

**COMMUNITY BASED TOURISM AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONS -
A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW**

Dr. Irfana Rashid

Senior Assistant Professor

Department of Management Studies, University of Kashmir.

Fiza Qureishi

Research Assistant

Department of Management Studies, University of Kashmir.

***This work is a part of the project sponsored by Indian Council of Social Sciences Research, New Delhi in the year 2019-2020.*

Evolution of CBT

The CBT projects are solving the problems related to the development of local communities for the last forty years. Different approaches have been adopted in these last forty years. Most commonly, these projects are based on the twin objectives of environmental conservation initiative and socio-economic development. This is particularly common in the less developed countries and in the communities that are situated in protected environmental locations. The emergence of tourism as a tool of development was first recognized after Second World War when earning foreign currency was considered as important for economic growth. Telfer (2009), in his study on examining the role of tourism in the development of a country, observed that tourism is used as a development tool by a number of countries. Telfer (2009) supported the observations of Brohman (1996) for a link between the development and tourism.

The concept of tourism was first emerged, as stated in books, as a reaction to all the negative consequences of the mass tourism that appeared during the 1970's. (Hall & Lew, 2009). During the 1970s, it was realized that the tourism is applicable beyond the rigid approach of economic development. The new issues such as empowerment and self-reliance were linked with the tourism (Telfer 2009). Hence, the concept of CBT was emerged as a tool to empower local communities.

The United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in 1972 emphasized the involvement of local communities in the decision-making process. This involvement should be in the implementation process and should encourage the advantages with the local community. This further emphasized in the International Tourism Congress in the year 1978 on "New Perspectives and Policies". The agenda for this congress was to identify the recent advances in the tourism industry. The two areas were discussed comprehensively. These areas are tourism planning and tourism & regional development. Due to the growing tourism industry and recognition of its role in the economic development as well development of a local community, the practitioners and researchers are exploring this area using different approaches.

During the 1980s, local residents were recognized as crucial for sustainable tourism development. Peter Murphy (1985) discussed the tourism development in his book on *Tourism: A Community Approach*. This book paved the way for future researchers to explore the concept of CBT and its influence on the local communities. In his book, Murphy (1985) suggested that the local communities must link their tourism development plan with their specific needs. Also in the changes that were prevailing during the time, the communities could have not afford to live in isolation and separated themselves from the ongoing tourism process because they were the most important part. (REST, 2010).

In 1987, the community participation further gained significance after the release of Brundtland Report by the World Commission on Environment and Development's (WCED). This report highlighted the importance of sustainable development. The global policies that are focused on using tourism for poverty eradication had further contributed in the emergence of the community-based tourism.

In the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992 in Rio De Janeiro, Agenda 21 was adopted by the 178 member countries. Agenda 21 emphasized the involvement of local communities in sustainable tourism development. One important outcome of this summit was 'co-management'. The 'co-management' encourages the national and the local governments, the civic organizations, and the local communities to come on the common platform and share the responsibility for the preservation of natural resources. This new approach was recognized by international agencies. This approach was different from rigid previous approaches that focused more on control of resources by the state agencies only.

In 1999, debate shifted to integrating tourism development plans with the progress planning of the poor countries. The decision that the poor countries had to make was to whether they should prefer the 'Tourism First' approach or the 'Development First' strategy. As the names suggest, one is focusing on development of tourism and the other on development of a nation as a whole. During this time, some misguided practices related to the tourism were quite common and hence, the prevailing tourism consultancy firms had suggested some implementation of some practices. Such practices were generating pseudo-hopes among the residents of a country due to ineffective planning of government.

Community Tourism- A Review

Community tourism can be described as sharing the local community's natural resources with visitors from home and abroad for the local community's environmental benefit while preserving the natural environment and lifestyle. Both concepts of community growth emphasize local people's role in enhancing their own social and economic status through tourism and its components. Community is basically a fundamental tool to the community based tourism, without the interference of the community this idea of tourism is not even in the picture.

