

PPT Working Paper No. 9



Review of the Impacts of Previous Pro-Poor Tourism Research

**Results of a survey to follow-up Pro-Poor Tourism
research carried out in 2000-2001**

Dorothea Meyer
Overseas Development Institute

January 2003

PPT Working Paper Series

- 9 Strengths and Weaknesses of a Pro-Poor Tourism Approach, Results of a Survey to Follow-Up Pro-Poor Tourism Research Carried Out in 2000-2001**, by Dorothea Meyer
- 10 Methodology for Pro-Poor Tourism Case Studies**, by Caroline Ashley
- 11 Strategies, Impacts and Costs of Pro-Poor Tourism Approaches in South Africa** by Anna Spenceley and Jennifer Seif
- 12 Tourism in Poor Rural Areas: Diversifying the Product and Expanding the Benefits in Rural Uganda and The Czech Republic**, by Jenny Holland, Louise Dixey and Michael Burian
- 13 Coping with Declining Tourism, Examples from Communities in Kenya**, by Samuel Kareithi
- 14 Addressing Poverty Issues in Tourism Standards**, by Dilys Roe, Catherine Harris and Julio de Andrade
- 15 Improving Access for the Informal Sector to Tourism in The Gambia**, by Adama Bah, and Harold Goodwin
- 16 Tourism to Developing Countries: Statistics and Trends**, by Dorothea Meyer, Dilys Roe, Caroline Ashley and Harold Goodwin (forthcoming)
- 17 Outbound UK Tour Operator Industry and Implications for PPT in Developing Countries**, by Dorothea Meyer

These working papers, produced under the title 'Lesson-Sharing on Pro-poor Tourism', are the result of a collaborative research project carried out by the PPT Partnership. The PPT partnership is comprised of Caroline Ashley (ODI), Harold Goodwin (ICRT) and Dilys Roe (IIED). They are funded by the Economic and Social Research Unit (ESCOR) of the UK Department for International Development (DFID).

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Aims and Key Questions Addressed	4
3	Research Methodology	6
4	Results.....	8
4.1	Usefulness of the PPT concept	8
4.2	Changes in awareness and understanding of PPT	10
4.3	Changes in behaviour and implementation	13
4.4	Discernible positive impacts on the poor	15
4.5	Use of research findings to influence others	16
4.6	Strengths and weaknesses of the research process and outputs	17
4.7	Priorities for future work on PPT	22
5	Summary: key findings and implications	25
Appendix 1	Questionnaire Survey	26
Appendix 2	Questionnaire Results.....	30
Appendix 3	Interview Guidelines.....	35
Appendix 4	Pro-Poor Strategies and Impacts Identified in the 2000-2001 Research	36

List of Tables

Table 1: Aim and content of the two research tools.....	6
---	---

List of Boxes

Box 1: The importance of integrating a variety of strategies	9
Box 2: Examples of the varied ways in which participants are using their PPT experience in recent work	14
Box 3: A strong priority on engagement with the private sector	23

1 Introduction

Is a 'pro-poor' approach useful in thinking about tourism? How, and in what way? Does it help to understand or prioritise tourism issues related to poverty, and does it affect actual practice? Such questions underlie a survey that was undertaken in 2002, the results of which are reported here.

In 2000-2001, six case studies of 'pro-poor tourism' initiatives were assessed as part of a DFID funded research project on *Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies*¹. The aim was to consider practical pro-poor tourism experience gained from six quite different tourism projects, and to identify lessons learned about pro-poor tourism strategies: what was being done, what progress and constraints emerged, and what impacts this had on the poor.

This was the first time that tourism initiatives had been assessed from an *explicitly pro-poor perspective*. The research process, informal feedback, and further Pro-Poor Tourism (PPT) work since then has led to an assumption that *taking an explicitly pro-poor perspective in tourism helps to focus attention more clearly on poverty issues, and on a wide range of issues that matter to the poor. As a result it helps strengthen implementation approaches that address needs of the poor more effectively*.

This assumption, however, needs to be tested; and ways to strengthen the value of PPT approaches need to be considered. As a first step, a survey was conducted in 2002 to follow-up with those who were involved in the six initial case studies, either as authors or implementers.

The main aim of the survey was to find out if the research process and results had influenced attitudes and/or practice in tourism among those involved. The purpose of this report is to summarise the findings of that survey.

It is important to note that the original case studies were not primarily intended to influence practice at the study site but were chosen as initiatives that were already incorporating some pro-poor element (though not labelled as such), and were assessed in order to identify *lessons useful to others*. Thus the main impact of the project stems from comparison of the case studies, production of synthesis lessons, and wide dissemination of these lessons internationally. The survey is therefore not a project impact assessment² and the analysis of changes in impacts on the ground was not a core aim. Nevertheless, the authors and implementers provide a very valuable pool of practitioners who engaged closely with PPT analysis two years ago, and can provide useful reflections on the value and limitations of adopting a PPT approach to tourism assessment.

Another important caveat is that this report is not looking at the impact of *implementation* of PPT strategies on the poor. That was a focus of the case studies, and of some other on-going work. The focus of this report is the impact of *adopting an explicit PPT approach in assessing tourism interventions*, in terms of how it influences attitudes and behaviour of practitioners. A key question is whether it increases adoption of PPT strategies and then, over time, pro-poor impacts, but it is the adoption of the approach, not the implementation of a set of strategies, that is being assessed.

¹ More details about the project can be found on www.propoortourism.org.uk

² A full project impact assessment would involve much more complex tracking of how findings have been disseminated and taken up around the world. This has not been done, but some of the major impacts have been identified and are being documented in a brief report, incorporating some key findings from this report (PPT Partnership forthcoming).

2 Aims and Key Questions Addressed

Testing whether the explicit use of pro-poor analysis has had an impact on understanding or practice, involves an assumption that a pro-poor approach is different from previous approaches used to assessing tourism interventions. While PPT overlaps considerably with several other approaches, such as community tourism and responsible tourism, some distinctive elements³ are worth highlighting at the start, in order to see if they emerge in the views of the respondents. These are:

- PPT focuses exclusively on issues that matter to the poor and aims to increase the priority given to poverty reduction issues. Other impacts of tourism, such as environmental or socio-cultural issues, are only a part of it to the extent that they directly impact on poverty.
- A PPT approach highlights a wide range of ways in which tourism affects the livelihoods of the poor (drawing on current thinking on poverty and livelihoods). Thus it goes well beyond a focus on just cash income or protecting the environment, both of which are already common to other approaches.
- Given the attempt to recognise a range of impacts on the poor, a PPT approach also recognises that a wide range of strategies can be part of PPT. Some of these focus on boosting cash incomes, while others focus on other livelihood issues or issues of participation and decision-making. Thus a PPT approach expands the menu of options being considered by those seeking to benefit the poor.

The range of strategies and impacts identified in the findings of the 2000-2001 project are listed in appendix 4. Comparison across the case studies found that the emphasis given to the three core types of strategies: (those focussed on economic benefits, those addressing non-economic livelihood benefits and those concerned with policy/process reform) varied considerably, although economic strategies featuring prominently in all cases. Nevertheless, it was concluded that it was important to pay attention to the full range of strategies.

The aim of the survey was to seek the opinions of those who had been involved in the PPT case studies and research on the value and limitations of the PPT approach and research. The main emphasis was on analysing whether *the research process* and *the findings* had an impact on both the general *understanding* of PPT, and the *implementation* of PPT strategies among those involved. It also assessed lessons on how the research process was conducted and findings disseminated. While this provides only a partial picture about the value of a PPT approach, the purpose is to contribute to our understanding about the value of PPT, and the ways in which its impacts can be enhanced.

The key questions addressed by the survey were:

1. Is the concept of Pro-Poor Tourism useful? If so, in what way?
2. Has PPT analysis changed awareness and/or increased understanding of tourism and poverty reduction linkages among those involved? More specifically, has it led to increased awareness of different strategies that can be used for PPT, or of different impacts that can be important to the poor?

³ Distinctive elements that emerged from the 2000-2001 project, in the views of the UK-based PPT partnership team. Whether these were reflected in changed thinking among case study participants was one of the issues to be explored.

3. Has the involvement in PPT analysis led to a change in actual work practice, either within the PPT case study or in other work? If so, how has it affected the implementation of the various strategies?
4. Are there any discernible positive impacts on the poor resulting from changes that can be attributed to the case study research?
5. Have those involved passed the findings on to others or used them to influence others? To whom, for what, and how have they been used by others?
6. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the research process and the research outputs? What was done well, what was not? Which outputs are most useful and why?
7. What are the priorities for future work on PPT?

