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38.1 The concept and definitions of community and community-based tourism

The definition of a community is ambiguous and indefinable. According to The Community Tourism Guide, a community is defined as ‘a mutually supportive, geographically specific, social unit such as a village or tribe where people identify themselves as community members and where there is usually some form of communal decision-making’ (Mann, 2014). In most cases, community refers to locality and network of relationships (Schaller, 2012). In Latin America, the term ‘rural tourism’ is used instead of ‘community-based tourism’. As its name suggests, ‘community-based’ generally refers to tourism managed by the community (Boronyak, Asker, Carrard & Paddon, 2010).

Amit and Rapport (2002) critically examined the community as a methodological, theoretical, phenomenological, political and legal construct. They discussed the ‘slipperiness’ of the concept, which they believe is ‘too vague, too variable in its applications and definitions to be of much utility as an analytical tool’ (Amit & Rapport, 2002). Over the past few decades, community-based tourism (CBT) has been implemented in most programmes and projects by both the national government and various international development agencies. CBT, as an alternative form of tourism development, centres on the involvement of the host community and emphasises that a significant number of the population must be involved (Jamal & Stronza, 2009).

The significance of CBT has undoubtedly been acknowledged over the past two decades (Manyara & Jones, 2007; Schaller, 2012). The concept of CBT and scholarly interest in it can be traced back to Peter Murphy’s 1985 publication Tourism: A community approach (Kontogeorgopoulos, Churyen & Duangsaeng, 2014). Soon, the term CBT emerged in the mid-1980s (Boronyak, Asker, Carrard & Paddon, 2010; Kontogeorgopoulos et al., 2014) and numerous efforts were made to define, extend and ascertain the best practices associated with CBT. It has often been popularly cited as alternative tourism and an approach for sustainability (Dodds, Ali & Galaski, 2018; López-Guzmán, Sánchez-Cañizares & Pavón, 2011). CBT is perceived as alternative tourism that is ‘a privately offered set of hospitality services (and features), extended to visitors, by individuals, families, or a local community’ (Pearce, 1995). On the other hand, Holden (1984, cited in Pearce, 1995) defies alternative tourism as
‘a process which promotes a just form of travel between members of different communities. It seeks to achieve mutual understanding, solidarity and equality amongst participants’.

The concept of CBT recommends a symbolic relationship between the tourist and the local community (Boronyak, Asker, Carrard & Paddon, 2010; Kontogeorgopoulos et al., 2014; Matarrita-Cascante, Brennan & Luloff, 2010; Wearing & McDonald, 2002). The tourist is treated as part of the system and is not given significant priority (Wearing & McDonald, 2002). Unlike any other form of tourism, CBT aims to maximise the benefits for local communities rather than just making profits. Similar to the concept of sustainable development, CBT strives to achieve socially equitable, ecologically sound and economically in the long term (Dodds, Ali & Galaski, 2018).

Dodds, Ali and Galaski (2018) identified three main types of CBT that comprise the following:

1. A project in which community members are employed using a rotation system and profits are allocated for community projects or dividends given to residents.
2. A project that involves family or group initiatives within the communities, based on community assets.
3. A joint venture between a community or family and an outside business partner.

To date, the definition of CBT is still ambiguous, and no consensus has been reached on the definition. This is because different researchers from different nations have used their own definitions. Understanding the phenomenon of CBT requires a basic grasp of its fundamental description. There is also a vast difference in the interpretation and application of CBT among different destinations around the world (Tasci, Semrad & Yilmaz, 2013).

### 38.2 Community development

Tourism is increasingly seen as a critical community development tool. This is mostly due to the recognition of its economic contribution in bolstering stagnating economies and its ability to unify local community residents (Fennell, 2003). On the other hand, Bushell and Eagles (2007) state that tourism plays a role in facilitating community development through business mentoring and educational opportunities that contribute to local communities in increasing skill and knowledge in residents as well as improving communities’ economic level.

Since the 1950s, community development has been seen as a social movement and has been a growing industry (Vidal, 1997) (see Table 38.1). Two of the pioneering scholars during the time, Biddle and Biddle (1965) viewed community development as a process that stressed the significance and value of each member in a community and the responsibility of citizens and developers. Specifically, the importance of citizen participation and responsibility towards community development was a common theme of study for most scholars who viewed the subject as a process and movement at the time (Keeble & Meisel, 2006).