Community building is an ongoing systematic endeavor that enhances neighborhood standards, interests and problem-solving tools. This type of tourism is a growing industry, as travelers worldwide seek meaningful experience from their leisure time. Residents receive money as owners, traders, service providers and workers. A part of the income from this part of tourism is isolated from the businesses that generated benefits to the entire community. The development of the rural area and its natives through the CBT is a wide concept that deals with the upliftment of the people by introducing new methods related to tourism and helping them to be their own boss in the area they master in. The meaning of the rural development in the research conducted is to understand the ground situation in which the natives are living and thus create a tourism centric environment with the already available resources to make the community self-sufficient. The idea is to create an atmosphere that will surely take care of the authenticity of the community and will provide them with developing technology simultaneously. The community is exactly same to the community based tourism what soul to a body is. It is not any dramatic concept that will have its own fantasy end. It requires a wholesome process that will lead the people who form the community to participate and endure the journey while making them reach the destination of the CBT. It actually creates more of self-sufficiency among the people that in return provide a destination to turn into the base for the CBT.

This form of tourism has more deal with the people and their emotions. The thoughts, ideas, perceptions are to be considered very important while creating a plan for the community to get indulged in the tourism process. While in other form of tourism the experience is given a specification but the concept of CBT is dependent on the idea of how the destination with meager resources or no resources at all will be presented to the tourist so as to acquire the experience of the community as well as taking care of the emotions and perceptions of the natives towards their destination. The hostility among the community is also a major path to be checked. Their values and emotions should be completely taken along while bringing the changes in their natural habitat. The amendments that the CBT brings in are definitely to be balanced between the emotional wellbeing and the economic gain of the society.

Mearns (2003) defined CBT as:"Tourism projects owned by one or more established communities or operated as a joint venture partnership with the private sector with equal community involvement as a means of using natural resources in a sustainable manner to improve their living standards which are economically viable.

CBT "is defined as tourism which involves rural or urban communities in identifying, developing, managing and promoting their history, culture, heritage or natural resources as tourism products".

Community-based tourism is a route to economic development, mainly for emerging economies. This is ensured through local community involvement and strategic partnerships with other stakeholders of tourism business. However, it is still difficult to achieve adequate levels of genuine community participation due to a lack of shared objectives, concrete practical guidelines, especially as regards to the method of activity, assessment of ideas and levels of community participation (Tosun 2006; Tosun & Timothy, 2003; Zapata, Hall, Lindo, & Vanderschaeghe, 2011, Budeanu, 2005; Simpson, 2001).

To understand CBT, one must have a clear understanding of the term 'community'. Different definitions of community is available, however, there is no agreement between the experts on a single definition. While CBT has been defined "as tourism owned and/or managed by communities and desired to deliver wider community benefit, benefiting a larger group than those directly employed in the initiative" (Goodwin and Santilli, 2009, p. 4). The community grows with the opportunities created by the tourism industry. There are two types of studies available in the domain of CBT. *First*, there are studies based on the community field theory that examines and the role of community groups in the tourism development. *Second*, there are studies that focus on examining the process in which communication organizations achieve mutual profits in a specific geographical area. The prime focus of CBT is the establishment and management of facilities such as Hotels, restaurant, etc. The facilities related to education and health should also be considered The another focus of a CBT project is the sustainable development in the local community, interaction in the local community and increased participation (Matarrita- Cascanteet *al.*, 2010 Trejos and Matarrita-Cascante, 2010). CBT is considered to be the panacea for all problems related to economics, society and environment. It is also seen as a viable solution of the poverty in the society.

Currently, the tourism industry is unable to reap the benefits. It is criticized for meager salary, resulting in low involvement of local residents. However, there is always a scope for transformation of the tourism sector. It is now available in new form and shape of CBT which has emerged as an alternative tourism. It is an alternative to the “mass tourism”. But, a careful check is required while implementing the concept of CBT. One myth that needs to be broken is that the CBT is panacea for all problems. While CBT has lot of potential, and is not a panacea for all problems. To make CBT successful, changes in the behavior of the local communities are required to bring. (Suansri, 2003; Sin and Minca, 2014; Ellis and Sheridan, 2014; Yang and Hung, 2014, Mearns and Lukhele, 2015).

