PART 1

Introduction to community-based tourism & community-based tourism initiatives

The handbook opens with Part 1, which introduces the reader to community-based tourism (CBT) and its initiatives. This part contains nine chapters and illustrates the conceptual, methodological and applied base of community-based tourism and its associated initiatives from tourism perspectives. It further elaborates on the different conceptual models and theoretical backgrounds of community-based tourism, and differentiates community products from other tourism and hospitality goods/products. The behavioural intentions and their implications are also dealt with, along with the ethical and cross-cultural issues of community-based tourism. This part also explains the changing dimensions of community-based tourism and its relationship with policy, the planning of tourism in communities and community well-being. Various authors/researchers contribute papers that focus not only on drafting the role of the community but also on highlighting the numerous concepts and trends associated with it. The objective of this part is to provide readers with insights into the issues and concerns of communities which are involved in tourism, either indirectly or directly, thereby providing or analyzing various theories, philosophies, policies and frameworks.

The first chapter, titled “Community-Based Tourism: A Preamble from Literature” written by Dr Sandeep Kumar Walia, tries to lay down the foundation of community-based tourism. It focuses on various associated concepts of local communities in tourism and their role in tourism development. The chapter begins with an intense review of various approaches and theories as applied by researchers to investigate the topic. Despite the fact that the outcomes of available studies about residents and their role in the development of tourism have mostly been convincing, further research into the community perspective with respect to the travel industry’s growth under various settings and types of development is suggested.

Considering the complex systems and insights of planning theory in tourism planning and local community development, Chapter 2, entitled “Harmonic Tourism Methodology: A Proposal for Tourism Planning in Rural Communities,” written by Yanelli Daniela Palmas Castrejón, Rocío del Carmen Serrano-Barquín and Alberto Amore, presents and applies the Harmonic Tourism Methodology as an alternative to community-based and community-led tourism planning, thus offering a viable approach to community-based tourism that may further help in generating more resilient and sustainable tourism development.

Similarly, Chapter 3, “Overview of Community-Based Tourism: From History to Evaluation Framework,” by Yusuke Ishihara serves as a source to revive and review the concept of
Community-Based Tourism, along with critical issues, such as its history, definition, central idea, implementation and the evaluative framework attached to it. In view of current trends in the fields of tourism and international development, the author has also discussed and provided a knowledge-based platform for broader perspectives of CBT.

Moving ahead to other aspects, in Chapter 4, another two authors, Aruditya Jasrotia and Amit Gangotia, have drafted and analyzed factors that act as facilitators and inhibitors to community-based tourism. The authors, in their study “Understanding the Facilitators and Inhibitors of Community-Based Tourism: A Case Study of Dharamshala,” take a dimensional look at the concept, supporting the theory that community-based tourism can have a vivacious role in encouraging community participation in the unprejudiced development of the local community. The study integrates the concepts of poverty mitigation, CBT and tourism development to explain the successful establishment of community-based tourism in Dharamshala, which can further be taken up by authorities in other destinations to follow up the necessary practices for sustained tourism development.

However any research cannot said to be completed without the analyzing the of previous literature and researches conducted in the targeted field, to which the Chapter 5 by Luciana Aparecida Barbieri da Rosa et al. (“A Longitudinal Study of Articles Published on Community-Based Tourism and Sustainable Development: Reflections and their Applicabilities in the Scope and on Web of Science Databases for the Period from 1998 to 2018”) is endorsed with the literature and the characteristics of publications related to the theme, community-based tourism and sustainable development in the Scopus and Web of Science database from 1998 to 2018, at the theoretical and empirical debates.

CBT has gained prominence over the last 20 years because it is considered one pathway to sustainable tourism development. It assumes that community participation in tourism is desirable; empowering community members to engage in the development and management of this kind of tourism fosters sustainability both in cultural and in economic terms. In contrast to this, Chapter 7, written by Carla Guerrón Montero, Laura Santos and Daniele Santtos, and entitled “Ethno-Ecological Community-Based Tourism from Within: Quilombo Tourism and the Quest for Sustainability in Brazil,” proposes that the model developed at Campinho, defined as ethno-ecological community-based tourism by quilombola members, provides an exemplified outlook on CBT.

Further considering the societal aspects of tourism, Verónica Mora-Jácome, Christian Viñán-Merecí and Alex-Paúl Ludeña- Reyes, in their chapter “Local Culture, Society and Resources as Products for Tourism Development at ‘El Cisne’ Parish,” analyze the current situation of the “El Cisne” parish, based on local culture, society and resources as well as the type of tourism that can be developed here, looking at the consequences of tourism on the basis of sustainable development by conducting the bibliographic review with respect to state of tourism the criteria for integration and sustainability was analyzed that can be assumed by the host communities.

