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Executive summary

Kiangan, a small village in the northern part of the Philippines, was recently elected as pilot study for the government’s new homestay programme. The Kiangan Homestay Association (KIHA) is hence presented as leading authority to numerous other communities. Due to this position, and as no preceding research has been conducted on the impact of homestay initiatives in the Philippines, the analysis of the KIHA deems highly interesting and timely. This dissertation focuses on the influences the KIHA exerts on the local community and its individual households. Research evaluates whether homestays can be considered as tools for sustainable tourism development from participants’ point of view. Furthermore, the most prominent objectives of homestay initiatives – revenue creation and enhanced development – are examined.

A qualitative research methodology was applied to obtain a better and deeper understanding of the homestay project in Kiangan. Thorough analysis revealed ambiguous results concerning the impact of this initiative on the local community. Both positive and negative aspects were found, considering both economic, environmental and social facets. To account homestays as a tool for sustainable tourism development, this ambiguousness needs to be alternated towards the beneficial side as much as possible.

Recommendations are formulated to increase the sustainability of the KIHA. Gradual development is deemed crucial for the sustainable growth of Kiangan’s tourism industry. Currently the influx of visitors is limited, but as Kiangan is gradually increasing its efforts to become one of the tourism hotspots in the area, the safeguarding of the sustainability of this growth is quintessential. The KIHA needs to set out a thorough planning in assistance with the municipal government. Moreover, internal agreements among the KIHA-members need to be set out to guarantee an optimal functioning. Distinct policy guidelines are highly important. Furthermore, important questions need to be addressed, such as whether the KIHA is a cornerstone in Kiangan’s sustainable tourism development or only a temporary solution until the arrival of private investors. Acknowledging these recommendations, the KIHA is considered an interesting source of income and development for the community, as revenue creating activities in Kiangan are highly limited.
Samenvatting

Kiangan, een klein dorp in het noorden van de Filipijnen, was recent geselecteerd als pilootproject voor het nieuwe homestay programma van de nationale overheid. De ‘Kiangan Homestay Association’ (KIHA) wordt aldus als toonaangevend beschouwd voor talloze gelijkaardige projecten. Door deze positie, en aangezien tot op heden geen onderzoek werd gevoerd naar de impact van homestay initiatieven in de Filippijnen, is de analyse van de KIHA interessant en actueel. Deze thesis focust op de invloed die de KIHA uitoefent op de lokale bevolking en individuele huishoudens. Onderzoek gaat na of homestays – vanuit het standpunt van de participanten – leiden tot een duurzame ontwikkeling van de toerisme sector. Bovendien worden de voornaamste doelstellingen van homestay initiatieven, winstcreatie en het stimuleren van ontwikkeling, onderzocht.


Aanbevelingen worden geformuleerd om de duurzaamheid van de KIHA te verhogen. Graduele ontwikkelingen zijn essentieel om een duurzame groei van de toerisme sector in Kiangan te vrijwaren. Momenteel is de instroom van toeristen beperkt, maar Kiangan drijft zijn inspanning gestaag op om de toeristische trekpleister van de omgeving te worden. Het beogen van een duurzame groei is aldus essentieel. Een sterk uitgewerkte planning met duidelijke beleidslijnen is hierbij noodzakelijk. Bovendien zijn interne afspraken noodzakelijk om een optimale werking van het KIHA te garanderen. Voorts moeten enkele belangrijke vragen beantwoord worden, zoals of de KIHA een hoeksteen is van de duurzame toerisme ontwikkelingen in Kiangan, of enkel een tijdelijke oplossing vormt tot de komst van private investeerders. Rekening houdende met deze aanbevelingen is de KIHA een interessante bron van inkomsten voor de gemeenschap, aangezien de input van financiële middelen beperkt is in Kiangan.
Chapter 1: Introduction

“The strong and sustained rise of tourism activity over the past few decades is one of the most remarkable economic, social and cultural phenomena of our time” (Dabour, 2003, p. 1). As the tourism sector can be considered an important driving force of economic development (Organisation of American States, 2000), many developing countries recently ranked tourism high in their national sustainable development (Dabour, 2003). One of the countries actively stimulating its tourism industry is the Philippines. The notable goal to increase the amount of visitors with 27% by 20161 highlights the government’s efforts. As the Department of Tourism (DOT) is currently focusing on revitalizing its commitments towards homestays, a thorough analysis of this tourism phenomenon is deemed interesting.

This dissertation evaluates the Kiangan Homestay Association (KIHA), a community initiative situated in one of the 11 communities of Ifugao province, the Philippines. As this initiative was elected in September 2013 as showcase under the new national homestay programme, an analysis of the programme’s influence on the participants deemed highly interesting and timely. This study covers a critical analysis of the social, economic and environmental aspects associated with the homestay programme and tourism in general. Chapter 2 gives an overview of this project’s objectives and approaches.

In the theoretical framework, both positive and negative aspects of the international tourism sector are highlighted. Due to the stimulating effect tourism exerts on national and local economies, “tourism development has become an important target for most governments, especially for developing countries” (Samimi and Sadeghi, 2011, p. 1). Hence, the application of tourism as poverty eradication tool is explained. Homestay programmes have been a successful tool to increase tourism visitation and broaden accommodation options in poorer rural communities, especially in South-East Asia (ABV, 2013; Tourism Office Kiangan, 1

---

1 The Philippine government sets out its objective to host 45.5 million visitors by 2016, an additional 12.5 million compared to 2011. The stakeholders’ vision is formulated “to become the ‘must experience’ destination in Asia” (National Tourism Development Plan, 2011).
The general opportunities and challenges of this concept are clarified and subsequently is focused on the Philippine homestay context.

A qualitative research methodology was applied to analyse the impact of the homestay association of Kiangan. The *modus operandi* is set out with a brief focus on the research process of this field study. The method of data collection and processing is discussed into detail in chapter 4. In order to analyse the findings of this research in a correct daylight, some remarks and considerations on the applied methodology are noted.

The results of this study are discussed in chapter 5. Kiangan as case study is briefly described by presenting an overview of the community’s geographical positioning, history and community profile. A critical analysis of the homestay association and its current functioning form the core of this dissertation. Participant’s and community members’ opinions are discussed and analysed. Finally, general conclusions are derived from the discussed results. Encountered difficulties of the Kiangan Homestay Association are evaluated, which leads to some points of attention for the KIHA, the Local Government Unit (LGU), and the DOT. Recommendations are made towards the project’s future.
Chapter 2: Research objectives

The Philippine government strives to attract 45.5 million visitors by 2016, an additional 12.5 million compared to 2011. This growth needs to be completed in an environmentally and socially responsible way, delivering “larger and more widely distributed income and employment opportunities” (Office of Tourism Planning, Research and Information Management, 2011, p. 6). Homestays are appraised to bring tourism revenues directly to the host family without monopolized affluent outside actors (Anand, Chandan and Singh, 2012), and moreover, additional livelihood opportunities are created (Anand et al., 2012; Pusiran and Xiao, 2013). Hence, this concept deems an opportune tool to effectuate a sustainable growth in the country’s tourism industry. By establishing the ‘Philippine New Homestay Programme’ in 2011, the Department of Tourism (DOT) aspires to attain the same homestay success as their neighbouring countries (e.g. Cambodia, Thailand, Indonesia). Homestays are considered a growing business in the Philippines.

Notwithstanding the bulk of positive reports on homestays, caution is required as – to our knowledge – no impact studies have been performed on these initiatives in the Philippines. As local communities and cultural traditions are prone of being influenced by tourism (Eraqi, 2007; Mirbabayev and Shagazatova, 2005; Sharma and Dyer, 2012), a socio-cultural analysis deems highly necessary. Additionally, literature reveals residents’ attitudes toward tourism play an important role for sustainable development (Gursoy and Rutherford, 2004; Sharma and Dyer, 2012), strengthening the importance of a locally implemented socio-cultural analysis even more. The first objective of the KIHA to “promote and protect the general welfare and well-being of the members of the association” (KIHA, 2012) will be put to inquiry.

The homestay association of Kiangan, the KIHA, has been elected as showcase project within the new national homestay programme, making this initiative an interesting assessment case. The impact of homestay programmes on the livelihood and social aspects of local inhabitants will be put to an inquiry. As main research objective of this report, a critical analysis of the impact of homestay programmes on local inhabitants is enacted. Due to the nomination of the
KIHA project, recommendations are not only considered to be beneficial for this local initiative, but formulations of specific findings and defaults may also be interesting for alternative settings. Moreover, some of the formulated recommendations of this report will be applicable for other and future homestay programmes in different regions. As the Philippine national government actively engages in promoting the homestay initiative nationwide, these implications deem convenient.

In the scope of this research as a heterogeneous group was interrogated. Even though the overall perception of tourism in the community is beyond the purview of this research, this report will shed some light on residents’ opinions and inquiries concerning the tourism situation in Kiangan. Hence, some remarks and considerations formulated in this report might be interesting for the overall tourism development of Kiangan, addressing the LGU, the tourism office and other tourism stakeholders.

The information for this qualitative report was collected through household surveys, as “household survey data can be used to estimate the impact of tourism development on household welfare” (Richardson, 2010, p. 4). Furthermore, semi-structured in-depth interviews, group discussions and informal conversations were conducted. For a detailed description of the applied methodology, one is referred to chapter 4 of this report.
Chapter 3: Context & Framework

In this chapter, the scope of this study is contextualised. Background information was retrieved from academic literature, policy papers as well as online information and research reports. The relevance of tourism in poverty eradication and development is clarified first. The current international setting is discussed, exploring and both positive and negative effects on a community in detail. A second section focusses on the concept of homestays. This tourism phenomenon is compared to other types of accommodation to set out a clear definition for this dissertation. Both threats and opportunities of homestays are described. Subsequently, the scope is narrowed to the Philippine setting and its current functioning.

3.1 Tourism as tool for development

3.1.1 International setting

Over the decades, tourism has experienced a continuous growth and increasing diversification to become one of the fastest growing economic sectors in the world (UNWTO, n.d.). Recently, the link with development was drawn and international stakeholders started to acknowledge the possibilities of tourism to achieve aims of accelerated development. These recent dynamics have turned tourism into a key driver for socio-economic progress (UNWTO, n.d.). How tourism can add to the development of a society is described in the next section. While international efforts have been made for years, the general public only recently became aware of these possibilities. The Manila Declaration on World Tourism in 1980 stated as first that “tourism in present-day societies is more than a purely economic activity of nations and people” and that “its development is linked to the social and economic development of nations”, in particular in developing countries (World Tourism Organisation, 1980, p. 1). The mission of the Tourism and Environment Programme of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) states: “To mainstream sustainability into tourism development by demonstrating the economic, environmental, and socio-cultural benefits of sustainable
tourism” (UNEP, n.d. (b)). The 65th UN General Assembly acknowledged the importance of tourism in 2010 by adding a resolution on the promotion of ecotourism for poverty eradication and environment protection (CED, 2010).

The increased international attention for tourism and its developmental possibilities recently grew, as the sector’s capacity expanded rapidly. International inbound tourists are defined as individuals who travel outside their usual environment to a country – other than the one in which they have their usual residence – for a period not exceeding 12 months; their main purpose in visiting is other than an remunerated activity (The World Bank, 2013). Making use of this definition, an estimate of 996 million international tourists travelled worldwide in 2011 (cf. Figure 1), creating 235 million jobs and 30% of the world’s export services (UNWTO, 2012b). In 2012, international arrivals augmented with 4% (1.035 billion visitors) and the same increase is forecasted for 2013 (UNWTO, 2013). The tourism travel market seems to be entirely recovered from the losses resulting from the late-2000s recession (Nigam and Srivastava, 2011).

![Inbound tourism: World](Figure 1 - International tourist arrivals, 1995 - 2012 (in millions). (Source: Kester, 2013)
In 2008, 40% of the journeys ended in a developing country and this share is only considered to augment (Mitchell and Ashley, 2010). Due to the stimulating impact of tourism on the economy (discussed into detail in the next section), “tourism development has become an important target for most governments, especially for developing countries.” (Samimi and Sadeghi, 2011, p. 1). This report focusses on one specific developing country, the Philippines.

3.1.2 Impact of tourism

As tourism is a multidisciplinary activity involving several industries and relying on a variety of skills, influences are dispersed over a widespread segment of the society (Telce and Schroenn, 2006). Nevertheless the international positive assumption surrounding tourism – described in the previous section, this report does not take this conceptualisation for granted. This section respectively presents a literature overview of the benefits and negative influences of tourism.

Positive effects

According to the Organisation of American States (2000, para. 1), “the most important economic feature of activities related to the tourism sector is that they contribute to three high-priority goals of developing countries: the generation of income, employment, and foreign-exchange earnings.” Considering Richardson (2010), an increased domestic consumption can be added to this list. Moreover, tourism has “a snowball effect in contributing to economic growth, since the development of new tourism destinations is often accompanied by the arrival of new businesses and NGOs” (Richardson, 2010, p. 3). As a bilateral causality can be drawn between economic growth and tourism development (Samimi and Sadeghi, 2011), the latter can be considered an important driving force for the development of a nation (Organisation of American States, 2000). This economic relationship is also known as the tourism led-growth hypothesis (Sinclair and Stabler, 2002). As tourism does not only benefit direct stakeholders of the tourism value chain, the sector is said to have a trickle-down effect on a wider segment of the population (Akama, n.d.).

Due to the economic benefits listed above, several authors claim the resilient prospect of tourism to function as a poverty eradication tool (Samimi and Sadeghi, 2011; UNESCAP, 2005; Oliveira, 2009; Luvanga and Shitundu, 2003). As such, the concept of pro poor tourism is often applied (Roy, Roy and Saha, 2010).
Notwithstanding the economic gain is the most acknowledged effect, various other aspects of
daily living are influenced by tourism as well. Reviewing the academic literature, various
benefits are identified: opportunities for capacity building and education might arise more
easily, vulnerability of communities and tribes may be reduced through e.g. livelihood
diversification, the socio-cultural status might improve through community recognition
(Jamieson, Goodwin and Edmunds, 2004), positive prospects in food security are documented
(Richardson, 2010), cultures might be enriched by the intercultural exchange, more poor
people might be empowered thorough effective engagement in local projects, etc. From
environmental point of view, tourism has the potential to create beneficial effects on the
natural surroundings by contributing to environmental protection and conservation (Sunlu,
2003). Awareness of environmental values is raised and tourism can function as financing
tool to protect natural areas.

**Negative effects**

Nevertheless the scope on beneficial aspects of the tourism industry, various negative effects
are described in the literature as well. The overall positive economic image is nuanced by the
fact that the trickle-down to lower socio-economic classes is limited. The industry is often
driven by the private sector, benefiting international companies rather than local economies
(Luvanga and Shitundu, 2003; Jamieson, Goodwin and Edmunds, 2004). The United Nations
Environment Programme (UNEP, n.d. (a)) claims that “[o]f each US$ 100 spent on a
vacation tour by a tourist from a developed country, only around US$ 5 actually stays in a
developing-country destination’s economy.” ² Moreover, an increased cost of living (e.g.
food prices) and a higher necessity of investment due to pressure on services and facilities,
causes negative economic effects for local inhabitants (Jamieson, Goodwin and Edmunds,
2004). Socially, internal conflicts might be generated (Hernandez Cruz et al., 2005;
Southgate, 2006), while Belsky (1999) mentions the exacerbated discrepancies in class,
gender and patronage due to tourism. As tourism entails many activities that can have adverse
environmental effects, some negative consequences can be addressed as well (Sulnu, 2003).
Construction of general infrastructure such as roads, airports, hotels and restaurants often
deteriorate the natural surroundings (Sulnu, 2003) and cause pollution (Mirbabayev and
Shagazatova, 2005). Ignorant behaviour of tourists, vandalising flora and fauna or causing

---

² Other studies on leakages in e.g. Thailand estimated that 70% of all money spent by tourists ended up leaving
the country (via foreign-owned tour operators, airlines, hotels, imported drinks and food, etc.). Estimates for
other Third World countries range from 80% in the Caribbean to 40% in India (Source: Green living, n.d.).
noise pollution, often adds to this flip-side (Global Development Research Center, n.d.). Finally, the demonstration effect of locals beholding tourists using drugs or alcohol, or committing crimes, appears to implement some negative behaviour in local communities as well (Dulnuan, 2005).

