

Devkant Kala / S. C. Bagri

Barriers to local community participation in tourism development: Evidence from mountainous state Uttarakhand, India

Abstract

Local community involvement, particularly in emerging and remote tourism destinations, is justified to accomplish sustainable tourism development efforts. Despite the benefits that tourism development offer, participation of community in geographically disadvantaged mountainous destinations is accompanied with many challenges. This qualitative investigation has understood and given voice to local residents of two emerging destinations of Uttarakhand, India. Data were gathered through interviews and were thematically examined. Findings reveal four key barriers that affect community participation in tourism development: practical, socio-cultural, apprehension and institutional. The study emphasizes the need for both greater advocacy of community participation, better synchronization among concerned government authorities, education and training for locals, and the need to design particular strategies which can encourage local participation that are customized to emerging destination context.

Key words: community participation; tourism development; barriers; mountainous destination; India

Introduction

Mountainous and remote rural areas of developing nations, usually attributed by subsistence economies, poor status of traditional agriculture, dependence on pastoralism, poverty, poor governance, fragile natural environments and susceptibility to natural disasters, pose unique challenges in tourism development (Sood, Lynch & Anastasiadou, 2017). Besides diversifying to other non-agricultural employment, tourism is considered as a possible solution to the challenges. However, it has been observed that economic, social, political and environmental aspects may impact the extent of participation in tourism by mountain communities (Nyaupane, Morais & Dowler, 2006). Tourism authorities have failed to recognize the spatial and societal distinctiveness of mountainous areas and to involve locals, which made the efforts of sustainable tourism development futile (Nepal & Chipeniuk, 2005). Tourism development in mountainous and remote rural areas is a challenge for planners, as they must balance development with ecology. Tourism literature highlights that the success of sustainable tourism development in geographically disadvantaged areas largely governs by the active participation of local people. Since the growth of tourism affects the locals directly and has the emotional impact on their lives, community participation is considered of immense significance. The locals must be involved as they are more familiar to tourism products associated with their socio, cultural background. The knowledge of local tourism offerings and appropriateness to local situations signify host communities' involvement in tourism development (Tosun, 2006). In view of this community-based tourism helps locals to control the tourism development, operate tourism facilities and infrastructures, manage indigenous

Devkant Kala, PhD, Assistant Professor (Selection Grade), School of Business, University of Petroleum & Energy Studies, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India; Email: devkant.kala@ddn.upes.ac.in

S. C. Bagri, PhD, Dean, School of Management & Professor at Centre for Mountain Tourism and Hospitality Studies, Hemwati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar Garhwal, Uttarakhand, India; E-mail: prof.bagri@gmail.com

resources, implement tourism-developing strategies, minimize economic leakages and increase tourism acceptance (Tosun, 2000; Tosun & Timothy, 2003).

Interestingly, community-based tourism, homestay tourism, rural tourism and sometime ecotourism are used synonymously in the Himalayan regions. Such forms of tourism are at the infant stage as tourists visiting rural areas take shelter in villages for food and accommodation. Miserably, the concept of community-based tourism is almost lopsided and tourists rarely get the feeling of community tourism except seeing some of the tourist places. In the present form of tourism development, only large business organizations including tour-operators, camp-owners and hotels are enjoying benefits whereas local people have been neglected and ignored significantly due to their uneducated, uncultured, ignorant and less articulated characteristics. Local communities have limited or sometimes marginalized contribution in decision-making and thus, deprived of financial benefits of tourism particularly in remote areas.

This paper explores the reasons why local communities of mountainous destinations are not participating in tourism development. The objectives of this study are: a) to identify major barriers that inhibit local community participation in tourism development in Uttarakhand; b) to examine the impact of identified barriers on the local communities' willingness to opt tourism industry as a profession and; c) to suggest ways of improving their participation in tourism business in future. This article contributes to barriers to community participation specifically in India, particularly on mountainous destinations. Only a few pertinent works focusing particularly to Uttarakhand have only been published, as will be presented in the literature review. The outcomes of this study will be of immense value to policymakers in designing an appropriate framework for enhancing community participation and developing the capacity of locals to play an active role in the tourism business.

