Assessing sustainable community-based tourism development in Thailand

Publication details
Uraiporn Kattiypornpong, Chatchasorn Chuntamara
Published online on: 21 Dec 2020


PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR DOCUMENT
32

ASSESSING SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY-BASED TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN THAILAND

Uraiporn Kattiypornpong and Chatchasorn Chuntamara

32.1 Introduction

Although the rapid growth of tourism facilitates prosperous national revenue generation with growing development of national infrastructure, there are many arguable debates on the balance of its positive and negative impacts on local communities’ economy, environment, culture and society. There has been substantial research, studies and projects on sustainable tourism in the past few decades that has variously emphasised different tourism areas. The United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) (2019) defines sustainable tourism as “tourism that takes full account of its current and future economic, social and environmental impacts, addressing the needs of visitors, the industry, the environment and host communities”. In addition, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the official International Year of Sustainable Tourism for Development in 2017 emphasised tourism as a stimulating tool or approach to achieve the universal 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and increasing the public awareness of sustainability issues (Boluk, Cavaliere & Higgins-Desbiolles, 2019; Moscardo & Hughes, 2018). However, the issues and goals are not understood by every stakeholder in tourism, especially those in community-based tourism (CBT) in rural areas.

There have been many attempts to provide a comprehensive meaning of CBT regarding its size, location, ownership, involvement, control, management and benefits and its relevant and successful components for many decades, yet the vagueness still exists (Beeton, 2006; Dwyer & Edwards, 2000; Honggang, Sofield & Jigang, 2009; Kontogeorgopoulos, Churyn & Duangsaeng, 2014; Li 2006; Simpson, 2008; Tosun, 2000). In addition, there is some research on CBT assessments (e.g., Brandon, Lindberg & Hawkins, 1993; Rochrungsat, 2008; Weaver, 2012), but still unclear is the degrees of community involvement or participation (Kontogeorgopoulos, Churyn & Duangsaeng, 2014) in CBT development.

Despite the substantial interest and attention towards CBT sites, published peer-reviewed research on Thailand’s CBT is rather small, compared to other CBT sites around the world (Kontogeorgopoulos, 2005; Kontogeorgopoulos, Churyn & Duangsaeng, 2014; Leksakundilok & Hirsch, 2008; Nguangchhaiyapoom, Yongvanit & Sripun, 2012; Walter, 2009; Wong, 2008. It is therefore important to assess stakeholders’ awareness of sustainable CBT development criteria and whether they are aware of the CBT development in their
local areas. By applying the Criteria for Thailand’s Community-Based Tourism Development (CBT Thailand) and Social Exchange Theory (SET), this study aims to assess and explain various stakeholders’ perspectives on sustainable community-based tourism (SCBT) development from the selection of two established CBT sites in Thailand as part of a comparative study.

This study is structured as follows: Section 32.2 provides selected literature review based on up-to-date studies on SCBT, criteria for Thailand’s CBT and SET in tourism. Section 32.3 presents the methodology of this study including study context and CBT sites, data collection and data analysis. The findings are presented in Section 32.4, followed by a discussion of the results. Section 32.5 includes the conclusion, theoretical and practical implications, limitations of this particular study and recommended future research.

32.2 Literature review

32.2.1 Sustainable community-based tourism development

Tourism is identified by international programmes (e.g., the United Nations World Tourism Organization, the SNV [Dutch Aid Organization] programme, the UK Overseas Development Institute’s programme of Pro-Poor Tourism (PPT), the UN International Trade Centre’s Tourism-led Poverty Alleviation Program, the Asian Development Bank’s Greater Mekong Sub-region Tourism Program, etc.), regional and national policies and initiatives around the world as a pertinent and innovative tool for sustainable development and poverty reduction, especially in the rural areas of developing countries (Banki & Ismail, 2015; Rossetto, Li & Sofield, 2007; Spenceley & Goodwin, 2007). Additionally, sustainable tourism development seems to have responded well to a few of the widely publicised SDGs such as eliminating poverty, reducing environmental impact and creating economic prosperity and jobs (UNWTO, 2017a, 2017b).

