

FURTHER STAGES OF THE INVESTMENT REDISTRIBUTIVE INCENTIVE MODEL (IRIM) IN TOURISM: TOWARDS MAINSTREAMING COMMUNITY-BASED TOURISM

Andrea GIAMPICCOLI¹, Oliver MTAPURI²

¹Durban University of Technology, Department of Hospitality and Tourism, Ritson Campus, P. O. Box 1334, Durban, 4000, South Africa, e-mail: ¹andrea.giampiccoli@gmail.com, ²e-mail: erasmus@dut.ac.za

²University of KwaZulu-Natal, School of Built Environment & Development Studies, Howard College Campus, Durban 4001, South Africa, e-mail: mtapuri@ukzn.ac.za

Giampiccoli A., Mtapuri O., 2020, *Further stages of the Investment Redistributive Incentive Model (IRIM) in tourism: towards mainstreaming community-based tourism*, „Czasopismo Geograficzne”, 91(1–2): 269–284.

Abstract:

Poverty and inequality have remained stubborn problems in many countries of the world. In its current form, conventional/mass tourism does not show any wherewithal and ‘desire’ to fight and reduce inequality and poverty, especially in proportion to its value and potential. The recently proposed Investment Redistributive Incentive Model (IRIM) is a new strategic tool in tourism as well as in other sectors with the potential to contribute to redistribution and decreasing poverty and inequality. This article is a conceptual paper that is based on extant (primarily secondary) literature. It expands the IRIM and proposes new successive stages. This implies, firstly, the creation of Locally Controlled Tourism Zones (LOCOTOZ) and, secondly, to model these new tourism zones based on community-based tourism (CBT) principles. Thus, LOCOTOZ are a specific type of Special Economic Zones (SEZs) (thus the nomenclature LOCOTOZ as Special Tourism Zones – STZs) geared towards redistribution and fighting poverty and inequality as their main drivers. Therefore, the article posits LOCOTOZ (or thereafter STZs) and its possible role in redistribution and fighting poverty and inequality.

Keywords: Investment Redistributive Incentive Model, Special Tourism Zones, Tourism Liberated Zones, Community-Based Tourism, Foreign Direct Investment, Investment

Introduction

Tourism is a major global sector. It progressively grew since the post-World War II era, and “by the new millennium, it was one of the fastest-growing industries in the world” [Toerien 2020:72]. The growth of tourism opens up its vast potential in poverty and inequality reduction and overall development. Thus, in ‘development’ circles, it has long been thought, “that tourism has the potential to reduce poverty” [Harrison and Pratt 2019:109]. For example, tourism has been widely adopted as a development strategy in developing countries for more than 50 years [Scheyvens

and Momsen 2008:22]. In the case of South Africa, upward growth trends in tourism opened the possibility of solving the perennial problems of poverty and unemployment in the country [Toerien 2020:72]. In essence, in a neoliberal context, trade liberalization, the establishment of free trade zones, up-scaled tourism development, and large remittances are some of the prescriptions suggested for developing countries to spur economic growth [Caraballo-Cueto 2016:181].

However, this vast potential in the tourism sector to reduce both poverty and inequality is not being reflected on the ground. The sector's footprint on poverty and inequality has been chequered marked by fluctuations in fortunes for the low-level workers who remained in precarity. For Small Island Developing States (SIDS), it has not overcome poverty and inequality [Scheyvens and Momsen 2008:22]. While tourism is a profitable economic activity, it impacts all the three pillars of sustainability, namely, social, economic, and environmental aspects [Mendes, Martins and Mouga 2019:3]. Tourism can perpetuate and, also, in some cases, increase inequality [Saayman and Giampiccoli 2016, Dłużewska 2019] thus, some scholars observe that tourism can exacerbate regional, class and gender inequalities and ignite environmental and social problems, denting its importance as a dependable developmental tool in developing countries [Tosun, Timothy and Öztürk 2003:133]. Evidence shows that conventional tourism has been good at overly exploiting local cultural and natural resources at the expense of local people and their resources – with enterprises often owned and controlled by foreign firms and substantial resource leakages from the rural communities [Wearing and McDonald 2002:198]. The Brundtland Commission defined sustainable development as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” [United Nations General Assembly 1987:43]. Welford, Ytterhus and Eligh, [1999] observe that sustainable development has ‘three important elements: economics, environmental issues and social and cultural issues’ – environmental concern is that non-renewable physical and resources are not depleted in the process of consumption and economic sustainability insinuates self-reliance at the grassroots level. Henry and Jackson [cited in Welford, Ytterhus and Eligh 1999] note that from this sprang the term ‘sustainable tourism’ which represents principles and policies for tourism development that protects a destination's environmental resources – built, natural, socio-cultural features) for future development.

