TOURISM IMPACTS OF POVERTY ALLEVIATION ON ETHNIC HOUSEHOLDS: COMPARING DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CHAM, KHMER, CHINESE ETHNIC HOUSEHOLDS IN AN GIANG PROVINCE, VIETNAM

Le Thị To Quyen [A], Tran Huu Tuan[B]

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The purpose of this paper is to compare the effects of tourism on poverty alleviation in minority households and to propose tourism development solutions to effectively reduce poverty for ethnic groups. This study surveyed ethnic households in An Giang Province, Vietnam, where the majority of Khmer, Cham, and Chinese households live in crowded conditions, and tourism was identified as an alternative means of poverty alleviation for the households.

Theoretical framework: Different ethnic groups, according to Kyle et al. (2019), have different perspectives on tourism in general and ethnic neighborhood tourism. Academic research on poverty alleviation in tourism has advanced from concept to development model (Jin et al., 2019), influencing factors, and implementation path (Jin et al, 2019; Guo, 2020). Even if no jobs are created, investment in tourism infrastructure can connect villagers to the larger economy, which will benefit local agriculture. (Lor et all 2019, Hall, 2007; Li et al., 2016; Oraboune, 2008). Aside from focusing solely on household income and consumption, Sen (1999) emphasized the importance of addressing the problem of capability deprivations in any effort to reduce poverty. For this reason, household capacity must be taken into consideration when assessing poverty reduction among different households. According to Duong & Dung (2018) and Ngoc (2018), the factors influencing livelihoods include objective and subjective household factors, while Nui (2019) indicated that the choice of household livelihood strategy differs depending on the household's economic level. Farmers will face a wide range of influencing factors when implementing livelihood strategies, and as a result, the livelihood outcomes experienced by each farmer will differ, Tuan and Dung (2015). Based on the literature review and the situation in the study area, it is evident that comparative studies on the level of poverty reduction among ethnic minority households have few research documents; therefore, the implementation of this study is insufficient.

Design/methodology/approach: The research was done in Tinh Bien, Tri Ton, An Phu, Tan Chau, and Chau Doc, An Giang. This was chosen as the study site because ethnic households exist there, affecting tourism development. Fieldwork was done in 2021 and 2022. The second phase allowed for data verification and gap filling. In the first phase, the sampling technique evolved as the author became more familiar with case studies and could assess the number of persons to approach given time restrictions. Questionnaires were utilized to acquire data. The 390 samples of questionnaires were from Tinh Bien, Tri Ton, An Phu, Tan Chau, and Chau Doc by employing Taro Yamane's algorithm to determine the number of households to survey. Post hoc one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the poverty reduction impact of tourism on three groups of households by assessment of the different demographic characteristics of the respondent.

Findings: The findings reveal that the poverty reduction impact of tourism on ethnic households differs before and after tourism implementation; ethnic households feel the poverty reduction impacts more strongly after tourism development. When

[A]School of Hospitality & Tourism, Hue University.Co-corresponding School of Social Science & Humanities. Can Tho University. E-mail: lethitoquyen@hueuni.edu.vn Orid: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8141-7358
[B] BSchool of Hospitality & Tourism. Hue University. E-mail: thtuan@hueuni.edu.vn
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9625-1343

comparing the impact of poverty reduction on economics, access to essential social services, livelihoods, and socio-cultural factors, Khmer, Chinese, and Cham households have significantly lower levels of poverty. Meanwhile, tourism has a greater impact on poverty alleviation in Khmer households than it does in Cham households, and Chinese groups wield more power than Khmer groups. When comparing the Human, Social, Natural, Financial, and Institutional assets of three ethnic minority households to understand the causes of different poverty alleviation, the Chinese have the most of all five assets, followed by the Khmer, and finally the Cham.

Research, Practical & Social implications: Tourism has provided an additional source of income for ethnic minority households in Vietnam, thereby reducing poverty, according to the study's findings. Despite this, the level of poverty reduction among ethnic minority households is contingent on the household's livelihood assets, which include human capital, social capital, natural capital, financial capital, and institutional capital. Due to a lack of education, professional tourism skills, and access to information technology, the human capital of ethnic minority households is limited. To enhance the efficacy of tourism development and alleviate poverty among ethnic minority households, it is necessary to improve means of subsistence.

Originality/value: The results indicate that the number of publications is growing, and the management and business area is the one that contributes the most, with the countries that produce in co-authorship also providing the most publications.

IMPACTOS TURÍSTICOS DE ALÍVIO DA POBREZA EM DOMÍNIOS ÉTNICOS: COMPARANDO A DIFERENÇA ENTRE CHAM, KHMER, DOMÍNIOS ÉTNICOS CHINESES EM UMA PROVÍNCIA DE GIANG, VIETNÃ

RESUMO

Objetivo: O objetivo deste artigo é comparar os efeitos do turismo no alívio da pobreza em famílias minoritárias e propor soluções de desenvolvimento do turismo para reduzir efetivamente a pobreza de grupos étnicos. Este estudo pesquisou famílias étnicas na província de An Giang, Vietnã, onde a maioria das famílias Khmer, Cham e chinesas vivem em condições de superlotação, e o turismo foi identificado como um meio alternativo de alívio da pobreza para as famílias.

Referencial teórico: Diferentes etnias, segundo Kyle et al. (2019), apresentam diferentes perspectivas sobre o turismo em geral e o turismo de bairro étnico. A pesquisa acadêmica sobre alívio da pobreza no turismo avançou do conceito ao modelo de desenvolvimento (Jin et al., 2019), fatores de influência e caminho de implementação (Jin et al, 2019; Guo, 2020). Mesmo que nenhum emprego seja criado, o investimento em infraestrutura turística pode conectar os aldeões à economia maior, o que beneficiará a agricultura local. (Lor et all 2019, Hall, 2007; Li et al., 2016; Oraboune, 2008). Além de se concentrar apenas na renda e no consumo das famílias, Sen (1999) enfatizou a importância de abordar o problema das privações de capacidade em qualquer esforço para reduzir a pobreza. Por esta razão, a capacidade das famílias deve ser levada em consideração ao avaliar a redução da pobreza entre as diferentes famílias. De acordo com Duong & Dung (2018) e Ngoc (2018), os fatores que influenciam os meios de subsistência incluem fatores objetivos e subjetivos do agregado familiar, enquanto Nui (2019) indicou que a escolha da estratégia de subsistência do agregado familiar difere dependendo do nível económico do agregado familiar. Os agricultores enfrentarão uma ampla gama de fatores de influência ao implementar estratégias de subsistência e, como resultado, os resultados de subsistência experimentados por cada agricultor serão diferentes, Tuan e Dung (2015). Com base na revisão da literatura e na situação na área de estudo, é evidente que os estudos comparativos sobre o nível de redução da pobreza entre os agregados familiares de minorias étnicas têm poucos documentos de pesquisa; portanto, a implementação deste estudo é insuficiente.