3 Research Methodology

The research undertaken used two different research tools: a questionnaire survey and semi-structured interviews. It also involved different, though overlapping, types of respondents: two respondents were involved purely as authors of case studies, three were involved only as implementers of the PPT initiatives, eight respondents were both implementers and authors. This is an important distinction as the authors were more intensively engaged in using the PPT approach, but at the same time they had limited or no direct involvement in the implementation of the PPT initiative itself. The majority of those that both implemented and wrote about the project were only involved in the implementation on a short term or temporary basis (i.e. project work in their capacity as facilitators and advisors).

The enquiry began by contacting those involved in the earlier research project, explaining the purpose of the project and requesting support. The questionnaire survey was then sent by email to those willing to participate. The questionnaire survey gathered basic information that allowed a comparison between respondents across contexts. The semi-structured telephone interview allowed further discussion of the initial answers, explanations of how and why changes occurred or did not occur, and more personal reflections.

Sending a questionnaire first, rather than relying on cold-calling, allowed respondents to prepare issues they would like to discuss and comments they would like to make. This promised to cut time and to provide the best possible efficiency. The questionnaire and phone interview provided distinct benefits and opportunities. The aims, sample and focus of each is summarised in Table 1. The questionnaire, the questionnaire results, and the telephone interview guidelines can be found in Appendices 1, 2 and 3.

Table 1: Aim and content of the two research tools

Questionnaire	Semi-structured interviews
Aim: Comparative, standardised tool	Aim: In-depth and location specific information
Target sample: All authors and those running the projects	Target sample: The authors and implementers (minimum one per case study)
N achieved: 12	N achieved: 13
Format: Four A4 pages; mix of closed and open questions	Format: Informal, semi-structured telephone interviews
Focus: basic and general information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of PPT • Changed awareness and understanding of PPT • Implementation of PPT strategies • PPT impacts • Dissemination of research findings • Report structure, style, methodology 	Focus: in-depth and location specific information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changed awareness of PPT, detailing specific issues • Implementation of PPT strategies (case study specific and detailed information) • Critical evaluation of the PPT approach and the PPT strategies • Evaluation of the usefulness of the PPT approach for further work/projects • Critical discussion of dissemination • What improvements could have been made to the PPT analysis? How relevant are the 'lessons' for those already involved in implementing PPT strategies?

The research was undertaken between July and September 2002. Such a lengthy research period, given the small number of interviewees, was necessary because of the timing (the main holiday season) and the work activities the respondents were/are involved in (a large number were non-contactable due to fieldwork activity for a considerable amount of time).

In total 12 questionnaires were returned, while 13 interviews were conducted. One respondent completed only the questionnaire, while two took only part in the interview. Initially 15 individuals were contacted and asked to participate, 14 responded.

4 Results

4.1 Usefulness of the PPT concept⁴

Main findings – a brief summary

The value of the PPT concept was the area of the most unanimous and positive comments.

There was wide consensus that the main benefit of the PPT concept was that it provided a more coherent structure for understanding a range of different poverty-related issues. The majority of respondents highlighted the integration of different types of PPT strategies as one of the key benefits of the approach. Some respondents also welcomed the shift from environmental issues to a focus on poverty through the use of PPT.

However, the majority of respondents criticised the term ‘pro-poor tourism’. The terminology was criticised for deriving too much from the development domain, with little appeal for consumers and governments. It was also criticised that the term was too much based on a ‘western’ use and definitions of poverty, with limited regard to local definitions.

Details and examples

A comprehensive and coherent approach

A large number of interviewees stated that while most of the PPT strategies were already well known to them, it was the way in which they have been ‘put together’ in a coherent concept, a comprehensive research process, and an encompassing document (the overview report), that proved to be the greatest value of the research. The creation of this ‘structure’ to assess poverty reduction through tourism was valued very highly (see Box 1).

The concept was welcomed for giving sharper attention to poverty issues....

‘The whole concept of PPT was very good, it was excellent. It really inspired me to think about tourism and get involved. I think there is just a general lack of awareness of these issues and it helped me greatly to focus on them. It is a very good idea and concept with a very positive focus’

‘Not that we sit here with the PPT overview report on our laps, but I feel strongly that certain issues have become sharper and that the whole concept was brought into mainstream thinking’

... and for increasing attention given to poverty relative to other concerns, such as the environment:

‘In the past far too much has focused on conservancy issues, you know, sustainable development was always seen as environmentally friendly development... This is important but the poverty issue was just not there... This is important and it is a huge shift, a very important shift away from the conservancy focused debate.’

⁴ Source: Questionnaire (Question 3 and Question 5) and interviews.

Box 1: The importance of integrating a variety of strategies

The majority of respondents commented that the strength of PPT was that it integrated a wide range of strategies. Some also felt that this somehow bridged the dichotomy that is often prevailing, in that there seems to be either a concentration on environmental or economic impacts and strategies.

'I think that this variety of strategies and impacts widens the potential for PPT considerably. It is crucially important that we move away from simply just focusing on a few selected strategies, but that we actually consider all the implications. The PPT research has, for me at least, really helped to achieve that, or at least move into that direction'

'Yes, at times some strategies are more important than others but what I found particularly valuable about the PPT research was that it actually confirmed that all these strategies need to be incorporated. They are all inter-linked and should all be considered rather than just taking one or two like for example business opportunities... You cannot just look at a few but you really have to move all at the same time to be able to move on. It is the interconnectedness between them that is important and that is the value of the PPT analysis. It is a different approach.'

'Yes, the awareness of all these PPT strategies increased fundamentally. For me especially because I was a newcomer to tourism and its impacts, so it was really very interesting and I learned a lot. I find the diversity of these strategies fascinating and a really useful tool.'

One respondent raised concerns over the definition of strategies and their immediate relevance for implementation:

'The PPT strategies I feel were a good way of capturing all the benefits, of bringing them all together. I also feel that some of the strategies could have been far better articulated, they seemed too nebulous, such as socio-cultural impacts ... So I think all PPT strategies are good and useful, but the actual difficulty lies with the implementation, what actually happens on the ground ... and here much more is needed'

Terminology

While enthusiasm for the PPT concept was the most common sentiment across the respondents, the most common criticism concerned the term 'Pro-Poor Tourism'. The terminology was criticised by the overall majority of interviewees as being inappropriate for the majority of audiences: the industry, the general public, governments and the poor themselves.

'But I am not too happy about the term pro-poor tourism... It is a very useful term for development agencies. We use it, it is important but it is too prescriptive, too bothersome ... PPT is a term for development agencies, we use it among ourselves, but it is difficult for outsiders.'

Many critics argued that the term was not sellable to consumers or the industry. The concern was that tourism can only ever be pro-poor if it is able to attract customers. The term 'pro-poor' tourism was seen as a major obstacle for selling the approach. While the majority of respondents valued the pro-poor tourism approach, they would not consider giving their product an explicit pro-poor label.

'We need a nice product and then add value by giving it a pro-poor direction....This is also where I have problems with the word pro-poor tourism. It is horrible and you can't sell it, neither to tour operators nor to tourists.'

'I do not like the name pro-poor tourism, it is too difficult, I guess it is too policy orientated... It is far too highbrow and academic, which I feel is difficult to mix with tourism. When I talk to people about it, they look a bit scared and then confused ... maybe it could be linked to fair trade issues ... I really do not like the name and I feel it does not convince a consumer to become interested in it.'

Two respondents in Latin America, particularly, disliked the use of the word 'poverty'. They argued that this was based on 'western' definitions that were unable to take into account local specifics and definitions by the 'poor' themselves. They also felt that policy-makers in their countries were put-off by the word 'poverty', although they recognised that there might be more acceptance of the word 'poverty' in Africa.

'One main criticism ... which indirectly makes it problematic to sell to policy makers ... it is simply the term pro-poor tourism, the word is not liked. It is not liked by governments because, well there is little acceptance that poverty is an issue, so of course they are not inclined to use this term. It should just be called tourism, with a strong underlying of pro-poor perspective, but not that explicitly. All tourism should ideally make a positive impact, so this seems all just like another jargon that is added. I just don't like the name, it is not useful, rather the opposite I feel'

'I am not so sure about the use of poverty and the term pro-poor tourism. I find it a very difficult term and that is, I guess, related to my field of work and the geographical area I work in. It might be very different for your work and all the African projects where the concept of "poor" can be more easily defined and used. We found here that there are different ideas of poor, and that this link between rural and poor is also not always accurate.'

Only one respondent viewed the terminology positively.

'Pro-poor is a good name, it is an approach rather than a name ... and I think it is a bloody good thing to call it pro-poor, there is always the choice between being too thin and floppy, and too potent ... this is potent and this is very good, it shifts the focus and I don't care if it does upset some people.'

In general those respondents that were involved in, and relying on, the direct implementation of tourism projects were far more critical of the name than outsiders observing or advising on the project.