As guided by the SDGs, CBT is defined as an alternative form of sustainable tourism development, owned and/or managed by community members and that intends to create and maximise opportunities and benefits for those members (Curcija, Breakey & Driml, 2019, p.341; Goodwin & Santilli, 2009, p. 4). Similarly, CBT initiatives have been promoted as a suitable mechanism for sustainable development, poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation and are believed to increase local incomes and jobs, develop skills and empower local people (Kiss, 2004; Lamers et al., 2015; Manyara & Jones, 2007; Mitchell & Muckosy, 2008; Nthiga et al., 2015; Snyman, 2012).

Based on a rapid literature search using the keywords “Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria”, there are only a few studies related to the UN’s Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and SDGs in tourism (e.g., Boluk, Cavaliere & Higgins-Desbiolles, 2019; Novelli & Hellwig, 2011; Saarinen & Rogerson, 2014) and a couple of studies related to Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria (GSTC) (e.g., Bricker & Schultz, 2011; Bristow & Jenkins, 2018). Saarinen and Rogerson (2014) cross-examine the potential tourism contribution towards achieving the MDGs and the relationships between tourism development and the MDGs and reveal the contradict impacts on the contribution of tourism development toward local benefits and achieving the MDGs. Importantly, they raise the concern of tourism industry in achieving those high expectations from the MDGs.

In addition, Novelliand Hellwig (2011, p. 205) highlight the importance of tour operators’ awareness of the MDGs in order to implement tourism development policies and contribute towards the achievement of the MDGs, and reveal the need for clarifying their role
as facilitators of development through the identification of focussed initiatives and guidelines at the micro level.

In achieving the development goals, bottom-up planning, participation and decentralisation are key success factors (Chambers, 1983; Korten, 1980). Furthermore, local community’s environmental awareness, participation, involvement and inclusion, empowerment and capacity building are important success factors, and communities are considered an imperative stakeholder in the tourism development process (Adams & Hulme, 2001; Ashley, 2000; Ashley, Boyd & Goodwin, 2000; Ashley & Mitchell, 2007, Britton, 1982; Burns, 1999; Hall, 2007; Imbaya et al., 2019; Kline, McGehee & Delconte, 2019; Mitchell & Ashley, 2009; Mountjoy et al., 2014; Novelli & Gebhardt, 2007; Tosun, 2006).

Although the MDGs are promoted and discussed widely at the global level, the general public are not familiar or aware of the MDGs (World Bank, 2007; McDonnell, 2004; Novelli & Hellwig, 2011). This generates an ongoing question: are the general public or local stakeholders aware of the new SDGs, especially GSTC, that are important for CBT development? In particular, what degree of awareness do local stakeholders have of CBT development? This consequently leads to this study’s research questions: are local stakeholders aware of SCBT development and to what degree they are aware of the criteria for CBT development in their local tourism areas? Thailand, like many countries, has enjoyed growing tourism and its contribution to income growth. It also faces similar issues on insufficient controls and regulations to prevent any negative impacts from tourism development (Kontogeorgopoulos, Churyen & Duangsaeng, 2014). Kontogeorgopoulos, Churyen and Duangsaeng (2014) highlight the significance of CBT in Thailand’s domestic tourism and reveal that the most significant success factors for CBT in Thailand are fortunate geographical conditions, external support and transformational leadership. They also accentuate the obstacles in planning, initiatives and sustainability of CBT projects in Thailand. In addition, they challenge the meaning of “success” in CBT, as it is based largely on individual perspectives and expectations. Therefore key success factors of CBT are varied due to the uniqueness of each destination (Kattiyapornpong et al., 2018a, 2018b; Kattiyapornpong, Chuntamara & Ditta-apichai, n.d.).