Desenho/metodologia/abordagem: A pesquisa foi feita em Tinh Bien, Tri Ton, An Phu, Tan Chau e Chau Doc, An Giang. Este foi escolhido como local de estudo porque ali existem famílias étnicas, afetando o desenvolvimento do turismo. O trabalho de campo foi feito em 2021 e 2022. A segunda fase permitiu a verificação de dados e preenchimento de lacunas. Na primeira fase, a técnica de amostragem evoluiu à medida que o autor se familiarizou com os estudos de caso e pôde avaliar o número de pessoas a serem abordadas com restrições de tempo. Questionários foram utilizados para aquisição de dados. As 390 amostras de questionários eram de Tinh Bien, Tri Ton, An Phu, Tan Chau e Chau Doc, empregando o algoritmo de Taro Yamane para determinar o número de

Intern. Journal of Profess. Bus. Review. | Miami, v. 7 | n. 4 | p. 01-22 | e0527 | 2022.

2

domicílios a serem pesquisados. A ANOVA post hoc one-way foi realizada para comparar o impacto do turismo na redução da pobreza em três grupos de famílias por meio da avaliação das diferentes características demográficas do entrevistado.

Resultados: Os resultados revelam que o impacto do turismo na redução da pobreza nas famílias étnicas difere antes e depois da implementação do turismo; as famílias étnicas sentem os impactos da redução da pobreza mais fortemente após o desenvolvimento do turismo. Ao comparar o impacto da redução da pobreza na economia, acesso a serviços sociais essenciais, meios de subsistência e fatores socioculturais, as famílias Khmer, Chinesas e Cham têm níveis significativamente mais baixos de pobreza. Enquanto isso, o turismo tem um impacto maior no alívio da pobreza nas famílias Khmer do que nas famílias Cham, e os grupos chineses exercem mais poder do que os grupos Khmer. Ao comparar os ativos Humanos, Sociais, Naturais, Financeiros e Institucionais de três famílias de minorias étnicas para entender as causas de diferentes alívios da pobreza, os chineses têm a maioria dos cinco ativos, seguidos pelos Khmer e, finalmente, os Cham.

Pesquisa, implicações práticas e sociais: O turismo forneceu uma fonte adicional de renda para famílias de minorias étnicas no Vietnã, reduzindo assim a pobreza, de acordo com os resultados do estudo. Apesar disso, o nível de redução da pobreza entre famílias de minorias étnicas depende dos bens de subsistência da família, que incluem capital humano, capital social, capital natural, capital financeiro e capital institucional. Devido à falta de educação, habilidades profissionais de turismo e acesso à tecnologia da informação, o capital humano das famílias de minorias étnicas é limitado. Para aumentar a eficácia do desenvolvimento do turismo e aliviar a pobreza entre as famílias de minorias étnicas, é necessário melhorar os meios de subsistência.

Originalidade/valor: Os resultados indicam que o número de publicações está crescendo, sendo a área de gestão e negócios a que mais contribui, sendo que os países que produzem em coautoria também fornecem mais publicações.

Palavras-chave: Alívio da Pobreza, Famílias Étnicas, Educação Executiva, Impacto do Turismo, um Gigante.

IMPACTOS TURÍSTICOS DEL ALIVIO DE LA POBREZA EN LOS HOGARES ÉTNICOS: COMPARACIÓN DE LA DIFERENCIA ENTRE LOS HOGARES ÉTNICOS CHAM, KHMER Y CHINO EN UNA PROVINCIA DE GIANG, VIETNAM

RESUMEN

Propósito: El propósito de este documento es comparar los efectos del turismo en el alivio de la pobreza en los hogares de minorías y proponer soluciones de desarrollo turístico para reducir efectivamente la pobreza de los grupos étnicos. Este estudio encuestó a hogares étnicos en la provincia de An Giang, Vietnam, donde la mayoría de los hogares khmer, cham y chinos viven en condiciones de hacinamiento, y el turismo se identificó como un medio alternativo para aliviar la pobreza de los hogares.

Metodología: La investigación se realizó en Tinh Bien, Tri Ton, An Phu, Tan Chau y Chau Doc, An Giang. Este fue elegido como el sitio de estudio porque allí existen hogares étnicos, lo que afecta el desarrollo turístico. El trabajo de campo se realizó en 2021 y 2022. La segunda fase permitió la verificación de datos y el llenado de brechas. En la primera fase, la técnica de muestreo evolucionó a medida que el autor se familiarizaba más con los estudios de casos y podía evaluar el número de personas a las que acercarse dadas las restricciones de tiempo. Se utilizaron cuestionarios para adquirir datos. Las 390 muestras de cuestionarios fueron de Tinh Bien, Tri Ton, An Phu, Tan Chau y Chau Doc empleando el algoritmo de Taro Yamane para determinar el número de hogares a encuestar. Se realizó ANOVA post hoc de una vía para comparar el impacto del turismo en la reducción de la pobreza en tres grupos de hogares mediante la evaluación de las diferentes características demográficas del encuestado.

Conclusiones: Los hallazgos revelan que el impacto del turismo en la reducción de la pobreza en los hogares étnicos difiere antes y después de la implementación del turismo; los hogares étnicos sienten que los impactos de la reducción de la pobreza son más fuertes después del desarrollo del turismo. Al comparar el impacto de la reducción de la pobreza en la economía, el acceso a los servicios sociales esenciales, los medios de vida y los factores socioculturales, los hogares khmer, chinos y cham tienen niveles de pobreza significativamente más bajos. Mientras tanto, el turismo tiene un mayor impacto en el alivio de la pobreza en los hogares jemeres que en los hogares cham, y los grupos chinos ejercen más poder que los grupos jemeres. Al comparar los activos humanos, sociales, naturales, financieros e institucionales de tres hogares de minorías étnicas para comprender las causas de los diferentes alivios de la pobreza, los chinos tienen la mayor parte de los cinco activos, seguidos por los jemeres y finalmente los cham.

Implicaciones de la Investigación:

el turismo ha proporcionado una fuente adicional de ingresos para los hogares de minorías étnicas en Vietnam, reduciendo así la pobreza, según los hallazgos del estudio. A pesar de esto, el nivel de reducción de la pobreza entre los hogares de minorías étnicas depende de los activos de subsistencia del hogar, que incluyen capital humano, capital social, capital natural, capital financiero y capital institucional. Debido a la falta de educación, habilidades turísticas profesionales y acceso a la tecnología de la información, el capital humano de los hogares de minorías étnicas es limitado. Para mejorar la eficacia del desarrollo del turismo y aliviar la pobreza entre los hogares de minorías étnicas, es necesario mejorar los medios de subsistencia.

Intern. Journal of Profess. Bus. Review. | Miami, v. 7 | n. 4 | p. 01-22 | e0527 | 2022.

3

INTRODUCTION

In many countries around the world, tourism is one of the quickest growing economic sectors. Tourism's economic contribution in 2021 is anticipated to be US$1.9 trillion, up from US$1.6 trillion in 2020 although still significantly below the pre-pandemic value of US$ 3.5 trillion (UNWTO, 2022).

Tourism is an essential industry that contributes to a developing country's development and wealth, as well as poverty reduction. (Llorca-Rodríguez et al., 2020; Muganda, Sahli, and Smith, 2010; Scheyvens and Russell, 2012; Ap and Crompton, 1988). The tourist sector has grown rapidly over the last two decades, owing to its many strengths, and it now plays an essential part in Vietnam's socioeconomic development plan and poverty reduction goals (Tung & Cuong, 2020). Tourism development is viewed as a significant tool for poverty reduction; nevertheless, the implementation of pro-poor tourism must address the whole range of effects on poor people, including their economic status, living conditions, education, training, and health care, Wang et al (2020). However, few studies have compared the poverty-reduction impact of tourism on ethnic households.

