, in order to provide a better understanding of the current situation, as well as some idea of the trends in performance" is important (Twining-Ward, 2007, p. 8) thus the *in loco* presence of the university can certainly facilitate close relationships and problem-focused collaborations.

CONCLUSION

Urban areas around the world are very important tourism destinations. This is happening against a backdrop of swelling poverty in many urban areas (in both developed and developing countries). In poor urban contexts, slums, townships and favelas are widespread. While CBT has largely been linked to rural contexts, it, as we have seen, can also be done in urban contexts. We argue that CBT development transcends locality, as it deliberately targets disadvantaged community members in pursuit of empowerment, social justice, equity and so on. This article has contributed to the notion of the success factors of a CBUT and defining a community for urban contexts. It explored available possibilities in urban areas, specifically in poor/disadvantaged/marginalised urban contexts informed by the three factors of 'proximity'; infrastructure; and geography. Generally, the presence of better infrastructure in urban areas relative to far away rural contexts, works in favour of urban contexts. The proximity of urban areas to various entities and organisations and to the tourism market are important opportunities that should be exploited. Greater complexity posed by geographical location, its boundaries and its population are important matters to consider in CBT development. All in all, we observe that CBUT is not recognised enough and not adequately promoted in city/metropolitan areas around the world. This should change as CBUT has the potential to contribute to urban regeneration and development in poor areas first as well as across the whole city to empower local people so that they take control and benefit from, the tourism sector. We suggest the following areas for further research: to investigate the implications of different factors affecting CBUT in terms of spatial, social, economic and political aspects; how can CBUT address urban poverty; to investigate the phenomenon of overtourism and its impacts on CBUT; and what other yardsticks can be used to measure the success of a CBUT venture.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

One of the authors received funding from the Department of Science and Innovation and National Research Foundation-funded South African Research Chair (SARCHi) at the University of KwaZulu-Natal. The views expressed in this article are not necessarily the views of the National Research Foundation or its management or governance structures.