Table 38.2 shows the relationship between a community and social, economic, political, environmental and cultural components. As described by Aref (2010), at community levels, tourism offers opportunities for direct, indirect and induced employment and income, spurring regional and local economic development. The whole process of tourism development is an essential tool in community development and, because of this, a lot of current local communities have adopted tourism development to provide the economic, social, cultural and overall development of the community. Allen et al. (1993) stated that tourism is increasingly...
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being viewed as a significant component of community development. Nevertheless, even though a lot of people appreciate tourism as a development tool, there is still little understanding of tourism development in the current literature. However, in the past few years, the local communities have released numerous publications related to this matter, due to the developmental promise of tourism, and since then, there has been growth in research on tourism and its contribution to community development.

### 38.3 Empowerment

The word ‘empowerment’, which was initially adopted from Latin, signifies the meaning of power and freedom. The term ‘empower’ was already used in the 1690s by the well-known writer William Penn, who was also an expert in the Latin language (Dictionary.com, 2019). Empowerment is one of the most commonly used terms in studies of community
empowerment can be understood as a process of giving power to someone or to a community to make decisions or take actions as they want, without imposing much control.

According to Perkins and Zimmerman (1995), empowerment is a process whereby the community gains control over their lives, demographic participation of the community structure and critical understanding of their surroundings. This means that the community is considered empowered when they are able or allowed to make their own decisions without any outside influence. Friedmann (1992) has mentioned that there are three types of empowerment: psychological, social and political (Table 38.3). Social power is the authority that the community has to access information, knowledge and skills, participation in social organisations and financial resources (Friedmann, 1992). Support around the particular community can be reached and enjoyed only if the community is socially empowered. Lennie (2002) also mentioned that this is the most critical type of empowerment in sustainable rural community development. The concept of political power is about the level of authority that a community has to make decisions that will affect their future. Political power can only be achieved if the community is socially empowered in the first place (Friedmann, 1992). Psychological

Table 38.3 Types of empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Empowerment</th>
<th>Social Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New knowledge and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Awareness and understanding of issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Skills, abilities and competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support, friendship and inspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political empowerment</td>
<td>• Having a voice and being listened to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participating in policymaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Taking action to change own life or community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Networking and lobbying inspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment</td>
<td>• Self-confidence and self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Feeling more valued and respected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Motivation, interest and enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Freedom to do things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological empowerment</td>
<td>• Knowledge about ICTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Awareness and understanding about ICTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Skills and competence in using new ICTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ongoing support and advice in using ICTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to high-quality technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Confidence to use and speak about ICTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic empowerment</td>
<td>• Access to business opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to productive resources in an area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Equal sharing of economic profits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
power, however, refers more to an individual’s inner ability and confidence to be successful in political and social participation. Anderson (2002) suggested that the internal motivation of an individual is the first step of the empowerment process and that empowerment will not be achieved without self-confidence at the individual level.

Apart from the three empowerment domains suggested by Friedmann (1992), two more important fields highlighted in previous studies are economic and technological empowerment (Table 38.3). Scheyvens (2002), who specifically studied empowerment of the local communities in eco-tourism, mentioned that economic empowerment can be achieved when there is an opportunity for the community in the form of employment and business. However, economic empowerment is considered significant only when the economic profit is equally shared among the members of the community. Lennie (2002), who studied rural women’s empowerment process, stressed the importance of technological empowerment. Technological empowerment can be achieved when there is clear access for the community to acquire ICT knowledge and skills. It can be argued that the influence of ICT in almost all industries makes technological empowerment a compulsory indicator for community empowerment and development.

### 38.4 Community participation

Community participation is employed as the leading dimension in this study to understand the level of involvement of the Indigenous community in tourism activities. Participation is considered a dominant term in the field of community development. A community can enjoy development only if it undergoes the process of involvement (Asnarulkhadi, 2003). Benefits such as identification, mobilisation and utilisation of community resources and knowledge, improved planning and decision making and formation of a better cohesive community can result from community participation (Talbot & Verrinder, 2005). Haris and Zakaria (2012) stated that several other terms such as public participation, volunteerism, public involvement, people involvement, public cooperation and collective action were widely used in community development–participation studies.