4.2 Changes in awareness and understanding of PPT ⁵

Main findings – brief summary

Respondents generally were extremely positive about the way in which their awareness of an overall PPT approach has increased due to the participation in the research process. For some respondents, the process had clearly increased the attention they pay to poverty issues. Others felt they were already prioritising poverty issues, but were now better able to understand them using the comprehensive PPT approach.

⁵ Sources: Questionnaire (Question 3, Question 5, and Question 7) and interviews.

For most respondents the awareness of the nine individual PPT strategies also increased. All of the nine PPT strategies were mentioned by at least 40 per cent of respondents as strategies where awareness has increased. Five of these strategies were mentioned by over 80 per cent of respondents.

Details and examples

New/increased understanding of PPT

For some the focus on poverty was entirely new:

‘Yes, it was the first time that we considered poverty issues, that we focused explicitly on poverty, so that was useful...While we have long focused on the socio-economic situation in the community, setting high enough wages to compete with more destructive industries for example, we never explicitly focused on poverty as such. This was certainly new and valuable’.

Some respondents also noted that a focus on rural livelihoods and rural peoples’ perspectives rather than a strong focus on purely economic or environmental issues, was a welcomed addition.

‘I am now using more of a focus on livelihoods and rural peoples’ perspectives rather than private sector or conservationist views, and I feel that this has positive impacts although it is often far to early to tell’.

Some felt that they have learned considerably about the potential of tourism for poverty reduction due to their involvement.

‘As I said earlier, it (PPT) just changed my views on the subject and showed the potential of tourism, which I actually never realised before. It really got me into it and I will continue to be involved in this areas as far as possible’.

For others, it was the focus on a great variety of impacts and strategies that was new.

‘I don’t know about other methods, but for me this was certainly new in that it looked at the broader picture, not just the environment, not just the commercial aspects but all of it combined. For me it was new as I never really thought about this before.’

More coherent understanding of PPT

Reflections on how personal understanding of tourism and poverty linkages had changed were very positive. Several respondents said that although they were familiar with the issues before, the PPT research approach helped them to analyse and understand them differently by providing a new angle (see also Box 1 above).

‘All issues were known to us, I have worked in this field for a long time now, so they were important, but it was actually the way in which they were brought out into the open, that has really been helpful, to collect ideas and use them in a coherent structure. This also gave it some kind of theoretical perspective, which we, or I at least, did not have before. Put together it all makes a lot of sense. There was really nothing much new but by simply putting it together it made a huge difference, so now we have what we always thought in a written form, rather than just playing with ideas, they are now shaped and firm’.

'This was just a new angle and it was helpful in rethinking other issues, maybe issues that we would not necessarily consider. I also think that there are many overlapping issues between eco-tourism and pro-poor tourism, so there is much to learn I guess, and new avenues, new issues to take on board.'

Awareness of PPT strategies

While the awareness of all nine PPT strategies increased by at least over 40 per cent of respondents, there were five strategies that were noted by over 80 per cent of respondents. These strategies were:

- Expanding business opportunities
- Expanding employment opportunities
- Enhancing collective benefits
- Capacity building, training and empowerment
- Partnerships with the private sector

The fact that these strategies were concerned mainly with economic impacts, training and private sector partnership might reflect the predominant role of tourism as employment and income creator.

Awareness of PPT impacts

Looking at the 15 very diverse impacts⁶ that tourism can have on poor people, each of these was voted by on average just under 50 per cent of respondents as impacts to which respondents would now give more importance to. Each respondent mentioned at least one impact that has become more important. The average number of impacts mentioned as having become more important was five. As for the individual impacts, this was very unevenly spread. Although each impact received on average just under 50 per cent of votes some were less 'popular' (i.e. only 25 per cent mentioned that 'optimism, pride and participation' became more important) while 75 per cent mentioned 'human capital (skills, education, health)' and 'access to information'.

Other impacts increasing strongly in importance were: 'Access to market opportunities and livelihood options' (66.6 per cent), 'distribution of benefits' (58.3 per cent), 'aggregate collective income' (58.3 per cent), and 'social capital and community organisation' (50 per cent). Some respondents mentioned that the importance of certain items was already very high and thus might not have increased drastically. It is likely that cash benefits (wage income and casual income) were already considered important issues, and it is notable that those impacts voted for most often cover a range of less tangible livelihood issues.

A few respondents explained in some detail what they felt they had learnt about PPT. The main aspects they highlighted were that they learned about the importance of incorporating the different strategies and perspectives, but also the importance of dealing effectively with the private sector and with policy makers. One South African implementer described his lessons as such:

'First, and this is crucial, we have seen that it simply makes a hell of a lot of commercial sense to design operations in a pro-poor way. This is the most important and major lesson. PPT has become, certainly here in South Africa, a common business practice. The second lesson is that for a project to be pro-poor it needs to be commercially sound. ... For this to work it is also very important to have realistic expectations. Maybe I should add a third lesson that I learned

⁶ See Question 7, Appendix 2

here, and that is that by focusing on a developmental agenda one cannot throw all other issues out of the window. You need to focus on poverty and the developmental issues but you need to do this by looking closely at others such as commercial viability but also environmental issues. It can only work together, and I feel that the developmental focus might be at times too narrow. What is important is to approach PPT from a sound business point of view. You are not just giving out aid but you actually enter into business relationships with communities. If you as a tour operator use a community to add value to your tourism project, then you simply need to compensate the community for that. So that means you are actually normalising PPT, and I feel that operators, at least here in South Africa, are comfortable with that’.

4.3 Changes in behaviour and implementation ⁷

Main findings – brief summary

Respondents were very positive about how the experience of their participation in the PPT research influenced their on-going work.

While several respondents in 2002 were no longer involved in the case study they wrote about or implemented, the majority stated that they try to incorporate some of the PPT concepts or results in other work. Over 66 per cent have implemented PPT findings in other projects, which shows the great potential of PPT to be transferred to other contexts.

Although many respondents will not use the phrase Pro-Poor Tourism explicitly, the PPT approach has nevertheless become important to most and is being incorporated into existing and future work.

Details and examples

Specific examples of how respondents changed work practice relate predominantly to them giving increased attention to policy and planning issues, as well as greater emphasis on working with the private sector. Box 2 gives some examples of how the PPT approach is influencing respondents’ ‘way of working’, ranging from implementing tourism projects in other countries, to writing reference guides and tourism guidelines.

All nine strategies⁸ were mentioned by at least one respondent as a strategy that is now being implemented with greater effort. The highest vote (50 per cent of respondents) was given to ‘capacity building, training and empowerment’. The lowest percentage was achieved by ‘enhancing benefits to infrastructure and environment’ and ‘addressing socio-cultural impacts of tourism’ (each was mentioned by only 16.6 per cent of respondents).

With regard to the 15 identified PPT impacts, a relative small number of respondents have actually increased their efforts in achieving these impacts.

On average less than half of all respondents mentioned that their implementation activities has changed. The reasons are likely to be based on the fact that many are not anymore involved in the original case study or in any other tourism case study at the moment. Many thus simply lack the opportunity to implement PPT. While the overall majority stated that they might change their focus in future, many simply did not have the chance at present to work on a tourism related project. The impacts mentioned most frequently as the ones where respondents increased their effort to achieve

⁷ Sources: Questionnaire (Question 4, Question 5b, Question 6 and Question 7b) and interviews.

⁸ Sources: Question 5b, Appendix 2

them were: ‘human capital’ (33.3 per cent of respondents), ‘social capital and community organisation’ (33.3 per cent), ‘access to natural capital’ (33.3 per cent), and ‘access to market opportunities’ (33.3 per cent).

While the awareness of the various impacts and strategies increased considerably for the overall majority of respondents, only a small minority actually changed implementation and increased effort given to achieving certain impacts. Several interviewees explained that the main reason was their role as ‘outsiders’, i.e. outside analysts and researchers, observing the project and impacts rather than actually implementing it. Furthermore, as mentioned above, a number of interviewees broke their connections with the initial project, and were thus simply not aware of the actual situation on the ground. Others mentioned that the reason for this lack of implementation was simply the fact that relatively little time elapsed between the initial study and the follow-up research. There was simply not enough time to considerably change behaviour.

Box 2: Examples of the varied ways in which participants are using their PPT experience in recent work

‘We are working here at the moment on tourism policies and there is of course input from the PPT strategies. This is to influence policy direction and policy reform and it is of course important to bring the poverty issues into the discussion...Two concrete implications of this research: first, I have been involved in facilitating a participatory process for the design of a second phase of the programme described in the PPT case study, and I have therefore used the lessons and directions of the case study in that process. Second, I am also applying the lessons from the case study, and from the PPT work as a whole, in a local-level research project on coastal resources and sustainable livelihoods, which includes a tourism component’.

‘I am trying to take this further and to focus at the macro level in terms of planning and policy decisions. I also continue to be involved at the micro level, information, training and education’.

