The Mehloding Adventure Trail a community-based approach?



Faculty of Life Sciences, Copenhagen University 10th of April 2007 Sustainable Land Use and Natural Resource Management Thematic Course: Interdisciplinary Land Use and Natural Resource Management

Composed by:

Haneen Ghazawneh, Lisa M.D. Jørgensen, Arafa A. Khatib & Riyong Kim

Supervisors: Torben Birch-Thomsen & Andreas de Neergaard

Abstract

Tourism is the world's largest industry and in South Africa it is the fourth largest generator of foreign exchange. The Mehloding Adventure Trail, located in Eastern Cape Province in South Africa, is an example of community based ecotourism, in which the primary aim is to create jobs and to protect the local environment through a community-based approach. The objective of this study is not to look at the projects initiation but look at the current socio-economic and environmental impacts on the communities in the area, Makomereng and Mafaisa, and evaluate the future challenges and potentials of the project. The study will explore if the "community-based approach" is applied.

The results show that project management is impacted by communication and dependency on external funding. The project has also provided direct and indirect economic and social benefits to the community. These are in the form of job creation, capacity building, improvement of infrastructure, and respect for local tradition. Gender, age and social status have no significant impact on the distribution of these benefits. Natural resources are also largely used in the area, but resources are currently not affected to a large extent by the project due to its age and scale. Resource conservation and environmental management measures are in place in the chalets. Sustainability can be achieved through awarenessraising on issues of community ownership and environmental management. In conclusion, the project can be deemed as a community-based ecotourism.

List of contents

List of Figures	3
List of Boxes	3
List of Tables	3
1. Introduction	4
1.1 Study area	4
1.2 Understanding the core concepts	6
1.2.1 Tourism and Ecotourism	6
1.2.2 Community-based ecotourism	7
1.2.3 Quality of life	8
1.2.4 Sustainability	8
1.3 Objectives	9
1.4 The Research Question	10
	11
2. Nietnodology	11
2.1 Matheda description	11
2.1 Methods description	11
	13
3. Results and Discussion	15
3.1 Project Management	15
3.1.1 Project management impacts on the project	17
3.1.2 Self sufficiency	18
3.2 Quality of life	19
3.2.1 Quality of Life in the local context	19
3.2.2 Economic impacts	20
3.2.2.1 Economic gains and job opportunities	20
3.2.2.2 Distribution of benefits	23
3.2.3. Social Impacts	24
3.2.3.1 Access to benefits – terms of gender, age and social status	24
3.2.3.2 Education and capacity building	26
3.2.3.3 Culture and tradition	28
3.3 Resource Conservation and Environment	31
3.3.1 The eco in 'ecotourism'	31
3.3.2 Current status of natural resources and project impacts	32
3.3.3 Waste and Environmental Management	38
3.4 Sustainability	40
3.4.1 Sustainability in the local context	40
3.4.2 Future potentials and constraints	40
4. Conclusions and recommendations	44
5. Acknowledgements	47

6. References	48
7. Appendix	i
1. Individual time schedules	i
1.1 Riyong Kim	i
1.2 Haneen Ghazawneh	ii
1.3 Lisa M.D. Jørgensen	iii
1.4 Arafa A. Khatib	iv
2. List of Informants	v
3. Questionnaires and Interviews	viii
3.1 Questionnaire for non-participants	viii
3.2 Questionnaire for participants	X
3.3 Semi-structured interviews - Quality of Life	xiii
3.4 Semi-structured interviews - Environment and Project Management	XV
4. Workshops Outline and Results	xix
4.1 Community Participatory Workshop	xix
4.2 School Workshop	xxix
5. Project Establishment	xxxiii
6. Background on current status of natural resources in South Africa	xxxv
7. Synopsis	xxxvii

List of Figures

Figure 1. The Mehloding Adventure Trail, Eastern Cape, South Africa	5
Figure 2. Framework of analysis for community-based ecotourism	9
Figure 3. Map of Trail Walk	13
Figure 4. Operational structure	16
Figure 5. Tourist numbers for 2005-2006	18
Figure 6. Total income and community redistribution 2006	23
Figure 7. Temporary job by gender for 2005	24
Figure 8. Temporary job by gender for 2006	25
Figure 9. Community members presenting results from Quality of Life Exercise	26
Figure 10. Wattle wood being harvested for fuel, Makomereng	34
Figure 11. Caretaker 1 and liquid manure drums, Machekong chalet	38
Figure 12. Protea caffra	42

List of Boxes

Box 1. Ecotourism definitions	7
Box 2. Villagers quotes on the indirect benefits of the Trail	22
Box 3. Interview with a villager involved during construction	22
Box 4. Traditions and medicinal plants	28
Box 5. Villagers quotes on positive impact of tourism	28

List of Tables

Table 1. Description and purpose of methods used	. 12
Table 2. List of MCTT Trustees	. 15
Table 3. Permanent jobs created by Mehloding Adventure Trail	. 20
Table 4. List of some animal species present in the area	. 37

1. Introduction

Tourism is the world's largest industry (SAGI, 1996) and in South Africa it is the fourth largest generator of foreign exchange (DEAT, 1999 in Spenceley, 2005). Within the tourism industry ecotourism is the fastest growing sector with a growth rate of 10-15 % per annum (Panos, 1997 in Scheyvens, 1999). Because this industry is growing, it is important to understand where ecotourism projects lie in the continuum of paradigms which range from "all tourism is ecotourism" to "ecotourism impossible" (Orams, 1995).

In South Africa community-based tourism has received strong support from the postapartheid government as a part of their rural development strategy. Since ANC¹ came to power after the 1994 elections, community led initiatives have been growing in number (Ndlovu and Rogerson, 2003). The Mehloding Adventure Trail which is the case study of this paper, is an example of such an initiative. The primary aim of the Mehloding Adventure Trail project was to create jobs and to protect the local environment through a community-based approach (Impumelelo Innovations Award Trust, 2007). This study wishes to evaluate to what extent this has been achieved. The report consists of: (1) understanding the study area and the core concepts; (2): presentation and evaluation of methods used in field; (3) results and discussion based on field data which will be discussed in four themes: management, quality of life, environment and sustainability; and (5) conclusion and recommendations based on the analysis of data for improvement of the project.

1.1 Study area

The Mehloding Adventure Trail is located in the foothills of the southern Drakensberg mountain range (also known as Ukhahlamba). The Trail is situated on the junction of the Eastern Cape and KwaZulu Natal provinces in the Alfred Nzo District in South Africa and the southern border of Lesotho (Ndlovu and Rogerson, 2003; MAT, 2007). The area where the Trail is located comprises of mainly of Xhosa and Sotho speaking people and has significant plant and animal diversity being recognized as an endemic centre in South Africa (Ndlovu and Rogerson, 2003). The Trail is located in a former

¹ African National Congress (ANC) was the political party that led the struggle for majority rule in South Africa under the Apartheid rule (1948-1994) (Kopstien and Lichbach, 2005).

homeland² and this area is one of the poorest regions in the country where unemployment is around 60 percent (May, 2000). As a result multiple livelihood strategies are a characteristic amongst the poor households, the main one being subsistence agriculture (Ntshona, 2002).

Trail facts

The Trail is in total 58 km long and the full hike takes four days (see Figure 1). The starting point is at the Malekhalonyane chalet (Day 1) near the village Motseng. A fourteen km walk separates this chalet from Makhulong chalet (Day 2) close to the Mpharane village. Day two is a 19.5 km walk from Makhulong chalet to Machekong chalet (Day 3) near the village Mafaisa. Day 3 is a 12.5 km hike from Machekong chalet to Madlangala chalet (Day 4), which goes through the villages Pepela and Makomereng. The last day is a 12 km hike and ends at Belford Dam Site which is under construction (MAT, 2007). Matatiele, a town in Kwa-Zulu Natal Province, forms the gateway to the Trail. With a population of approximately 5000 people, it is the service centre and economic core of the rural communities in the area (Matatiele IDP, 2002; Trotter, undated).



Figure 1. The Mehloding Adventure Trail , Eastern Cape, South Africa (Source: Ndlovu and Rogerson, 2003).

² Homelands were the "impoverished rural areas to which Africans were banished under apartheid, supposedly to govern themselves" (Kopstein and Lichbach, 2005, p.464).

The Trail was officially opened in October 2003 and is run by the Mehloding Community Tourism Trust (see section 3.1 and Appendix 5 for more information on project establishment). The project involves around 25 villages including the villages Mafaisa and Makomereng, which will comprise our study site.

There is growing popularity and endorsement for community-based initiatives in South Africa and other parts of the world. However, "community-based ecotourism" in many places functions as a marketing gimmick to attract more tourists (Honey, 1999; Scheyvens, 1999). Many projects practise only superficial environmental management and often involve the community to a minimal extent. In the light of this, it is important to look at the integrity of community-based ecotourism projects like Mehloding Adventure Trail.

1.2 Understanding the core concepts

There are debates amongst scholars about the concepts ecotourism and communitybased ecotourism (Fennell, 1999; Page and Dowling, 2002; Tsaur *et al*, 2006; Scheyvens, 1999). Due to this and different commonsense understandings of the concepts in everyday life, it is important to clarify these concepts. Four major concepts will be defined namely (1) Tourism and Eco-tourism; (2) Community-based ecotourism; (3) Quality of life, and (4) Sustainability. The purpose of the section is not to give a broad academic evaluation of the paradigms and the history of these concepts, but to give a general understanding of the concepts before starting the analysis.

1.2.1 Tourism and Ecotourism

Fennell (1999) sees problems in creating a general definition of tourism, and points to Smiths (1990) understanding that each definition should be fitted to serve different purposes. As this paper studies Mehloding Adventure Trail, a specific definition that suits an interdisciplinary approach is needed, and therefore tourism will be understood as:

(1) a dynamic element, which involves travel to a selected destination; (2) a static element, which involves a stay at the destination; and (3) a consequential element, resulting from the above two, which is concerned with the effects on the economic, social, and physical subsystems with which the tourists is directly or indirectly in contact (Mathieson and Wall, 1982, in Fennell 1999, p. 3).

What makes ecotourism different from tourism? As mentioned above the paradigm ranges from all "all tourism is ecotourism" to "ecotourism impossible" (Fennell, 1999; Page and Dowling, 2002; Tsaur *et al*, 2006; Scheyvens, 1999; Orams 1995). In spite of these different paradigms there are some themes that most of the definitions incorporate (see Box 1), including environmental conservation and financial benefits to the host area. Therefore the understanding of ecotourism is:

...environmentally responsible, enlightening travel and visitation to relatively undisturbed natural areas in order to enjoy and appreciate nature (and any accompanying cultural features both past and present) that promotes conservation, has low visitor impact, and provides for beneficially active socio-economic involvement of local population (Ceballos-Lascurain, 1996 in Scheyvens, 1999, p. 245).

Box 1. Ecotourism definitions

The ecotourist practices a non-consumptive use of wildlife and natural resources and contributes to the visited area trough labor or financial means aimed at directly benefiting the conservation of the site...(Ziffer, 1989 in Orams, 1995).

...ecotourism is responsible travel to natural areas which conserves the environment and improves the welfare of local people (Lindberg and Hawkins 1993, p. 8 in Weaver, 2001, p. 6)

...low impact nature tourism which contributes to the maintenance of species and habitats...providing revenue to the local community (Goodwin 1996, p. 288 in Fannell 1999, p. 35-36)

... responsible travel that conserves the environment and sustains the well-being of local people (US Ecotourism Society in Orams, 1995).

....ecotourism is an enlightening travel experience that contributes to conservation of the ecosystem, while respecting the integrity of host communities...(Wigth 1993 in Page and Dowling, 2002 p. 26).

1.2.2 Community-based ecotourism

In the South African context, Ndlovu and Rogerson (2003) point out that communitybased tourism revolves around participation and ownership of tourism enterprises by local people. Although this definition aptly describes the indicators of communitybased tourism in the study site context, community-based ecotourism is more than the social and economic aspects but include essential environmental and conservation aspects. Thus, in this report Schevyens (1999) definition is used, where ...a community-based approach to ecotourism recognises the need to promote both the quality of life of people and the conservation of resources (Scheyvens, 1999, p. 246).

1.2.3 Quality of life

Quality of life is connected to individual perceptions which again are rooted in a cultural, social and environmental circumstance (Rapley, 2003) or rooted in the individuals world-building³. The World Health Organisation (WHO, 1993) emphasizes these points by stating that quality of life is multidimensional concept – and therefore not just well-being⁴ (Rapley, 2003). In the present context *quality of life* is inspired by WHO definition and should be understood as:

...an individual's perception of their position in life in the context of the culture and value systems in which they live and in relation to their goals, expectations values and concerns... [It] refers to a subjective evaluation which is embedded in a cultural, social and environmental context (WHO, 1993, in Rapley 2003, p. 50).

1.2.4 Sustainability

The commonly cited concept of sustainable development was coined in the 1987 Brundtland Report "Our Common Future" (p. 43) as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". Central to this concept is the economic, social and environmental sustainability which make up the process of sustainable development. In terms of tourism development, sustainability in this context is defined as

> ...three interconnected aspects: environmental, socio-cultural, and economic. Sustainability implies permanence, so sustainable tourism includes optimum use of resources, including biological diversity; minimization of ecological, cultural and social impacts; and maximization of benefits to conservation and local communities. It also refers to the management structures that are needed to achieve this (UNEP, 2002, p. 1).

³ Berger (1973) introduces the process of world building, as a dialectic process between the society and humans. The dialectic between society and humans works in three steps: 1. Externalization: is human activity, in other words it is where the human creates society trough its actions, by introducing new products and meanings. 2. Objectivation: this is the process where some of the human actions/products get an independent ontology; for example the rules of languages, identity and gender roles. 3. Internalization: is where the objectivity of society is socialized into the individual – the cultural objects are being socialized into others (Berger, 1973, pp.13-24).

⁴ The problem in defining *quality of life* lies in separating it from 'well –being'. According to Higgs (2006) the difference between 'well-being' and quality of life is where quality of life covers the whole human being but well being only covers specific parts.

1.3 Objectives

The Mehloding Adventure Trail has been running since October 2003. The objective of this study is not to look at the projects initiation but look at the current impacts on the communities in Makomereng and Mafaisa, to explore if the proclaimed "community-based approach" is applied, and to investigate the project's socio-economic and environmental impacts on the communities. Furthermore, the study will evaluate the future challenges and potentials of the project.

This will be done using the following framework shown in Figure 2. The framework encompasses four different components of the community-based approach adapted from Scheyvens (1999). The first, project management, as mentioned above is an important part of the success of community-based initiatives, and is therefore necessary to examine. The second component, quality of life, addresses the socio-economic and cultural aspects within the community that forms one pillar of the community-based ecotourism paradigm described by Scheyvens (1999). The third component, environment, addresses conservation and protection of natural resources and forms the other pillar of the community-based ecotourism paradigm. The fourth component, sustainability, will combine the results of these three components to evaluate future potentials and constraints of the project.



Figure 2. Framework of analysis for community-based ecotourism.

1.4 The Research Question

To what extent has **community-based ecotourism** been achieved in Mehloding Adventure Trail?

Sub-questions

4.

- 1. How is the project managed?
 - Who is involved in the management of the project and how are decisions made?
 - What are the project management impacts on the projects?
- 2. What is the impact on quality of life?
 - What does quality of life mean in the local context?
 - What are the economic gains
 - How are benefits distributed?
 - Who has access to benefits (jobs, education)? And does this differ by gender, age and social status?
 - What are the project impacts on education/ capacity building?
 - What are the project impacts on culture and tradition?
- 3. What is the impact on the environment?
 - What does resource conservation mean in the local context?
 - What is current status of natural resources and the projects impacts on these natural resources?
 - What environmental management measures are in place?
 - How do 1, 2 and 3 affect the project sustainability?
 - What does sustainability mean in the local context?
 - What future potentials and constraints does the project face?

2. Methodology

The problems with evaluating ecotourism lie in the difficulty of quantifying many of the aspects of associated with sustainable ecotourism (Tsaur *et al*, 2006). As a result, a qualitative methodology was the primary means of data collection in this study, through semi - structured interviews with key informants, participatory rural appraisal techniques (PRA), focus group discussions and field walks and hikes on the trial. By using different methods, triangulation was accomplished giving not merely a knowledge and understanding of the issues of relevance but also an impression of how prevailing these issues are.

2.1 Methods description

The main study site was Makomereng, the village next to Madlangala chalet, where the majority of methods were used. Mafaisa, the village next to Machekong chalet was a secondary sampling area to enrich the data.

The research team consisted of students from Denmark, Australia, Palestine, South Africa, and Lesotho, stemming from diverse educational backgrounds - environmental sciences, biology, geography, social sciences and economics - forming a truly interdisciplinary party. The first step of the research was the creation of an online workspace for the group, and consequent group meetings and online brainstorming was arranged in order to exchange ideas regarding the objectives of the study and research question. The following table summarises the range of methods applied (see Appendix 3, 4 for interview guides and outline of workshops).

Method	Description	Purpose	Quantity
Literature	Articles, reports, books,	Secondary data	-
review	websites		
Semi-	Purposive snowball	To delve into relevant issues with	44
structured	sampling with key	flexibility	
interviews	informants including		
	o operations manager,		
	 Mehloding Community 		
	Tourism Trust,		
	o trustees,		
	o project employees,		
	o participants,		
	\circ non-participants and		
	o guides (see Appendix		
	8.3		
	for list of informants)		
Workshops	School workshop: 56 school	To gain understanding of	2
Workshops	children at the Nkhupulweni	community and youth's view on	2
	School in Makomereng in	tourism and the environment	
	two classes in grade 8 and 9		
	Community workshop: 22	To determine the extent that	1
	community members in	community-based ecotourism	
	Makomereng	contributes to quality of life and	
		resource conservation according	
		to the community's standards	
PRAs	Keyword exercise	To debate concepts and share	10
	Venn diagram	ideas	1
	D' 1'	To determine importance of	1
	Pie diagram	natural resources	1
		To determine availability of	1
	Community history	natural resources	1
		To explore the significant events	
		becurring in the community that	
Focus	Two focus group	To gather tourist ideas and	2
Group	discussions with two	impressions about the Adventure	2
discussion	different groups of tourists	Trail and its objectives	
(FGD)	in Madlangala Chalet		
Participant	Observation and talks at any	To develop an understanding of	-
observation	given time during the field	the community's culture and their	
and	trip with the local	relationship to their environment.	
informal	community	as well as building relations with	
talks	-	the local community	
Field walk	Hiking from Madlangala to	To move the project from abstract	1
and hike	Machekong chalet (see	to more practical, and to observe	
	Figure 3)	the environment and the impact of	
		the Trail	

Table 1. Description and purpose of methods used



Figure 3. Map of Trail Walk (Source: GPS points during hike, Keegan, 2007)

2.2 Methods evaluation

Choosing Mafaisa as a secondary study site proved to be valuable as it became apparent that the data from Makomereng was confounded on the basis that students residing in the village were perceived as tourists. Often questions relating to benefits gained from tourism were answered in relation to the benefits brought by students and not chalet tourists. This bias was not present in Mafaisa as no students were residing there. Semi – structured interview guides were developed prior going to field but were quickly adapted according to interviewee's awareness of concepts. In the field, the questionnaires that were developed (see Appendix 3.1 and 3.2) quickly turned into interviews due to the difficulties for interpreters to translate specific English questions into Xhosa. Therefore questionnaires were discarded, and questions turned from specific to more broad.

The community workshop and PRAs proved also to be an effective way of extracting and sharing information and ideas within the community. In FGDs, discussing different issues as a whole group was also effective in extracting information as the participants were able to build upon each others responses and experiences. Informal talks and participant observation proved useful in triangulating the data collected in interviews, where sometimes actions spoke louder than words. Direct observations during the hike allowed triangulation of data.