### 32.2.2 Criteria for Thailand’s Community-Based Tourism Development (CBT Thailand)

The Criteria for CBT Thailand were initially published by the Designated Areas for Sustainable Tourism Administration (DASTA). DASTA is a public central agency of the Thai government that aims to increase revenue and distribute income to local communities by managing and developing potential areas for integrated tourism. It was also awarded the ‘Global Sustainable Tourism Council (GSTC)–Recognised Standard’ status (PATA, 2018). These standard criteria have been allied in a number of ways; namely, (1) to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the CBT development process in Thailand (continuous planning, operating and evaluating outcome), (2) to build community capacity and fulfil the community’s potentials, (3) to monitor and prevent any unwanted negative changes in communities and (4) to build immunity for communities by being aware of their capacity, in order to reap the benefits from tourism and strengthen their local resource management.

Although the criteria for Thailand’s CBT was reviewed by GSTC technical experts and the GSTC Accreditation Panel and were deemed equivalent to the GSTC criteria for sustainable tourism, they only indicate the minimum elements to ensure sustainability. In addition, the Criteria for CBT Thailand were the first standard in the world that accentuated...
CBT development and community involvement in sustainable tourism development with GSTC-recognised status (PATA, 2018).

### 32.2.3 Social Exchange Theory (SET)

This study focuses on sustainable CBT tourism and applies SET to better understand stakeholders’ perspectives and opinions towards sustainable tourism development. SET is very helpful in clarifying each stakeholder’s perspective (Kattiyapornpong et al., 2018a, 2018b; Kattiyapornpong, Chuntamara & Ditta-apichai, n.d.) as it offers the additional views of the economists that theories and tools from different knowledge areas may be usefully, fruitfully and synergically used to investigate various issues at each stage of tourism development (Bimonte & Punzo, 2016, p.129). In addition, this study applies SET’s “Economic”, “Socio-Cultural” and “Environmental” dimensions (Ozel & Kozak, 2017) toward the impacts of SCBT development to explain stakeholders’ perspectives, as those aspects reflect most of SCBT development.

### 32.3 Methods

To achieve this study objective, this study applies SET to explain various stakeholders’ perspectives on SCBT development at two CBT initiative projects in Thailand and additionally applies the Criteria for CBT Thailand to assess SCBT development as a comparative study. The research methodology of this study is presented in Figure 32.1.

#### 32.3.1 Research design

In the research design stage, the researchers collected information on the Criteria for CBT Thailand, the Sustainable Tourism Management Standard (STMS), the GSTC and literature review based on the criteria for CBT development. The Criteria for CBT
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Thailand were selected and adapted based on consultancy and discussion with academic experts and local CBT developers. The criteria were adjusted and applied as a tool for self-assessment of stakeholders’ awareness of the criteria for CBT in the Thailand context.

The questions-based SET dimensions (economic, social and environmental impacts) were developed from the literature review and consultancy with academic experts.

32.3.2 Data collection

32.3.2.1 Study context

Thailand is one of countries with the highest tourist arrival in the world and one of the countries in South East Asia with leading CBT initiative projects. The researchers initially studied CBT initiative projects in Thailand and contacted related stakeholders for more information and potential research projects. A few meetings were set with local stakeholders such as local CBT developers, academics and communities in order to understand each CBT initiative project, unique key success factors and challenges.

After the initial evaluation, two established CBT sites in Thailand were selected as part of a comparative study on assessing SCBT development.

**CBT1 Bang Kachao, Samut Prakan province: long established CBT site**

This particular area is part of DASTA’s CBT initiatives. This area is called the “green lung of Bangkok” and was named “the best urban oasis” (Marshall, 2006) because it has ample green areas near the capital city, Bangkok, and is popular with nature lovers and cyclists. It is located on the river bend part of the Chao Phraya River (the main river in Bangkok) with 32 canals in the area. There are six districts in this area that have on-going CBT initiatives.