Apart from the community development spectrum, participation is often employed in organisational management, operational management, labour representation in industrial control, social mobilisation and political movements (Joshi, 1998). Wilson and Wilde (2003) also

![Figure 38.1 The four dimensions of community participation](image-url)
suggested a community participation model consisting of four dimensions that could be used to understand the level of involvement of the community in a development project (Figure 38.1). These themes/aspects of community participation are broken down into 12 benchmarks. The benchmarks of community participation are as follows:

**38.4.1 Influence**
1. The community is recognised and valued as an equal partner at all stages of the process.
2. There is meaningful community representation on all decision-making bodies from initiation.
3. All community members have the opportunity to participate.
4. Communities have access to and control over resources.
5. Evaluation of regeneration partnerships incorporates a community agenda.

**38.4.2 Inclusivity**
1. The diversity of local communities and interests is reflected at all levels of the regeneration process.
2. Equal opportunity policies are in place and are implemented.
3. Unpaid workers/volunteer activists are valued.

**38.4.3 Communication**
1. A two-way information strategy is developed and implemented.
2. Programme and project procedures are clear and accessible.

**38.4.4 Capacity**
1. Communities are given resources to participate.
2. Understanding, knowledge and skills are developed to support the partnership working.

Indigenous communities are more vulnerable to deprivation, violations of their fundamental human rights, violence and abuse. They often feel disempowered; outsiders or governments do not grant them access to many assets. According to the Norwegian Refugee Council (2008), the participation of the community is essential because:

- It mitigates those effects by giving people back some power through building self-reliance, a sense of achievement, influence and control.
- It allows people to make choices that restore some sense of normality, enabling them to be the subject and not the object of their own lives.
- Participation and involvement creates opportunities for people to solve their problems and can lead to growing self-esteem.
- It helps ensure that interventions are appropriate and effective.
- It puts people back in control of their own lives, decreases dependency and increases self-reliance.

Apart from that, well-managed participation can result in a more open environment where both the community and outsiders feel respected and able to communicate their views and
contributed effectively. This environment leads to greater transparency and accountability and may reduce conflict and corruption.

Stoker (1998) defined community participation, which closely related to ‘political participation’. Community participation takes place when the members of a particular community take part in any part of the formulation, passage and implementation of public policies. Although theories of participation gained academic attention in the 1990s, the critical debate had started during the 1960s. The first grasp of the theoretical perspective of community participation was initiated by Arnstein (1969) with the Ladder of Citizen Participation. The work of Arnstein is crucial because it explains that there are various levels of involvement, from manipulation or therapy progressing to consultation and placation, or what later scholars perceive as genuine participation, to the successful levels of partnership and citizen control.

Asnarulkhadi (2003) also clustered Arnstein’s eight rungs of the community participation ladder into three types and levels of participation: forced participation, convinced participation and volunteered assistance (Figure 38.2). The characteristics of the levels of involvement are listed below:

**38.4.4.1 Forced participation**

- It is the lowest level of participation.
- The local community is forced to be involved in any development.
- The community is aware of neither the purpose nor outcome of the involvement, and they only follow the instructions given.
- Since the community is not involved from the beginning of the project, the sense of belonging towards the project does not exist.
- The strong presence and control of the outsider are seen as manipulation and therapy of the community.

**38.4.4.2 Convinced participation**

- Participation occurs only when the community is convinced to get involved in the development projects by the development agent or government.
• The community is treated as a player of the developmental project but not as the primary stakeholder who holds high accountability.
• Compared to forced participation, in this level the community at least has a limited influence on the development.

38.4.4.3 Volunteered participation
• This is the highest level of participation.
• The community is enabled to make a decision, make changes and be aware of the process and output of the development.
• The community is responsible and fully accountable for its moves.
• Since the community is involved from the beginning of the development project, the sense of belonging emerges.