Most of the studies refer CBT as a mechanism in which local communities involve in tourism activities and emphasize the need for empowering the local communities to ascertain the ecologically feasible tourism in the remote areas. But, the implementation of CBT projects is not easy as the aspirations of the local communities are sometimes attainable (Rocharungsat, 2008; Snyman2012).

Previous researchers (Scheyvens, 2002; Garrod, 2003; Novelli and Gebhardt, 2007; Rocharungsat, 2008; Stone& Duffy, 2015) have suggested that the main requirement for successful implementation of CBT is the local residents’ involvement. The community participation ensures the control of resources with the beneficiaries and their involvement in the development of their community. Some specific benefits of community participation are enhance satisfaction of the tourists, fair cost distribution, designing of better plans for tourism and welfare of the local community, etc. (Tosun and Timothy 2003)

Different researches on CBT are enrooted on the level of participation by the local residents and the bonds that local residents are able to create with the visitors. Facilitator role is played by the public administrations, private institutions and the NGOs. However, there are some disadvantages linked with the local participation. This includes scarcity of financial resources, poor infrastructure, cultural limitations, and conflicts with the public administrations. “For Community Based Tourism (CBT) implementation; inclusion of participants, evaluation of individual and collective benefits, settings of goals and analysis of decision to be implemented are highly essential. The main benefits of community tourism are the direct economic impact on families, socio-economic upliftments, and sustainable diversification of lifestyles. Perception of tourism is based on the evaluation of the local community’s attitude including the environment, infrastructure and events. The participation model of people in the local community produce a powerful influence on the tourist’s experience and tourism planning effects the community as a whole” (Briedenhann and Wickens, 2004; Rastegar, 2010)

The collective efforts provided the desired benefits for all the participants and hence, it is highly desirable that there should be collaboration networks that can provide access to capital, markets, knowledge, and the technology. Similarly, the previous studies observed that the collaboration networks contribute in promoting innovative tourism and provides security against any unforeseen situation (Borgatti and Foster, 2003; Aas et al., 2005; Inkpen and Tsang, 2005; Koontz, 2006;Pforr, 2006; Novelli *et al.*, 2006; Wang and Fesenmaier, 2007; Wang and Xiang, 2012; Arnaboldi and Spiller, 2011).

The collaboration in CBT has a mechanism to deal with the various issues related to operations and organization during the tourism development. In fact, the collaborative process may lead to the self-organization of tourist activities within a community covering all stakeholders, thereby reducing network inequalities. But, when the collaboration process is not inclusive, the desired benefits from the process will not be realized. This is because excluding some stakeholder's results in creating tensions affective negatively the CBT development goals (Araujo and Bramwell, 1999; Gilchrist, 2003; Bramwell and Lane, 2000; Liu et al., 2014; Landorf, 2009).

When the communities have required tourism skills as well as the access to required resources, they can contribute actively in the tourism development. They can involve in planning as well as in the management of tourism business. For this, controlling and protecting the interests of the communities is of prime importance. In the CBT domain, the word 'Community Control' is used to denote the level of power that communities exercise in tourism-related decisions (Scheyvens, 2002).

Community development and area regeneration are closely related to each other and this can majorly be done through the art of tourism and to develop such an idea and trust between the community and developers is a must without which the central goal of this development will not be achieved. A core aim of community involvement in the area regeneration is to improve the capacity of the individuals to undertake the activity that will promote the socio-economic development of a place. In modern times, the recognition of the social and the cultural aspect of a community are much valued and is given much preference. The interests of researchers in CBT studies have risen due to the concept of "good governance" associated with it. The involvement of the community ensures that the potential beneficiaries contribute immensely in the tourism development by allowing their resources to be used in the tourism activities. Previous researchers have also found some methods to increase the local participation as a way to increase benefits for the local community. Locally Oriented tourism is of great benefit to locals, as it has the potential to maintain the local community's culture and ethics. The progress of a rural community is reflected in their ability to explain its experience, observations and problems to all the stakeholders and not just to the local residents and government bodies. Local control maximizes benefits and minimizes costs. The researchers have also suggested that experience from local tourism provides information and generate enthusiasm. Everything related to the community and its well-being is developed and safeguarded through a proper mechanism. (Andreas Cebulla 2000, Murphy, 1985, Stone & Stone 2011, Timothy 2003).

