Tourism and Its Sustainability in a Local Community Participation Model : A Theoretical Discussion

Khem Kumar Gautam [†]

Abstract

Tourism, particularly community tourism, has been vigorously adopted as an economic magnifier in almost all economies. I have been advocated in tourism literature as a remarkable contributor to socioeconomic and environmental justice, because of its contributions to creating employment opportunities and promoting cultural and environmental conservation activities at the local level. A community's enthusiasm towards tourism may be undermined by among others, diverse stakeholders' vested interests, and elite hegemonies in the decision-maker process. These factors often obstruct the equal participation in the tourism decision-maker process. Although the tourism literature has stressed the importance of local community participation in tourism decision-maker, research on the actual level of community participation is relatively scarce; Among the limited research is Arnstein's (1969) analysis, called the ladder of citizen participation in which she explained the progression of non-participation to citizen control. This study aims to fill such research gap by exploring the actual level of resident participation in a community setting based on Arnstein's framework.

Keywords : community tourism, local participation, GDP, environmental sustainability, local economy

INTRODUCTION

Tourism demand and consumption have soared since the end of World War II around the world (Hall and Page, 2017; Sharpley R. and Telfer D.J., 2015; UNWTO, 2013). Consequently, there has been a commensurate growth in the world economy in general and private investment in the tourism sector in particular. Following the remarkable

contribution of tourism to the world gross domestic product (GDP), governments in developed or less developed economies have been promoting and prioritizing tourism as a developmental panacea, a growth multiplier, and a mean to earn foreign money, and boost employment. By the end of the 20th century, several countries are promoting themselves as tourist destinations. Although tourism has emerged as both an integral element of development policy and a significant economic sector in many countries. (Sharpley and Telfer, 2015). The tourism literature has reviewed critically the mass form of tourism, especially owning to its socio-environmental and/or ecological costs to the host community (Murphy P.E, 1985 and 2004; Fennel David A., 2015; Jenkins I. and Schroder R., 2013). Peter E. Murphy's (1985) *Tourism: a community approach*' is a pioneering work on community-management-based tourism, which is an alternative model. This tourism model has been advocated as more sustainable and socially just from ecological and social equity viewpoints because it emphasizes on a tourism host's direct involvement in tourism management-related decisions.

Community tourism has been prioritized in the national tourism agenda of many countries. Other countries' national agenda contains terms, such as pro-poor tourism, as community tourism's economic contribution includes the improvement of local employment and natural resources; local knowledge, skills, and capacity for conservation of local heritages and natural environment add and sustain the local attractions, a sense of place, and the reason to visit the place. Local people's apathy toward the tourists visiting their communities may be detrimental to both the tourism hosts and their guests and, ultimately, the long term sustainability of the tourism business. The long-term viability of tourism and its positive contribution to the community can be fostered only with the welcoming attitudes of the locals, which can only be attained if the perceived benefits of opening up to tourism are positive and the system confirms the social exchange theory (Wang and Pfister, 2008; Jurowski, 1997; Choi and Sirakaya, 2005). Lankford and Howard (1994) stated that the local attitudes toward tourism may vary depending upon the length of residency of locals in the particular locality, the locality's economic dependence of tourism, distance of tourism center from the home of residents, residents' involvement in tourism decision-maker process, birthplace, level of knowledge, level of contact with tourists, and demographic characteristics, perceived impact of local outdoor recreation opportunities and the rate of community growth while

surveying the host responses to the visiting guests.

The community's willingness and the larger community's involvement in a "meaningful way"（Reid et.al., 2004; Joppe, 1996）to welcome the visitors in their community is a prerequisite and thus the stakeholder's participation in all tourism decision-maker process is fundamental. The community's participation in tourism decision-maker process to gain the stakeholders' participation is not intrinsically the end goal or the solution, unless the level of the participation is scrutinized in a way that there is real participation of all members of the community, their voices or concerns have been considered, and their common welfare are ensured in the planned projects. A practical tourism planning must identify the present positions of the principal elements of community-based tourism（CBT）and further steps on which the community and stakeholders could embark（Okazaki, 2008）. Sherry R. Arnsein（1969）developed a typology of citizen participation using the examples from three federal social programs, namely, urban renewal, anti-poverty, and model cities in the United States.（Citizen participation is meant as community participation）. Elaborating on citizen participation, Arnstein（1969）wrote:

> It is the redistribution of power that enables the have-not citizens, presently excluded from the political and economic processes, to be deliberately included in the future. It is the strategy by which the have-nots join in determining how information is shared, goals and policies are set, tax resources are allocated, programs are operated, and benefits like contracts and patronage are parceled out. In short, it is the means by which they can induce significant social reform which enables them to share in the benefits of the affluent society.

This study aims to gauge the level of community participation in tourism decision-maker process based on Sherry R. Arnstein's（1969）ladder of citizen participation, in which eight different rungs of ladder（i.e. manipulation, therapy, informing, consultation, placation, partnership, delegated power, and citizen control）are analogized as different levels of participation.