As described in the Arnstein (1969) and Asnarulkhadi (2003) frameworks, the lack of community participation can lead to failure in community development because the community would only be manipulated by outsiders. The researchers also agree that active participation takes place only when the community is involved in the upper levels of the ladder that appreciates the community. According to Blom, Sunderland and Murdiyarso (2010), many community development projects have failed to materialise due to a lack of genuine participation of the community. The World Bank also provided a valid justification for the involvement of the community development perspective. The reasons community should be involved in the development are:

• Local people have an enormous amount of experience and insight into what works, what does not work and why.
• Involving local people in planning projects can increase their commitment to the project.
• Involving local people can help them develop technical and managerial skills and thereby increase their opportunities for employment.
• Involving local people helps increase the resources available for the programme.
• Involving local people is a way to bring about ‘social learning’ for both planners and beneficiaries. ‘Social learning’ means the development of partnerships between professionals and local people, in which each group learns from the other.

Dissimilar to Arnstein’s model, the Norwegian Refugee Council (2008) segregated participation of the community into seven types or degrees. From the lowest degree of involvement, passive and information transfer, the community is better valued in consultation, material motivation and functional degrees (Table 38.4).

Genuine participation can be seen at the degrees of interactive and ownership, where the community is valued in the decision-making process aimed to develop the community. According to this model, the ultimate goal of participation is creating a sense of ownership among community members, which means the community is entirely in charge of the decision-making process and resource ownership.

Although the scholars provided a well-established typology of participation, these models are not mainly from a tourism background and do not reflect the tourism and community participation relationship framework. However, they can still be used as a solid theoretical basis for Indigenous tourism study. As discussed earlier in the chapter, the definition of Indigenous tourism comes from four possible situations. These situations, if adapted to the model of the participation ladder, can result in an Indigenous tourism participation model.
Table 38.4 Degree of participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Participation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>The community controls decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>The community is wholly involved in decision-making with other actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>The community fulfils only a particular role with limited decision-making power (for example, forming a water committee which is then supervised by an NGO staff member).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Motivation</td>
<td>The community receives goods or cash in return for a service or role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>The community is asked for their opinion on what they would like to see, but their opinion has limited say in decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Transfer</td>
<td>Information is gathered from the community, but they are not involved in the resulting discussions which form decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>The community is informed of decisions and actions but has no say in either the process or the result.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The participation model shown in Figure 38.3 was designed after combining Arnstein’s participation model and Hinch and Butler’s Indigenous tourism model. This model was developed because there is no specific model to address Indigenous Peoples’ participation in tourism. The Nam Ha communities of Laos are at the lowest level of involvement, where they are only involved in ecotourism programmes run by outsiders. Although the Kakha Mongols actively present their culture through mega Indigenous events, these events are organised by outsiders.
The Mashantucket Pequot and Mohegan tribes of Native Americans are at the peak of tourism and control of their business, but they are involved in the casino tourism business, not Indigenous tourism businesses. One well-established participation is portrayed by the Maoris of New Zealand, who have full control of their Indigenous tourism business.

### 38.5 Sustainable community-based tourism

Sustainable tourism becomes the main challenge of developing quality tourism products without negatively affecting the natural and cultural environment that maintains and takes care of them. At the heart of sustainable tourism is a set of implicit values related to determining and integrating economic, social and cultural goals (Theobald, 2005). The participation of all relevant stakeholders, as well as strong political leadership, is required to develop this tourism, to ensure full cooperation and consensus-building. Any achievement of sustainable tourism is continuous development and requires regular monitoring to introduce the necessary preventive and corrective measures whenever necessary. It also means tourism is economically viable but does not destroy the resources on which the future of tourism will depend, notably the physical environment and the social fabric of the community (Swarbrooke & Page, 2012).

Moreover, sustainable tourism must maintain a high level of tourist satisfaction and ensure a meaningful experience for the tourists, raising their awareness about sustainability issues and promoting sustainable tourism practices amongst them as the UNWTO (2004) has insisted. To develop this kind of tourism, stakeholders should set up guidelines and management practices applicable in all types of destinations. Thus sustainability principles should concern environmental, economic, and socio-cultural aspects of tourism development, and a suitable balance must be established between these three dimensions to guarantee long-term sustainability (Swarbrooke & Page, 2012). The scholar also mentioned that sustainable tourism should:

1. Make optimal use of the environmental resources that constitute a crucial element in tourism development, maintaining essential ecological processes and helping conserve natural heritage and biodiversity.
2. Respect the socio-cultural authenticity of host communities, through conserving their respectful buildings, cultural heritage and traditional values, and contributing to inter-cultural understanding and tolerance.
3. Guarantee the possibility of long-term economic operations; socio-economic benefits to all stakeholders that are fairly distributed, including stable employment and income-earning opportunities and social services to host communities; and contributing to poverty alleviation.