‘As a tourism specialist at DBSA I am aiming at incorporating PPT principles in the projects that I work on, focusing particularly on how the DBSA should become involved in tourism projects’.

‘Operators I am working with in South Africa are increasingly thinking about what they can do. There is a focus on poverty alleviation within the development of the South African Responsible Tourism Guidelines, and reference to PPT within the forthcoming Responsible Tourism Manual.’

‘Yes, we use it in other context.... SNV has this regional tourism working group and we apply it in Bhutan, Vietnam, Laos and maybe later in Cambodia. We are presenting it in Bhutan at the moment. This is really important and it is being used and applied when we can’.

‘I continue to do research on Pro-poor tourism. The work I did for the ODI inspired me to do my PhD on pro-poor tourism and I will use the experience I gained in Uganda.’

‘I did a study on the potential of eco-tourism in the Gulf of Mannar in South India in February 2002, I found the experience of having done your study, the findings and the approach very useful’.

‘I now focus more on community participation and the building of strategic partnerships between communities and the private sector.’

4.4 Discernible positive impacts on the poor ⁹

Main findings – brief summary

Overall respondents were rather reserved in identifying impacts on the poor.

While all were enthusiastic about the value of the approach and strategies, few could identify actual, measurable impacts on the poor.

Most replied that a longer time frame, as well as a detailed impact assessment would ideally be required to identify such impacts.

Details and Examples

Even where the participant's own work has been clearly influenced by the PPT approach, most felt it was too soon to identify impacts on the ground:

'My work has been influenced by PPT research, however the processes around tourism projects are often very slow, and thus the actual positive impacts are difficult to measure'.

'We have seen first impacts but it is a very long-term process. We saw improvement in information and education, but it is a major step from there to actually setting up a commercial business. We aim high and want to see major changes, at least in the long term, but it is frustrating, some people have lost faith, sometimes the enthusiasm has gone and financial and funding worries do not help. Small changes: yes, I believe it is possible. I just hope the enthusiasm stays'

Several authors who continue with being involved in their original case study emphasised the lack of, and the need for, an impact analysis to identify changes.

'Very difficult as I don't have all the information here; it is very difficult to estimate and I can't do that; it is also very early days'.

'It is difficult to measure precisely the impacts of the PPT, there is a problem with the measurement and it is also too early, it takes a long time to see results.'

One also highlighted that impact derive from change implementation, and not from a research process.

'I am not sure if the research really has led to see the importance of PPT. It has been more the experience in the field that showed the importance. However, it is still important to look back at research material and compare the practice with what has been found in other areas. Also, it is too early to indicate any changes'.

While respondents found it difficult to discuss specific impacts on the ground, there were comments about long-term impacts deriving from changing attitudes and approaches at a broader level (e.g. among other policy-makers or practitioners), especially where PPT was fitting into a receptive context as in South Africa.

⁹ Source: Questionnaire (Question 8) and interviews.

'There are of course many positive impacts, but they very much depend on the projects. But what I can certainly see is that there was a major change of attitude in recent years, which is bound to have major impacts on poor rural areas.'

4.5 Use of research findings to influence others¹⁰

Main findings – brief summary

The majority of respondents had shared the research findings and outputs with others in some way or other.

As dissemination of the findings was not part of their contracted task in the project, the use they have made of the findings is a reflection of the value of the outputs to them in their work.

The majority knew of others who were interested in the findings, knew them and/or had used them.

Details and examples

92 per cent of respondents had discussed the report with others, the majority of which shared the findings with others involved in their particular project. Several mentioned that they used the findings to influence others. Over half of all respondents stated that they have cited the findings in their own work and also that they were aware of others, although not involved in the initial research, who were using the findings (i.e. implementation in other projects, policy discussions).

Respondents gave several examples of how they have used the material made available to them.

'This [the overview report] was very good, I use it a lot. I use it for programme development. I refer to it quite a lot. I used it recently for a scientific seminar'.

'We have used them [briefing papers] and disseminated them in local meetings, it is a very good tool to convey the main issues in a way that is easy to read'.

'At the moment the policy briefing and the other small leaflet are very good. We use them to get the ideas across to the industry. Some of them have shown interest, so I think the impact is good'.

'It [the briefing papers] was very good and I copied it a lot too. I also sent it back to SNV Den Haag, and it is being used by other SNV tourism advisors'.

'I was not at all involved in the process, but I am involved in the dissemination by displaying the material in the information office. It has been used by NGOs, some tourists, our members and students, a lot of students actually, so the dissemination is okay and the interest is high, although this is generally interest among those who are already aware of PPT. For tourists, the few that come here, it is not really of interest'.

Two authors, one from St Lucia and one from South Africa, were very optimistic and quite specific about the encouraging prospects for wide adoption in their respective countries.

¹⁰ Sources: Questionnaire (Question 2 and Question 3) and interviews.

'We feel here in the Caribbean, not just in St. Lucia, but in the Caribbean in general, that we have quite a different situation. Most islands are strongly relying on the tourism industry and therefore it is important to incorporate poverty issues. We also have very established structures, very different to the situations found in other case studies where they aim to set up a new product... However, I have certainly seen that it is possible to introduce the pro-poor component, and I feel that it might be possible to change some of these structures. It is a difficult and long-term process, but from the heritage experience we feel there are possibilities and also that there is large interest in these issues. So for us it is important that we take what we have and we shift it. That means that we have to work with these structures, the product that we offer and make it more pro-poor without necessarily using the term pro-poor tourism, we need to devise and implement policies that are taking these issues on board and design a good tourism product.'

'And I feel this very strongly here in South Africa where it just makes perfect business sense to incorporate pro-poor issues into tourism. I feel that the majority of tour operators and owners have actually adopted it. They all understand that it is very important to look after one's neighbours. This is particularly important in rural areas, and I feel that it has become a common practice... I feel that it has been widely accepted here, from a very commercial standpoint, that pro-poor tourism issues need to be incorporated. It is seen that these are simply issues that need to be focused on in order to make the tourism product a success and it is impossible to ignore it.'

4.6 Strengths and weaknesses of the research process and outputs¹¹

Main findings – brief summary

The main strengths were:

- The PPT approach and concept, and the application of common criteria for assessing the different case studies.
- Benefits to the participants, in terms of expanding their thinking, and (for implementers) giving them a chance to stand back and reflect on their project, and/or to learn from other case studies.
- The quality of the final outputs, particularly the overview report, which synthesises lessons from the case-studies.
- The dissemination process.

The main weaknesses identified were:

- The term 'Pro-Poor Tourism'.
- Lack of contact between case study researchers during the research.
- Lack of depth of analysis for some case studies.
- The lack of information and practical support for funding and implementation tools (see below).

¹¹ Sources: Questionnaire (Question 9, Question 1 and Questions 3) and interviews.

Details and examples

Value of document

Respondents greatly valued the material that they received. By far the most widely read document was the overview report, in fact all respondents read it, followed by the policy brief (92 per cent) and the business brief (83 per cent).

'The material I received was brilliant, clearly written, concise and really, really interesting. It is great to have it here.'

The overall majority of respondents judged the overview report as excellent.

'The information we received was very good, I use the overview report quite a lot, it has been really helpful. It was good to put all these issues together in one document...More information is not necessary, otherwise we will get this information overload. What is helpful is easily accessible information, summarising the main points. The overview report for example, I have used many times, I often go back to it when I have to read up on certain issues, it is good for that, so more information is not necessarily needed.'

'Yes, the overview report was very good, it contained all the right information and brought all the important issues together. It is very concise and the right length, more information would not have been necessary.'

'What I found very useful was the main report, you know the larger one [the overview report]. It has a very coherent structure, which is really the usefulness of it. You know, the ideas were all there before but bringing them together using a coherent structure is very useful.'

'The large report [the overview report] was very good...It was important to have this theoretical base – all the ideas were present among those working in the field but it was very important to actually write them up and get them together...The comparability was very important ... This brought what we all thought together ... The value really was to collect these views from the field and to put them into a coherent structure.'

While all respondents valued the idea and especially the format of the briefing papers, some were actually unable to recall the content. The business brief (sent out in April 2002) has made less of an impact than the policy brief (2001). Both papers were valued mostly for their 'briefness', and have been used to 'spread' information about PPT.