Literature review

Community participation and tourism development

Community participation is believed as a method of grassroots democracy, where individuals have a right to participate in decision-making on matters that directly affect their lives. It is seen as a corrective style especially where local residents are poor or geographically disadvantaged (Burns, 2004). Styliadis, Biran, Sit and Szivas (2014) and Bello, Lovelock and Carr (2016) advocated that the objective of sustainable tourism development can be attained through the voluntary involvement of local communities. Murphy (1985) recognized there would be proper consensus, less chance of delays and more harmonious development, only if more individuals are motivated to involve in tourism development at an early stage. Snyman (2012) supported that tourism should be community driven, where community members are responsible to control tourism infrastructures and facilities available in their surroundings. Either directly or indirectly, the local community comes across both favourable and unfavourable outcomes of tourism, and thus their participation is essential to better handle the impacts and to gain the benefits generated through tourism activities (Cole, 2006).

Participation is capable of transforming the passive attitude of community into responsible and favourable outlook, inspiring entrepreneurial ventures, building partnership and collaboration, promoting a spirit of cohesiveness and rejuvenating relationship between people, tourism destination and external stakeholders (Moscardo, 2011; Pongponrat, 2011; Idziak, Majewski & Zmysłony, 2015) and consequently, can increase the prospects of more successful and sustainable development (Dyer, Gursoy, Sharma & Carter, 2007). However, researchers deliberate that participatory tourism development may vary from locality to locality and region to region. They opine that not every form of community

participation could produce standard expected benefits to locals since it can take many forms ranging from manipulative participation to citizen power (Tosun, 1999). Kayat (2002), Mbaiwa (2005), Wang, Yang, Chen, Yang and Li (2010), Pongponrat (2011), Dogra and Gupta (2012), Khani (2012) reveal that host communities of developing countries such as India, China, Malaysia, Botswana, Thailand, and Iran, seldom participated in tourism-related decision-making. The active participation of the community in many destinations is not apparent due to highly centralized decision-making and underestimating the role of locals in decision-making processes.

Barriers to community participation in tourism development

In order to achieve voluntarily participation of local communities, factors that affect the level of their participation should be well identified and managed. In his three-dimensional framework, Tosun (2000) classified cultural, operational and structural limitations to community participation. He accepted that prevailing socio-economic and political conditions are the main reasons for these limitations in developing countries. Tosun and Timothy (2003) found that a low level of education, unawareness and limited means of collecting information are reasons for community non-participation in tourism development. Cole (2006), Manyara and Jones (2007) and Marzuki, Hay and James (2012) revealed that poor educational level, inadequate capabilities, unawareness, apprehensive and reluctant nature of community to take part in the decision-making process are major limitations in remote areas of Indonesia, Kenya and Malaysia respectively. Breugel (2013) found that unawareness, inability, insufficient infrastructures, poor coordination, remoteness and smaller size of destinations prevent residents to participate actively in tourism in Thailand.

Stone and Stone (2011) identified the absence of ownership sense, insufficient employment generation, deficiency of information, loss of advantages, and a disparity in tourism board structure restrict locals' participation in Khama Rhino Sanctuary Trust, a community-based tourism enterprise in Botswana. Kim, Park and Phandanouvong (2014) identified low education & understanding about tourism, poor socio-economic conditions, lack of time for tourism, seasonality, power disparities and locals' distrust in authorities as key hindering factors in Houay-Kaeng Village, Laos. Saufi, O'Brien and Wilkins (2014) identified lack of tourism information, education and financial resources, perceived negative impacts and imbalance in tourism agencies' priorities in developing local tourism inhibit local participation in Lombok, Indonesia. They highlighted the significant role of the private sector, improvement in entrepreneurial skills in collaboration with educational and financial institutions, and role of government agencies as a catalyst in enhancing community participation.