Sustainable tourism development requires the informed participation of all relevant stakeholders, as well as strong political leadership to ensure full participation and consensus-building. Sustainable tourism is a continuous process, which requires constant monitoring of impacts, and preventive measures on timely basis.

Both responsible tourism and ecotourism are becoming effectively dependent on the level of environmental sustainability. Responsible tourism and ecotourism relate to sustainable development, which involves development and protection of nature (Swarbrooke & Page, 2012). If tourism is not sustainable, many negative implications will have to be experienced. Tourists do not have a direct impact on local communities because some of the effects might
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Table 38.5 Advantages and disadvantages of tourism on the host community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Economy**          | • Bring money to local businesses, enhance the local economy and increase income for local residents.  
                          • Create new jobs and employment-related to tourism for the local community  
                          • Improve the standard of living for local residents  
                          • Improve the infrastructure of the destinations | • Inflation and an increase in prices  
                                         • Decrease the local and traditional employment opportunities  
                                         • Local people cannot live in the local tourism area anymore  
                                         • Tax payment will be more for local residents due to new infrastructure  
                                         • Most of the money brought into the local areas go to the large companies active in the tourism industry in those local communities |
| **Environment**      | • Renovation of derelict sites and buildings  
                          • Increase and enhance environmental projects  
                          • Improve the landscapes of the local communities | • Destruction of natural resources and landscapes  
                                                             • Increase pollution  
                                                             • Traffic congestion  
                                                             • Increase waste and litter |
| **Social and Cultural Life** | • Preservation of customs and crafts  
                          • Enhancement and increases in public services  
                          • Development of community facilities  
                          • Development of language skills, communication skills and social skills for local people | • Increase in taxes for developing infrastructures  
                                                             • Increase in crime  
                                                             • Youths move away from local traditional areas  
                                                             • Local custom and religions become trivialized  
                                                             • Increase the conflicts of tourists with the host communities |

not be visible immediately, but in fact, the impacts of tourists and the industry can be very significant and influential. According to Rogers (2010), there are positive and negative effects in three aspects (the economy, environment and social and cultural life), which can be assumed to be the advantages and disadvantages of tourism on the host community and are described in Table 38.5.

Other types of rural tourism also share the same basic principles of environmental and social conservation within a locally based economic system. Therefore, sustainable Indigenous tourism can be classified as tourism in which Indigenous People themselves serve as the primary attraction and are directly involved through control of their cultural and economic resources. Smith, Kreuter and Krannich (2005) identify ‘the four Hs’ that compile and stimulate Indigenous tourism: habitat, heritage, history and handicrafts. The influence the particular Indigenous community has on possessing and controlling the production of tourism and the four Hs can be seen as tools to determine tourism’s potential for and contributions towards sustainable development (Butler and Hinch, 2007).

Gomes (2012), who viewed sustainability from an ecological perspective, argued that the mainstream development policies suggested by governments are obsessed with financial growth and greater market integration, and alternative development models must be replaced.
with conventional developmental ideas. A model introduced by the scholar highlights three essential elements of Orang Asli development in Malaysia that help them achieve a 'better life' (Figure 38.4).

Equality is emphasised by the Indigenous community, whereby the power and resources are shared among members of the community and not dominated by an individual. They also practice non-violence towards outsiders and within their community to show that they are a peaceful community. According to Gomes (2012), Indigenous People often behave civilly towards outsiders to maintain a harmonious relationship. The scholar criticised the view of the term sustainability by researchers, as it is often slanted towards economic sustainability. Sustainability should be seen from the ecological perspective as an achievement of nurturing the natural environment. Indigenous People live sustainably by ensuring that whatever they do does not compromise the ability of future generations to live in harmony with nature and with one another (Gomes, 2012; United Nations, 2007).

38.6 Summary

This chapter began by explaining the definition, models and theories of community development and participation. Next, studies on perception and the impact of tourism were described, focussing on widely studied rural tourism attributes and articles. The concepts and roots of sustainable tourism were also revised to get a better understanding of the relationship between sustainable tourism and Indigenous tourism. Finally, a conceptual framework was proposed after reviewing all the previous studies discussed.
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