Ⅰ. TOURISM IN A COMMUNITY AND ITS SUSTAINABILITY

Historically, the mounting desire of people to seek and explore new places has evolved

as tourism. People explore new destinations where local culture, ethics, indigenous customs, and historical heritage growingly become important. In this respect, people seeking to experience cultural diversity as a means of self-enrichment. Tourism is a resource industry that is dependent on nature's endowment and society's heritage (Murphy, 1985); it has grown from the pursuits of a privileged few to a mass movement of people, with the urge to discover the unknown, explore new and strange places, seek changes in an environment and undergo new experiences in its broadest and generic sense, encountering new experiences can do more to develop understanding among people, provide jobs, enhance foreign exchange, and raise living standards than any other known economic force (Robinson 1976, xxi, Kaiser, and Helber 1978, ix cited in Murphy, 1985).

　In 2012, the number of tourists crossing international borders reached 1.035 billion, up from 995 million in 2011 (UNWTO, 2013); the growth rate is increasing because of, among others, rise in global GDP, people's desire to travel, and the income level of the middle class. Consequently, tourism industry has been among the largest industries in the world (Sharpley and Telfer, 2015; Fennell, 2013; Hall and Page, 2017). However, the global tourism industry is highly fragmented, with many types of businesses and levels of industrialization, but they all have a common purpose (i.e. to help a visitor enjoy his/her trip) and product (i.e.travel experience). However unlike other industries, it is the consumer who travels and not the product (Murphy, 1985: 12). Fennell (2013) cited several scholars who have raised the issue of sustainability in the tourism industry. For example, Macbeth (1994) drew attention to the fact that sustainable tourism is more reactionary than protective in nature. He suggested that "the history of capitalism is full of examples of how reactionary tendencies are easily coopted by capitalism to sustain its own existence, thus extending the status quo of exploitative relations rather than overthrowing them"(Macbeth, 1994: 44); such situation will continue to occur, unless the present form of capitalism is overcome. For another, Liu (2003) argued that sustainable tourism research has been sporadic and disjointed because of, among others, a critical lack of focus on tourism demand, inter-generational equity, and the nature of tourism resources. He suggested that a transformation of current research must take place according to systems and interdisciplinary perspectives. In addition, McKerracher (1993a) believed that tourism is vulnerable to loosing sustainability because of four

main reasons; first, tourism is not recognized as a natural resource-dependent industry; second, the tourism industry is invisible especially in urban areas; third, tourism is weak electorally, with limited government support; and fourth, there is a distinct lack of leadership that drives the industry, which ultimately makes tourism vulnerable to attacks from other land users. Lastly, Clarke（2002）maintained that no type of tourism can ever properly be sustainable, as sustainability is more typically a process to a desired state rather than an end to itself.

The promotion of relevance of sustainability in all aspects of tourism resulted in the recent move by mass tourism operators to introduce authentic and less commercialized experiences, and "the discovery of cultures and amazing unspoiled places", Fon et al. （2006）appeal to market demands; this move is aligned with the principle that keeping pace with society means behaving in a sustainable manner to be competitive. Clarke （1997）specified four different and discrete stages in the relationship between tourism and sustainability. The first stage includes a perspective in which the concepts of mass and sustainable tourism are completely opposites, separated by a conceptual barrier. The second stage places both mass and sustainable tourism on continuum, based on flexibility of earlier ideas shared between the two concepts. The third is referred to as an approach or a movement, which is characterized by mass tourism improving or taking on aspects of sustainability so that it will not be positioned as a villain. The fourth stage is convergence, which indicates that all forms of tourism, regardless of scale, can be sustainable in nature.

Kaosa-ard（2002）cited Thailand as an example, where its tourism authority has been compelled to focus on quality rather quantity. The hotel association of Thailand argued that those who stay in big hotels, ride in chauffeurs, and dine in expensive restaurants are better tourists because they spend more money at the destinations. Conversely, civil groups of one form or another claimed that the best type of tourist is one who spends his and/or her money at locally owned hotels and eats at local food stalls, where money penetrates more deeply and widely.

Tourism is included in the national development plans of all countries as a vehicle for development owning to its emergence as a major social and economic phenomenon in the last decades（Sharpley and Telfer, 2015）. Since the early 1900s has been increasingly widespread and accounted for the single largest peaceful movement of people across

cultural boundaries in the history of the world (Lett, 1989:277, cited in Sharpley and Telfer). In 2012, international tourism reached a billion (UNWTO, 2013b), the annual trend is unsettling in the near future. The industry is regarded as a growth booster and a development panacea, tourism is used as plan to redistribute wealth. The advantages of tourism are its lack of trade barriers of natural resources as a free infrastructure and a product and capacity to be an ultimate economic development and poverty reduction strategy (Murphy, 1985; Fennell, 2015; Hall and Page, 2017). Nevertheless, the disadvantages of tourism include the opening up of destinations to market the forces and impacts of globalization, that is the question of who benefits from tourism if communities are excluded and multinational companies are welcomed (Telfer, 2015).