Mustapha, Azman and Ibrahim (2013) identify the reluctance of stakeholders towards power-sharing, centralization of authorities, elite domination, unawareness, insufficient economic resources, poor professional attitude and limited capability of the local community to participate in tourism at Tekek Village, Malaysia. Kunjuraman and Hussin (2017) examined the difficulties of community-based homestay program in Dagat village, Malaysia and revealed internal challenges (amateur individuals, leadership issues, poor monetary resources) and external challenges (absence of fundamental infrastructure, absence of monitoring framework, lack of formal organisational structure, absence of marketing and promotional efforts) confine the community participation. Aref (2011) indicated that financial constraint is a major reason for community non-participation in Shiraz, Iran. Tourism authorities generally consider community participation as an unnecessary and costly process in terms of time, efforts, financial resources and abilities required to coordinate the entire procedure (Tosun, 2000).

It can be apparent from the literature that these limitations are closely interconnected to each other and consequently it is relevant to comprehend the structures and mechanism through which they

inhibit host communities from active participation in tourism development. Despite all the efforts, local communities barely ever participate in tourism development activities and commonly experience a low participation in or a complete exclusion from decision-making (Mustapha, Azman & Ibrahim, 2013). This condition is predominantly acknowledged mainly in emerging remote tourism destination and generally in developing countries.

Barriers to local community participation in Himalayan destinations

The first planned ecotourism destination of India - Thenmala has set the example of extending benefits of community-based ecotourism to locals. Community participation ensured through Thenmala Ecotourism Promotion Society, Eco-Development Committees and *Vana Samrakshana Samithies* contributed positively towards economic empowerment, environmental sustainability, cultural perseverance, employment opportunities and standard of living of locals. Sirubari, the first model village of Nepal and winner of PATA Gold award (2001), has set the example on how to extend tourism benefits to poor villagers. Villagers developed tourism products from the elementary level through active community involvement. Tourism efforts of villagers helped in alleviating poverty, preserving culture, traditions, and environment and have made improvement in professional abilities, revenue-generating ventures, family incomes and quality of life (Thapa, 2005). In Bhutan, Gurung and Seeland (2008) highlighted the necessity of ecotourism in achieving equitable economic development, environmental protection and cultural promotion, which contributes to Gross National Happiness. They suggested the supportive role of government and tourism policymakers in financial assistance, improving skills of locals and establishing small tourism and hospitality enterprises.

Community-based homestays in Ladakh have been instrumental in conserving the rapidly worsening Himalayan natural and cultural resources, empowering women and providing sustainable livelihoods to local communities (Anand, Chandan & Singh, 2012). Initiated by Snow Leopard Conservancy in association with UNESCO, Ladakh Himalayan Homestay program, supplemented the earnings of households, preserved wildlife and increased ownership by host communities (Lama, Jackson & Wangchuk, 2012). Chaudhary & Lama (2014) appraised the efforts of NGOs, Ecotourism promotion committees and local communities in community-based tourism development in Sikkim, India. In Great Himalayan National Park, of Himachal Pradesh state, Bansal and Kumar (2013) reviewed the ecotourism for community development and concluded that unawareness, incapability, lack of constant support and consultation from government authorities are limiting factors. Dogra and Gupta (2012) revealed that attitude of tourism development authorities, limited financial resources, poor capacity of people and unavailability of time inhibit community participation in a rural destination of Jammu & Kashmir, India. Sood et al. (2017) studied the community non-participation factors in homestay scheme in Kullu and identified daily workload of women, lack of awareness/information, lack of finance, lack of institutional mechanisms, lack of skills and confidence, fear of loss of cultural values and safety concerns as key barriers.

In Uttarakhand, Gupta and Bhatt (2009) found that unawareness, perceived negative aspects of tourism, seasonality, lack of proper training and entrepreneurial skills hinder local community participation in tourism in Sari eco-village, near Tungnath. Bagri (2010) identified unawareness about governmental schemes, poor institutionalized mechanism, low education, poor entrepreneurial skills and poor infra-structural facilities limit residents' participation in tourism in two offbeat destinations of Uttarakhand. Thus, in the context of geographical remotes destinations, it is warranted to document the various barriers and their likely impact on host community participation in tourism development.