### 3.2 Homestay programme

As stated in the previous section, thoughtfulness deems highly necessary while implementing tourism initiatives. Showcases, addressed as leading authority for numerous other cases, certainly need a careful implementation due to their widespread impact. Homestay programmes are considered a growing concept in the Philippines and an already established authority in overall South-East Asia. No previous research has been conducted on the impact of such programmes on Philippine communities and individual households. As the community of Kiangan is elected as demonstration model in this South-East Asian country, a critical analysis of the current situation deems highly interesting to evaluate possible flaws. This section elaborates and clarifies the emerging tourism concept in both the international and Philippine setting. The homestay programme as potential tool for sustainable tourism development is elucidated.

#### 3.2.1 Definition

Although homestays are relatively new as industry, the term is merely a buzzword used to describe the age-old concept of travellers residing with a family other than their own (Richardson, 2004). In the book ‘Commercial Homes in Tourism’ (Lynch, McIntoeh and Tucker, 2009, p. 25) homestays are referred to as “*commercial homes whereby visitors or guests pay to stay in private homes where interaction take place with a host or family*”. As this definition is not highly specific, different types of accommodation (e.g. farm stay, gîtes de France, Bed and Breakfast (B&B) and couchsurfing) can be covered. Moreover, the concept of homestay might be different in connotation and meaning, depending on the country or context. In several countries, the idea of homestay is known as ‘farm stay’, ‘home visit system’ or ‘agricultural homestay’ (Pursiran and Xiao, 2013). To set out a clear

---

3 As stated earlier in this dissertation, neighbouring countries of the Philippines (e.g. Cambodia, Thailand, Indonesia) already experienced the homestay success.
definition for this dissertation, the main points of difference with other initiatives are elucidated.

As can be deduced from the labelling, farm stays are bound to the countryside. Homestay initiatives on the contrary are not linked to a specific scenery or landscape. Nevertheless, homestays are predominantly established in little-developed tourism areas as the absence of big hotels or resorts facilitates opportunities and lessens competition. Without geographical restrictions, homestays are nonetheless mainly situated in rural or suburban areas (Salamia, Othman and Maheran, 2011).

The distinction of homestays with initiatives such as Gîtes de France and Bed & Breakfast is principally the degree of cultural proximity and emersion. Homestays gain their popularity as they enable participants to experience life as it is lived day to day in the host country. These accommodation have the unique potential to promote cultural exchange by sharing life and family experiences (Richardson, 2004). Moreover, respect is raised for the host’s culture (Jamilah and Amram, 2007). In contrast to B&B’s or gîtes de France were the interaction and cultural involvement limited (Pusiran and Xiao, 2013), homestay owners try to integrate the visitor entirely in the daily way of living. This is enacted by for example taking them on their weekend activities or doing little daily together. Furthermore, the gîtes de France concept is geographically restricted to France, while homestays have an international notion.

Couchsurfing and homestays have a common emphasis cultural emersion, but as the couchsurfing design is free of charge, the conceptual difference mainly lies within the financial character. The income derived from homestays is considered an additional income for the host family, whereas couchsurfing is a voluntary initiative. In addition, the provision of a proper bedroom is not compulsory in the later concept. Hence, living rooms or other vacant areas are occasionally placed at the guest’s disposal, in contrast to a decent guestroom in homestays.

Depending on the setting, homestay scenarios may range from a complete family experience to a single-room rental. Fees for rooms and meals show discrepancies as well, as they are set by the individual owner or the established association. Two major types of homestay programs are generally acknowledged; (1) accommodation for students attending local colleges and universities interested in an extended overseas experience and (2) tourism based homestays for visitors seeking a cultural, historical and ecotourism encounter (ABV, 2013). Often, a combination of both is enforced. Homestays are mainly situated in rural areas (cf.
supra). As the practising of traditional living is often better preserved in more remote areas, homestays are the ideal way for tourist to come in touch with the genuine local culture (Pusiran and Xiao, 2013). Besides being the best way to immerse in the culture and tradition of a particular ethnic groups, homestays have been recognised as a way to provide cheap budget accommodation to visitors (Pusiran and Xiao, 2013). In the context of a homestay as study programme, the effects of language proficiency are often described in literature (Rivers, 1998; Richardson, 2004). As the scope of this study is limited to the impact of homestay initiatives on local communities, this discussion is beyond of purview of this research.

While homestays can occur in any destination worldwide, some countries put more effort in encouraging these initiatives. Especially South-East Asian countries such as Malaysia, Thailand and Cambodia are strongly elaborating their tourism potentials (Philippine National Tourism Office, 2011a). As the majority of these initiatives are private-owned, statistical information on the amount of tourists utilising this type of accommodation is hard to find. According to Malaysian statistics, the number of visitors staying in homestays was 128,000 in 2010 alone (Zainon, 2010, cited in Pusiran and Xiao, 2013, p. 5). Due to the success in neighbouring countries, the Philippines currently attempt to stimulate their homestay industry as well. Before taking a closer look at the national setting, both the opportunities and challenges on homestays are described.

3.2.2 Homestay opportunities

Homestay programmes have been a successful tool to increase tourism visitation and broaden accommodation options in poorer rural communities, especially in South-East Asia (Tourism Office Kiangan, 2012; ABV, 2013). Regarding the three pillars of sustainability – economically, socially and environmentally – various advantages are induced by homestays. Economically, the revenue gained on tourist accommodations is divided among a wider range of individuals, as generally more stakeholders are involved compared to regular tourism settings. As Mirbabayev and Shagazatova (2005, p. 3) state, “[the] economic and social impacts on the local community depend on how much of the incomes generated by tourists go to the host communities. In most all-inclusive package tours more than 80% of travellers’ fees go to the airlines, hotels and other international companies, not to local businessmen and workers”. Moreover, “large hotel chain restaurants often import food to satisfy foreign visitors and rarely employ local staff for senior management positions, preventing local farmers and workers from reaping the benefit of their presence” (Mirbabayev and
Shagazatova, 2005, p. 3). As the industry is mainly private owned, only a small amount of operators and individuals directly benefit from the overall tourism sector. Local communities occasionally benefit, but in an indirect way (Lindberg, 1996) and to a much lesser extent (Mirbabayev and Shagazatova, 2005). As income created through homestay programmes is handed directly to the host families, benefits of tourism are not monopolized by outside actors (Anand, Chandan and Singh, 2012). Livelihood opportunities, additional income and employment opportunities (ABV, 2013; Anand et al., 2012; Pusiran and Xiao, 2013) emerge from this concept, whereby it is considered as a tool for poverty eradication and development (Pusiran and Xiao, 2013). Moreover, no major investments are required to run a homestay, which makes the programme accessible to households across economic classes (Anand et al., 2012).

Ecologically, homestays create the advantage of facilitating older building to host visitors; they can reside in already existing empty rooms. As expansions of facilities often lead to pollution and exploitation of resources (Mirbabayev and Shagazatova, 2005), homestay initiatives can be considered more environmental-friendly. Moreover, this programme creates recognition to protect the natural environment among the inhabitants, as natural beauty accounts as tourism attraction for visitors (Alampay, 2005).

Cultural and social aspects of the homestay programme are considered some of the main rationales for implementation. In general, tourism strengthens the pride of host families for their traditional culture (UNWTO, 2012a). As homestay participants consider the disclosing of their way of living as one of the assets of the programme, community pride is strengthened even more (ABV, 2013). Moreover, intercultural exchange enriches both visitors and host families, and culture is preserved through the active demonstrations of dances, food preparations and celebrations (ABV, 2013).

Nevertheless the benefits on economic, environmental and social aspects, caution is required in the modes of implementation as unbridled tourism might have the opposite effect (Endresen, 1999). Research concerning homestay programmes is still in its infancy (Knight and Schmidt-Rinehart, 2002; Richardson, 2002) and the need for more profound investigation raises (Richardson, 2004).
3.2.3 Homestay challenges

Study findings by several researchers endorse that various challenges emerge from the discussed initiative. In order to ensure its sustainability and success, issues concerning the operation of homestays need to be addressed. Table 1 gives a short overview on the current challenges for homestays; input is collected from different authors (Anand et al., 2012; Nor Ashikin and Kayat (2010); Pusiran and Xiao, 2013; Zaki, Johan, Affendi, and Norria, 2011). Challenges are classified in two categories, internal and external challenges. The definition of internal challenges refers to aspects that can be controlled by the homestay participants or associations themselves. Meanwhile, external challenges are in this context defined as factors arising beyond the control of these stakeholders.

Table 1 - Internal and external challenges for homestay programmes; items marked with * are elucidated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External challenges</th>
<th>Internal challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competition from other accommodation providers</td>
<td>Lack of community participation and commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure in meeting international standards</td>
<td>Unbalanced demography (*2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misuse of homestay term by opportunists (*1)</td>
<td>Low standards of accommodation and infrastructure facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training</td>
<td>Conflicts in community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of marketing and promotion</td>
<td>Communication problem (*3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of tourist activities</td>
<td>Culture shock to village community (*4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over-commercialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of hospitality experience and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inability of poor people to participate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the abovementioned downsides don’t need extra elucidation as the entitlement explains itself. Nevertheless, the highlighted themes in the table (*) are clarified some more:

(*1): The misuse of the homestay term by opportunists – governing different kinds of accommodations – is a threat to the genuine homestay programme as its original setting dissolves. Exploitation by external parties in the private sector (e.g. travel agents) also affects
the homestay programme’s name by making use of villagers and not reimbursing them for services rendered (Zaki et al., 2011; Pusiran and Xiao, 2013).

(*2): As traditional and small-scale villages often suffer from migration problems whereby younger generations migrate to bigger towns or cities, an unbalanced participation in the homestay programme might be a problem for the community. Older generations have to run the accommodations and within a certain timeframe a lack of replacement hosts arises. As such, the sustainability of the programme is affected. Youth participation is crucial to maintain homestay programmes in the future (Pusiran and Xiao, 2013; Nor Ashikin and Kayat, 2010).

(*3): Another possible internal downside is the communication between hosts and guests. Good communication between both parties increases the intensity of the homestay experience. Whenever this contact is disturbed or impeded by a lack of communication skills or mastering of an international language, the intensity and goals of the programme are affected (Pusiran and Xiao, 2013; Zaki et al., 2011).

(*4): Some village communities experience a culture shock when they open up their rural homes to international tourists (Pusiran and Xiao, 2013). Not only are they often astonished by the newest gadgets tourists bring along (e.g. smart phones, IPods, laptops, etc.), but discrepancies in socio-cultural norms occasionally cause some problems as well (Zaki et al., 2011). As these issues mainly arise when a village first opens up to the outside world, this might dissipate in time when inhabitants get more used to the concept of tourism and improve their interaction with guests (Pusiran and Xiao, 2013).

Depending on the local setting and the involved individuals, several of the abovementioned problems might arise in a homestay initiative. As each case has its own characteristics, caution needs to be taken while drawing generalisations. To understand the underlying nuances of a project and to formulate recommendations to ameliorate its functioning and sustainability, local-level household surveys with the homestay owners and other residents are required (Anand et al., 2012). This report summarises the findings of a field study to the homestay initiative of the community of Kiangan. The question raises whether this local project is a sustainable development tool for the participants. To answer this question and to formulate some recommendations, the above mentioned challenges and opportunities will be interpreted in the local setting. Primary to a detailed analysis of the situation in Kiangan in chapter 5, the Philippine scene is set out first.
3.2.4 Philippine context

As archipelago covering 7107 islands, the Philippines (also known as Pearl of the Orient) has a rich flora and fauna and is even considered one of the top 25 biodiversity hotspots in the world (National Ecotourism Steering Committee, 2002). In spite of its natural and cultural richness, its performance as an international tourist destination remains rather disappointing (Henderson, 2011); with its 33 million visitors, the country is ranked 94th out of 139 countries in tourism arrivals (National Tourism Development Plan, 2011). In order to boom the tourism industry, the Department of Tourism (DOT) recently launched diverse policy programmes to ameliorate the countries tourism opportunities and to attract more international visitors. Focussing on sustainable growth, the long-term goal of the National Tourism Development Plan (2011-2016) is “to develop an environmentally and socially responsible tourism that delivers larger and more widely distributed income and employment opportunities” (Office of Tourism Planning, Research and Information Management, 2011, p. 6). Further, this strategy sets out its objective to host 45.5 million visitors by 2016, an additional 12.5 million compared to 2011. The stakeholders’ vision is formulated “to become the ‘must experience’ destination in Asia” (National Tourism Development Plan, 2011).

To achieve these ambitious tourism objectives, different strategic plans are elaborated. As neighbouring countries in Asia-Pacific already introduced the concept of homestay successfully, the Department of Tourism recently decided to rethink its policy on this theme. Not only the pressure to keep up with the adjoined countries (Warner Andradada, personal communication, August 8, 2013), but also the inquiry of grassroots homestay initiatives to be backboned by the government (elaborated in the next paragraph) entailed a revitalization of the homestay programme in 2011. Nevertheless the DOT office of tourism standards already adopted the idea of homestays in 1993, it was only in the late 2000s that a first programme was worked out. Yet, this plan never achieved any actual realisations and as such, the establishment of the ‘Philippine New Homestay Programme’ (PNHP, cf. Annex III) in 2011 was promising for the sector. The plan introduces new guidelines and accreditation criteria for the sector, as well as a reestablishment of the training package (ABV, 2013). The purpose of this programme is to offer host

Figure 2 - Seals of official DOT Homestay accreditation.
families better guidance and support, and to provide visitors a quality guarantee through the introduction of accreditations seals (cf. Figure 2) (Warner Andrada, personal communication, August 8, 2013). As overall objective, the homestay programme has a clear developmental aspect: “The objective is to increase their [local inhabitants] income. Something that will benefit them. It’s not just accommodation to create more activities. We want to provide money for the local communities. If the tourism grows in the community, the benefits will go down to all. It’s a trickle-down effect.” (Warner Andrada, personal communication, August 8, 2013).

In order to attain these objectives, the DOT conducted a market study to fully understand the concept and its contribution to the local tourism industry (Philippine National Tourism Office, 2011b). Hence recommendations to improve the current programme were formulated.

Accreditation by the Department of Tourism

The national Tourism Act of 2009 (R.A. 9593) states that all tourism facilities and services in the Philippines should maintain international standards of excellence. More specifically, the DOT wishes to make accreditation compulsory in all kinds of tourist accommodations. An accreditation is “a certification issued by the Department to a tourism enterprise that officially recognizes it as having complied with the minimum standards for the operation of tourism facilities and services”. The function of the accreditation process is twofold:

(1) Establish a system of registration, information, linkage, and mutual assistance among accredited tourism enterprises to enhance the value of accreditation and improve the quality of service rendered by such enterprises;

(2) Evaluate tourism projects in accordance with standards and endorse the same to appropriate government agency for availment of incentives, and provide technical assistance to incentive-giving institutions in the formulation of tourism incentives and the administration of their functions.

In order to stimulate establishments to meet the accreditation criteria, the DOT states that only accredited enterprises will be beneficiaries of promotional, training and other programs of the Department and its attached agencies and corporations.
Homestays

Accreditation standards for homestays were introduced in 2012. In order to receive the accreditation seal of the DOT (see Figure 2), candidates need to take part in the education, organized by the DOT. When courses are attended successfully, a DOT-inspector examines the house of the participant in order to check whether the following standards are met:

A. Homestay Sites
   1. There is prevailing peace and order situation in the area.
   2. There are existing natural and man-made attractions in the community.
   3. The site is easily accessible to tourists and with existing transportation services, good road conditions and other basic community infrastructures.
   4. The host community is willing to join the National Homestay Program.
   5. There is a dearth of commercial accommodation facilities in the area to service tourists.

B. Home Facilities
   1. Structures are of durable building materials and are in good, presentable condition.
   2. The surroundings are pleasant and healthful.
   3. There shall be at least one (1) adequately furnished guestroom to accommodate paying visitors.
As mentioned previously, recent evolutions in the homestay policy did not come unanticipated. A diversified number stakeholders – varying from private individuals, NGOs and community-based initiatives – already launched this idea several decades ago, prior to any national involvement. The homestay development is a bottom-up process; initiated by private individuals and communities and later on formalised and institutionalised by the DOT (dr. Roberto Kalugdan, personal communication, August 19, 2013). Due to the current revived interest in homestays, local and private initiatives flourish to broaden and ameliorate the market in the country (e.g. PROCESS-Bohol, FlipFlop and Homestay Philippines Inc.). These initiatives are situated all around the country, but as big cities mostly provide adequate services for tourism accommodation, homestay programmes predominately focus on more
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rural and less popular tourism destinations (Emilia M. Roslinda, personal communication, July 29, 2013; Mina Gabor, personal communication, August 6, 2013).

