COMMUNITY-BASED TOURISM IN FIJI – A CASE STUDY OF WAYALAILAI ECOHAVEN RESORT, YASAWA ISLAND GROUP

Keywords: community-based tourism, poverty alleviation, socio-economic impacts, socio-cultural imparts, social capital, environmental impacts, Fiji

INTRODUCTION

The growth of tourism in developing countries has led to increased interest in tourism as a development tool for alleviating poverty (Chok, Macbeth and Warren, 2007; Sofield et al., 2004; UNESCAP, 2003). At the same time, a need has emerged for more sustainable tourism planning, policies and programmes that consider tourist expectations of resource management as well as the needs of local communities, who, in developing countries, are often marginalised rural communities (UNEP, 2012). As a consequence, there has been an increased focus on indigenous tourism and pro-poor tourism, and many ecotourism and community-based ecotourism (CBE) schemes claim benefits to local communities, though as yet there is little evidence to date to substantiate such claims (Goodwin, 2007). Furthermore, when considering tourism's contributions to poverty reduction, one must consider 'how, and to what extent tourism can address the wider poverty agenda by contributing to health, education, welfare and community capacity building' (Goodwin, 2007: 86). Arguably, indigenous CBE, which has grown in developing countries with rare and exotic biodiversity and indigenous cultures, can indeed revive or sustain local cultural practices and educate and entertain tourists, but indigenous peoples rarely have control over tourism development (Goodwin, 2007, p.85; Liu & Wall, 2006). More often, they are objects of the 'tourists gaze' (Urry, 2002).

COMMUNITY-BASED TOURISM

Community-based tourism (CBT) development is promoted in many developing countries as a tool that enables the equitable distribution of economic benefits from tourism, encourages local involvement in the decision-making process, and better meets the needs of local communities and indigenous peoples (Britton, 1982; Brohman, 1996; de Kadt, 1979; Tosun, 2000). In the South Pacific, CBT or CBE is promoted as a development tool for rural and marginalised areas, including remote outlying islands (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2004, p.5). However, some suggest that community development in tourism is merely rhetoric, and question the extent to which local residents truly share in the economic benefits of tourism (Joppe, 1996; Mitchell, 2003). What involvement will communities have? How will this be done? Will it just be a limited number of low paying seasonal jobs or something more significant? Should communities be involved at all? However, despite such criticisms, for the long-term sustainability of tourism development, community involvement and support is often considered vital (Armstrong, 2012; Tosun, 2002).

Scheyvens defined community-based tourism enterprises as 'those in which the local communities have a high degree of control over the activities taking place, and a significant proportion of the economic benefits accrue to them. They may also be characterised by local ownership and a low level of leakage' (2002:10). Even where local indigenous communities have a high degree of control, levels of power and economic benefits are not necessarily equitable. In Fiji, for example, community

participation does occur but power and control generally remain in the hands of chiefs, elders, and wealthy elites, who are predominantly male (Gibson, 2013).

Definitions of community participation in the development process vary, but most agree that the process should be voluntary, educational, empowering and includes more participatory decision making (Ashley, Roe and Goodwin, 2001; Simpson, 2007; Simpson, 2008). Participation exists, for example, where grass roots people can form partnerships with authorities who help them identify problems and needs and empower them to take responsibility for planning, managing and controlling their futures (Tosun, 2000). Stone claimed active community participation was when development was designed so that 'intended beneficiaries are encouraged to take matters into their own hands, to participate in their own development through mobilising their own resources, defining their own needs, and making their own decisions about how to meet them' (1989: 207).

PRO-POOR TOURISM

Since the late 1990s, the concept of pro-poor tourism (PPT), with its alleged potential to contribute to poverty alleviation, has received extensive support from donors, development agencies, tourism organisations and governments (Scheyvens, 2009). In contrast to sustainable tourism, which focuses on protection and conservation, PPT aims at increasing net benefits to the poor whilst considering environmental concerns. Researchers, consultants, and aid agencies have promoted PPT approaches since the late 1990s (Harrison, 2008). Furthermore, PPT is not a

model or theory but ‘an orientation or approach to any form of tourism which focuses on the net benefits accruing to poor people in tourist destination areas’ (Harrison, 2008, pp.855-856). It goes beyond a community focus by promoting strategies that specifically focus on the poor, although others may also benefit. PPT strategies can generate different benefits to local communities, which can be divided into three types: economic benefits, livelihood benefits and intangible benefits, which enhance participation and partnerships amongst different stakeholders (Scheyvens, 2012: 223). To increase the benefits from PPT, the development of community tourism is important. Although impacts of PPT initiatives maybe limited, they can provide such invaluable financial and livelihood benefits as better access to information and infrastructure and pride in local cultures and traditions (Ashley et al., 2001; Simpson, 2007). However, obstacles to implementing PPT benefits exist, including poor understanding of tourism, a lack of skills, poor quality products, and limited access to markets. These can be countered by increased consultation with the poor, especially when developing infrastructure and services for tourists (Ashley et al., 2001).

