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Few chapters in this book follow the conventional 'scientific format'. In synthesizing the different and seemingly incompatible approaches used by different authors, this chapter draws the connections between the different research paradigms reflected in this volume – autoethnography, self-reflexivity and conventional approaches. As Finlay and I argued in Chapter 9, useful social research also needs to be nuanced, textured and respectful of our subjects主持人 (as is indicated in Chapter 12). How do we mesh our often alienating assumptions and paradigms required by development agencies and national policy with the assumptions, local experience and cultures of those we claim to be benefiting? Success or failure rests upon resolving the contradictions that often arise in doing the research.

Schematic models provide structures that aid discussion. They provide explanatory and predictive frameworks (cf. Anderson et al. 2005; Keeves 1997). Already tested practice needs to be modified according to situational context. Even then, outcomes cannot be entirely predicted. Operational, structural and cultural restraints are involved, and their combined effects are difficult to estimate (Hottola 2009b: 185).

The Public-Private-Community Partnership (PPCP) model presented in this chapter has been generated through observation of the development, implementation and evaluation of the !Xaus Lodge / Transfrontier Parks Destinations (TFPD) model. The model incorporates principles of participatory development communication, including the need for dialogue, particularly where there may be differences between partners in ontology (indigenous vs. Cartesian) and rationality (sacred and profane).1

---

1 Not all PPCPS are characterized by differences in ontology, rationality and epistemology between partners. This model takes the types of negotiations that will need to happen into account in the likelihood that these differences may be present.
Although developing communities are increasingly recognised as stakeholders by corporations, the challenge is to build a sustainable partnership with such communities (Overton-de Klerk and Oelofse 2010: 389). The solution presented here extends the Communication for Participatory Development model (CFPD) (Kincaid and Figueroa 2009) in relation to PPCPs in lodge development.

**The TFPD Model: For-Profit Philanthropy**

TFPD’s success is evident in its replicability in numerous PPCPs: !Xaus Lodge, Machampane Wilderness Camp (Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park)\(^2\), Covane Fishing and Safari Lodge (Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area)\(^3\) and Witsieshoek Mountain Lodge (Maloti Drakensberg Transfrontier Conservation Area).\(^4\)

TFPD aligns its management and marketing of community-owned lodges within “for-profit philanthropy”, a branch of the wider concept of social business (Yunus 2007). A social business pursues a blended purpose: serving a living mission and earning profit (Kelly 2009; see also Bylund and Mondelli 2007). The entrepreneur manages the business in such a way that the social output is maximized while costs are kept below revenues (Bylund and Mondelli, 2007:23).

TFPD disassociates itself from the pro-poor tourism (PPT) approach (see Ashley et al. 2001a) maintaining that PPT implies a negative connotation as tourists are encouraged to visit a lodge simply because the community that owns it is assumed to be poor. TFPD terms this “ag shame tourism”, and instead aim to attract tourism by offering world-class operations and a high quality experience on par with comparative commercial lodges (O’Leary, e-mail, 12 May 2011). Emphasis is thus placed on the economic value of the lodge which “lies in ethical business principles that generate a steady and growing income for the community owners and the area” (TFPD, 2010: 1). TFPD develops economically viable destinations rather than “cultural survival initiatives” as the ill-fated Kagga Kamma claimed was its purpose (White 1995: 50). Nor does TFPD depend on the “exotic spectacle” to attract tourists as did Ostri-San (see Bregin 2001).

‘Doing business differently’ entails integrating pro-poor procedures into everyday business practice. This is evident, for example, in the way that !Xaus has boosted the local economy by supporting local

---


\(^3\) See www.covanelodge.com.

\(^4\) See www.witsieshoek.co.za.