This article argues that leakages are negative and undermine sustainability in all its forms. For example, the economic sustainability of tourism growth can be defined “as the net economic improvements for the local economy that tourism development can produce in the long term, taking into account all the diverse impacts that affect the different sectors and industries of the local economy” [Garrigós-Simón, Galdón-Salvador and Gil-Pechuán 2015:723]. The threats to economic sustainability

or economic growth arises from leakages linked to imports and huge stakes owned by foreigners in tourism facilities [Garrigós-Simón, Galdón-Salvador and Gil-Pechuán 2015:724, see also: Budeanu 2007]. This resonates with Pratt, Suntikul and Dorji [2018:627] who note that sustainability is impaired when economic benefits are fleeced outside the country. A United Nations Conference on Trade and Development [UNCTAD, 2013:11] document also observes that leakages can diminish the positive impacts of tourism in developing countries. The same document [UNCTAD 2013:13] indicates that

transnational corporations (TNCs) in the tourism sector, together with the influx of foreign direct investment (FDI), leads to financial leakages. While such FDI provides important amounts of capital, TNCs repatriate profits, tend to be vertically integrated with suppliers outside the local economy and often bring in highly skilled international staff that take up the managerial positions.

From an economic perspective it has been argued that reducing leakages is a necessary strategy for sustainable tourism development and this is predicated on strengthening intersectoral linkages [Pratt, Suntikul and Dorji 2018:626]. As such, to decrease the negative impacts of tourism and to enhance its positive role in decreasing poverty, inequality, and foster holistic development, especially among disadvantaged community members, new solutions are needed. This is because persistent poverty, unemployment, and inequality are hinting at the failure of current models to solve them, and the same models buttress current systems that assign benefits and power unequally [Giampiccoli and Mtapuri 2020a:2]. At the core of these systems is neoliberalism, which has led to social inequalities, and therefore cannot solve those [Scheyvens and Hughes 2019:1065]. Whereas the need to have a sustainable tourism sector has been recognised by “by all major tourism-related organizations” [Garrigós-Simón, Galdón-Salvador and Gil-Pechuán 2015:722].

Giampiccoli and Mtapuri [2020a] recently proposed the Investment Redistributive Incentive Model (IRIM) as a new pathway to decrease inequality in the tourism sector (in as much as the IRIM can be applied to any economic sector). IRIM rewards companies that restructure their ownership and management structure to include workers and/or local people or such companies contribute in any other ways to redistributive measures [Giampiccoli and Mtapuri 2020a]. This paper transposes the IRIM to community-based tourism (CBT) for application. Community-based tourism has been proposed as a tourism development approach that “emerges as a form of resistance to the global tourism market pressures resulting in the exclusion of local populations, weakening the potential benefits of tourism, and threatening their social, cultural, and environmental cohesion” [Torres Tricárico, dos Santos Pires and da Conceição Walkowski 2019:4]. Based on the foregoing, the aim of this paper to promote IRIM and to posit its new stages. Thus, the creation and specification

of Special Tourism Zones (STZs) or previously denominated Locally Controlled Tourism Zones (LOCOTOZ) [Giampiccoli and Mtapuri 2020a] is at the core of this paper. Similarly to a previous study by Garrigós-Simón, Galdón-Salvador and Gil-Pechuán, [2015:734] this article's ambition is to make this model relevant, from a practical point of view, to tourism planners, managers and practitioners frame new policies that mitigate leakages and promote economic sustainability.

In terms of structure, the paper presents a brief literature review highlighting a few significant problems related to tourism development and their impacts on local people in the first part. In the second part, it presents its contribution to Special Tourism Zones (STZs) using a fictitious example.

Methodology

This is a conceptual article and is not based on primary data. It is compiled from extant academic literature as well as institutional documents and reports. Xin [2013] argues that both empirical and conceptual research possess both advantages as well as limitations. A conceptual paper draws on notions from several concepts and research results to guide a research project [Green 2014:35]. The purpose of conceptual work is to develop logical and complete opinions about relations instead of testing them empirically [Gilson and Goldberg 2015:127]. Xin [2013:70] is of the view that conceptual research may also scaffold previous concepts that emerge from empirical data collection and a central distinctive point of conceptual research is that it can progress without using empirical data. According to Gilson and Goldberg [2015] a conceptual paper does not have data, it focuses on integration and weaving together new relationships between constructs to achieve logical arguments without empirically testing them. In this context, this article, uses information, theories and data from published literature and documents to build and describe STZs and their potential role in redistribution and fighting poverty and inequality.