Over the years, An Giang province has issued a number of documents to concretize the policies of the Central and Provincial Governments on supporting production, diversifying livelihoods, and contributing to poverty reduction for ethnic minority households. However, because each household has different capabilities and livelihood strategies, poverty reduction levels vary and have not yet resulted in high efficiency for ethnic minority households in An Giang province. The first objective is to highlight the comparison of the level impact of tourism on poverty reductions among Chams, Khmer and Chinese ethnic households. This relates to the second aim, which is to emphasize the importance of examining ethnic capacities livelihood assets relations affect difference poverty reduction by tourism development. The intention is to look beyond approaches to propose solutions to improve the impact of poverty reduction through tourism development, with the goal of assisting ethnic minority households in increasing their income, reducing poverty, and contributing to economic development.

LITERATURE REVIEWS

Some empirical studies have been conducted in various countries around the world to determine the extent and direction of the tourism-poverty nexus. Poverty is a fluid and distinctive concept that is influenced by a variety of subjective elements that vary by region,

Intern. Journal of Profess. Bus. Review. | Miami, v. 7 | n. 4 | p. 01-22 | e0527 | 2022.

4

such as gender, age, ethnic, and culture. (Rufaro & Tafadzwa 2020; Davidson & Sahli, 2015; Medina-Muñoz et al., 2016b; Yang & Hung, 2014). Poverty manifests itself in many ways within a country, including a lack of sufficient income and productive resources to ensure a sustainable livelihood, hunger, and malnutrition; ill health; limited or no access to education and essential services; increased morbidity and mortality from illness; homelessness and inadequate housing, unsafe environments, and social discrimination and exclusion from decision-making. Rufaro & Tafadzwa 2020; Folarin & Adeniyi, 2020; Llorca-Rodríguez et al., 2020; Zhao & Ritchie, 2007). As a result of the DFID's pro-poor tourism initiative in 1999, there has been an abundance of research on the link between tourism and poverty alleviation (Medina-Muñoz, 2015). Academics, on the other hand, have questioned whether tourism can help alleviate poverty (Zhao & Xia, 2019). This disparity is due to a wide range of factors including poverty levels, poverty alleviation tourist investments as well as participation by poor residents (Wang et al, 2020). Research on poverty has tended to focus primarily on economic effects, such as increasing household income, creating jobs, and promoting the sale of agricultural products (Scheyvens et al 2019; Spenceley et al 2010; Hampton 2005). It's time for academics to pay more attention to the non-economic impacts of tourism on poverty alleviation rather than the economic ones, (Medina-Muñoz, 2015). Similarly, to help alleviate poverty in more and more developing countries, tourism has been hailed as a major factor. Research into the impact of tourism on poverty alleviation has increased significantly in recent years. (Wang, 2020). It has been demonstrated that, in terms of economic effects, Pro-poor tourism benefits small tourism operators by increasing household income and facilitating the sale of agricultural products. (Croes et all, 2013; Spenceley et all, 2010; Saayman et al 2012; Briedenhann, 2011) while urbanization, infrastructure construction, improved health and educational services, gender equality, cultural communication, vulnerability reduction, human capital, and capacity building have all been identified as positive sociocultural impacts (Anderson, 2014; Soliman, 2014; Croes, 2014; Stonich, 1995).

It is the goal of the Sustainable Livelihood (SL) concept to go beyond traditional definitions and approaches to poverty eradication. Because they only looked at one aspect or manifestation of poverty (like low income), these studies were found to be too narrow. They also ignored other critical aspects of poverty, like vulnerability and social exclusion. When it comes to making a living in a sustainable way, more attention is being paid to factors and processes that either limit or enhance the ability of the poor to do so. Poverty alleviation will be better served by the SL concept (Sabin, 2021). People's livelihoods are impacted by tourism development, which reduces poverty and increases income. Increased tourism revenue boosts

rural residents' take-home pay and contributes to the area's economic development (Mahony & VanZyl, 2002;), similarly, Hoang & et all (2020) pointed that tourism development has increased the living standards of ethnic minorities and led to more intensive farming systems with the rebirth of abandoned fields. However, there is a lack of literature on comparing the impacts of tourism on poverty alleviation to ethnic households. According to Adiyia et al. (2017), tourism has created an additional off-farm income activity in many SSA countries, which is critical for rural households to reduce poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa. Although tourism employment generates lower incomes than alternative off-farm activities, it still allows households to strengthen their livelihood strategies through investments in on-farm or alternative off-farm activities. As regards to Yang et al. (2021), whether tourism development can effectively alleviate poverty in ethnic areas is still debatable. It is critical to quantify and evaluate the effectiveness of tourism poverty alleviation to improve tourism in ethnic areas. Different ethnic groups, according to Kyle et al. (2019), have different perspectives on tourism in general and ethnic neighborhood tourism. Academic research on poverty alleviation in tourism has advanced from concept to development model (Jin et al., 2019), influencing factors, and implementation path (Jin et al, 2019; Guo, 2020). Even if no jobs are created, investment in tourism infrastructure can connect villagers to the larger economy, which will benefit local agriculture. (Lor et all 2019, Hall, 2007; Li et al., 2016; Oraboune, 2008). Aside from focusing solely on household income and consumption, Sen (1999) emphasized the importance of addressing the problem of capability deprivations in any effort to reduce poverty. For this reason, household capacity must be taken into consideration when assessing poverty reduction among different households. According to Duong & Dung (2018) and Ngoc (2018), the factors influencing livelihoods include objective and subjective household factors, while Nui (2019) indicated that the choice of household livelihood strategy differs depending on the household's economic level. Farmers will face a wide range of influencing factors when implementing livelihood strategies, and as a result, the livelihood outcomes experienced by each farmer will differ, Tuan and Dung (2015). Based on the literature review and the situation in the study area, it is evident that comparative studies on the level of poverty reduction among ethnic minority households have few research documents; therefore, the implementation of this study is insufficient. This study will contribute to the evaluation of the current situation in the region and identify appropriate strategies for reducing poverty for each ethnic group of households.

Intern. Journal of Profess. Bus. Review. | Miami, v. 7 | n. 4 | p. 01-22 | e0527 | 2022.

6

METHODOLOGY AND DATA

The research was conduct at Tinh Bien district, Tri Ton district, An Phu district, Tan Chau town, and Chau Doc city is located An Giang. This was chosen as the study site because ethnic households live mainly in these areas and implications for the way tourism development is being done. Field research was carried out between February 2021 and February 2022. Data was collected in two phases, with the second phase allowing for the verification of earlier data and the filling of gaps. In the first phase, the sampling strategy evolved as the author became more familiar with case study and was able to assess the number of people who could be approached given the time constraints. Data were collected through questionnaires which were used to gather information and data. The sample groups of questionnaires were local ethnic households which are living in Tinh Bien district, Tri Ton district, An Phu district, Tan Chau town, and Chau Doc city.