**CBT2 Tung Na Mon, Pathum Thani province: newly established CBT site**

This site is considered newly established, compared to Bang Kachao site, based on CBT initiative development. This site was initiated and dedicated as a CBT and agricultural learning centre inspired by Mon culture (Mon is a hill-tribe in Myanmar at present, cited in Katthyapornpong, Chuntamara & Ditta-apichai, in press). It is also known as a Mon self-efficient economic learning centre. This CBT site was initially developed on the private land of a local community resident under the Community Development Department, which is supported by the Government and the provincial One Tambol (district) One Product (OTOP) project. In addition, DASTA applies the Criteria for CBT Thailand to assess this CBT site to determine whether this CBT site is suitable to include in the CBT development areas in Thailand.

The sampling was collected using snowballing methods, starting with CBT academics by asking them to give contact references of local developers, who then gave references of local community leaders, members and respondents. A total of 40 stakeholders from the two selected tourism sites was collected for this study (Table 32.1), including local CBT developers, academics and host communities (community leaders, members and residents).

Each in-depth interview lasted for approximately 30–45 minutes. Each researcher listened to and transcribed the interview recordings individually and separately, and then compared the transcripts in order to avoid any missing data and validate it.

In addition, the Criteria for CBT Thailand were used for the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) to check whether local community members and residents were aware of the CBT development criteria.
32.3.3 Data analysis

All in-depth interviews were transcribed, coded and critically analysed using the Nvivo programme based on thematic analysis approach. Furthermore, the additional self-assessment results were simply calculated based on the guidelines of CBT Thailand. Each criterion was assessed based on each respondent’s awareness of the particular CBT sites.

32.4 Findings and discussion

Respondents were asked to share their views on sustainable CBT development in their local areas. Various perspectives were revealed in this study. The respondents highlighted the keys to sustainable CBT development, including understanding, community involvement and participation, volunteering mind, community unity and strength, self-sufficiency, support from partners, time for realisation and planning well.

It is important that all stakeholders in this CBT site understand the local area and [its] characteristics. [CBT1]

Relevant factors for the sustainable development in this area are community involvement and participation, volunteering mind, community unity and strength and self-sufficiency. [CBT2]

The most sustainable factor is participation from all community members. [CBT1]

People in community have different roles and responsibilities, but they should participate and involve in all community events or tasks if possible. [CBT1]

In CBT management, the community needs to realise the strengths and weaknesses in order to identify the potential in CBT development, what need or support we require from our partners or from the government. [CBT2]

In order to develop the CBT, we need ‘time’ to identify problems and mistakes because it is considered new to us. We also need to create the guideline for tourists, so they do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>CBT1 Bang Kachao</th>
<th>CBT2 Tung Na Mon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local CBT developers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT academics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community leaders</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community members and residents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32.1 Respondents of two CBT sites
not cause the community trouble. This will enhance mutual happiness if tourists and community are happy so that we call it ‘sustainability’. It has to come from our hearts.  

[CBT1]

Based on SET’s three dimensions, respondents were asked to explain the economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts.

### 32.4.1 Economic impacts

Most respondents saw economic benefits from CBT development, shared by everyone in the community. In addition, they did not see any negative impacts on the local economy from CBT development.

Community leaders and members who own the homestays near the floating market have earned more income since 2004. People in this area make more money from related tourism businesses such as coffee shops/cafés, agricultural products.  

[CBT1]

Kids and young people in this area have earned from part-time jobs on the weekends from CBT.  

[CBT1]

The floating market brings more tourists to the area and generates income to local families. There are jobs created from One Tambol (district) One Product (OTOP) projects, which help[s] in income distribution.  

[CBT1]

Local community residents are able to make money from selling products in this area, especially housewives and students. There are also new jobs generated in this area.  

[CBT2]

Local people can improve their skills in the job.  

[CBT2]

More money distribution in this area, so people can afford to spend more on their lives and well-being.  

[CBT2]

There is no negative economic impact at the moment.  