Everything around has its pros and cons and all the industries developed so far have also earned a bad name along with the good in market. Tourism has also some disadvantages. It is estimated that millions and millions of people travel all over world for holidays and there are lot of chances that the figures will rise up with each passing time. A large size of land has been changed to accommodate hotels, airports, etc. Huge numbers of coastlines have been turned into unproductive resources where tourists are brought through different modes. "Cultures have been subsumed, ritualized for the benefit of hordes of camera-wielding, high spending, experience-seeking people from well-heeled countries anxious to capture every moment on film". Indigenous economies are largely dependent on the tourism. The activities of a large number of people affects natural environment negatively. The wildlife has also suffered due to the boom in the tourism. Such incidents and more share a dark side of the coin which ultimately hampers the community as a whole in terms of their own ethnicity. (Pete Wikkinson 1992, Vassilis Karagkounis 2009).

Although CBT has numerous benefits, it can also result in difficulties that should be considered. For example, the CBT has some serious limitations. The problems are “(1) it stimulates social differentiation and intra-community conflict processes (2) a low level of economic viability, (3) it encourages natural resources to be used as commodities and (4) the structural constraints of the tourism industry and/or the State – constraints which hamper the local population’s control over the activity – are undervalued” (Kiss, 2004; West and Carrier, 2004; Walpole and Thouless, 2005, Blackstock, 2005; Morais *et al.*, 2006; Notzke, 2004; Telfer and Sharpley, 2008; Duffy, 2008; Fletcher, 2011; Goodwin and Santilli, 2009; Schellhorn, 2010; Tucker and Walsh, 2010; Lacher and Nepal, 2010).

Many believe that the CBT is more a romantic idea than a logical concept. They give a strong emphasis on the idea that the tourism contributes a lot in destroying the natural phenomenon of an area. The model of CBT has been advocated and criticized simultaneously and this has given a space to a large number of arguments. Poverty has been very much a rural phenomenon and this can be reduced by introducing all new means of earning including tourism and it will surely demand a large help from the natives. To start with, the CBT has the major hurdle from the community itself where the people most of the times do not want to involve in activities which are not usual to their traditions. They become resistant to any change that may occur citing the threat to their own ideas which they have emotional bond with. Confident, resilient, energetic and independent are the key features of an empowered community. It is well networked and has a higher social capital. Although the CBT has the power to support people in a number of ways, such as maintaining natural resources, culture, income generation, empowerment of local people and growing entrepreneurial activity, but if this is not intended for people’s actual upliftment and is not initiated with regard to the idea of sustainable community growth, then all this will not be pay its reward (**Elliot 2014**; Moren Tibabo Stone, 2015).

Conclusion

Tourism has started to develop its forms and get into new areas with new names. Its dimensions have changed with every step that it has taken ahead. Varieties have been added to it and community based tourism has been formed in this process. Even though tourism has always been dealing with people, but in the case of Community based tourism the scenario changes and it has lead tourism to indulge with the people on a very ground scale. Community as the name suggest is the amalgamation of people at a certain area who strive to conduct their livings together with the resources and their motivation of living together. Community based tourism is to engage with the people of such area to develop a destination with the resources that are present and mould them into a product that can be presented to people of interests. This form of tourism has been evolved from ages through different acts; from being taken as an alternative to mass tourism to a larger step taken in favour of less developed nations, this form of tourism has seen it all. The community based tourism is a global concept which allows people to develop their nations through upgrading a destination for the experience of the people who will visit it. Since the changes that have been brought to the people’s travel concept, the idea of experience has been largely popping up. Initially tourist only used to visit for leisure purpose or for meeting friends and relatives but later on it all changed and now people are striving to learn the experience and to see how the people of other community or for that matter other culture live and conduct their work schedule. This all gives rise to community based tourism as it provides a ground level experienced travel to a person.