Initially, PPT initiatives focused on such niche tourism markets as ecotourism and CBT, but it is now suggested that even mass tourism could increase participation of the poor (Bleitrach and Foch, 2010), by considering alternative livelihood initiatives such as handicrafts, traditional performances, tour guiding, and the supply of agricultural produce (Gibson, 2013: 85; Kieti, Jones & Wishitemi, 2009). The tourism industry is thought to be suitable for pro-poor initiatives, because it is

'…labour-intensive, inclusive of women and the informal sector; based on natural and cultural assets of the poor; and suitable for poor rural areas with few other growth options' (Ashley and Roe, 2002: 61).

Research by Scheyvens and Russell (2010) into tourism and poverty alleviation in Fiji established that although not all (or only) the poor may benefit directly from tourism, benefits could be spread more evenly if policies for communal benefits were developed by businesses and government. Therefore, although local chiefs and indigenous owners of CBT resorts are likely to receive the largest proportion of economic benefits from tourism, the community at large will benefit from contributions to education and churches, and from improvements in housing and village infrastructure (water, power, sewerage). As shown in the Wayalailai case study, detailed below, such benefits may possibly be more appropriate indicators of success and fulfil community motivations for CBT in indigenous, close-knit, communal, societies, (Gibson, 2013).

SOCIAL CAPITAL

Social capital is claimed to be a significant influence on community participation in community development, and highly influential in the success of community-based small medium tourism enterprises (SMTEs) (Pretty and Ward, 2001; Macbeth, Carson, and Northcote, 2004; Jones, 2005; Zhao, Brent Ritchie & Echtner, 2011). It is seen to be especially important in enabling rural or periheral communities to transform themselves from traditional resource-based subsistence economies to those

with an emphasis on entrepreneurship in tourism (Johannesson, Skaptadottir, and Benediktsson, 2003).

Within indigenous Fijian societies, social relationships cross several hierarchies (for example, village, clan, tribe, province and nation), and are both strong and complicated. Such communities as those in the case study have the potential to use social capital to support their community-based tourism developments, where an important determinant of economic success is the level of social capital and the relationships among project participants (Ostram, 2000). In indigenous communities, physical capital alone is insufficient for economic growth and, when combined with other forms of capital, social capital is an essential component of development.

ECOTOURISM AND CBT IN FIJI

Community-based ecotourism has the potential to make a valuable contribution to rural economic development in Fiji. In the 1970s and early 1980s, the government formulated nature-based tourism strategies as a form of alternative development to conventional mass resort tourism (Harrison, 1998). Since then, Fiji's tourism industry has diversified, and a variety of new products have emerged. These range from conventional mass tourism in hotels and resorts, to such niche markets as ecotourism and community-based tourism, and budget products catering to the backpacker or youth tourism market (Eccles and Costa, 1996).

In 1992, the Fiji Government adopted the National Environment Strategy, which supported the concept of sustainable tourism through the increased development of ecotourism. This recognised the benefits of foreign exchange, employment, and income generation for landowners, the complexities of the land tenure system, and the need to conserve the environment and cultural heritage. The Fiji Government also identified ecotourism as way of increasing the participation of *i-taukei* (indigenous Fijians) in business, considering ecotourism a 'social and economic development tool, to educate and promote sustainable development, for resource owners and backpacker resort owners' (Verebalavu-Faletoese & Kuridrani, 2006: 8). A further benefit of ecotourism was its small scale and low start-up capital and operating costs, when compared to mass resort tourism (Farrelly, 2009, p.3).

Definitions of ecotourism vary, and what is referred to as ecotourism in Fiji, could be broadly considered backpacking, budget, indigenous, village-based, or CBT in other countries. The range of such activities is neatly summarised in a 2003 strategic environmental assessment of Fiji's tourism development plan, which recommended that the government concentrate on supporting modes of tourism that have lower leakages, few environmental impacts, and that attract tourists whose motivations were aligned to ecotourism or CBT (Levett and McNally, 2003, p.xviii). The benefits of ecotourism ventures for indigenous Fijians were that, given the small-scale nature of these businesses, they could be started with little capital investment, would cater for ecotourists interested in an educational cultural experience, would be owned and operated by local people and would be village or nature-based, and would

have fewer leakages than large-scale tourism. Other envisaged benefits were economic, in the form of contributions to foreign exchange and employment, greater retention of income because of local ownership, and the use of locally produced resources. Social benefits included the preservation of natural and cultural heritage and, in some cases, the revival of cultural practices. Environmentally, ecotourism development could encourage the protection of endangered species, preserve natural and cultural sites, and develop an awareness of unsustainable practices such as logging or slash and burn agriculture.