The DOT recently (October 2013) confirmed its selection of showcases for the national programme. The three elected communities are dispersed around the country; the regions of the Visayas, Mindanao and Luzon are respectively presided by the communities of Argau, Karaga and Kiangan. Due to its prominent status, this report focusses on the homestay programme of the latter community. Monitoring the number of accredited homestays in the Philippines, Kiangan additionally appears to be an interesting case as 16 out of 52 national participants are registered in this municipality (DOT, n.d.).

3.3 Conclusion

As noted in the first section of this chapter, the arguments and opinions regarding the tourism sector are dispersed. Analysing the current tendencies, the international positive atmosphere surrounding the tourism sector is nuanced. Voices claiming the advantages and dangers of the sector often contradict and oppose each other. Nevertheless these diverse points of view, international governments – especially the ones of developing countries – mainly seem to focus on the positive (economic) advantages associated with this sector (Samimi and Sadeghi, 2011). By enforcing their tourism industry they aspire to stimulate the development of their country, creating more wealth and wellbeing for their inhabitants. While pursuing these objectives, the interests of the national population are considered of main importance. Intrinsically, overall caution needs to be paid when implementing and monitoring tourism projects; the widespread range of possible negative and harmful effects needs to be prevented.

Considering the ambitious goals of the Philippine government discussed in the second section, vigilance is required to ensure the wellbeing and benefits for the Filipinos. Hence, an analysis of the effects of a homestay programme on its community is opportune, as this sector is appraised as emerging sector by the national government in 2011. Research needs to be conducted to explore the niches and possible challenges for host families and communities (Pusiran and Xiao, 2013). The community of Kiangan is elected as case study due to its prominent status in the ‘Philippine New Homestay Programme’. The next chapter presents the methodology used to scrutinize this community.
Chapter 4: Methodology

This chapter elaborates on the methodology applied during the course of the study. To place this study in its specific context, the decision-making process on the selected case study is described first. Subsequently, the collection method for data and information is elucidated, concluding with some remarks and considerations on the applied methodology.

4.1 Research focus

The commencement of this research was engendered by the International School for Sustainable Tourism (ISST), located in Subic Bay, the Philippines. As priming, but nevertheless important player on the elaboration of sustainable tourism in the Philippines and more broadly South-East Asia, this institution brought about the basic insights for the current research. Doctor Mina Gabor, president of the ISST and former secretary of state of both tourism and trade\(^4\), instigated the focus on homestay programmes during multiple interviews and discussions. As both the ISST and the national government are pinned on the amplification of this rather new phenomenon, a qualitative analysis on the participants’ perception of this phenomenon deemed highly interesting.

Aside from the ISST, other institutions were contacted in order to enlarge the knowledge on homestay programmes. Intense contact was maintained with both the Regional Centre of Expertise (RCE) of the United Nations\(^5\) situated in Cebu, and the NGO PROCESS-Bohol\(^6\).

\(^4\) Doctor Mina Gabor was secretary of state under four different presidents, respectively Ferdinand Marcos, Corazon Aquino, Fidel V. Ramos and Joseph Estrada.

\(^5\) In the context of the United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (DESD, 2005-2014), the United Nations University (UNU) called for the development of regional networks to promote Education for Sustainable Development (ESD). These networks – referred to as Regional Centres of Expertise – address local sustainable development challenges through research and capacity development.

\(^6\) PROCESS-Bohol, or Participatory Research, Organization of Communities and Education towards Struggle for Self-reliance, is a community-based NGO which has as mission to “continuously empower the poor farmers and fishers towards effective and sustainable management of resources and promotion of just and gender-sensitive environment” (PROCESS-Bohol Inc, n.d.). One of the established programmes to empower the farmers and fisherman is the homestay programme.
Both institutions have emerging projects on homestays, but as the link with the governmental programme was non-existing, the relevancy of these programmes is beyond the scope of this dissertation. Nevertheless, interesting discussions and meetings added to the knowledge on homestay projects, reflected in this paper.

This dissertation opted for the elaboration of one specific case study: the homestay programme of Kiangan. The preference of one specific case is engendered by the in-depth knowledge of the research findings. Moreover, discrepancy between diverse initiatives and communities makes it difficult to generate an overall summary on homestays. The selected case study is one of the three showcases of the new homestay programme, initiated by the national government. This highlights the respectability of the homestay association of Kiangan (Philippine National Tourism Office, 2011). Accounting the limitations to use one case study as a means for generalisation, the evaluation and recommendations made on a showcase project of the national government deem interesting. The homestay programme of Kiangan is no part of the ISST initiative; defiantly the interesting information gathered through this institution, this research opted not to select one of the ISST-projects as case study, as the programme is still in its infancy.

4.2 Data collection

This dissertation is based on qualitative field research. The research is explorative in nature as it aims to paint a picture of the current status of the homestay programme in the Philippines and its impact on the local community. The perceived impacts of tourism, and more specifically homestay programmes, form the core of the collected data.

The content of this policy paper is based on interviews, conducted during a field trip to the Philippines from June until September 2013. In preparation of this field trip, academic literature was analysed to comprehend the actual tourism situation. By drawing the state of art, several research questions raised. This report focuses on the question whether homestay programmes are a sustainable option for tourism development, from the participants point of view. As concrete information on Philippine programmes are scarcely found online or in libraries – certainly concerning the impact on the local community – a field research
undoubtedly added positive value to this report. Without the conducted interviews, the present in-depth knowledge and insights would not have been attained.

During the course of the field study, data was collected through semi-structured in-depth interviews, group discussions and informal conversations. Inquiries prior to, and during the research revealed interesting stakeholders. The key informants of this study can generally be allocated to three categories: (1) homestay participants, (2) officials – national, local, academic and NGO-level – and (3) citizens of Kiangan. Appendix I comprises an overview of all the individuals interviewed during the field research, with their corresponding function. In total 37 individuals were contacted and questioned, with consideration of a maximal variety of age and profession.

The first group – the homestay participants – contains 11 individuals, contacted with the assistance of a membership list of the Homestay Association. None of the contacted members refused cooperation and all of them were interviewed according to a set-up questionnaire, elaborated prior to the Kiangan field trip (cf. Appendix II). As the questionnaire embodies the social, economic and environment impact of the homestay programme, holistic knowledge is approached as much as possible. Next to semi-structured interviews, 12 participants joined the group discussion held at the end of the field research; 10 homestay owners, the DOT officer of Kiangan and the SITMo (Save the Ifugao Terraces Movement) president were present. The organisation of this debate was encouraged by both homestay participants and the researcher. The latter presented preliminary conclusions and recommendations on the field research. Additional information was added by the participants, making the recommendations (cf. chapter 6) more applicable and concrete.

The second group – various kinds of officials – contains 13 individuals, ranging from the national (3), local (7), NGO (2) and academic (1) level. The respondents were assembled by both purposive sampling – officials contacted through the website of the Philippine government drawn up beforehand – and snow-ball sampling. The latter technique mainly proved to be very effective to get efficiently in touch with high-ranked individuals. Regarding the posed questions, interviews were mainly led by the gathering of information on current policies and ideas. Depending on the position and function of the interviewee, a basic questionnaire was drafted to outline the conversation, but side leaps were often taken.

Key informants among the third category – the citizens of Kiangan – are diverse in profession and background. Among the interviewees were sari-sari (local shop) owners, doctors, farmers,
housewives, carpenters, tour guides, volunteers, etc. The respondents were assembled by snow-ball sampling or were acquainted through daily contact. Mainly, no fixed questionnaire was followed but conversations were unstructured, interactive and led by one major question: “What are your thoughts on tourism and how does the homestay programme affect your community socially, environmentally and economically”. Besides the list of residents in appendix, informal daily conversations with tricycle drivers, shop owners or friends added to an awareness of some of the issues at stake.

Formal meetings were recorded with the consent of the interviewees and subsequently transcribed. Throughout informal conversations, field notes were taken with the agreement of the individual at stake and conversations were reconstructed with the transcripts as footing. Afterwards, the content of the audio fragments and field notes were thematically structured and interpreted.

During the interviews with the homestay participants and other citizens of the village, an emic approach was applied; meaning the researcher obtained the perspective of the local community and tried to analyse “how local people think” (Kottak, 2006, p. 47). This method tried to represent the perceived impacts of the community and the participants as accurately as possible. Besides interviews – forming the primary information source for this report – secondary data such as statistics on tourist arrivals and tourism master plans or programmes were gathered from local, provincial and national DOT offices.

4.3 Remarks and considerations

Although the fieldtrip to the Philippines enriched this research enormously, limitations must be considered as well. In this section, some remarks on the followed methodology and procedure are listed. These considerations must be taken into account when reading this dissertation.

- Kiangan’s tourism sector and its accommodations are still in an early stage of development. Hence, no previous research has been conducted on the impact of the homestay programme. With no benchmark studies available, the impact of the sector on the community is hard to determine. As such, the remark of Hall and Page (2000, cited in Dulnuan, 2005, p. 165) that “one of the immediate problems facing the
researcher in reconstructing patterns of tourism visitation, activity and expenditure is the absence of up-to-date, reliable and consistent tourism statistics” can be well related to this case study. As such, this research tried to analyse and evaluate the present social and economic evolvements. The effects of a homestay programme on the concerned participants and the community as a whole are assessed in this report.

- Evaluating tourism impacts on a community as a Western student is not without concerns. Lack of native knowledge and the position as foreigner may create an unintentional biased setting. As such, aspects of this study – for example the types of information collected – may be influenced. The researcher also accounts that prejudices might play a role in the interpretation of collected data. Critical analysis of own positioning was adopted to minimize these constraints, but nevertheless is acknowledged that complete objectivity cannot be attained.

- The determined effects of the homestay programme are accounted as core of the collected data. The absence of hard evidence to verify these perceptions form a limitation of this study. Nevertheless, Pearce (1994, cited in Dulnuan, 2005, p. 167) – as eminent authority on tourism studies – stated that “real and perceived impacts are equally important from the point of view of assessing community feeling”. As this report mainly focusses on the impact of homestay programmes and tourism on the overall community, perceptions and perceived impacts are considered a highly interesting source of information.

- The elaboration of specific case studies always raises questions concerning the generalisation of the assembled information. In the case of Kiangan, caution is paid for inadequate sweeping statements. Nevertheless, as the homestay programme of Kiangan is nominated as one of the three showcases of the national government, formulations of specific findings and defaults may be interesting for alternative and future homestay settings. Hereby is hoped that both government officials and important stakeholders in the tourism value chain account the value of the findings of this case while delineating the sector’s policies.

- Due to time restraints, the amount of people interviewed in this dissertation is rather limited compared to a full research project. Nevertheless, this study tried to cover a maximal variety of opinions and individuals within the given timeframe. Hence is believed that recommendations towards the KIHA are well-documented and relevant.
Regarding the homestay setting in Kiangan, suggestions are made towards the national level. In order to fully grasp the entire impact of homestay programmes in the Philippines, findings of this dissertation should be double checked with data of analogous researches in the two other showcases of the PNHP, Argau and Karaga. By combining the information all three pilot projects, even more accurate and correct comments and recommendations can be made when referring to the national level.
Chapter 5: Results

This chapter elaborates on the results of the research conducted in the homestay association of Kiangan. A thorough analysis of the positive and negative sides of this programme is represented, focusing on the social, environmental and economic aspects of the initiative. Prior to the elaboration of these elements, the context of the case study is briefly elucidated.

5.1 Kiangan as case study

5.1.1 Area study and brief history

This study describes the impact of tourism as perceived by the inhabitants of Kiangan, one of the 11 municipalities in the province of Ifugao. This mountainous province is situated in the Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR) in the northern part of Luzon, the biggest island of the archipelago (cf. Figure 3). The municipality of Kiangan consists of 14 barangays, the smallest political units in the Philippines (cf. Figure 4). The community counts 16,294 inhabitants and has a land area of 20,419 has. Kiangan is located at the Southwest of the province of Ifugao about ten kilometers from the provincial capital of Lagawe. It is bounded in the east by the municipalities of Lagawe and Lamut, in the west by Tinoc, in the north by Hingyon and in the south by the newly created Municipality of Asipulo (the daughter municipality) (Tourism Office Kiangan, 2012).
The topographical features of Kiangan are generally mountainous and rise at an elevation of approximately 500 to 1,500 meters above sea level. The highest point is Mount Anapawon (1,482 meters) and the lowest points are those along the Ibulao river ranging from 500 to 700 meters above sea level (Municipality of Kiangan, 2011a). The region is considered to have two seasons; wet and dry. Dry spell is from January to April and wet season ranges from May to December (website municipality of Kiangan Municipality of Kiangan, 2011a).

Kiangan has a rich cultural history and is considered to be the cradle of the mighty Ifugao culture. This claim is taken from oral mythology whereby Kiyyangan is assumed to be one of the earliest settlements in Ifugao. This riverside village is mentioned to be the area where the first Ifugao ancestors, Bugan and Wigan, first lived. The Old Kiyyangan is the precursor of the present-day Kiangan municipality. When Kiangan became a municipal district in 1935, its present name Kiangan was registered officially (Tourism Office Kiangan, 2012). Three ethnic groups are still accommodated in the village: the Ifugao (Ayangan and Tuwali subgroups), the Kalanguya and the Ilocanos (Tourism Office Kiangan, 2012). Each ethnic group has its own dialect, but the most common used languages nowadays are Ifugao, Tagalog, Ilocano and English.
5.1.2 Community profile of Kiangan

A Community-Based Monitoring System (CBMS) survey in 2008 showed that farming is the most common occupation in Kiangan, holding 63.4% of the jobs (Municipality of Kiangan, 2011b). Professionals working as employees or officials in either government or NGO offices comprise about 14%. The rest are self-employed in their own business, or employed as labours. The 2008-survey also revealed that Kiangan counts 416 Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs) (Municipality of Kiangan, 2011b), the biggest export product of the country (Department of Trade and Industry, 2012). Nevertheless the vast majority of the community is employed in the agricultural sector, the amount of citizens in both the rural and urban area are more or less equally disseminated (cf. Table 2).

Table 2 - Population and demographic profile (source: Tourism Office Kiangan, 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total households</th>
<th>Total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiangan</td>
<td>3245</td>
<td>16294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>7689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>8605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in most parts of the Philippines, religion is quintessential in Kiangan. The community is predominately Roman Catholic, comprising 73.9% of the villagers. Other important convictions are Pentecostal (9.9%) and Born Again Christians (7.9%) (Tourism Office Kiangan, 2012). It was a Belgian priest, father Moerman, who introduced Christianity in the traditional Ifugao community in 1910. Nevertheless his ideas initially conflicted with the traditional culture in various ways, the priest was able to gain the confidence of the people which even leaded to a semi-hero status of the Belgian father:

“To an Ifugao, the bravest man in the world is an Ifugao – except one particular Belgian national, whom they consider to be the bravest and greatest Ifugao of them all because he, single-handed, stood up against and defied the whole tribe and won. Above all, because he gave them Christ. This man is Rev. Fr. Jerome Moerman, a Catholic missionary who has become a living legend among the natives.”

(Dait, 2011, p. 107)
The Cordillera region is rich in natural resources and most of the country’s mineral reserves, particularly gold and copper, are found here (Dulnuan, 2005). Despite its natural wealth, the region lacks behind in terms of economic growth, which explains why the vast majority of the population remains poor. Of all 80 provinces in the Philippines, Ifugao is one of the bottom 10 provinces when it comes to Gross Domestic Income (GDI) (Human Development Network, 2012). In Kiangan 53.9% of the households live under the poverty threshold and 39.9% of them don’t attain the threshold for food security (National Statistical Coordination Board, 2009). Because of this, Kiangan is considered a fourth class municipality in the annual income ranking of the country.

To cope with these problems the government adopted several strategies; one of them was the enhancement of tourism in the Cordillera (Dulnuan, 2005). As noted in the theoretical framework in chapter 3, the Philippines is an illustration of a developing country boosting its economy and national development through tourism. The CAR region, covering Kiangan and 74 other municipalities, was identified as a priority for tourism development in the National Tourism Master Plan (NTMP) of 1991.

In the specific tourism plan of the CAR region – the Cordillera Tourism Master Plan (CTMP) – ‘culture’ and ‘nature’ are adopted as main thrust for development. As stated in one of the four objectives of this plan (Cordillera Administrative Region, 2004, p. 3), the developmental aspect of tourism is illustrated: “To provide income and livelihood opportunities to the various people of the Cordillera and contribute to the regional growth”.