Could other methods or approaches have been used?

Baseline data would have been essential for any impact assessment to be carried out. In this study, baseline data for environmental variables was unavailable and therefore any genuine account of environmental impact would have been difficult. Nevertheless, a thorough natural science examination of biodiversity and impacts could have been done, such as water sampling, plant and animal biodiversity counts, in order to evaluate the state of the current environment. This is because the information extracted through interviews was limited by the lack of knowledge amongst respondents.

Hiking the whole Trail and sampling in all the Trail villages would have given a more comprehensive evaluation of the extent of community-based approach taken, and the Trail's effect on the local environment.

3. Results and Discussion

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results collected in the field and analyse and discuss these in relation to the research question. The analysis is divided into four main sections that include: (1) Project Management, (2) Quality of Life, (3) Resource Conservation and Environment, and (4) Sustainability.

3.1 Project Management

Mehloding Community Tourism Trust (MCTT) was formed in 2002 as a legal entity, owner and manager of the Mehloding Adventure Trail. The Trail spans over 25 villages which are represented by five Community Tourism Organisations (CTOs) (Makaula, 2007a; Ndlovu and Rogerson, 2003; ERS, 2004).

	MCTT Trustees
٠	Mosilo Kuali (Chairperson)
•	Bulelani Letulo (Deputy chair)
•	Faro Tello (Treasurer)
•	Tsipo Lesholo (Secretary)
•	Xingwana Andnes (Deputy secretary)
•	Moshesh Simoi
•	Xolo Vislet
•	Victor Spambo
•	Kikine
•	Co-opted Andrew Duminy + Earnest
	Baai

Table 2. List of MCTT Trustees

(Source: Operations Manager, pers. comm.,, 12/03/07)

The MCTT consists of 11 volunteer trustees – one trustee for each chalet to work on behalf of the community as a representative. Nine trustees attend the meetings on a regular basis. Other attendees include 2 founders (Mr Maxholo and Mr Lesia), Mr Robert Mnika (guide), and Ndoko (lawyer) (Chairperson, pers. comm., 06/03/07). A Business Unit, based in Matatiele, is responsible for the day to day operation of the Mehloding Adventure Trail. The unit deals with booking, marketing, staff development and training. The office also serves as a place to display craft from local people, house

the guide association and a venue for meetings and trainings. The operational levels of the management can be summarized in the following structure:

Operations Office			
Caretakers (5)	Hostesses		
1. Nozuthako Letuka (Masakala)	1. Nomsa Sutu (Machekong)		
 Puseletso Lecheko (Machekong) Kwanele Bali (Makhulong) 	2. Kholu Thekuso (Makhulong) 3. Thembeka Xingwana		
4. Gwaza Richmond (Madlangala)	(Malekhalonvene)		
5. Nkopane Raymond	4. Sindie Mandubu (Madlangal		
(Malekhalonyene)	5. Sarah Shasho (Masakala)		

Figure 4. Operational structure (Source: Operations Manager, 12/03/07).

As shown in the structure, the project has created a certain number of permanent jobs as will as some temporary jobs as will be discussed in (Section 3.2.1.1).

Different task teams within the Trust address different issues including (Chairperson, pers. comm., 06/03/07):

- Human resources task team
- Financial management task team, whose main focus is fundraising
- Trail development task team, whose focus is to upgrade the Trail to international standards and security. This team is in response to the Trust feeling the Trail is not complete.

New ideas concerning the project are welcomed by all members of the project, including non-participants as well as management staff. Similarly, new proposals are put up for discussion at CTO meetings and then presented to the Trust management for approval, action or dismissal (Trustee 2, pers. comm., 05/03/07). However the majority of the villagers are not aware of their ownership of the Trail and this may be the answer

for the low participation in meetings regarding the project and the lack of input from villagers (Trustee 1, pers. comm., 11/03/07).

Decisions concerning employment of new staff are assigned partly to the CTO, but the final decision rests with the Trust Management. It is the CTO's task to communicate to the villagers when a new position is available. In cooperation with the Trust, applicants will be chosen based on selection criteria advertised.

3.1.1 Project management impacts on the project

Some inconsistency is present within the management regarding the structure particularly in the awareness of the existence of the Local Tourism Organization (LTO) (Founder, pers. comm., 11/03/07; Chairperson, pers. comm., 06/03/07). If the LTO is established in the future it could take some workload off the Trust for it to focus on other tasks (Chairperson, pers. comm., 06/03/07). If there is confusion about structure and organization within the management, roles and responsibilities may be unfulfilled. Different levels of knowledge could be related to capacity building of different staff (see section 3.2.3.2)

Communication is also a constraint to project implementation, and these problems result from the physical distance as well as the hierarchical structure of the MCTT (Chairperson, pers. comm., 06/03/07). Logistics can complicate communication between management and community and this prolongs decision making. Also language might interfere with communication between the community and Trust. Trustees report back to the community about issues discussed at Trust meetings, which are conducted in English. Moreover communicating complex issues such as business strategy complicates things when villagers are not familiar with jargon and technical terms (Chairperson, pers. comm., 06/03/07). Nonetheless, MCTT is undergoing a change in structure to become more business-like where Board meetings will become quarterly (Operations Manager, pers. comm., 06/03/07).

In addition, some communication flow is missing within the Trust. For example, the management do not know exactly who and how many people in Madlangala are benefiting from the project (Chairperson, pers. comm., 06/03/07). This is important as the project decision makers should be able to evaluate if the project is achieving its goals of job creation and flow of benefits to the community. Observation showed that different information regarding arrival of tourists came from different sources and

created confusion, also suggesting that there is a need for enhanced information flow between the different organs within the project.

3.1.2 Self sufficiency

Operational expenses such as food, vegetables and commissions are paid from the project income via the Trust account. The exact operational costs and overheads (wages, transport, training, rent, and materials) are currently funded by Alfred Nzo Municipality (Operations Manager, pers. comm., 06/03/07). Only project staff are paid, but trustees work voluntarily, and this may affect their motivation to participate in monthly Trust meetings. It was difficult to obtain the exact operation costs due to limited time.

In order to make the project self-sufficient and not dependent on external sources of funding, two groups of 10 tourists in the chalets every month are needed (Operations Manager, pers. comm., 06/03/07). This is feasible as numbers are increasing and have increased 15% since establishment (Operations Manager, pers. comm., 06/03/07). In 2005, the number of tourists per month was on average 21 and in 2006, 33 tourists per month which is a 37% increase. As it is evident in Figure 5 the trend of number of tourists since January 2007 is increasing. Promotion of the Trail is broadening to different national media (such as 'GO' magazine, Laroo, pers. comm., 07/03/07) as well as international media campaigns (B.T, 24/02/07).

Indeed, it is difficult to determine whether the Trust's aim to become truly selfsufficient into the future as the Trust has a financial management task team whose main focus is fundraising.



Figure 5. Tourist numbers for 2005-2006 (Source: Monthly reports, 2005-2006).

3.2 Quality of life

The purpose of this section is to analyse and discuss the socio-economic impacts of the Trail on the communities in Makomereng and Mafaisa. Firstly quality of life in the local context will be determined. Following this, the analysis will contain two main categories: (1) Economic impacts: including economic gains, job opportunities and the distribution of benefits; (2) Social impacts that contains: the distribution of the Trail's benefits (in terms of gender, age and social status), the education/capacity building, and lastly the projects impacts on the local culture and tradition. The reason for focusing on these main categories is that the environmental benefits of ecotourism often eventuate as a desirable side effect after the economic benefits, such as the actual amount of revenue and jobs generated, have first been demonstrated (Weaver, 2001). Secondly, Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) (2002) highlights that responsible tourism in South Africa should ensure equal access to tourism as both consumers and providers, and respect and protect local cultures from overcommercialisation and over-exploitation.

3.2.1 Quality of Life in the local context

As mentioned in section 1.2.3 *quality of life* is connected to the individual's perception of their position in life. This perception is embedded in a cultural, social and environmental context and is therefore multidimensional. To find the community's perception of quality of life a community workshop was held where the participants determined what made their community happy and what would make the community happier. The general categories were: money, job, activities, roads, electricity, culture and education (Community Participatory Workshop, 10/03/07; see Appendix 4.1). According to the definition of community based ecotourism, quality of life must be promoted (see section 1.2.2) and it is these categories that will be used to evaluate to what extent the Trail is community based.

3.2.2 Economic impacts

3.2.2.1 Economic gains and job opportunities

The stated primary objectives of the Trail relate closely to the Trust vision and mission:

To operate community based tourism products in a fair and transparent manner, creating suitable employment and livelihood opportunities, through partnership and fair distribution of benefits while promoting and conserving the natural and cultural heritage (ERS, 2004).

Direct economic gains of the project were job creation for the local community during the construction of the project and now in the operation of the project. The project created 450 jobs during the construction phase, and since November 2003 the Trust created employment for 9 permanent employees (Makaula, 2007a). For each chalet there is one caretaker and one hostess. A fulltime Operations Manager is employed to administrate the Business Services Unit in Matatiele (see Table 3).

Job description	Number of employee	Salary
Operations Manager	1	-
Hostess	4 (1 in each chalet)	R 850
		R10 commission/tourist
Caretaker	4 (1 in each chalet)	R 850

Table 3. Permanent jobs created by Mehloding Adventure Trail

(Source: Makaula, 2007b)

Additionally, extra part time work is created for cleaner and caterer in each chalet when there is a booking of more than five tourists (Hostess 2, pers. comm., 04/03/07). At this operational stage, the project is creating on average around 25 part time jobs (Makaula, 2007a).

To fulfill the project mission as a community-based project, all the employees are local residents from the villages surrounding the chalets. This fulfils one of the Responsible Tourism Guidelines⁵ of created by DEAT (2002), where at least 50% wages go to people living within a 50km radius of the project. The MCTT pays 100% of its wages

⁵ These are guiding principles for national tourism initiatives to practise responsible tourism (see DEAT, 2002 for further information).

to local people, thus far exceeding the Responsible Tourism Guidelines (ERS Monthly Progress Report May 2005)

The project is good for the village; it has provided some jobs. But not enough tourist come to provide more source of income, if there were more jobs the youth would get involved more (Caterer, pers. comm., 04/03/07).

One could argue that the project is not providing enough jobs to the community, but one should keep in mind that it is a small scale project and it depends on the number of tourists. The volunteer highlighted the same point where, the objective of the Trail is "good" but the extent to which this is community-based is minimal because the business is still small (Volunteer, pers. comm., 06/03/07).

The Trail also generates part time employment for guides who facilitate walking tours to view rock art, bird watching, nature and cultural entertainment along the Trail. Guides are rotated to ensure that different local communities are involved (Operations Manager, pers. comm., 12/03/07). Fresh produce is purchased in the village when tourists arrive and this is another method of encouraging people to be self sufficient, and sell the surplus of their products. Similarly, local community gain income through selling crafts and vegetables to tourists (Hostess 1, pers. comm., 09/03/07).

Indirect benefits, according to communities in Mafaisa and Makomereng, comprise the improvement of roads, providing fences, water tanks, and capital for small businesses (see Box 2). These may represent other community projects but most have been initiated by the Trust and its members. From the management point of view, indirect benefits include capacity building of trustees, who in turn encourage locals to supply fresh produce to the chalets (for more information on capacity building, see section 3.2.3.2). The trustees have developed a database based on detailed surveys with CTO members, and more than 50 group and family enterprises have been included in the database. The majority of enterprises are run by women, but that most are not generating income (ERS Monthly Progress Report, May 2005; see section 3.2.2.1).

According to Trustee 1, "the project is not only a community project but it also brought changes to the village" (pers. comm., 11/03/07). Extra benefits to the community have been provided through a community levy, which is charged per night per paying tourist. This is saved and every year redistributed to each CTO under the form of equipment or support for local projects such as schools and clinics (Makaula, 2007a).

The project gains has not replaced other livelihoods, but has encouraged villagers to expand the range of livelihood income sources. An example is a farmer who grows and sells vegetables to villagers in the village and in the town Matatiele, is also providing Madlangala chalet with vegetables and was providing vegetables to workers during the construction of the chalet (Participant 3, pers. comm., 05/03/07).

Box 3 shows the general perception of villagers that the chalet and its expansion can automatically bring jobs. The project has been a main source of income for many villagers during construction; however there are unrealistic expectations that if more chalets are built, permanent employment will increase to an extent where it would become a main source of income for the whole community. Although the project is still small there will not be enough permanent jobs for everyone even if it expands.

Box 2. Villagers quotes on the indirect benefits of the Trail

...before it was a bad road and not easy for cars to get up to chalet but now it is easy (Non-participant 1, pers. comm., 11/03/2007).

Since the chalet has been build the access to the town Matatiele is easier and also transport is easier (Non-participant 9, pers. comm., 09/03/2007).

...the project has provided fences for lonely mothers and water tanks for vegetable gardens (Caretaker 2, pers. comm., 11/03/2007).

I spent the money that I got as a caterer in the shop of the village and buying vegetables from neighbours (Caterer, pers. comm., 04/03/2007).

Box 3. Interview with a villager involved during construction of the chalets, Makomereng

I'm not married and I'm not working now, my brother is working in Cape town and he sends me some money. I'm living with my sister who has three children and gets child grants for them. I was so happy when I was involved in the road construction for one month, I got paid R900/month. This project has no negative impact on the village at all; the construction of the road has not change the land next to the road.

Tourists stay up in the chalet, I have been there it is such a hotel, but I would like tourists to come down to the village and stay longer to show them the leather craft place, and I really like meeting new people and friends.

Really I would like the project to expand, to have more tourists, to build more houses for tourists and to have the opportunity to work on the project once more, also my sister knows how to do crochet, hope she will have the opportunity to sell them.

Non-participant 1, pers. comm.,11/03/07

3.2.2.2 Distribution of benefits

As shown in Figure 6, 40% of the project benefits are returned to the community, however, different parts of the community are benefiting from the project. Seventeen percent of the project profits are paid in the form of commission wages to the hostesses and guides. Twelve percent of the project profits are paid to the guides and drivers, 6% as a CTO levy and 3% to horse association. Only 1% of profits go to the vegetables sellers in the local community.



Figure 6. Total income and community redistribution 2006

Furthermore, the trustees do not benefit in term of payment, but receive reimbursements for transport and education in connection to their work for the organization. The main limitation in the project as mentioned in section 3.1.2 is that it is still not self–sufficient and still depending on Alfred Nzo Municipality.

3.2.3. Social Impacts

3.2.3.1 Access to benefits - terms of gender, age and social status

Gender

According to the Operation Manager (pers. comm., 06/03/07) there are five female and four male permanent employees in 2007. However, the temporary employed are highly represented by women. The under representation of men in the temporary jobs can be explained by the fact that most of the men migrate to other areas and are not available to work (non-participants, pers. comm., 03/07; Ndlovu and Rogerson, 2003). Due to this fact it is difficult to evaluate whether or not there is gender discrimination in job assignment. One thing that can be concluded from the annual reports (2005, 2006) is that jobs like cleaner, caterer, hostesses is primarily occupied by women, where the jobs as caretaker, driver are primarily occupied by men (see Figure 7 and 8). The gender division within Trail management is not determined.



Figure 7. Temporary job by gender for 2005 (Source: Annual Report of the Mehloding Adventure Trail, 2005)



Figure 8. Temporary job by gender for 2006 (Source: Annual Report of the Mehloding Adventure Trail, 2006)

Age

The age representation in the jobs is also skewed by most young to middle-aged men migrating out of the village for work or study, thereby not available to participate in the project. The semi-structured interviews made in Makomereng, Mafaisa and Pontseng with the participants did not all result in information about the participant specific age, and it is therefore difficult to draw exact conclusions about age distribution. However, from the semi-structured interviews in connection with participant observation and the informal talks with participant villagers and the interpreters, it looks like that there is no age discrimination in the project. In this way the project seems to benefit all ages and therefore adds to the communities' quality of life as a whole.

Social status

The evaluation of the social status will be done by looking at the jobs created by the project (see section 3.2.2.1). The reason for this is that in the short amount of time in the field, it was difficult to get a full picture of the social status, but trends can be drawn from the information extracted in the field.

As mentioned in section 3.1, the participant are selected by the members of the community this could create problems such as popularity. Furthermore, it is demanded that the permanent participants should be able to make themselves understood in English, which could alienate the non-English speaking villagers. If the focus is shifted

to the temporary jobs another trend appears. As mentioned in section 3.1, the hostesses or the caterers pick the extra help when it is needed. The informal talks with the hostess, caterers and cleaners in Makomereng showed that family relations and friendship bonds guided who they choose as extra help. This was the same with the caretakers and their choice of vegetable growers - caretaker 1 buy vegetables from his parents house (Participant 2, pers. comm., 09/03/07), and caretaker 2 were told to buy vegetables from hostess 2 gardens (Participant observation; Caretaker 2, pers. comm., 11/03/07). In this way the temporary jobs are not equally distributed amongst the villagers.

Even though there is jealousy towards the people with jobs in the project, it seems it is not connected to popularity or nepotism, but to the fact that they have a job, which most of the community members do not (Operations Manager, pers. comm., 11/03/07, Chieftess, pers. comm., 04/03/07, Cleaner, pers. comm., 04/03/07, Hostess 1, pers. comm., 09/03/07). With an unemployment rate of over 60 % in the black rural areas in South Africa created by the past apartheid rule, this is not surprising (May, 2003; Ndlovu and Rogerson, 2003). More interviews with the 'social outcasts' as well as more time in field are needed before clear trends can be seen.

3.2.3.2 Education and capacity building

It was apparent from the community workshop that Makomereng as a community regarded education and training as a factor that would raise their quality of life (see Appendix 4.1 and Figure 9). According to Trotter (undated), the main impact of the Mehloding Adventure Trail during construction was training/capacity building and through this came empowerment of the local villagers. This is still the case, as the project has continuously been providing participants with training, which range

from workshops provided by the Eastern Cape Figure 9. Community members Tourism Board or DEAT supported workshops to



presenting results on Quality of Life (Source: Kim, 2007)

training of participants by the international volunteer (Operations Manager, pers. comm., 06/03/07; Volunteer, pers. comm., 06/03/07).

Since the Trail management employs and uses the workforce in the local communities and train participants, there is no doubt that the project is building the local community's capacities. However, the extent to which this is happening is limited by the small scale of the project which limits the scale of job creation and training (as mentioned in section 3.2.2.1.).

There is an inequality in the distribution of training as training is not extended to all participants in the project. The hostesses⁶, caretakers⁷, guides⁸ and the caterers⁹ as well as the Operations Manager¹⁰ received training when they have been selected for the job and continue getting training from either workshop or from the international volunteer (Hostess 1, Caretaker 1, pers. comm., 09/03/07; Caretaker 2, pers. comm., 11/03/07; Guides, pers. comm., 05/03/07, Volunteer and Operations Manager, pers. comm., 06/03/07). Additionally, both the hostesses and the caretakers have meetings where they share experiences. Hostesses are organised and appreciate the monthly meetings where share experiences and ideas, but the caretakers hold meetings irregularly (Hostess 1, Caretaker 1, pers. comm., 09/03/07).

However, the temporary employees or other participants such as cleaners, drivers, handicraft- and vegetable providers, do not get any training from the projects (Cleaner, pers. comm., 04/03/07; Participant 1, pers. comm., 05/03/07). Furthermore, this group has little knowledge of the organisation around the Trail and the Trail history in general compared to the other participants mentioned. When asked whether or not they wanted training the answers were divided. Some like the Cleaner (pers. comm., 04/03/07) wanted training and more information about the Trail project and others like Participant 1 (pers. comm., 05/03/07) were not so outspoken about it.

headscarf), and tourist reception (to be friendly and welcoming) (Caterer, pers. comm., 04/03/07). ¹⁰ Operations Manager received training in business management and marketing (Operations Manager

⁶ Hostesses received: "a one month hostess training at beginning of job, host training, attended 2 week training in 'Bed and Breakfast' management, and a 3 day, first aid training" (Hostess 1, pers. comm..., 09/03/07).