United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) have been advocating about the sustainable development of tourism from a long time and eventually provided goals for the sustainable development of nations. These goals help in following the path by which the current resources will be consumed in such a way that the future generations will also find their share equally. Many principles have been set to safeguard the interests of the community while developing the community based tourism at any place. The matters related to the ownership, employment, demographic changes, resource implementation, cultural learnings, ecological balance etc all are discussed in the principles which pave a way for the successful CBT.

Community based tourism helps in developing a destination along with providing great number of employment to the natives while keeping in consideration the cultural boundaries and ecological balance. It also helps to get a name to the destination in the tourism world. But everything is not promised. On one side CBT proves to be very beneficial to a destination but it also in many ways and at many times ruins the innocence of the destination. Apart from that the community many a times becomes very hostile towards the tourism process that they become rigid in moulding their ways for the people to visit, citing a big challenge for the planners of CBT. The host population plays a major role in creating a successful CBT model and when they are not involved and interested in the idea, the whole process goes in vain. Thus for a successful CBT, three major things are essential; convinced host population, flexible community based tourism idea and implementing agency.

REFERENCES

- Aas, C., Adele, L., & Fletcher, J. (2005). Stakeholder Collaboration and Heritage Management. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(1), 28-48.
- Agenda 21, 1992. United Nations Conference on Environment & Development. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/outcomedocuments/agenda21>.
- Arnaboldi, M., & Spiller, N. (2011). Actor-network theory and stakeholder collaboration: The case of Cultural Districts. *Tourism Management*, 32(3), 641-654.
- Blackstock, K. (2005). A critical look at community based tourism. *Community Development Journal*, 40(1).
- Borgatti, P. S., & Foster, P. C. (2003). The Network Paradigm in Organizational Research: A Review and Typology. *Journal of Management*, 29(6), 991-1013.
- Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2000). Collaboration and Partnerships in Tourism Planning. *Channel View Publications Clevedon*, 1-9.
- Briedenhann, J., & Wickens, E. (2004). Tourism routes as a tool for the economic development of rural areas - vibrant hope or impossible dream? *Tourism Management*, 25(1), 71-79.
- Brohman, J. (1996). New directions in tourism for Third World development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(1), 48-70.
- Budeanu, A. A. (2005). Impacts and responsibilities for sustainable tourism: A tour operator's perspective. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 13(2), 89-97.
- Cebulla, A. (2000). Trusting community developers: The influence of the form and origin of community groups on residents' support in Northern Ireland. *Community Development Journal*, 35(2).

- Choi, H. C., & Sirakaya, E. (2006). Social Indicators Research Series. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1274-1289.
- Cooper, C., & Hall, C.M. (2016). Contemporary Tourism: An International Approach.
- De Lopez, T.T. (2001). Stakeholder management for conservation projects. A case study of ream national park, Cambodia 1. *Environmental management*, 28 (1), 47-60.
- Ellis, S. & Sheridan, L. (2014). A critical reflection on the role of stakeholders in sustainable tourism development in least-developed countries. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 11 (4), 467-471.
- Fiorello, A., and Bo, D. (2012). Community-Based Ecotourism to Meet the New Tourist's Expectations: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of hospitality marketing and management*, 21 (7).
- Garrod, B. (2003). Local Participation in the Planning and Management of Ecotourism: A Revised Model Approach. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 2(1).
- Gebeyaw., (2011). Socio- Demographic Determinants of Urban Unemployment. The Case of Addis Ababa. *Ethiopian Journal of Development Research*, 33(1).
- Goodwin, H., & Santilli R. (2009). Community-Based Tourism: a Success? *Responsible Tourism*.
- Graci, S., & Dodds, R. (2010). Sustainable Tourism in Island Destinations. *Routledge*.
- Gunn, C.A. (1994) *Tourism Planning: Basics, Concepts and Cases*, 3rd edition (Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis)
- Hall, C.M. & Lew, A.A. (2009). Understanding and managing tourism impacts: An integrated approach. *New York: Routledge*.
- Harrison, D., & Schipani, S. (2007). Lao tourism and poverty alleviation: Community-based tourism and the private sector. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(2) (3), 194–230.
- Hockert, E. N., (2009). Sociocultural Sustainability of Rural Community-based Tourism: Case study of local participation in Fair Trade Coffee Trail.
- Hunt, L., & Haider, W., (2001) Fair and Effective Decision Making in Forest Management Planning. *Society of Natural Resources*, 14, 873 – 887.
- Inkpen, A. C., & Tsang, E.W. (2005). Social Capital, Network, and Knowledge Transfer. *The Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), 20.
- Ioannides, D. (1995). Planning for International Tourism in Less Developed Countries: Toward Sustainability? *Journal of planning literature*, 9(3), 235-254.
- Jamal, T. B., & Getz, D., (1995). Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(1,) 186-204.
- Kiss, A. (2004). Is community-based ecotourism a good use of biodiversity conservation funds? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 19, 232–237.