CBT focuses on the involvement of the host community in planning and maintaining tourism development to create a more sustainable industry (Hall, 1996). The tourism industry is dependent on the locals' involvement through their role as employees or local entrepreneurs, and goodwill towards tourists (Laws, 1995; Dann, 1996; Taylor and Davis, 1997; Cole, 1997). However, many studies have been limited to the assumption that tourism will be more successful if residents are supportive (Laws, 1995; Stabler, 1997; Jamieson, 1997). Pearce (1992) suggested that CBT delivers local control of development, consensus-based decision-maker and an equitable flow of benefits to all those affected by the industry. Murphy (1985, 1988) argued that tourism planning and implementation must incorporate resident values and visions, whereas Haywood believed that "healthy, thriving communities are the touchstone for a successful tourism industry" (1988, 105; Harper, 1997). Blank (1989) discussed the "community-tourism industry imperative" and concluded that local control of tourism is a win–win situation for most rural communities. Pearce, Moscardo and Ross (1996, 9) believe "a resident responsive tourism is the watch word for tomorrow". CBT indicates apparent similarities to broader community development and participatory planning philosophies, which also advocate greater community control of processes at the local level (Ife, 1996).

The concept of CBT first appeared in Murphy's (1985) study, which explored the links between tourism and its management by the local community in developing countries; he studied further this concept in 2004 (Murphy and Murphy, 2004). Several other studies have also analyzed the relationship between tourism and local communities

(Richards and Hall, 2000). However, several critics have rejected such form of community management. Jamal and Getz (1990) asserted that the capacity to partake cannot be guaranteed merely by the right to do so; the means to be involved is also necessary. Although Gray (1985) emphasized that community residents need adequate resources and skills to acquire the capacity to participate, the power to obtain them is often held by governments or other stakeholders who do not regard the locals as equal partners. The residents themselves often do not even know where to begin when it comes to participation (Joppe, 1996).

Despite its implementation barriers, the community-based approach is still the best course of action. First, local issues have a direct influence on tourist experience, that is, a backlash by the locals may lead to a hostile behavior towards tourists (Pearce, 1994). Thus, tourist environments should be created in harmony with the social climate, where residents will benefit from tourism and not become the victims (Wahab and Pigram, 1997). Second, the image of tourism is based on the assets of the local community, including not only the local people but also the natural environment, infrastructure, facilities and special events or festivals; therefore, the cooperation of the host community is essential to access and develop these assets appropriately (Murphy, 1985). Third, public involvement functions as a driving force to protect the community's natural environment and culture as tourism products, while simultaneously encouraging greater tourism-related income (Felstead, 2000). Fourth, because the tourism industry is sensitive to both internal and external forces, many tourism development plans are often only implemented partially or not at all (Bovy, 1982). A well-developed CBT could mend the resentments by empowering local people by generating employment opportunities, thereby improving their incomes and developing their skills and institutions (Jamal and Getz, 2000; Reed, 1997; Tylor, 1995; Wallace, 1991). However, the local communities must be actively involved in the tourism projects, beginning in the initial planning stages to eventually share the benefits and costs of the projects in their areas (Naguran, 1999; Weaver, 1998).

Regardless of the quality of tourism-oriented features, attractions, products, and services, tourism can bring substantial social, economic, and environmental impacts to rural communities and the surrounding areas (Wang and Pfister, 2008). Moreover, the way locals define the nature and magnitude of these impacts has been a significant

concern for planners, community leaders, and social scientists for several decades. Research on tourism impacts on host communities has undergone several evolutionary stages from unrestrained advocacy of tourism development to scientific examination of the benefits and costs of tourism industry in various settings (Jafari, 2001). Many researchers and planners have suggested that an effective tourism planning requires the resident's involvement to mitigate the negative impacts and to clarify the benefits associated with the tourism industry (Arnstein 1969; Chambers 2002; Sewell and Coppock 1977; Rohe and Gates 1985; Wates 2000).

Ⅱ．ALTERNATIVE TOURISM AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Community development originated in the self-help programmers that were developed during the depressions years in the United Kingdom, United States and Canada (Smith, 1990a cited in Fennell, 2013). A defining characteristic of community development is that it is based on local initiatives by advocating a site-specific approach to finding solutions to community problems using community members and resources. Bujold (1995, 5, cited in Fennell, 2013) defined community development as the process by which the efforts of the people themselves are united with those of governmental authorities to improve economic, social and cultural conditions of that community. Tourism is seen increasingly as a key community development tool, with the recognition of its economic contribution in bolstering stagnating economies and diversifying existing sectors, and its ability to unify community members. Such is the case in the Shetland Islands, Scotland, where tourism is relied upon to sustain an economy that once was dominated by North Sea oil development, and the Finnish Island of Aland, where all tourism initiatives are owned and controlled by the local people (Joppe, 1996). If tourism development is to be viable as a long-term economic strategy, the social and ecological concerns must be addressed, and the resource base must be protected in the process. The host community is the economic, social, cultural, and infrastructural resource base for most tourism activity, and the residents' quality of life is a measure of the condition of the resource (Christensen, 1995, 63, cited in Fennell, 2013).