As Harrison and Brandt have noted (2003: 156), although village-based ecotourism in Fiji is unlikely to replace large scale resort-based tourism, more could be done to ensure that tourism development is based on environmentally sustainable practice and make a valuable contribution to poverty alleviation, employment creation and the socio-economic development of marginalised rural communities and villagers. It is here that indigenous-owned, community-based tourism can play a useful and important role, as demonstrated in the following case study.

CASE STUDY: WAYALAILAI ECOHAVEN RESORT

Study area

The ethnographic case study of Wayalailai Ecohaven Resort, in the Yasawas, provides an example of a participatory approach to indigenous tourism. Wayalailai resort, belonging to the province of Vuda, is located on the island of Wayalailai in the Yasawa Island Group in North Western Fiji. Like most resorts in the Yasawas, it

provides a stereotypical tropical island 3S 'sun, sea and sand' and adventure holiday, which especially appeals to the more limited-budget backpacker market. Wayalailai Ecohaven resort has operated since 1996 and received government assistance, in the form of loans and training, from the Ministry of Tourism.

Figure 1 Wayasewa (Wayalailai) Island (www.mappery.com)

Research methods

Following a detailed literature review, data (which were mostly qualitative) were gathered over a period of three years during visits that varied from a few days to six

months. They involved techniques of participant observation, at the village and in the resort, and in-depth and focus interviews of community groups (youth, women, men, elders and staff) to reveal their primary motivations for developing CBT and to identify the impact on poverty alleviation made by the resort on Wayalailai, as well as the potential cultural challenges accompanying its operation.

In Fiji strict protocols exist regarding the interaction between men and women of different ages, and elders, women and youth were interviewed together and separately. For example, it is unlikely that *i-taukei* women and youth will speak out in front of male elders and chiefs; even in a group setting, gender roles are very specific and there is little interaction between males and females (Gibson, Pratt and Movono, 2012). Furthermore, conducting a formal 'interview' or a 'focus group' among *i-taukei,* or seeking responses to a semi-structured questionnaire, can sometimes be inappropriate in such a context. In an effort to please the researcher, indigenous Fijians are likely to provide the answer they think the researcher wants to hear rather than giving their own views (Evening, 2000; Gibson, 2003). A more culturally appropriate form of eliciting responses are *talanoa* session, where people meet and talk informally while drinking *yaqona* (kava) around the *tanoa* (communal kava bowl). In this situation, *i-taukei* are more open and spontaneous in their responses (Gibson et al., 2012).

Namara village

Namara village is located on Wayasewa, and is adjacent to Wayalailai Ecohaven Resort. The village consists of three landowning units (*mataqalis*[1]): Boutolu, Taqova, and Yaubola, which own Wayalailai Ecohaven Resort. The resort has a 99-year native lease for the land on which it is built. The lease was issued by the Native Land Trust Board (NLTB), now known as the i-Taukei Land Trust Board (TLTB), on behalf of the landowning mataqalis of Boutolu, Tagova and Yaubola. As with all leases, the TLTB receives lease monies and distributes it to beneficiaries from these clans after taking a 15% commission or management fee. This commission is reported to be decreased by a further 5% in 2013 (Krishna, 2012).

Namara has a population of 127 and consists of 27 families. 35 per cent of the population are under 18 years of age, with the rest evenly split between males and females (W. Nakalougaga[2], Namara,personal communication, 2011). Namara village is located on Wayasewa, and is adjacent to Wayalailai Ecohaven Resort. The village consists of three landowning units (mataqalis): Boutolu, Taqova, and Yaubola. These clans own Wayalailai and Kuata Nature Resort (Kuata).

[1] Land owning descent group structure. Several *tokatoka* form a *mataqali* or clan.

[2] *Turaga ni koro* or village headman, Namara Village. The Turaga ni koro is the keeper of village records and demographic statistics.

Education levels within the village vary. All villagers speak English and have at least two or three years of secondary school. Children attend primary school at Naboro village and then either the secondary school at Nasawa Secondary School on Waya Island or one of the secondary schools on the mainland, where they board with relatives. Today, though, many of the youth are dropping out of school to work in resorts for what they perceive to be a relatively easy cash income (W. Nakalougaga, personal communication, 2011).

Historical background

The nearest island in the Yasawa Island Group to Viti Levu, Wayalailai is a two-hour trip from Port Denarau via the ferries operated by Awesome Adventures and South Seas Cruises' (SSC) (See Figure 1). Wayalailai Ecohaven Resort, which is 100 per cent indigenous Fijian community-owned and operated, was the second resort built in the Yasawa Island Group after Coral View on Tavewa Island, and opened in 1996, financed entirely from local sources.