The overall defined goal of tourism promotion in the CTMP is “to preserve, conserve and enhance the area’s natural environment and its rich tribal culture for people and visitors to appreciate, enjoy and learn from it” (Cordillera Administrative Region, 2004, p. 3). This concept is tested in the current report; the extent of conservation and benefits for local inhabitants is analysed on its economic, environmental and social facets.

---

7 As comparison, the national percentage of Filipinos living under the poverty line is 33% (Municipality of Kiangan, 2011b).
8 The poverty threshold is established on 6481 pesos per month (± 110 euro) for a family of five. The criterion on food security is put on 4132 pesos (± 70 euro) for a family of five.
5.1.3 Tourism situation Kiangan

The tourism sector in Kiangan is still in its infancy. The Cordillera region and Ifugao are touristic hotspots in the country, but within this region visitors are mainly attracted to the rice terraces in Banaue & Hungduan (dubbed as the 8th wonder of the world (Cordillera Administrative Region, 2004)) and the more urban regions of Sagada and Baguio City. Currently, the amount of visitors residing in Kiangan is rather limited (statistics will be discussed into detail in the next subsection) and per se, the income generated from this industry is minimal. As tourism is considered a relatively easy way of earning money, the municipality of Kiangan wishes to expand their share in the tourism sector: “We have been exploring the use of tourism as a development tool and a catalyst to economic development. Since 1990’s, the vision of Kiangan has included eco/cultural tourism. However, this desire has never been put into an extensive and intensive exploration.” (Tourism Office Kiangan, 2012, p 1). From 2010 onwards, the process of tourism development is accelerated and put into action, which can be derived from the vision of the municipality:

“The municipality of Kiangan is an agriculturally developed ecotourism destination based on a sound and sustainable economic development program through the unified efforts of globally competitive and enterprising people supported by innovative and dynamic administrative policies ensuring the reservation of socio-cultural heritage for a better quality of life.” (Tourism Office Kiangan, 2012, p. 14)

The strengthening of the tourism council in 2010 (Eulalie Dulnuan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013) and the elaboration of a Tourism Master Plan for the community in 2012 underlines this thesis even more. Notwithstanding these initiatives, the present mayor of Kiangan, Jonathan Cuyahon, is said not to grant too much importance to tourism (dr. Roberto Kalugdan, personal communication, 19 August 2013). The mayor was re-elected for his second term in July 2013 and optimism is reigning for more emphasis on tourism in the near future (Eulalie Dulnuan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013; Masah Ayahao Melicor,
personal communication, 21 August, 2013; dr. Roberto Kalugdan, personal communication, 19 August, 2013). The municipal planning engineer Jos Albert Aguan states: “we [LGU of Kiangan] are focussing on the preparation of the facilities first before starting with the advertisement. We wouldn’t want to have tourists coming in and then realising that we are not prepared for it.” (Jos Alberta Aguana, personal communication, 30 August, 2013). The importance of a slow and well considered tourism growth is also acknowledged by Marlon Martin, the manager of SITMo. As an answer on the question “How should tourism develop in the years to come?” he formulated:

“At least slowly. We don’t want the amount of tourist to suddenly quadruple by next year. Let’s take it slow. The influx of tourists in the area should be in sync with how the municipality of Kiangan is evolving. We’re not ready yet to accept that many visitors this year, but maybe within some years we’ll be more ready.”

Currently, the Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP) of Kiangan is being developed, which displays the allotment of money to all different sectors within the community. As tourism is assumed to be an important industry within the municipality (phrased in its vision, cf. supra), a substantial budget is considered to be granted for tourism development (Jos Alberta Aguana, personal communication, 30 August, 2013) ⁹.

**Tourism stakeholders**

The tourism council, established in 2010, is an autonomous board organised by tourism-oriented inhabitants of Kiangan. The organisation is headed by Marlon Martin, who is also president of SITMo (Save the Ifugao Terraces Movement), a local NGO operating on the preservation of the UNESCO-protected rice terraces in Kiangan. Masah Ayahao Melicor, director of the homestay association, is vice-president and Eulalie Dulnuan, the regional DOT officer, is secretary. The current support granted by the LGU to the tourism council is scarce (± 15,000 pesos; equivalent of 254 euro) and as such, the resources of the council are limited.

SITMo, the NGO striving for the preservation of the well-known Ifugao rice terraces, applies an all-inclusive approach: community-led initiatives in eco-tourism, indigenous knowledge education, bio-diversity conservation and social enterprise development are included in the

---

⁹ This statement reflects on the field research that was conducted for this dissertation (July – September 2013). The comprehensive development plan of Kiangan is assumed to be ready in December 2013, and as such, no concrete data can be presented yet.
organisations functioning (SITMo, 2013). Due to their experience with tourists, their didactic methods of guiding and their indigenous knowledge, SITMo is the main attractor of visitors in Kiangan. On regular basis groups of mainly Korean or Japanese students are guided around Kiangan and its rice terraces, to experience the ‘Life Cycle Tour’. Students experience all different stages of the rice producing process and get in touch with the local culture and rituals. For each group visiting the community SITMo donates 1,000 pesos to the tourism council, which makes them the main source of income of the council. As other stakeholders, e.g. homestay owners and tricycle drivers, also benefit from the efforts made by the tourism council, voices raise to apply a fixed donation from these counterparts as well. As such, the tourism council would have more financial potentials to promote tourism in Kiangan. Hitherto, these contributions are still under consideration.

Statistics

Statistical data gives a notion of the popularity of Kiangan as tourism spot. Within the province of Ifugao, Kiangan was ranked 4th out of 11 communities on tourist arrivals in 2012 (cf. Table 3). Banaue is far-out the most popular destination in the area (hosting 40,750 visitors) due to its 8th wonder of the world, the steep Ifugao rice terraces. Hungduan is ranked second due to its proximity to the Banaue terraces; tourists often comprise both visits in one trip. Officially Lagawe is ranked third in the tourist arrivals but the supervising tourism operation officer of the provincial tourism information, Marietta Hangdaan, noted that the collecting system currently has two flaws. First of all, the collection of tourist arrivals is hampered due to definitional inadequacies. No differentiation is made between businessmen staying overnight and individuals actually spending their time visiting the area. As Lagawe is the business capital of the province and hosts quite some businessmen overnight, the tourist arrivals appear to be high. Nevertheless, Ms Hangdaan (personal communication, 22 August, 2013) noted that Kiangan is actually ranked third on tourism arrivals and Lagawe is rather a business hub than a tourist destination.
The implementation of a new data collection system in 2011 was considered a second weakness in the tourism statistics. Tourism representatives no longer collect the data, but establishments submit the information directly to the provincial tourism office. Hotels, hostels and other establishments pay taxes to the Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR). These taxes depend on the gross receipts they monthly earn, and reflect the total amount of visitors they host. Ms Hangdaan assumes incorrect statistics are submitted to the provincial office to evade these taxes (Beverly Baybayon, personal communication, 23 August, 2013; Marietta Hangdaan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013). Together with the international War on Terror and the skirmishes for an independent Mindanao in the south of the country, this explains the drop in tourist arrivals in the region since 2011 (cf. Figure 6).

---

10 Balikbayan refers to Filipino nationals who are permanently residing abroad including their spouses and children, regardless of nationality or country of birth. It also refers to those of Filipino descent who acquired foreign citizenship and permanent status abroad (NSCB, n.d.).
Notwithstanding the above mentioned flaws, statistical information displays the limited tourism inflow in Kiangan and the overruling of Banaue. Various individuals forecast the augmenting of tourist arrivals in Kiangan at the expenses of the overnights in Banaue. First of all, bad management is presumed to be a pitfall for the tourism industry in Banaue and Batad. Guides present excursions out of the community instantly when visitors step out of the bus, leaving no benefits for the community itself. Moreover, alternative travellers are believed to avoid Banaue in the near future due to its overwhelming popularity (Eulalie Dulnuan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013; Lilia Umanhan, personal communication, 28 August, 2013; Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). Several sources also point out that Banaue’s tourism industry grew massive and fast, implementing both natural and cultural negative impacts (Alangui, 1999; Dulnuan, 2005). As this occasionally creates irritation among residents, the popularity of the destination might get affected (Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013).

**Tourist attractions and accessibility**

The diversity of tourist attractions in Kiangan convince some residents that their village has a great tourism potential – notwithstanding the low tourism statistics at present. The community is considered the cradle of the mighty Ifugao culture (tourism office Kiangan, 2012), and comprises the Ifugao rice terraces which are on the UNESCO-heritage list. These terraces are
considered exemplary for the harmony between humankind and the environment (UNESCO, n.d.). In 2001 the terraces were mentioned on the World Heritage Committee’s list of endangered sites. The intense efforts of the Philippine government to augment the management and preservation of these paddies resulted in the removal of this list in 2012. Furthermore, Kiangan has the peculiarity of being the site where World War II ended for Asia and the Pacific. The Japanese general Tomoyuki Yamashita informally surrendered to the Allied Forces on September 2, 1945, at the Kiangan Central School (tourism office Kiangan, 2012). Table 4 gives a general overview of the different tourist attractions in Kiangan.

Table 4 - Overview of tourist attractions in Kiangan (Source: Tourism office Kiangan, 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Attraction</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiangan War Memorial Shrine</td>
<td>History &amp; Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ifugao Museum</td>
<td>History &amp; Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Museum</td>
<td>History &amp; Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagacadan Rice Terraces</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bae Rice Terraces</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph’s Church &amp; Museum</td>
<td>History &amp; Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagnit Waterfalls</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangaggawan Caves</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Kappugan</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utu and Inlayut Falls</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awa</td>
<td>History &amp; Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotad Ad Kiyangan</td>
<td>Culture/Tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory Day</td>
<td>Special Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakle Ad Kiyangan</td>
<td>Culture/Tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Kiyangan Site</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbuliklik Rock</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambuaya Lake</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Indalmogan/Mt. Patkik</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibulaeo River</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At present, SITMo is the only institution actively organizing tourism tours. As mentioned above, interactional rice cycle tours are strongly promoted. Tourists are not only experiencing the life of rice farmers, they are also actively involved in the process by working on the field and in the farms. Currently, another travel agency is being established in the village: the Tuwali Terraces Tours & Services. The pro-profit organisation already established an office in Manila, but was not yet operative at the time of the field research.

The community of Kiangan is located in a fairly remote area. Nevertheless, Kiangan has one bus line to Manila (Ohayami Trans) and two lines to Baguio (KMS and Ohayami Trans), which are the most common gateways for tourists. As the bus ride takes more than eight hours, the rudimentary accessibility is believed to restrain the growth of tourism in Ifugao (Marietta Hangdaan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013). Doctor Roberto Kalugdan (personal communication, 19 August, 2013) noted that “big things are about to happen to the transport-system by 2016”. First of all, the Kiangan-Tinoc road is currently broadened to become a national road. Named ‘the trans heritage road’, this road interconnects Ifugao and Bigan – both cultural heritage sites. This road-upgrading is part of the TRIP programme, the Tourism Road Improvement Prioritisation, which is spearheaded by the DOT and the Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH). As stated by the provincial tourism officer of Ifugao, Marietta Hangdaan, “Kiangan is the lucky one in this programme”: the community is given 142 million pesos for the road construction programme in 2012 and an additional 140 million for 2013. Compared to two other ‘lucky birds’, Batad (100 million pesos and an extra 40 million) and Lagawe (80 million), Kiangan received the big money. Besides Ifugao, no other provinces of the CAR received money from the TRIP-programme as they failed to attain the established criteria (Marietta Hangdaan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013). As second future improvement the reopening of the Bagabag airport – the closest airport to Ifugao, on 45 min of Kiangan – is mentioned. After years of close-down, the airport currently only admits chartered flights to utilise the airport facilities. The disclosing for all commercial airlines is expected to increase the number of visitors drastically (Marietta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taro By Products/Delicacies</th>
<th>Souvenirs &amp; Delicacies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rock of Pumbakhayon</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Air Museum</td>
<td>Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ifugao Academy</td>
<td>History &amp; Culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Hangdaan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013; dr. Roberto Kalugdan, personal communication, 19 August, 2013). Lastly, European airlines are finally allowed to land in the Philippine airports. All this is expected to improve the total amount of (international) visitors, as flaws in this system are currently considered to be the main flaw for the tourism industry. Initiating these projects, the government hopes to boost the tourism industry in the Cordillera. At present, parts of this information is still confidential and offline.

5.2 Homestay association of Kiangan

5.2.1 Background

The commencement of the homestay programme in Kiangan dates back to the years 2000, whereas the Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM) – the mother NGO of the current SITMo – encouraged people to visit Kiangan (Marlon Martin, personal communication, 4 September, 2013; Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). As no hotels, resorts or visitor accommodations were available, tourists requested local inhabitants to stay in their houses. Some residents became aware of the possible economic benefits of hosting visitors, which led to the establishment of several private owned homestays. Though, no cooperation or regulations existed between these private initiatives (Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). During the legislation of mayor Ayahao (2006-2008), the enhancement of the tourism industry was proposed in order to stimulate the local economy. Hence, the idea of a united homestay association started to rise. The final preparations of mayor Ayahao’s tourism plan took place during the last quarter of his term. As he wasn’t re-elected and the next mayor, Jonathan Cuyahon, decided to be less strenuous on tourism development in his community, the tourism plans were dropped. This was a disillusionment for the homestays as “they were not given any attention or training” at that time (Eulalie Dulnuan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013).

Notwithstanding the drop of tourism promotion provided by the LGU, the Kiangan Homestay Association (KIHA) was able to establish itself in 2010 due to the assistance of the tourism council and the DOT officer of Kiangan, Eulalie Dulnuan (dr. Roberto Kalugdan, personal communication, 19 August, 2013). Since the installation of the homestay association, SITMo
hosts the majority of its visitors through this programme. As about 80% of the homestay guests are provided by SITMo, this strongly increased the KIHAs occupancy rate (Eulalie Dulnuan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013). The president of this NGO, Marlon Martin (personal communication, 4 September, 2013), states that they “don’t mind that SITMo is now earning less money. Before the homestay association was initiated, we put all the tourist in our dorms. But ever since they established the association, we prefer to send the visitors to them, as more people can earn some revenue through tourism.” Due to the cooperation with SITMo and the limited but steady amount of independent visitors in Kiangan, the KIHA was able to consolidate its functioning.

When the Department of Tourism finalised its accreditation policy in 2011 (more information, cf. 3.2.4), the homestay association of Kiangan was eager to join. To obtain a quality guarantee for its visitors, the KIHA even decided to make the DOT accreditation compulsory for its members. Twenty-three accreditation candidates participated in the preliminary education and inspection in 2011 and 16 of them were accredited in 2012 (Eulalie Dulnuan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013).

5.2.2 Current functioning

Currently, 16 homestays in Kiangan are accredited by the Department of Tourism. As Table 5 displays, only 11 of the accredited members are active at the moment. Reasons for a passive status are diverse; renovations, illness and residing in a foreign country are noted as argument. Participation in the educational programme of the DOT is mandatory prior to accreditation. As no new trainings were provided since 2011, the amount of members remained stable. Currently, about five families are interested in becoming a new KIHA member. In 2013, a training was programmed, but due to lack of funds, the provincial tourism office had to cancel the schooling (Marietta Hangdaan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013). Hence, no certainty exists on when the candidates might join the association.
Table 5 - DOT accredited homestay owners in Kiangan (Source: Municipality of Kiangan, 2011b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name Homestay</th>
<th>Number of rooms</th>
<th>Maximum number of guests</th>
<th>Active status</th>
<th>Passive status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mila Arcaina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiangan Viewpoint</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenaventura</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomultim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luz Martin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tindaan (=Pit’s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo &amp; Sons</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liwanen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline/Masah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyagawon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micasa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nena</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remy’s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The homestay association of Kiangan is composed of mainly older individuals, as “they are the ones with empty rooms, as their children live in other municipalities or abroad” (Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). Every two year, a democratic vote is organised among the participants to elect their president. Since 2012 Masah Ayahao Melicor – one of the few not retired members – is chosen as chairman of the association. In order to attain an equal visitor distribution among all participants, Ms Melicor is the one allotting guests to the different homestays. SITMo-groups are divided among the KIHA members who have the lowest amount of visitors for that period. Whenever a member is not able to be a host – which they can freely do at any time (e.g. because of family affairs, holidays, lack of house keeper) – the next member in line is addressed. Walk-in guests are referred to Ms Melicor by the tourism office and she presents the possible homestay options. Due to foreigners’ personal requests or uncontrollable circumstances, this system is not
always followed strictly (Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). Controversies concerning the distribution system or other topics are discussed during the organised pre- and post-meetings of each group visit. During these meetings the homestay participants share their problems and concerns and attempt to self-monitor their functioning.