⁷ Caretakers received a two month training and they continue to be trained by the Volunteer when new challenges appear. The last training the caretakers was in plumbing this year (Caretaker 1 and 2, pers, comm., 09/03/07 & 11/09/07; Volunteer, pers. comm., 06/03/07).

⁸ Guides were trained in first aid, and also participated in National Qualification Framework which was concerned about environmental protection and tourist management (Guide 3, pers. comm., 05/03/2007).
⁹ Caterer were trained in the following areas: management, hygiene (wearing closed shoes, and

¹⁰ Operations Manager received training in business management and marketing (Operations Manager, pers. comm., 06/03/07).

3.2.3.3 Culture and tradition

According to Ndlovu and Rogerson (2003) the traditional practices are very important in the Trail area. This notion was supported with the information extracted from the community workshop (see Appendix 4.1), where a group listed traditional community gatherings, as an important part of their quality of life. During the group's presentation to the rest of the participants in the workshop, there was applause and shouting at this point. Other important rituals include initiation schools and the practise of traditional medicines (see Box 4). When triangulating the results, the Trail's impact on the local culture both in Mafaisa and Makomereng seems minimal and mostly positive (see Box 5).

Box 4. Traditions and medicinal plants

...if you have a the medicinal plant Imbeko in the area, you can prevent lightning from coming to burn your house down. (Hostess 1, pers. comm., 09/03/07,).

Imbeko gives protection from lightning, and is normally burnt to link the spirits with the sangoma. (Guide 1,2, pers. comm., 07/03/07)

Box 5. Villagers quotes on positive impact of tourism

I like meeting new people and learning about new cultures. (Cleaner, pers. comm., 04/03/07).

Tourist coming builds our self esteem...because there are interested in our way of *living*. (School teacher 1, pers. comm., 07/03/07).

I would like more tourists to come. (Non-participant 4, pers. comm., 07/03/07).

The tourists do not disturb our culture. (Chieftess, pers. comm., 04/03/07).

... they do not an effect on my practice. (Inyanga¹¹, pers. comm., 11/03/07).

One reason why the villagers do not see tourists and the Trail as disturbing their culture or traditions might be that the tourists rarely visit the villages. Another reason for perceiving the negative impact as low could be that the project is working close with the traditional chiefs of the villages:

¹¹ An Inyanga is a traditional medicine person, above the sangomas and is not in connection the spirits with the spirits during healing sessions (Ly, pers. comm., 10/03/07).

It is very important for management to have a good relationship with the Chiefs, because people listen to the Chiefs. So if anything is wrong in the chalet it must be reported to the Chief. (Operations Manager, pers. comm., 11/03/07).

In this way, the project is recognising the traditional structures of the communities and not alienating the community from the project. Furthermore villagers are already performing traditional dances at the chalets without getting paid, which are another way to support and maintain the local culture (Non-participant 18, pers. comm.,09/03/07, School teacher 1, pers. comm., 07/03/07).

Despite the seemingly positive impacts on culture, the villagers of Mafaisa do not want the tourist in the mountains in the period of the initiation schools as it is considered sacred and could impact on their local traditions (Non-participant 18, pers. comm., 09/03/07). Even though the management is aware of this and informs the community when tourists are in the area when the ritual is held it still seems to be creating conflicts:

The ritual holders are very aggressive in this period and don't what women in the area especially local women so in this period it is only the male guides that take the tourist on the hike. (Guide 3, pers. comm., 05/03/07).

Another possible negative impact on the local culture in Makomereng and Mafaisa is that is the presence of tourists. Some sangomas¹² think tourists are scaring the spirits¹³ and polluting the ancestral grounds where plants are grown. On the other hand the Inyanga that is chief of sangomas in Makomereng does not share this concern and would like more tourists to come to the area (Inyanga, pers. comm., 11/03/07).

As mentioned, almost all of respondents interviewed and participants in the workshop would like more tourists to come. In connection to this, a concern could be that their culture would degraded or be lost in these new influences. However, many are not concerned and think that it will help to maintain their culture (Non-participant 9, pers. comm., 09/03/07; School teacher 1, pers. comm., 0703/07; Founder, pers. comm., 11/03/07; Chieftess, pers. comm., 04/03/07; Inyanga, pers. comm., 11/03/07). By

 $^{^{12}}$ A Sangoma is a traditional medicine person that listens to the spirits in there healing sessions (Ly, pers. comm., 10/03/07).

 $^{^{13}}$ These spirits protected the medicinal plants in the mountains and keeps them pure (Vind, pers. comm, 10/03/07).

highlighting the community's cultural identity it could be argued that it is providing a sense of "belonging" (Higgs, 2006), which keeps the villagers from feeling alienated by the project. This is in contrast to other ecotourism projects where local people have become alienated from their own culture by public displays (Scheyvens, 1999; Tsaur *et al*, 2006; Page and Dowling, 2002). From this small study little can be concluded on this matter¹⁴.

In sum, the Trail is, in Scheyvens (1999) words, improving the psychological empowerment (building self-esteem) and the social empowerment (improving community cohesion) in the communities.

¹⁴ A complete study of the Trail's impact on culture and tradition and an in-depth evaluation has not been done due to the limited time in field. Therefore this study only shows general trends of (possible) cultural impacts.

3.3 Resource Conservation and Environment

The purpose of this section is to explore perceptions of the natural environment and analyse the environmental impact of the ecotourism project amongst communities in Makomereng and Mafaisa. This will be achieved through exploring perceptions of communities towards the environment and resource conservation, which indicates how communities use their resource and how important it is to them. The main resources used and recognised as resources that could be affected by tourism will be elaborated, including water, wood, land, soil, medicinal plants, as well as biodiversity. From here, the actual impact that the project may or may not have on natural resources will be described. This will be followed by a brief description of environmental management measures in place.

3.3.1 The eco in 'ecotourism'

The common understanding of ecotourism as opposed to tourism (see section 1) is rooted not only in the provision of benefits to the host community, but also preservation and conservation of the environment. This latter objective is becoming increasingly superficial. Over the past decades, the 'eco-' prefix has been used as a buzzword to market green and environmentally friendly products, just like it has projected the tourism market. More often than not however, the 'eco-' prefix means little more than a marketing gimmick, or a diluted form of ecotourism that represents only minor environmentally friendly measures, such as not washing laundry every day, or adding on a nature hike to the conventional mass tours (Honey, 1999).

The results from the field research pointed very differently to participants' awareness and knowledge of resource conservation and the environment, as opposed their awareness of the socio-economic benefits provided by the Trail (see section 3.2). The interviews conducted in Mafaisa and Makomereng with vegetable growers, artists, cookers and cleaners, and hostesses, showed a distinct lack of knowledge regarding sustainable use of natural resources or thereby any possible environmental impact that tourism may have on the area. This data is skewed by the fact that the Drakensberg area is resource rich, in terms of the most important and abundant resources for the community, which were identified as water, fuelwood, and soil (Community Participatory Workshop, 10/03/07). The abundance of natural resources leaves little motivation to think about sustainable use, and therefore makes it difficult for respondents to foresee any environmental impact of tourism on the environment. In addition, given the location of the community is previously disadvantaged black homelands (see section 1), it is not surprising that environmental conservation may be given less attention where finding a job or food to eat take greater priority (DEAT, 1996).

The school children recited pre-taught definitions on what natural resources were, but had little understanding of the impact of tourism on the environment due to the limited knowledge of tourism as a whole (School Workshop, 06/03/07). The school teacher and principal also could not foresee environmental impact of tourism on the Trail, although they could recognise natural resources. Again, this could point to their perception that resources were in abundance, and thus infinite.

The caretakers in Machekong and Madlangala chalets had some degree of knowledge on environmental issues, but this was contained to local (or chalet) waste management, composting and water management. Guide 1 and 2 were the most knowledgeable on environment and resource conservation issues and what it meant to use resources sustainably. It could be speculated that continued exposure to tourists could increase their environmental awareness, as tourists do not pick the flowers and only take pictures (Guide 3, pers. comm., 04/03/07). Similarly, Guide 1 and 2 active involvement in marketing and promotion of the Trail such as the INDABA tourism exhibition in Durban (Agritourism Meeting, 09 June 2006; ERS Monthly Progress Report May 2005) encourages them to keep up to date with current industry guidelines for ecotourism projects, and the principles and values behind these projects.

3.3.2 Current status of natural resources and project impacts

Water

The availability, access and management of potable water are some of the biggest problems facing South Africa due to population increase and destructive apartheid era legacies of maldistribution and pollution (Hoffman and Ashwell, 2001; DWAF, 1997; DEAT, 1996, 1999; see Appendix 6). The National Water Policy White Paper developed by the government of South Africa in 1997 attempted to address the unjust

water policy and at the same time redress the issue of water management in the face of the growing population of South Africa (DWAF, 1997).

The main resource used in the ecotourism project by tourists and by villagers in Mafaisa and Makomereng is water. All interviewees considered it the most important resource and largely available (Community Participatory Workshop, 10/03/07). In Makomereng, water comes mainly from rain-fed wells in the mountains, which replenish during March to December¹⁵ (Trustee 2, pers. comm., 05/03/07).

Tourism and increase in tourist numbers is not perceived a threat to the availability and access to water by villagers. In Mafaisa, the chief has regulated water use to 20L per day three times during the day, totalling 60L per household per day (Non-participant 15 and Participant 5, pers. comm., 09/03/07). Even so, Mafaisa respondents view that there are not enough tourists at any one time to make a significant impact on water availability (Participant 5, pers. comm., 09/03/07). Similarly, the attitude is reflected in Makomereng, but this is in stark contrast to the message sent out by the South African government and reflected in the White Paper on Water Policy (DWAF, 1997) that highlight the threat of increasing water scarcity (see Percival and Homer-Dixon, 1995; DEAT, 1999; Gerardy, 2002). The attitude may be a result of relative water abundance from climatic variables, as opposed to any threat from water-consuming wattle species (which would only have an effect, if any, on downstream settlements; Lorenz, pers. comm., 29/03/07).

Water features along the Trail were not visited so no results are shown for tourist impact on these areas, although swimming is allowed in the rivers and waterfalls along the Trail. If tourist numbers increase and washing with detergents occurs regularly, phosphate pollution could become a problem (ERS, 2004).

Wood

A major problem in the area is the rapid invasion of the alien black wattle (*Acacia mearnsii*) and silver wattle (*Acacia dealbata*), a high water consuming species introduced from Australia in the 19th Century (de Neergaard *et al*, 2005). Several studies have been made in the area regarding the invasion of the alien species, and in

¹⁵ These months characterize the period over winter (April to September) which is typically dry. Nonetheless, Trustee 2 maintains that wells are cleaned in summer and filled in winter months (pers. comm., 05/03/07).

regard to whether the wattle is resource or pest (see de Neergaard *et al*, 2005; Le Maitre *et al*, 2002; de Wit *et al*, 2001). In Makomereng, wattle wood represents a very important resource to the community and is seen more as a resource than a pest (community workshop 10/03/07; Lorenz, pers. comm., 29/03/07, see Figure 1010). Similarly, in Mafaisa, wattle is a widely

used resource and a main source of fuelwood. Both these villages are not supplied with electricity, which like 40% of South Africans is the primary reason for high dependence on fuelwood as a heating source (Percival and Homer-Dixon, 1995). Wattle's abundant supply poses no threat to deforestation¹⁶, is easily accessible, and inexpensive (unlike kerosene used to fuel lamps and occasionally stoves that is purchased). However, wattle clearing programs in place may also exacerbate soil erosion (McLeod, 1999 in de Neergaard *et al*, 2005).



Figure 10. Wattle wood being harvested for fuel, Makomereng (source: Khatib, 2007).

Yet, more often than not, Protea wood is stolen or cut down for fuelwood due to its high resistance to fire and longer burning time than wattle wood, as well as its relative abundance in the area (ERS, 2004). Although it is illegal under customary and national law to cut down Protea tree, harvesting of broken branches is allowed and even so

¹⁶ In some places in the Madlangala area, groups engage in the cutting of wattle under the Department of Water and Forestry's Working for Water program (see de Neergaard *et al*, 2005).
conservation of protea on the community level is not highly practiced (Guide 1, pers. comm., 05/03/07; Chieftess, pers. comm., 04/03/07).

Land

Land ownership and tenure is one of the biggest challenges in the post apartheid era. During apartheid, 83% of land was under white control and ownership. Post apartheid land reform policies geared towards tenure reform, restitution and redistribution of this land has also been limited, due to lack of capacity in government institutions and traditional local power structures, among other factors (Hallowes, 2002; Walker, 1998). The Trail and three out of four of its chalets (excluding Malekhalonyane chalet) are located on communally owned lands¹⁷, and ultimately owned by the state (Masibambane, undated; see Appendix 6 for further information). Malekhalonyane Chalet is located on Motseng Tribal Trust Land (ERS, 2004).

Recent legislation, namely the Communal Property Association (CPA) Act of 1994 and the highly criticized Community Land Rights Act of 2004 (see Kariuki, 2004), allows communities, represented by a democratically elected association, to hold land title and make decision about user rights and ownership (Lent *et al*, 2000). Although it is not determined whether the Trust and CTOs in each area of the Trail will make a claim to title, this aspect is an important consideration when regarding future Trail ownership by communities as often incentives to invest long-term into a resource, in this case the chalets and Trail, are linked to having the rights of exclusion and alienation¹⁸ (Schlager and Ostrom, 1992). Ultimately the state owns the land resource and therefore future changes to landscape or land use may adversely affect the Trail. For this reason the issue of land ownership is significant.

In a similar way, the insecurity of land tenure under apartheid and the limited implementation of land reform post-apartheid could be one of the reasons why none of the respondents interviewed named land as a natural resource. Walker (1998) claims it is because rural people view land as a social resource first and foremost.

Land use is also limited as Madlangala and Machekong chalets were fenced off, and the unvisited chalets were also very likely fenced to protect chalet grounds from cattle

 $^{^{17}}$ Communal tenure describes tenure where settlement members share rights in the land. (see Lent *et al*, 2000 and Appendix 6 for further definition).

¹⁸ Exclusion rights are "the right to determine who will have an access right, and how that right may be transferred". Alienation rights are "the right to sell or lease either or both of [the right to exclusion or the right to management]" (Schlager and Ostrom, 1992, p.251).

grazing. Nevertheless, due to the infertility of soil in the area, land around the chalets and Trail is not suitable for crop production (ERS, 2004; de Neergaard *et al*, 2005), thereby not affecting possible agricultural uses.

Soil

Soil erosion is the largest form of soil degradation in South Africa and along the Trail, soils are highly weathered and the combination of steep topography and poor land management results in high vulnerability to soil erosion. Despite this, the Trail has no significant impact on the stability or integrity of the soil itself and in comparison to other areas of South Africa, the problem is insignificant (ERS, 2004; de Neergaard, pers. comm., 07/04/07). However, the Guides 1 and 2 (pers. comm., 07/03/07) foresee it as a problem, both aesthetically and physically, should tourists numbers increase dramatically and proper mitigating measures not be put in place. The Trail is built upon old cattle tracks and footpaths for 80% of the route, but in certain parts guides follow their experience of where they went last time (Anon, 2006; ERS, 2004). It is this practice that could result in soil compaction, degradation and vegetation loss. However, this is minimal with current numbers of tourists, and relative to cattle traversing the area the impact is insignificant.

Ecosystem integrity and Medicinal Plants

At the moment the general estimation by local authorities, local inhabitants, guides and tourists is that biodiversity and abundance of natural resources is not threatened, and the Trail's and environment's carrying capacity is not exceeded. Carrying capacity in connection to environment and biodiversity is not stated in any records not even in the Environmental Management Plan by the ERS (2004). This may need to be specified if the Trail may become more popular in the future and number of tourists increase (see section 3.1).

Interviews with tourists showed mountains scenic attractiveness and other natural elements such as river, streams, rock art and waterfalls are valued. Conversely these natural features were not given the same interest/notice by locals. Unquestionably the locals value their environment but living in mountains the scenic beauty for them maybe less extraordinary. This is most likely the reason that this resource was not mentioned by interviewed respondents. However the resource was considered important as a means of attracting tourist to the area.

Water mongoose (Atilax paludinosus)
Cape Clawless Otter (Aonyx Capensis)
Black-backed Jackal (Canis Mesomelas)
Rock Dassie (Procavia capensis)
Mountain Reedbuck (Redunca fulvorufula)
Hares (Lepus spp.)
Baboons (Papio sp.)
Striped fieldmouse
Puff Adder (Bitis arietans arietans)
Rhinkal (Hemachatus spp.)
Grey Rhebok (Pelea capreolus) (protected)
Wattled Cranes (rare)
Crowned Cranes (rare)
Bearded Vulture (<i>Gypaetus barbatu</i>) (rare)
Rudd's Lark (Heteromirafra ruddi) (rare)
Black eagle (Aquila verreauxii)

Table 4. List of some animal species present in the area

Other significant resources in the area are medicinal plants, which a significant proportion of the local population uses to cure minor illnesses such as headaches and stomach aches (Ly, pers. comm., 04/04/07). According to Inyanga (pers. comm., 11/03/07) the trends in use of medicinal plants have not changed since the Trail has been established and neither has the abundance.

A range of indigenous fauna is present in the area, mammals, reptiles, amphibians and birds (see Table 4).

Table 4 In the area, 264 bird species have been recognized (ERS, 2004). Based on an occurrence of rare avian species the area holds status as a National Heritage site (Riley, 2001 in Trotter, undated). Hunting and habitat degradation has affected the number of Buck species. Human interruption from tourists or initiation schools in mountains caves may have an affect on the presence of small mammals (ERS, 2004).

⁽Source: ERS, 2004)

3.3.3 Waste and Environmental Management

Waste management

Machekong and Madlangala chalets have sealed septic tanks that collect sewage from the toilets and can hold sewage for up to five years. With increase in tourists, proper sewage treatment fields will need to be developed (Volunteer, pers. comm., 06/03/07, Caretaker 1 & 2, pers. comm., 09/03/07; 11/03/07).

All organic waste is also collected and composted for the chalet gardens. Machekong chalet had ongoing compost site, although Madlangala chalet compost was unnoticeable. Non-organic waste is separated, paper is burnt on site, but recyclable and non-recyclable garbage is collected on a regular basis by the VSA volunteer and



Figure 11. Caretaker 1 and liquid manure drums, Machekong chalet (Source: Kim, 2007)

transported to Matatiele where it is put into a local dump. The reason for this is that there are no recycling facilities for 300km around Matatiele (Volunteer, pers. comm., 06/03/07). Caretaker 1, however, recycles in an innovative way, making tin cans into ashtrays (Caretaker 1, pers. comm., 09/03/07). Litter is a major problem throughout South Africa (DEAT, 1996), and along the Trail it could become a problem if tourist numbers increase (Focus group 1, pers. comm., 07/03/07; Volunteer, pers. comm., 06/03/07). Awareness-raising is the primary mode of waste management. Tourists are asked not to litter and encouraged to bury their waste when necessary. Guides take a monitoring role in ensuring against pollution along the Trail (ERS, 2004).