According to the United Nations, community development is a "process designed to create conditions of economic and social progress for the whole community with its

active participation" （p.81）. Specialists working in the field of community development have long considered that at the heart of the process is the emphasis on self-sufficiency and local control over change, making the process actually more important than the outcome. Community development has proven to be especially effective in responding to the needs of disadvantaged populations and marginalized communities by creating jobs and improving their social circumstances （Joppe, 1996）. Social exchange theory suggests that individuals will engage in social exchange if one, the resulting rewards are valued, two, the exchange is likely to produce valued rewards, and three, perceived costs do not exceed perceived rewards （Skidmore 1975）. Previous research has recognized that the elements being exchanged by the host community residents include not only economic components but also social and environmental factors （King, Pizan, and Milman 1990; Milman and Pizam 1998; Perdue, Long and Allen 1990; Shluter and Var 1988）. Residents' appear to be willing to ener into an exchange with tourists if they feel the transaction will result in a gain （Pizam 1978; Tyrrel and Spaulding 1984）.

Tourism can be manipulative and in cultural terms, socially, and environmentally detrimental and can be unsuccessful to deliver an anticipated economic lift （Sharpley, 2002）. A key reason for the growing interests in partnerships in tourism development is the belief that tourist destination areas and organizations may be able to gain competitive advantage by bringing together the knowledge, expertise, capital and other resources of several stakeholders （Kotler et al., 1993）. According to Bramwell （2000） （Jamal and Getz, 1995; Joppe, 1996; Murphy, 1985; Timothy, 1999）, the broadly-based ownership of tourism policies can bring democratic empowerment and equity, operational advantages, and enhanced tourism product. It is often suggested that socially equitable development depends on participation by all sectors of society in the decision-maker process regarding development options （Bramwell, 1998; LGMB, 1993）. By involving stakeholders from several fields of activity and with many interests there may be greater potential for the integrative or holistic approaches to policy-making that can help to promote sustainability （Jamal and Getz, 1995 and 1996; Lane, 1994）. Bramwell （2000） cited Benveniste （1989） and Roberts and Bradley （1991） in explaining that broad participation in policy-making could help democratize decision-maker, empower participants, and lead to capacity building and skill acquisition amongst participants and those whom they represent as well as to a more equitable distribution of resulting

benefits and costs. Questioning Wood and Gray（1991: 146）, Bramwell（2000）mentioned "Collaboration occurs when a group of autonomous stakeholders of a problem domain engage in an interactive process, using shared rules, norms and structures, to act or decide on issues related to that domain". Only well organized and state-licensed interest groups may play a prominent role in policy formation by groups or agencies that exist in certain policy arenas（Hall and Jenkins, 1995; Reed, 1997）. It is emphasized that society favors the participation of more powerful interests in governing regimes, although what is at issue is depicted as not so much domination as the capacity to achieve certain goals （Stoke, 1995）.

　Fennell（2013, 123-124）stated that the style and extent of tourism development in the 1990s has been tempered by the trend toward the increase in mega-development projects designed to cater to a growing market of travelers who are looking for self-contained, hassle-free vacations and interest in sustainable tourism design started in the early 1990s in part as a result of an American national park service publication dedicated to the principles of sustainable design. Among the first action strategies on tourism and sustainability emerged from the Globe '90 conference in British Columbia, Canada. At this meeting representatives from the tourism industries, government, non-governmental organizations and academe discussed the importance of the environment in sustaining the tourism industry, and how poorly planned tourism developments often erode the qualities of the natural and human environment that attracts visitors. The conference delegates suggested that the goal of sustainable tourism are: 1）to develop greater awareness and understanding of the significant contributions that tourism can make to environment and the economy; 2）to promote equity and development; 3）to improve the quality of life of the host community; 4）to provide a high quality experience for the visitor; and 5）to maintain the quality of the environment on which the foregoing objectives depend（Fennell, 2015）. Nature-based tourism is a form of tourism that encompasses other forms of tourism, e.g. mass tourism, adventure tourism, low-impact tourism, and ecotourism, which use natural resources in a wild or an undeveloped form. Cultural tourism is defined as visits by persons from outside the host community motivated wholly or in part by an interest in the historical, artistic, scientific or lifestyle/heritage offerings of a community, region, group or institution'（Silberberg 1995: 361, cited in Fennel, 2015）. Tourism Canada defined adventure tourism as "an outdoor leisure

activity that takes place in an unusual, exotic, remote, wilderness destination, involving some form of unconventional means of transportation, and tends to be associated with low or high levels of activity"（Canadian Tourism Commission 1995, 5, cited in Fennell, 2015）. According to Fennell（2015）, ecotourism gave way to an expanding market that clamors to take advantage of new alternative tourism opportunities in places that are virtually terra incognita. The term "eco" in ecotourism stands for ecological; the allure for this type of travel stems from the onset of sustainable development and the media hype generated from its converge. At present and in the near future, sustainable tourism and associate infrastructures operate within natural capacities for the regeneration and future productivity of natural resources; recognizes the contribution that people and communities, customs and lifestyles make to the tourism experience, and accept that these people must have an equitable share in the economic benefits of tourism; as guided by the wishes of the local people and communities in the host areas（Fennell, 2015）. Alternative tourism（AT）is a generic term that encompasses a whole range of tourism strategies（e.g."appropriate", eco, soft, green, responsible, people to people, controlled, small-scaled, and cottage tourism,）. All these strategies purport to offer a more benign alternative to conventional mass tourism（Conference Report, 1990, cited in Weaver, 1991 and Fennell, 2015）. Fennell cited Dernoi（1981）who stated that the advantages of AT will be felt in five ways.

