RETHINKING ENGAGEMENTS WITH INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES THROUGH TOURISM

PUVANESWARAN KUNASEKARAN
Senior Lecturer
Taylor's University
Faculty of Social Sciences and Leisure Management
School of Hospitality, Tourism & Events
No. 1 Jalan Taylor's, Subang Jaya – 47500, Selangor, Malaysia
Tel: + 60 123307043
puvaneswaran.kunasekaran@taylors.edu.my

JEETESH KUMAR
Corresponding Author
Senior Lecturer
Taylor's University
Faculty of Social Sciences and Leisure Management
School of Hospitality, Tourism & Events
No. 1 Jalan Taylor's, Subang Jaya – 47500, Selangor, Malaysia
Tel: + 60 102535574
jeetesh.kumar@taylors.edu.my
himsian@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

This chapter explores the antecedents of sustainable tourism practice of the indigenous community. Tourism development is closely aligned to eradicate poverty, rural community development, reduce the disparity between the rich and poor, leading to national cohesion and cultural commodification. Community-Based Tourism (CBT) is a type of rural tourism usually managed by communities and intended to deliver more comprehensive community benefit Currently; sustainable tourism spectrum is heavily dominated by economic and environmental perspectives, ignoring the importance of socio-cultural aspect. The indigenous people are firmly attached to their culture, and they believe that tourism helps them not only to protect their culture but also to learn foreign culture from tourists. 'Outsiders' through various developmental initiatives have always been guiding the minority indigenous communities to engage in tourism business effectively. However, the generally used top-down approach has resulted in non-genuine participation of the community in tourism development in their areas. Thus, the issue of sustainable indigenous tourism practice is still questionable when the outsiders mainly influence the planning and implementation of development projects. This chapter presents explicitly the influence of participation, empowerment and community capacity building on sustainable indigenous tourism. This unique contribution will be a significant addition to the body of knowledge within the sustainable tourism and indigenous people area, which is heavily focused on the western indigenous cultures. In a nutshell, CBT can be considered as a perfect form of tourism towards achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). However, genuine participation of the local community and the active involvement of relevant stakeholders are essential to attain sustainable community-based tourism.

Keywords: Indigenous tourism, sustainability, community participation, tourism development,

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, p. 18). 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 term 'community-based', it is generally referring to tourism that managed by community (Boronyak, Asker, Carrard, & Paddon, 2010).

Amit and Rapport (2002) critically examined 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, p. 13). Over the past few decades, CBT has been implemented in most of the programs and projects by both the national government various international development agencies. Community-based tourism, 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 (Schaller, 2012; Manyara & Jones, 2007). The concept of CBT and scholarly interest 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 to CBT. It has often been popularly cited as alternative tourism and an approach for sustainable (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, p.15, 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 tourist and local community (Kontogeorgopoulos et al., 2014; Matarrita-Cascante, Brennan, & Luloff, 2010; Wearing & McDonald, 2002; Boronyak, Asker, Carrard, & Paddon, 2010). Tourist is treated as part of the system and is not given significant priority (Wearing & McDonald, 2002). Unlike another form of tourism, CBT aims to maximise the benefits of 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 comprises the following;

1) A project in which community members are employed using a rotation system and profits are allocated for community projects or dividends 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 there is no consensus reach on the description. This is because different researchers from different nations have used their definitions. Understanding the phenomenon of CBT needs a basic understanding of its fundamental description. There is also a vast difference in interpretation and application of CBT among different destinations around the world (Tasci, Semrad, & Yilmaz, 2013).

Community Development

Tourism is increasingly seen as a critical community development tool. It 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 local communities and residents as well as improving the communities' economic level.

Insert Table 1 here

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

The table below shows the relationship between a community and social, economic, political, environmental, and cultural components. As described by Aref (2010) and Coccossis (2004), 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 essential as an essential tool in community development, and because of this, a lot of present local communities have adopted tourism development to provide economic, social, cultural and overall development of the community. Allen et al. (1993) stated that tourism is increasingly 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.

Insert Table 2 here

Empowerment

The word 'empowerment' which was initially adopted from Latin brings the meaning of power and freedom. The term 'empower' was already used in the 1690s by the well-known writer

William Penn who is also an expert in the Latin language (Dictionary.com, 2019). Empowerment is one of the most commonly used terms in studies of community development. Generally, empowerment can be understood as a process of giving power to someone or a community to make decisions or 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. Which means that the community is considered empowered when they are able or allowed to make their own decisions without any outsiders' influence. Friedmann (1992) has mentioned that there are three types of empowerment; psychological, social and political. Social power is the authority that the community has to access information, knowledge and skills, participation in social organisations, and financial resources (Friedmann, 1992). The 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 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 an empowerment process and that empowerment will not be achieved without self-confidence at the individual level.