Water management

Water from sinks and showers are separated from the toilet and funnelled for reuse. In Machekong chalet, the greywater enters two drums in the garden out of which the caretaker makes liquid manure (see Figure 1; Caretaker 1, pers. comm., 09/03/07). In Madlangala chalet, greywater is thrown out as it is "too dirty" to use (Caretaker 2, pers. comm., 11/03/07). Water heating in the three of four chalets is done through wood-fired

donkey boilers on the basis of abundance of firewood in the areas. Mostly wattle wood is used, but on one occasion Caretaker 2 was seen using Protea wood to fuel a barbeque claiming it was chunks that had been broken off by the storm (although it was clearly cut). A gas geyser is used in Makhulong chalet, but if this is broken, tourists are given a bucket of water to wash in the 'traditional' way (ERS, 2004; Guides 1 and 2, pers. comm., 07/03/07). All the waste from the boiler fires are added to the compost (ERS, 2004).

Water conservation measures in both chalets are taken by creating awareness through signs that inform the user that area is in drought. Nevertheless there are no concrete measures such as installing dual flush systems into the toilets or water-saving showerheads. Water in all chalets but Malekhalonyane are connected to bulk supplies, where Malekhalonyane chalet relies on a natural spring source via a small pump. Any over use will be mitigated by the chalet being hooked up to a bulk water supply (ERS, 2004).

Traditional rules for water protection also exist and include the belief that if you urinate in the water then your clothes will be washed away by the river when you are down there to wash them (Guides 1 and 2, pers. comm., 07/03/07). Tourists trying to gain a cultural experience may indeed respect the traditional rules.

Other environmental management

The design of the chalets is thermally efficient with north facing windows to trap heat, and thick walls and thatch for insulation from heat and cold (ERS, 2004). Extra blankets are also provided thus requiring little need for further heating or cooling. Currently, no anti-erosion measures are in place, although anti-erosion poles are to be installed at the first signs of soil erosion (ERS, 2004).

3.4 Sustainability

3.4.1 Sustainability in the local context

The definition in section 1.2.4 states sustainability as containing environmental, sociocultural and economic aspects. These aspects are reflected in the responses given during the Community Participatory Workshop (10/03/07). Participants stated that having a sense of community, security from crime, exposure to tourism activities and benefits, and respect towards tourists were important in minimising socio-cultural impacts. Environmental management could be promoted by the cleanliness and maintenance of accommodation facilities. Economic aspects were also important to the community, as they recognised the need for continued and increase tourist numbers.

Poor management was seen as a constraint to sustainability of the project, which is also recognised in the definition in 1.2.4. Furthermore, the community highlighted the need "to know the exact meaning of the tourism project" (Community Participatory Workshop, 10/03/07), implying the need for further awareness-raising.

3.4.2 Future potentials and constraints

The biggest constraint connected to the sustainability of the project as a whole are economic variability and the projects scale. At the moment the project is not selfsufficient, as operational costs are supported by the Alfred Nzo Municipality

(Operation Manager, pers. comm., 06/03/07). Since the project is supported by the Municipality,

"People still don't know they own the project" Trustee 1, pers. comm., 11/03/07.

politicians feel ownership over the project and this could create problems in the future (Operations Manager, pers. comm., 06/03/07). Therefore, there are constraints connected to the project being supported by the Municipality. The project has a potential of becoming self-sufficient, but this depends largely on increase in tourism to the area. One of the largest potentials lies in the domestic market where the Trail at the moment is not promoted enough but broadening (Focus group 1, pers. comm., 07/03/07). As mentioned in section 3.1 the projects scale is too little to provide a sole income for most of the participants, as guides 1 and 2 explain "tourism alone cannot stand alone, other sources of income must come" (Guides 1 and 2 pers. comm., 07/03/07). However, if the carrying capacity of chalets is maximised, more full-time

jobs could be created for caterers, cleaners, drivers, and vegetable growers. On one hand only a certain number of jobs could be created, but on the other hand the project has potentials in terms of spill-over effects to the community.

Other potentials and constraints in the sustainability lie in the skills bases of the Trust, Trustees, and employees of the project. Both the MCTT and the trustees have a high degree of knowledge regarding the Trail , are from the communities themselves, and have a commitment to developing the Trail even further (Ezamajola Consulting Services, 2005; Founder, pers. comm., 11/03/07). This is constrained by limited business management capacity, poor communication, and no industry knowledge or expertise. Currently much of the institutional and organisational knowledge resides in only one Operations Manager (Operations Manager, pers. comm., 06/03/07). Trustees also suffer from lack of commitment, possibly a result of no financial remuneration, and lack of ownership (Ezamajola Consulting Services, 2005; Trustee 2, pers. comm., 05/03/07). Similarly, employees of the Trail also require continued capacity building and a sense of ownership needs to be built in general in communities along the Trail. The changing of structure of the Trust could affect the degree that the community influences decision making.

In terms of culture and tradition, there are potentials the villages Makomereng and Mafaisa are not utilising. For example, the Masakala Guest House organises sangomas to practice rituals for tourists, and this could be created along the Trail (MAT; Guides 1 and 2 pers. comm., 07/03/07). The Inyanga in Makomereng supports this idea (Inyanga, pers. comm., 11/03/07) however cultural exploitation and degradation of social identity could become a problem if these rituals become commercialised. Furthermore, the villagers in Makomereng and Mafaisa expressed the willingness to have tourists in the villages, and in this way more villagers will get benefits from the project in economic, cultural and social terms. However, there are constraints connected to this as certain traditional rituals such as the initiation schools should be kept private, as it could harm the quality of life of the villagers (Non-participant 18, pers. comm., 09/03/07).

Environmental degradation is recognized as a threat for the MCTT and Mehloding Trail as that is what the Trail is sold on (Ezamajola Consulting Services, 2005). However, constraints to environmental sustainability stem largely from attitudes and awareness of communities living around the Trail as to the importance of conservation of natural resources. Indeed, many of the environmental problems facing South Africa today, like unequal distribution in land, soil erosion, deforestation, air pollution and water scarcity, are disregarded by a large proportion of South Africa's population and the awareness of conservation benefits is very low (DEAT, 1996). One such area is knowledge and understanding of the availability of water and particularly in relation to the rest of South Africa. Wattle also remains a threat to the integrity of biodiversity, as Protea conservation represents the contrary (Figure 12). Education and awareness-raising may not be sufficient. Rather, other alternatives to energy need to be provided for wattle eradication, and Protea conservation, to be fully embraced by communities. One initiative that aims at awareness-raising amongst tourists and community is getting the tourist involved, like in Couran Cove Island Resort, Queensland, Australia, where tourists plant native seedlings around the resort (Lim and McAleer, 2005).



Figure 12. Protea caffra (Source: Jørgensen, 2007)

The area has applied for consideration as a World Heritage Site and plans for cooperation with the larger Maloti Drakensberg Transfrontier Project to the north-east of the Trail are in place. With no current protected areas along the Trail, World Heritage status has the potential to conserve and protect the area as one that has "outstanding universal value" to humanity (UNESCO, 1972, p.2) and attract even greater tourist numbers. Nevertheless, the criteria to fulfill World Heritage status may require other land uses, such as cattle grazing to be regulated or even stopped, which

may have consequences for communities living in proximity to the area. Similarly, any form of resource conservation, such as national parks could result in adverse impacts for local communities and park-people conflicts as seen in Royal Chitwan National Park, Nepal (see Stræde and Helles, 2000), and Saiwa Swamp National Park, Kenya (see Ogutu, 2004). Villagers in Mafaisa (participants and non-participants, pers. comm., 09/03/07) have already expressed their dissatisfaction should resource use be limited by World Heritage. The project management, including Operations manager, founder (pers. comm., 11/03/07), and the guides and volunteer (pers. comm., 07/0307; 06/03/07) view World Heritage as a positive initiative and point out that education and awareness raising about its benefits is essential in mitigating any negative response from villagers.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

The objective of the study was to explore if the proclaimed "community-based approach" has been applied in the Mehloding Adventure Trail. To achieve this, the study investigated the project's socio-economic and environmental impacts on the local community and evaluates the future challenges and potentials of the project. Although numbers do not determine the extent to which a project is community-based, it can be determined that the distribution of benefits and spill-over effects do not extend to the whole community due mainly to the small scale of the project.

At the present time information flow between Trust and community is not optimal and some inconsistency within e.g. the structure of the Trust is present. Continued and regular training in project management, as well as skills transfer between employees is recommended. This additional training of project staff is needed for improving quality of service and making lines of command more efficient.

The Trust is undergoing a change of structure, and this may enhance the information flow. However making the project more business like may affect the community's influence on decision making as it is imaginable that there will be more top down steering and a gap between community and Trust could enlarge.

In terms of *quality of life*, it is possible to conclude from of interviews and workshops that the project is a community-based project. In some cases, ecotourism initiatives have eroded the customs and self-esteem of the local communities, resulting in psychological disempowerment, which occurred for the Yagua Indians of the Peruvian and Columbian Amazon (Scheyvens, 1999) however this is not the case of the Mehloding Adventure Trail. The general statement from interviewees and workshop participants was that the project has brought positive things to their lives and they do not view the project as being cultural, social nor environmental degrading. In fact findings showed that the project to a certain extent has improved quality of life by enhancing the locals' self-esteem as foreigners show an interest in their culture.

In terms of resource conservation there is a lack of documentation regarding environmental conditions at the time of project establishment and therefore there is no baseline for comparison of impacts that the project may have brought. However it is possible to draw some conclusions about the present situation. This study concludes that general knowledge among local residents on environmental and resource conservation is minimal. Education of communities on general benefits of environmental conservation and waste management is advisable, as loss of environmental integrity could be the very thing that destroys the tourism attraction. Impacts on the environment at this stage are minimal due mainly to the small scale of the project rather than the awareness of the tourists or communities. The management measures in place attempt to encourage environmental friendliness, but more measures can be taken as well as more education of staff and tourists. In order to improve environmental management measures, dual flush toilets and water-saving showerheads could be installed in the chalets to conserve water resources.

The project has brought direct and indirect benefits to the local community. These include full-time employment and spill over effects. All employees are from the community, and therefore all community members benefit in some way. Even though few people are employed the benefits goes out to many as the money earned by one participant often supports a household with many members. Other spill-over effects from the project are education and capacity building of the community. Further suggestions that could bring spill-over effects are visits by tourists to villages, and/or creation of a small market at the Trail end, which could add to *quality of life*.

A crucial point that makes this project community-based is that the project is owned by the community. However a problem is the community's unawareness of this and the lack of knowledge of ownership is reflected in the participation in e.g. community meetings held by the CTO. The unawareness within the community should be addressed by real decision making power, through proper socialisation and organisation, in order to encourage the community's sense of ownership and participation.

Sustainable sources of income should be generated in order for the project to become independent on government funding. However, realistically this can only be achieved with an increase in tourist revenue. Economic self-sufficiency could be possible if market base was broadened through promotion. Promotion of the Trail on a national level is needed in order to bring in more domestic customers. At the moment the

majority of guests are international travellers. Additionally if the area was to become World Heritage this could attract more tourists. However this might at the same time affect the livelihoods and practices of local community members in a negative way.

Trail upgrade, through signage and Trail paths, is needed not only for purposes of attracting more visitors and getting international accreditation, but to protect areas of low resilience and minimising further unnecessary impact of the Trail created through 'off-roading' or lack of awareness from tourists. A full impact assessment in the future would be advisable as at this time the project is young and small-scale.

In sum, the objective of this study was to evaluate the integrity of the Mehloding Adventure Trail in light of whether it promoted quality of life and resource conservation. From this study it can be concluded that the Mehloding Adventure Trail is a community-based ecotourism project has been achieved. This is clear from the fact that it is community owned, employs villagers in the local communities, respects local traditions, and therefore improves villagers' *quality of life*. Furthermore, the scale and age of the project has allowed for minimal environmental impact. Although there are room for improvement within the project it seems that ecotourism is possible, and thereby the Mehloding Adventure Trail adds to the debates of whether or not *community-based ecotourism* is possible in reality.

5. Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the whole community of Makomereng and Mafaisa for their hospitality and tolerance. We would like to thank our South African counterparts, Mamasheane Matabotabo, and Michelle Dye and especially our interpreters, Pakama, Khaya and the Leek guy for their tireless and hard work. We would also like to thank Andreas de Neergaard and Torben Brich-Thomsen for their supervision as well as Trevor Hill, Catherine Traynor, Sash, Noel Chellan, Dayle Trotter and Keegan. Thanks to the kitchen ladies (molweni amanenekazi!) and Sindi for their food and wonderful company and Nomonde and Nomsa (from Machekong). We would like to thank the Wattle group, Agricultural group and Medicinal plants group for their invaluable data. We would like to thank each other for the motivation and effort as a group.

6. References

• Agrawal, A., and Gibson, C.C. (1999) Enchantment and Disenchantment: the Role of Community in Natural Resource Conservation. *World Development* 27 (4), pp. 629-649.

• Ainslie, A.R., Cinderby, S., Petse, T., Ntshona, Z., Bradley, P.N., Deshingkar, P. and Fakir, S., (1997). *Rural livelihoods and local level natural resource management in Peddie district*. Stockholm Environment Institute, York.

• Anon. (2006) *Mehloding Adventure Trail: a report on the construction and maintenance requirements of the Trail*. January 2006.

• Aylward, B. and Lutz, E. (2003) *Nature tourism, conservation, and development in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.* Washington, USA: World Bank. 2003; xxii + 475 pp.

• Berger, Peter L. (1973): Religion and World-Construction, in *The Social reality of Religion*. Penguin Books, London pp. 13-37.

• Beukes, L. (2005) *email to Mazwi on July 13, 2005 regarding Mehloding Adventure* Trail . Leonore Beukes, Tourism specialist for Maloti Drakensberg Transfrontier Project.

• Bratton, M. (2005) South Africa. In: Comparative Politics. Interests, Identities, and Institutions in a Changing Gobal Order. Ed. Kostein, Jeffrey & Lichbach, Mark, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp.433-465

• Buckley, R. (2003) *The Practice and Politics of Tourism and Land Management*. In Buckley, R., Pickering, C. & Weaver, D.B. (eds.) *Nature-Based: Tourism, environment and land Management*. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, pp. 1-7.

• Danielsen, N. B., (2007) Øko-rejser. B.T. 24/02/2007.

• De Neergaard, A., Saarnak, C., Hill, T., Khanyile, M., Berzosa, A.M., and Birch-Thomsen, T., (2005) Australian wattle species in Drakensberg region of South Africa – An invasive alien or a natural resource? *Agricultural Systems* 85, pp. 216-233.

• De Wit, M. P., Crookes, D. J., and van Wilgen, B. W., (2001) Conflicts of interest in environmental management: estimating the costs and benefits of a tree invasion. *Biological Invasions* 3, pp. 167-178.

• DEAT (Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism) (1996) *White Paper on The Development and Promotion of Tourism In South Africa*. Government of South Africa, May 1996 [Online] Available from: <<u>http://www.environment.gov.za/PolLeg/WhitePapers/tourism96.htm</u>> [accessed 29th March 07].

• DEAT (1999) *National State of the Environment Report South Africa*. [Online] Available from: <<u>http://www.ngo.grida.no/soesa/nsoer/issues/water/#status</u> > [accessed 29th March 07]

• DEAT (2002): *National responsible tourism development guidelines for South Africa. Provisional Guidelines, March 2002.* [Online] Available from: http://www.icrtourism.org/International%20Initiatives/Responsible%20Tourism%20Guidelines.doc> [Accessed 1st April 07].

• Dovie, D. B. K., Shackleton, C.M & Witkowski, E. T. F. (2002) Accessing natural resources: implications for sustainable management and livelihoods. In: Benjaminsen, T. A., Cousins, B. & Thompson, L. (eds.) Contested resources: challenges to the governance of natural resources in Southern

Africa Papers from the International Symposium, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa, 18-20 October-2000; pp. 336-345

• DWAF (1997) *National Water Policy White Paper*. [Online] Available from: <<u>http://www.dwaf.gov.za/Documents/Policies/nwpwp.pdf</u>> [accessed 28th March 07].

• Einarsson, P. (1993): All animals are equal but some are cetaceans. Conservation and culture conflict, in K. Milton (ed.): *Environmentalism: The view from anthropology*, pp. 73-84. ASA monograph, 32. London: Routledge.

• Environmental and Rural Solutions (ERS) (2004) *Mehloding Adventure Trail: Environmental Management Plan.* June 2004. Matatiele: Alfred Nzo District Municipality.

• Ezamajola Consulting Services (2005) *Mehloding Community Tourism Trust: Institutional Framework and alignment workshop – summary of the deliberations recorded during the two day workshop.* Thursday and Friday, 21-22 July 2005. Mehloding trust offices, Matatiele.

• Fennell, D. A. (2003) Ecotourism in the South African context. Africa-Insight. 33(1/2): 3-8

• Foucat, V.S. A. (2002) Community-based ecotourism management moving towards sustainability, in Ventanilla, Oaxaca, Mexico. *Ocean & Coastal Management* 45 (2002) 511–529.

• Franklin, A. (2003): Tourism an Introduction. SAGE Publications Ltd, London

• Geertz, C. (1999) Thick description: toward an interpretive theory of culture. *The Sociology of Knowledge*. Vol. 2, pp. 375-402.

Gerardy, J. (2002) Manage water judiciously, EC urged. *Dispatch Online* Friday, September 27, 2002
 [Online] Available from: <<u>http://www.dispatch.co.za/2002/09/27/easterncape/EEC.HTM</u>> [accessed 13th February 07].

• Hallowes, D. (2002) Chapter one: the environment of apartheid-capitalism: discourses and issues In: Bond, P. (2002) *Unsustainable South Africa: Environment, development, and social protest.* University of Natal Press. Pietermaritzburg, South Africa.

• Higgs, N.T. (2006): Measuring and understanding the well-being of South Africans: Everyday quality of life in South Africa, in *Social Indicators Research*, nr. 81 pp. 331-356.

• Hoffman, T., and Ashwell, A. (2001) *Nature divided: land degradation in South Africa*. University of Cape Town Press.

• Honey, M.S., (1999) Treading lightly? Ecotourism's impact on the environment. *Environment*, June 1999. [Online] Available from: <<u>http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi m1076/is 5 41/</u> ai 54895821/pg 1> [accessed 28th March 07].

• Impumelelo Innovations Award Trust (2007) Impumelelo Innovations Award Trust – Award Ceremony 2006/7 [online] Available from http://www.impumelelo.org.za/news_fs.php> [Accessed 09.04.2007]

• Jones, S. (2005) Community-based ecotourism: The Significance of Social Capital. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 303–324.

• Kariuki, S. (2004) Failing to Learn from Failed Programmes: South Africa's Communal Land Rights Bill (CLRB 2003). *Stichproben. Wiener Zeitschrift für kritische Afrikastudien.* Nr. 7/2004, 4 Jg. [Online] Available from: <<u>http://www.univie.ac.at/ecco/stichproben/Nr7_Kariuki.pdf</u> > [accessed 29th March 07] • Kok, S., Martinsen, L., Schmidt, K. (2001) *Ecotourism Development in Madlangala*. SLUSE ILUNRM Course Report, South Africa. 17th December 2001.

• Kopstein, J., and Lichbach, M. (2005) *Comparative Politics: Interests, Identities, and Institutions in a Changing Global Order*. Cambridge University Press.

• Le Maitre, D. C., van Wilgen, B.W., Gelderblom, C.M., Bailey, C., Chapman, R.A., and Nel, J.A. (2002) Invasive alien trees and water resources in South Africa: case studies of the costs and benefits of management. *Forest Ecology and Management* 160, pp 143-159.

• Lent, P.C., Scogings, P.F., van Averbeke, W. (eds) (2000). *Natural Resource Management and Policy in Eastern Cape Province, South Africa: Overview Paper*. Agricultural and Rural Development Research Institute, University of Fort Hare, Alice, South Africa.