According to the An Giang province Statistics Department (2020), the total number of ethnic minority households in An Giang province is 18,892 households. The thesis's research subject is the Cham, Chinese, and Khmer ethnic minority households engaged in tourism. In 2020, the total number of ethnic minority households in An Giang province was 18,892. Taro Yamane's formula is used in the study to determine the number of households to survey.

$n = N / (1 + N (e^2))$
n = the number of households to be polled
N = The total number of EM households in the province (overall).
e = Permissible error (0.05)
Therefore:
$n = 18,892 / (1 + 18,892 (0.05^2))$
$n = 390$

This study had a sample size of 390 people

According to An Giang province's Statistics Department (2020), Khmer ethnic minority households are concentrated in Tinh Bien and Tri Ton districts, while Cham ethnic minority households are concentrated in An Phu and the town. Ethnic Chinese households are concentrated in Chau Doc and Long Xuyen cities in Tan Chau. However, according to the results of the survey conducted in the study area, tourism development activities are much more prevalent in Tri Ton district, Tinh Bien district, An Phu district, Tan Chau town, and Chau Doc city. Furthermore, because the current situation of the Covid-19 epidemic is very complicated, the author conducts the survey in five places where the majority of ethnic minority households are concentrated, which are Tri Ton district, Tinh Bien district, An Phu district, Tan Chau town, and Chau Doc city, because ethnic minority households have developed tourism activities in

Intern. Journal of Profess. Bus. Review. | Miami, v. 7 | n. 4 | p. 01-22 | e0527 | 2022.

7

these four areas. As a result, surveying ethnic minority households in this area will provide an accurate and objective assessment of tourism impacts, whereas ethnic minority households in the remaining areas have not developed many tourism activities. The sample size of three groups of Khmer households, Cham households, and Hoa households is equal due to the sample size of 390 samples to ensure unbiased comparison.

The next step was a random sampling technique in which 390 household were selected randomly from the list of ethnic households in five surveyed area from An Giang Ethnic Committee. In each household only one person was surveyed to represent the household's attitudes towards tourism. At the time of delivering questionnaires to households, if nobody was present at an intended home, the questionnaire would be delivered to the neighboring one.

The information and data obtained from questionnaires was analyzed by SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 20 to compare the effects of tourism on poverty alleviation in Chams, Khmer and Chinese minority households and illustrate the Human, Social, Natural, Financial, and Institutional assets of three ethnic minority households to understand the causes of different poverty alleviation by a Post Hoc One-Way ANOVA analytical study.

CASE STUDY

An Giang province is located in Mekong Delta area, 240km km from Ho Chi Minh city. The province covers an area of 3,536.8 equals 1.03% of the Viet Nam's area. Administratively, An Giang consists of 2 cities (Long Xuyen; Chau Doc), 1 town (Tan Chau) and 8 district (An Phu, Tinh Bien, Tri Ton, Chau Phu, Chau Thanh, Thoai Son, Cho Moi, Phu Tan) with a total population of 1.904.352 inhabitants. (An Giang Statistical Office, 2021). In terms of ethnicity, besides the Kinh people (lowland Vietnamese) who account for 17.91% of population, An Giang is home of three ethnic minority groups: Khmer (4%), Cham (0.58%), Chinese (0.4%) other ethnic groups (0.02). The regional economy is undergoing significant transformation, with the contribution of agroforestry and fishing to Sapa's economy increasing 1,97% in 2020, tourism and services growth 1,48% and industry and construction increased by 6.66% in the same period. Although An Giang household poverty rate decreased from 4.9% (2019) to 4.0% (2021) (An Giang Statistical Office, 2021), However, poverty among ethnic minority households remains high rate (6.23 %), where poor people are defined as those who earn under VND (Vietnam Dong) 1,500,000 (about $65) in rural area and 2,000,00 (about $86) per month

Intern. Journal of Profess. Bus. Review. | Miami, v. 7 | n. 4 | p. 01-22 | e0527 | 2022.

8

and deprivation from at least three indicators measuring the level of deprivation of basic social services[C].

An Giang has linked ethnic tourism to poverty reduction, in particular, has aggressively developed a community tourism model in recent years, beginning in 2007 with the sponsorship of the Dutch Farmers' Organization (Agriterra), a farmer tourism project run by the Provincial Farmers' Association. An Giang was founded in two stages, from 2007 to 2009 and again from 2011 to 2014. Three communes have been chosen by the project to build farmer tourist sites: My Hoa Hung (Long Xuyen city), Tan Trung (Phu Tan district), and Van Giao (Tinh Bien district). The project's outcomes have contributed to the expansion of community tourism, attracting many domestic and foreign tourists, including international visitors. The project "Building a Model of Community-Based Tourism in An Giang Province" is part of the An Giang provincial thematic scientific project, which is chaired by the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities at Can Tho University. Accommodation, food, and sightseeing service groups in Van Giao, Vinh Trung, and An Hao communes with a large Khmer ethnic population. As a result of the project, tourism activities have helped to improve people's lives, and the poor now have a way out of poverty. However, after the project ended, community-based tourism activities in some areas declined, unable to sustain and promote the project's achievements. Tourism development for poverty alleviation is still a major concern for An Giang province, as the rate of poverty reduction has slowed in recent years, and there is still a risk that many people will fall into poverty when poverty reduction is threatened. Decision No. 2879/QD-UBND on approving the survey and review results of poor and near-poor households in An Giang province at the end of 2019, (An Giang Statistical Office, 2020).

FINDING & ANALYSIS

Interviewees 'profiles

The demographic respondent characteristics consisted of 8 variables which were classified as sex, residence, ethnic group, occupation before doing tourism business, occupation after doing tourism business, years of living, and place of residence. According to the statistics from the surveyed questionnaires, most respondents (60.6%) were female, while only 39.4% were male. In terms of age, 60.3% of respondents were between the ages of 31 and 50, while 21.2% were between the ages of 51 and 70, and 18.5% were between the ages of 18 and 30. Ethnic were nearly equivalent (33.3 percent Chams, 33.3 percent Chinese and 33.4 percent

---

[C] The Prime Minister of Vietnam issued Decree 07/2021/ND-CP establishing the multidimensional poverty line for the period 2021-2025.

Khmer). In terms of occupation prior to engaging in tourism, doing business (53.2% of respondents) was more prevalent than other jobs, while 16.6% of respondents identified as farmers, 6.8% as state civil servants, 3.1% as artisans, 11.1% as homemakers, 0.6% as freelancers, and 8.6% as those with other occupations. After doing tourism business, ethnic households change occupations, with tour guides accounting for 2.8%, catering businesses for 24.3%, and food and beverage businesses accounting for 24.3%; accommodation businesses for 6.2%; shipping businesses for 2.2%; traditional crafts for 8.9%; employment at tourist destinations accounting for 5.2%, and farmers for 3.1%. According to the survey, a significant number of people in An Giang province have changed careers due to their involvement in tourism, contributing to an increase in income that can be derived from the province's tourism capital. People have altered their non-agricultural livelihoods to include more tourism-related activities to improve their households' standard of living. Regarding the lifespan of residents, the survey revealed that the period from 10 to 30 years accounted for 50.3%, the period from 31 to 40 years for 23.8%, the period from 41 to 50 years for 16.2%, and the period from 51 to 60 years for 9.7%. Consequently, it demonstrates that the locals have lived in the study area for an extended period, so the evaluation will be objective due to their long-term attachment to the locality, as they understand it. As regards to place of residence, hamlets accounted for 50.5% of the rural population; towns accounted for 19.4%; towns and cities accounted for 28.9%; and districts accounted for 1.2%. It demonstrates that the ethnic composition of An Giang province is skewed. As a result, most ethnic households are concentrated in small towns and rural areas rather than in densely populated urban areas.