1. There will be benefits for the individual or family: home-based accommodations will channel revenue directly to families. Moreover, families will acquire managerial skills.

2. The local community will benefit. AT will generate direct revenue for community members, in addition to upgrading housing standards while avoiding huge infrastructure expenses.

3. For the host community, AT will help avoid the leakage of tourism revenue outside the country. AT will also help prevent social tensions and may preserve local traditions.

4. For those in the industrialized generating country, AT is ideal for cost-conscious travelers or for those who prefer close contacts with locals.

5. There will be benefits for international relations: AT may promote international, interregional, and intercultural understanding.

Neto（2003, cited in Fennell: 223）argued that the responsible forms of tourism, such as ecotourism aim to bring socioeconomic benefits to local communities, but are not necessarily designed to alleviate poverty, such as pro-poor tourism. Both can be sustainable tourism development strategies, however, the former focuses primarily on environmental sustainability, whereas the latter on poverty alleviation through the participation of the poorest divisions of society.

Ⅲ．LOCAL PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY TOURISM

Drake（1991: 132, cited in Fennell, 2013）defined local participation as "the ability of local communities to influence the outcome of development projects such as ecotourism that have an impact on them and suggested a model of local participation in the development of ecotourism projects"（1991, 149–155）. His model listed nine phases of local participation. In phase one, the role of local participation in the proposed project is determined; the research team is selected in phase two; preliminary studies are conducted in phase three; the level of local involvement and then an appropriate participation mechanism are determined in phase four and five; in phase six,　dialogues and educational efforts are initiated; in phase seven, a collective decision-maker is performed; phase eight involves the development of an action plan and an implementation scheme; and phase nine comprises; monitoring and evaluation. Investigating the perspectives of three stakeholder groups involved in community–based tourism（i.e. decision-makers, operators and tourists）. In Malaysia, Indonesia, and Thailand, Rocharungsat（2004; 79）concluded that it is unrealistic to imagine that communities will always be able to successfully and independently implement all stages of community-based tourism, as they juggle among marketing, hospitality, conservation, and evaluation（as cited in Fennell, 2013）. Nevertheless, if all stakeholders are serious in their hopes to realize a successful sustainable model of a community-based tourism, the goal of a strong empowered community must be shared among themselves. The biggest concern for destination communities must be conservations of their natural tourism resources. A successful tourism development leads to an increase in the number of visitors and the possibility of visitor-induced stress on a community's physical environment. The problem is most acute in areas with outstanding scenic beauty

or recreational opportunities that possess good access to tourist-generating regions. Tourism is highly desirable to most communities because as they attract and serve visitors, they earn as new or basic income. Successful economic strategies for destination communities will require a consideration of exogenous forces community benefits, and development scale, in addition to the more direct concern of resource availability and market opportunities. Maximizing the socioeconomic development potential and minimizing the discontent and out-migration of the young in tourism requires a broader community involvement, in this way, repeating the tourism rewards is possible. Such involvement will require the support of residents because how they react to proposed developments and social impact of many visitors will be fundamental in establishing a hospital atmosphere. The way a community responds to opportunities and challenges of tourism depend to a large extent on its attitude to the industry. Attitudes are personal and complex variables. There are three determinants of community attitudes to tourism. The first determinant refers to the types of contact between residents and visitors, which can have a bearing on the residents' reaction to, and support of, the industry. Another determinant is the interrelating importance of the industry to individuals and the community. The third determinant concerns inconvenience will become more tolerable if some compensation is evident (Murphy, 1985: 41-120).

The tourism literature equivocally raises concern in support of the host community's upper hand involvement in all tourism related activities in their jurisdiction of tourism arrangements as they will be the first one to be exposed to the good or bad consequences that come along with it. The host community members must have equal access to the benefits that accrue from tourism as the mandatory costs are imposed on them, thus their decision on further propelling or rejecting the tourism enterprise must be more important than the government's (Joppe M., 1996). In considering tourism as a means to the development of a community, the important aspect to is the community's perception or attitude toward the visitors who visit in their place. Jurowski (1997) argued that certain factors such as the potential of economic gains, use of tourism resources, eco-centric attitude, and attachment to the community, affect the residents' perceptions of the impacts and modify, directly and indirectly, their support for tourism. Liu et al. (1987) highlighted the importance of holistic integration of the socioeconomic and environmental impacts on resident perceptions at the outset of tourism planning at