- Lim, C., and McAleer, M., (2005) Ecologically sustainable tourism management. *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 20, pp.1431-1438.
- Makaula, N., (2007a) *Makaula N*. information via e-mail 21/02/2007.
- Makaula, N., (2007b) Makaula N. information via e-mail 12/03/2007.
- Masibambane (undated) Legal Opinion by Masibambane on Behalf of ERS re: Mehloding Trail Specialist Legal Consultants.
- MAT (Mehloding Adventure Trail) (2007) *Masakala Guest House*. [Online] Available from: http://www.mehloding.co.za/masakala.htm> [Accessed on 30.03. 07]
- May, J. (2000) *The structure and composition of rural poverty and livelihoods*. In: Cousins, B. (ed.) *At the Crossroads: Land and agrarian reform in South Africa in to the 21 century*, pp. 21-33
- Nek, E., Hill, T and Binns, T. (1997) Development from below in the 'New' South Africa: the case of Hertzog, Eastern Cape. *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 163, No. 1, pp. 57-64
- Ndlovu, N and Rogerson, C. (2003) Rural local economic development through Community-based tourism. The Mehloding hiking and horse Trail, Eastern Cape, South Africa. *Africa Insight*, Vol. 33, No. 1/2, pp. 124-129.

• Ntshona, Z. (2002) The contributions of communal rangelands to rural livelihoods in the Maluti district: Valuation of fuelwood. In: Benjaminsen, T. A., Cousins, B. & Thompson, L. (eds) Contested resources: challenges to the governance of natural resources in Southern Africa Papers from the International Symposium, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa, 18-20 October-2000; pp. 317-327.

• Ogutu, Z.A. (2004) Conflicts over resources: Saiwa Swamp National Park (Kenya) and its environs. *Earth and Environmental Science*. Vol. 41 (1) January, 1997. pp. 25-31.

- Orams, M.B. (1995) Towards a more desirable form of ecotourism. *Tourism Management*. 16(1) pp.3-8.
- Page, S. J., & Dowling, R. K. (2002) *Ecotourism*. Pearson Education Limitie, Harlow.
- Percival, V., and Homer-Dixon, T., (1995) *Environmental Scarcity and Violent Conflict: The case of South Africa*. Occasional Paper, Project on Environment, Population and Scarcity. [Online] Available from: http://www.library.utoronto.ca/pcs/eps/south/sa1.htm> [accessed 28th February 07]

• Pickering C., and Weaver, D.B., (2003) *Chapter 2, Nature-based tourism and sustainability: Issues and approaches.* In: Buckley, R., Pickering, C. and Weaver, D.B (eds.) *Nature-Based: Tourism, environment and land Management.* CABI Publishing, Wallingford, pp. 11-17.

• Preston-Whyte, R.A., and Watson, H.K. (2005) *Nature Tourism and Climatic Change in Southern* Africa. In: Hall, C.M., and Higham, J. (eds.) *Tourism, Recreation and Climatic Change, Aspects to Tourism Series*, No. 22., Channel View Publications, Clevedon, Chapter 8, pp. 130-142.

• Rapley, Mark (2003): Quality of Life Research. SAGE Publications Ltd, London

• Roberts, D.L. (2005) *Climate Change and Potential Human Conflict: Western Cape Province, South Africa.* Council for GeoScience of South African Human Security and Climate Change: An International Workshop, Holmen Fjord Hotel, Asker, near Oslo, 21-23 June 2005. [Online] Available from <<u>http://www.cicero.uio.no/humsec/papers/Roberts.pdf</u>> [accessed 28th March 07].

• Rolston, H. (1990) Science-based versus traditional ethics, in Engel, J.R. and Engel, J.G. (eds.): *Ethics of Environment and Development*, pp. 63-72. London: Belhaven Press.

• Ross, S., and Wall, G. 1999. Ecotourism: towards congruence between theory and practice. *Tourism Management* 20, pp 123-132.

• SAGI (South African Government information) (1996): *The Development and Promotion of Tourism in South Africa* [online] Available from: http://www.info.gov.za/whitepapers/1996/tourism.htm [Accessed 9th April 07]

• Scheyvens, R. (1999) Ecotourism and the empowerment of local communities. *Tourism Management* 20, pp. 245-249.

• Schlager, E., Ostrom, E. (1992) Property-rights regimes and natural resources: a conceptual analysis. *Land Economics*, 68 (3): 249-262.

• Sessions, G. (1994): Ecocentrism and the Anthropocentric Detour, in C. Merchant (ed.): *Keys Concepts in Critical Theory: Ecology*, pp. 140-51. New-Jersey: Humanities Press.

• Spenceley, A (2005) Nature-based tourism and environmental sustainability in South Africa. *Journal- of-Sustainable-Tourism*. 13(2): 136-170.

• Stræde, S., and Helles, F., (2000). Park-people conflict resolution in Royal Chitwan National Park, Nepal: buying time at high cost? *Environmental Conservation*, 27: 368-381.

• Trotter, D. (Undated) Chapter 5- Matatiele.

• Tsaur, S.H., Lin, Y.C. & Lin, J.H. (2006): Evaluating ecotourism sustainability from the integrated perspective of resource, community and tourism. *Tourism Management*, 37, pp. 640-653.

• UNEP (2002) *About Sustainable Tourism*. [Online] Available from: <<u>http://www.uneptie.org/pc/tourism/sust-tourism/about.htm</u>> [accessed 31st March 07].

• UNESCO (1972) *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. [Online] Available from: <<u>http://whc.unesco.org/archive/convention-en.pdf</u> > [accessed 30th March 07].

• UN World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

• Yunis, E. (2003) Sustainable Tourism: World Trends and Challenges Ahead. In: Buckley, R., Pickering, C. and Weaver, D.B (eds.) *Nature-Based: Tourism, Environment and Land Management*. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, pp. 11-17.

• Walker, C., (1998) *Land Reform and Gender in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. UNRISD. [Online] Available from: <<u>http://www.unrisd.org/unrisd/website/document.nsf/0/AF426AFD7DD941F180256B</u> <u>67005B7059?OpenDocument</u>.> [accessed 29th March 07].

• Weaver, D. (2001): *Ecotourism*. John Wiley & Sons Australia, Sydney.

Appendix

1. Individual time schedule

1.1 Riyong Kim

Date	Activity		
Friday 2 nd March	Leave Pietermaritzburg; welcome and settle into houses		
Saturday 3 rd	8.00 field walk to hill and chalet; informal talk with caretaker		
2	14.00 preparation of Participatory Workshop; group reflection and planning		
Sunday 4 th	3.00 drive car to Kokstad		
2	15.00 interview with Sindi Swa; group reflection		
Monday 5 th	10.00 interview with Victor Spambo		
•	12.00 questionnaires to participants – Mamashea and Marareni		
	19.00 interview with Gloria (guide); group reflection		
Tuesday 6 th	07.30 Matatiele Interview with Nomondi		
•	09.00 interview with Mrs Mosilo (MCTT Chair)		
	10.00 meeting with Nicky ERS (to collect secondary data)		
	11.30 interview with Charles Coombe (VOLUNTEER)		
	19.00 debrief on day's results; group reflection		
Wednesday 7 th	08.00 Madlangala chalet; arrange tourist FGD		
•	09.00 – 10.00 observation of caretaker		
	11.00 writing up interviews; preparing FGD		
	14.00 interview with guides Robert and Tsepo		
	19.30 FGD with 7 tourists at Madlangala chalet; group reflection		
Thursday 8 th	07.30 Field walk to Machekong chalet		
Friday 9 th	08.00 Interview with hostess Nomsa		
-	09.00 interview with caretaker Putlestsko		
	10.30 interview with 4 participants/ non-participants in Mafaisa		
	17.00 return to Makomereng; prepare evening presentation		
	19.00 evening presentation; group reflection		
Saturday 10 th	08.00 prepare community workshop		
	13.00 – 17.00 community workshop at school; group reflection		
Sunday 11 th	09.00 Pontseng interview with Mr Lesia; Mr Tsidliso (trustee); Ms Ntlai		
	(participant)		
	14.00 FGD with 4 tourists at Madlangala chalet		
	16.00 writing up Matatiele interviews; preparation of questions for follow up		
	Matat interviews		
	19.00 group reflection		
Monday 12 th	08.00 Madlangala chalet; write up workshop, interviews and prepare		
	community presentation		
Tuesday 13 th	Return to Pietermaritzburg		
Wednesday 14 th	09.00 meet with group; type up interviews, prepare presentation		
Thursday 15 th	09.00 type up interviews; finalise presentation		
Friday 16 th	09.00 type up interviews; attempt interview with Alfred Nzo Municipality		
	13.00 presentation		

1.2 Haneen Ghazawneh

Date	Activity
Friday 2 nd March	Leave Pietermaritzburg; welcome and settle into houses
Saturday 3 rd	8.00 field walk to hill and chalet; informal talk with caretaker
·	14.00 preparation of Participatory Workshop; group reflection and planning
Sunday 4 th	08.00 interview with Numsi
·	09.00 interview with Nyamika
	11.00 attending church in Pepela
	13.00 interview with the chieftess in Pepela
	15.00 debrief on day's results; group reflection
Monday 5 th	10.00 interview with Victor Spambo
-	12.00 questionnaires to participants – Mamashea and Marareni
	19.00 interview with Gloria (guide); group reflection
Tuesday 6 th	07.30 Matatiele Interview with Nomondi
	09.00 interview with Mrs Mosilo (MCTT Chair)
	10.00 meeting with Nicky ERS (to collect secondary data)
	11.30 interview with Charles Coombe (VOLUNTEER)
	19.00 debrief on day's results; group reflection
Wednesday 7 th	08.00 interviews with 7 participants/non-participants in Makomereng
	14.00 writing up interviews; preparing FGD
	19.30 FGD with 7 tourists at Madlangala chalet; group reflection
Thursday 8 th	07.30 Field walk to Machekong chalet
Friday 9 th	08.00 Interview with hostess Nomsa
	09.00 interview with caretaker Putlestsko
	10.30 interview with 4 participants/ non-participants in Mafaisa
	17.00 return to Makomereng; prepare evening presentation
	19.00 evening presentation; group reflection
Saturday 10 th	08.00 prepare community workshop
	13.00 – 17.00 community workshop at school; group reflection
Sunday 11 th	08.00 Interview with Inyanga
	09.00 interviews with 4 participants/non-participants in Makomereng
	13.00 Interview with caretaker Richmond
	14.00 FGD with 4 tourists at Madlangala chalet
	16.00 writing up Matatiele interviews; preparation of questions for follow up Matat
	interviews
a	19.00 group reflection
Monday 12 th	08.00 Madlangala chalet; write up workshop, interviews and prepare community
Tuesday 13 th	Return to Pietermaritzburg
Wednesday 14 th	09.00 meet with group; type up interviews, prepare presentation
Thursday 15 th	09.00 type up interviews: finalise presentation
Friday 16 th	09.00 type up interviews: attempt interview with Alfred Nzo Municipality
induy io	13.00 presentation

1.3	3 L	₋isa	Μ.	D.	Jø	rg	jer	nse	n
-----	-----	------	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	---

Date	Activity			
Friday 2 nd March	Leave Pietermaritzburg; welcome and settle into houses			
Saturday 3 rd	08.00 field walk to hill and chalet; informal talk with caretaker			
	4.00 preparation of Participatory Workshop; group reflection and planning			
Sunday 4 th	08.00 interview with Numsi			
	09.00 interview with Nyamika			
	11.00 attending church in Pepela			
	13.00 interview with the chieftess in Pepela			
	15.00 debrief on day's results; group reflection			
Monday 5 th	00 interview with Victor Spambo			
	12.00 questionnaires with two participants – Mamashea and Marareni			
	19.00 interview with Gloria (guide); group reflection			
Tuesday 6 th	07.30 Matatiele Interview with Nomondi			
	09.00 interview with Mrs Mosilo (MCTT Chair)			
	10.00 meeting with Nicky ERS (to collect secondary data)			
	11.30 interview with Charles Coombe (VOLUNTEER)			
	19.00 debrief on day's results; group reflection			
Wednesday 7 th	08.00 interview with school teachers at Nkhupulweni school in Makomereng			
	11.30 interviews with 3 participants/non-participants			
	14.00 writing up interviews; preparing FGD			
41-	19.30 FGD with 7 tourists at Madlangala chalet; group reflection			
Thursday 8^{m}	07.30 Field walk to Machekong chalet			
Friday 9 ^m	08.00 interview with hostess Nomsa			
	09.00 interview with caretaker Putlestsko			
	interview with 4 participants/ non-participants in Mafaisa			
	17.00 return to Makomereng; prepare evening presentation			
a toth	19.00 evening presentation; group reflection			
Saturday 10 th	08.00 prepare community workshop			
a s s th	13.00 – 17.00 community workshop at school; group reflection			
Sunday 11 th	09.00 Pontseng interview with Mr Lesia (founder); Mr Tsidliso (trustee); Ms			
	Ntlai (participant)			
	14.00 FGD with 4 tourists at Madlangala chalet			
	16.00 writing up Matatiele interviews; preparation of questions for follow up Matat interviews			
i.	19.00 group reflection			
Monday 12 ^m	08.00 Madlangala chalet; write up workshop, interviews and prepare community presentation			
Tuesday 13 th	Return to Pietermaritzburg			
Wednesday 14 th	09.00 meet with group; type up interviews, prepare presentation			
Thursday 15 th	09.00 type up interviews; finalise presentation			
Friday 16 th	09.00 type up interviews; attempt interview with Alfred Nzo Municipality			
	13.00 presentation			

1.4 Arafa A. Khatib

Date	Activity		
Friday 2 nd March	Leave Pietermaritzburg; welcome and settle into houses		
Saturday 3 rd	8.00 field walk to hill and chalet; informal talk with caretaker		
	14.00 preparation of Participatory Workshop; group reflection and planning		
Sunday 4 th	8.00 interviews participant, caterer Numsi + nonparticipant Nyamika		
-	11:00 Church		
	Afternoon: Interview with Chieftees		
Monday 5 th	8.00 Making appointment with principal Mr. Mbobo		
	10.00 interview with Victor Spambo		
	Afternoon: Interviews + preparation of school workshop		
	19.00 interview with Gloria (guide); group reflection		
Tuesday 6 th	8.00-14.00 School workshop		
-	Afternoon: reading EMP		
	19.00 debrief on day's results; group reflection		
Wednesday 7 th	08.00 Madlangala chalet; arrange tourist FGD		
-	09.00 – 10.00 observation of caretaker		
	11.00 observing interview		
	14.00 interview with guides Robert and Tsepo		
	19.30 FGD with 7 tourists at Madlangala chalet; group reflection		
Thursday 8 th	07.30 Field walk to Machekong chalet		
Friday 9 th	08.00 Interview with hostess Nomsa		
	09.00 interview with caretaker Putlestsko		
	10.30 interview with 4 participants/ non-participants in Mafaisa		
	17.00 return to Makomereng; prepare evening presentation		
	19.00 evening presentation; group reflection		
Saturday 10 th	08.00 prepare community workshop		
	13.00 – 17.00 community workshop at school; group reflection		
Sunday 11 th	08.00 interview with participants + non-participants in Makomereng		
	12.00 Interview with caretaker Richmond (Madlangala chalet)		
	14.00 FGD with 4 tourists at Madlangala chalet		
	16.00 writing up Matatiele interviews; preparation of questions for follow up		
	Matat interviews		
	19.00 group reflection		
Monday 12 th	Morning: Interview with Nomonde, EDA and Nicky in Matat		
	Afternoon: community presentation		
Tuesday 13 th	Return to Pietermaritzburg		
Wednesday 14 th	09.00 meet with group; type up interviews, prepare presentation		
Thursday 15 th	09.00 type up interviews; finalise presentation		
Friday 16 th	09.00 type up interviews; attempt interview with Alfred Nzo Municipality		
	13.00 presentation		

2. List of Informants

Informant	Name, age, gender and livelihood of	Date of	Place	
reference	informants	Interview		
	F = Female, M= Male			
Chieftess	Victoria (F), 44 yrs old	04 March 07	Pepela	
Operations Manager	Nomonde (F), 28 yrs old	06 March 07;	Matatiele	
		11 March 07		
Founder	Mr. Simon Lesia (M), age: ?,	11 March 07	Pontseng	
Trustee 1	Tdsiliso Kikine (M), Machekong chalet	11 March 07	Pontseng	
Trustee 2	Victor Spambo (M), Madlangala chalet	05 March 07	Makomereng	
Chairperson	Mrs Mosilo Kuali (F), Chairperson of MCTT	06 March 07	Matatiele	
FDA 1	Mrs Zandile (F) Director	11 March 07	Matatiala	
EDA 1 EDA 2	Vuvo (M) Agriculturalist	11 March 07	Matatiele	
Cuide 1	Tsano Lasholu (M)	07 March 07	Madlangala chalat	
Guide 2	Pohert Mnika (M)	07 March 07	Madlangala chalet	
Guide 2	Cloria Mayamoni (E) 20 yrs	07 March 07	Maliangara chalet	
Volunteer	Charles Coomba (M) from Naw Zaaland	05 March 07	Matoriala	
volunteer	Business Advice Specialist with	00 March 07	Watatiele	
	Volunteer Services Abroad			
Caretaker 1	Puseletso Lecheko (M), 28 yrs	09 March 07	Machekong chalet	
Caretaker 2	Richmond Eiwaza (M). 57 vrs.	11 March 07	Madlangala chalet	
	Madlangala chalet			
Hostess 1	Nomsa Situ (F), 28 yrs, Machekong	09 March 07	Machekong chalet	
U. store 2	chalet	04 Marsh 07	Malaanaa	
Hostess 2	Sindi Swa (F), Madiangala chalet	04 March 07	Makomereng	
Caterer	Numsi (F), 40 yrs, Madlangala chalet	04 March 07	Makomereng	
Cleaner	Nyamika (F), 23 yrs, Madlangala chalet	04 March 07	Makomereng	
Participant 1	Mamashea (F), elder, vegetable grower	05 March 07	Makomereng	
Participant 2	Aleta Lecheko (F) mother of caretaker,	09 March 07	Mafaisa	
	vegetable grower and livestock			
Participant 3	Filomon Marareni, Makomereng, farmer	05 March 07	Makomereng	
Participant 4 Makamohela Ntlai (F), 52 yrs, artist		11 March 07	Pontseng	
Participant 5	Paulos Lewatle (M), 30 yrs, beer seller	09 March 07	Mafaisa	
School teacher 1	Suping Mbobo (M), 39 yrs, school principal	07 March 07	Makomereng	
School teacher 2	Ntombifuthi Mbiko (F), 35 yrs, Math &	07 March 07	Makomereng	
T / 11 1	Natural Science teacher	11 14 1 07	7.6.1	
Inyanga (medicine	Shadrack Marareni (M), 75 yrs, chief of	11 March 07	Makomereng	
man)	sangomas in Makomereng		2.6.1	
Non-participant 1	Andreas Mkangala (F), 42 yrs,	11 March 07	Makomereng	