Insert Table 3 here

Apart from the three empowerment domains suggested by Friedmann (1992), two more important fields highlighted in the previous studies are economic and technological empowerment. 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 forms 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 empowerment process, stressed the importance of technological empowerment. Technological empowerment can be achieved when there is clear access to 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 empowerment indicator for community empowerment and development.

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 as a dominant term in the field of community development. The community can enjoy the development only if it undergoes the process of the involvement (Asnarulkhadi, 2003). The 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 the community development-participation studies.

Apart from community development spectrum, participation is often employed in organisational management, operational management, labour representation in industrial control, social mobilisation and political movement (Joshi, 1998). Wilson and Wilde (2003) also 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. These themes/aspects of community participation are broken down into 12 benchmarks.

Insert Figure 1 here

The benchmarks of community participation are as below;

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.

Inclusivity

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

Communication

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

Capacity

1) Communities are resourced to participate.
2) Understanding, knowledge and skills are developed to support partnership working.

The 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 of the 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 by 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 create opportunities for people to solve their problems and can lead to growing self-esteem
- It helps to 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 the outsiders feel respected and able to communicate their views and contribute 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 the particular community take part in any of the course of formulation, passage and implementation of public policies. Although the theories of participation gain 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 the involvement from manipulation or therapy progressing to consultation and placation or what the 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. The characteristics of the level of involvement are listed below:

Insert Figure 2 here

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 form 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 a community.

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 the forced participation, in this level, the community at least has a limited influence on the development.

Volunteered Participation
- This is the highest level of participation.
- The community is enabled to make a decision, make changes and 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 Arnstein (1969) and Asnarulkhadi (2003) frameworks, the lack of community participation can lead to failure in the community development because the community would only be manipulated by outsiders. The researchers are also agreeable that active participation takes place only when the community is involved in the upper levels of the ladder that appreciate the community. According to Blom, Sunderland, & Murdiyarso, (2010), many community development projects 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 to develop technical and managerial skills and thereby increase their opportunities for employment.
- Involving local people help to increase the resources available for the program.
- 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 degree.

Insert Table 4 here

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 the 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 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 the indigenous tourism study. As discussed earlier in the previous chapter, the definition of indigenous tourism comes from four possible situations. These situations, if adapted to the model of participation ladder, can derive an indigenous tourism participation model.

Insert Figure 3 here

The participation model above is designed after combining Arnstein's participation model and Hinch and Butler's indigenous tourism model. This model is developed because there is no specific model to address indigenous people's participation in tourism. The Nam Ha

communities of Laos are at the lowest level of involvement where they are only involved in eco-tourism programs run by outsiders. Although the Kakha Mongols are actively presenting their culture through mega indigenous events, these events are organised by outsiders. The Mashantucket Pequot and Mohegan tribes of native American Indians are at the peak of tourism and control of their business, but they are involved in the casino tourism business, not indigenous tourism business. One well-established participation is portrayed by the Maoris of New Zealand who have full control of their indigenous tourism business.

Sustainable Community Based Tourism

Sustainable tourism becomes the main challenge to develop 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 determine and integrate economic, social and cultural goals (Theobald, 2005). 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 it requires regular monitoring of measures 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, 2012).

Moreover, sustainable tourism must maintain a high level of tourist satisfaction and ensure a meaningful experience to the tourists, raising their awareness about sustainability issues and promoting sustainable tourism practices amongst them as UNWTO (2004) 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, 2012). The scholar also mentioned that sustainable tourism should:

1) Make optimal use of environmental resources that constitute a crucial element in tourism development, maintaining essential ecological processes and helping to conserve natural heritage and biodiversity.
2) Respect the socio-cultural authenticity of host communities, through conserving their respectful buildings, cultural heritage, traditional values, and contribute to inter-cultural understanding and tolerance.
3) Guarantee 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. Achieving sustainable tourism is a continuous process, and it requires constant monitoring of impacts, introducing the necessary preventive and corrective measures whenever necessary. Sustainable tourism should also maintain a high level of tourist satisfaction and ensure a meaningful experience to the tourists, raising their awareness about sustainability issues and promoting sustainable tourism practices amongst them (UNWTO, 2004).