different stages of tourism development, from the beginning to the end in any tourism settings. Attitudes toward tourism are favorably influenced by the extent to which local residents feel that they maintained a certain level of control over its planning and development process; they are most likely to be employed in a job that caters to tourists; and they have knowledge of the local industrial and economic base (Lankford and Howard, 1994). Ap and Crompton (1998) conducted a survey in three different tourism communities in Texas, United States, and identified social and cultural factors, economic, crowding and congestion, environmental, services, taxes and community attitudes as seven distinctive dimensions of impacts that the community experience of tourism. Certain elements, such as socioeconomic and spatial factors, economic dependency, resident and community typologies, and theoretical perspectives (e.g. community attachment, and social exchange and growth machine theories) are important in framing resident attitudes toward tourism in a community (Harrill, 2004). Harrill (2004) added that citizen participation process can help identify tourism-related issues and groups of people concerned about or opposed to tourism planning and development in their communities.

The communities having or willing to have their stake in the tourism enterprises may not be of unanimous character; that is, they comprise multiple stakeholders in terms of the power upon which they influence and the interest and expectations that they have from the tourism in their places. Reed (1997) noted "Power relations are an integral element in understanding the characteristics and consequences of community-based planning where tourism is emergent. Attempts to balance or disperse power differences among stakeholders by selecting suitable structures may in fact be contested activities." Community involvement in tourism can be considered from at least two viewpoints, namely the decision-maker process and the benefits of the tourism development (Tosun, 2000). De Kadt (1992) contended that the compulsory call for community control via alternative tourism often neglects the tendency of the local elite to adopt the organs of participation for its own benefits and of the possibilities that these communities will become dependent on outside experts owing to their lack of prior experience in tourism planning (as cited in Tosun, 2000). Participation in tourism by different interest groups varies with differing groups' power, objectives, and expectations from community participation, and these factors shape their attitudes towards forms of community

participation（Tosun, 2006）.

In relation to the policy formulation and implementation of local tourism in a community, Cascante（2010）studied how a community agency,（i.e. a construction of local relationships with ingredients, such as strong social interaction, community-wide participation, open communication, tolerance etc.）, used to increase the adaptive capacity of local people in a small village of La Fortuna, Costa Rica and attained the sustainable social, economic and environmental goals of local social response mechanisms, locally owned tourism enterprises, economic diversification and self-reliance, distributive justice, and community and enterprises wide environmental practices through attitudinal, behavioral and organizational conditions. Lankford（1994）studied tourism communities in six counties within the Columbia River George of Oregon and Washington, and then identified four different stakeholders with differentiated policy choices and interests. He concluded that tourism continues to play a major economic role in the community by providing jobs. However, he argued that tourism-produced jobs may not be highly desirable and the different tourism stakeholders in the community members, such as government employees, elected officials, business owners and ordinary resident groups, might differ on the notions of long range planning intended to mitigate socio-environmental impacts to the community.

CBT model is not without its limits. Critics have questioned its long-term viability and sustainability. Blackstock（2005）criticized that the current conceptualization of CBT is naïve and unrealistic and focuses on maximizing the economic stability of the industry through legitimating tourism development as locally controlled and in the community's interest. His arguments are based on the following; i）CBT takes a rather functional approach that lacks the transformative intent of community development, as CBT is presented as a way of ensuring the long term survival of a profitable tourism industry rather than empowering local residents, ii）Local communities are presented as homogeneous blocks, devoid of internal power struggles or competing values, and iii）It ignores the external constraints to local participation and local control, or sidesteps the barriers to local participatory decision-maker. Tosun（2000）listed certain operational（centralization of public administration of tourism, lack of coordination, lack of information）, structural（attitudes of professionals, lack of expertise, elite domination, lack of appropriate legal system, lack of trained human resources, relatively high cost

of community participation, lack of financial resources, etc.) and cultural limits (limited capacity of poor people, and apathy and low level of awareness in the local community) to local participation in community tourism in developing countries. These limits exist because of prevailing socio-political, economic and cultural structures although these structures might not equally exist in every tourist destination. Tosun (2000) added that although these limitations may vary over time according to types, scale and levels of tourism development, the market served, cultural attributes of local communities, and forms and scale of tourism developed are beyond the control of local communities. Formulating and implementing the participatory tourism development approach requires a total change in socio-political, legal, administrative and economic structure of many developing countries, for which hard political choices and logical decisions based on cumbersome social, economic and environmental trade-offs are *sine quo non* alongside deliberate help, collaboration and co-operation of major international donor agencies, international tour operators, and multinational companies.

Nonetheless, certain prerequisites that must be considered are suggested in the community tourism literature. Kibicho (2008) recommended three conditions that must be met to achieve successful CBT; these conditions include satisfying the opinion leaders (or political leaders), securing support from official leaders (or government representatives), and determing how to integrate the operatives (the general populace or the mass) in the proposed or ongoing tourism projects. Kibicho (2008) also enumerated factors that are critical to a successful CBT; these factors include the inclusion of stakeholders, recognition of individual and mutual benefits, appointment of legitimate convener, and formulation of aims, objectives, and perception that decisions arrived at will be implemented. Moreover, the operatives, opinion leaders, and official leaders are interested in the participation in the projects activities; are concerned with the community's benefits from the project, and value the success of the projects more than the rest of the groups (Kibicho, 2008).