'As summaries of the main points these papers are very useful. So, rather than reading all 6 books, one can get a good overview of the main issues by looking at the briefing papers. And this is what these people need, a quick way to familiarise themselves with the issues'

'[The policy brief] was good. It was really useful because it was so concise: 4 pages, fast to read. Exactly what policy makers need. Nobody will read the full report, so this was very good, excellent format... I don't recall much of that [the business primer], I must admit, I have got it here but I can't remember much of it right know. But, again I think it was brief, easy to read and to the point'

'Both the briefing papers I found very good because they were short and precise. They give you all the information you need and are very easily accessible. The format was very good'

'Yes, I liked the briefing papers, they are great when trying to shift thoughts and ideas in other peoples' heads, precise, informative and quick to read'

Respondents, however, did not have uniform views about the case study reports. While all respondents read at least their own and *one* other case study, the majority did not read more than that, although many skimmed through them. The case study material was clearly used for comparative purposes, as respondents tended to read a case study that was related to their own work with a comparable product or strategy. The case studies were thus a strong comparative tool, but also a very selectively used one. The most often mentioned case study was NACOBTA/UCOTA, followed by the Nepal case study.

'I looked at two other case studies. The NACOBTA, I read the NACOBTA one of course. Also, I read the Nepal case study, which was very interesting. I did look briefly through the others but did not read all of it – the overview was good for that'.

'I looked at all six of them and started reading a bit, but I actually did not find the time to look at all of them. One of the African ones, I think the Uganda case study, was very interesting and particularly relevant to the St Lucia case'.

A chance to reflect

In terms of the benefits to participants, several felt the value lay in the opportunity to stand back and reflect on their work, or to re-assess it.

'I think this [the involvement in the process] was very beneficial... It allowed me the time to reflect on the heritage programme. I was involved in the design of the project, so it was very interesting to come back to it and to take things a bit further'.

'The biggest value for us was actually to concentrate on writing down all the lessons that we learned from previous projects and our work. It was very important, actually, to focus on writing up the important issues and to end up with a structured report on what is possible. This was very useful to us, to be able to write up all the experience once and for all, to actually really think about what we learned in all the projects in the past.'

All respondents identified personal benefits from some aspect of involvement in the research. The overall majority (66.7 per cent) mentioned that they found their 'direct involvement in the research process' and 'the ability to discuss PPT with others' *very* useful. In total, 83 per cent valued their direct involvement in the research process and 92 per cent liked the possibility to discuss PPT strategies with others.

Learning from other case studies: strengths and weaknesses

The 'ability to learn from other case studies' was regarded by respondents as the most useful element of the research process. Many mentioned that the ability to learn about PPT from the experience of others was greatly appreciated and highly valuable.

'It was a very good initiative, highly welcomed and I particularly liked the comparison with other case studies. It was very interesting and the involvement for us was very beneficial, it helped us to re-assess what we were and are doing.'

'It was very interesting to see how it is done in other places and to compare ones approaches and strategies.'

While all respondents valued the ‘learning from other experiences’, for some the case study material also provided a very good source of information and contacts.

‘Yes, this is very important, to see what is done elsewhere... It is also a good source of information, like you get contact details and can reach others when you have a particular problem or question. The contact information was really very helpful’.

However, five respondents commented that greater interaction between the case study authors would have helped, or that they felt somewhat isolated from other case studies.

‘It would have been very good to get all those people actually writing about these projects together, to have the opportunity to actually exchange views and get a common methodology going before starting the research. Direct communication rather than by proxy. I think this should have been done prior and post project. I feel this would have provided much more critical information through direct contact, far more in-depth information could have been revealed. As it is, some of the case studies seem a bit nebulous, and more involvement to reveal all the information would have been great. Although I know of course that there were restrictions in terms of finances and time to get every body around a table.’

One author in Latin America commented on his geographic isolation:

‘The problem was here, I feel a bit, that I was very much working in isolation. There were no meetings or discussions with the others ... So, that was a bit difficult and I think that we here were more isolated from the other case studies, which were mainly in Southern Africa.’

Dissemination process: strengths and weaknesses

Respondents had overwhelmingly positive opinions of the research and dissemination process, as well as the content and style of the material disseminated. 75 per cent of respondents ranked ‘the way in which the information was disseminated’ as ‘good’, and several interviewees referred to it as ‘excellent’. The majority of interviewees judged the dissemination of research findings, both in terms of content as well as process, as very good.

‘Dissemination was great...the material received was very good, informative, precise and useful ... there is nothing to criticise about the dissemination process, it was great’.

‘The whole dissemination process was very good. We received a lot of information, all very useful. Both content and presentation were very good. I really have to say that I don’t think that I have ever received an equal amount of information from any other research process... The dissemination was very good, and the information was of course very useful’.

There was however one criticism of the dissemination material and this concerned the language and writing style used. Several interviewees felt that the overview report was written by, and written for, those already very much aware of poverty issues. An easier accessible language, it was felt, could have improved it.

‘The policy level was very new for me, it is very important but at times I found that there was too much on policy, making it difficult for newcomers, that was also a slight criticism of the overview report, it was slightly too policy focused. It should be opened up more for those not directly involved in these issues. It [the overview report] was very interesting but I feel it was

too specific. It was written for those already aware of all the issues. It really was full of jargon, far too much, and should be revamped to make it accessible to a wider audience’.

The business brief was also criticised for not using clear enough ‘business language’, but still being very much in the development mould.

‘What would have been good, though, is just to have a tag line to actually explain in very simple terms what PPT is all about. So, more simplified and more direct wording would have been great...The business brief was good as well, but it was a bit predictable. It uses very general terms and it would be great to actually see some information of financial successes or so, because that would convince businesses to adopt PPT. I think that would have been very good. It should be targeted more to tour operators. It would be also interesting to know what tour operators think about PPT.’

Weaknesses in analysis of specific case studies

In ranking the usefulness of the various elements of the research process and outcomes, the lowest scores were given to the way in which the case studies were analysed individually. Some respondents felt that more information (i.e. detailed information on tourism income and visitor segment structure and size) as well as more detailed and local aspects (i.e. more input from locals to include ‘local voices’) should have been included to increase the value of the analysis. These respondents felt somehow that the analysis did not show the complexity of the projects carried out on the ground and under-emphasised the achievements made. Many highlighted the need for an in-depth impact assessment. Most agreed, however, that while these aspects were important for them personally, they played a minor role in the comparative analysis, which was the prime aim of the project.

‘It would have been great to actually look at the case study in detail, to follow the circulation of money in the local economy, this would have revealed so much information, that was actually not dealt with because of the limitations to the case study analysis.’

‘It would have been helpful to go more into depth, all the important issues for Tropic were not covered and it seemed a bit patchy because of that’.

‘Generally, I think, the dissemination was fine, but as I said earlier I felt that much more could have been done with it. You had this wealth of information, six really interesting case studies with a lot of data and information, more use of that would have been great. At the moment they just seem to remain case studies, they would need to be linked and used more.’

Rating of specific elements of the research process

92 per cent of participants judged the aims of the research process as *good*, which was by far the highest score given to any element of the research process. While this answer could be expected from participants, the high score might also indicate that the commitment to the project was very high. The second highest rated aspect of the research process was the dissemination (75 per cent). Respondents were less enthusiastic about their ‘inclusion into the research process’ and the final ‘comparison between case studies’ that in both cases just 50 per cent rated it as *good*. Respondents were least satisfied with the analysis of their own case study. As a high number of the respondents were also the authors of the case study, it is assumed that they were on one hand modest about their own analysis, and on the other hand dissatisfied with the attention given to each individual case study in terms of descriptive analysis.

4.7 Priorities for future work on PPT¹²

Main findings - brief summary

Respondents mentioned the following issues and projects as their priorities for future work on PPT:

- From analysis to action: implementation, pilot projects, access to funding;
- Continuing focus on dissemination;
- Focus on the private sector, consumers and the developed world;
- Focus on policy and planning framework;
- Focus on human capacity, training and empowerment.

Most interviewees who mentioned these aspects were already active in these areas. All agreed that dissemination is crucial and should remain a main activity in future.

Details and examples

From analysis to action

Several respondents commented that analysis was one thing, but what was needed now was the piloting of PPT strategies, further implementation, and, most of all, detailed funding information.

‘Get funding for more PPT initiatives to be piloted using the strategies and approaches you analysed. This kind of thing calls for action research. We can only learn by doing it whether we can make it work. I feel this is the case with most of development ‘theory’ – it needs testing by getting on and doing it.’

‘There was no real pro-poor programme so far, so this have been great in shifting the ideas a bit. It is a great approach, an approach that can be used for implementation and I think that is what should be looked at now: the implementation.’

Barriers to achieving implementation were identified, such as the need for supportive policy and access to funding. Two respondents in Latin America argued strongly that they were particularly interested in information on funding sources.

‘What should be done, as a next step, is to link some of these projects to funding sources so that the focus on PPT can be continued’.

‘What would have been really helpful as a add-on to the material, would be information detailing how to actually get some funding for these kinds of projects. There is this gap between reading all these interesting case studies and becoming interested, but then not knowing where to turn next. It would also have been good to have some more information on other case studies and on organisations that actually work on the PPT front... You are left with the question ‘and what do I do now?’