Geographic scope of the study

Situated in the northern part of India, Uttarakhand state shares the international border with Nepal and Tibet (China), and the national border with Himachal Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh. The state is commonly known as 'Land of Gods' (*Devbhoomi*) because of having its association with Hindu Gods and Goddesses. This multi-destination state offers a variety of tourism products including religious Hindu pilgrimage shrines *Badrinath* and *Kedarnath*, Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve - the world heritage site, Jim Corbett National Park - the first national park of India, historic temples, heritage, nature, wildlife, yoga, meditation, peaks, forests, valleys, glaciers, rivers, flora and fauna. Both domestic and foreign tourists visit Uttarakhand and tourist inflow is steadily growing in the region. Agriculture, horticulture, tourism and power are the major sectors for generating revenue for the state. Since the majority of people resides in geographically disadvantaged areas, Uttarakhand has concentrated in tourism with a huge importance for the development of rural areas and improving the living standard of people. For the present research work, two emerging rural tourism destinations of Uttarakhand were identified. A brief description of these two destinations are given below:

Trijuginarayan

Located at an altitude of 1,980 meters, Trijuginarayan has been declared as a tourist village by Uttarakhand State Government considering its religious significance and natural surroundings. According to mythological books, it is believed that the marriage of Lord *Shiva* (one of the trinities of Hindu Gods) and Goddess *Parvati* (one of the forms of mother Goddess *Durga*) is solemnized here in *Treta-Yug* (it is believed that this period belongs to millions of years back when Lord *Rama* ruled India) in the presence of Lord *Vishnu* (one of the trinities of Hindu Gods). Because of this, Lord *Vishnu* is being worshipped here constantly throughout three *yugs* (eons), thus it is named Trijuginarayan. Pahari-Partihar architecture style of temples indicates the rich constructed heritage of Garhwal region. This destination offers a variety of tourism products including historical temple, architectural aspects, lakes and caves, 360° view of Himalayan peaks, dense forests with rich diversity of flora & fauna, purified water rivulets & springs, Mandakini river valley, trekking trail, rock-climbing, rappelling, paragliding, bird-watching, nature photography and cycle safari (Bagri & Kala, 2015).

Table 1
Distance from major places (in Kms)

Places	Trijuginarayan	Koti-Kanasar, Indroli, Pattayur tourism circuit
New Delhi (national capital)	481	366
Dehradun (state capital)	259	112
Nearest airport (Dehradun)	233	140
Nearest railway station	216 (Rishikesh)	112 (Dehradun)

Table 2
Number of tourist arrivals

Year	Uttarakhand	Trijuginarayan	Koti-Kanasar, Indroli, Pattayur circuit
2011	26,070,907	7,940	49,338
2012	26,963,679	8,557	52,037
2013*	20,038,811	7,584	21,574
2014	22,093,281	8,912	36,672
2015	29,602,820	9,411	48,590
2016	30,622,469	NA	NA

Source: Annual Reports (2011-2016) Ministry of Tourism, Govt. of India & Uttarakhand Tourism Development Board.
*Kedarnath natural disaster in Uttarakhand.

Figure 1
Map of India, Uttarakhand and survey destinations



Source: Google Maps.

Koti Kanasar, Indroli, Pattiya tourism circuit

Considering the enormous potential for rural tourism, Koti Kanasar, Indroli, Pattiya tourism circuit has been identified by Ministry of Tourism, Government of India as an emerging destination for eco-tourism promotion. Koti-Kanasar is known for the oldest and thickest deodar (*Cedrus deodara*) trees of the Asian subcontinent. Indroli village has two famous Hindu temples: *Mahakali* (dedicated to Hindu Goddess *Durga*) and *Mahasu* (dedicated to a Hindu deity Lord *Shiva*). Located at an altitude of 2100 meters, Pattiya is the most distant located village. *Jaunsaris* - a local tribe of this region - claim to be the descendants of *Pandavas* of the *Mahabharat* period i.e. 1200BC to 1000BC as suggested by archaeologists. Historical temples, old architectural aspects, lush green mountain meadows, dense forests, rich diversity of flora & fauna, snow-skiing, trekking and camping, adventure sports and nature-based recreational activities, eco walks, bird-watching, rock climbing, nature photography, organic farms, apple orchards, medicinal plant conservation area and simple villages maintaining an traditional way of life make this tourism circuit the continuous source of motivation for inquisitive globetrotters in the quest of enlightening experiences (Bagri & Kala, 2016).