The comparison of poverty reduction Khmer, Cham, and Chinese's ethnic households in term of economic.

H_0: $\overline{X}_1 = \overline{X}_2 = \overline{X}_3$: There is no economic difference in poverty reduction between three groups of households: Chams, Chinese, and Khmer..

H_a: $\overline{X}_1 \neq \overline{X}_2 \neq \overline{X}_3$: There is an economic difference in poverty reduction for three groups of households: Chams, Chinese, and Khmer.

At the 5% level of significance (the error level is 5%).

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of the economic difference in poverty reduction of three groups of households

Reducing poverty in economic terms	Mean	Standard deviation	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Khmer	4.49	.502	4.40	4.58	4	5
Chams	3.86	.723	3.72	4.00	2	5
Chinese	4.62	.531	4.51	4.73	3	5
Total	4.32	.673	4.25	4.39	2	5

(Source: The results of surveyed questionnaires of ethnic households in An Giang in 2021, n=390)

Table 1 shows that Cham households have the lowest mean reduction in economic poverty (3.86) when compared to Khmer households (4.49) and Chinese households (4.62). Test of Homogeneity of Variances, with sig. = 0.604 >5%; consequently, there is no difference in variance between groups; Anova analysis is permitted. Therefore, we will utilize the depth tests in the section entitled Equal Variances Assumed.

Table 2: ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between group	34.426	2	17.213	49.357	**.000**
Within Groups	112.294	388	.349		
Total	146.720	390			

(Source: The results of surveyed questionnaires of ethnic households in An Giang in 2021, n=390)

Table ANOVA, sig.=0.00 5%, indicates that there is a difference between household groups in terms of economic poverty reduction.

Table 3: Multiple comparisons of economic poverty reduction among three ethnic households

Independent variable: Economic aspect							
	(I) Ethnic	(J) Ethnic	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std.Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
LSD	Khmer	Chams	.630*	.078	**.000**	.48	.78
		Chinese	-.131	.081	.105	-.29	.03
	Chams	Khmer	-.630*	.078	**.000**	-.78	-.48
		Chinese	-.761*	.084	**.000**	-.93	-.60
	Chinese	Khmer	.131	.081	.105	-.03	.29
		Chams	.761*	.084	**.000**	.60	.93
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.							

(Source: The results of surveyed questionnaires of ethnic households in An Giang in 2021, n=390)

Table 3 shows that the reduction in economic poverty among Khmer households is distinct from that of Cham individuals, but there is no distinction between Khmer and Chinese households based on the Sig values there. Chams and Chinese households have different levels of poverty reduction when compared economically. The mean difference between Khmer and Cham households is .630, representing the average value of economic poverty reduction among

households Khmer is higher than that of Chams, whereas the Cham households are lower than that of Chinese households *because* the mean difference between Cham and Chinese households is -0.761.

The comparison of poverty reduction Khmer, Cham, and Chinese's ethnic households in terms of access to basic social services.

$H_0: \overline{X}_1 = \overline{X}_2 = \overline{X}_3$: In terms of access to basic social services, there is no difference in poverty reduction between three groups of households: Chams, Chinese, and Khmer.

$H_a: \overline{X}_1 \neq \overline{X}_2 \neq \overline{X}_3$: In terms of access to basic social services, there is economic difference in poverty reduction for three groups of households: Chams, Chinese, and Khmer.

At the 5% level of significance (the error level is 5%).

Table 4: Descriptive statistics of the difference in poverty reduction of three groups of households in terms of access to basic social services

Reducing poverty in accessing to basic social services	Mean	Standard deviation	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Khmer	4.49	.502	4.40	4.58	4	5
Chams	3.75	.659	3.63	3.88	3	5
Chinese	4.34	.616	4.21	4.46	3	5
Total	4.21	.669	4.13	4.28	3	5

(Source: The results of surveyed questionnaires of ethnic households in An Giang in 2021, n=390)

According to Table 4, the mean value of poverty reduction in terms of access to essential social services is greatest for Khmer households (4.49), followed by Chinese households (4.34), and then Chams (3.75).

An ANOVA analysis is appropriate because the test of homogeneity of variances indicates that there is no difference between groups with a significance level of 0.604 > 5%. As a result, the depth tests described in the section titled Equal Variances Assumed will be used.

Table 5: ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between group	32.278	2	16.639	47.877	**.000**
Within Groups	111.909	388	.348		
Total	145.188	390			

(Source: The results of surveyed questionnaires of ethnic households in An Giang in 2021, n=390)

Table ANOVA, sig.=0.005 percent, indicates that household groups have varying access to essential social services.

Intern. Journal of Profess. Bus. Review. | Miami, v. 7 | n. 4 | p. 01-22 | e0527 | 2022.

12

Table 6: Multiple comparisons of poverty reduction among three ethnic households in terms of access to essential social services

	(I) Ethnic	(J) Ethnic	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std.Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
LSD	Khmer	Chams	.733*	.078	**.000**	.58	.88
		Chinese	.151	.081	.062	-.01	.031
	Chams	Khmer	-.733*	.078	**.000**	-.89	-.58
		Chinese	-.582*	.084	**.000**	-.75	-.42
	Chinese	Khmer	-.151	.081	.062	-.31	.01
		Chams	.582*	.084	**.000**	.42	.75

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.
Comparing Sig values in Table 6 reveals that, the level of poverty reduction among Khmer households is distinct from that of Cham individuals, while there is no difference between Khmer and Chinese households. Compared to Chinese households, the degree of poverty reduction in Cham households varies. Average value of poverty reduction based on access to essential social services of Khmer is higher than that of Chams with the Mean Difference .733. Chams households experienced a mean difference of -0.582 compared to Chinese households which indicated that Chams have less access to vital social services than Chinese households.
The comparison of poverty reduction Khmer, Cham, and Chinese's ethnic households in terms of livelihood and social culture.

H_0: $\overline{X}_1 = \overline{X}_2 = \overline{X}_3$: There is no difference in poverty reduction between three groups of households: Chams, Chinese, and Khmer, in terms of livelihood and social culture.

H_a: $\overline{X}_1 \neq \overline{X}_2 \neq \overline{X}_3$: In terms of livelihood and social culture, there is difference in poverty reduction for three groups of households: Chams, Chinese, and Khmer.

At the 5% level of significance (the error level is 5%).