Human capital, training and empowerment were identified as main areas for which respondents saw a need and an opportunity to get involved.

¹² Source: Questionnaire (Question 10) and interviews.

‘Capacity building [is a main area of involvement], the other important issues is mainly related to organisations, and what can be done to provide organisations with structures and knowledge, to strengthen them and provide them with the power to act.’

Many respondents highlighted the need for further dissemination and, particularly, the need to reach out to the private sector (see Box 3). Others suggested that more emphasis should be placed on creating consumer awareness.

‘Consumers need to be made aware and then they will demand such a product, but at the moment the awareness is minimal. So if this is going to have an impact, ways should be found to get to the actual consumers. I see it here among people I know, they don’t know about tourism impacts and they certainly have never heard about pro-poor tourism. I said earlier that I do not like the name at all, but they have not even heard about responsible tourism. I think pro-poor tourism is just not attractive at the moment, I would rather focus on tourism in general, or even adventure tourism where the interest among the US audience lies at the moment, but not PPT.’

Box 3: A strong priority on engagement with the private sector

‘We need to understand what is demanded, what we can provide and how to create a commercially viable product’

‘I think it is extremely important to communicate and focus on the private sector. It is important here to get the tour operators on boards and I also think that it is necessary to sell these ideas to them, they must see it as a valuable and profitable option otherwise they will not show any interest. There should be much more collaboration with the private sector.’

‘Also more on market linkages, how to reach the businesses, more ways of promoting the south. We need research on who is coming from where, and why, and design products around that. At the national level the GTZ is doing quite a lot, they are actually studying why consumers come and what they want, like what attracts them and what can be used to design a good, sellable product. You need to find out about consumer behaviour and consumer needs’.

‘We have talked about this here and we feel that an important next step would be to actually be able to provide information to investors, to the private sector, you know, sound financial information on corporate/community partnerships. I feel that it is now extremely important to actually inform businesses that PPT is possible, that it is feasible, and most of all that it makes commercial sense. What we actually need to do is to design commercially sound projects, PPT being one aspect of this.’

‘Yes, wider dissemination is crucial and very important. But I think the focus now should be on the developed world... It is very important to look at individual tour operators and to study what they are doing in terms of pro-poor tourism and the impacts this can have. More advocacy should be done, this is very important and this should look at markets and consumers.’

‘I think that the next steps should be to actually look at the industry, I would be extremely interested to have some research on the US industry. I am strongly involved with the eco-tourism society and that would be of real interest to us here’.

Others would like to see more attention given to PPT at the macro level. Some of those interviewed are already involved in policy-making and planning and found that this was a very important next step for PPT.

'Policies! That is what we are working on at the moment. We need supportive policies otherwise it will be very difficult to achieve much. We are working at the macro level at the moment, it is really challenging, but is also difficult. More research at the macro level could help us'.

'For us now, I find a policy framework is very important. We need much more emphasis and work on that. It is the moving up from the micro to the macro level ... It is important maybe to look at the macro level, not provide more information but actually analyse some of the policy issues and how they are overcome'.

'It is now very important to incorporate PPT principles into national, regional and local tourism development policy making. Rather than just looking at what is done, it is important to focus on what can be done... How can policy and the planning framework facilitate PPT? I believe that we have seen that PPT can make a difference, this needs support, the potential of PPT needs to be used and an important aspect is here to design policies that exploit this potential'.

'Government support, or a supportive framework is needed, as we have felt strongly with Tropics. But, we feel that we are the most powerless here. Also, I think it is imperative that there is encouragement in terms of financial support'.

Others argued that rather than providing simply a resource base on PPT, although very important, it was felt that linkages should be established among agencies already using PPT.

'The PPT website is good, but it is primarily a resource base, it is good for students. You need to link to other organisations such as SNV and GTZ, who are doing a lot. You need to share, not do it alone but link up with others who use the same principles, maybe a different name but the same ideas. SNV is using PPT for example in 12 countries at the moment: these include Tanzania, Uganda, Benin and Asia of course.'

5 Summary: key findings and implications

Those researching and writing up PPT were generally extremely positive about the PPT approach, PPT strategies and the research process.

The most valuable aspect of the research process was the focus on a coherent PPT approach, the ‘putting it finally into writing’ and ‘having something to fall back on and re-read’. While relatively little is actually known about impacts on the ground, all interviewees stated that their involvement in the PPT research process has been a very valuable experience, changing their awareness of poverty and tourism linkages, and leading to increased emphasis on poverty issues. All concluded that they will continue to use the PPT approach, or at least an emphasis on poverty reduction through tourism.

The dissemination process and the content of the disseminated material were judged as extremely beneficial and valuable.

There was general agreement as to what should become the ‘next steps’. Important for all was the focus on the industry and the ‘developed’ world. Several mentioned that they have become involved in policy making and planning using a PPT approach and that this should now be the focus of new PPT initiatives and research. Others thought that continuous implementation, i.e. the long-term testing of the approach, should be the next step. Clearly, all thought that the continuation of the PPT approach should strongly be encouraged and supported.

All respondents maintained that future dissemination of PPT material is important. Material not only aimed at NGOs and individuals already involved in using tourism as a tool for poverty reduction or those in the ‘development’ field, but information aimed at the wider public. Several criticised that too much still remains within a group of insiders, using research, analysis and a writing style that is difficult to be accessed by outsiders.

Implications

The main implication is that adopting an explicit pro-poor approach to assessing tourism can make a difference. While evidence of impacts on the ground is patchy at the moment, those who participated showed great enthusiasm. The majority was certain to continue to apply a PPT approach as it helped them to prioritise issues related to poverty reduction and provided a coherent and comprehensive framework for analysis. For those exposed to the approach, it clearly affects their way of thinking about tourism. This is probably the greatest benefit of a PPT approach, particularly since those who took part are facilitators and advisors to a variety of tourism projects around the world. This is a very valuable and necessary precondition for effectively harnessing tourism for poverty reduction.

Other implications are that learning from experience through a case study approach is of high value. But also that this must be accompanied by piloting, implementation, and access to resources.

Several measures to make best use of PPT approaches emerge. These include closer work with the private sector, with policy makers and with consumers, greater attention to the jargon and perhaps reconsideration of the term ‘Pro-Poor Tourism’.

Lessons have also been learnt about the research process. These include the need for direct collaboration between case study authors, affirmation of the value of their intensive input to writing and structuring the overview report; and the importance of producing short briefing papers for wide circulation.

Appendix 1 Questionnaire Survey

Questionnaire

Introductory note: This questionnaire is for all those involved in the case studies that were assessed within the Pro-poor Tourism (PPT) project (April 2000-March 2001), including both those implementing the tourism initiatives and those who authored the case studies.

Q1: Have you written, received and/or read any of the following material regarding the Pro-Poor Tourism project? Please mark (x) the appropriate columns - multiple answers possible.

	RECEIVED	READ	WRITTEN
Poor Tourism Working Paper related to your project only:			
a) draft report			
b) final report			
Other Pro-Poor Tourism Working Papers ¹			
Overview report 2001: Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies: Making Tourism Work for the Poor			
Briefing paper 2001: Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies: Expanding Opportunities for the Poor			
Business brief 2002: The Tourism Industry and Poverty Reduction: A Business Primer (2002)			

¹ Pro-poor Tourism Working Papers 1 to 6 on 'Practical Strategies for Pro-poor Tourism' – Wilderness Safaris South Africa; Makuleke and Manyeleti tourism initiatives, South Africa; SNV in Humla District, West Nepal; NACOBTA the Namibian case study; The Uganda Community Tourism Association; TROPIC Ecological Adventures – Ecuador; St. Lucia Heritage Tourism Programme.

Q2: Were you involved in any of the following dissemination activities?

	Please mark
I passed on the final material to others	
I discussed the findings with others	
I implemented findings in the case study I was involved in	
I implemented findings in other situations	
I cited the findings in other work	
I know of individuals using the findings that were not involved in the research process	

Q3: How useful were the following aspects of the PPT research for your work?

	Very useful	Useful	Not useful	Not sure
The direct involvement in the research process				
The ability to learn from other case studies				
The ability to compare PPT strategies				
The ability to discuss PPT with others				

Q4: Are any of the findings influencing your current work? If, so which ones and how?

Q5: Has the research led to an increase in

a) your awareness of any of the following Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies? and

b) the effort you apply in implementing these strategies?

Please mark (x) the appropriate columns

	AWARENESS has increased	Effort applied to IMPLEMENTATION has increased
Expanding Business Opportunities		
Expanding Employment Opportunities		
Enhancing Collective Benefits		
Capacity Building, Training and Empowerment		
Enhancing benefits to infrastructure and environment		
Addressing socio-cultural impacts of tourism		
Building a more supportive policy and planning framework		
Promoting participation		
Partnerships with the private sector		

Q6: If the way in which you implement these strategies has changed, please explain briefly how

Q7: The PPT research assessed a wide variety of impacts that tourism has on poor people.