Gauging the tourism potential, these destinations are growing gradually and people from neighbouring places and adjacent states have started to visit these unexplored sites (Table 2). These destinations are matchless in their natural backgrounds, possess all the merits to entice tourists and potential to compete with other mountainous destinations successfully. Present tourism destinations require the involvement of locals and mutually acceptable policies in order to consolidate their apathy or involvement stage of the destination life cycle.

Methodology

A qualitative research method was employed as researchers focused more on explanation than measurement of phenomena or quantitative generalisations. Qualitative methods are helpful when utilizing numerous sources of evidence to investigate the contextual dimensions of complex issues in real-life circumstances and when the target group can be reached easily in their abode. Several trips to research sites were made and held some meetings with local community members which helped researchers to realize the factors of community non-participation in tourism development. Thus, a list of questions was prepared around the study theme for the interview script. The study employed in-depth interviews, qualitative questionnaires and observations for collecting primary data. Data were gathered in two phases: the first slot of data was collected in March-June 2013 (For Koti-Kanasar, Indroli, Pattayur circuit) and the second slot in March-June 2015 (for Trijuginarayan). The research team was included four researchers to ensure two members were at each interview. All researchers were qualified and experienced in conducting interviews and analysing qualitative data. Participants selected for the study were identified using purposive and snowball sampling method. First, the chief villager (*Pradhan*) recommended prospective participants. Then, the first participant suggested the next participant and so on. In total, 36 in-depth interviews were completed. During sample selection, an effort was made to incorporate observations of a cross-section of the community i.e. members of different age, sexual category, professions, and income to assess diverse viewpoints, understanding, and importance regarding tourism development.

Each interview was 30-45 minutes in length. Some interviews were recorded with the consent and later transcribed, whereas other interviews were limited to researcher notes. Interviewees preferred to speak in Hindi/*Garhwali* as it is a local dialect used in their daily lives. Collecting responses in the native language encouraged participants to express themselves more responsively and ensured the richness and authenticity of data. Team also listened for additional local residents during in-depth interviews. For internal consistency, interview responses were translated into the English language and verified by the language educators. Themes, sub-themes, and quotes were analysed to accomplish research objectives of the study. Some statements were presented directly from interviews while others were gathered from researcher notes using a best effort to get the exact wording correct. For the validity, multiple researchers present during an interview and discussion jotted down their notes independently, then deliberated and combined the data. This was often done hours after interviews or by the end of the day. These data were also shared with study participants for achieving construct validity. Reliability was attained using an interview script and data with field notes.

Findings

The findings indicate that only a handful elite community members are invited by tourism development authorities to participate in decision-making. The majority of local people are simply left out of the consultation and decision-making process. However, residents expressed that they should be included

in this process for the welfare of their communities. One respondent of Koti-Kanasar village stated, *"I want to safeguard nature water springs and forest in my locality as these resources offer us products and food to sell and consume...I am enthusiastic to take part in tourism as it empowers me to look after the natural resources in my village and lets me familiarize about environmental conservation."* Despite the awareness and readiness, community members in these destinations do not enthusiastically contribute to tourism activities. Based on interviews, researchers identified four categories of barriers for explaining the community non-participation in tourism development in the study areas.

Category one: practical barriers

Tourism by chance, not by choice

A variety of tourism products, favourable tourist inflows, positive perception and tourists' willingness to enjoy tourism offers entice locals to involve in the tourism business. Local people are not in the business of tourism by choice, but by chance. This involuntary involvement in tourism made locals participate less in tourism development. According to a resident from Koti village, *"to get the local people here to participate in any form of tourism is very hard. This is mostly because we didn't choose tourism, tourism chose us, and it has been a challenge for us to adapt to this rapid transformation since tourism is an irresponsibly unorganised sector. Moreover, there is hardly any presence of formal organizations for involving locals in tourism. Tourism planners do not really exist here and the government authorities support local participation only to the minimal extent."* One resident of Trijuginarayan shared that they are inadvertently involved in tourism. They have limited requirements and tourism is fulfilling all. They never thought of earning more from tourism.