Nevertheless the Kiangan Homestay Association is an autonomous association, they are not able to adapt the price setting according to their discretion. As stated by different interviewees (Lourdes Arcaina & Teresa Buenaventura, personal communication, 16 August, 2013; Luz Martin, 3 September, 2013), the KIHA is influenced by SITMo, their main custom provider, and the tourism council when it comes to the accommodation fee. Presently, a fare of 350 pesos is counted per overnight per person, breakfast included. An additional 150 pesos is charged per extra meal. A rise of the fees is discouraged by both SITMo and the tourism council, as this might discourage future tourists from visiting (Luz Martin, personal communication, 3 September, 2013). Nor the SITMo or the tourism council assist the KIHA financially. Moreover, both the Local Government Unit (LGU) and the national government don’t grant direct financial support to the KIHA either. Their mode of assistance is mainly allocated through the organisation of trainings and marketing (Eulalie Dulnuan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013).

The majority of the homestays are situated in the Poblecion – the principal barangay, which is considered the centre of the community – or in its near surrounding. The inhabitants of this central area are generally considered more open-minded and prosperous than the more remote barangays (Marlon Martin, personal communication, 4 September, 2013). Fifty years ago tourism in the Cordillera was nearly impossible due to the closed character of the community and its people (Prof. Paulo Fresnoza, personal communication, 8 August, 2013). Ifugao only recently started accepting strangers in their communities. Reluctancy towards outsiders is still present among inhabitants of distant subdivisions as they wish to preserve their cultural traditions and identity. As such, no homestays are hitherto established in these areas. The manager of SITMo even states that “they [inhabitants of remote barangays of Kiangan] are quite paranoid when it comes to outsiders” (Marlon Martin, personal communication, 4 September, 2013).

---

11 The amount of 350 pesos equals 6 euro; 150 pesos equals 2.5 euro.
5.3 Participants’ perception on Kiangan Homestay Association

The findings of the interviews conducted during this study’s fieldtrip are represented in this section. Community satisfaction and personal comfort are influenced by the perception of tourism impacts and as such, the analysis of these perceptions is interesting within the context of tourism development (Dong-Wan and Stewart, 2002). Several recurring themes were brought to light, which became the basis of the organizational structure represented here. Both the positive and negative aspects of the homestay programme are analysed.

5.3.1 Positive impacts of the homestay programme

In this subsection, the beneficial aspects of the KIHA initiative and tourism in general are discussed into detail. Subsequently, the positive impact on cultural exchange, daily living, economic well-being and the environment are described.

Cultural exchange

As stated earlier in this dissertation, tourism strengthens the pride of host families for their traditional culture (UNWTO, 2012a). The exposure of this culture is one of the main objectives of homestay projects; international exchange is engendered by the cohabiting. Among the participants of the homestay programme of Kiangan, this interaction is mentioned as highly interesting. Dorine Guinid (personal communication, 26 August, 2013) – one of the members of the KIHA – cited that “The interaction is most important. I love to interfere with tourists and to show them our culture.” (Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 26 August, 2013). Participants are able to establish their international connections and they learn about the world and its different cultures (Ray Baguilat, personal communication, 18 August, 2013). Ilocano people are generally no travellers, but because of the homestay initiative they are able to interact with various nationalities (Marlon Martin, personal communication, 4 September, 2013). Adult hosts are not only experiencing the encounter with visitors important for their own social development and cultural awareness, the interaction with their children and grandchildren is also considered quintessential; “the exposure is good for their education” (Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 26 August, 2013; Luz Martin, personal communication, 3 September, 2013). The training of communicative skills, the creation of cultural awareness and the practising of foreign languages are mentioned as beneficial for the
youth (Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 26 August, 2013; Masah Ayahao Melicor, 21 August, 2013). Due to globalisation – and as communication is fundamental when individuals of different cultures live together – the latter is perceived highly important (Pusiran and Xiao, 2013).

By living together, visitors experience how the community functions and how inhabitants of Ifugao for example spend their evenings or work in the garden. The Ifugao culture also encompasses a traditional cuisine (e.g. adobo, native chicken\textsuperscript{12}, red ants, ferns, etc.), which the visitors can enjoy during their stay. In fact, “\textit{[e]verything we do is shared with the visitors, you really mingle with the family}” (Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 26 August, 2013; Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013; Ray Baguilat, personal communication, 18 August, 2013). The increased attention on the rich Ifugao culture – which is brought forth by homestays – augments the assurance of an active preservation (Marlon Martin, personal communication, 4 September, 2013). Demonstrations of dances, food preparations and celebrations by both the SITMo and individual households, add to this conservation.

\textit{Daily living}

The peril of a culture shock in a relatively closed community, as reaction on the inflow of tourists, is often described in literature (Pusiran and Xiao, 2013; UNEP, n.d. (c); Zaki et al., 2011). Multiple interviews with a diverse range of individuals led to the understanding that the impact of external cultures (caused by e.g. gadgets such as iPad / smart phones / laptops, way of dressing, mode of interaction, etc.) is limited in Kiangan. Not only is the number of international visitors limited, the main group of tourists also comes under supervision of SITMo to learn about the native culture. Prior to their field trip, the students of SITMo are introduced in the local habits and culture and are asked to behave in accordance to the local rules. Hence, the exposure to culturally different behaviour of both the native community and the homestay participants is restricted. Moreover, through training the homestay participants receive assistance from the DOT on how to maintain their traditions (Warner Andrada, personal communication, 8 August, 2013).

\textsuperscript{12} The recipe of ‘native chicken’ is not only unique due to the use of indigenous chicken species, but the mode of preparation is also special. As Alberta Donata (personal communication, 21 August, 2013) explains: \textit{“We don’t pull the feathers off, but we burn them off with the fire”} which creates a typical aroma.
Nevertheless some individuals in the community are pinned on the rapid increase of the tourism sector, the majority of the population favours a stagnation or a slow growth of the industry. One of the homestay participants stated the following (Theresa Buenaventura, personal communication, 16 August, 2013):

“For me this is a sleeping town. I’m contented with a simple life like this. If lots of tourists come, our way of life is maybe disturbed. We are contented with a few visitors who come to our homestay. If you have a continuous homestay, you sometimes also feel the stress; sometimes you don’t have the privacy anymore to put up your feet and lay down to watch TV. [...] I wouldn’t like it if there would be tourists coming every day.”

**Income and economy**

In contrast with the segment of the population discussed in the previous paragraph, some individuals in Kiangan wish to enlarge the tourism industry significantly to create more economic well-being for both the community and private individuals. They are convinced that projects such as the homestay programme can make a significant difference for a community like Kiangan (Masah Ayahao Melicor, August 21, 2013; dr. Roberto Kalugdan, personal communication, August 19, 2013). Other revenue creating sectors are very limited in the community, and as such tourism deems a good alternative to ameliorate the economic situation (Jay Red, personal communication, 26 August, 2013; Roy Adam, 16 August, 2013). Contrary to some other programmes (Mina Gabor, personal communication, 6 August, 2013)\(^\text{13}\), the KIHA initiative does not only encompass well-off individuals; the implementation rules of the association state that everyone is free to enter the programme. Aspirant participants need to wait until the next educational programme is organised by the DOT. Due to a lack of funds this training has been postponed a few times (Marietta Hangdaan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013) which in reality hinders some aspirant members to join the organisation.

Some interviewees acknowledge the ‘poverty eradication’ factor of tourism and homestays more specifically. Lourdes Arcaina, one of the homestay participants (personal communication, 16 August, 2013), stated that the extra income created through the

\(^{13}\text{In order to join the programme of Ms Gabor for example, 10,000 pesos (equivalent of ± 170 euro) needs to be paid for the educational programme. The gross of the Philippine population is unable to pay this fee.}\)
programme helps in the financing of the household. The main share of the additional income is invested in the house again; e.g. reconstruction, installation of a hot/cold shower, extra linen, etc. (Alberta Donata, personal communication, 21 August, 2013; Lourdes Arcaina, personal communication, 16 August, 2013). Nevertheless, all participants declared during a group discussion\(^4\), not to be financially depending on this extra revenue earned through tourism. Most of the members are retired and receive enough money from their pension or their children (Alberta Donata, personal communication, 21 August, 2013; Mila Arcaina, personal communication 16 August, 2013; Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 27 August, 2013). The non-pensionable members have private businesses or fixed jobs to maintain their cost of living (Lourdes Arcaina, personal communication, 16 August, 2013; Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013).

Not only homestay participants, but other individuals residing in the community or its surroundings benefit from the homestay visitors as well; this phenomenon is called the trickle-down effect (discussed into more detail in section 3.1.2). Some individuals mentioned the beneficial effect of the homestay programme on their economic situation. Visitacion L. Codamon (personal communication 20 August, 2013), the proprietor of ‘Brant’s restaurant & Snackhaus’, mentioned she earns money on the homestay programme, as some hosts don’t cook for their guests, but order the food in her eatery. Occasionally, some of the guests come and eat in her little restaurant as well. Unlike most big hotels\(^5\), homestay owners buy their food and toiletries on the local market (Eulalie Dulnuan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013). As such, market traders also partially benefit from visitors staying in the homestay programme and “extra money is brought into the local circulation” (dr. Roberto Kalugdan, personal communication, 19 August, 2013). As some of the homestay operators hire someone within the community to assist them in operating the homestay, or to guide their visitors around the rice terraces, extra employment is also created (Jhon Gaude, personal communication, 22 August, 2013; Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). As Philippine families have a strong tradition of sharing income and benefits

\(^{14}\) During the group discussion, held on 7 September 2013, 10 members of the KIHA were present: Masah Melicor, Mila Arcaina, Luz Martin, Theresa Buenaventura, Lourdres Arcaina, Dorine Guinid, Ms Marvic, Ms Liwanen, Nena Dait and Ms Tindaan. Additionally, Martin Marlon (president of SITMo) and Eulalie Dulnuan (local DOT officer) were present.

\(^{15}\) Eulalie Dulnuan, the DOT officer in Kiangan, explained that the Banaue hotel, the biggest hotel in the Cordillera region, does not buy its food on the local market because for examples worms might have affected the food. Moreover, exclusive fruits and vegetables are used in these kinds of hotels, which have to be purchased outside the municipality.
among their relatives, even more families indirectly benefit from tourism revenues (Lenie Tayaban, personal communication, 1 September, 2013). Different opinions on the economic effects caused by the homestays and the trickle-down on the entire community are elucidated in the next section, 5.3.2.

**Environment**

Environmentally, the presence of tourism increases the awareness of the local inhabitants to maintain their natural beauty and increase its conservation (Sunlu, 2003). The specific influence of tourism on environmental aspects of homestays is rather limited. Some interviewees mentioned the more conscious engagement in sorting and recycling their garbage (Alberta Donata, personal communication, 21 August, 2013; Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 27 August, 2013) and the importance of the cleanliness policy, governed by the LGU (Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). This policy currently focuses on the prohibition of the spitting of moma. Moma in Ifugao refers to the basic betel nut mix of nganga (Areca cathecu) nut, piper leaves (Piper betel) and apog (lime) (Philippine Council for Agriculture, Aquatic and Natural Resources Research and Development - PCAARRD, 2009). Both young and old Ifugaos chew this mixture because of the induced sensation, which is described to be similar to the smoking of cigarettes (and which is also very addictive). When the moma is chewed, the mixture obtains a red colour. This is spit on the roads and pavements, which litters the community (cf. Figure 8). Nevertheless its cultural significance, the government of Kiangan wishes to ban the spitting in public in order to increase the community’s cleanliness. Unless in Lagawe – the neighbouring community – the efforts of the LGU in Kiangan currently don’t make much progression (Eulalie Dulnuan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013; Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). Not only do homestay operators wish to ban the spitting to present a

---

16 Moma is used in indigenous practices. Stories on the betel nut affirm its cultural significance in the Cordillera; for instance, when an Ifugao couple is trying to get engaged, they must first chew betel nut fruit. If the colours of their saliva match, they are on their way to a wedding. Apart from its use in rites and being an alternative for smoking cigarettes, other practical uses of betel nut include: astringent to remove bad breath, pain reliever to those who suffer from toothache, and purgative treatment to eliminate worms among children and domesticated animals (PCAARRD, 2009).
clean village to visitors, but also local inhabitants are annoyed by the permanent pollution of the public areas (sectoral workshop on economic development of Kiangan, 28 August, 2013, cf. Appendix IV).

The UNESCO-protected rice terraces of Nagacadan are considered the most important natural resources of Kiangan. Both the inhabitants and the LGU start to realise that community-based sustainable tourism is not possible without the natural surroundings. As such, the augmenting of the tourism sector in the village raises the overall acknowledgment that this, and other natural areas, need to be well-protected and maintained (Juan Dait Junior, personal communication, 26 August, 2013). When groups of tourists visit the rice terraces with SITMo, a certain amount of money is handed to the farmers’ association, which is responsible for the preservation of the paddies. The inflow of money through tourism gives the association extra financial means to accomplish its conservational duty. In addition to the financial benefit of tourism, the sector indirectly also assured the replanting of the native rice, tinawon, which was over the years replaced by more productive rice species (Julia Bayaccan, personal communication, 26 August, 2013). New varieties can be harvested two to three times a year in comparison with tinawon, which can only be harvested once a year. Nevertheless the difference in productivity, the latter is much more beneficial for the soil, as it requires much less chemicals and fertiliser compared to the new varieties (Julia Bayaccan, personal communication, 26 August, 2013; Martin Marlon, personal communication, 4 September, 2013). Moreover, the soil has time to recover from the harvest, which is not possible in the case of multiple harvestings (Jhon Gaude, personal communication, 22 August, 2013). The gradual shift towards the native variety is engendered by both the ecological impact on the soil and the increased attention on the rice paddies due to tourism (Julia Bayaccan, personal communication, 26 August, 2013; Martin Marlon, personal communication, 4 September, 2013). As the rice terraces of Nagacadan were put in the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2001 (UNESCO, n.d.), the awareness to protect the area is raised among both the government and the local inhabitants (Juan Dait Junior, personal communication, 26 August, 2013). The influx of tourists through the homestay programme indirectly help to augment this awareness.

---

17 SITMo is engaged in increasing the awareness of the local farmers towards the loading of the soil and the environment in general. Workshops, impact studies and personal communication add to this awareness.
5.3.2 Negative impacts of the homestay programme

Often is believed that families and tourists who participate in homestay projects are cultural sensitive and very eager to learn from the traditional culture (Emilia Roslinda, personal communication, 29 July, 2013). Nevertheless their good-hearted intentions of respecting the local culture and not influencing the community situation, a certain degree of negative impacts or adaptations occurs at the indigenous setting due to tourism (Marietta Hangdaan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013). In this subsection, the adverse effects of the homestay programme and tourism in general are described. The shortages in water, waste and electricity management in Kiangan are elaborated first, followed by organisational problems concerning the KIHA, the exposure of the indigenous culture and the competition aspect instigated by homestays. Finally, the economic aspect is elucidated.

Utility deficiencies

Homestay owners state that water supply is the most common problem regarding the hosting visitors. The community of Kiangan holds two modes of water supply, by the LGU or by a private company. The provision by the local government is highly irregular; inhabitants only receive water a few hours a day, in which the water flows continuously. As the hosing system and the water pressure are insufficient to supply the entire community continuously\(^{18}\), an alternative supply system is established: certain areas of the community receive water for a few hours and are then cut off to supply other areas. Nevertheless the efforts of the LGU to distribute water equally among all residents, there is still no optimal functioning as some people receive less water than others (Lourdes Arcaina, personal communication, 16 August, 2013). To be able to use the water all day long, citizens need to capture the water in barrels, buckets and other tank-like materials (Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). Due to the irregular water supply and the insufficient water pressure, little buckets need to be used when taking a shower or using the toilet (Alberta Donata, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). However homestay visitors generally don’t mind these modes of water supply – as they intend to immerse entirely in the local culture, some less adventurous tourists might opt for other types of accommodation to have better facilities. Moreover, some days the water system totally fails which is a troublesome situation for

---

\(^{18}\) In contrast with the assumption most tourists make, the amount of water is not the cause of the irregular water flow. Kiangan is located in a mountainous area and as such multiple drinkable water sources are available. During rainy season (May – December) water is abundantly available. The supply of water is more scarce during dry season (January – April), but mainly attains the demand of the village.
homestay hosts, as residents and hosts can be left without water for several days (Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013).