Literature review

This literature briefly presents some significant concerns related to the tourism sector and its impacts on local host populations with specific attention to the disadvantaged strata of society. For instance, one of the significant issues is leakage, "financial leakage is one of the greatest negative impacts of mass tourism..." [Chong 2020:159]. For tourism to contribute to reducing poverty in developing countries considerably, it is imperative to minimizing leakages of all forms [Pratt, Suntikul and Dorji 2018:626], especially in developing countries where the problems of poverty and inequality are pronounced. It is evident that it is in these same countries that tourism is supposed

to assist with socio-economic improvement where these leakages are profound. Chong [2020:159] notes that monetary “leakages are more evident in under and developing countries which are generally still lacking in quality product development, independent operation management, quality resources, and competent and qualified skilled individuals.” Certainly, leakages have profound negative impacts as they stifle the capacity of local communities, and their prospects for future economic growth and sustainability [Alzboun et al. 2016:18]. These negative impacts have ripple effects as they dent the confidence of the locals in tourism when noise and heavy traffic affects them [Chong 2020:158].

Further, the impacts of tourism can also be seen when it diminishes local values through standardization, commodification, and loss of authenticity as the locals adapt to the demands of tourists [Altmann and Aleksanyan 2016:62]. To sum up, tourism can have a negative footprint on tourist destinations if not properly managed [Dłużewska and Rodzoś 2018:261, Zhuang, Yao and Li 2019:3]. Tourism management cannot be left to tourists but requires the active involvement and participation of locals in the harvesting and preservation of their cultures, heritage, and resources for their benefit. Tourists and foreign firms have been over-harvesting in destinations (especially in developing countries) to the disadvantage of local communities who remain in poverty.

Tourism leakages are correlated to the structure of the tourism sector, which is often foreign-dominated in demand and supply. A study related to small islands, but arguably valid for many other geographical contexts, explains the relationship between leakages, multinational companies, and negative local consequences by expressing that large transnational corporations (TNCs) “operators are vertically or horizontally integrated and use subsidiary companies to service much of the tourist’s visit, including accommodation, transport, activities, and attractions. This leads to economic leakage (profits flowing off-island) to foreign-owned businesses, leaving little opportunity for smaller, local enterprises to benefit from tourist expenditure” [Chong 2020:8]. Along this line, a case from Turkey mentions the structural context within which multinational foreign companies take advantage of local/national priorities, thus even if

the number of tourists visiting Turkey has increased year after year, revenues from tourism are still below expected values. This is because mass tourism is characterized by lower spending per tourist, so, in order to stay competitive, Turkey has engaged in bidding wars with other countries in the Mediterranean Basin, which has benefited more the multinational corporations organizing the tourist flow rather than Turkey [Egresi 2016:47].

In Turkey, beach tourism has fundamentally contributed to its economic development. However, this has raised significant concerns given emerging evidence of widening

social inequality, in which large investors have disproportionately benefited from tourism spoils at the expense of local people as local small businesses (who were involved in the early stages of tourism development) were replaced over time by large mostly foreign multinational corporations [Egresi 2016:49]. Reporting on a study from Kenya, Zhuang, Yao and Li [2019:3] mention that tourism institutions were mainly under the control of external investors with minimal local participation and characterised by high leakages and the inability of locals to participate due to numerous barriers. This indicates that specific actions need to be taken to open up opportunities that foster local control of tourism. This paper argues that an approach such as CBT can assist in that regard. Community-based tourism is an alternative to conventional tourism. Conventional tourism is characterised by the dominance of external investors, which diminishes local control of destination resources and little local control [Tucker 2016:335]. Destinations and destinies should be under the control of locals, that is, the wider population and not just the elite in the interest of fairness.

Tourism can tackle poverty, but the fundamental issue is to ensure that the poor are involved in tourism activities [Holden 2008:140]. In this context, inclusive tourism and beyond it, CBT can be seen as a viable approach. In that vein, the UNWTO expressively mentions that the fight against poverty and inequality is global, but “economic growth in itself is insufficient for fighting poverty and inequality unless it is both sustainable and inclusive” [UNWTO 2018:9]. More inclusive and sustainable measures are required. As such, inclusive tourism focuses on marginalized people and is related to transformative tourism, which embraces marginalized groups in the practice of tourism that is where transformative in that they challenge stereotypes, attempt to reduce inequalities, and understand the circumstances of minority groups [Scheyvens and Hughes 298:592]. Community-based tourism follows similar lines of inclusion and goes beyond it. In other words, CBT ventures are under the control and management of communities who derive major benefits arising from such ventures [Juma and Khademi-Vidra 2019:2]. Community-based tourism “should not be viewed as an end in itself, but as a means towards empowering poor communities to take control over their land and resources, to tap their potential, and to acquire the skills necessary for their own development” [Mearns 2012:72].

Thus, CBT must provide local communities with control over tourism ventures and their development [Tolkach 2017:287], including local ownership and decision-making [Tucker 2016:335]. Community-based tourism is intended for disadvantaged community members and as such government should assist, as a research on a local municipality in South Africa observes, that the involvement of Government centres on providing resources, guidance and supportive legislation to ensure the success of these ventures [Mnguni, Giampiccoli and Mtapuri 2019:50]. The next section introduces the special tourism zones (STZs).