Non-participant 2	unemployed, homegarden Etta Mkangala (F) (Numsi's mother), grants and sells brooms to the villagers	11 March 07	Makomereng
Non-participant 3	Hector (M), 20 yrs, unemployed, income from parents	07 March 07	Makomereng
Non-participant 4	Josephina (Mamthi Mkangala) (F), 50 yrs, child support and income from sons	07 March 07	Makomereng
Non-Participant 5	Kornelia Ndlungwana (F), homegarden and grants from husbund	11 March 07	Makomereng
Non-participant 6	Lindani Marareni (M) (son of Inyanga), 36 yrs,	11 March 07	Makomereng
Non-participant 7	Lizwe Marareni, (F) grants (R840/month), homegarden and produce vegetables	07 March 07	Makomereng
Non-Participant 8	Elisabeth Lewtle (F), 35 yrs, and Alfred Lewtle (M), farmers	09 March 07	Mafaisa
Non-participant 9	Motloheloa Motseki (M), 24 yrs, income from husband	09 March 07	Mafaisa
Non-participant 10	Mransinia Marareni (F), 39 yrs, income from parents	10 March 07	Makomereng
Non-participant 11	Marium (F), income from daughter and husband ; volunteer at school	07 March 07	Makomereng
Non-participant 12	Mzimkhulu Mnyameni (M), 68 yrs, pension, income from wife (nurse)	11 March 07	Makomereng
Non-participant 13	Nelisine Mkangala (F), 22 yrs income from parens	07 March 07	Makomereng
Non-participant 14	Nosino Mandudo (F), 52 yrs, sells paraffin, matches, veges, and grants	07 March 07	Makomereng
Non-participant 15	Spambo (M), 50 yrs	07 March 07	Makomereng
Non-participant 16	Mamolemo Motsapi (F) 23 yrs	09 March 07	Mafaisa
Non-participant 17	Nomisumzi Sambo (F)	05 March 07	Makomereng
Non-participant 18	Mr. Lecheko (M), ? (F), ? (M) and ? (M) income: grants and selling vegetables	09 March 07	Mafaisa
Focus group 1	 Azil Rubei (M) 75 yrs, pharmacist, South African Darwie Vrwey (M) photographer, South African Esma Laroo, (F) journalist for SA travel magazine, South African Micheal Simmons (M) 72 yrs South African Barney Kupowitz (M), retired 	07 March 07	Madlangala chalet
	pharmacist, South African		

	 6. Warren Halgreen (M) 38 yrs, Financial Services, South African 7. Gary Schwarz (M) doctor, nephew of 5, South African 	
Focus group 2	 Robin Woodd (M) Civil Engineer 11 March 07 Madlangala chale nearly retired, England Jill Woodd (F) Medical secretary England Bernd Kadritzke (M) retired, Poland, live in Germany, Sheelagh Kadritzke (F) retired, English living in Germany 	×t
Community	Group A 10 March 07 Makamarang	
workshop	 Khunjuzwa Spambo, F, 25 yrs Nomsa Mnyameni, F, 33 Nokuphiwa (Francina) Marareni, F, 39 Ntombekhaya Mabhayi, F, 32 (late) Makhosandile, M, 24 (late) Zweli Marareni, M, 33 Group B Mondli, M, 17 Siyoka, M, 17 Siyoka, M, 17 Tshep, M, 19 Nkosindiphile, M, 18 Group C Ngoqwina, M, 30 Lamlani, M, 26 Zengele, M, 31 Dhothi (Mashai), M, 35 Group D Luxolo, M, 21 Manduleli, M, 20 Sanele, M, 18 Luyolo, M, 22 Group E Sindi Swa, F 	
	 Nyameka, F Nomluleki, F 	

3. Questionnaire and interview guides

3.1 Questionnaire for non-participants

Date:	Location:

Introduction:

We are a group from Copenhagen University and KwaZulu Natal University doing a project on the Mehloding Adventure Trail . We would like to interview you on the impacts of the Trail on you and the community. The objective of our study is to determine to what extent community-based ecotourism has been achieved.

Personal ID:		
Name:	Age:	Gender: M / F
Occupation/ Livelihood:		
Education:		
No. of household members:		

- 1. Do you know about the Trail? Yes_____ No _____
- 2. Have you ever participated in Trail? Yes_____ No _____ *If not, why?*

If yes, in what way and why

- Do you want to take part in the Trail? Yes _____ No _____
 If yes, why?
- 4. Have you been offered or applied to be in the ecotourism project? Yes _____ No _____ *If yes, why and in whish position?*
- 5. Do you think that Trail has a positive impact on the community:

If Yes [] please indicate below in what way (raking):

- Job creation []
- Income generation []
- Encourages domestic production []
- Improving infrastructure etc []
- Improving education programs []

- Empowerment []
- Health facilities []
- Equity []
- Other, please specify _____

If No [] please indicate below in what way:

- Undermines local culture []
- Undermines local authorities []
- Creating social cleavages []
- Money spend on an irrelevant project []
- other, please specify _____
- 6. Do you think that the SLUSE students has a positive impact on the community:

If Yes [] please indicate below in what way (raking):

- Job creation []
- Income generation []
- Encourages domestic production []
- Improving infrastructure etc []
- Education programs []
- Empowerment []
- Equity []
- Other, please specify _____

If No [] please indicate below in what way:

- Undermines local culture []
- Undermines local authorities []
- Creating social cleavages []
- Money spend on an irrelevant project []
- other, please specify _____
- 7. (To sum up) Is the Trail good for the village? Yes____ No____ *Why? or Why not?*
- Have the village changed since the Trail began? Yes _____ No _____
 If yes, in what way?
- 9. Do you feel that you benefit from the Trail (even thought you are not participating in the project yourself)? Yes_____No____

How?

10. Do you have any suggestions to the ecotourism project? Yes____ No_____ *Which?*

3.2 Questionnaire for participant

Date: _____ Location: _____

Introduction:

We are a group from Copenhagen University and KwaZulu Natal University doing a project on the Mehloding Adventure Trail . We would like to interview you on the impacts of the Trail on you and the community. The objective of our study is to determine to what extent community-based ecotourism has been achieved.

Personal ID:		
Name:	Age:	Gender: M / F
Occupation/ Livelihood:		
Education:		
No. of household members:		

1. Do you think that Trail has a positive impact on the community:

If Yes [] please indicate below in what way (raking):

- Job creation []
- Income generation []
- Encourages domestic production []
- Improving infrastructure etc []
- Improving education programs []
- Empowerment []
- Health facilities []
- Equity []
- Other, please specify _____

If No [] please indicate below in what way:

- Undermines local culture []
- Undermines local authorities []
- Creating social cleavages []
- Money spend on an irrelevant project []
- other, please specify _____

2. Do you think that the SLUSE students has a positive impact on the community:

If Yes [] please indicate below in what way (raking):

- Job creation []
- Income generation []
- Encourages domestic production []
- Improving infrastructure etc []
- Education programs []
- Empowerment []
- Equity []
- Other, please specify _____

If No [] please indicate below in what way:

- Undermines local culture []
- Undermines local authorities []
- Creating social cleavages []
- Money spend on an irrelevant project []
- other, please specify _____
- 3. (To sum up) Is the Trail good for the village? Yes____No____ Why? or Why not?
- 4. Have you learnt new skills for employment? Yes____ No____ *If YES which?*

Why? or Why not?

- 6. Would you like to have another position within the Trail? (*Are you satisfied with your occupation within the Trail?*) Yes_____ No_____ Why?
- Do you want to stay in the Trail? Yes ____ No ____
 Why?

Why?

- Do you think that the benefits are equally distributed in the community? Yes _____ No _____
 In what way?
- 10. Is the income from the Trail your only source of income? Yes_____ No_____

If NO what other sources of income do you have (ranking: 1 is most important source of income):

- 1 Home gardens []
- 2 Trail []
- 3 Community projects []
- 4 Agriculture field []
- 5 Transfers []
- 6 Pension funds []
- 7 Forestry []
- 8 Others (specify)_____

11. Where do you spend your income (from the Trail) (ranking: 1 is most)?

- 1 In small informal shop within the village []
- 2 In the town of Matatiele (goods and services) []
- 3 Other towns []
- 12. Do you have any suggestions for the future of Trail? Yes____ No____ *Which?*

3.3 Semi structured interview - Quality of Life: Management

Trust, operation manager and the EDA Matat.

Date: _____ Location: _____

Introduction:

We are a group from Copenhagen University and KwaZulu Natal University doing a project on the Mehloding Adventure Trail. We would like to interview you on the impacts of the Trail on you and the community. The objective of our study is to determine to what extent community-based ecotourism has been achieved.

Personal ID:

Name:	Age:	Gender: M / F
Occupation/ Livelihood:		
Education:		
No. of household members: _		

1. Overview of the community:

- 1 Which ethnicities are represented in the community?
- 2 What are the numbers for unemployment? (Before and after?)
- 3 Gender and age representation in the villages? (*Is must of the man migrant workers and therefore not in the villages*?)
- 4 Are there large social cleavages within the community?
- 5 Is there a traditional structure/hierarchy in the community? *If yes, hoe would you categories as the top 5 of the local authorities?*
- 6 Is the traditional structure of big importance in the community? And has there been a change since the project began?
- 7 How is the educational level of the community?

2. Understandings behind the project/ecotourism:

- 8 What is your definition of ecotourism?
- 9 What does community-based tourism mean?
- 10 What is quality of life? Connected to this, what make the community happy and happier?
- 11 What is the general objective of the ecotourism project?
- 12 What are your criteria's for evaluating the project?

3. Project data - Overview:

- 13 How did the project start? project history?
- 14 How is it funded? *is there and end date for funding? What would help make the project self-sufficient?*
- 15 How many people are involved? How many people from Makomereng and Mafaisa are involved (and not involved)?
- 16 Are the foreign workers coming to the area to gets jobs?
- 17 Who would you categorize as key informants? Is there a town committee (who is participating)?
- 18 Do you provide some kind of educational period connected to the project?

4. The process of implementing a community project:

- 19 How are people selected to participate in the project? What are the criteria's for the different occupations, for instance a guide?
- 20 How is decisions implemented? Is tradition and culture taking connected to the project?
- 21 Who comes with new initiative?
- 22 How is the benefit of the project redistributed in the communities?
- 23 Does the project benefit the non-participant in the community?
- 24 What role does the local community play?
- 25 What role does the government play?
- 26 What role does NGO's play?

5. Potential and challenges:

- 27 What do you see as the main challenges in the project (and for the future)?
- 28 What potential do you see in the project?
- 29 What have the biggest challenges concerning the implementation?
- 30 What would you say was the problem areas of the community? (lack of resources, lack of useable knowledge etc.)

3.4 Semi-structured interview - Environment and Project Management

Chief, Mehloding Tourism Trust, guides

Date: _____ Location: _____

Introduction:

Democral ID.

We are a group from Copenhagen University and KwaZulu Natal University doing a project on the Mehloding Adventure Trail . We would like to interview you on the environmental impacts of the Trail and management of the ecotourism project. The objective of our study is to determine to what extent community-based ecotourism has been achieved.

rersonal ID:		
Name:	Age:	Gender: M / F
Occupation/ Livelihood:		
Education:		
No. of household members:		

Current status of natural resources (eg. fuelwood, water, timber, NTFPs, plant/ animal species richness, scenic resources).

- 1. what **natural resources are available** in the area?
- 2. what is the **current status** of natural resources? (scarce, abundant) is it threatened (endangered, polluted, overharvested)?

Trends in resource use

- 3. what is the **past (i.e. before the Trail) trends** in the use of natural resources? (in terms of fuelwood, water, timber, NTFPs, plant/ animal species richness, scenic resources e.g. rock art, waterfalls).
- 4. what are the **current trends** in the use of natural resources? (in terms of fuelwood, water, timber, NTFPs, plant/ animal species richness, scenic resources e.g. rock art, waterfall).

Resource access

- 5. who has **access** to the natural resources mentioned ?
- 6. who **owns** the natural resources?
- 7. does this differ among gender, age, ethnic group? (equity in distribution of resources)
- 8. who **manages** the resource and how? (sustainable)
- 9. are the **rules governing resource access and ownership** and use? (inclusion into user group, sanctions)

Project impacts

- 10. what do you think the **tourists want to see** along the Trail ?
- 11. which areas are mainly visited by tourists?
- 12. what resources are mainly used by tourists?
- 13. has the **Trail affected the use** of natural/cultural resources by villagers? (in terms of access to resources, availability etc).
- 14. has the Trail affected the levels of biodiversity along the Trail ?
- 15. has any indigenous vegetation been planted at the guesthouse/ removal of alien vegetation?
- 16. has there been **any new building/ infrastructure/ refurbishing** been undertaken by local builders and labourers? What are they?
- 17. are perishable food and other supplies provided locally to tourists during their visit?
- 18. are horses used on the Trail?
 - a. If so, where are the horses from (ownership/ leasing arrangements)?
 - b. If not, why (e.g. horse theft)?
- 19. what **waste management practices** are in place at the guesthouses and along the Trail ? (storage and disposal of solid and effluent waste)
- 20. are there any stormwater control and/or erosion measures implemented along the Trail itself?

Resource conservation

- 15. what are the **government restrictions/ regulations** on resource conservation? Are there government programs for conservation? (existence of conservation agency?)
- 16. what are the **traditional practices** for resource conservation? Why/ why not are they (not) practiced?
- 17. has the Trail **affected the conservation status** (if they have one) of natural resources? (eg. fuelwood, water, timber, NTFPs, plant/ animal species richness, scenic resources).
- 18. are you **aware of any need to conserve** natural and cultural resources in the area? (loss of ruralness, and degradation of natural resources)
- 19. which resources are most important to conserve? (ranking)

Land degradation

- 19. how many tourists are on the Trail every month? Is there a peak period and when?
- 20. has there been an increase in tourists since project establishment?

- a. Since the last 12 months?
- b. Do you expect an increase in next 12 months?
- 21. how many villagers use the Trail every month? For what purpose?
- 22. what affect does human use of the Trail have on the **local environment**? (e.g. carrying capacity on soil, water)
- 23. do you think there is a **maximum number of people** that the Trail can hold before degradation? Why?
- 24. has the **size of the Trail changed** since it became a ecotourism project?

Future potentials and constraints

- 24. Are there any **potential for expansion**(s) (new projects) within the project?
- 25. What are the potentials for other areas to attract visitors?
- 26. Are there any potential to kick-start new community-based projects in surrounding areas?
- 27. What part(s) of the Trail is most **popular**? (ranking)
- 28. Does the Trail have the **potential to improve local environment quality**?
- 29. Does the project have the **potential to conserve resources** that haven't been protected before?
- 30. What are the **major constraints** facing the future of the project? (Government, conservation law)
- 31. What are the future pressures on resource exploitation?
- 32. What are the future pressures from surrounding development? (roads etc.)

Project management

Involvement/ participation

- 33. Who is **involved** in the project and what **roles** do the play? (partnerships, stakeholders)
- a. What is the **purpose and achievements** of their involvement?
- 34. Who is **involved** in the project **management**?
- 35. What **positions** do they **hold** in the community?
- 36. What **educational level** does the staff have?
- 37. What **other skills** do they have?

Establishment

- 38. how was the Trust **formed**?
- 39. how are the Trust **members benefiting**?
- 40. what were the **original goals** of the initiative?
 - b. What are the goals now? If they've changed, why?

Operation/ management

- 41. how is the project being operated and managed? (Mehloding community tourism Trust)
 - c. What is the **administrative structure** for the project? (hierarchy)
 - d. What are the operating costs for the management of the project?

- e. What is the monthly/ annual turnover vs expenditure (wages, infrastructural maintenance)?
- f. Who makes the **financial decisions**?
- g. Who makes the **employment decisions**?
- h. Who decides who manages the different parts of the project?- Is it by election/vote or appointment?
- 42. is the project **self-sustaining and income generating**? (not funding dependent)

Marketing

- 43. what **marketing measures** are in place?
 - i. How? (internet, tourism expos, workshops)
 - j. Is it being marketed to domestic, regional or international tourists?
 - k. What is the project being marketed/ promoted as (e.g. community-based, ecotourism, etc).
- 44. has the project received any awards/ recognition in terms of its tourism/ community development achievements? From who?

Management impacts

- 45. what are the **primary successes and weaknesses** of the project identified to date?
- 46. Does the current management succeed/work in carrying out the project? Why? Why not?

Future sustainability

- 47. what role is there for government/external agencies/ private sector/ community groups to play in **any further endeavors** associated with the project?
- 48. what are the future plans for the project ?
- 49. what are your suggestions for the future of the project?
- 50. who can be **expected to benefit** in the future from the project?
4. Workshop outline and results

4.1 Community Participatory Workshop

10th March 07 13.00 to finish in Makomereng village

OUTLINE OF PROGRAM

1. Introduction and Outline

- Introduction of facilitators
- Introduction of participants *
- Project background and objective
- 2. What is Community? (individual)
- 3 keywords (5 min)
- Grouping keywords into themes (15 min)
- Presentation by each group ** (10 min)
- 3. What is Tourism? (individual)
- 3 keywords (5 min)
- Grouping keywords into themes (15 min)
- Presentation by each group ** (10 min)

(BREAK *)

4. Natural Resources and Environment (groups)

- Listing and identifying Natural Resources (10 min)
- Ranking of importance (Pie diagram) (10 min)
- Ranking of abundance (Venn diagram) (10 min) (BREAK)

5. Quality of Life (groups)

- What makes you happy in life (individual 5 min)
- What will make you more satisfied/happy? (individual 5 min)
- What makes the community happy? (in groups 10 min)
- What would make the community more happy? (groups 10 min)
- Community History*** (groups 30 min)
- 1 List 5 last important events ****
- 2 Arrange event on a community time line

(BREAK *)

6. Future Potentials and Constraints

- Keywords of potentials (5 min)
- Keywords of constraints (5 min)
- Grouping keywords into themes *
- Presentation by each group
- 7. Closure and thanks

* not done, ** presented by facilitator instead, *** moved to last, **** only 3 events asked for due to time constraints

Participants:

Group A

- 1. Khunjuzwa Spambo, F, 25 yrs
- 2. Nomsa Mnyameni, F, 33
- 3. Nokuphiwa (Francina) Marareni, F, 39
- 4. Ntombekhaya Mabhayi, F, 32
- 5. (late arrival) Makhosandile, M, 24
- 6. (late arrival) Zweli Marareni, M, 33

Group B

- 7. Mondli, M, 17
- 8. Siyoka, M, 17
- 9. Tshep, M, 19
- 10. Nkosindiphile, M, 18

Group C

- 11. Ngoqwina, M, 30
- 12. Lamlani, M, 26
- 13. Zengele, M, 31
- 14. Dhothi/Dloti (Mashai), M, 35

Group D

- 15. Luxolo, M, 21
- 16. Manduleli, M, 21
- 17. Mayibongwe, M, 20
- 18. Sanele, M, 18
- 19. Luyolo, M, 22

- 20. Sindi Swa, F
- 21. Nyameka, F
- 22. Nomluleki, F

Results

Exercise 2 – What is community?

- 1. People on the area living together (8)
- 2. Working together with many people in the area (1)
- 3. State for government (1)
- 4. Group for the state (1)
- 5. People who are staying in the village (4)
- 6. People who work or do things together (3)
- 7. Group of citizens (1)
- 8. Members of the community (2)
- 9. Owners of the place (1)

Exercise 3 - What is tourism?