Lack of knowledge

Communities located in remote locations are often unaware of tourism benefits. This lack of tourism awareness arguably prevents the effectiveness of community participation in development processes but also host communities' capacity to fulfill the expectations of visitors. A local of Trijuginarayan said that the community still looks at tourism from a tourist's perspective rather than on being the custodian of nature and ecosystem. Opportunities are available to us to operate accommodation, transport services, tour guiding, eateries and restaurants, entertainment, and souvenir emporiums, which are not optimally exploited because no one from us is even aware of their economic importance. Another member added, *"...the level of tourism awareness is very low. The only thing we know about tourism is that tourists will come to the destination and leave the money behind. Out of 100%, I would say only 2% of local people have a clear knowledge of what tourism is all about; we do not understand that tourism is more than just tourists and money."* In distant villages like Pattiyur, interviewees who already involved in tourism business by operating eateries were also unaware of the concept of tourism. Locals shared their willingness to participate in tourism development but said they are unaware of the concept. They expressed that a low level of awareness about tourism is the major contributor to the apparent lack of interest from the community. They also felt that local authorities should organize awareness sessions in villages.

Low education

Participants expressed that poor education background of local community makes them incapable to take tourism profession related-decisions on their own and even make them incompetent to understand the objectives of tourism-related training programs. Some of the participants believe that decisions made by authorities are imposed on local community due to the poor educational background. Participants

deliberated that even a mere discussion with residents is by itself sufficient and appropriate. One participant stated, "...*decision-makers always abstain us because they think we cannot contribute. We all know the reason for this behaviour. It's all about our poor educational background.*" Low education makes them unwilling to contribute to and takes responsibility for any facets of tourism development. A respondent of Indroli village added, "...*I want to be a tour guide. Sadly, I have poor communication skills and do not know how to speak the English language. So I am not confident whether I can take this as my profession.*"

The local people in Uttarakhand are not professionally qualified enough to contribute to the decision-making process. They raised this issue due to the lack of tourism and hospitality-related professional courses in educational institutions. "...*Although many educational institutions are available in the region, these institutions are primarily offering traditional courses. Considering the potential of tourism and hospitality sector in the state, these institutions should offer short duration professional courses in hotel and restaurant operations management, business communication...*" added by a resident of Trijugarayan.

Category two: socio-cultural barriers

Poor living conditions

The majority of inhabitants in both the destinations have been deprived of living requirements. Most of the residents involved in agri-business and pastoralism for their livelihood. Some male members migrate to nearby towns for low-level jobs. Though they wish to invest and involve in tourism-related activities such as accommodation, homestay services, eateries, tour guiding or tour escorting, it is a little difficult for residents to start without the financial help of concerned authorities. The limited financial capacity of locals discourages them to commence entrepreneurial ventures. One participant commented, "*You know our tough daily lives and poor financial situation. In this harsh living conditions, it is nearly impossible for us to become entrepreneurs. If I had money and pleasant living conditions, I would have owned a small tourism venture instead.*" Another participant added that he wants to manufacture and sell souvenirs to visitors, but he doesn't have adequate economic resources to materialize this idea. "*As you know, capital is needed to establish an income-generating tourism venture. This is why the majority of us are incapable to start tourism business, it's not that we don't prefer!*" added by a local of Trijugarayan.

Busy daily routine

Many participants appraised of their busy routine for agriculture, pastoralism, childcare and household cleanliness, it deprived of their participation in prescribed training of skill development courses. People do not have time to rush to tourism business and even participate in similar kinds of activities. They cannot leave their primary and traditional sources of income. Cornwall (2008) pointed out that self-elimination may be a logical option when individuals observe that participation in such initiatives is time-consuming. One respondent said, "*I realized it tough to arrange my time to participate in tourism-related activities. Every day, I have to wake up early for agricultural work in my fields. I also give some time to look after my cattle. When I return home, it seems too late ... I have to perform my household tasks too...I wish I had extra time for tourism development initiatives.*" In the same line, another interviewee commented, "*Everybody imagines about tourism business, he or she wastes his or her available time and efforts doing tourism activities. They don't go to their agricultural fields. So who will perform these important life-sustaining activities? I think that the whole aspect of tourism planning and development should be in the hands of our government officials.*" Consistent with the findings of Kayat (2002) and Dogra and Gupta (2012), local people and full-time employed individuals of these destinations are reluctant to involve in tourism showing their apprehension about the adverse impact of involvement on their primary livelihoods.