- Kontogeorgopoulos, N. (2005). Community-based ecotourism in Phuket and Phangnga, Thailand: Partial victories and bittersweet remedies. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 13(1), 4–23.
- Koontz, T.M. (2006). Collaboration for sustainability? A framework for analyzing government impacts in collaborative-environmental management. *Sustainability*, 2, 15–24.
- Landorf. C., (2009). Managing for sustainable tourism: A review of six culturalWorld Heritage. *Sites Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(1), 53-70.
- Lavery, P. 1987. Travel and tourism. *Elm*.
- Mason. P. (1990). Tourism impacts, Planning and Management. Butterworth Heinemann Publications.
- Matarrita-Cascante, D. (2010). Beyond growth. Reaching tourism-led development. *Annals of Tourism Research* 37(4), 1141–1163.
- Matheison, A., & Wall, G. (1982). Tourism: Economic, Physical & Social Impacts. Prentice Hall.
- Mearns, K., (2003). Community Based tourism- the key to empowering sankuyo community in botswana. *Africa Insight*, 33 (1) (2), 33-36.
- Mearns, K. F., &Lukhele. S.E. (2015). The operational challenges of community-based tourism ventures in Swaziland. *African Journal for Physical Health Education, Recreation and Dance*.
- Moscardo, G., (2008). Sustainable Tourism Innovation: Challenging Basic Assumptions. *Tourism and hospitality research*, 8(1), 4-13.
- Murphy. P. E., (1985) Tourism- A community Approach. *Methuen*.
- Murphy. P.E., & Murphy. A.E. (2004), Strategic Management for Tourism Communities: Bridging the Gap. *Channel view Publications*
- Ndabeni, L., &Rogerson, C.M.(2005). Entrepreneurship in rural tourism: The challenges of South Africa’s Wild Coast. *Africa Insight*, 35(4), 130–41.
- Novelli, M., and Gebhardt, K. (2007). Community Based Tourism in Namibia: ‘Reality Show’ or ‘Window Dressing’. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(5), 443-479.
- Novelli. M., & Schmitz. B., (2006). Networks, Clusters and Innovation in Tourism: A UK Experience *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1141-1152.
- Okazaki, E. (2008). A Community-Based Tourism Model: Its Conception and Use. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16 (5), 511-529.
- Pforr. C., (2006). Tourism in Post-Crisis is Tourism in Pre-Crisis: A Review of the Literature on Crisis Management in Tourism.
- Rastegar, (2010). Tourism Development and Residents' Attitude: A Case Study of Yazd, Iran. *Tourismos*, 5(2).
- REST. (2010). Community based tourism handbook: Principles and meaning. Available from: www.sribd.com/doc/32621006/community-basedtourism.
- Rocharungsat. P., (2008), Community-based tourism in Asia DOI: 10.1079/9781845934477.0060.