- 1. Is the school people (3)
- 2. Move from place to another for visit (4)
- 3. Place for visiting and have fun (1)
- 4. Knowledge about the area where you live and places you visit (1)
- 5. When we are visited by people from other countries and when we experience and see more interesting things (1)
- 6. Environment (2)
- 7. Business (1)
- 8. Exploring, adventure through traveling from one place to another studying or enjoying yourself with group (1)
- 9. Place where visitors/tourists stay (1)
- 10. Work (1)
- 11. Area of attraction (1)
- 12. Place where one would love to go and learn about (1)
- 13. Protea, dames and rivers (1)
- 14. People come to OUR village to learn and have experience (3)
- 15. When one leaves his area to another area for a short period (1)

Exercise 4 - Natural Resources and Environment

A) Identify and list the resources you use from your surroundings/ area (in groups)

Group A

- 1. stones,
- 2. trees
- 3. water
- 4. sand
- 5. medicinal plants
- 6. grass
- 7. soil
- 8. animals
- 9. natural vegetables
- 10. fruit

Group B

- 1. wood,
- 2. water
- 3. medicine
- 4. food
- 5. clothes

Group C

- 1. wood
- 2. water
- 3. stone
- 4. soil
- 5. sun
- 6. rain
- 7. sand mountain

Group D

- 1. river sand
- 2. pit sand
- 3. wood
- 4. water
- 5. grass
- 6. grazing land
- 7. thatching grass
- 8. environment → wildlife, medicinal plants, caves, inititation ceremony

- 1. water
- 2. wattle
- 3. grass
- 4. soil
- 5. stones

B) Show the most important resources you use by drawing pieces of a circle

Group A

- 1. water,
- 2. soil
- 3. natural vegetables
- 4. fruit
- 5. trees
- 6. stones
- 7. grass
- 8. medicinal plants
- 9. animals
- 10. sand

Group B

- 1. food and water
- 2. medicince and wood
- 3. shelther and clothes
- 4. electricity

Group C

- 1. water
- 2. wood
- 3. grass
- 4. environment
- 5. wildlife
- 6. sand
- 7. initiation schools

Group D

- 1. water
- 2. wood
- 3. soil
- 4. rain
- 5. sand
- 6. stone
- 7. sun
- 8. mountain

- 1. water
- 2. wattle

- 3. soil
- 4. grass
- 5. stones
- C) Show the easiest resource to find by drawing the biggest circle. Show the next easiest resource to find by drawing a smaller circle.

Group A

- 1. water
- 2. soil
- 3. stone
- 4. grass
- 5. vegetables
- 6. medicinal plants
- 7. trees
- 8. sand
- 9. fruit
- 10. animals

Group B

- 1. wood
- 2. western medicine
- 3. water
- 4. food
- 5. soil
- 6. stone (?)

Group C

- 1. water and wood
- 2. sand and grass
- 3. medicinal plants and intitation schools
- 4. wildlife

Group D

- 1. water
- 2. wood
- 3. soil
- 4. rain
- 5. sand
- 6. stone
- 7. mountain
- 8. sun

- 1. water
- 2. wattle
- 3. soil
- 4. grass
- 5. stone

Exercise 5 - Quality of life

A) Individual, 3 keyword exercise (5 min)

1. What makes you happy in your life?Soccer, horse riding and musicTo rejoice, to love one other and to have a nice timeTo play football, to stay with my parents and to see myself succeeding in lifeSoccer, game and musicTo get money, if I could own a project

Money, get happy when I meet new with people Better health, to see more tourists and to work together as a community To work with people, to love someone and to believe in god To eat a lot of fruits, to jog in the morning and to find a job Playing soccer, singing and working (George Spambo) To have a good parents, to have good friends To make new friends, to achieve one of my goals, to love Need work (to find a job), to play soccer, To gather with my family, to be loved, to explore To believe in god, to have good parents to have good friend in life

2. What would make you happier in life?

To mix with people, to find a job and to have better health To meet new people, to laugh every day, not to make others fulls, to suffer for the poorest To have money, to be patient and to be humble To find a job, to attend school and to get to know people To be what I want to be, to have my parents not ill, and to learn more Money, a car and when you run a business If I can get my own house, a job and if I can learn Love, money and a girlfriend To be on the moon, realizing the potential of my children and extending my hand of help to the need in my area Money, talk with people and the meeting of friends To have happiness in my life, to succeed in life To meet on a date someone I love the most preferably my wife, to work in a descent place, to be honest to myself Kissing my girlfriend, swimming and reaching my goal

B) In Groups 5 keyword exercise (10-15 min)

1. What makes your community happy?
Group A
Youth commitment to projects and sport
Watching of movies, sports and news on the TV at our school
Cultural activities and race respecting
Seeing and meeting new people of different races
Happiness of visitors to our village

Group B:

To participate in sport activities To have the police To have the community projects To have youth To go to school

Group C:

Traditional ceremonies/feasts Sports i.e. soccer, netball and rugby Livestock and farming Plowing Crime free society

Group D:

Job creation Watching soccer Getting good things, such as water and roads Increasing birth rates (HIV/AIDS) Attending church

2. What would make your community happier?

Group A: The visit of overseas people to our village Getting information from all visitors Sustainable tourism business Respect of other peoples believes Chasing out the corruption in our government department

Group B:

If we can get electricity To have a stadium Tare roads More schools in the area (village) Street lights

Group C:

Crime free, peace and love Community gatherings, singing traditional songs and eating meat, to get cultural bier (soghum) Planting vegetables and milies Worshiping god Watching sports

Group D:

When the tourist visit us If we can get electricity Increasing of education World cup to our country To have field to play

C) Community History:

- 1 1818 → from Lesotho to South Africa (Madlangala Village) From Natal to Lesotho
- 2 1906 \rightarrow the government built the church for the community Accommodating of other villages to or lands
- 3 1976 \rightarrow apartheid is Sowetho, many were killed by booms but now we live in democracy
- 4 $27/04/1989 \rightarrow$ Nelson Mandela was released
- 5 $27/04/1994 \rightarrow$ the first time ever black people to vote The first black president was introduced
- 1 April 2004 \rightarrow introduced our first woman chief

Exercise 6 - Future Potentials and Constraints

What will keep the tourism project going on?

- 1. The community to protect & keep the project (crime free)
- 2. The community to know the exact meaning of the tourism project
- 3. Tourists to invest in the project by coming time and again

- 4. To have more community
- 5. To have the road
- 6. To keep the tourists happy
- 7. Respecting tourists
- 8. Maintaining our guesthouse
- 9. Cleaning our community houses

What will stop the tourism project going on?

- 1. Killing tourists
- 2. Community vandalizing the good (valuable) things of the project
- 3. When tourist point that its not attractive
- 4. Crime
- 5. lack of electricity
- 6. Disorder
- 7. To steel, swear and hurt tourists
- 8. Poor management
- 9. community isolation to tourism activities and benefits

4.2 School Workshop

School workshop at Nkhupulweni in Makomereng village, 6th of March 2007

Two workshops were held in grade 8 and 9, ages ranging from 14-21.

Two different introductions were given in order to see difference in response. Grade 8: facilitator presented herself and gave short introduction to the outline of program and objectives of the workshop.

Grade 9: Facilitators presented themselves but gave no information about their background. No introduction to program.

OUTLINE OF PROGRAM

Introduction of facilitators

Introduction and Outline

1. Keyword exercise 1: tourism (5-10 min)

Presentation of identified keywords by facilitator and students

Keyword exercise 2: environment (5-10 min)

Presentation of identified keywords by facilitator and students

Keyword exercise 3: chalet (5-10 min)

Presentation of identified keywords by facilitator and students

Break 15 min

Keyword exercise 4: natural resources. (5-10 min)

Presentation of identified keywords by facilitator and students

Exercise 5: Map drawing: What would you show tourists if you were a guide?

Break during exercise.

Presentation of drawing by each group.

Finalising session, general talk about environment and tourist, closure and thanks

Results

TOURISM:

- 1 Mountain (3)
- 2 Place where travelers arrive/stay (1)
- 3 Place to visit (6)
- 4 Ukhahlamba (Drakensberg)
- 5 Place at mountains where visitors live (1)
- 6 Industry that travel away from home (3)
- 7 Tourists (2)
- 8 People who visit (1)
- 9 Visitors from Durban or Pietermaritzburg (1)
- 10 Education for visitors and near mountains (1)
- 11 Place in mountains, visitors from JHB & PMB (1)
- 12 Where important people stay during tour (1)
- 13 Place for tourists (1)

ENVIRONMENT:

- 1 Province of Eastern Cape (1)
- 2 Madlangala (1)
- 3 Village (2)
- 4 Place (7)
- 5 Area (1)
- 6 Home (1)
- 7 Mabua (2)
- 8 Place where you live (10)
- 9 Place near mountains (1)

CHALET:

- 1 Tourism education of people (4)
- 2 Place of visitors (1)
- 3 Place of project (1)
- 4 Farming (1)
- 5 Place where people come from from DBN & CT (2)
- 6 Name of townships (1)
- 7 Hotel (10)
- 8 Hostel (3)
- 9 Travel to DBN & CT (1)
- 10 Hotel of farming (1)
- 11 Durban hotel (1)
- 12 Hotel in Ukuhlamba (1)

NATURAL RESOUCES:

- **1** Found in Nature without having to produce them (16)
- 2 Raw materials (1)
- 3 Things provided by God (2)

Examples given: Land, water, minerals, forest, plants, animals, grass, stone, trees, air and soil

Group Presentation of Maps (What would you show a tourists if you were a guide?)

GROUP 1:

- 1 Mountains, wild animals, water from mountains
- 2 Schools and learners so that they can see that learning does not take place here
- 3 River tourists can swim and drink water
- 4 Church show tourists that they believe in God too so tourists can join them

GROUP 2:

- 1 Mountains (3 sisters) there are no mountains where the tourists come from
- 2 Snakes we have different types of snakes
- 3 Poultry projects maybe they use a different system of poultry projects in their country
- 4 Church different from the ones that tourists have
- 5 School & teachers show tourists the type of education they get and what subjects they do
- 6 Cows other countries don't have cows
- 7 Tourism where tourists stay
- 8 Soldiers security

GROUP 3:

- 1 Mountains show tourists plants that grow only on the mountains
- 2 Church to show that they have churches, not just in urban areas
- **3** Tourism where they are welcomed
- 4 Shop where tourists can buy food
- 5 School to get knowledge from school childrens and learn from them
- 6 River tourists can enjoy sound of river
- 7 Trees maybe they don't have tress where they come from

GROUP 4:

- 1 Proteas only found on mountains
- 2 School also education in rural areas
- 3 Playground to show that they also paly soccer
- 4 Church also believe in God
- 5 Tourism where they sleep
- 6 Car they have other forms of transport
- 7 Trees shade
- 8 Shop tourists can buy what they need (sweets, bread)
- 9 School education here as well

GROUP 5:

- 1 Mountains herbs, baboons, cattle posts
- 2 Birds sing nicely
- 3 Tourism where tourists sleep
- 4 Church- if tourists want to attend churches
- 5 Piggery projects tourists have never seen pigs
- 6 Shop to buy anything
- 7 Trees- show tourists that trees are important for shade and wood
- 8 School learners can learn from tourists
- 9 Toilets for tourists to use, shouldn't use open space
- 10 Playground show they also do sports, soccer
- 11 Solar panel show they have TV, light
- 12 Pre-school show tourist that education starts young

5. Project Establishment

In 1998, an integrated development plan (IDP) developed by South Africa's National Department of Local Government and Housing identified tourism as one of the economic sectors to spearhead eradication of poverty in previously disadvantaged communities. The IDP resulted in a new concept of establishing a village-to-village trail (Operation manager, pers. comm., 21/02/07). In order to get the project running, a handful of organizations national as well as international bodies have been involved. The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) financially supported the local NGO, Environment and Development Agency (EDA) in initiating the project. A steering committee, comprising different local stakeholders, was formed as a result of a tourism awareness day commenced by the EDA and the Eastern Cape Tourism Board in 1999 and the local tourism institution, the Ukhalamba Tourism Association (UTA) was formed in 2000 from the steering committee (Ndlovu and Rogerson, 2003). UTA started an extensive awareness raising process, explaining and clarifying the tourism concept and mission of UTA to over 50 local villages in the area. This led to the formation of 8 Community Tourism Organisations (CTO's) (Operation manager, pers. comm., 21/02/07: Ndlovu and Rogerson, 2003).

In March 2001, Mehloding Adventure Trail was established with funding from the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT), Alfred Nzo District Municipality and Department of Provincial and Local Government (Operation manager (MAD document), pers. comm., 21/02/07). Mehloding Community Tourism Trust (MCTT) was formed in 2002 as a legal entity, owner and manager of the Mehloding Adventure trail (see 3.1). 5 of 8 CTO's involved are in the project (Trotter, undated). The 5 CTO's cover 25 villages of different sizes and hold a stakeholder position because of their geographical position relative to the trail but only 5 villages are directly involved. (Operation manager, pers. comm., 21/02/07: Ndlovu and Rogerson, 2003: ERS, 2004).

Partnerships exist with a New Zealand NGO, Volunteer Service Abroad (VSA), Environmental and Rural Solutions (ERS) and Fair Trade in Tourism South Africa (FTTSA) (Operation manager, pers. comm., 21/02/07).

VSA is with the experience of a Tourism Practitioner assisting the Trust (MCTT) in business related matters and practical skill training. The VSA volunteer has helped to develop an efficient booking system (Makaula, 2007a).

Fair Trade in Tourism South Africa (FTTSA) has assisted in the advertising, marketing, and certified the project as a responsible tourism (Makaula, 2007a).

In 2002 ERS which is an independent consultancy firm was appointed by DEAT to assist with administrative and financial management. DEAT required an environmental management plan (EMP) for the project in order to grant authorization for it to proceed (Trotter, undated: ERS, 2004).

6. Background on current status of natural resources in South Africa

WATER

Water resources are mainly derived from surface water , where almost 40% of rivers are seasonal, and ground water, which accounts for 15% of the water used in South Africa (Hoffman and Ashwell, 2001). Both of these resources are also relatively limited compared to world standards (DEAT, 1999). Currently each South African receives 1200 kL a year, but historically access to water has been unequal disadvantaging black South Africans, and divided also along lines of class and gender (Hallowes, 2002). Previous legacies of maldistribution, pollution, structural damage to water ecosystems and substandard sanitation were left behind after the apartheid era, not to mention a great lack of management capacity government (DEAT, 1996, 1999). As a previously disadvantaged area, the majority of the Eastern Cape province would not have had the full access to and productive use of water under apartheid as the needs of the apartheid state were serviced by the Department of Water Affairs before the needs of the black majority (DWAF, 1997).

Currently, already 11 of the 19 catchment areas have not enough water to meet demand (Gerardy, 2002). Surface run-off is highly variable within the province, more so than rainfall itself, and therefore annual and seasonal variability of run-off dramatically affect water resource estimates for an area (Middleton and Lorentz, 1988 in Lent *et al*, 2000). Around 50% of water use in Eastern Cape is used on irrigation, 27% on urban use, 10% on rural use and remaining on afforestation (Gerardy, 2002). However, similar to the Ciskei homeland, agriculture seems to be declining in importance in the area, particularly amongst the younger generations, which could be due to increased dependence on state grants and pensions or urban migration (Bryndum, pers. comm.,30th march 07; Ainslie *et al.* 1997 in Lent *et al*, 2000). This does not mean that water use is decreasing however, as results from Pepela show that tap water is occasionally used to irrigate homegardens, though this is not confirmed in Makomereng (Bryndum, pers. comm., 30th March 07). Several Makomereng farmers have also been supplied with drip irrigation systems from the MCTT.

WOOD

The vegetation in the Mehloding Trail area is dominated by the grasslands which vary from highveld in

the lower lying areas to montane grassland (typically over 1650m altitude). The montane grasslands area is also home to two species of Protea, *P. roupelliae* and *P. caffra*, which are both protected species, as well as a high diversity of other species. Few pockets of afro-montane forest exist also in protected ravines, but mostly tree growth is restructured by dry frosty winters and frequent fires (ERS, 2004).

LAND

Communal tenure in the Transkei (and Ciskei) was modified as land became scarce. Land allocations became subject to restrictions and differed according to gender and class, and increasingly control over allocation was transferred from the hands of the community to the state (Lent *et al*, 2000). As a result of this, the land under the Trail and chalets is state-owned. Nevertheless, Mehloding Community Tourism Trust members now operate the land on behalf of the rural communities under a lease, until legal provision are made for granting of title to the Trust (Masibambane, undated). Currently the communal land is held under a system known as "permission to occupy" or PTO. A PTO has been issued in terms of the Development Trust and Land Act 18 1936 and the Proclamation 26 of 1936. The Act and Proclamation give rights to an individual to occupy a specified or unspecified piece of land for a specific purpose, attaching certain terms and conditions to occupation. These PTOs now fall under the competency of the National Dept of Land Affairs (DLA). Interim protection of communal land is afforded through Informal Land Rights Act NO. 31 of 1996 protects the existing rights of rural communities and requires that their permission be sought and granted if any of their existing rights are to be changed or taken away (Masibambane, undated).

SOIL

Eastern Cape soils are limited by low infiltration rates, soil compaction, phosphorus deficiency, shallow to moderate depth, and acidity (in the eastern regions) (Lent *et al*, 2000). Along the Trail, soils are highly weathered and the combination of steep topography and poor management results in high vulnerability to soil erosion. Lack of organic matter coupled with frequent burning causes soil to become easily detached and washed down during summer months. Similarly, low infiltration causes large amounts of surface run off, compounding to the problem of gullying in the area (ERS, 2004). The low nutrient character of the soil also reduces potential for it to be used for other land uses.

7. Final Synopsis

The Mehloding Adventure Trail: a community-based approach?



(source: http://www.mehloding.co.za/trailinfo.htm)

Faculty of Life Sciences, Copenhagen University 22 February 2007

Sustainable Land Use and Natural Resource Management Thematic Course: Interdisciplinary Land Use and Natural Resource Management

Composed by:

Haneen Ghazawneh Lisa M.D. Jørgensen Arafa A. Khatib Riyong Kim

Supervisors:

Torben Birch-Thomsen Andreas de Neergaard

List of contents

1. Background	3
1.1 The Mehloding Adventure Trail – a case study	4
2. Objective	6
2.1 The Research Question	7
3. Methodology	8
3.1 Sampling strategies	8
3.2 Methods	9
3.3 Triangulation	10
4. Time schedule	11
5. Bibliography	12
Appendix A	14
Appendix B	16

1. Background

Ecotourism destinations have increased rapidly in the last two decades and it is now one of the world's biggest industries (Page & Dowling, 2002). Ecotourism is a term which has just come into use in the late 1980s but a concept originating in the 1970s, and is still largely debated by scholars. The definitions lie within a continuum of paradigms which range from "all tourism is ecotourism" to "ecotourism impossible". In other words, ranging from a view where human behaviour is considered as natural and therefore have low responsibility to other living organisms to where all tourism will have negative impacts on the natural environment (Orams, 1995). One definition among many defines ecotourism as:

... environmentally responsible, enlightening travel and visitation to relatively undisturbed natural areas in order to enjoy and appreciate nature (and any accompanying cultural features both past and present) that promotes conservation, has low visitor impact, and provides for beneficially active socio-economic involvement of local population.

(Ceballos-Lascurain, 1996 in Scheyvens, 1999, p. 245).

Due to the wide variety of definitions available and surrounding debates, a detailed discussion of ecotourism definition will be conducted in the report.

The concept of sustainability in tourism development projects has gained increased significance as a result of the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 (Yunis, 2003). In connection to this, Scheyvens (1999) puts forward discussions concerning whether or not ecotourism is problematic:

...some writers emphasise the potential for ecotourism to promote the well being of both local peoples and their environment...[while] others caution us from uncritically accepting ecotourism as a common good. (Scheyvens, 1999, p. 245).

In other words, there is a growing concern that "ecotourism" is used as a marketing tool and that it is promoted despite local protests. In some cases, ecotourism initiatives have even eroded the customs and self-esteem of the local communities, resulting in psychological disempowerment, which occurred for the Yagua Indians of the Peruvian and Columbian Amazon (Scheyvens, 1999). It is argued that the root of the problem is the lack of sufficient focus on socio-cultural factors within the community, as well as lack of attention to issues surrounding management and implementation of ecotourism projects around the world (Page & Dowling, 2002; Tsaur *et al*, 2006; Scheyvens, 1999). As a result of this, ecotourism has been subject to academic debate over the last three decades and more attention has been given to the

different approaches taken in ecotourism.

Community-based ecotourism is one approach to ecotourism that "*recognises the need to promote both the quality of life of people and the conservation of resources*" (Scheyvens, 1999, p. 246). Some of the main foundations of the community-based approach is: 1) being run with the involvement and consent of local communities, 2) involving communities rather than individuals, 3) respect for traditional culture and social structures, and 4) minimising cultural and environmental impacts (Page and Dowling, 2002). Again, the definition of community-based ecotourism is highly contested, and this will be debated further in the report.