Table 7: Descriptive statistics of the difference in poverty reduction of three groups of households in terms of livelihood and social culture

Reducing poverty in accessing to basic social services	Mean	Standard deviation	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Khmer	4.50	.502	4.41	4.58	4	5
Chams	3.89	.637	3.76	4.01	3	5
Chinese	4.57	.580	4.45	4.69	3	5
Total	4.32	.644	4.25	4.39	3	5

(Source: The results of surveyed questionnaires of ethnic households in An Giang in 2021, n=390)

Table 7 shows that the poverty reduction of livelihood and socio-cultural aspects of Chinese households (4.57) is equal to that of Khmer households (4.50) whereas Cham households (3.89) are the least prevalent.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances shows sig. = 0.298 > 5%, so Anova is valid. We'll use the Equal Variances Assumed depth tests.

Table 8: ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between group	29.359	2	14.679	45.017	**.000**
Within Groups	104.998	388	.326		
Total	134.357	390			

(Source: The results of surveyed questionnaires of ethnic households in An Giang in 2021, n=390)

In table 8, sig.=000 5% demonstrates a difference in poverty reduction among household groups in terms of livelihood and socio-cultural aspects.

Table 9 : Multiple comparisons of poverty reduction among three ethnic households in terms of livelihood and social culture

Independent variable: livelihood and social culture							
	(I) Ethnic	(J) Ethnic	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std.Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
LSD	Khmer	Chams	.609[*]	.075	**.000**	.46	.76
		Chinese	-.069	.078	.377	-.22	.08
	Chams	Khmer	-.609[*]	.075	**.000**	-.76	-.46
		Chinese	-.678[*]	.081	**.000**	-.84	-.52
	Chinese	Khmer	.069	.078	.377	-.08	.22
		Chams	.678[*]	.081	**.000**	.52	.84

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

As shown by Table, the level of poverty reduction in livelihood and socio-cultural aspects of Khmer is higher than that of Chams with the Mean Difference .609. Nevertheless, there is no difference between Khmer and Chinese households. Chinese and Cham households have different levels of poverty reduction in livelihoods and sociocultural aspects. Cham households' poverty reduction is less than that of Chinese households, as the mean difference between the two is -0.678.

The causes of different level of poverty alleviation among Chams, Chinese, Khmer ethnic households

Human assets

Five assets of Cham, Chinese, and Khmer households are compared using Post Hoc One-Way ANOVA. To compare human assets, the mean value of human assets in Chinese

households is higher (4.50) than the mean value of human assets in Khmer and Cham households (4.31 and 4.29, respectively). This suggests that Chinese households have superior human capital compared to those of the Cham and Khmer. Comparing all Sig values >0.005 reveals disparities between Khmer, Hoa, and Cham household human assets. The Mean Difference of 0.364 between Khmer and Cham households indicates that Khmer households have a higher average value of human assets than Cham households, whereas human asset of Khmer ethnic households are lower than Chinese households with the Mean Difference of -193. Chinese households possess the highest level of human capital, flowed by Khmer and Chams, respectively.

Social assets

The Mean social capital of Chinese households is higher than that of Cham and Khmer households (4.05 and 4.05) (4.11). This demonstrates that Chinese households have greater social assets than Cham and Khmer households. The social assets of Khmer households are not different from those of Cham households, but they are different from those of Chinese households, according to the Sig value of Multiple Comparison, whereas the social resources of Cham households are different from those of Chinese households. The mean difference between Khmer and Chinese households is -0.433, indicating that Khmer households have a lower average value of social resources than Chinese households. Cham and Chinese households have a -0.496 average social capital disparity, indicating that Cham households are less prosperous than Chinese households. As a result, Chinese households outnumber Cham and Khmer households in terms of social resources. This indicates that Chinese households are more likely than the other two groups to earn a living through tourism.

Financial assets

There was a statistically significant difference between the financial assets of Chinese, Cham, and Khmer households, with mean values of 4.91, 4.39, and 5.39, respectively, indicating that Chinese households had significantly more financial assets than Cham and Khmer households. Comparing all Sig values of Multiple Comparison demonstrates that the financial assets of Khmer, Chinese, and Cham households are distinct. The Mean Difference between Khmer and Cham households is -261, indicating that Khmer households have lower average financial resources than Cham households. With a Mean Difference of -0.526 l, Cham households have fewer financial capital than Chinese households. The average difference between the financial assets of Khmer and Chinese households is -0.787, indicating that Khmer households have a lower average value. Thus, among the three groups of households, the Chinese have the greatest financial resources, followed by the Cham and the Khmer.

Natural assets

According to Table 13, the mean value of natural resources in Khmer households is the lowest (3.86), followed by Cham households (4.32), and Chinese households (4.36). Chinese households have more natural assets than Khmer households to develop tourism-based livelihoods. The Cham and Hoa peoples are similar because their mean value is nearly equal. Sig values of Multiple Comparison table reveals that Khmer households have different natural capital than Chams and Chinese households. However, Chams households have the same natural asset as Chinese households. Khmer households are compared to those of Cham households with the Mean Difference is -.462, indicating that the average value of Khmer households' natural assets is lower than that of Cham households. Between Khmer and Chinese households, Khmer households have fewer natural assets than Chinese households, with a mean difference of -.577.

Institutional assets

Chinese households have the highest mean value of institutional resources (4.57), followed by Cham households (4.08), and Khmer households (4.17). The institutional resources of Chinese households differ from those of Khmer and Cham households. The mean difference between Khmer and Chinese households is -0.392, indicating that Khmer households have a lower mean institutional resource value than Chinese households. The average difference in institutional resources between Cham and Chinese households is -0.480, which indicates that Cham households have fewer institutional resources than Chinese households.

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Comparing the five resources of the three groups of households, the human resources of the Chinese are the greatest, followed by those of the Khmer, and then those of the Cham, while ranking the three dimensions of tourism's impact on poverty reduction. The Chinese were also ranked first, followed by the Khmer and the Chinese. From this, it can be deduced that human resources are a primary factor influencing the disparity in tourism's impact on poverty reduction across three dimensions. Human resources are advantageous in terms of level of education; households are equipped with information access devices, have women who are skilled in the kitchen, have many members of working age, and a dependency ratio of less than 50 percent will be observed. The factors affecting the level of poverty reduction vary by household group. Tourism will have a greater poverty-alleviating effect on households with greater human capital. The research findings also support the view that human capital quality has a positive impact on households' livelihood diversification strategies because they can perform non-farm activities or have hired labor in agriculture, industry, and natural exploitation (Tuan & Dung, 2015). Human capital, on the other hand, is the most important source of capital

in the livelihood development strategy, as humans are the creators of livelihood activities (Hung, 2013) and Elis (2000) indicated human capital is important in encouraging the use of other types of livelihood assets. In terms of comparison of social, financial, natural, and institutional assets, the Cham are second-best. Nevertheless, human resources lag Khmer households, so tourism's level of poverty reduction in terms of economy, access to social services and livelihoods, and culture is level 3. Thus, this study also supports Elis's (2000). Although the research was conducted on households from ethnic minorities, the results still consider human capital. Human assets are the primary factors reducing poverty in areas inhabited by ethnic minorities, and appropriate policies are required to improve the quality of human resources if tourism is to benefit the poor.