Considering the increasing pace of change and intensifying competition resulting from the globalization of trade, business operations, and travel, the need to determine new ways for destination communities to be competitive while remaining its sense of place is critical (Jamal and Getz, 1995). Sufficient trainings provided to the tourism staffs in local businesses and quality hospitality services that serve to strengthen tourist satisfaction

are the key elements for the success of CBT model（Guzman et.al. 2011）.

This study described the significance of the local stakeholders' participation in the tourism development, an analysis that originated from Arnstein's important discussion on the have-nots holding the power of community control in relation to be relationship between the powerholders and the powerless stakeholders in the context of the regional development.

CONCLUSION

Resident participation in CBT model has been widely advocated in tourism literature amid its limiting factors, such as heterogeneity of the hosts and their internal and external barriers to participation（Blackstock, 2005; Tosun, 2000）, which must also be equally studied. Resident participation in CBT model can be a juxtaposing idea to what Arnstein（1969）illustrated as a ladder of citizen participation in which each rungs of a ladders corresponds to the extent of citizens' power in determining the plan and/or program. She used the United States' federal programs, such as Urban Renewal, Anti-Poverty, and Model Cities, as example. She stated "the eight-rung ladder is a simplification, but it helps to illustrate the point that so many have missed that there are significant gradations of citizen participation. Knowing these gradations makes it possible to cut through the hyperbole to understand the increasingly strident demands for participation from the have-nots as well as the gamut of confusing responses from the powerholders." In this ladder of participation, manipulation and therapy are the bottom rungs of the ladder and described as non-participation level. In this level, the objective is not to enable real participation but to enable powerholders to educate or cure the participants to substitute for genuine participation. The third and fourth rungs are informing and consultation, an extent of tokenism. People at these levels can hear and have their voices heard by the powerholders, but they lack the power to ensure that their concerns will be heeded by the powerful; as a result, they cannot change the status quo. Placation is simply the upper level of tokenism, in which the powerholders possess the ultimate right and power to decide. Further up the ladder are partnership, delegated power, and citizen control which depict a citizen's power in the decision-maker. Partnership enables them to negotiate and engage in trade-offs with traditional

powerholders. The topmost rungs, delegated powers and citizen control refer to the full managerial power of citizens in all the decisions.

The similar gradations of citizen participation as described by Arnstein（1969）are existent in community tourism, although in different contexts and community setting. This illustration was drawn from the United States federal social development programs, which contain sharply delineated groups of people as powerholders and powerless stakeholders in the decision-maker process. In the case of community tourism planning, there may be less visible distinction between the two groups of people, as long as the ultimate goal to plan for tourism in such a way that community interests are well-protected and benefits are equally shared among all stakeholders. The fair inclusion of community members in the participation process, that is, allowing them to voice their concerns and be heard at the implementation level, makes all enthusiastic towards the common good and dismantle the hierarchy of participation ladder.

REFERENCES

Ap, J. and Crompton J.（1998）. Developing and testing a tourism impact scale, *Journal of travel research,* 37（2）, 120–130.

Arnstein, Sherry R.（1969）. A Ladder of Citizen Participation, *Journal of American Institute of Planners,* 35（4）, 216–224.

Blackstock, K.（2005）. A critical look at community based tourism, *Community development journal,* 40（1）, 39–49.

Bramwell, B.（1998）. *Selecting policy instruments for sustainable tourism.* In W.F. Theobald（ed.）Global Tourism（361–379）. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Bramwell, B.（2000）. *Tourism collaboration and partnerships: politics, practice and sustainability,* B. Bramwell and B. Lane（ed.）Aspects of Tourism 2. Channel View Publications.

Cascante, D. M., 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）, 735–756.

Chambers, Robert.（2002）. *Participatory Workshops.* London, Earthscan.

Choi, H. C. and Sirakaya, E.（2005）. Measuring residents' attitude toward sustainable tourism: development of sustainable tourism attitude scale, *Journal of Travel research,* 43（4）, 380–394.

Chok, S. and Macbeth, J.（2007）. Tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation: a critical analysis of 'pro-poor tourism' and implications for sustainability, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10（2-3）, 144-164.

Craig, G.（2007）. Community capacity-building: Something old, something new..? *Critical Social Policy,* 27（3）, 335-359.

Dredge, D.（2006）. Networks, conflict and collaborative communities, *Journal of sustainable tourism*, 14（6）, 562-581.

Fennel, David A.（2015）. *Ecotourism*, fourth Edition. Routledge.

Guzman, T. L., Borges, O. and Canalejo, M. C.（2011）. Community-based tourism in cape verde- a case study, *Travel and hospitality management* , 17（1）, 35-44.

Hall, C. M. and Jenkins, J.M.（1995）. *Tourism and Public Policy,* London: Sage.

Hall, C. Michael and Page, Stephen J.（2017）. *the Routledge Handbook of Tourism in Asia,* Routledge.