Similarly, Sónia Moreira Cabeça’s research in Chapter 9, “Community-Based Tourism, a Means Toward Cultural Heritage Preservation: The Case Of Cante Alentejano (Alentejo, Portugal),” explains intangible cultural heritage and safeguarding requirements through community involvement and, from the tourism point of view, of community-based tourism. Lastly, Octavio Barrientos, Glen Croy, Jagjit Plahe and Peter Holland’s chapter “Social Movements and Community-Based Tourism: The Case of Pichilemu” profiles the targeted area in comparison to the theorised understanding of social movements and over-tourism, and demonstrates the emergence of the CBT enterprise.
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COMMUNITY-BASED TOURISM
A preamble from literature
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1.1 Introduction
The tourism industry is drafting out a role for itself as a major part of economic development in the world, particularly to the developing nations. Organizers and planners who have considered the economy solely on the basis of “brick and mortar” stores have begun to consider the travel industry a sensible framework with conventional ventures. At the same time, residents in various regions are encountering the consequences of the travel industry establishing itself in their home regions. To attain support for travel industry ventures and activities, various organizers and planners have attempted to understand how the general public reacts to the influence that tourism can have on development. It can bloom when the local population of a community is inclined towards it and when its members have positive perceptions towards tourists and the development of this industry. This positivism in the community also depends on whether its members see themselves taking part in the development process of tourism. This is where the concept of community-based tourism (CBT) comes in: where tourism activities are owned and managed by the community, and all the benefits are delivered to and focussed on them (Goodwin & Santilli, 2009). When a particular destination is introduced, the life quality of the local community goes through some transformations in attitudes towards tourism. CBT is actually a multi-ethnic framework used to grow economies, both urban and rural, thus providing communities with prospects for enhanced livelihood (Anuar & Sood, 2017).

There is wide accord in the literature concerning the need to understand the host community’s disposition toward travel industry development (Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004; Chen & Chen, 2010; Choi & Murray, 2010; Wang & Chen, 2015). Communities, especially in developing nations, are considered generally unacquainted with the costs and complexity associated with rapid tourism development in their areas (Rosenow & Pulsipher, 1979). While this is a prominent part of the literature (for instance Oviedo-Garcia et al., 2008; Chen & Chen, 2010; Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012; Woosnam, 2012; Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2015; Wang & Chen, 2015; Almeida-García et al., 2016), there is still some uncertainty around this matter; more analysis is needed, in more diverse places, particularly with respect to local communities and using new research methodologies (Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004; Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2011; Nunkoo et al., 2013; Sharpley, 2014).
1.2 Finding space for community in tourism: community-based tourism

Tourism is always viewed as a source of financial development by the local populations of a community as it incorporates different components that enhance their personal satisfaction as well as the development process of natural and cultural resources (Kandampully, 2000; Andercek et al., 2005). Despite these benefits, it has also led to negative consequences on local populations’ personal satisfaction, e.g., a rising cost of basic items, wrongdoings, changes in local peoples’ ways of life, transportation and parking issues, etc. (Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Brunt & Hambly, 1999; Tosun, 2002). Because of the outgoing influence of tourism, destinations representations have significant influences on the local community (Salazar, 2012).

For organizers and planners who have little knowledge of the tourism industry, other than being travellers themselves, the desire to retain information about this industry and host communities’ dispositions towards the tourism business can signify fear or nervousness. Regardless of the interest, only a few studies on organizing and developing in tourism have made their way into renowned journals (Inskeep, 1988; Loannides, 1995; Marcouiller, 1995, 1997; Harrill & Potts, 2003), and books on tourism business administration are rare (Gunn, 1997; Bosselman et al., 1999; Judd & Fainstein, 1999; Hall, 2003).

1.2.1 Community as a support system for tourism development

Tourism development is perceived by a local community as beneficial and as creating favourable circumstances that increase the chances of effectiveness in various ways, including via economic benefits, improving the quality of life of the local population, socio-cultural benefits, and improvements in tourist infrastructure and the host-tourist relationship (Niezgoda, 2011). The findings of some research studies (Hanafiah et al., 2013; Wang & Chen, 2015) indicate that most locals have positive feelings towards tourism development and are in support of it.

Contact between local people and visitors is a focal point for a positive experience in tourism (Luo et al., 2015), and it also emphatically influences satisfaction among travellers and residents when it comes to tourism (Pizam & Fleischer, 2002; Andercek et al., 2005; Eusébio & Carneiro, 2012; Kastenholz et al., 2013; Kastenholz et al., 2018). Visitor contact is also an unpredictable concept that has been conceptualized in different ways. Reisinger and Turner (2008) describe social contact in the travel industry as “the individual experience that happens between a tourist and a host” (p. 37).