[CBT2]

### 32.4.2 Socio-cultural impacts

The respondents stated that CBT helps bring back their happy families. They also highlighted that CBT helps the community be independent and self-sufficient. Similar to economic impacts, there were no negative socio-cultural impacts they could see.
There are many local residents moving back to live at their homes in this area, including those who are early retired. They move back to open their own tourism-related businesses. This change impacts positively on community residents as family members live together and they are happier.

\[ CBT1 \]

Local people have more jobs and earn money from CBT or related tourism business in this area. They have more time to spend with their families more and they are happier.

\[ CBT1 \]

When local people are happy, it creates friendliness in the area. So tourists will come more.

\[ CBT1 \]

When local residents have jobs and careers, they earn from them. They will not get involved with drugs and gambling. This creates better environment for families and society.

\[ CBT2 \]

Income from CBT helps the community to be independent and self-sufficient.

\[ CBT2 \]

I do not see any negative socio-cultural impact in this area.

\[ CBT2 \]

### 32.4.3 Environmental impacts

The respondents revealed various negative environmental impacts in their local communities such as litter, noise, pollution, road traffic and accidents, which are related to planning well in CBT development.

There is a limit number of guests in this CBT site. It helps reducing a negative impact on local environment such as noise at night and local traffic (road and bicycle safety) for community residents.

\[ CBT1 \]

The largest changes in this area include less green area, too many people and more noise which are impacts from tourism development.

\[ CBT1 \]

There is a problem on the rubbish that comes from CBT development and tourists in this area.

\[ CBT2 \]

Once this area has been promoted as the lung of Bangkok or the most natural (green) area next to Bangkok, there have been more tourists and people in this area which created problems in waste, traffic, and pollution.

\[ CBT1 \]
In tourism development, many big trees were cut down to clear the area for tourism purpose, which was unfortunate.

Although some respondents highlighted many negative environmental impacts at both CBT sites, there were some delighted initiatives.

There are a few positive impacts based on rubbish recycle initiative projects. For example, plastic containers will be recycled in different forms of different usages such as pots for planting, buckets, etc. which are provided to local people for free for re-use. Some people will get free food if they exchange with plastic they collect.

Creating CBT activities increases the green and natural spaces in this area.

It (CBT) facilitates the community involvement to keep the area green, clean and tidy.

In addition, respondents were asked to share what they would like to see happen in the sustainable development in their area. Some good ideas and insights were discovered.

This area could be developed for health and well-being tourism due to its environmental and natural resources. I believe that we have capacity in this area. We can promote how to look after their health by consuming more herbs in cooking or relaxing. We have many local vegetables that grow in the area that can be cooked healthily. Once tourists are aware of this and realise the benefits of having good health knowledge and experience from this area, they will come back.

Since the commencement of the CBT initiative development, I have learnt so much about many good things including food, traditional wisdom and knowledge in this district and nearby. It would be great if we could do more promotion on CBT information to raise awareness about what we have, so people in this area know, then they will travel within the area rather than go outside.

We can do more on promoting this area to increase awareness and interest in local CBT activities such as local tie dye technique[s], herb garden, planting, dessert cooking, bicycle riding, etc. through social media such as LINE and Facebook social network platforms.

It would be great to bring in the star rating standard that used for the hotel for our homestay[s] in CBT.

The area is very small with limited roads and parking. It should implement the parking regulation. For example, local residents can drive in the area and park at their home[s],
while visitors should park their cars in the designed area and travel into the area by the community shuttle buses. This way will help reducing traffic, road accidents and pollution in the area.

[CBT1]

Interestingly, CBT1 revealed the wish to see the CBT planning being implemented effectively in order to move forward and solve the problems.

I would like to see the CBT planning implemented effectively. Although there are many problems and solutions, there are many details to pay attention to in order to minimise any impacts on community residents. I hope all problems will change in a positive way in a few years.

[CBT1]

Tables 32.2–32.6 present each criterion used by DASTA to assess the potential CBT. In this study, we applied each criterion for the self-assessment report that asked community members and residents to assess their awareness of each criterion to understand each CBT development site better. Figures 32.2–32.6 demonstrate the comparison results of SCBT Criteria.

Table 32.2 presents the overall results of respondents’ awareness on SCBT management at the two CBT sites. The respondents at Bang Kachao (CBT1) site have higher awareness of its SCBT than respondents at Tung Na Mon. This possibly explains the impact of the establishment of the CBT site, as CBT1 has existed longer than CBT2. Therefore the respondents’ awareness of the SCBT management is higher.