Special Tourism Zones

Special Tourism Zones are envisaged to mimic the most famous Special Economic Zones (SEZ). The presence and development of SEZs is widespread (currently, 2019, there are nearly 5,400 zones across 147 economies) and the SEZs growth is related to a new wave of “industrial policies and a response to increasing competition for internationally mobile investment” [UNCTAD 2019:XIII]. Special Economic Zones are related to neoliberal expansion and globalization. A case study from India proposes that SEZs are linked to neoliberalism [Anwar and Carmody 2016]. It has been observed that the impacts of SEZs are often detrimental to local populations (specifically to the local disadvantaged social groups). Cases from India [Saine 2013, Parwez 2018:154] and Ghana [Ayentimi, Burgess and Dayaram 2019] show how SEZ or free trade zone negatively affect local labor conditions. Special Economic Zones “have become a favoured development strategy for countries with few other industrialization options in the globalized era” and they offer various advantaged to the investor such as packages of tax exemption, low labour costs, infrastructure, and tariff waiver [Brown 2019:440]. Thus,

SEZs have gained significant traction as a policy tool to promote industrial development in low- medium- and high-income countries, and a growing number of states have adopted SEZ laws. Nevertheless, while business clustering can make economic sense, many SEZs have been associated with compressions of land, labour, and human rights. Dispossessing the land rights of marginalised people and suspending their labour rights are unacceptable ways to promote FDI. If not adequately thought through, SEZ laws can violate human rights and undermine the foundations of political organization [Cotula and Mouan 2018:4].

It can be summarized that “SEZs have become notorious for two main reasons: exploitative labour conditions, and land dispossession” [Brown 2019:440, Hirsch 2019]. This paper argues that STZs should be conceptualized and implemented differently from SEZs. First of all, SEZs are a result of the top-down and usually a government’s and international entities directing their establishment and regulation. In contrast, STZs should have a bottom-up approach where the community is at the forefront (the protagonist) in their establishment of STZs within a specific context, with locally devised roles and rules which favour the locals. Thus, the two types of zones (SEZs and STZs) should be understood differently. STZs should be based not on a neoliberal framework but a CBT framework that counteracts the neoliberalism and its tenets. Special Tourism Zones should be based on CBT principles and characteristics and meant for disadvantaged social groups and advancing issues such as social justice, empowerment, sustainability, and self-reliance [Tasci, Semrad and Yilmaz 2013:10, Giampiccoli 2015]. Community-based tourism also includes the need for local control, ownership, and management of CBT (and tourism in general)

by local people. These form the measures or indicators for the success or failure of an STZ. Thus, CBT should be under the control of local communities who should be the implementers of projects and ventures [Sutresna et al. 2019:72]. Community-based tourism is about equity, redistribution, and collective ownership with no winners or losers [Tasci, Semrad and Yilmaz 2013:2, Dangi and Jamal 2016:12, Ullan de La Rosa, Aledo Tur and Garcia Andreu 2017:469]. In other words, differently from SEZs, CBT promotes local control and ownership of land.

Giampiccoli and Mtapuri [2020a:7] posit that the IRIM uses investment incentives like tax cuts and rebates for purposes of redistribution when firms alter their management and ownership structure to cascade greater benefits to workers in Individual Ownership Schemes, Collective Ownership Schemes or involving local community members in the management and ownership of firms for altruistic reasons and social justice. The IRIM applies to all sectors of the economy with concomitant adjustments. It also applies to private firms as well as state-owned companies [Giampiccoli and Mtapuri 2020a]. IRIM suggests contributing to the general local population. For example, it is proposed that if 5% of a “company’s profit is given to the local neighborhood people, the company will also get IRIM incentives – proportionately at the same percentage of sharing” [Giampiccoli and Mtapuri 2020a:7]. The basic assumption of IRIM is that proper incentives can attract a company to reconfigure its ownership and/or management structure so that redistribution is facilitated. Beyond ownership and management structures – considered as core elements of IRIM, incentives can also be linked to other redistributive measures (redistribution should not be conceptualised only in economic terms) such as furthering the education of workers and local people or supporting local economic linkages to benefit small businesses [see Giampiccoli and Mtapuri 2020a].

Based on the above, the proposed STZs leverages the thinking behind IRIM. The IRIM could initially be applied in specific areas with specific investment needs in order to address high socio-economic inequality. Specific areas could have deliberate action to amplify IRIM so that tourism comes gradually under the sole control of the local population [Giampiccoli and Mtapuri 2020a:10].

It is essential to understand that STZs is possible to be implemented at any geographical level, village, town, city, province, state, region, country, and the specific space that it is initially devoted to it. STZs must be open to flexible modes with options for many home-grown combinations that can be developed. Two (fictitious) proposals of STZs are presented here as examples. These are:

- At the city level, STZ will consist of a specific neighbourhood (see Figure 1)
- Country-level STZ can consist of specific municipalities or other administrative boundaries such as provinces (see Figure 2).