The resort management is accountable to a Board of Directors, consisting of elders from the villages of Namara, Naboro, and Yamata. This reflects the background of its construction, which was the result of an initiative by the three villages, which collectively decided to finance the resort entirely from donations from every family, and to provide volunteers to build and work at the resort. The old primary school, empty since a landslide in 1985, was converted into dormitories and a dining room, while the *bures* (thatched houses) were built from local reeds and timber using "free"

village labour as social capital. Six were built in a month, after which the resort opened for business. For the first two months, all food and beverages for guests and staff were provided from donations using local resources. Two months later, they were able to use the earnings from guests to purchase goods from the mainland.

Built on two levels overlooking the sea and Kuata Island, Wayalailai is one of the largest backpacker resorts in the Yasawas, and sleeps up to 80 or 90 guests at a time. Most resort employees come from the three villages, especially Namara, though a few specialist staff, for example, engineers, electricians and chefs, are from elsewhere in Fiji.

Social capital – benefits and costs

Wayalailai has a large pool of social capital to draw from, as it is owned by three clans or *mataqali*. To obtain labour, the resort must rely on the good will of the clan, and although the labourers are"free," they are not guaranteed. In fact, the main contributors of social capital, from the clans, are women and young male clan members. Male elders rarely contribute directly, except when ceremonial exchanges are performed, but they are responsible for selecting the people to represent their family. Social capital has undoubtedly benefited the resort. Without the 'free' labour provided by the community, its construction would have been extremely costly and it would have taken much longer to complete. However, in providing such capital, a strong sense of ownership has developed among the clans. As members have built the resort for 'free' and donated their time, labour and food, they

feel that not only are they 'owners', but also that they are entitled to use the resort and reap the benefits. This has led to abuse by villagers and Wayalailai management has implemented strict regulations regarding clan access and behaviour at the resort.

IMPACTS OF COMMUNITY-BASED TOURISM INITIATIVES

The clans of Wayalailai hoped that ownership of the resort and tourism would provide an alternative livelihood for their people. The benefits they have received include employment and much needed cash incomes to help fulfil traditional obligations, pay church tithes and school fees. Over the years, the community has discovered that tourism has brought benefits and some negative impacts but the overall feeling is that tourism has been beneficial, in that it has enabled them to fulfil their dreams, participate in ceremonial obligations, and compete with other CBT resorts in the Yasawas Group (V. Ratugolea[3], personal communication, 18 April, 2010). Interestingly, villagers consider fishing and farming as forms of self-employment, but 'real work' is only when you are employed by the resort. They feel that their ownership of Wayalailai has given them the opportunity to participate as equals in traditional Fijian society, and has substantially increased community pride (Gibson, 2013).

Socio-economic impacts of CBT

Economic benefits to the clans provided by Wayalailai include (mainly part-time) employment The resort employs about 30 staff at any one time, of whom 10 are full

[3] Resort Manager, Waylailai Ecohaven resort.

time (five women and five men), and 20 are part time. The resort rosters staff and ensures that every week households have at least one person earning a cash income. As with most tourism resorts, employment is seasonal and the number of employees varies, depending on occupancy, new developments, or maintenance requirements. Nevertheless, as indentified by WTO (2004 in Goodwin, 2007: 92) the researcher discovered these cash contributions, although only between F$50-$150.00 a week, make a significant contribution to household income and suppplement cash obtained from subsistence farming. Findings from employee interviews indicate that villagers are satisfied with supplemented income, which is used to purchase food and such luxuries as *yaqona*, cigarettes, mobile recharge cards and the occasional trip to the mainland.

There are also collective benefits in the areas of housing, and aanitation, religion and education By the end of 1996, a housing scheme, funded by the resort, built ten new houses, two for every *mataqali,* House construction continues, with families making submissions to elders for building funds. Namara villagers receive free electricity between 6.00–10.30 pm, and all households have access to fresh, indoor plumbing and flush toilets. As well as the benefits already outlined, clans on Wayalailai have the discretionary income to spend on consumer goods such as clothing, and household goods such as furniture, televisions, DVD players, refrigerators, gas ovens, mobile phones and laptops.

Religion is extremely important to the clans of Wayalailai (and *i-taukei* communities in general). Wayalailai villagers are Methodist, and since the opening of the resort two churches have been built in Namara and Yamata, with a third under construction in Naboro at the time of writing. In addition, incomes from the resort assist **families** in paying the Methodist Church tithe of FJ$65 a year per family, amounting to approximately FJ$19,500.00 per year for Wayalailai.

There are also educational benefits. A boarding school for kindergarten and primary school students at Naboro catering to villagers from Wayalailai operates from Monday to Friday, with parents taking turns to cook and provide meals. This also enables parents with young children to work during the week, and have children at home over the weekend. Secondary school students attend school on the mainland or at the neighbouring island of Waya and work part time at the resort to obtain money for school fees, uniforms and textbooks.