In the results from individual criterion, the respondents at Bang Kachao (CBT1) had higher awareness of most criteria, except A1 (the effectiveness of CBT management), A3 (the effectiveness of tourist visitation guidance) and A8 (the effectiveness of accounting and financial system), which can be explained by the length of CBT establishment. The respondents at the newly established CBT2 possibly have not experienced any issues on CBT management, tourist visitation guidance and accounting and financial systems at this early stage.

Table 32.2 Sustainable community-based tourism (SCBT) management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>CBT1</th>
<th>CBT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (A)</td>
<td>Sustainable community-based tourism (SCBT) management</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 (A1)</td>
<td>There is an effective community-based tourism (CBT) management.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 (A2)</td>
<td>There is an effective agreement for CBT management.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 (A3)</td>
<td>There is an effective guidance on tourist visitation.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 (A4)</td>
<td>There is an effective human resource management in CBT.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 (A5)</td>
<td>There is an effective promotion on a CBT involvement.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 (A6)</td>
<td>There is an effective cooperation with other partners both from government and private sectors.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 (A7)</td>
<td>There is an effective CBT marketing and public relations plan.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 (A8)</td>
<td>There is an effective accounting and financial management system.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 (A9)</td>
<td>There is an opportunity for children and youth taking parts of CBT management.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of development. On another hand, respondents from CBT1 would have experienced some issues on CBT management since it was established. Figure 32.2 demonstrates the similarities and differences on each criterion of these two CBT sites.

The overall results of respondents’ awareness on economic and social impacts of community well-being are showed in Table 33.3 and Figure 33.3. Interestingly, the awareness of respondents at CBT2 on criteria B1 and B4 was higher than CBT1. However, the overall results between CBT1 and CBT2 were not much different. These two CBT sites have high awareness of the economic and social impacts of community well-being. This aligns with the results from the economic dimension of SET from the interview results, that all respondents see positive economic impacts from CBT in their local areas.

All criteria of respondents’ overall awareness of the reservation and promotion of community cultural heritage at CBT1 were higher than at CBT2 (see Table 32.2 and Figure 32.2). This could be explained that CBT2 was established less than two years ago, therefore the overall awareness of reservation and promotion of community cultural heritage was lower than CBT1.

Table 32.5 and Figure 32.5 represent the overall awareness of systematic and sustainable natural resources and environmental management at each CBT site. The awareness of

---

**Figure 32.2**  The comparison results on sustainable community-based tourism (SCBT) management

**Table 32.3**  Economic and social impacts of community well-being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>CBT1</th>
<th>CBT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (B)</td>
<td>Economic and social impacts of community well-being</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 (B1)</td>
<td>The income distribution is effective.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 (B2)</td>
<td>There is an effective promotion on the quality of life.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 (B3)</td>
<td>The quality of community products enhances the opportunity to increase tourism revenue.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 (B4)</td>
<td>Human rights of people from diverse groups e.g. children, women, seniors, disability and minority in tourism are emphasised.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 32.4 Reservation and promotion of community cultural heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>CBT1</th>
<th>CBT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (C)</td>
<td>Reservation and promotion of community cultural heritage.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 (C1)</td>
<td>There is a quality of information on cultural heritage of CBT.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 (C2)</td>
<td>There is an effective promotion on cultural heritage of CBT.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 (C3)</td>
<td>There is an effective conservation and restoration of community cultural heritage.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 32.3 The comparison results on economic, social and well-being

Figure 32.4 The comparison results on reservation and promotion of community cultural heritage
systematic and sustainable natural resources and environmental management at CBT2 was much lower than CBT1 on most criteria, except D1 (the effectiveness of tourism area management). The length of CBT establishment can explain the differences between these results.