However, any specifically demarcated spaces can become a STZ based on accepted criteria.



Fig. 1. Example of STZs in city neighbourhoods (circled in Red). Maps from Google Maps
Ryc. 1. Przykład STZ w dzielnicach miasta (zakreślony na czerwono). Mapy z Google Maps



Fig. 2. Example of STZs at the country level (circled in Red). Maps from Google Maps
Ryc. 2. Przykład STZ na poziomie kraju (zakreślony na czerwono). Mapy z Google Maps

We concede that not all areas in the world have similar endowments, similar working communities, or similar resources for tourism. Therefore STZs are context specific. The choice of these two fictional examples is for illustration only. Further, the delimitations of an STZ can either be geographical or common interests/similar economic activities. Geographical/spatial demarcation for an STZ can be a village, town, city, province, state, region or country; while common interests/economic activities include restaurants, accommodation facilities, wine farms and so on clustered in some way in to a community of practice. The STZs will have its own specific coordinating office. Each STZ should promote tourism activities based on principles of CBT in the interest of redistribution and equity. Following IRIM [Giampiccoli and Mtapuri 2020a], STZs should have specific incentives to attract and facilitate the establishment of tourism/CBT ventures in the STZs. Thus, special tax incentives, and others, such as a fast-tracked bureaucracy will be given to local people to be involved in the tourism sector. IRIM can be based on variables, “(which vary based on each specific context) where each variable is assigned a value which reflects specific IRIM incentives. For example, some of the variables could be: company size (in terms of number of employees), proportion of employee by category, turnover, profit, value of investments, specific location, and economic sector. The value and type of incentive will be linked to each variable in some form of ranking” [Giampiccoli and Mtapuri 2020a:8]. An illustrative example proposes that if “the company’s profit given to the workers is 5% and to the local community another 5%, the company will redistribute 10% profit to benefit the workers and the local community.” In this case the company will be granted a total of 5% tax reduction based on the company profit after what is given to the workers (5%) and community (5%). Moreover, another 5% tax reduction for 5 years will follow the same procedure [Giampiccoli and Mtapuri 2020a:9]. In addition, specific limits of ownership to outsiders will be imposed – thus, the aspiration to reach 100% ownership and control of the tourism sector by local people living within (or in close proximity to) the STZs should be the final goal. While collaboration and partnership with outside entities can be seen favorably (within a specific condition of fair and equal relationships), the tourism business within STZs should remain fundamentally controlled by local people living in the STZs itself.

At the same time, three main types of STZ can be envisaged:

1. IRIM based STZ – where companies work based on IRIM principles. This STZ will possibly also not have people living within it, as they will be specific areas devoted to lodges or resorts or other tourism facilities.
2. CBT based STZ – when STZ will be based on CBT principles;
3. A mixed model IRIM and CBT STZ – this model will usually have people living within it and will embrace companies with IRIM principles as well as those with CBT principles. In this model, companies based on the IRIM principle

should eventually decrease and leave space to a full CBT STZ. In this model, IRIM and CBT principles are amalgamated.

In all these zones, strict specific limits of ownership and control should be applied to outsiders – in any case, and outsiders should not own more than 50% of the business as a matter of principle. A fifty percent threshold is meant to ensure that control remains with the local people. Any control by outsiders beyond 50% means that the local people have abdicated control to outsiders. Moreover, specific limits in terms of size of tourism businesses by each owner should be implemented to allow a greater spread of control and benefits from tourism to more local people.

The STZs can also include community-based diffused tourism (CBDT) linking issues of CBT with geographical characteristics of ‘Albergo Diffuso’ (AD) tourism model, thus, “integrating the socio-economic and business ownership/control characteristics and principles of CBT with the geographical/space characteristics of AD” [Giampiccoli and Mtapuri, 2020a]. Albergo Diffusi “are *horizontal* accommodation facilities, where hospitality is effectively distributed within the historic built environment, by exploiting the possibility of using architectural structures and scattered individual residential units, by means of a suitable, researched and calibrated change of intended use” [Villani and Dall’Ara 2015:170]. In AD, “bedrooms are all located within the pre-existing units. They are of different sizes, independent, and at a distance generally not more than 200/300 meters from the main building, which acts as reception and an information centre” [Valeri and Paoloni 2017:112].

It is envisaged that STZs should be established in areas that are attractive to tourism, not in ‘desolate’ tourism spaces as a ‘charity’ gift to disadvantaged social groups. The speed to establish each specific STZ will be based on local circumstances. Ideally, STZs should, with time, conjoin, and become the mainstream tourism framework of a specific country. The model we propose is general because conditions are different from place to place in terms of prevailing conditions (legal, resources etc).