- Sakata, H., and Prideaux, B.(2013). An alternative approach to community-based ecotourism: A bottom-up locally initiated non-monetised project in Papua New Guine.*Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(6), 880-899.
- Sautter, E. T., &Leisen, B. (1999). Managing stakeholders: a tourism planning model. *Annals of tourism sustainable*, 26(2), 312-328.
- Schellhorn. M., (2010). Development for whom? Social justice and the business of ecotourism. *Journal of sustainable Tourism*, 18(1). 115-135.
- Scheyvens, R. (2002).Tourism for Development: Empowering Communities. *Harlow Pearson Education Limited*.
- Simpson, K. (2001). Strategic Planning and Community Involvement as Contributors to Sustainable Tourism Development. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 4(1), 3-41.
- Sin, H. L., Minca, C., (2014). Touring responsibility: The trouble with ‘going local’ in community-based tourism in Thailand.*Geoforum*, 51, 96–106.
- **Snyman**, S. (2012). The Role of Tourism Employment in Poverty Reduction and Community Perceptions of Conservation and Tourism in Southern Africa.*Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(3), 1-22.
- Stone, M.T., (2015). Community-based ecotourism: A collaborative partnerships perspective.*Journal of Ecotourism*, 14 (2) (3), 166-184.
- Suansri, P, (2003). Community based tourism handbook. *Responsible Ecological Social Tour-REST*.
- Sustainable Development Goals. Available on <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals.html>.
- Swarbrooke, J.(1999). Sustainable Tourism Management. *CABIpublications*.
- Telfer, D. J.,&Sharpley, R.(2008). Tourism and Development in the Developing World. *Routledge*.
- Telfer, D.J. (2009). Development Studies and tourism. *The SAGE handbook of tourism Studies*. 147-163
- Timothy, D. J., & S. Boyd. (2006). Heritage tourism in the 21stcentury: Valued traditions and new perspectives. *The Journal of Heritage Tourism*,1(1), 1-16.
- Tolkach, D., King, B., & Pearlman, M. (2013). An Attribute-Based Approach to Classifying Community-Based Tourism Networks. *Tourism Planning & Development*,10(3), 319-337.
- Tolkach. D. and King. B. E, (2015).Strengthening Community-Based Tourism in a new resource-based island nation: Why and how? *Tourism Management*, 48, 386-398.
- Tosun, C. and Jenkins, C.L. (1996) Regional planning approaches to tourism development: The case of Turkey. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17, 519–531.
- Tosun, C., (2006). Expected nature of community participation in tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 27(3), 493-504
- Tosun, C., Timothy, D,J., (2003). Arguments for Community Participation in the Tourism Development Process. *The journal of tourism studies*, 14 (2).

- Tran. L. and Walter. P 2014. Ecotourism gender and development in northern Vietnam. *Annals of Tourism Research*.
- Tucker. H., &Walsh. N., (2010). Tourism ‘things’: The travelling performance of the backpack. *Sage journals*. 9(3), 223-239
- Wahab, S. (1975). An introduction to the scientific study of tourism management. *Tourism International Press*.
- Walpole, M., &Thouless, C., (2005). Increasing the value of wildlife through non-consumptive use? Deconstructing the myths of ecotourism and community-based tourism in the tropics. *Cambridge University Press*.
- Wang, Y., &Fesenmaier, D.R. (2007). Collaborative destination marketing: A case study of Elkhart County, Indiana. *Tourism Management* 28(3), 863-875.
- Wang, D. and Xiang, Z.(2012). The New Landscape of Travel: A Comprehensive Analysis of Smartphone Apps. *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism*, 308-319.
- West, P., and Carrier. J. G.(2004). Ecotourism and Authenticity: Getting Away from It All? *Current Anthropology*, 45(4), 483-498.
- Wilkinson. P., (1992) Tourism—the curse of the nineties? Belize—an experiment to integrate tourism and the environment. *Community Development Journal*, 27 (4), 386-395.
- World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). Our Common Future. New York: *Oxford University Press*.
- Yuksel, F., Bramwell, B. and Yuksel, A. (1999). Stakeholder interviews and tourism planning at Pamukkale, Turkey. *Tourism Management*,20(3), 351-360.
- Yang, X., and Hung, K.(2014). Poverty alleviation via tourism cooperatives in China: the story of Yuhu. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(6).
- Zapata, M. J., Hall, C. M., Lindo, P., &Vanderschaeghe, M. (2011). Can community-based tourism contribute to development and poverty alleviation? Lessons from Nicaragua. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(8), 725–749.