The overall awareness of service quality of CBT at these two CBT sites were not much different. However, the awareness of service quality of CBT at CBT2 was higher than CBT1 on four out of seven criteria; namely, E1 (satisfaction of service quality), E3 (quality of tourist service centre), E6 (the safety of tourism service centre) and E7 (the effectiveness of CBT travel route management). The results draw interesting insights into each CBT site on the service quality each CBT site provides. The length of establishment and the number of visitors at each site can help explain the difference.

Figure 32.7 demonstrates the overall awareness of CBT assessment at both CBT sites.

Table 32.5 Systematic and sustainable natural resources and environmental management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>CBT1</th>
<th>CBT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 (D)</td>
<td>Systematic and sustainable natural resources and environmental management.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 (D1)</td>
<td>There is an effective tourism area management.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 (D2)</td>
<td>There is a quality of information on natural resources and environment.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 (D3)</td>
<td>There is an effective promotion on the local knowledge of natural resources or environment through CBT.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 (D4)</td>
<td>There is an effective conservation and restoration of natural resources or environment in the community.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 (D5)</td>
<td>There is an effective raising awareness on the importance of reserving natural resources or environment through tourism.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 32.5 The comparison results on systematic and sustainable natural resources and environmental management
Table 32.6 Service quality of CBT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>CBT1</th>
<th>CBT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (E)</td>
<td>Service quality of CBT</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 (E1)</td>
<td>Service quality of CBT is satisfactory.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 (E2)</td>
<td>There is an effective CBT communicator.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 (E3)</td>
<td>There is a quality in tourist service centre.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 (E4)</td>
<td>There is an effective coordination on service.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 (E5)</td>
<td>The travel route and activity are safe.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 (E6)</td>
<td>The tourist service centre is safe.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 (E7)</td>
<td>There is an effective management on CBT travel route.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 (E8)</td>
<td>There is an effective management on travel incidents and emergency.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 32.6 The comparison results on service quality of CBT

Figure 32.7 The comparison results of overall self-assessment on CBT development criteria
32.5 Conclusion

The SCBT process is complex and unique to each individual CBT site. It is necessarily needed to be understood by all stakeholders, especially from the grassroots or bottom-up level, as local communities can act as good facilitators and participants or barriers toward SCBT development. Being aware with better understanding of the Criteria for CBT Thailand will facilitate creating mutual benefits among all stakeholders in CBT development.

This study aims to assess the awareness of CBT stakeholders of CBT development. It applies the Criteria for CBT Thailand and SET to assess and explain various stakeholders’ awareness on CBT development initiatives at two local CBT sites in Thailand.

The overall results from in-depth interviews with respondents were positive and their awareness of CBT development criteria was quite high. The overall results of SAR on respondents’ awareness of CBT development from those two CBT sites vary on some criteria (Figure 32.7). In summary, there were some criteria that needed better emphasising in order to increase local stakeholders’ awareness and enhance better understanding of the Criteria for CBT Thailand assessment, to increase the local participation and involvement in CBT development.

Implications of this chapter include the recognition of the standard criteria used for assessing SCBT development to ensure and enhance local community benefits and usefulness of SET in explaining each stakeholder’s perspective on SCBT. This chapter assists tourism-related government bodies, agencies and businesses in CBT development and guides tourism industry practices. It also demonstrates the usefulness of using standard criteria to assess SCBT development in order to enhance the cooperation between the tourism industry and local communities, which consequently results in creating mutual benefits among all stakeholders.

32.6 Limitation and future research

This study is limited only to two local tourism sites in Thailand. Therefore, the results cannot be generalised to other destinations due to the uniqueness of each destination and different stages of CBT development. The limitations of this study include that the study sample might be narrow as it was based on two CBT sites and the results were unique to each CBT site based on their individual characteristics and challenges. Future studies could be included, as could more stakeholders from both supply and demand sites, such as residents and tourists. The results of the Criteria for CBT Thailand should also be compared between CBT developers and CBT leaders and members in order to identify significant gaps in each party’s awareness and improve understanding of CBT development that highly necessitates community involvement and participation. The assessment of the Criteria for CBT Thailand could be applied to other CBT areas in order to increase the awareness of CBT development.
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