To avoid these kinds of problems, most homestay owners opt for the second type of water supply, the private company (Mila Arcaina, personal communication, 16 August, 2013). This provision is continuous and resembles the water system as it is known in the Western world. Faucets are used to regulate the water flow and the extra generated water pressure assures the use of showers and toilets. This type of water supply is more expensive – a fixed amount of 400 pesos monthly – than the supply provided by the LGU – about 100 pesos\(^{19}\) (Mila Arcaina, personal communication, 16 August, 2013). Regarding tourism, this type of water supply is better; “at least now I’m sure to have water if tourists come. The water is really our problem.” (Mila Arcaina, personal communication, 16 August, 2013).

Problems with waste management is another issue that arises among homestay holders. The community of Kiangan in general has serious problems with its waste collecting system. The Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) addressed several warnings to the community concerning its mode of collection and disposal of garbage, but no improvements were made by the LGU (Eulalie Dulnuan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013; Roy Adam, personal communication, 16 August, 2013). As the dumping area of the community was filled and the DENR wanted to make a clear statement towards the LGU, the waste collection – which is normally provided twice a week – totally stopped on August 15\(^{th}\) 2013 (Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 27 August, 2013). While finishing this report in November 2013, the waste collection was still interrupted (Kevin Bayawon, personal communication, 21 November, 2013). To abolish the garbage that has been piling up for 4 months, villagers currently start burning and dumping the garbage, affecting the natural environment (Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 27 August, 2013; Kevin Bayawon, personal communication, 21 November, 2013). The hosting of guests produces more garbage, which creates an even bigger waste problem for homestay operators. Nevertheless, only a few members mentioned the problems with waste collection during the field research. Some participants believe that if internal LGU problems concerning this topic endure, serious problems might arise on the long run (Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 27 August, 2013).

\(^{19}\) 100 pesos equals 1.7 euro, 400 pesos equals 6.8 euro; some households already use water meters, which assures them to only pay for the amount of water they use. Nevertheless, this amount of households is still very limited; in general, inhabitants of Kiangan pay a fix amount of money for their water supply, regardless their consumption.
Power outages often occur within the community and the whole of Ifugao. For homestay families this is considered problematic, especially when visitors are residing in the house. No hot showers can be taken, no lights can be illuminated, gadgets cannot be charged or meals cannot be prepared (if an electric kitchen is available). Most homestay owners did not mention these brownouts as a specific problem for their accommodation, but whenever the amount of tourists would augment, this could become a critical issue (Lourdes Arcaina, personal communication, 16 August, 2013).

**Organisational problems concerning the KIHA**

The Kiangan Homestay Association is an independent organisation with its own regulations and objectives. Though, a well-established cooperation with the LGU and other tourism stakeholders is quintessential to develop the homestay sector. The partnership with these parties is not always without concerns, as different stakeholders have different interests and plans. As noted earlier (*cf.* section 5.1.3), the LGU of Kiangan is not intensively focussing on the attraction of tourists at the moment, and as such this industry is only growing slowly in Kiangan. As Jos Alberta, the planning engineer of the municipality stated, they “are focussing on the preparation of the facilities first before starting with the advertisement” (Jos Alberta, personal communication, 30 August, 2013). Some members of the KIHA agree with this mind-set, as they are contented with the guests they receive (Mila Arcaina, personal communication, 16 August, 2013; Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 27 August, 2013), but others perceive this as a lack of political will (Lourdes Arcaina & Theresa Buenaventura, personal communication, 16 August, 2013). This topic sometimes causes irritations among the homestay owners, which is directed towards the LGU. The members of the KIHA assume their establishments are sufficient to host the tourists as they are DOT-accredited, but the LGU rather seems to disagree. Preference is given to private investors who would put up a hotel: “as a municipality we are really encouraging private investors to come over. We are inviting them. [...] In previous years I had experiences with foreign tourists coming to Kiangan and they did not want to stay in the homestays.” (Jos Alberta, personal communication, 30 August, 2013). Moreover was stated that the Land Use Plan (LUP) 20 of the municipality can be adapted in order to attain the wishes of future investors: “*If a certain

---

20 The Land Use Plan (LUP) is the regional planning document of the municipality. This plan displays the commercial and agricultural areas. Hotels and other types of resorts can only be established in the commercial area. Currently, no strict boarders are determined yet as the document is still in progression (Ann Gumangan, personal communication, 27 August, 2013).
region is not considered a building area for a hotel, we could ask the sangunjan body\textsuperscript{21} to make amendments on the existing LUP, so that the region could be converted.” (Jos Alberta, personal communication, 30 August, 2013). The idea to attract investors to construct hotels is counteracted by the homestay association – who wants to promote its own establishments – and the tourism council. Concerning the influx hotels, Eulalie Dulnuan – secretary of the tourism council – stated that this “would not be appropriate for the first years to come. We expect to have hotels many years from now, maybe within 20 years, but for now the tourism sector has to grow slowly.” (Eulalie Dulnuan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013). In other words can be stated that the developmental plans of the LGU and the KIHA discord, with the tourism council more backing up the latter. Discrepancies in vision might create tensions once the influx of tourists augments.

Besides the LGU, the homestay association has some points of discussion with the Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR). When Filipinos establish a business they are obliged to register with the BIR in order to pay the necessary taxes\textsuperscript{22}. “Homestays are considered a business, so all participants should come and register with us”, Beverly Baybayon, the regional BIR officer claims (personal communication, 23 August, 2013). Nevertheless, various homestay owners currently don’t pay taxes to this institution as they believe they should not. The president of the KIHA mentioned that “[s]ome homestays registered their business in the BIR, but Julius [Julius Judalena – one of the DOT-employees responsible for the national homestay programme] told us a long time ago that homestays should not be taxed, as it is not considered a business.” (Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013).

Though, this communication has never officially been made towards the BIR, resulting in the latter institution persistently claiming its taxes from the homestay owners (Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). In order to solve this discussion, the vagueness should be eliminated by open communication.

The homestay association does not only have certain discussions with the external partners, internally some issues arise as well. The main point of concern is the rotation system to divide the guests among the available homestay participants. Whenever visitors arrive in Kiangan, Masah – as president of the KIHA – is addressed to accommodate them. She contacts the

\textsuperscript{21} The \textit{sangunjan body} is the legislative body of the municipality with the major and all councillors.

\textsuperscript{22} If the gross receipt on the business is below 1.9 million pesos per year [\(\pm 32,000\) euro], owners are considered as non-value added tax payers and they have to pay 3\% tax of the gross receipts they earn. If the gross receipt is higher than 1.9 million, they have to pay 12\%. In Kiangan, all homestay members are in the category of 3\% payers (Beverly Baybayon, personal communication, 23 August, 2013).
members who received the smallest amount of visitors during that quarter and asks if they are able and willing to host people. When this request is answered positively, the visitors are accommodated in these homestays; if not, the next homestay in line is approached. Nevertheless this distribution system is not mentioned in the constitutions and bylaws of the KIHA, it is well-known and generally applied among the participants. Though, several issues arose on this topic during the field research. Jealousy and gossiping increased as some participants assumed this rotation system was not followed strictly, which was strongly contradicted by Ms Melicor (Eulalie Dulnuan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013; Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). Not only Ms Melicor as president of the association, but also the leading guide of SITMo – who normally contacts Masah with the request of hosting visitors in the homestays – is addressed as cause of this issue. The latter occasionally skips this communication and places tourists in homestays of his choice (Eulalie Dulnuan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013), which “sometimes causes some trouble among the homestays. He should really communicate with Masah.” (Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 27 August, 2013). During a group discussion held on the request of the researcher (7 September, 2013), all present members agreed to improve the transparency by openly displaying the distribution scheme. Moreover, a workshop was planned in order to reformulate the guidelines concerning the rotation system and the internal communication.

Another perceived internal weakness of the KIHA is the unbalanced demography; the average age of the participants is 68 years old (Eulalie Dulnuan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013; Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). Currently, the majority of the members are retired woman with spare rooms in their house. In order to increase the interaction between the host family and the guests, and to attract younger families to the programme, the age of the participants should be more diversified (Eulalie Dulnuan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013). As the president of the association is at the same time the youngest member, this sometimes causes leadership problems (Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 27 August, 2013; Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013).

A final reproach towards the internal workings of the KIHA is the initial recruitment of its members. At present the programme is open for everyone who attends the DOT training, but when this session was first organised, officials only invited apparently suitable individuals to
join the association (Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 27 August, 2013). As such, some individuals who were willing to join could not participate. In the context of a fair competition, and in order to give everyone equal opportunities regarding tourism benefits, this selection was not appropriate. Hitherto, no second round was organised due to a lack of funds (Marietta Hangdaan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013). Moreover, some members think the amount of homestay operators should stay fixed until the amount of tourists augments (Luz Martin, personal communication, 3 August, 2013).

Exposure of the indigenous culture and impact on daily living

Kiangan is the cradle of the Ifugaos, a mighty and ancient tribe. Due to colonialism\(^{23}\) and globalisation (television, international trade, cell phones, etc.), the remote area got less isolated over the centuries. The growth of tourism over the last few decades added to the exposure of the Ifugao culture to the outside world. Various interviewees mentioned the diminishing of their cultural traditions and values due to the influx of international visitors. Inhabitants of Kiangan are descendants of a very closed and introvert clan and only recently started accepting strangers in their community (Prof. Paulo Fresnoza, personal communication, 8 August, 2013). Nevertheless native-born residents generally perceive tourism impacts as negative and are less willing to support any increase in the overall number of tourists (Brida, Disegna and Osti, 2011), this statement does not entirely account for Kiangan. Elders also acknowledge other resources than tourism – such as religion and media – as influencing factors on their traditional culture (Juan Dait Junior, personal communication, 27 August, 2013; Marietta Hangdaan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013). Below, several topics influencing homestay operators and the community as a whole are described.

Juan Junior Dait, former executive director of Ifugao Terraces Commision and well-established authority concerning the Ifugao culture, stated during an interview that the traditional morals are not lost, but “they are [gradually] being lost through tourism. [...] It’s changing throughout the years.” (personal communication, 27 August, 2013). Exemplary for

\(^{23}\) In 1521, the explorer Ferdinand Magallan discovered the Philippines as first European. As he died on the island of Cebu while trying to defeat the local tribe leader Lapu-Lapu, the archipelago was officially colonised by Spain in 1565. The Spanish rule dominates the Philippine history, as is lasted more than 3 decades - until 1898. The Spanish-American war resulted in the domination of a new world power, America, from 1898 until 1946. During World War II, the Philippines was shortly occupied by the Japanese as well. In 1946 the country finally gained its independence. The centuries of colonisation had their impact on the development of various indigenous communities.
this degradation, he mentioned the native community posing for pictures in traditional attire. Especially in Banaue, the tourism hotspot of the region, various young and old Ifugaos dress up in their traditional clothing in order to receive some money from tourists (Ray Baguilat, personal communication, 18 August, 2013). “Morally it’s not good but the people need money, so of course they do it. Anyway, this is corrupting the values of the people. [...] Even if you promote tourism as the economic benefit of the town, we should be able to maintain our culture without corrupting it” (Juan Dait Junior, personal communication, 27 August, 2013). The inhabitants of Kiangan are currently not affected by this kind of business as the number of visitors is still limited (Ray Baguilat, personal communication, 18 August, 2013; Luz Martin, personal communication, 3 September, 2013), “but when the tourism situation changes over the years, similar situations may arise” (Juan Dait Junior, personal communication, 27 August, 2013). As such, caution needs to be paid to sustain the community as it is. “Kiangan is a very nice and quiet place, I would not like it to be changed because of a lot of tourists. Tourists are in a way intruders and I don’t like it too much.” (Julia Buyaccan, personal communication, 26 August, 2013). Other impacts of tourism on traditional rites and practises are recorded as rather limited. Various interviewees mentioned they had no problems when visitors joined ritual traditions, such as weddings, burials or other family occasions. “It’s already quite some time that tourists are attending our cultural traditions and this is not weird for us anymore. Actually, I think this is a good way of spreading and sharing our culture.” (Julia Buyaccan, personal communication, 26 August, 2013). Nevertheless, other respondents mentioned that “[t]heir presence sometimes draws away the attention from the ceremony. Visitors should be informed on not attending any ceremony if they are not invited. This might disturb the practice of local rituals” (Jhon Gaude, personal communication, 22 August, 2013). Inhabitants of Kiangan “have to find a balance between maintaining and respecting their culture and letting tourists in” (Juan Dait Junior, personal communication, 26 August, 2013) to prevent their culture from changing entirely. The maintenance of a culture as it was centuries ago is nearly impossible and often not desirable for a local community. “[W]e are not in a museum, we also have to grow” (Marietta Hangdaan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013), but the rapidity and direction of modifications should not deny the entire culture and history of the Ifugaos (Juan Dait Junior, personal communication, 27 August, 2013).
The way of clothing by tourists (shorts, miniskirts, tops, etc.) is addressed by various interviewees as troublesome (Luz Martin, personal communication, 3 September, 2013; Theresa Buenaventura, personal communication, 16 August, 2013) as they are not used to this revealing way of dressing in public. “This is really disrespectful towards our community, they should not do this. But probably the foreigners do not really know” (Luz Martin, personal communication, 3 September, 2013). Research revealed that this cultural difference is not really a problem within the own community, as only a small amount of tourists visits Kiangan (Theresa Buenaventura, personal communication, 16 August, 2013). Tourism hotspots such as Banaue and Sagada mainly struggle with these issues. Moreover, one homestay operator mentioned the physical behaviour of couples as irritating as well (Theresa Buenaventura, personal communication, 16 August, 2013):

“[W]hen I was coming from Manila to Baguio, there was a tourist couple sitting next to me in the bus. And the whole drive from Manila to Baguio, they were kissing each other. I was really about to talk to them, but they didn’t go to Kiangan. [...] Even during the stopovers, they were really glued to each other, kissing the whole time. I don’t know if they were ever advised on the culture that we have, respect for the culture that we have.”

Furthermore, homestay owners prefer children of different sexes not to sleep together in their house as “[o]ur culture does not accept people – and certainly not children – of the same sex sleeping together” (Dorine Guind, personal communication, 27 August, 2013). “In our culture it is actually really taboo if you are sleeping together if you are not married.” (Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). SITMo-groups can easily be controlled as students are divided among different households by Ms Melicor, but independent travellers select the household they prefer themselves. In order not to affront the guests, no selection can be made on marital status. Occasionally annoying situations arise, for example when the guests appear to be a prostitute and her customer (Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). To avoid these troublesome situations, inhabitants of Kiangan noted that they prefer to only accept booked visitors – especially when they are Filipino (Marvic Bulahau, personal communication, 7 September, 2013) – but in reality this is hard to accomplish. Visitors should be value-oriented on the local traditions before visiting Ifugao province (Juan Dait Junior, personal communication, 27 August, 2013; Theresa Buenaventura, personal communication, 16 August, 2013).
Communicational problems with homestay visitors are noted as the biggest issue for host families. Filipinos are well-trained in English during primary and secondary school\textsuperscript{24}, but international guests such as Koreans and Japanese often lack basic knowledge of this language. As SITMo mainly cooperates with institutions located in these countries, the majority of the visitors have a Japanese or Korean nationality. The lack of knowledge of an international language of these students hinders a fluent and correct communication between both parties. This is not only considered pitiful as the cultural exchange is hampered, but household rules and little irritations cannot be expressed properly (Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 27 August, 2013). When students are paired up, SITMo guides try to place one English-speaking student in each homestay group, but this often fails (Luz Martin, personal communication, 3 September, 2013). As such, communication is often based on body language, but "the old Filipinos are not used to using body language and this causes bad communication, which sometimes leads to frustrations." (Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013).

\begin{quote}
\textit{Some Koreans even gave me a bottle of liquid once, but we could not ask them what it was. I was doubting whether it was maybe mouth water, but I didn't dare to use it. The next time some Koreans came that spoke a little bit of English, they told me that it was wine and that they actually had offered me a gift.}" (Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 27 August, 2013)
\end{quote}

Finally, homestay operators are often confronted with differences in eating culture as guests and hosts often dine together. The orientation programme of the DOT requires homestay owners to present their traditional cuisine, but as visitors (especially children visiting Kiangan with SITMo) are not always fond of this cooking, hosts often adapt to the desire of the guests (Luz Martin, personal communication, 3 September, 2013). Nevertheless, some operators stated that they really try to introduce the traditional recipes to the guests in order to maintain these traditions (Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 27 August, 2013). Little children are asked to give the local cookery a chance and sometimes this leads to success experiences. The presence of young guests sometimes creates a certain disorder in the house (cloths scattered, smoking in the rooms, fighting, etc.). Homestay owners consider these issues as

\textsuperscript{24} At the age of 6, Filipino children receive their first English classes. The amount of courses taught in English augments as they proceed to higher grades. Mathematics, science and other general courses in secondary are often taught in English. Moreover, young children often communicate in English with certain members of their family in order to stimulate their language skills at a young age.
normal aspects of their choice to host students, but acknowledge that homesick children can sometimes be quite troublesome and disturbing for their household (Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 27 August, 2013).