Discussion

Zonification of spaces has arisen from the quest and enormous appetite in developing countries that are competing for foreign direct investments (FDI). The calls for FDI have been accompanied by lucrative trade and labour regimes such as tax cuts and relief, labour law relaxations and export incentives, easy divestment policies, and the establishment of one-stop shops for approval. Some of these attractive trade and labour regimes may not apply to the rest of the country. That is why they are called SEZs. While they have been lauded to spur growth, they are also notorious for the perpetuation of workers exploitation. Where there is a minimum wage policy in the rest of the country, it may not apply in these zones. For Cotula and Mouan [2018:4],

SEZ laws can undermine human and labour rights if they are not carefully crafted. Nevertheless, SEZs have gained greater importance lately.

This paper posits that STZs, which take a cue from SEZs if purposively conceptualized and implemented using IRIM and CBT principles, can result in more significant benefits going to workers and their communities. The imbrication of these more elegant principles of incentives and ownership, control, self-determination, social justice, empowerment, and sustainability enhance the chances of redistribution with a purpose – to alleviate poverty and reduce inequalities. While SEZs are by and large a product of a top-down technocratic directive, STZ should be a product of a bottom-up approach involving private firms and communities and their grassroots leadership and organisations with the facilitation of government entities. If SEZs are founded on neoliberal theories, STZ in this context should be grounded in Community Development and Grassroots Theories. An example of a grassroots theory which we posit is, when communities work together, no-one will be left behind, as each will be rewarded commensurate to their needs, effort, capabilities, and uptake. This paper suggests three types of variegated STZs, the first based on IRIM principles, the second on CBT principles, and the third that is informed by both IRIM and CBT principles. The latter allows for transitioning to full-fledged CBT ventures, which is the ideal, intended, and ultimate goal. The implications of these formations are to inform practice – good practice – that ensures that a more significant majority of community members benefit from their resources.

Conclusion

The tourism sector has the potential to decrease poverty and inequality. However, the current tourism industry is far from accomplishing and realising its potential because rampant leakages. Leakages are a serious problem as they can hamper and undermine local community development. Special Economic Zones are a creation of neoliberalism and there is much debate about their effectiveness as well as incidents of exploitation of workers including controversies regarding control of local resources. This article argues that new strategies need to be excavated that enhance the chances for tourism to contribute to the reduction of poverty and inequality. As such, one of the ways to do so is the new approach to tourism development suggested in this article. Specifically, the strategy rests on the creation of STZs whose aim is to promote and support local control of facilities, and foster the accrual of the majority of the benefits to local people from tourism. The STZs can be implemented in various geographical spaces taking into context specificities. The STZs that are based on principles of IRIM and CBT represent the new strategy that enhance the tourism sector's positive potentials to address social problems.

The ambition of this article, has been to put forward a new tourism development approach based on the creation of STZs. It acknowledges that there will be challenges during implementation, however, the proposed STZs are a promising mechanism to decrease leakages and ultimately to allow the tourism sector to fulfil its potential role towards the development of local economies. New research and perspectives on this issues are welcome and needed to ignite new vistas and opportunities for tourism development.

Acknowledgement

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

References

- Altmann G., Aleksanyan G.,** 2016, *Sustainability in tourism: problems and some basic directions of sustainable tourism management*, Ученые записки ЕГУ. Геология и география 2: 59–67.
- Alzboun N., Khawalidah H., Backman K., Moore D.,** 2016. *The effect of sustainability practices on financial leakage in the hotel industry in Jordan*, Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management 27: 18–26.
- Anwar M.A., Carmody, P.,** 2016, *Bringing globalization to the countryside: Special Economic Zones in India*, Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography 37: 121–138.
- Ayentimi D.T., Burgess J., Dayaram K.,** 2019, *Union suppression and union substitution strategies of multinational enterprises in Ghana*, Industrial Relations Journal 50(4): 379–398.
- Budeanu A.,** 2007, *Sustainable tourist behaviour – a discussion of opportunities for change*, International Journal of Consumer Studies 31(5): 499–508.
- Brown J.A.,** 2019, *Territorial [in:] Coherence: Labour and Special Economic Zones in Laos's Border Manufacturing*, Antipode 51(2): 438–457.
- Caraballo-Cueto J.,** 2016, *Free trade zones, liberalization, remittances, and tourism, for what? Jobless growth in the Dominican Republic*, International Journal of Development Issues 15(2): 181–200.
- Chong K.L.,** 2020, *The side effects of mass tourism: the voices of Bali islanders*, Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research 25(2): 157–169.
- Cotula L., Mouan L.,** 2018, *Special economic zones: engines of development or sites of exploitation?*, IIED Briefing Papers, October 2018. International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED).
- Dangi T.B., Jamal T.,** 2016, *An Integrated Approach to “Sustainable Community-Based Tourism*, Sustainability 8(475): 1–32.
- Dłużewska A.M.,** 2019, *Well-being versus sustainable development in tourism – The host perspective*, Sustainable Development 27(3): 512–522.