REFERENCES

- Benneworth, P. (Ed.) (2013). *University Engagement with Socially Excluded Communities*. Springer: Dordrecht.
- Bhartiya, S. P. & Masoud, D. (2015). Community Based Tourism: A Trend for Socio-Cultural Development and Poverty Lessening. *GJRA – Global Journal for Research Analysis*, 4(10), 348-350.
- Boyle, M-E., & Silver, I. (2005). Poverty, partnerships, and privilege: Elite institutions and community empowerment. *City & Community*, 4(3), 233-253. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6040.2005.00115.x>
- CBT Vietnam (n.d.). CBT Vietnam - About CBT Vietnam project. Retrieved 11 August, 2017, from <http://www.cbtvietnam.com/#cbtvietnam-home-page>
- CBUT (n.d.). Sustainable urban tourism Community-Based Urban Tourism. Retrieved 4 August, 2017, from <https://sustainedu.com/system/files/attachments/Sustainable%20Urban%20Tourism%20Lesson%205%20-%20Community-based%20Urban%20Tourism.pdf>
- de Oliveira Rezende, R. (2014). Communitarian tourism and favela tour as expressions of the new dynamics of tourism consumption. *Tourism in Analysis*, 25(2), 354-372. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11606/issn.1984-4867.v25i2p354-372>
- Dürr, E., & Jaffe, R. (2012). Theorizing slum tourism: Performing, negotiating and transforming inequality. *European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 93, 113-123. www.jstor.org/stable/23294474.
- Edwards, D., Griffin, T., Hayllar, B., & Ritchie, B. (2010). Understanding urban tourism impacts: An Australian study. PROJECT # 120011 - CRC for Sustainable Tourism Pty Ltd 200. Retrieved 11 August, 2017, from <https://opus.lib.uts.edu.au/bitstream/10453/17696/1/2010000008.pdf>
- Frenzel, F. (2013). Slum tourism in the context of the tourism and poverty (relief) debate. *Journal of the Geographical Society of Berlin - DIE ERDE*, 144(2), 117-128. DOI: 10.12854/erde-144-9
- Galdini, R. (2007). Tourism and the city: Opportunity for regeneration. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, 2(2), 95-111. <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/6370/>
- Giampiccoli, A., & Mtapuri, O. (2017a). Role of external parties in Community-Based Tourism development: Towards a new model. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 6(2/20), 1-12. http://www.ajhtl.com/uploads/7/1/6/3/7163688/article_20_vol_6_2_2017.pdf
- Giampiccoli, A., & Mtapuri, O. (2017b). Beyond community-based tourism: Towards a new tourism classification system. *Gazeta de Antropologia*, 33(1), 15-32. <http://hdl.handle.net/10481/44467>
- Giampiccoli, A., & Mtapuri, O. (2020). Towards a coalescence of the community-based tourism and 'AlbergoDifusso' tourism models for sustainable local economic development. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 9(1/64), 1-20. https://www.ajhtl.com/uploads/7/1/6/3/7163688/article_64_vol_9_1_2020_ukzn-dut.pdf
- Giampiccoli, A., & Saayman, M. (2017). Community-based tourism, responsible tourism, and infrastructure development and poverty. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 6(2), 1-28. http://www.ajhtl.com/uploads/7/1/6/3/7163688/article_19_vol_6_2_2017.pdf
- 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.
<https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC166032>
- Giampiccoli, A., Saayman, M., & Jugmohan, S. (2016). Are 'Albergo Diffuso' and community-based tourism the answers to community development in South Africa?. *Development Southern Africa*, 33(4), 548-561.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0376835X.2016.1180968>
- Hamzah, A., & Khalifah, Z. (2009). *Handbook on community based tourism: How to develop and sustain CBT*. Kuala Lumpur: Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Secretariat. Retrieved 21 December, 2020, from <https://www.apec.org/Publications/2009/12/Handbook-on-Community-Based-Tourism-How-to-Develop-and-Sustain-CBT-December-2009>
- Hussin, R., & Kunjuran, V. (2014). Sustainable community-based tourism (CBT) through homestay programme in Sabah, East Malaysia. *Proceeding of the Social Sciences Research ICSSR 2014* (pp.41-61) (e-ISBN 978-967-11768-7-0). 9-10 June 2014, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia.
- Kaur, P., Jawaid, A., & Bt Abu Othman, N. (2016). The impact of community based tourism on community development in Sarawak. *Journal of Borneo Kalimantan*, 2(1), 15-26.
http://www.borneo.unimas.my/images/jbk2016/2_community-tourism_Parveen_ArifNorizan.pdf
- Kayat, K. (2014). Community-based rural tourism: A proposed sustainability framework. *SHS Web of Conferences* 12, 01010. <https://www.mendeley.com/catalogue/8236696b-f35d-3e54-b93d-4e89ff6d7a5c/>
- Kayat, K., & Zainuddin, N. F. A. (2016). Community-based Tourism Initiative in Rural Malaysia: Is it a success?. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 6(S7), 242-249. <https://econjournals.com/index.php/irmm/article/view/3262/pdf>
- Leksakundilok, A., & Hirsch, P. (2008). Community-based tourism in Thailand. In J. Connell, & B. Rugendyke (Eds.), *Tourism at the grassroots. Villagers and visitors in the Asia-Pacific* (pp. 214-235). London: Routledge.
- Lindström, K., & Larson, M. (2016). Community-based tourism in practice: evidence from three coastal communities in Bohuslän, Sweden. *Bulletin of Geography. Socio-economic Series*, 33(33), 71-78. <https://doi.org/10.1515/bog-2016-0025>
- Mano, A. D., Mayer, V. F., & Fratucci, A. C. (2017). Community-based tourism in Santa Marta Favela/RJ: Social, economic and cultural opportunities. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo*, 11(3), 413-435. <https://doi.org/10.7784/rbtur.v11i3.1314>
- Marullo, S., & Edwards, B. (2000). From charity to justice: The potential of university-community collaboration for social change. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43, 895-912. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027640021955540>
- Mtapuri, O., & Giampiccoli, A. (2013). Interrogating the role of the state and nonstate actors in community-based tourism ventures: toward a model for spreading the benefits to the wider community. *South African Geographical Journal*, 95(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03736245.2013.805078>
- Mtapuri, O., & Giampiccoli, A. (2016). Towards a comprehensive model of community-based tourism development. *South African Geographical Journal*, 98(1), 154-168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03736245.2014.977813>
- Murphy, A. K., & Allard, S. W. (2015). The changing geography of poverty. *Focus*, 32(1), 19-23. <https://www.irp.wisc.edu/wp/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/foc321d.pdf>
- National Department of Tourism (2016). *Operational guidelines for community-based tourism in South Africa*. Pretoria: National Department of Tourism. Retrieved 21 December, 2020, from