Harrill, R.（2004）. Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: a literature review with implications for tourism planning, *Journal of planning literature*, 18（1）, 1-16.

Jafari, Jafar.（2001）. The scientification of tourism in Valene L, Smith and Maryann Brent (eds.) *Host and guests revisited: Tourism issues of the 21st century,* Cognizant Communication Corporation, 28-41.

Jamal, T.B. and Getz, D.（1995）. Collaboration Theory and Community tourism planning, *Annals of Tourism Research* 22（1）, 186-204.

Jenkins I. and Schroder R.（2013）. *Sustainability in tourism: A multidisciplinary approach,* Springer Gabler.

Joppe M.（1996）. *Sustainable community tourism development revisited*, Pergamon tourism management.

Jurowski, C.（1997）. A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism, *Journal of travel research* , 36（2）, 3-11.

Kibicho, W.（2008）. Community-based tourism: A Factor-Cluster Segmentation Approach, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16（2）, 211-231.

King, B., A. Pizam, and A. Milman（1993）. Social Impacts of Tourism: Host perceptions, *Annals of Touristm Research*, 20（4）, 50-55.

Kotler, P., Haider, K.H. and Rein, I.（1993）. *Marketing Places: Attracting Investment, Industry, and Tourism to Cities, States, and Nations,* New York: Free Press.

Lane, B.（1994）. Sustainable rural tourism strategies: A tool for development and conservation, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 2（1-2）, 102-111.

Lankford, S.V.（1994）. Attitudes and perceptions toward tourism and rural regional development, *Journal of travel research*, 32（3）, 35-43.

Lankford, S.V. and Howard, D.R.（1994）. Developing a tourism impact attitude scale, *Annals of*

tourism research, 21（1）, 121–139.

Lane, B, and Bramwell（1994）. *Rural Tourism and Sustainable Rural Development*, Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Local Government Management Board（LGMB）（1993）. *A Framework for Local Sustainability,* Luton: LGMB.

Li, W.（2005）. Community decision-maker: participation in development, Annals of Tourism Research, 33（1）, 132–143.

Liu, J.C., Sheldon, P.J. and Var,T.（1987）. Resident perception of the environmental impacts of tourism, *Annals of tourism research*, 14（1）, 17–37.

Long, P.T., R.R. Perdue, and L. R. Allen（1990）. *Rural Resident Community Life Satisfaction and Tourism Development Attitudes: A Comparision of Forest and Nonforest Community Residents*, Contribution of Social Science to Multiple Use Management（General Technical Report RM-196）. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service.

Murphy, Peter E.（1985）. *Tourism: A community approach*, Routledge.

Murphy, Peter E.（2004）. *Strategic Management for Tourism Communities: Bridging the Gaps*, Channel View Publications.

Okazaki, E.（2008）. A community-based tourism model: its conception and use, *Journal of sustainable tourism*, 16（5）, 511–529.

Pizam, A.（1978）. Tourism's Impacts: The Social Costs to the Destination Community as Perceived by Its Residents, *Journal of Travel Research*, 16（4）, 8–12.

Reed, M.G.（1997）. Power relations and community-based tourism planning, *Annals of Tourism Research,* 24（3）, 566–591.

Reid, G. Donald et al.（2004）. Community tourism planning: A self-assessment instrument, *Annals of tourism research,* 31（3）, 623–639.

Rohe, William M., and Lauren B. Gates,（1985）. *Planning with Neighborhoods*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Schluter, R., and T. Var（1988）. Resident Attitudes toward Tourism in Argentina., *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15（3）, 442–445.

Sewell, Derrick W.R., and John T. Coppock（1977）. *Public Participation in Planning*. Chichester, UK: Wiley. Skidmore, W.（1975）. *Theoritical Thinking in Sociology,* New York/London: Cambridge University Press.

Sharpley, R., and Telfer, David J.（2002）. *Tourism and Development: Concepts and Issues*, Multilingual Matters Limited.

Stoker, G.（1995）. Regime theory and urban politic,. In D. Judge, G. Stoker and H. Wolman（eds） *Theories of Urban Politics*. London: Sage, 54–71.

Tosun, C.（2000）. Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries, *Tourism Management*, 21（6）, 613–633.

Tosun, C.（2006）. Expected nature of community participation in tourism development, *Tourism Management*, 27（3）, 493-504.

Tosun, C. and Timothy, D.（2003）. Arguments for community participation in the tourism development process, *Journal of tourism studies,* 14（2）, 2-15.

Tyrrel, T. J., and I. A. Spaulding（1984）. A Survey of Attitudes toward Tourism Growth in Rhode Island, *Hospitality Education and Research Journal.* 8（2）, 22-33.

Wang and Pfister（2008）. Residents' attitudes toward Toutism and perceived personal benefits in a rural community: *Journal of travel research*, 47（1）, 84-93.

Wates, Nick（2000）. *The community Planning Handbook,* London: Earthscan.

Zhao, W. and Ritchie J. R.（2007）. Tourism and poverty alleviation: an integrative research framework, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10（2-3）, 119-143.