- Dłużewska A., Rodzół J.**, 2018, *Sustainable tourism supranational policies and the well-being – Gaps and challenges from the hosts' and the guests' perspective*, *Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes* 5: 250–268.
- Egresi I.**, 2016, *Tourism and Sustainability in Turkey: Negative Impact of Mass Tourism Development*, [in:]: I. Egreasi (Editor), *Alternative Tourism in Turkey Role, Potential Development and Sustainability*, Cham: Springer: 35–53.
- Garrigós-Simón F.J., Galdón-Salvador J.L., Gil-Pechuán I.**, 2015, *The economic sustainability of tourism growth through leakage calculation*, *Tourism Economics* 21(4): 721–739.
- Giampiccoli A., Mtapuri O.**, 2020a, *Introducing the Investment Redistributive Incentive Model (IRIM): A new redistribution perspective in tourism investment and beyond*, *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure* 9(1/58): 1–16.
- Giampiccoli A., Mtapuri O.**, 2020b, *Towards a coalescence of the community-based tourism and 'Albergo Difusso' tourism models for Sustainable Local Economic Development*, *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure* 9(1/64): 1–20.
- Giampiccoli A.**, 2015, *Community-based tourism: Origins and present trends*, *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance* 21(2): 675–687.
- Gilson L.L., Goldberg C.B.**, 2015, *So, what is a conceptual paper?*, *Group & Organization Management* 40(2): 127–130.
- Green H.E.**, 2014, *Use of theoretical and conceptual frameworks in qualitative research*, *Nurse Researcher* 21(6): 4–8.
- Harrison D., Pratt S.**, 2019, *Tourism and poverty*, [in:]: R. Sharpley and D. Harrison (Editors), *A Research agenda for tourism and development*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Pub: 109–124.
- Hirsch P.**, 2019, *Limits to neoliberal authoritarianism in the politics of land capitalisation in Thailand: beyond the paradox*, *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, 2019, DOI: 10.1080/02255189.2019.1666705
- Holden A.**, 2008, *Environment and tourism*, Oxon: Routledge.
- Juma L.O., Khademi-Vidra A.**, 2012, *Community-Based Tourism and Sustainable Development of Rural Regions in Kenya; Perceptions of the Citizenry*, *Sustainability* 11(4733): 1–23.
- Mearns K.**, 2012, *Community-based tourism and peace parks benefit local communities through conservation in Southern Africa*, *Acta Academica* 44(2): 70–87.
- Mendes S., Martins J., Mougá T.**, 2019, *Ecotourism based on the observation of sea turtles – A sustainable solution for the touristic promotion of São Tomé and Príncipe*, *Cogent Social Sciences* 5(1)1696001: 2–16.
- Mnguni E.M., Giampiccoli A., Mtapuri O.**, 2019, *Conceptualising the role of local government in community-based tourism development in the South Coast, KwaZulu-Natal*, South Africa, *New Generation Sciences* 17(2): 44–53.
- Parwez S.**, 2018, *Labour and Labour Welfare in Special Economic Zones in India with Special Reference to Gujarat*, *South Asian Survey* 23(2): 135–157.
- Saine P.**, 2013, *Special Economic Zones and the Exploitation Underneath*, <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2359449> (accessed 24/04/2020).
- Pratt S., Sontikul W., Dorji U.**, 2018, *Economic sustainability? Examining the linkages and leakages between agriculture and hotels in Bhutan*, *International Journal of Tourism Research* 20: 626–636.