In the context of South Africa, community based tourism has received strong support from the post-apartheid governments as a part of their rural development strategy. For this reason, small community led initiatives have been growing in the post-apartheid era (Ndlovu and Rogerson, 2003). One example is the Mehloding Adventure Trail in Eastern Cape Province in South Africa, which is the case study in this report. This example of community-based ecotourism tries to achieve its goals by making tourism a community initiative by building on foundations of participation and empowerment (Scheyvens, 1999; Ndlovu and Rogerson, 2003). This means that it is only considered 'successful' if the local community are participating and have some measure of control over it.

1.1 The Mehloding Adventure Trail – a case study

The Mehloding Adventure Trail is located in the southern foothills of the Drakensberg (Ukhalamba) mountain range, on the borders of Eastern Cape and KwaZulu Natal provinces and the South African-Lesotho boundary (see Figure 1). The average altitude is 1,600m asl. The area comprises of mainly Xhosa and Sotho speaking people, and traditional social structures and practices, such as male circumcision and customary marriages, are highly regarded (Ndlovu and Rogerson, 2003).

The trail was established as means to promote local economic development through job creation for the people in the area, and to preserve the local environment and biodiversity. The trail was officially opened in October 2003 and is run by the Mehloding Community Tourism Trust. The trail involves around 25 villages including the villages Mafaisa and Makomereng, which will comprise our study site.



Figure 1. The Mehloding Adventure Trail, Eastern Cape, South Africa (Ndlovu and Rogerson, 2003).

In any analysis of community projects in South Africa, it is important to keep the political history of South Africa in mind. The former apartheid rule has had a strong impact on the worldview and the livelihoods of people that live in South Africa today. Large social cleavages still exist and are still closely connected to the ethnic cleavages, as it is the black rural communities that carry the legacy of restricted access to land and markets under apartheid. Consequently, any analysis of the sustainability of a community-based ecotourism program should take into consideration the different hidden cultural codes, structures, discourses and the political development of South Africa (Bratton, 2005; Geertz 1999; May, 2000; Kopstein and Lichbach, 2005).

The Mehloding project area is a former homeland and is one of the poorest regions in South Africa. Unemployment is around 60% and the majority of communities live in poverty (May, 2000). Multiple livelihood strategies are a characteristic amongst the poor households. In other words they do not only rely on one livelihood strategy such as agriculture but combine several strategies including home gardens, fuel-wood collection, non-timber forest product collection, and other community-projects

(May 2000; Ntshona, 2002). Thus, it is important to study the Mehloding Adventure Trail ecotourism project in Eastern Cape in relation to the other livelihood strategies of the household and communities involved.

In the light of the growing popularity and endorsement for community-based initiatives in South Africa and other parts of the world, it is important to look at the integrity of community-based projects like Mehloding Adventure Trail. The purpose of this study is therefore to assess the degree to which the community-based approach has been implemented and what impacts this has had on the local communities involved.

2. Objective

The purpose of the Mehloding Adventure Trail project is to create jobs and to protect the local environment through a community-based approach (Impumelelo Innovations Award Trust, 2007). The objective of the study is to explore if the proclaimed "community-based approach" is applied, and to investigate the project's socio-economic and environmental impacts on the local community. Furthermore, the study will evaluate the future challenges and potentials of the project.

This will be done through using the following framework shown in Figure 2. The framework encompasses four different components of the community-based approach adapted from Scheyvens (1999). The first, project management, as mentioned above is an important part of the success of community-based initiatives, and is therefore necessary to examine. The second component, quality of life, addresses the socio-economic and cultural aspects within the community that forms one pillar of the community-based ecotourism paradigm described by Scheyvens (1999). The third component, environment, addresses conservation and protection of natural resources and forms the other pillar of the community-based ecotourism paradigm. The fourth component, sustainability, will combine the results of these three components to evaluate future potentials and constraints of the project. This framework will be further elaborated and discussed in the report.

Figure 2. Framework of analysis for community-based ecotourism

2.1 The Research Question

To what extent has **community-based ecotourism** been achieved in Mehloding adventure trail?

Sub-questions

- 1. How is the project managed? in terms of:
 - Who is involved in the management of the project?
 - What are the administrative and operating costs of the project?
 - How are decisions made by the project management?
 - How does the project management affect project implementation?
- 2. What is the impact on quality of life? in terms of:
 - What are the economic gains and the distribution of gains?
 - What job opportunities have been and will be created?
 - To what extent is the project providing education/ capacity building?
 - To what extent has the project affected culture and tradition?
 - Who has access to benefits (jobs, education)? And does this differ by gender, age and social status?
- 3. What is the impact on the environment? in terms of:
 - What is the current status of natural resources and trends in uses of natural resources?
 - Who has access to resources?
 - What are the projects impacts on biodiversity such as medicinal plants, ecosystem integrity?
 - To what extend does ecotourism degrade local resource such as water, waste and land?
- 4. How do 1, 2 and 3 affect the project sustainability?
 - What future potentials and constraints does the project face?

3. Methodology

The problems with evaluating ecotourism lie in the difficulty of quantifying many of the aspects of associated with sustainable ecotourism (Tsaur *et al*, 2006). As a result, a qualitative methodology will be the primary means of data collection in this study (this argument will be elaborated in the report).

3.1 Sampling strategies

The study site Makomereng and Mafaisa have about 100 households each. Since most of the information needed is qualitative, a snowball sampling strategy will be adopted for both villages. The final number of participants for the workshop and questionnaires will be determined in the field. This is because exact numbers and identities of participants in the project still remain unclear.

3.2 Methods

A variety of methods will be used to collect key information from respondents (see Appendix A). These include:

a. Literature review

Articles, reports, books, websites etc. will be reviewed in order to give background information and at the same time giving some source of verification.

b. Participatory workshop

A participatory workshop will be held, in order to get opinions and views of the local community on several key concepts such as 'community', 'ecotourism', and 'sustainability'. This workshop will be appropriate to give a general introduction to the study, whilst giving over control to the participants to determine their own indicators of success. The workshop will be a forum for building trust and establishing dialogue with the local community, and will involve villagers participating and not participating in the project as well as local authorities and managers of the project.

c. Focus group discussion

Villagers will be divided according to age and gender to discuss issues such as impact of culture, and project management to more depth.

d. Questionnaire

Both villagers participating and villagers not participating in the project will be selected as respondents. Questionnaires allow analysis of trends and are useful in creating general overview of household and income data. To ensure the questions are understood correctly, a pilot test will be conducted.

e. Semi-structured interview

This method will provide more qualitative data from respondents and give room for flexibility during an interview to delve into relevant issues. Semi-structured interviews will be done with key informants.

f. Field walk and observation

A field walk with key informants will help give a general picture of the area and the current status of the natural environment. The walk will also provide an opportunity to visit and interview the neighbouring village, Mafaisa.

g. Informal talks

Informal talks will take place at any given time with the selected sources. This provides a casual environment in which to gain background information on the study area.

3.3 Triangulation

The different methods which will be applied are should help to answer different questions. Some overlaps in the answers are not unlikely but some of these overlaps will help determine the accuracy of

the statements given by the different stakeholders. These include:

Key informants:

- 1 EDA Trust responsible for implementing the project
- 2 GEM (Group for Environmental Monitoring)
- 3 Villagers participating in project
- 4 DEAT (Department for Environmental Affairs and Tourism)
- 5 Trail Guide
- 6 Chief, local authority in village
- 7 UTA Ukhlamba Tourism Association, a Community Tourism Organisation owning project assets

Other information sources:

- 8 Eastern Cape Tourism Board
- 9 Villagers not participating in project
- 10 Local School Teachers
- 11 Chalet owners
- 12 Tourists

By triangulating the different results/data the quality of the information will be enhanced.

4. Time schedule

Each night will involve several hours of group review and reflection on the data gathered by each sub-group. Group SE refers to the 3 person group looking at the socio-economic issues addressed by Research Question 2. This group will comprise an economist, a socio-cultural scientist, and a geographer. Group ENV refers to the 3 person group looking at the environmental issues addressed by Research Question 3, and also the Project Management issues addressed in Research Question 1. This group will comprise a biologist, an environmental scientist, and a geographer. Below is the schedule for group work in the field. A full schedule can be seen in Appendix B.

26 Feb	27 Feb	28 Feb	1 Mar
Leave for Pietermartizburg	Group work with PMB	Group work with PMB	Group work with PMB
-	counterparts	counterparts	counterparts
	- field preparation	- field preparation	- field preparation
	- developing methods	 developing methods 	 developing methods
2Mar	3 Mar	4 Mar	5 Mar
Leave for villages	Whole group:	Group SE:	Group SE:
	Observation and prepare for	Interview with school teachers,	Interview with EDA and
	workshop	and medicine men	Tourism Dept
	Informal Interview with Chief in	Group ENV:	
	Makomereng and Mabua	Interview with chief	Group ENV:
			Interview with guide
6 Mar	7 Mar	8 Mar	9 Mar
Participatory Workshop	Group SE:	Whole group:	
Matrix ranking	Questionnaires - villagers (not)	Trail walk	Trail walk (return)
	involved	Guide talk, observation,	Observation, informal talks
		informal interview with	with other villagers
	Group ENV:	chalet-owners, talks with	
	Interview with EDA	tourists and with other villagers	
10 Mar	11 Mar	12 Mar	13 Mar
Group SE:	Whole group:	BUFFER DAY	
Focus Group Discussion with	Questionnaires - villagers (not)		Leave village for
elders and youth	involved		Pietermaritzburg
	Interviews with villagers NOT		
Group ENV:	involved		
Focus Group Discussion with			
Villagers involved			
14 Mar	15 Mar	16 Mar	
Group work for presentation of	Group work for presentation of	Group work for presentation of	
initial results	initial results	initial results	
		Presentation	

5. Bibliography

- 13 Aylward, B. and Lutz, E. (2003) *Nature tourism, conservation, and development in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.* Washington, USA: World Bank. 2003; xxii + 475 pp.
- 14 Bratton, M. (2005) South Africa. In: Comparative Politics. Interests, Identities, and Institutions in a Changing Gobal Order. Ed. Kostein, Jeffrey & Lichbach, Mark, Cambridge Univercity Press, Cambridge, pp.433-465
- Buckley, R. (2003) *The Practice and Politics of Tourism and Land Management*. In Buckley, R.,
 Pickering, C. & Weaver, D.B. (eds.) *Nature-Based: Tourism, environment and land Management*.
 CABI Publishing, Wallingford, pp. 1-7
- 16 Dovie, D. B. K., Shackleton, C.M & Witkowski, E. T. F. (2002) Accessing natural resources: implications for sustainable management and livelihoods. In: Benjaminsen, T. A., Cousins, B. & Thompson, L. (eds.) Contested resources: challenges to the governance of natural resources in Southern Africa Papers from the International Symposium, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa, 18-20 October-2000; pp. 336-345
- 17 Geertz, C. (1999) Thick description: toward an interpretive theory of culture. *The Sociology of Knowledge*. Vol. 2, pp. 375-402.
- 22 Fennell, D. A. (2003) Ecotourism in the South African context. Africa-Insight. 33(1/2): 3-8
- Kok, S., Martinsen, L., Schmidt, K. (2001) *Ecotourism Development in Madlangala*. SLUSE
 ILUNRM Course Report, South Africa. 17th December 2001.
- 24 Kopstein, J., and Lichbach, M. (2005) *Comparative Politics: Interests, Identities, and Institutions in a Changing Global Order*. Cambridge University Press.
- 25 May, J. (2000) *The structure and composition of rural poverty and livelihoods*. In: Cousins, B. (ed.) *At the Crossroads: Land and agrarian reform in South Africa in to the 21 century*, pp. 21-33
- 26 Nek, E., Hill, T & Binns, T. (1997) Development from below in the 'New' South Africa: the case of Hertzog, Eastern Cape. *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 163, No. 1, pp. 57-64
- 27 Ndlovu, N & Rogerson, C. (2003) Rural local economic development through Community-based tourism. The Mehloding hiking and horse trail, Eastern Cape, South Africa. *Africa Insight*, Vol. 33, No. 1/2, pp. 124-129.
- 28 Ntshona, Z. (2002) The contributions of communal rangelands to rural livelihoods in the Maluti

district: Valuation of fuelwood. In: Benjaminsen, T. A., Cousins, B. & Thompson, L. (eds) *Contested resources: challenges to the governance of natural resources in Southern Africa Papers from the International Symposium, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa, 18-20 October-2000*; pp. 317-327.

- 29 Orams, M. B. (1995) Towards a more desirable form of ecotourism. *Tourism Management*. Vol 16, No. 1, pp.3-8.
- 30 Page, S. J., & Dowling, R. K. (2002) Ecotourism. Pearson Education Limitie, Harlow.
- 31 Pickering C., and Weaver, D.B., (2003) Chapter 2, Nature-based tourism and sustainability: Issues and approaches. In: Buckley, R., Pickering, C. & Weaver, D.B (eds.) Nature-Based: Tourism, environment and land Management. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, pp. 11-17
- 32 Preston-Whyte, R.A., and Watson, H.K. (2005) Nature Tourism and Climatic Change in Southern Africa. In: Hall, C.M., and Higham, J. (eds.) Tourism, Recreation and Climatic Change, Aspects to Tourism Series, No. 22., Channel View Publications, Clevedon, Chapter 8, pp. 130-142.
- 33 Ross, S., and Wall, G. 1999. Ecotourism: towards congruence between theory and practice. *Tourism Management* 20, pp 123-132.
- 34 Scheyvens, R. (1999) Ecotourism and the empowerment of local communities. *Tourism Management* 20, pp. 245-249.
- 35 Spenceley, A (2005) Nature-based tourism and environmental sustainability in South Africa. *Journal-of-Sustainable-Tourism.* 13(2): 136-170
- 36 Tsaur, S.H., Lin, Y.C. & Lin, J.H. (2006): Evaluating ecotourism sustainability from the integrated perspective of resource, community and tourism. *Tourism Management*, 37, pp. 640-653.
- Yunis, E. (2003) Sustainable Tourism: World Trends and Challenges Ahead. In: Buckley, R.,
 Pickering, C. & Weaver, D.B (eds.) *Nature-Based: Tourism, Environment and Land Management*.
 CABI Publishing, Wallingford, pp. 11-17.
- 38 Weaver, D. (2001): Ecotourism. John Wiley & Sons Australia, Sydney.

Appendix A

Methods and sources used

Key information to be	Sources	Methods
collected:	Concerning to the	I to an in
What is a community?	Secondary data	Lit. review
XX71 / · · · · 1 1	Villagers	Participatory workshop
What is community-based	Secondary data	Lit. review
ecotourism?		Interview
	Villagers	Participatory workshop
What is ecotourism?	Secondary data	Lit. review
	Villagers	Participatory workshop
What is quality of life?	Secondary data	Lit. review
	Villagers	Participatory workshop
Who is involved in project	Key informants (UTA, chief,	Semi-structured interviews
management?	EDA)	Informal talks
	Villagers involved	
	Secondary data	Annual reports, project
		papers
Administrative and operating	Secondary data	Annual reports, financial
costs of the project		records
	EDA, UTA	Interview
Decision making	Key informants (UTA, chief,	Semi-structured interviews
arrangements	EDA)	Informal talks
	Villagers involved	
	Secondary data	Annual reports, project
		papers
Influence of management on	Key informants (UTA, chief,	Semi-structured interviews
project implementation	EDA)	Informal talks
	Villagers involved	Focus group discussion
	Villagers not involved	
	Secondary data	Annual reports, papers
Who is involved in the project-	Key-informants (Chalet	Semi-structred interview
and why?	owners, guides, chief, EDA,	
	UTA)	Questionnaire
	Villagers involved	
	Villagers not involved	Interview
Income generation	Secondary data	Annual reports
	EDA	Interview
	Villagers involved	Questionnaire
Job creation	Secondary data	Annual reports

	1	
	EDA	Interview
	Villagers involved	Questionnaire
Distribution of benefits	Key-informants (EDA, Chief)	Interview
	Villagers	
	Villagers	Participatory workshop
		Matrix ranking
Access to education/ Capacity	Key-informants (guide, school	Interview
building	teachers)	Field walk (with guide)
8	EDA	Interview
Impact on culture	Key-informants (Chief and	Semi-structured interview
impact on culture	local authorities Tourism	
	Board FDA)	Focus group discussion
	Villagers	rocus group discussion
	Flders Youth	
Current status of natural	Enders, Found	Interview
resources	Secondary data (DEAT)	Reports
resources	Guide	Field welk
	Group	Observation
Trands in uses of natural	EDA	Interview
	EDA Secondami data (DEAT)	Demonto
resources	Secondary data (DEAT)	E ald malle
<u>W/1 - 1</u>		
Who has access to resources?	Key-informants (EDA, guide,	Interview
	chief)	
	Villagers	Participatory workshop
Project impacts on	EDA	Interview
biodiversity	Secondary data (DEAT)	Reports
	Guide	Field walk
Project impacts on Resource	EDA	Interview
conservation	Secondary data (DEAT)	Reports
	Guide	Field walk
Impact on land degradation	EDA	Interview
	Secondary data (DEAT)	Reports
	Guide	Field walk
Future potentials and	Group	Analysis and observation
constraints	EDA, UTA	Interviews
	Villagers	Participatory workshop

Appendix B

Group work schedule

Week	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
1: 5-11 Feb	Group formation	Problem analysis and research question development	Literature review and search	Reference presentation - development of research question	Group work - identify key questions - share refs to be read	Literature search
2: 12-18 Feb	group work - share reviews	group work - id research question and key info	group work - identify methods	Group work - finalise draft synopsis	Group work - finalise synopsis - prepare presentation 16.00 draft synopsis due	Literature search
3: 19-25 Feb	Synopsis draft presentation	Group work -reviewing final synopsis	Group work -reviewing final synopsis	12.00 Final synopsis due	Arrive in Durban	Durban
4: 26-4 Mar	Leave for Pietermartizburg	Group work with PMB counterparts - field preparation - developing methods	Group work with PMB counterparts - field preparation - developing methods	Group work with PMB counterparts - field preparation - developing methods	Leave for villages	Whole gro Observati for worksh Informal II Chief in M and Mabu
5: 5-11 Mar	<u>Group SE:</u> Interview with EDA and Tourism Dept <u>Group ENV:</u> Interview with guide	Participatory Workshop <i>Matrix ranking</i>	<u>Group SE:</u> Questionnaires - villagers (not) involved <u>Group ENV:</u> Interview with EDA	Whole group: Trail walk Guide talk, observation, informal interview with chalet-owners, talks with tourists and with other villagers	Trail walk (return) Observation, informal talks with other villagers	Group SE Focus Gro with elder Group EN Focus Gro with Villag
6: 12-18 Mar	BUFFER DAY	Leave village for Pietermaritzburg	Group work for presentation of initial results	Group work for presentation of initial results	Group work for presentation of initial results Presentation	safari
7: 19-25 Mar	Arrive copenhagen	Results and Analysis write up	Results and Analysis write up	Supervision class Results and Analysis write up	Results and Analysis write up	Results ar write up
8: 26-1 Apr	Results and Analysis write up	Discussion and Analysis write up	Discussion and Analysis write up	Discussion and Analysis write up	Discussion and Analysis write up	Discussion write up

9: 2-8 Apr	Discussion and Analysis write up	Final Report write up	Final Repo write up			
10: 9-15 Apr	Final Report write up	16.00 Report due	Exam preparation	Exam preparation	Exam preparation	Exam prep
11: 16-22 Apr	Exam preparation	Exam preparation	Exam preparation	SLUSE EXAM		