Other monies have been ploughed back into he resort. The original *bures* have been rebuilt, and a new coffee house, café and dormitory have been constructed.

Perceived negative Socio-cultural impacts of CBT/CBE

Studies show tourism can have negative as well as positive impacts on resident communities (Friday, 2003; George, 2004; Martin, 1998) and, while villagers in Wayalailai generally feel that tourism has been beneficial, village elders and older

staff members expressed concern at the changing behaviour of young men and women in the village.

It needs to be understood that clans on Wayalailai live a simple, frugal, predominantly subsistence lifestyle, governed by strict codes of conduct and dress codess. Alcohol consumption is banned in the village, women must wear tops with sleeves (no tee-shirts) covering their elbows, and *sulus* {sarongs] , skirts or dresses must reach at least mid-calf. And in the evenings, mean, too, must wear *sulusi.* Shorts or long trousers are not allowed.

With earnings from tourism, some of these expectations are being challenged. New forms of consumption have emerged and traditional authorities are being questioned. Among young workers, for example, alcohol consumption and cigarette smoking have increased, and *yaqona* consumption, by many, is excessive, to the extent that the resort has implemented policies to regulate consumption due to high levels of absenteeism.

Women are beginning to dye their hair, wear makeup, and, when off the island, to wear jeans, shorts, tee-shirts, baseball caps and sunglasses, all of which are banned in the village. Although elders and traditional leaders on Wayalailai attribute many of these changes to tourism and backpackers, the extent to which these changes are 'demonstration effects' from tourism, or results of modernisation and access to increased western consumer goods, or gifts from family who have migrated overseas,

is arguable (Scheyvens and Russell, 2010: 20). Village women purchase many of their items of clothing from second-hand stores in towns – e.g. Lautoka or Nadi on the main island of Viti Levu, which import their clothes from Australia and New Zealand, so this potentially has more influence on their clothing choices than young backpacker tourists. It may indeed be the case that, as in the Caribbean, 'nontourist influences are more important predictors of ...consumption behaviour' (McElroy and de Albuquerque, 1986: 33). Others have also noted that tourism cannot be the only determinant of cultural change (Berno 1995; Crick 1989; MacNaught, 1982), and that local people are also influenced by examples of western lifestyles in advertisements, films, television, magazines and such social networking sites as Facebook (Fisher, 2004: 230).

People are now missing church services, some because they have to work at the resorts on Sundays, while others may have consumed too much *yaqona* or alcohol the night before. Such behaviour is considered by elders disrespectful, and many fear their culture is slowly being changed by tourism. Furthermore, with better access to education and employment, young men and women are starting to question decisions of their elders at village meetings. This is considered by the elders to be disrespectful, for young people do not traditionally have the right to speak out or disregard the wishers of their elders.

Indeed, elders also feel that one result of the new source of income from tourism has been the breakdown of the family unit. Today, with both parents working either at

the resorts or on the mainland, close family members bring up their children. Children attend secondary school at Waya, or on the mainland, where they board or stay with relatives.

Environmental impacts of CBT

For indigenous Fijians, their relationship with the *vanua* (land) is more than an economic relationship; it is a spiritual association which is a key feature of their individual and collective identity and a major feature of a holistic world view in which humans are part of rather than separate from the land (Ravuvu, 1983: 70). Given their dependency on, and interconnectedness with, the environment, they grow up caring and protecting their *vanua*, abide by the ways of the land (*vakavanua*) and see their community as a key component of their identity (Brison, 2001; Nainoca, 2011). Villagers feel a sense of responsibility and stewardship for their environment, which they value and consider important for their survival. This practice is called *mamaroi* or *maroroya*. As children, growing up in the village, Fijians are taught to take care of their *vanua,* family, and resources for the future.

Arguably, tourism development might be having an effect on this relationship. In particular, as the resort expands and community development occurs, evidence from surveys of Wayalai staff and villages show that environmental impacts are emerging which need to be addressed. Increased numbers of visitors and developments associated with them, e.g. flush toilets, have begun to have negative impacts on the environment. Deforestation to build the resort and village houses has led to

landslides, and siltation which has affected the reefs. Sand, coral and volcanic rocks have been removed for construction. Runoff from the overflow of septic tanks has led to increased nutrients in the sea and seaweed growth on rocks surrounding the resorts and villages.