Contact among tourists and residents is a continuous area of research with a nonappearance of both theoretical principle and practical examination (Eusébio & Carneiro, 2012; Eusébio et al., 2016). The repetition of contact in different settings and the satisfaction with this contact are the generally used measures (for instance Turner & Reisinger, 2003; Eusébio & Carneiro, 2012; Kastenholz et al., 2013; Eusébio et al., 2016). In most destinations, the social contact between hosts and guests is short, temporary and unequal to the extent reflected for both the characters (De Kadt, 1979; Turner & Reisinger, 2003; Eusébio & Carneiro, 2012; Kastenholz et al., 2015). In any case, if circumstances for interaction emerge, contact among tourists and inhabitants may occur (Eusébio & Carneiro, 2012), and, if these interactions are satisfying, apparently ethnic bias and generalizations will decrease, social improvements will be enhanced and pressure between the tourists and hosts while they learn more about each other will be reduced (Turner & Reisinger, 2003; Luo et al., 2015).

According to Akis et al. (1996) and Weaver and Lawton (2001) well-behaved locals and occupants who are frequently in contact with tourists have progressively more positive
attitudes towards tourism development. The analysis carried out by Weaver and Lawton (2001) found that communities that have thorough interactions with visitors seem to articulate more affirmative attitudes towards tourists and, of course, tourism development. Andereck et al. (2005) analyzed whether residents who have more contact with travellers see larger amounts of positive tourism influences and inferred that residents who have moderate contact with tourists see increasingly distinct outcomes (for instance in community life and in the economy) and exhibit no differentiation concerning the negative impacts of tourism (for instance in the community and in regard to ecological issues).

The larger proportion of research focusses on understanding host-resident attitudes toward the development of tourism in developed countries (for instance Dyer et al., 2007; Gu & Ryan, 2008; Kaltenborn et al., 2008; Oviedo-García et al., 2008; Byrd et al., 2009; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2012; Látková & Vogt, 2012; Woosnam, 2012; Sharpley, 2014). However, past research studies present a nonappearance of acceptance as far as the components affecting the host community’s attitudes toward tourism development are concerned (Chen & Chen, 2010). Additionally, there are numerous studies examining the undeviating and indirect influences of destination association and the guest-host relationship on inhabitant attitudes toward tourism development.

The travel industry is considered by development authorities to be among the most crucial financial activities that support the economic advancement of nations, especially developing ones. A number of researchers have conducted studies in such nations (for instance Akis et al., 1996; Sirivongs & Tsuchiya, 2012; Simão & Môsso, 2013; Ribeiro et al., 2013; Sharpley, 2014; Sánchez et al., 2016) and have done so even more unequivocally in island tourism destinations. Accordingly, these destinations customarily stand up to monetary and social obstructions that restrain their organized development, and the populations are frequently dispensed from the tourism industry’s basic process of management and planning (Dyer et al., 2007). Likewise, Wang and Chen (2015) note, “In developing visitor destinations, the tendency and interests of travelers are normally placed before the people who live and work in these regions” (p. 17). This adds to the requirement of community-based tourism research and its role in the development of nations, which may highlight widely different consequences in developing nations from those seen in developed ones (Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004; Rasoolimanesh et al., 2017 y).

1.3 Community: a dividend to social exchange practices

While attempting to address the host community’s issues and elucidate their viewpoint and role in supporting the development of tourism, researchers have proposed numerous theories. Although many have been put forward, Social Exchange Theory has been the most widely used and discussed by researchers (Byrd et al., 2009). Ap (1992, p. 668) defines this as “a general sociological theory attributed in understanding the trading of assets among individuals and groups in a trade situation.” Researchers consider Social Exchange Theory to have made the most fundamental theoretical contribution to the understanding of local residents’ attitudes towards tourism development (Fredline & Faulkner, 2000). Regardless of the wide utilization of this theory by researchers, fundamental constructs such as power and trust, which are critical to the trade relationship between residents of a tourist destination and the travel industry, have been considered and examined less often. While a couple of studies have looked at the construct of power in explaining residents’ attitudes toward tourism development (for instance Madrigal, 1993; Kayat, 2002a), aside from some examinations – in Nunkoo and Ramkissoon (2011); Nunkoo et al. (2012); Nunkoo and
The construct of trust has staying mostly uninvestigated in tourism literature. Nunkoo and Ramkissoon (2011) contend that “The study of power and trust that incorporate the Social Exchange Theory eventually can’t be sufficiently composed in a solitary framework in research on host community residents’ attitudes toward tourism” (p. 966).