**Competition and jealousy**

The increase of a tourism industry generally goes hand in hand with an augmenting competition. Homestay operators undergo both an internal (facing other homestay operators) and external competition (facing other tourism accommodations such as hotels/resorts/hostels and other tourism-oriented communities). The latter competitor is limited in Kiangan as currently no hotels or resorts are located in the community’s near surroundings. As stated earlier (cf. ‘Organisational problems concerning the KIHA’), different stakeholders have different opinions regarding this issue. The plans of the LGU to attract private investors for the construction of new tourism facilities do not accord with some other tourism stakeholders. Among the homestay members different opinions arise as well; some host families claim that the presence of other accommodations would increase the influx of tourists, which would benefit their own establishments (Luz Martin, personal communication, 3 September, 2013; Marvic Bulahau, personal communication, 7 September, 2013). Contrastingly, other operators conceive alternative accommodations as direct competitors, which might negatively influence their own business by taking future customers away; “*when this happens, our homestays would die*” (Lourdes Arcaina, personal communication, 16 August, 2013; Vincent Bulahau, personal communication, 26 August, 2013). Currently no concrete plans are established to construct a hotel, but Kiangan does account 4 hostels. Due to their rather poor conditions, these facilities are not conceived as important tourist accommodations. Instead, the hostels are often used as training centre, meeting room or lodging for government employees.

Next to alternative facilities, other tourism-oriented communities are perceived as a kind of external competitor as well. In the province of Ifugao, Banaue encompasses the bulk of the tourism influx. In order to maintain its prominence, this community is unwilling to cooperate with the other communities of Ifugao to organise a tour combining all the tourism sites of the province (sectoral workshop on economic development of Kiangan, 28 August, 2013). This is seen as one of the reasons why the tourism influx in Kiangan, and the KIHA, stagnates (Eulalie Dulnuan, personal communication, 22 August, 2013).

---

25 The 4 hostels of Kiangan are the Kiangan Youth Hostel, the Senior Citizens Centre, Girl Scouts Hostel and the WWII memorial shrine guesthouse.
The abovementioned aspects of increased competition have little effect on the daily life of homestay participants. Though, the internal competition does affect the daily life and habits of some participants. Nevertheless most of the participants claim no jealousy or competition reigns among the different members – especially not because most of them are related in one way or another, several discussions and occurrences pointed out differently. “It should not be, but unfortunately it [the KIHA] sometimes causes some troubles. Before tourists came here, there were no problems, but since we started with the association, some troubles started to arise among the different houses. [...] They started to gossip among each other.” (Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 27 August, 2013). Rumours and jealousy mainly deal on a conceived unequal distribution of visitors, which “sometimes creates a bad atmosphere” (Vincent Bulahau, personal communication, 26 August, 2013). The organisational problems and possible solutions concerning the distribution system were elucidated earlier (cf. ‘Organisational problems concerning the KIHA’). As the KIHA strongly wants to oppose the triggering of social disagreements among its members, the association agreed to reformulate its organisational guidelines and to make the rotation system more transparent (Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). “The thing we need most is a decent communication, coordination and rotation” (Luz Martin, personal communication, 3 September, 2013). One of the homestay participants stated that “the mission of the homestay changed lately. We started this association because of the contact with the visitors; it’s nice for us to have company and we want to show the visitors our culture. But at the moment, I have the feeling that some participants are in the association purely out of economic benefits. This should not be, it’s not the sole reason why we started all of this.” (Dorine Guinid, personal communication, 27 August, 2013).

A certain degree of jealousy is also felt from the inhabitants of Kiangan who cannot join the programme; “[s]ome people sometimes come to me and ask in a little jealous way how much I’m earning on the homestays” (Luz Martin, personal communication, 3 September, 2013). Most homestay operators don’t grant much attention to these remarks, but this jealousy does not promote the unity of the community. Possible measurements to limit similar visions are presented in the following section.
Economy and personal prosperity

Various international sources recognise the economic benefits of tourism (cf. 3.1.2; Organisation of American States, 2000; Richardson, 2010; Samimi and Sadeghi, 2011). Moreover, it is stated that the tourism industry trickles down to the entire community and as such does not only benefit the directly involved individuals (Akama, n.d.). As homestays initiatives – such as the KIHA – are organised by local individuals and are situated in less touristic areas, they are considered important opportunities to make an economic difference for the community. This could eventually lead towards poverty eradication (Pusiran and Xiao, 2013). Though, all 10 members present on the group discussion organised on 7 September 2013, stated their financial situation did not change since they joined the homestay programme. Moreover, they noted they are not economically depending on the income they earn through the programme. This can be explained as all members are considered relatively well-off; poor families don’t have spare rooms they can rent to foreigners – which is the basic condition to join the programme (Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). This is confirmed by Ray Baguilat, a retired inhabitant of Kiangan: “[t]he majority of the money goes to the upper-class because these are the people owning the housing and the transportation” (personal communication, 18 August, 2013).

Nevertheless the bulk of the tourism revenue is earned by well-off individuals, this is nuanced as for example market vendors and tricycle drivers indirectly also benefit from tourism; the so-called ‘trickle-down effect’ (Ray Baguilat, personal communication, 18 August, 2013; dr. Roberto Kalugdan, personal communication, 19 August, 2013). In theory this idea appears accurate, as more individuals in the community equals more sold and used commodities. This is refined by various interviewees: “It should be like this, but my point of view is that only the owners of the homestays are earning at this moment” (Linda Dait, personal communication, 26 August, 2013); “I don’t think tourism is beneficial for common people at this time. Actually, it’s only the homestayers that are benefiting at the moment. It’s a kind of a private business” (Geraldine Gawi, personal communication, 26 August, 2013). The discrepancy between theory and reality can be explained as only a little amount of tourists come to the community and as such only a few farmers or tricycle drivers earn some extra pesos (Roy Adam, personal communication, 16 August, 2013). The amplitude of the tourism industry is too limited to achieve a profound impact on the local community or to claim poverty eradication is effectuated. Nevertheless, homestays are considered a better alternative
compared to a hotel, as the latter stimulates the local economy even less (Linda Dait, personal communication, 26 August, 2013). Due to the limited impact on common residents, one of the inhabitants states that individuals not involved in the tourism industry are not that much fan of the sector (Geraldine Gawi, personal communication, 26 August, 2013). This is perfectly affirmed by one of the homestay participants himself, who is the owner of the only supermarket in the town:

“When people tell you they would not like to have a lot of visitors coming over to Kiangan, I think these are the common people talking. The people who have a business like me, will always like it when more tourists would come over. But if I would be one of the common people who doesn’t have a shop, I don’t think I would like it if a lot of people would come. It would be too crowded. But now I’m happy for my business.” (Vincent Bulahau, personal communication, 26 August, 2013).

Besides the fact that most residents don’t benefit from foreigners visiting their community, the field research also pointed out that the price of commodities rises due to this industry. “When there is a lot of demand, the price really rises. During the elections or during high season [for tourists] the price of pork and chicken rises from 160 pesos per kilo to 200 pesos.” (Theresa Buenaventura, personal communication, 16 August, 2013). This is contradicted by some other sources, which claim price inclinations are not due to the tourism season – the amount of visitors in Kiangan is too small to cause this effect – but rather vary due to weather conditions such as typhoons (Ray Baguilat, personal communication, 18 August, 2013). Whatever the causality of this increase, the price difference is a big issue for the farmers who don’t earn more income (Julia Buyaccan, personal communication, 26 August, 2013). One homestay owner claims this change in price is not easy for the establishments as well, as room rates remain fixed (Theresa Buenaventura, personal communication, 16 August, 2013).

In order to augment the tourism benefits for the entire community, the LGU is currently implementing a tourism revenue code. When this constitution is approved, every tourist visiting Kiangan will have to pay ±30 pesos\(^{26}\) registration fee (sectoral workshop on economic development of Kiangan, 28 August, 2013). This money will go to the LGU and by investing it in communal infrastructural upgrading and local projects, the entire community

---

\(^{26}\) An equivalent of ±0.5 euro.
will benefit (Francis Galab, personal communication, 27 August, 2013). The KIHA also intends to donate a percentage of their income to the LGU, in order to distribute the tourism revenue among a wider segment of the population (Masah Ayahao Melicor, personal communication, 21 August, 2013). Moreover, this initiative should reduce the jealousy tourism creates within the community (cf. ‘Competition and jealousy’). Currently, this intention is not yet realised.

### 5.4 Conclusion

The results of this field study are well summarised by a statement of Juan Dait Junior, one of the tourism council members and senior inhabitant of Kiangan: “Tourism is double-edge: it can destroy and it can build” (personal communication, 26 August, 2013). The same accounts for homestay initiatives such as the Kiangan Homestay Association; both positive and negative aspects of the initiative were revealed during interviews conducted in the context this dissertation. The intercultural exchange and social contact with the visitors is considered the most positive effect of the homestay initiative; the interaction is conceived beneficial for both elders and children. Moreover, positive environmental effects on the natural surrounding (e.g. rice terraces), and the community as a whole entity (e.g. cleanliness of the LGU), due to an increased awareness were noted as advantages of the tourism industry. As negative impact, the disturbance of the indigenous culture – way of clothing, degradation of traditional morals – was noted. Communicational problems with guests were frequently mentioned as disturbing factor in the households of the KIHA-members, which furthermore often limits the abovementioned positive intercultural exchange. Deficiencies in diverse facilities – water management, waste collection and electricity supply – were recorded as facets that hamper the establishment of model homestays. A distinct increase in the jealousy among the operators was defined as the main consequence of the internal organisational problems the KIHA undergoes. Deficient communication with other stakeholders of the tourism value chain (LGU, DTI) hinders an optimal cooperation. The economic prosperity – considered one of the most important aspects of homestay initiatives – is analysed as ambiguous; both positive and negative visions arise concerning the well-being of the homestay families and the community as a whole. Individuals benefiting from the tourism industry tend to conceive its impacts as less troublesome.
Profound research on the homestay initiative of Kiangan uncovered certain obstacles the association is dealing with. The next section encompasses recommendations made towards the KIHA, the municipal government of Kiangan and the DOT in order to ameliorate the functioning of the initiative. Suggestions are formulated in order to limit the negative impact of tourism on the local community, and especially the KIHA-members.
Chapter 6: Conclusions & Recommendations

The last part of this dissertation presents the researcher’s conclusions and recommendations. The context and framework (cf. chapter 3) clearly highlighted the ambiguity of the tourism sector on economic, environmental and social aspects. The impact of the industry is dispersed. Homestay initiatives reflect the same inconclusiveness. From an economic point of view, livelihood opportunities, additional income and employment prospects are noted as benefits arising from these programmes. However literature mentions the trickle-down on the overall population, this appeared to be restricted in various cases as well. Homestay operators receive the bulk of the tourism revenue, and additionally, mainly well-off individuals participate in these programmes. As such, the poverty eradication aspect of homestay initiatives appears to be rather limited. Culturally, homestay initiatives raise some points of discussion too. The intercultural exchange is praised as one of the most important assets of homestay programmes, but at the same time the disappearance of traditions – due to the intercultural exposure – is revealed.

This report focused on the impact of the homestay industry in Kiangan, a small community located in the northern part of the Philippines. The abovementioned ambiguity of the tourism sector was determined in the analysis of this case study as well. The impact of tourism on the local community is considered both positive and negative, whether it comes to economic, social or environmental aspects. Economically, KIHA-members benefit from the initiative, but the trickle-down to other individuals in the community is mainly restricted due to the limited number of tourists. Moreover, the ones earning money are at the same time considered as the high-class of the municipality, because they have the facilities to join the programme. The poverty eradication aspect of the KIHA is very limited. The social facet of the KIHA is perceived highly important for its members; their social development and cultural awareness augments through the interaction with foreigners. Additionally, the beneficial effects on communicative skills and knowledge of foreign languages is mentioned. Nevertheless these positive aspects, various interviewees mentioned social downsides of the homestay initiative. The indigenous culture is (unwillingly) disturbed by the presence and influence of
international guests. Traditional habits (e.g. way of clothing, cultural rituals) tend to disappear over the years. Inhabitants of Kiangan acknowledge these cultural modifications are stimulated by the influx of tourists, but recognise the critical and widespread influence of colonialism and globalisation (television, international trade, cell phones etc.) as well. Furthermore, the augmenting of competition and the reduction of privacy were noted during this research. Environmentally, the presence of the natural surroundings is deemed more important since the growth of tourism. Efforts to maintain the rice terraces of Nagacadan and to keep the municipality clean increased, as its importance for tourists was acknowledged by the villagers. Contrastingly, the increase in dumping of garbage by tourists was recorded in tourism-hotspots such as Banaue, but these impacts currently appear to be limited in Kiangan as tourism numbers are relatively small. Nevertheless, the escalation of dumping was induced due to problems with the waste collecting system.

The lack of a well-organised joint planning among various stakeholders creates a deficient cooperation, which establishes additional pressure on the above mentioned aspects. Differently-orientated policies and visions accentuate internal disagreements, creating tension among various stakeholders. As Kiangan is gradually increasing its efforts to become one of the tourism hotspots in the area, a thorough planning deems highly necessary to set out distinct policy guidelines. To guarantee a sustainable and well-organised growth, all tourism stakeholders need to work together. Furthermore, important questions need to be answered, such as whether the KIHA is a cornerstone in Kiangan’s sustainable tourism development or only a temporary solution until the arrival of private investors; or whether the homestay initiative aspires to create prosperity among the whole community or solely its own members. An open dialogue with all stakeholders – the LGU, the tourism council, the KIHA, the farmers’ associations, etc. – would improve the communication and cooperation between different parties. Joint planning enhances the credibility and legitimacy through an open and accessible process; it minimizes adversarial situations, promotes consensus and avoids conflicts. The establishment of the Tourism Master Plan in 2012 is an important step in the right direction for Kiangan.

Impacts of tourism are conceived differently, depending on the interviewees personal background and experiences. As a voluminous amount people is involved in the tourism industry, a variety of opinions and judgements arises from this sector. Nevertheless the acknowledgement that not everyone can benefit equally, the overall purpose of homestay
initiatives is to maximise the group of people benefiting from this sector. As tourism – and homestays more specifically – are interesting tools to instigate socio-economic progress and to achieve accelerated development, maximal efforts should be made to bring the mentioned downsides to a minimum. The KIHA, and tourism in general, are considered interesting sources of extra income in Kiangan as revenue creating activities are limited to agriculture. A gradual and sustainable growth, with caution for possible negative impacts, could help the community develop in the long term. The slow growth in tourism arrivals is actually considered beneficial, as downsides can be more easily interpreted and adjusted in small-scale situations. Hence, gradual development is deemed critical; “the slowness of the LGU in coming up with tourism is actually a positive thing. Influences from outside reach our village gradually.” (Martin Marlon, personal communication, 4 September 2013). As Kiangan is currently stimulating its tourism industry, the safeguarding of the sustainability of this growth is quintessential.

Based on the findings of this dissertation, recommendations are made in order to ameliorate the programme’s functioning in the future. The Kiangan Homestay Association (KIHA), the Local Government Unit (LGU) and the Department of Tourism (DOT) are addressed to optimise the initiative’s functioning and sustainability, for both its members and the entire community.