> The increase of tins on the island (from tinned food and beverages), the use of bottled drinks in the bar and careless disposal is causing pollution. We are facing problems like lots of seaweeds and the reef being spoilt by boat anchors and cutting down of trees on Kuata and Wayalailai increase possibility of erosion. It is also hard to cater for water for many people during dry season. (I. Galo[4], personal communication, Wayalailai, 2009).
>
> Damaging of our beautiful corals, affected by the anchors of our boats that take tourists to the reefs (J. Nawaqa[5], personal communication, Wayalailai, 2009).
>
> Our reef is not as healthy as before (13 years back), could be because of the sunscreen or other kinds of stuff tourists use while swimming (M. Nailiva[6], personal communication, Wayalailai, 2009).
>
> We have several toilets with septic tanks which are affecting our ocean. Rainy days allow dirty water to flow down to our beautiful sea and this causes bad seaweed to grow (R. Vata[7], personal communication, Wayalailai, 2009).
>
> Washing of clothes, bedsheets, towels everyday, and detergents are washed

[4] Wayalailai staff member and Namara villager
[5] Wayalailai staff member and Namara villager
[6] Wayalailai staff member and Namara villager
[7] Wayalailai staff member and Namara villager

away in the soil and this will be a problem in the next ten years (S. Waqa[8], personal communication, Wayalailai, 2009).

CONCLUSION

This chapter reviewed research and literature on community-based tourism and the role of tourism in poverty alleviation. Using a case study of Wayalailai Ecotourism Resort in the Yasawa Island Group, it discussed how community-based tourism can provide social and economic benefits to an indigenous community, promote ecotourism and long term sustainability of the product.

Community-based tourism is supported by the Fiji government for the socio-economic benefits it can bring (Jarvis & Hobman, 2006). However, for tourism to contribute to sustainable development, it must be economically viable, ecologically sensitive, and culturally appropriate (Wall, 1997). Hall and Lew (2009) noted that ultimately, the planning and management of tourism impacts is a matter for public policy (p.230), although, with increased tourism development and concerns about tourism impacts, tourism businesses must consider the wider social and natural environments within which they operate.

This study indicates that rather than evaluating success solely in financial or economic terms, assessment should also include such cultural dimensions as the ability of indigenous entrepreneurs to balance traditional and business obligations

[8] Wayalailai staff member and Namara villager

and maintain their status within indigenous and local society. It is, after all, their business. Overall, clan members believe the resort is a success, but place a high level of importance on village development, for example, housing, running water, toilets, payment of church tithes and school fees, increased living standards, and the ability to contribute to traditional obligations and ceremonies. By contrast, profit maximisation, saving and reinvestment in the resort are considered to be of secondary importance. CBT at Wayalailai has provided extensive economic and social benefits for a once marginalised, remote, island community, and is an example, of how, with planning and consideration of cultural aspirations, tourism potential for alleviating poverty can have substantial impacts for marginalised communities.

REFERENCE LIST

Armstrong, R. (2012) 'An analysis of the conditions for success of community based tourism enterprises', *International Centre for Responsible Tourism.* Occasional Paper OP 21(2012),1-52.

Ashley, C., and Roe, D. (2002) 'Making tourism work for the poor: strategies and challenges in Southern Africa', *Development Southern Africa,* 19/1: 61-82.

Ashley, C., Roe, D., and Goodwin, H. (2001). *Pro-poor tourism strategies: Making tourism work for the poor. A review of experience.* Pro-poor tourism report No. 1. ODI, IIED, CRT.

Ateljevic, I., & Doorne, S. (2004) 'Diseconomies of scale: A study of development constraints in small tourism firms in central New Zealand', *Tourism and Hospitality Research,* 5/1, 5-24.

Berno, T. (1995) 'The socio-cultural and psychological effects of tourism on indigenous cultures', Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand.

Bleitrach, V., and Foch, A. (2010) 'Lessons learned from this issue. Should tourism be promoted in developing countries?' *Private sector and development, Proparco's Magazine, 7,* September 2010.

Brison, K.J. (2001) 'Constructing identity through ceremonial language in rural Fiji', *Ethnology,* 40/4: 309-327.

Britton, S.G. (1982) 'The political economy of tourism in the third world', *Annals of Tourism Research,* 9: 331-358.

Brohman, J. (1996) 'New directions in tourism for third world development', *Annals of Tourism Research,* 25/1: 48-70.

Chok, S., Macbeth, J. and Warren, C. (2007) 'Tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation: A critical analysis of "pro-poor tourism" and implications for sustainability', *Current Issues in Tourism,* 10/2-3, 144-165.

Crick, M. (1989) 'Representations of international tourism in the social sciences: Sun, sex, sights, savings and servility', *Annual Review of anthropology,* 18: 307-344.

de Kadt, E. (1979) 'Social planning for tourism in the developing countries', *Annals of Tourism Research,* January/March: 36-48.

Eccles, G., & Costa, J. (1996) 'Perspectives on tourism development', *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management,* 8/7: 44-51.

Evening, E.S.H. (2000) 'A case study of investigation of the factors responsible for limiting the marketing exposure of small-scale village-based tourism schemes in Fiji', Unpublished Masters thesis, Lincoln University, Canterbury, New Zealand.