Using the idea of power as a segment of Social Exchange Theory, a few researchers have studied residents’ attitudes toward tourism development (Table 1.1). Madrigal’s (1993) study on two Arizona community groups demonstrates that occupants’ opinions of the prospect of tourism were strongly related to their individual control over tourism development. Contrarily, some opinions were related to the control of businesses over tourism. Kayat’s (1992b) study on the island of Langkawi, Malaysia, found that residents had positive attitudes and were strong supporters of the future development of tourism. Nunkoo and Ramkissoon’s (2011) study on Grand-Baie, Mauritius, similarly recommends that residents were emphatically disposed toward tourism as compared to less disposed ones.

Nunkoo and Ramkissoon (2011) affirm that low trust in tourism institutions may reduce residents’ valuation of and appreciation for tourism development in any particular region. Using the Social Exchange Theory as the theoretical base of their investigation of the residents of Grand-Baie, Mauritius, they found that residents with a lot of trust in tourism planning and decision-making organizations see tourism development positively, while those with lower levels of trust are less predisposed towards the tourism business. The outcomes of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors and year of publication</th>
<th>Focus areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McCool and Martin (1994)</td>
<td>Community attachment; development of tourism; attitude; length of being a domicile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Madrigal (1995)</td>
<td>Resident’s perception; tourism development; role of government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindberg and Johnson (1997)</td>
<td>Demographic variables; economic gain; minimal disruption of daily local facilities; environment; tourist interaction; community/culture disposition; decisions process; community attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoon et al. (2001)</td>
<td>Tourism impact (economic, social, cultural and environmental); support for tourism development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gursoy et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Community attachment; eco-centric attitude; resources utilization by residents; perceived benefits; perceived costs; support for tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko and Stewart (2002)</td>
<td>Perceived tourism benefits, impacts of tourism; satisfaction; support for tourism development by local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurowski and Gursoy (2004); Gursoy and Rutherford (2004)</td>
<td>Community concern; eco-centric attitude; utilization of the tourism resources by the residents; state of the local economy; perceived benefits; perceived costs; support for tourism development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gursoy and Kendall (2006)</td>
<td>Resource utilization by Residents; State of the Local Economy; Perceived benefits of tourism; Perceived Social and Socio-economic Costs; Attitudes towards Tourism Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Threat; Social Exchange; Contact; Attitudes; Stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gursoy et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Destination image among residents; Support for Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward and Berno (2011)</td>
<td>Development; Tourism Impacts; Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styhidi et al. (2014)</td>
<td>Power; Trust; Guest Host Interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunkoo and So (2016); and Eusébio et al. (2018)</td>
<td>Host Tourist Interactions; Place Attachment; Residents’ Perceptions of Tourism Impacts; Residents’ Attitudes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s own analysis.
their examination emphasize the necessity of trust in the social exchange between residents and tourism institutions.

1.4 Conclusion

Although the tourism business has variously benefitted local communities, it has also led to some negative social, cultural and environmental impacts. It has been less welcomed due to its ability to disrupt and harm local systems, undermine social principles, spoil social structures and strip systems of their uniqueness. There are a number of studies investigating community association and host-guest contact in tourism development. Despite of the way in which the eventual outcomes of existing literature about power and residents’ attitudes toward tourism development have by and large been inducing, further studies concerning this under varied settings and structures need to be carried out. Consequently, the construct of trust is a promising one and needs further assessment and research by scholars in this field. The majority of research in this area has been undertaken in developed nations; hence, researchers and scholars need to further study the views of developing nations toward tourism. Moreover, there are a predetermined number of studies investigating communities and their roles in tourism, their attachment with the place, the role of interaction between them and tourists, and their role in tourism development. Tourism can never be considered just from the tourists’ perspective as the role of the community, as a host, a source or a service provider, merits significant discussion. Despite the fact that the outcomes of the available studies about residents and their role in the development of tourism have, further research into communities’ power with respect to travel industry development under various settings and types of development need to be carried out.

The involvement of the community in various forms and their participation in CBT, its assessment and planning processes, situations and reactions in terms of attitude, participation etc. requires the potential for the members of the local community to enhance their skills, networks, and buoyancy that further enhance tourism development and its benefits. Accordingly, this volume compiles numerous ideas and studies in tourism development that have been conducted by researchers and scholars. The majority of the studies reviewed in this book use a theoretical approach; however, the authors also apply theories and concepts from other fields, such as sociology and psychology, to understand and examine local communities’ roles in tourism development in various destinations and in various forms and practices.
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