Emphasizing the relationship between poverty reduction and human assets, if people are trained and have good knowledge and skills in tourism, they will have tourism business strategies to increase household income. and contribute to escaping poverty. The Cham people have limited human resources with religious ties, so women have limited educational opportunities, limited equipment to access information, and limited exchange for learning from outside experiences. As a barrier to the effectiveness of tourism activities, poverty reduction has not been effective. Even though this research differs from previous poverty alleviation studies in that it compares three types of ethnic households, it supports earlier claims that those with more knowledge, skills, capital, and connections tend to benefit more from tourism (Dao Truong et al, 2015; Mitchell & Ashley, 2010; Pleumarom, 2012).

To achieve effective poverty reduction, it is necessary to consider all five resources, even though social, financial, natural, and institutional resources are not the most important, but they do contribute to and influence poverty reduction. By utilizing remaining assets and enhancing human capital, we can assist households in developing well-developed tourism activities, thereby reducing poverty effectively. This understanding is similar to the wiew that social, physical and financial capital promotes farmers to achieve good livelihood results. These sources of human capital, natural capital, social capital, physical capital, financial capital is interrelated and interact as well as support each other, (Thanh, 2019; Thu, 2019, Adger, 1998).

Ishii (2012) found that the effects of tourism on poverty alleviation were greater on young women and girls than on older men. According to Huy et al. (2020), there is no difference between Kinh and ethnic minority households when it comes to tourism participation. Our findings reveal the paradox that three distinct types of ethnic households have disparate outcomes in terms of economic, access to basic social services and livelihood, and social culture in terms of poverty alleviation. Ethnic differences influence tourism-based poverty reduction outcomes; therefore, ethnicity must be considered when proposing tourism-based poverty reduction measures.

Tourism has provided an additional source of income for ethnic minority households in Vietnam, thereby reducing poverty, according to the study's findings. Despite this, the level of poverty reduction among ethnic minority households is contingent on the household's livelihood assets, which include human capital, social capital, natural capital, financial capital, and institutional capital. Due to a lack of education, professional tourism skills, and access to information technology, the human capital of ethnic minority households is limited. To enhance the efficacy of tourism development and alleviate poverty among ethnic minority households, it is necessary to improve means of subsistence.

In short, all assets have an impact on the level of poverty reduction through tourism for An Giang's ethnic minority households, but human capital are the most important determinant. Human resources are a primary factor influencing the disparity in tourism's impact on poverty reduction across three dimensions. Comparing the effects of tourism on poverty reduction in terms of economic aspects, access to essential social services, and livelihoods and sociocultural terms, the Chinese come out on top, followed by the Khmer and the Chams. Similarly, Chinese resources rank highest, Khmer ranked second and lasted for Chams in comparison of human resources, whereas Khmer households were at the bottom, Chinese got the first, followed by Chams for comparing social, financial, natural, and institutional assets. When developing tourism in ethnic minority areas, ethnic factors must be considered because each ethnic group will have different assets, so tourism solutions that effectively reduce poverty for each group of households are required. Human, social, financial, natural, and institutional resources for each household group must be investigated, with a focus on improving human resources because the human factor is critical to project effectiveness. The tourism industry assists ethnic minority households in increasing their income and decreasing poverty.

REFERENCES

Adger, W.N., (1999). Social Vulnerability to Climate Change and Extremes in Coastal Vietnam. World Development, 27(2): 249-269.

Adiyia B., Vanneste D. & Van Rompaey A. (2017). The poverty alleviation potential of tourism employment as an off-farm activity on the local livelihoods surrounding Kibale National Park, western Uganda. Tourism and Hospitality Research. 17(1): 34-51.

An Giang Statistical Office, (2021). An Giang Provincial Statistical Yearbook 2021. An Giang: An Giang Statistical Office.

Anderson, W. (2014). Cultural tourism and poverty alleviation in rural Kilimanjaro, Tanzania Journal Tourism Culture Change, 13, 208–224.

Ap, J., & Crompton, J. L. (1998). Developing and testing a tourism impact scale. Journal of Travel Research, 37(2), 120 – 131.

Briedenhann, J. (2011). The Potential of Small Tourism Operators in the Promotion of Pro-Poor Tourism. Journal Hospitality Marketing. Management, 20, 484–500.

Carney, D. (1998). Sustainable rural livelihoods. Russell Press: Nottingham.

Carney, D. (1998). Sustainable rural livelihoods. Russell Press: Nottingham.

Chambers, R., & Conway, G.R. (1992). Sustainable rural livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21st century. (No. IDS Discussion Paper 296). Brighton: IDS.

Croes, R. (2014). The Role of Tourism in Poverty Reduction: An Empirical Assessment. Tourism Economy, 20, 207–226.

Croes, R.; Rivera, M.A. (2013). Tourism's potential to benefit the poor: A social accounting matrix model applied to Ecuador. Tourism Economy, 23, 29–48.

Dao Truong, V., & Hall, C. M. (2015). Exploring the poverty reduction potential of social marketing in tourism development. Australian Journal of South-East Asian Studies, 8(2), 125–142.

Davidson, L. & Sahli, M. (2015). Foreign direct investment in tourism, poverty alleviation, and sustainable development: A review of the Gambian hotel sector. Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 23(2), 167-187.

Duong, L.A. & Dung, P.T.M. (2018). Changing livelihoods of farmers in the suburbs of Nam Dinh city in the process of urbanization. Vietnam Journal Agriculture Science, 15(2), 270-279.

Ellis, F. (2000). Rural livelihoods and diversity in developing countries. New York: Oxford University Press.

Folarin, O., & Adeniyi, O. (2020). Does Tourism Reduce Poverty in Sub-Saharan African Countries. Journal of Travel Research, 59(1), 140–155.

Garza-Rodriguez, J. (2019). Tourism and poverty reduction in Mexico: An ARDL Cointegration Approach. Sustainability, 11(845), 2-10.

Guo, Y. (2020). Research on the poverty alleviation practice model and path of rural tourism in Henan province from the perspective of targeted poverty alleviation. Agriculture Economy, 10, 55–56.

Hall, C. M. (2007). Pro-poor tourism: Who benefits? Perspectives on tourism and poverty reduction 3. London: Channel View Publications.

Hampton, M., (2005). Heritage, local communities, and economic development. Annual Tourism Research, 32, 735–759.

Hoang, T.T.H., Anton, V.R., Patrick, M., Gerard, G., Chi, K.C, Thinh, N.A, Luc.H, Veerle, V. (2020). Impact of tourism development on the local livelihoods and land cover change in the Northern Vietnamese highlands. Environment, Development and Sustainability, 22, 1371–1395.

Hung, T.V. (2013). Upland Livelihoods - Some case studies on new approaches. Hanoi: Agriculture Publishing House.

Ishii, K. (2012). The impact of ethnic tourism on hill tribes in Thailand. Annals of Tourism Research, 39, 290-310.

Jin, S., Huang, J., & Lin, Z. (2019). Thinking on the path to realize the development of tourism poverty alleviation in ethnic areas. Journal Yanbian University, 52, 93–101.

Kyle M., W., Naho U., M, Manuel, A., R & Dongoh., J (2019). Explaining minority residents' attitudes of ethnic enclave tourism from general perceptions of tourism impacts. Journal of Tourism and Cultural change 17(4), 467 -484.