Has the research led you to

a) give more importance to these impacts? and

b) increase the effort you make to achieve them?

	Importance increased	Implementation changed
Aggregate, collective income		
Wage income for individual employees		
Casual income, micro-enterprise earnings		
Distribution of Benefits		
Human capital (skills, education, health)		
Physical capital (infrastructure etc.)		
Financial capital (credit and collective investment)		
Social capital and community organisations		
Access to natural capital (land, water, etc.)		
Access to information		
Influence over the policy context		
Access to market opportunities and livelihood options		
Cultural values		
Optimism, pride and participation		
Exposure to risk and exploitation		

Q8: If your work has been influenced by the PPT research, can you already identify positive impacts on poor people as a result of such change? Please explain briefly.

Q9: Finally, we would like to ask for your comments about the research process.

How would you judge the following aspects of the research process?

	Good	OK	Poor	Not Sure
The aims of the research project				
Your inclusion into the research process				
The analysis of your case-study				
The comparison between case-studies				
The information you were provided with (for example, briefing papers, drafts, final documents etc)				
The way in which the information was disseminated.				

Q10. Do you have suggestions as to where the Pro-Poor Tourism research should go from here? What would be important next steps?

Could you please return this questionnaire by Monday 22nd of July 2002.

d.meyer@odi.org.uk or fax: +44 (0)20 79220399

Follow-up informal telephone interviews.

We are conducting informal telephone interviews to obtain your views and further details of the issues discussed in the questionnaire. We hope you will be happy to take part. We will try to call you between middle of July and the end of August 2002. However, if you would rather specify a time that is convenient to you, do let us know when and how best to contact you.

Your name:

Preferred day:

Preferred time:

Your contact telephone number:

*We thank you very much for your time and effort
and look forward to speaking to you very soon.*

Appendix 2 Questionnaire Results

Q1: Have you written, received and/or read any of the following material regarding the Pro-Poor Tourism project?

	RECEIVED	READ	WRITTEN
Pro-Poor Tourism Working Paper related to your project only:	66.6%	75%	75%
a) draft report			
b) final report	66.6%	75%	66.6%
Other Pro-Poor Tourism Working Papers	75%	75%	16%
Overview report 2001: Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies: Making Tourism Work for the Poor	91.6%	100%	8.3%
Briefing paper 2001: Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies: Expanding Opportunities for the Poor	91.6%	83,3%	-
Business brief 2002: The Tourism Industry and Poverty Reduction: A Business Primer (2002)	83.3%	66.6%	-

Q2: Were you involved in any of the following dissemination activities?

	Please mark
I passed on the final material to others	75%
I discussed the findings with others	91.6%
I implemented findings in the case study I was involved in	33.3%
I implemented findings in other situations	50%
I cited the findings in other work	58.3%
I know of individuals using the findings that were not involved in the research process	58.3%

Q3: How useful were the following aspects of the PPT research for your work?

	Very useful	Useful	Not useful	Not sure
The direct involvement in the research process	66.6%	16.6%	-	8.3%
The ability to learn from other case studies	33.3%	66.6%	-	8.3%
The ability to compare PPT strategies	33.3%	41.6%	-	8.3%
The ability to discuss PPT with others	66.6%	25%		8.3%

Q4: Are any of the findings influencing your current work? If so, which ones and how?

‘Policies and strategies for PPT; capacity building requirements at the national and local level.’

‘As a tourism specialist at DBSA I am aiming at incorporating PPT principles on the projects that I work on, focusing particularly on how the DBSA should become involved in tourism projects’.

‘Change in focus towards pro-poor within tourism enterprises-operations I am working with in South Africa increasingly thinking about what they can do. Focus on poverty alleviation within the development of the South African Responsible Tourism Guidelines, and reference to PPT within the forthcoming Responsible Tourism manual.’

‘I found the whole approach very exiting and challenging, I am trying to incorporate elements of this in my present work whenever I can.’

‘I seek to include local communities as key stakeholders in the eco-tourism planning process in projects supported by the nature conservancy (and by tropic).’

‘I am using the documents as reference guides when writing about sustainable tourism, when preparing presentations, etc. I have the feeling that the documents assist me in increasing my knowledge about pro-poor tourism and they help me to express my ideas to others.’

‘I use the pro-poor tourism strategies in developing new tourism development programmes in the SNV Asia cluster.’

‘Not really because I am not working in tourism development at the moment...However, when I did a study on the potential of eco-tourism in the Gulf of Mannar in South India in February 2002, I found the experience of having done your study, the findings and approach very useful.’

‘Yes. In totally different fields as well – HIV/AIDS and education.’

Q5: Has the research led to an increase in

a) your awareness of any of the following Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies? and

b) the effort you apply in implementing these strategies?

Please mark (x) the appropriate columns

	AWARENESS has increased	Effort applied to IMPLEMENTATION has increased
Expanding Business Opportunities	83.3%	33.3%
Expanding Employment Opportunities	83.3%	25%
Enhancing Collective Benefits	83.3%	33.3%
Capacity Building, Training and Empowerment	83.3%	50%
Enhancing benefits to infrastructure and environment	41.6%	16.6%
Addressing socio-cultural impacts of tourism	75%	16.6%
Building a more supportive policy and planning framework	75%	33.3%
Promoting participation	75%	25%
Partnerships with the private sector	83.3%	41.6%

Q6: If the way in which you implement these strategies has changed, please explain briefly how

‘The case study helped to highlight the need for a comprehensive approach. It also identified concrete directions for policy and planning.’

‘Through emphasis within the Responsible Tourism Guidelines and the RT manual. Focus for FEDHASA’s Imvelo (responsible tourism) awards on pro-poor aspects – and transparent reporting of impacts (also in relation to the guidelines focus).’

‘It was all very new to me and very exciting. I have so far had limited experience with actual implementation as I was not involved in the project at the end. I am however sure that I will bear this experience in mind when I consider getting involved in other projects. Overall, it has been really valuable to me and allowed me to take a new look at these kinds of projects.’

‘[I] have been involved in promoting these strategies for some time but it was valuable to learn of other experiences. Not directly, but the greater awareness of the pro-poor approach and other case studies will contribute to my own project implementation.’

‘It mainly has shown me how important these aspects are within the development of pro-poor tourism. Before I was less focused on policy and partnership with private sector for example.’

‘Not really’

‘Since I was never actually implementing the project nor I did the study on any other pro-poor tourism initiative, there hasn’t been any change in the way I implement with respect to PPT. I was already working in ‘pro-poor’ ways that you mentioned above by working at the grassroots in extremely remote areas in Nepal, but I hadn’t necessarily formulated them as ‘strategies’ that I was using.’

‘I focus more on community participation and the building of strategic partnerships between communities and the private sector.’

Q7: The PPT research assessed a wide variety of impacts that tourism has on poor people.

Has the research led you to

a) give more importance to these impacts? and

b) increase the effort you make to achieve them?

	Importance increased	Implementation changed
Aggregate, collective income	58.3%	25%
Wage income for individual employees	33.3%	25%
Casual income, micro-enterprise earnings	41.6%	25%
Distribution of Benefits	58.3%	16.6%
Human capital (skills, education, health)	75%	33.3%
Physical capital (infrastructure etc.)	41.6%	25%
Financial capital (credit and collective investment)	41.6%	25%
Social capital and community organisations	50%	33.3%
Access to natural capital (land, water, etc.)	41.6%	33.3%
Access to information	75%	25%
Influence over the policy context	41.6%	16.6%
Access to market opportunities & livelihood options	66.6%	33.3%
Cultural values	41.6%	8.3%
Optimism, pride and participation	25%	8.3%
Exposure to risk and exploitation	41.6%	16.6%

Q8: If your work has been influenced by the PPT research, can you already identify positive impacts on poor people as a result of such change? Please explain briefly.

‘Two concrete implications of this research: 1) I have been involved in facilitating a participatory process for the design of a second phase of the programme described in the PPT case study, and I have therefore used the lessons and directions of the case study in that process. 2) I am also applying the lessons from the case study, and from the PPT work as a whole, in a local-level research project on coastal resources and sustainable livelihoods, which includes a tourism component.’

‘My work has been influenced by PPT research, however the processes around tourism projects are often very slow, and thus the actual positive impacts are difficult to measure.’

‘More of a focus on livelihoods and rural people’s perspectives than private sector or conservationist views.’

‘It is very difficult for me to say, as I was not involved in the end. It would be very interesting though to go back and take a close look at the lessons learned, I am sure Andy would have told you about the impacts.’

‘At Tropic we have worked closely with the Accion Amazonia Foundation to develop a new business plan with the Huaorani community of Queheri’ono which has lead to interest from the IDB in investing in our eco-tourism joint venture with the community, which includes a training component.’