Passive role of women

Women are the backbone of this mountainous state. Women generally perform all kinds of activities from agriculture to household, from small business to pastoralism. These are difficult and time-consuming activities. Comparatively, women in the hilly regions are much stronger and very much associated with natural resources, as they visit the mountains regularly to gather timber and fodder. Thus, they play a strong role, especially in protest. Community members expressed that the involvement of women is still poor in the decision-making. Acknowledging this statement, a respondent stated, *"Traditionally, only the men are decision-makers in a family and in society. Women participation in decision-making is very poor and usually unacceptable. It will take time to overcome this traditionally inherent element of this society.* The strong male-dominating culture prevailing in developing societies has been the main problem to involve women in the decision-making. Poor educational background of the community and particularly of women is the main reason behind their non-participation. Women are often disqualified from meetings. A female participant stated, *"There was a meeting in our village, but only male members of the village were called. We were not asked to attend the meeting..."* However, few participants also illustrated that education and entrepreneurial prospects are some of the motivating elements for changing the outdated patriarchal mindset. A male respondent expressed, *"Government is promoting women education and providing employment opportunities to them. These initiatives will make women educated and self-employed. This will also develop the ability to stand on her own and take decisions herself. Society is in a transition phase and has realized the significance of women in a society."*

Category three: apprehension barriers

Perceiving tourism seasonality

Seasonality of tourist visitation and limited income generation are other important factors that affect locals' participation. Community members expressed their dissatisfaction with the extent of earnings generated particularly in rainy and winter seasons in which visitors hardly travel. A local resident of Trijuginarayan shared, *"I used to run a small eatery in the village. My customers were tourists only. They were coming here only for 4-5 months and the numbers were not encouraging, even in the peak season. How could I survive and look after my family with this seasonal business?"* The experiences of local people exhibited a negative appreciation of tourism as a means of monetary activities in these rural destinations. A local resident of Indroli village added, *"I could earn only a little money by selling souvenir for travellers, mainly in the summer season which is insufficient for my household expenditures... Therefore, I discontinue my involvement in tourism-related activities... I put my efforts in performing other activities that produce more money for me and my family."* Interestingly, one respondent shared that the fear of commonness is his apprehension of being involved in the tourism development. He added, *"...tourism business is not profitable anymore as more individuals will employ in the similar business."*

Lack of expertise

There is a common saying that the rural people are not benefited from tourism-related schemes due to lack of industry awareness and business expertise. Since seasonality is a major drawback of the tourism business, rural people have no choice except to abandon the plan of joining the tourism industry due to lack of other means for their livelihood. One participant pointed out, *"We have poor educational qualifications and no distinctive abilities, so how can we take the advantage of tourism?"* Another respondent expressed, *"We want to generate more income from tourism-related occupations but we have no knowledge what is the suitable method to do it. We do not possess any professional skills; we can only contribute our labour... We, people without adequate skills, just do not matter in the participation in tourism initiatives."*

These comments reveal that poor professional attitudes and lack of expertise of community members are enough for non-participatory tourism development in this mountainous state. People are hesitant about their abilities as prospective tourism entrepreneurs and they are not confident if they would be able to meet the requirements of tourists from urban areas. Although tourism business has low entry barriers in terms of monetary resources and required skills, respondents' apparent lack of expertise, confidence and exposure act as high entry barriers.

Perceived negative impacts

Community perceives that tourism brings social, cultural, economic and environmental impacts in both favourable and unfavourable directions. However, a majority of residents have serious apprehensions about its adverse aspects. A participant of Koti-Kanasar circuit raised his concern about the erosion of socio-cultural values once tourism development will take place. Local traditions and cultural milieu of the ancestral villages may worsen. Participants also have the reservation on the increased flow of visitors would increase the cost of living. A few participants were afraid of reduction of agricultural outputs and increase the cost of living if tourism infrastructure facilities would be constructed on the fertile agricultural land. Matured community members also opine that the young generation may lose their customs and traditions by observing tourists' behaviour. Participants pointed out other concerns such as traffic congestion, overcrowding, pollution, increasing waste, construction of concrete structures, changing the rural landscape, disturbance and devastation of wellconserved vegetation and wildlife. The perceived negative impacts also discourage locals to promote and participate in tourism development.