- <https://tkp.tourism.gov.za/Documents/Community%20Based%20Tourism%20Operational%20Guidelines.pdf>
- Ndlovu, J., Cele, N., Phoofolo, T., Gumede, M., & Marschall, S. (2017). Community based tourism projects as a vehicle for creating entrepreneurial opportunities in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *African Journal for Physical Activity and Health Sciences*, June (Supplement), 14-31. <https://journals.co.za/content/journal/10520/EJC-85b711135>
- Ndlovu, N., & Rogerson, C. M. (2004). The local economic impacts of rural community-based tourism in Eastern Cape. In C. M. Rogerson, & G. Visser (Eds.), *Tourism and development issues in contemporary South Africa* (pp. 436-451). Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Nxumalo M. (2003). Challenges facing black entrepreneurs in the South African tourism industry: A study on bed and breakfast establishments. Unpublished MA Research Report, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Odeku, K. O., & Meyer, E. L. (2014). Knowledge production, community engagement/development and global climate change. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(7), 671–679. DOI: 10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n7p671
- Olalekan, B. G. (2014). Urbanization, urban poverty, slum and sustainable urban development in Nigerian Cities: Challenges and opportunities. *Developing Country Studies*, 4(18), 13-19. <https://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/DCS/article/view/15980/16153>
- Pavlic, I., Portolan, A., & Butorac, M. (2013). Urban Tourism towards Sustainable Development. *International Journal of Multidisciplinarity in Business and Science*, 1(1), 72-79. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/file/195653>
- Petrovic, F., & Bieliková, H. (2015). Potential of community based tourism in area with dispersed settlement – NováBaňaštál region (Slovakia). *Zeszyty Naukowe*, 8(IV-2), 5-15. https://www.wste.edu.pl/materialyII/ZESZ_NAUK/zn%208.pdf#page=5
- RamsaYaman, A., & Mohd, A. (2004). Community-based ecotourism: A New proposition for sustainable development and environmental conservation in Malaysia. *Journal of Applied Science*, 4(4), 583-589. DOI: 10.3923/jas.2004.583.589
- Rifai, T. (2012). Foreword. In UNWTO (Ed.), *Global Report on City Tourism - Cities 2012 Project* (p.4). Madrid: UNWTO. <https://www.unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284415300>
- Rodin, J. (2007). *The University and Urban Revival: Out of the Ivory Tower and into the Streets*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. DOI: 10.1353/rhe.0.0003
- Rogerson, C. M. (2004a). Tourism, small firm development and empowerment. In R. Thomas (Ed.), *Small firms in tourism: International perspectives* (pp. 13-33). St. Louis, MO: Elsevier Science. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9780080517285/chapters/10.4324/9780080517285-6>
- Rogerson C. M. (2004b). Urban tourism and small tourism enterprise development inJohannesburg: The case of township tourism. *GeoJournal*, 60, 249-257. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:GEJO.0000034732.58327.b6>
- Saayman, M., & Giampiccoli, A. (2016). Community-based and pro-poor tourism: Initial assessment of their relation to community development. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 12, 145-190. <http://ejtr.vumk.eu/index.php/volume12/289-v12145community-basedandpro-poortourisminitialassessmentoftheirrelationtocommunitydevelopment>

- Sakata, H., & Prideaux, B. (2013). An alternative approach to community-based ecotourism: A bottom-up locally initiated non-monetised project in Papua New Guinea. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(6), 880-899. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2012.756493>
- Shams, M., Saffari-Raad, A., & Ghasemi, A. (2015). An analysis on urban tourism by SWOT model (Case Study: Boushehr City). *Journal of Scientific Research and Development*, 2(6), 298-305. <https://www.sid.ir/FileServer/JE/1003920150205.pdf>
- Smith, S. (2014). Universities are taking neighbourhood engagement to the next level. *Next City*. Retrieved 11 August, 2017, from <https://nextcity.org/daily/entry/eds-meds-cities-university-community-engagement>.
- Steinbrink, M. (2012) 'We did the Slum!' – Urban poverty tourism in historical perspective. *Tourism Geographies*, 14(2), 213-234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2012.633216>
- Suansri, P. (2003). Community based tourism handbook. Responsible Ecological Social Tour (REST), Bangkok. <https://www.mekongtourism.org/wp-content/uploads/REST-CBT-Handbook-2003.pdf>
- Tasci, A. D. S., Semrad, K. J., & Yilmaz, S. S. (2013). *Community based tourism finding the equilibrium in COMCEC context: Setting the Pathway for the Future*. Ankara: COMCEC Coordination Office. http://www.sbb.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Community_Based_Tourism_Finding_the_Equilibrium_in_the_COMCEC_Context%E2%80%8B.pdf
- Twining-Ward, L. (2007). *A Toolkit for Monitoring and Managing Community-based Tourism*. Netherlands Development Organisation (SNV) and University of Hawaii, School of Travel Industry Management. <http://www.bibalex.org/Search4Dev/files/283814/115937.pdf>
- UNDP/UNFPA, UNICEF & WFP (2009). Agenda Item 1: Population Growth and Rapid Urbanization: Food Insecurity on the Rise in Urban Settings. Joint Meeting of the Executive Boards of UNDP/UNFPA, UNICEF and WFP, 23 and 26 January 2009, New York. https://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/B-8713E-JMB_Jan_09_-_population_growth.pdf
- United Nations Human Settlements Programme (2016). *Urbanization and Development: Emerging Futures*. World Cities Report 2016. Nairobi: United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat). <https://unhabitat.org/sites/default/files/download-manager-files/WCR-2016-WEB.pdf>
- UNWTO (2012). Global Report on City Tourism - Cities 2012 Project (AM Report n° six). Madrid: World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). Retrieved 21 December, 2020, from <https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284415300>
- Vasanthakumaran, T., DivyaRajeswari, S., Annammadevi, N., Nandhini, J., Bunch, M., Marley, D., & Franklin, B. (2012). Community engagement in Chennai Slums. A reflection from the field. *Internationales Asienforum*, 43(1-2), 99-113. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11588/iaf.2012.43.214>.