‘I am not sure if the research really has led to see the importance of the above. It has been more the experience in the field that showed the importance. However, it is still important to look back at research material and compare the practice with what has been found in other areas. Also, it is too early to indicate any changes.’

‘I don’t think my work is related closely enough to connect impacts of my work on the poor with the PPT research. The poor that I work with benefit from increased access to market opportunities and livelihood options, from increased social capital through strengthening of community based organisations and local NGOs, from micro-enterprise opportunities, skill development, knowledge up-grading and access to information. If I’m honest though, this isn’t as a result of the PPT research I did. I was doing it already’.

‘It has increased the confidence of the poor in what they are able to do. It has also increased their initiative and they place more value on their culture and environment.’

Q9: Finally, we would like to ask for your comments about the research process.

How would you judge the following aspects of the research process?

	Good	OK	Poor	Not Sure
The aims of the research project	91.6%	-	-	-
Your inclusion into the research process	50%	33.3%	8.3%	8.3%
The analysis of your case-study	33.3%	58.3%	-	-
The comparison between case-studies	50%	16.6%	-	25%
The information you were provided with (for example, briefing papers, drafts, final documents etc)	66.6%	8.3%	-	16.6%
The way in which the information was disseminated.	75%	-	8.3%	8.3%

Q10. Do you have suggestions as to where the Pro-Poor Tourism research should go from here? What would be important next steps?

‘Further dissemination of results; incorporation of PPT principles into national, regional and local tourism development planning and policy etc.’

‘More case studies would be really interesting to do and learn from – work on the areas in which the authors thought there were gaps in the PPT research and fill them. E.g. in the Rocktail/Ndumu study – would have been really useful to follow money from tourists to communities, and identify leakages, and where socio-economic development could capture more of the tourism revenue (e.g. spending of employees wages locally). I would be very interested in working on this aspect with ODI/IIED/ICRT if it was possible. Maximising business opportunities from existing tourism/sustainable natural resource use.’

‘More case studies.’

‘Financing models, sound business advice, more information to the private sector.’

‘PPT could work with initiatives identified to link them with funding sources to develop and upgrade their operations and help implement monitoring systems to evaluate achievements of pro-poor goals.’

‘Continue with making researches and distributing documents, they are important for the development of tourism as a tool for poverty reduction.’

‘Continue to monitor the impact of these PPT initiatives and others over a period of years to see what the lasting impacts of them have been.’

‘Get funding for more PPT initiatives to be piloted using the strategies and approaches you analysed. This kind of thing calls for action research. We can only learn by doing it whether we can make it work. I feel this is the case with most of development ‘theory’ – it needs testing by getting on and doing it.’

‘I think the focus should be placed on how to build the capacity of the poor in the pro-poor tourism. What are the challenges and what are the success stories. In addition we should look into challenges and success stories in benefit sharing with the community.’

Appendix 3 Interview Guidelines

Topic 1: Dissemination

Which reports/which papers did you find particularly useful?

- Your case study
- Other case studies
- Overview report
- Policy briefing paper
- Business briefing paper

Your involvement in dissemination? What was particularly important and valuable?

Improvement suggestions. What would you have liked to see?

Topic 2: Usefulness of PPT research

What was most useful?

- Involvement in the process
- Learning from other case studies
- Other

Are findings influencing your current work?

Which findings are particularly useful?

Topic 3: PPT strategies

- Increased awareness? How?
- Increased implementation efforts? How?
- What have you learned? What are you implementing?
- Are any of the PPT strategies particularly important for your work?
- Has the way in which you implement these strategies changed? How?

Topic 4: Impacts

- Can you already identify positive impacts?

Topic 5: Overall evaluation of the PPT analysis

- Important lessons learned?
- What was new compared to other methods?
- Would you use the PPT analysis in other contexts? if so explain

Topic 6: The next steps?

Appendix 4 Pro-Poor Strategies and Impacts Identified in the 2000-2001 Research

As indicated in this report, a key feature of the PPT approach is the emphasis on a wide range of strategies for increasing benefits to the poor, and on a wide range of impacts that matter to the poor. To help readers in interpreting the comments of respondents on these, the strategies and impacts identified in the research are presented here.

Pro-Poor Tourism (PPT) aims to increase the net benefits for the poor from tourism, and to ensure that tourism growth contributes to poverty reduction (Ashley, Roe and Goodwin 2001:viii). PPT strategies aim to unlock opportunities for the poor. This not only includes the analysis of the vital economic costs and benefits, it also focuses strongly on social, environmental, cultural and political aspects of livelihood costs and benefits, thus moving away from seeing tourism solely as income generator.

The table below lists the PPT strategies, as they were categorised in the 2001 report. Three broad types were identified (related to economic benefits, non-economic impacts, and policy/process issues), with each further sub-divided.

Core area	Sub-section	Analysis of strategies implemented in the case studies
1. Increased economic benefits	1.1. Expanding business opportunities for the poor	The main activities in most case studies were related to enterprise support and expanding markets. The case studies highlight the need to combine supply side measures with measures to expand demand.
	1.2. Expanding employment opportunities for the poor	Most activities were concerned with skills' improvement, little, however, focused purely on formal employment.
	1.3. Enhancing collective benefits	All case studies showed positive effects, however, there was not one single superior way of achieving this – rather, a number of strategies were employed. On the other hand, a number of case studies highlighted that problems can occur with the misuse of collective benefits.
2. Positive non-economic benefits	2.4. Capacity building training and empowerment	This was a central strategy in all case studies. However, it was seen as an essential but long-term process and little information was revealed about short-term gains.
	2.5. Mitigation of environmental impacts	Generally, very little attention was given to mitigating environmental impacts.
	2.6. Addressing socio-cultural impacts	In all case studies the focus was on developing the culture for tourism rather than protecting it. Socio-cultural issues were addressed only to a very limited extent.
3. Policy/process reforms	3.1. Building a more supportive policy and planning framework	All case studies stressed the importance of building up a more supportive policy framework. The case studies showed a variety of ways of fostering this. Results however have so far been limited as it was seen as a very difficult and long-term process.
	3.2. Promoting participation	The case studies showed three distinct ways of promoting participation (stake in investment; 'empowerment' and representation; and participatory planning processes). Most progress has however been made through less direct means (increased communication and change of attitude) which were seen as weaker but preliminary steps on the participation ladder.
	3.3. Bringing the private sector into pro-poor partnerships	The case studies showed a great variety of initiatives and all judged this a crucial. Three ways emerged: 1. Legal partnership; 2. Close arrangements between communities and tour-operators; 3. Government action to encourage private operators. However, process appears to be very limited especially with international tour-operators.

The research identified a range of impacts of tourism on livelihoods of the poor, and these were divided into financial impacts, and other livelihood impacts (see table below). Indirect impacts relating to poverty reduction prospects, such as policy-makers' attitudes, were also considered briefly but not categorised and tabulated.

Impacts	Impact – sub-sections	Results
Financial impacts	Total earnings (scale of aggregate income)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a great variety of aggregate income • linkages are urgently needed • craft earnings are very important • low multipliers in less developed communities (high leakage for imports)
	Individual income	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the few employed permanently earn twice as much as normally available • employment is created which would otherwise not have been available • income is spent on education, health and clothing • very high casual employment (4-10 times higher than formal employment) with greatly varying effects • high indirect financial benefits to extended families (up to 30-50 other people)
	Distribution of benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • regular wage earners are skilled (high benefits to the already better-off) • inequalities in the distribution of collective income is common • although collective income per resident might be low in some cases it nevertheless helped finance community development
Livelihood impacts	Human capital: skills, education and health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • positive in at least three ways: 1. Enhanced skills through training; 2. funding for local schools; 3. improved access to health
	Physical capital: roads, water and other infrastructure and tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • direct improvements (road and water access) • investment made with collective income (irrigation; communication) • spin-off from wider tourism development (access to electricity and water)
	Financial capital: credit and collective income	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • emerges strongly in all case studies either through loans made available to SMEs; wage earners gain access to credit; collective income as source for investment funding
	Social capital and community organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • community institutions have been strengthened • increased tension over community funds; inequitable power balances; problems with collective management; some institutions are more inclusive than others
	Natural capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tourism provides incentives for conservation • negative impacts due to increased usage (i.e. litter) • generally, however, limited reports on impacts
	Access to information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhanced information and increased communication; • increased external contacts (telephones, radios etc.)
	Policy context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the poor are increasingly seen as stakeholders
	Market opportunities, livelihood options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new opportunities are realised
	Cultural values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • positive about cultural impacts
	Optimism, pride and participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased optimism and pride although the extent to which the poor take part in decisions is unclear
Exposure to risk and exploitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • negative impacts due to dependency and exploitation 	