Recommendations concerning the KIHA

- Members have to abide the programme’s concept and standards, formulated in the ‘Constitution of Bylaws of the Kiangan Homestay Association’. A clearly defined rotation system for guests needs to be added to this document. Open communication is deemed highly important to avoid internal disagreements; as such, public displaying of the accommodated amount of visitors is highly recommended. To ensure a consistent working, all involved parties (KIHA-members, LGU, SITMo) should instantly be informed when adjustments are made. Strict guidelines and procedures need to be set out to avoid miscommunication;
• A memorandum of understanding should be developed between the KIHA and SITMo, the main provider of guests. This memorandum should seek to address roles and responsibilities of each partner in order to prevent points of discussion. All involved individuals of both parties should be informed to ensure a coordinated cooperation;

• The continuous monitoring of the project’s performance should be enacted. Homestay operators need to be stimulated to express their concerns regarding the association and its current functioning. The organised pre- and post-meeting are deemed an ideal setting. The president needs to stimulate constructive discussions among the members to bring forward the recurring problems the operators encounter;

• A yearly survey of all stakeholders needs to be organised in order to determine the programme’s main problems, and to safeguard its optimal functioning. A summary of the recurring themes of the pre- and post-meetings should help to focus on the profound problems. Points of improvement should be formulated in accordance with the concerned stakeholders, and should induce the improvement of the ongoing guidelines and practices;

• To ensure the KIHA’s economic benefits are divided among a wide segment of the community, a refunding towards the LGU/tourism council should be initiated. The money should be reinvest in the community (e.g. communal infrastructural upgrading, local projects, etc.) to guarantee its developmental intentions;

• The formulation of a clearly defined code of ethics and good practice guidelines (‘do and don’ts list’) for visitors should be envisaged by the homestay operators. Hence, guests are informed on habits and traditions being preserved in the households of Ifugao. To overcome language problems, these documents are preferably translated in the most common mother languages of guests (Japanese, Korean), or illustrations should visualise the issue at stake;

• Cross-cultural communication needs to be enhanced by improving both the communication and non-verbal skills of the homestay families. By organising a workshop on cross-cultural communication, the KIHA might stimulate its members to be more engaged in the cultural exchange. Both an increased social
contact and more active disclosure of potential irritations between host and guests will be instigated;

- Candidate members should be informed on the dual aspirations of the KIHA. Intentions of joining the programme should not be solely economic, but the importance of cultural exchange and the promotion of the traditional Ifugao culture should also be engendered.

**Recommendations concerning the LGU of Kiangan**

- A workshop on the development of the tourism industry should be organised, uniting all stakeholders of the tourism value chain. The purpose, obligations and limitations of each shareholder should be defined, in order to incorporate the different visions and to sharpen the focus of the tourism development. Hence, a sustainable and well-coordinated growth is envisioned;

- Financial profits produced by the tourism industry should benefit a wide segment of the inhabitants. The LGU should encourage tourism stakeholders (SITMo, KIHA) to donate a percentage of their earnings to the community. The municipality should coordinate the investment of this money in community-relevant projects, such as infrastructural upgrading or local projects benefiting for example farmers;

- Utility deficiencies organised on local level (i.e. waste collection, water supply) should be improved to assist homestay owners in the operation of their establishment. Failure of these provisions hinders an optimal functioning of the homestays. Moreover, the overall population of Kiangan would favour an improved water supply and waste management;

- The community of Kiangan should be proactive in providing knowledge regarding the Ifugao culture. Capacity building programmes (e.g. school of Ifugao traditions) should anticipate on cultural differences and enhance the cultural awareness among Ifugaos. As such, the pride of the Ifugao families for their traditional culture is strengthened and the decline in Ifugao traditions is hampered. Moreover, value-orientation should be offered to visitors of the community. Information on ‘do and don’ts’ limits the degradation of values and traditions;
The local authority should safeguard a slow growth of the tourism sector, in order to guarantee a sustainable development. Furthermore, a proper planning and implementation are essential to reach these objectives.

Recommendations concerning the DOT

- Community-based, small-scale homestay projects should be involved in the decision-making process of the DOT’s national homestay programme. This bottom-up process assures appropriate decisions are made on the national level (e.g. feedback should be given on which topics are interesting for trainings/workshops). Well-governed assistance from the national level plays a significant role in establishing and maintaining these programs;
- Accreditation sessions and trainings concerning the operation of homestays should be organised regularly by the DOT. Hence, the inflow of new members is assured, which enlarges the sector’s capacity. Moreover, a control is instigated on the functioning of the homestays, enhancing the product’s internal quality and reputation;
- Workshops on the maintenance and incitement of the traditional culture increases the capacity-building of the homestay members. Cross-cultural training should be a component of the orientation process and should be delivered by an expert in this field of study. Hence, influences of tourists are counterbalanced and the traditional culture is preserved.

In conclusion, more research is required on the impact of homestay programmes to ensure this initiative accounts as tool for sustainable tourism development. Specific settings comprise unique characteristics. Hence, the reflection of one case study’s findings is insufficient to drawn general conclusions on the national homestay programme. In order to fully grasp the comprehensive impact of these initiatives in the Philippines, findings of this dissertation should be double checked with data of analogous researches in the other showcases of the PNHP, Argau and Karaga. By combining the information all three pilot projects, more accurate and correct comments and recommendations can be made towards the national level.
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## Appendix I – Overview of interviewees

Overview of individuals interviewed during field research; grouped in officials, Homestay association of Kiangan and Citizens of Kiangan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Link with tourism sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officials</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mina Gabor</td>
<td>Former secretary of state of trade and tourism; president of the ISST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eulalie Dulnuan</td>
<td>Local DOT official of Kiangan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marietta H. Hangdaan</td>
<td>Supervising tourism operation officer of provincial tourism information &amp; assistance centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner Andrada</td>
<td>Chief officer DOT, Office of Product Research and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paolo Fresnoza</td>
<td>Professor Asian Institute of Tourism – University of the Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjan Puguon</td>
<td>Councillor of Tourism and Culture of the municipality of Kiangan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos Albert Aguana</td>
<td>Municipal Planning and development coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilia Roslinda</td>
<td>Executive director PROCESS Bohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Manticajon</td>
<td>Coordinator RCE Cebu; human rights lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilia B. Umanhan</td>
<td>DTI - Senior trade and industry development specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Baybayon</td>
<td>Revenue collection officer at Kiangan of Bureau of Internal Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Gumangan</td>
<td>Researcher Planning Division LGU Kiangan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Galab</td>
<td>Treasurer tricycle association + member farmers’ association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homestay Association in Kiangan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masah Ayahao Melicor</td>
<td>President homestay association – nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mila Arcaina</td>
<td>Homestay owner – retired teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lourdes Arcaina</td>
<td>Homestay owner – shop owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tes Buenauntura</td>
<td>Homestay owner – retired school principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Donato</td>
<td>Homestay owner – retired teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Bulahau</td>
<td>Homestay owner – owner grocery shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvic Bulahau</td>
<td>Homestay owner – owner grocery shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorine Guinid</td>
<td>Homestay owner – retired teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luz Martin</td>
<td>Homestay owner – retired teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Dait</td>
<td>Homestay owner and owner pension house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhon Gaude</td>
<td>Assistant in homestay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizens Kiangan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Adam</td>
<td>Volunteer SITMo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Baguilat</td>
<td>Retired teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Bayawan</td>
<td>Volunteer tourism office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Roberto Kalugdan</td>
<td>Doctor – owner Ibulao Ibulao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitacion L. Codamon</td>
<td>Owner Brant’s restaurant &amp; Snackhaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Buyaccan</td>
<td>Sari sari owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldine Gawi</td>
<td>Caretaker – applicant HS programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Red</td>
<td>Inhabitant Kiangan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Pinkihen</td>
<td>Carpenter – applicant HS programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juan B. Dait junior &amp; Linda Dait</strong></td>
<td>Member tourism council; former executive director of Ifugao Terraces Commision and former provincial secretary of Ifugao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenie Tayaban</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa M. Pineda</td>
<td>SITMo guide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II – Questionnaire homestay participants

Basic list of questions for homestay participants; during interviews, questions were altered and added, depending on the given answers.

1. **Basic information**
   1.1. Name and main profession?
   1.2. How long already part of the homestay programme?
   1.3. Motivation to participate? How did you enrol?
   1.4. Average amount of guest per month/year?
   1.5. Did you receive any education on the homestay programme?
      1.5.1. What subjects?
      1.5.2. Provided by who?
      1.5.3. Did it meet your expectations?
      1.5.4. Cost of the training?
   1.6. What are your thoughts on tourism? What is for you the most positive and negative aspect concerning the homestay?

2. **Impact on lifestyle**
   2.1. Economically
      2.1.1. How much do you earn by average on the homestay programme?
      2.1.2. Did your economic situation change since you participated?
      2.1.3. Does the homestay create financial inequality in the village? Did the cost of living change due to tourism?
      2.1.4. Is everyone able to participate in the programme?
   2.2. Environmentally
      2.2.1. Did the environment change last decades? Was this due to tourism?
2.2.2. What impact does tourism have on the natural surroundings? + and/or -
2.2.3. Is the tourism policy concerned with the environment?

2.3. Socially
2.3.1. How does tourism affect your community? Did the social situation in the village change since the start of the programme? (e.g. habits, drugs, crime …)
2.3.2. You have the feeling your culture has changed to face the needs of the tourists? Are you able to maintain your own cultural values?
2.3.3. Is there jealousy among different members?
2.3.4. Sometimes annoyed by tourists? If yes, what irritates you most? What is pleasant about the tourists visiting?
2.3.5. Problems with privacy when there are guests in the house?

3. **Future improvements**: which adaptations would improve the current project?
   3.1. Adaptations on education
      3.1.1. What kind of information do you expect to get? Do you feel you have gaps in your knowledge to run the homestay properly?
      3.1.2. What would make the homestay more pleasant for you?
   3.2. Adaptations concerning tourists
      3.2.1. Should there be a ‘do and don’ts’ information for the tourists? Need to educate them?
      3.2.2. Should there be a maximum amount of tourists or should some areas be restricted for tourists?
   3.3. Adaptation of Department of Tourism (DOT)
      3.3.1. As a citizen, are you included in the decision-making of the community/government concerning tourism?
      3.3.2. Changes necessary in the accreditation system?
      3.3.3. More support needed from the DOT? Which issues are most urgent?
   3.4. Adaptations on sustainability
      3.4.1. How can the natural environment be protected more? Who should be in charge of this protection?
      3.4.2. Enough awareness in the community to preserve the nature? Why yes/no?

4. **Anything you would like to add, highlight or correct something?**
Appendix III – Philippine New Homestay Programme

I. OBJECTIVES

The program is anchored on the main objective of positioning the Philippines as one of the most preferred homestay destinations in the ASEAN Region. Specifically, it aims to:

- Allow homestay guests to experience genuine Filipino culture through interaction with host community and families through participation in cultural and traditional activities;
- Develop and promote culture-based activities that shall enhance visitor experience to promote year-round homestay patronage and encourage longer stay;
- Enhance the capability of homestay owners/families and host communities in handling guests, and in homestay business operations;
- Develop homestay standards, regulations and accreditation system in accord with the ASEAN;
- Develop homestay promotional and marketing plans;
- Establish a monitoring and feedback mechanism.

II. NEW HOMESTAY DEFINITION

A form of tourism where tourists experience living with a Filipino host family. Tourists may learn from their daily way of life by participating in the host community’s distinctive cultural and traditional practices.

III. PROGRAM COMPONENTS

The program will have the following components:

1. **Product development/enhancement**

Activities on this component will focus on the development and enhancement of the current mechanics and criteria based on the objectives set and ASEAN homestay standards, and conduct of re-orientation activities. A market-based program approach will likewise be considered. Development of a community cultural-based activities for guests to lengthen their stay and promote year-round patronage will also form part of this component. Culturally rich
areas/sites will be identified where the new homestay concept will be piloted. A study tour in an ASEAN country with Homestay Best Practice shall be conducted to provide inputs on the program reconceptualization. A downloadable and printed Philippine Homestay Manual will be developed which will be made available to anyone who may be interested in Philippine Homestay Program. Research on homestay global trends shall continuously be done as inputs for product enhancement.

Criteria for Selection of Homestay Sites:

- Must be within the identified NTDP Tourism Development Areas
- Presence of existing tourism products and markets (e.g. natural and cultural attractions visited by tourists) that will complement with the development of homestay;
- Site should be easily accessible to tourists, i.e. existing transport services, good road condition, other infrastructure;
- Total willingness of the host community and families to commit in joining the program and abide by the program’s concept and standards;
- There must be a minimum of 10 rooms per community;
- Can be located in areas where there are existing commercial accommodation establishments;
- Prevailing peace and order in the area;
- Supportive Local Government Units and stakeholders

2. Development of new Homestay Standards, Regulations and Accreditation System

Current DOT standards, regulations and accreditation system on homestay shall be reviewed and studied, and will be revised accordingly based on ASEAN Standards by the DOT Office of Tourism Standards and Regulation. A special logo/icon specifically for homestay will be designed and printed to be displayed in participating homestay houses.

3. Training Modules Development/Capability Building

Capability building programs shall continuously be implemented to standardize homestay operations in the country and enhance the capability of homestay host families in handling guests. The current training module will be revised and enhanced and will include lengthy discussions on business aspect of homestay and will use the “hands on approach” and “community to community” training as per ASEAN Homestay Standards. Follow-up training modules for homestay stakeholders will likewise be designed and conducted to sustain and enhance the program which will include environmental and cultural preservation topics. Program implementers such as DOT, LGUs, etc. will likewise be oriented/trained to ensure standard implementation of the program.
### 4. Promotion and Marketing

Promotion and marketing activities will include development of promotional collaterals to be distributed and displayed in various tourism establishments, tourism reception offices in airports, seaports and bus terminals.

The new Homestay Program will be re-launched with strong partnerships with other government agencies and the private sector. Support of the tour operators, travel agencies, airlines, sea and land transport operators, travel magazines will be sought through development of homestay packages and promotion of the program to their valued clients assuring them of a different experience they will get in staying in homestay houses. Corporate rates can be developed and offered to tour operators and travel agencies to encourage patronage from their guests.

A Philippine Homestay Directory, Website and On-line booking will be developed and will be linked to DOT and other tourism related agencies’ websites. Social media networks may also be utilized in promoting the program.

### 5. Establishment of a Monitoring System/Databases

Regular monitoring of the program at the regional level will be done using the monitoring and evaluation system to be designed and institutionalized. A regular monitoring and evaluation report will be submitted through the DOT Regional Offices, which will serve as the program’s feedback mechanism. The LGUs and Homestay Association will do the monitoring and evaluation at the municipal level. Homestay operators, guests and product databases will also be established.

### 6. Provision of Incentives to Host Communities/Families

Participating communities and families shall enjoy the following benefits/incentives:
- Access to different financial and lending institutions through credit windows, cooperatives and technical grants for house and room renovations;
- Free beddings, blankets, towels and toiletries in the initial homestay operations;
- Tax Exemption;
- Participation in DOT training programs;
- Inclusion in the DOT promotions and marketing;
- Automatic DOT accreditation

### 7. Pilot Implementation

The pilot implementation entails the following activities:
- Selection of 3 pilot areas Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao
- Community product and development
- Community organizing and workshops
- Training on homestay and other relevant aspects
- Promotions and Marketing
IV. INSTITUTIONAL LINKAGES

The program implementation shall require strong collaboration between the Department of Tourism (DOT), Tourism Promotions Board, LGUs, private sector and NGOs. Local Homestay Associations will be revived and strengthened to be led by local champion with strong leadership qualities and respected by the local community.
Appendix IV – Sectoral Planning Workshop

Sectoral planning workshop on tourism and farming in order to establish the Comprehensive Development Plan; August 28, 2013.

List of participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emma Achten</td>
<td>Student – research master thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eulalie Dulnuan</td>
<td>Local DOT officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masah Ayahao</td>
<td>President homestay association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland Dimog</td>
<td>Private entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland Bonctiwon</td>
<td>Blacksmith – producer OTOP product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos Aguana</td>
<td>Municipal planning and development coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjan Duguon</td>
<td>Councillor Kiangan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Galab</td>
<td>Treasurer tricycle association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formulated problems concerning the Kiangan Homestay Association and strategies to cope with these issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed conditions</th>
<th>Causes and explanations</th>
<th>Implication</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Sectoral goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of arrivals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More advertisement</td>
<td>20 nights per homestay per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decreased</td>
<td>No advertisement;</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>through tour packages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>economic crisis;</td>
<td>decreases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improvement of the dorms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and cheap price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jealousy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities hot and cold water</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culturally declined services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of knowledge in handling homestay visitors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limited knowledge in food preparation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>