Both responsible-tourism and eco-tourism are becoming effectively dependent on the level of environmental sustainability. Responsible tourism and ecotourism relate to sustainable development; this tourism involves developing and protecting nature development to be appropriate and sustainable over time, and where the environment's ability to support other activities and processes is not harmed since tourism cannot be isolated from other resource use activities (Swarbrooke, 2012). If tourism is not sustainable, many negative implications will have to be experienced. Tourists do not have a direct impact on the local communities because some of the effects might not be visible immediately on host communities, but in fact, the impacts of tourists and tourism industry can be very significant and influential. According to Rogers (2010), there are positive and negative effects in three aspects (Economy, Environment, and Social and Cultural life) which can be assumed as the advantages and disadvantages of the tourism on the host community and are as follows:

Insert Table 5 here

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 and Krannich (2005) identify "the four H's" that compile and stimulate indigenous tourism; habitat, heritage, history and handicrafts. The influence the particular indigenous community has to possess and control the production of tourism and the four H's 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 the governments are obsessed with financial growth and greater market integration and alter-Native development models must be replaced with conventional developmental ideas. A model which was introduced by the scholar highlights three essential elements of Orang Asli development in Malaysia that make them achieve a 'better life'.

Insert Figure 4 here

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 to 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 which 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 and the ability of future generations to live in harmony with nature and with one another (United Nations, 2007 and Gomes, 2012).

Summary

This chapter began by explaining the definition, models and theories of community development and participation. Next, the studies on perception and impact of tourism were described focusing on widely studied rural tourism attributes and articles. The concepts and

roots of sustainable tourism 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.

REFERENCES

Allen, A., Hafer, A., Long, T., and Perdue, A. (1993) 'Rural residents' attitudes toward recreation and tourism development', *Journal of Travel Research,* 31 (4), pp. 27-35.

Amit, V. and Rapport, N. (2002) *The trouble with community: anthropological reflections on movement, identity and collectively*. London: Pluto Press.

Anderson, R. D. (2002) 'Reforming science teaching: What research says about inquiry', *Journal of science Teacher Education*, 13 (1), pp. 1-12.

Aref, F. (2010) 'Residents' attitudes towards tourism impacts: a case study of Shiraz, Iran', *Tourism Analysis,* 15 (2), pp. 253-261.

Arnstein, S. R. (1969) 'A Ladder of citizen participation', *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35 (4), pp. 216-224.

Asnarulkhadi A. S. (2003) *Pengenalan Pembangunan Komuniti*. Serdang: Selaseh Press Sdn. Bhd.

Biddle, W. W. and Biddle, L. J. (1965) *The* community development process: The Rediscovery of Local Initiative. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.

Blom, B., Sunderland, T. and Murdiyarso, D. (2010) 'Getting REDD to work locally: lessons learned from integrated conservation and development projects', *Environmental Science & Policy*, 13 (2), pp. 164-172.

Boronyak, L. J., Asker, S. A., Carrard, N. R. and Paddon, M. (2010) Effective community-based tourism: a best practice manual.

Bushell, R. and Eagles, P. (2007) *Tourism and protected areas: benefits beyond boundaries*. London: CABI.

Butler, R. and Hinch, T. (2007) 'Tourism and indigenous people: issues and implications. 2nd edn. Michigan: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Carrard, N., Willetts, J., Mitchell, C., Paddon, M. and Retamal, M. (2010) 'Selecting sanitation solutions for peri-urban areas: a case study of can Tho, Vietnam', *Water Practice and Technology*, 5 (4). https://doi.org/10.2166/wpt.2010.108

Coccossis, H. (2004) *Sustainable tourism and carrying capacity*. UK: Ashgate Publishing.

Dictionary.com. (2019) *Dictionary.com is the world's favourite online dictionary*. Available at: https://www.dictionary.com (Accessed 27 Sep. 2019).

Dodds, R., Ali, A. and Galaski, K. (2018) 'Mobilizing knowledge: determining key elements for success and pitfalls in developing community-based tourism', *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21 (13), pp. 1547-1568.

Fennell, D. A. (2003) *Ecotourism: an introduction.* 2nd edn. London: Routledge.

Friedmann, J. (1992) *Empowerment: the politics of alternative development*. USA: Blackwell.

Gomes, A. (2012) 'Alter-native development: indigenous forms of social ecology', *Third World Quarterly*, 33 (6), pp. 1059-1073.