- Saayman M., Giampiccoli A.**, 2016, *Community-based and pro-poor tourism: Initial assessment of their relation to community development*, European Journal of Tourism Research 12: 145–190.
- Scheyvens R., Hughes E.**, 2019, *Can tourism help to “end poverty in all its forms everywhere”? The challenge of tourism addressing SDG1*, Journal of Sustainable Tourism 27(7): 1061–1079.
- Scheyvens R., Momsen J.H.**, 2008, *Tourism and Poverty Reduction: Issues for Small Island States*, Tourism Geographies 10(1): 22–41
- Strydom A.J., Mangope D., Henama U.S.**, 2019, *Making community-based tourism sustainable: evidence from the Free State province, South Africa*, GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites XII(24/1): 7–18.
- Sutresna I.B., Suyana U.I.M., Saskara I.A.N., Setyari N.P.W.**, 2019, *Community based tourism as sustainable tourism support*, RJOAS 10(94): 70–78.
- Tasci A., Semrad K., Yilmaz S.**, 2013, *Community based tourism finding the equilibrium in COM-CEC context: Setting the Pathway for the Future*, Ankara: COMCEC Coordination Office.
- Toerien D.**, 2020, *Tourism and poverty in rural South Africa: A revisit*, South African Journal of Science 116(1/2): 72–79.
- Tolkach D.**, 2017, *Tourism and anarchism*, Tourism Recreation Research 42(3): 284–298.
- Torres Tricárico L., dos Santos Pires P., da Conceição Walkowski M.**, 2019, *Spaces for Collaborative Arrangements as Social Sustainability in Rural Accommodation in Brazil: Pouso dos Paula*, Sustainability 11(3236): 1–19.
- Tosun C., Timothy D.J., Öztürk Y.**, 2003, *Tourism growth, national development and regional inequality in Turkey*, Journal of Sustainable Tourism 11(2–3): 133–161.
- Tucker H.**, 2016, *Community-Based Tourism as Sustainable Development*, [in:] I. Egreasi (Editor), *Alternative Tourism in Turkey Role, Potential Development and Sustainability*, Cham: Springer, 335–347.
- Ullan de La Rosa F.J., Aledo Tur A., Garcia Andreu H.**, 2017, *Community-Based Tourism and the Political Instrumentalization of the Concept of Community. A New Theoretical Approach and an Ethnographical Case Study in Northeastern Brazil*, Anthropos, 112: 467–486.
- United Nations General Assembly**, 1987, *Report of the world commission on environment and development: Our common future*, Oslo, Norway: United Nations General Assembly, Development and International Co-operation: Environment.
- UNCTAD**, 2013, *Sustainable tourism: Contribution to economic growth and sustainable development*, Trade and Development Board, Trade and Development Commission, Expert Meeting on Tourism’s Contribution to Sustainable Development Geneva, 14–15 March 2013. https://unctad.org/meetings/en/SessionalDocuments/ciem5d2_en.pdf (accessed on 06/09/2020).
- UNCTAD**, 2019, *World Investment Report, 2019. Special Economic zones. Key Messages and overview*, New York: United Nations.
- UNWTO**, 2018, *Inclusive Tourism Destinations Model and success stories*, Madrid: World Tourism Organisation.
- Wearing S., McDonald M.**, 2002, *The Development of Community-based Tourism: Re-thinking the Relationship between Tour Operators and Development Agents as Intermediaries in Rural and Isolated Area Communities*, Journal of Sustainable Tourism 10(3): 191–206.

- Welford R., Ytterhus B., Eligh J.**, 1999, *Tourism and Sustainable Development: An Analysis of Policy and Guidelines for Managing Provision and Consumption*, Sustainable Development 7: 165–177.
- Xin S., Tribe J., Chambers D.**, 2013, *Conceptual research in tourism*, Annals of Tourism Research 61: 66–88.
- Zhuang X., Yao Y., Li J.**, 2019, *Sociocultural Impacts of Tourism on Residents of World Cultural Heritage Sites in China*, Sustainability 11(840): 1–19.

**ZASTOSOWANIE MODELU ZACHĘTY DO REDYSTRYBUCJI INWESTYCJI
(IRIM) W TURYSTYCE: DZIAŁANIA W KIERUNKU WŁĄCZENIA
TURYSTYKI SPOŁECZNOŚCI LOKALNEJ DO GŁÓWNEGO NURTU
GOSPODARKI TURYSTYCZNEJ**

Streszczenie:

W wielu krajach świata ubóstwo i nierówności społeczne stanowią istotny problem. W obecnej formie, zwłaszcza mając na względzie wartość udziału na rynku, turystyka konwencjonalna / masowa nie podejmuje realnych działań, ani nawet nie wykazuje „chęci” do zwalczania i zmniejszania nierówności i ubóstwa. Niedawno zaproponowany model zachęty do redystrybucji inwestycji (IRIM) jest nowym narzędziem strategicznym w turystyce, a także w innych sektorach, które może przyczynić się do redystrybucji dochodów oraz zmniejszenia ubóstwa i nierówności. Niniejszy artykuł jest pracą koncepcyjną opartą na istniejącej, głównie metodologicznej, literaturze. Autorzy rozwijają model IRIM i proponują wdrożenie jego uzupełnień. Oznacza to, po pierwsze, utworzenie Lokalnie Kontrolowanych Stref Turystycznych (ang. LOCOTOZ), a po drugie, modelowanie tych nowych stref turystycznych przy wykorzystaniu zasad turystyki opartej na społecznościach lokalnych (ang. CBT). LOCOTOZ to specyficzny rodzaj Specjalnych Stref Ekonomicznych (SSE) nastawionych na redystrybucję dochodów i tym samym walkę z ubóstwem i nierównościami.

Słowa kluczowe: Model Zachęty do Redystrybucji Inwestycji (IRIM), Specjalne Strefy Turystyczne, Strefy Wolne od Turystyki, Turystyka Społeczności Lokalnej, Międzynarodowe Inwestycje Bezpośrednie, Inwestycje.