Farrelly, T.A. (2009) *Business va'avanua: cultural hybridisation and indigenous entrepreneurship in The Bouma National Heritage Park, Fiji.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand. Online. Available HTTP: <http://mro.massey.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10179/1166/02_whole.pdf?sequence=4> (accessed 4 June 2013).

Fisher, D. (2004) 'The demonstration effect revisited', *Annals of Tourism Research,* 31/2: 428-446.

Foley, D. (2006) 'Does business success make you any less indigenous?' *Indigenous Entrepreneurship,* 241-257. Online. Available HTTP: <http://www.swinburne.edu.au/lib/ir/onlineconferences/agse2006/foley_p241.pdf> (accessed 10th January 2013).

Friday, J. (2003) 'Performing authenticity: The game of contemporary backpacker tourism (Australia)', Unpublished PhD thesis, Lakehead University, Canada.

Furneaux, C., and Brown, K. (2007) *Indigenous entrepreneurship: an analysis of capital constraints.* AGSE, 2007, 669-682. Online. Available HTTP: <http_www.aphref.aph.gov.au_house_committee_atsia_indigenousenterprises_subs_attachmenta33.pdf> (accessed 3rd January 2013).

George, E.W. (2004) 'Commodifying local culture for tourism development: The case of one rural community in Atlantic Canada', Unpublished Phd Thesis, The University of Guelph.

Gibson, D. (2003) 'More than smiles: employee empowerment facilitating the delivery of high quality consistent services in tourism and hospitality', unpublished Master's Thesis, University of the South Pacific, Suva, Fiji.

Gibson, D. (2013) 'The cultural challenges faced by indigenous-owned small medium tourism enterprises (SMTEs) in Fiji. Case studies from the Yasawa Islands', *The Journal of Pacific Studies,* 32:106-131.

Gibson, D. (2013) '*Living in the moment: cultural challenges faced by indigenous owned budget resorts in Fiji – case studies from Wayalailai, Yasawa Island Group'*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Suva: The University of the South Pacific.

Gibson, D., Pratt, S. and Movono, A. (2012) 'Tribe tourism: a case study of the Tribewanted Project on Vorovoro, Fiji', in S. Fullagar, K. Markwell, and E. Wilson (eds.) *Slow tourism: experiences and mobilities* (pp. 322-347), Bristol: Channel View.

Goodwin, H. (2007) 'Indigenous tourism and poverty reduction', in R. Butler and T. Hinch (eds.) *Tourism and indigenous peoples,* (pp.84-94). Oxford: Butterworth: Heinemann.

Hailey, J.M. (1985) *Indigenous Business in Fiji.* Honolulu: Pacific Islands Development Programme East-West Centre.

Hall, C.M., and Lew, A.A. (2009) *Understanding and managing tourism impacts: An integrated approach,* London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Harrison, D. (Ed.). (1998) *Ecotourism and village-based tourism: a policy and strategy for Fiji.* Suva, Fiji: Government Printer.

Harrison, D. (2008) 'Pro-poor Tourism: A critique', *Third World Quarterly*, 29/5, 851 – 868.

Harrison, D., & Brandt, J. (2003) 'Ecotourism in Fiji', in D. Harrison (ed.), *Pacific Island Tourism*, (pp. 139-151), New York: Cognizant Publications.

Jarvis, J. & Hobman, E. (2006) *Flashpackers – Backpackers and Independent Travellers in Fiji 2006.* Melbourne: Tourism Research Unit & National Centre for Australian Studies, Monash University.

Johannesson, G., Skaptadottir, U., and Benediktsson, K. (2003) 'Coping with social capital? The cultural economy of tourism in the north', *Sociologia Ruralis,* 43/1: 3-16.

Jones, S. (2005) 'Community-based ecotourism: the significance of social capital'. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 32/2: 303-304.

Joppe, M. (1996) 'Sustainable community tourism development revisited', *Tourism Management,* 17/7: 475-479.

Kieti, D.M., Jones, E., & Wishitemi, B. (2009) 'Alternative models of community tourism: balancing economic development and the aspirations fo the poor', *Tourism Review International,* 12: 275-290.

Krishna, I. (2012, 22 October) TLTB announces fees reduction in 2013. *FijiLive*. Retrieved December 4, 2012 from http://www.fijilive.com/fijliive-printstory. Fijilive?48400.Fijilive

Levett, R., & McNally, R. (2003) *A strategic environmental assessment of Fiji's tourism development plan.* Online. Available HTTP: <http://www.worldwildlife.org/what/wherewework/coraltriangle/WWFBinaryitem7758.pdf> (accessed 10 June, 2013).

Lindsay, N.J. (2005) Toward a cultural model of indigenous entrepreneurial attitude. *Academy of Marketing Science Review, 5*. Online Available HTTP: <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/lindsay05-2005.pdf> (accessed 13 January 2013).