Li, Y., Yu, H., Chen, T., Hu, J., & Cui, H. (2016). Livelihood changes and evolution of upland ethnic communities driven by tourism: A case study in Guizhou province, Southwest China. Journal of Mountain Science, 13(7), 1313–1332.

Linh, H.Q. (2017). Analysis of factors affecting poverty in Tra Vinh province. Journal of Science and Technology, 26 (02), 45 -54.

Llorca-Rodríguez, C. M., García-Fernández, R. M. & Casas-Jurado, A. C. (2020). Domestic versus inbound tourism in poverty reduction: evidence from panel data. Current Issues in Tourism, 23(2), 197-216.

Lor, J.J, Kwa, S, & Donaldson, J., A. (2019). Making ethnic tourism good for the poor. Annals of Tourism Research, 76, 140-152.

Lv, H., Zhong, H., & Ding, Z. (2020). Analysis of the influencing factors of community residents' participation in tourism poverty alleviation in ethnic areas – based on the survey of Zhaoxing Scenic Spot in Guizhou. Journal Guilin University Technology, 40, 637–642.

Mahony, K., & Van Zyl, J. (2002). The impacts of tourism investment on rural communities: Three case studies in South Africa. Development Southern Africa, 19(1), 83–103.

Medina-Muñoz, D.R., Medina-Muñoz, R. D. & Gutiérrez-Pérez, F. J. (2016b). A sustainable development approach to assessing the engagement of tourism enterprises in poverty alleviation. Sustainable Development, 24, 220–236.

Medina-Muñoz, D.R.; Medina-Muñoz, R.D.; Gutiérrez-Pérez, F.J. (2015). The impacts of tourism on poverty alleviation: An integrated research framework. Journal Sustainable Tourism, 24, 270–298.

Mitchell, J.; Ashley, C. (2010). Tourism and Poverty Reduction: Pathways and Prosperity; Earthscan: London, UK.

Muganda, M., Sahli, M., & Smith, K. (2010). Tourism's contribution to poverty alleviation: A community perspective from Tanzania. Development Southern Africa, 27(5), 629-646.

Ngoc, V.T.T.N. (2018). Tourism economy towards sustainable development in Thua Thien Hue province. Doctoral thesis, Ho Chi Minh National Academy of Politics: Ho Chi Minh city.

Nui, N.H. (2019). Sustainable livelihood development for forest dependent people in Bac Can. PhD thesis. Ha Noi: Vietnam Academy of Agriculture.

Oraboune, S. (2008). Infrastructure (rural road) development and poverty alleviation in Lao PDR. IDE Discussion Paper. No. 151. 2008.4. http://hdl.handle.net/2344/747. Accessed 7/7/2022.

Pleumarom, A. (2012). The Politics of Tourism, Poverty Reduction and Sustainable Development. Malaysia: Third World Network publication.

Rufaro, G., Tafadzwa, M., (2020). Exploring the Tourism-Poverty Alleviation Nexus in the Brics Group of Nations. *Ekonomika,* 99(1), 93–109.

Saayman, M.; Rossouw, R.; Krugell, W. (2012). The impact of tourism on poverty in South Africa. *Development South Africa*, *29*, 462–487.

Sabin., K. (2021). Sustainable Livelihood Framework: Monitoring and Evaluation. *International Journal Social Science Management, 8*(1), 266-271.

Scheyvens, R., & Russell, M. (2012). Tourism and poverty alleviation in Fiji: Comparing the impacts of small- and large-scale tourism enterprises. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 20*(3), 417 - 436.

Scheyvens, R.; Hughes, E. (2019). Can tourism help to "end poverty in all its forms everywhere"? The challenge of tourism addressing SDG1. *Journal Sustainable Tourism, 27*, 1061–1079.

Sen, A. Development as Freedom; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 1999.

Soliman, M.S. (2014). Pro-poor tourism in protected areas—Opportunities and challenges: "The case of Fayoum, Egypt". *Anatolia*, *26*, 61–72.

Spenceley, A.; Habyalimana, S.; Tusabe, R.; Mariza, D. (2010). Benefits to the poor from gorilla tourism in Rwanda. *Development South Africa*, 27, 647–662.

Spenceley, A.; Habyalimana, S.; Tusabe, R.; Mariza, D. (2010). Benefits to the poor from gorilla tourism in Rwanda. *Development South Africa*, 27, 647–662.

Stonich, S.C.; Sorensen, J.H.; Hundt, A. (1995) Ethnicity, class, and gender in tourism development: The case of the Bay Islands, Honduras. *Journal Sustainable Tourism, 3*, 1–28.

Thanh, D.T., Lien, T.H., Tạo, N.T., Hue, H.T.M. (2019). Characteristics of livelihood capital sources and factors affecting household income in Drang Phok village, Yok Don national park. Journal of forestry science and technology 1, 130 -140.

Thu, N.H. (2019). Models of development of livelihood resources in our country in the world and labor orientation for rural areas in Vietnam. Journal of Development and Integration, 45(55), 16 - 26.

Intern. Journal of Profess. Bus. Review. | Miami, v. 7 | n. 4 | p. 01-22 | e0527 | 2022.

21

Tuan, V.V., & Dung, L.C. (2015). Factors affecting livelihood outcomes of households in the Mekong Delta. Can Tho University Journal of Scientific, 38, 120 – 129.

Tung. T.L., & Cuong. K.L., (2020). Impact of tourism on poverty reduction: Evidence from an emerging tourism market. Montenegrin Journal of Economics, 16 (3), 45- 55.

United Nation World Tourist Organization (UNWTO), (2022). World Tourism Barometer, 20(2), Spain: Madrid.

Wang, K.; Gan, C.; Chen, L.; Voda, M. (2020). Poor Residents' Perceptions of the Impacts of Tourism on Poverty Alleviation: From the Perspective of Multidimensional Poverty. Sustainability 2020, 12(18), 2-18.

Worku M. (2017). The Role of Forest Biodiversity Conservation Practices for Tourism Development in a Case of Tara Gedam Monastery, South Gonder Zone. Ethiopia. Journal. Ecosystem Echography 7(2), 1-6.

World Tourist Organization, (2021). World Tourism Barometer, 19(5), Spain: Madrid.

Yaling L., Rui L., & Yuting L., (2021). A Study on Poverty Alleviation by Tourism in the Border Area Between China and Myanmar. Proceeding of International Conference on Tourism, Economy, and Environmental Sustainability (TEES 2021) Conferences, China.

Yang J., Wu Y., Wang J., Wan C., and Wu Q., (2021) A Study on the Efficiency of Tourism Poverty Alleviation in Ethnic Regions Based on the Staged DEA Model. Frontier Psychology, 6(12), 1-13.

Yang, X. & Hung, K. (2014). Poverty alleviation via tourism cooperatives in China: The story of Yuhu. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 26(6), 879 – 906.

Zhao, L.; & Xia, X. (2019). Tourism and poverty reduction: Empirical evidence from China. Tourism Economy, 26, 233–256.

Zhao, W. & Ritchie, J.R.B. (2007). Tourism and poverty alleviation: An integrative research framework. Current Issues in Tourism, 10(2–3), 119–143.

Intern. Journal of Profess. Bus. Review. | Miami, v. 7 | n. 4 | p. 01-22 | e0527 | 2022.

22