Haris, A., W. and Zakaria, A., H., (2012) *Penilaian Keperluan dalam Pembangunan Komuniti*. Kuala Lumpur: Universiti Malaya Press.

Jamal, T. and Stronza, A. (2009) 'Collaboration theory and tourism practice in protected areas: Stakeholders, structuring and sustainability', *Journal of Sustainable tourism*, 17 (2), pp. 169-189.

Joshi, H. (1998) 'The opportunity costs of childbearing: More than mothers' business', *Journal of Population Economics*, 11 (2), pp. 161-183.

Keeble, S. and Meisel, J. (2006) Asset-based community development: A literature review. *Humboldt State University, Department of Sociology, Senior Project, Spring*.

Kontogeorgopoulos, N., Churyen, A. and Duangsaeng, V. (2014) 'Success factors in community-based tourism in Thailand: The role of luck, external support, and local leadership', *Tourism Planning & Development*, 11 (1), pp. 106-124.

Lennie, J. (2002) 'Rural women's empowerment in a communication technology project: some contradictory effects', *Rural Society*, 12 (3), pp. 224-245.

López-Guzmán, T., Sánchez-Cañizares, S. and Pavón, V. (2011) 'Community-based tourism in developing countries: a case study', *Tourismos*, 6 (1). https://doi.org/10.1080/03736245.2014.977813

Maimunah, I. (2009) 'Corporate Social Responsibility and its role in community development: An international perspective', *Journal of International Social Research*, 2 (9). Pp. 199-209.

Mann, M. (2014) *The community tourism guide: Exciting holidays for responsible travellers*. London: Routledge.

Manyara, G. and Jones, E. (2007) 'Community-based tourism enterprises development in Kenya: An exploration of their potential as avenues of poverty reduction', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15 (6), pp. 628-644.

Matarrita-Cascante, D., Brennan, M. A. and Luloff, A. E. (2010) 'Community agency and sustainable tourism development: The case of La Fortuna, Costa Rica', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18 (6), pp. 735-756.

Norwegian Refugee Council (2008) Pu*blic Participation in Environmental Assessment and Decision Making*. Available at http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12434 (Accessed: 9 Nov 2018).

Pearce, P. L. (1995) 'From culture shock and culture arrogance to culture exchange: Ideas towards sustainable socio-cultural tourism', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 3 (3), pp. 143-154.

Perkins, D. D. and Zimmerman, M. A. (1995) 'Empowerment theory, research, and application', *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23 (5), pp. 569-579.

Rogers, E. M. (2010) *Diffusion of innovations*. 4th edn. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Sanders, H. L. (1960) 'Benthic studies in Buzzards Bay III. The structure of the soft-bottom community 1', *Limnology and Oceanography*, 5 (2), pp. 138-153.

Scheyvens, R. (2002) 'Backpacker tourism and third world development', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29 (1), pp. 144-164.

Stoker, G. (1998) 'Governance as theory: five propositions', *International Social Science Journal*, 50 (155), pp. 17-28.

Suansri, P. (2005) 'Ecotourism: people participation', *Tourism for Life and Nature Project, Bangkok, 118*.

Swarbrooke, J. and Page, S. J. (2012) *Development and management of visitor attractions*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heineman.

Talbot, L. and Verrinder, G. (2005) *Promoting Health: The Primary Health Care Approach*. 3rd edn. Australia: Elsevier.

Tasci, A. D., Semrad, K. J. and Yilmaz, S. S. (2013) Community basted tourism: Finding the equilibrium in the COMCEC context.

Theobald, W. F. (2005). *Global Tourism*. 3rd edn. New York: Butterworth-Heinemann/Elsevier.

United Nations World Tourism Organization. (UNWT) (2007) *Facts & Figures*. Available at http://www.unwto.org/facts/menu.html (Accessed: 22 June 2015).

United Nations World Tourism Organization. (UNWTO) (2004) *Sustainable Tourism Development*. Available at http://sdt.unwto.org/en (Accessed: 22 September 2015).

Vidal, A. C. (1997) 'Can community development re-invent itself? The challenges of strengthening neighbourhoods in the 21st century', *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63 (4), pp. 429-438.

Wearing, S. and McDonald, M. (2002) 'The development of community-based tourism: Re-thinking the relationship between tour operators and development agents as intermediaries in rural and isolated area communities', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 10 (3), pp. 191-206.

Wilson, M. and Wilde, P. (2003) *Benchmarking community participation developing and implementing 'Active Partners' benchmarks*. United Kingdom: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.