Liu, A., & Wall, G. (2006) Planning tourism employment: a developing country perspective, *Tourism Management,* 27: 159-170.

Macbeth, J., Carson, D. and Northcote, J.K. (2004) 'Social capital, tourism and regional development: SPCC as a basis for innovation and sustainability', *Current Issues in Tourism,* 7/6: 502-522.

MacNaught, T. (1982) 'Mass tourism and the dilemmas of modernisation in Pacific Island communities', *Annals of Tourism Research,* 9/3: 359-381.

Martin, B.M. (1998) 'Tourism as a means of economic and sociocultural adaptation in a Fijian village', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Colorado.

McElroy, J., and de Alburquerque, K. (1986) 'The tourism demonstration effect in the Caribbean', *Journal of Travel Research,* 25/31: 31-34.

Milne, S. (2005) *The training needs of South Pacific tourism SME owners and managers 2005.* Online. Available HTTP: <http://csrs2.aut.ac.nz/NZTRI/nztrinew/documents/SPTO_Training_Needs_Final_Report.pdf> (accessed 10 July 2013).

Mitchell, R.E. (2003) 'Community-based tourism: moving from rhetoric to practice', *E-Review of Tourism Research*, 1/1: 1-4.

Nainoca, W.U. (2011) 'The influence of the Fijian way of life (bula vakavanua) on community-based marine conservation in Fiji, with a focus on social capital and traditional ecological knowledge', unpublished PhD thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Ostram, E. (2000) *Social capital: a fad or fundamental concept?* 172-214. Bloomington: Centre for the Study of Institutions, Population and Environmental Change, Indiana University. Online. Available HTTP: http://www.exclusion.net/images/pdf/778_latuk_ostrom.pdf (accessed 21 August 2012).

Pretty, J. & Ward, H. (2001) 'Social capital and the environment', *World Development,* 29/2: 209-227.

Ravuvu, A.D. (1983) *Vaka i-Taukei: The Fijian way of life,* Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific. Reprinted 2012.

Roe, D., Goodwin, H. and Ashley, C. (2002) *The tourism industry and poverty reduction: A business primber.* London: Pro-Poor Tourism Briefing No. 2/2002.

Saffu, K. (2003) 'The role and impact of culture on South Pacific Island entrepreneurs', *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research, 9 (2),* pp. 55-73.

Scheyvens, R. (2002) *Tourism for development empowering communities,* Harlow: Prentice Hall.

Scheyvens, R. (2009) 'Pro-poor tourism: is there value beyond the rhetoric?' *Tourism Recreation Research,* 34/2: 191-196.

Scheyvens, R. (2012). *Tourism and poverty.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Scheyvens, R., & Russell, M. (2010) *Sharing the riches of tourism,* Palmerston North: School of People, Environment and Planning, Massey University.

Simpson, M.C. (2008) 'Community benefit tourism initiatives – A conceptual oxymoron?' *Tourism Management, 29,* 1-18.

Simpson, M.C. (2007) 'An integrated approach to assess the impacts of tourism on community development and sustainable livelihoods', *Community Development Journal, Advance Access published October 17, 2007, 1-23.*

Sofield, T., Bauer, J., Delacy, T., Lipman, G. and Daugherty, S. (2004) *Sustainable tourism- Elimination poverty (ST-EP): An overview*. Queensland, Australia: CRC for Sustainable Tourism.

Stone, L. (1989) 'Cultural cross-roads of community participation in development: a case from Nepal', *Human Organisation,* 48/3: 206-213.

Tosun, C. (2000) 'Limits to Community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries', *Tourism Management*, 21/6: 613-633.

Tosun, C. (2002) 'Host perceptions of impacts. A comparative tourism study', *Annals of Tourism Research,* 29/1: 231-253.

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and World Tourism Organisation (2012) 'Tourism in the green economy – background report' Madrid: UNWTO. Available HTTP: <http://www.unep.org/greeneconomy/Portals/88/documents/ger/ger_final_dec_2011/Tourism%20in%20the%20green_economy%20unwto_unep.pdf> (accessed 20 September 2012).

UNESCAP (2003) *Poverty alleviation through sustainable tourism development.* UN, New York. Online. Available HTTP: <http://unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TPTS_pubs/Pub_2265_fulltext.pdf> (accessed 23 September 2012).

Urry, J. (2002) *The Tourist Gaze* (2nd ed.), London: Sage.

Verebalavu-Faletoese, J. & Kuridrani, L. (2006) *Evaluation report of ecotourism projects in Fiji*, Suva, Fiji: Ministry of Tourism.

Wall, G. (1997) 'Is eco-tourism sustainable?', *Environmental Management,* 24/1: 483-491.

Zhao, W., Brent Ritchie, J.R., and Echtner, C.M. (2011) 'Social capital and tourism entrepreneurship', *Annals of Tourism Research,* 38/4: 1570-1593.