Category four: institutional barriers

Power disparities

The local community believed that tourism development authorities have the capacity to propose and develop tourism-related activities without their active participation and support. Conversely, some participants expressed that they are not given the equal chances to make decisions on tourism-related initiatives because of the poor background and limited abilities. Although they are encouraged to share their views and opinions, only a few selected members are invited to attend the programs and meetings. Locals perceive power disparities is one of the reasons for the poor participation in tourism development. One participant stated, *"I never got an opportunity to share my ideas and opinions regarding tourism development initiatives in my locality... I used to present my views when I participated the community meetings, but I sensed that officials didn't listen to me..."* Locals are only asked to monitor and update concerned authorities about ongoing tourism activities. They also felt debarred and uncertain that any of their opinions would be deliberated in forthcoming development policies in their villages. A disheartened participant shared, *"...tourism officials have a better understanding of tourism planning and development ... I am not willing to involve, mainly in the community meetings or discussion forum... well... actually, I am not a strong or influential community member so I am not asked at all... my views and suggestions will hardly be given any weight in the designing action plan for tourism development anyway. Why should I worry?"* This indicates that the community felt skeptical to contribute to the consultation activities. Participants expressed that there exists a communication gap between community and tourism planners responsible to increase the level of distrust among them. In addition, poor tourism infrastructure, the clash of harvest and tourism seasons, poor networking skills and inadequate coordination between private tourism providers and locals were also highlighted by participants, which inhibit residents to involve in tourism development.

Discussion

This qualitative investigation examined and debated the barriers of community participation in the tourism planning and development in two emerging destinations. The four main broad constraints that emerged in the present study, as perceived by the community members, relate to practical, socio-cultural, apprehensions and institutional. Remarkably, these barriers are not specific to participatory tourism development strategy, but related to and/or an extension of the prevalent economic, socio-cultural and political framework in developing regions, which have impeded them from achieving a sophisticated level of progress. Mirroring the findings of Tosun (2000), this study advocates that abolition of these obstacles to participatory tourism development approach essentially depends upon diminishing usual difficulties of emerging destinations. Since there are no mandatory guidelines to operationalise community-based participatory tourism development, the active participation can be attained with specific and deliberate strategies framed at the village and local level considering the barriers identified in the study.

Most participants considered tourism as a relatively unwelcome sector. They expressed that although destinations have tourism potential they can't take the advantage of the industry due to lack of operational skills as well as the poor educational background. The communication gap between tourism-planners and community make local people less knowledgeable about tourism and related entrepreneurial opportunities it might offer. Similar to Cole (2006), Manyara and Jones (2007), Marzuki et al. (2012), Kim et al. (2014) and Saufi et al. (2014), authors believe that the lack of information not only restricts community responsiveness about tourism but also lessens their empowerment. Considering their poor educational and social background, local shared that they are not capable enough to share prompt decision and hence never invited into a discussion. This mirrors the findings of Aref (2011), Dogra and Gupta (2012), Kim et al. (2014), Saufi et al. (2014) and Sood et al. (2017). With agriculture and pastoralism as principal revenue sources, interviewees sensed that tourism might not be well-matched with their prevailing work pattern. The opportunity cost of tourism over agriculture is higher, this makes tourism less attractive to local residents. The current busy routine also discourages local involvement as harvest season coincides with peak tourist season. The present study admits that women in mountainous destinations already undertake the majority of the work, consequently insufficient time for tourism activities. Regardless of the different data collection locations, the involvement of female in tourism found insignificant.

Lack of skills and the poor professional attitudes adversely affect individual capabilities and business confidence echoing the outcomes of Kim et al. (2014), Saufi et al. (2014) and Sood et al. (2017). Many participants perceive that tourism business is seasonal in nature and having limited income opportunities. They have apprehensions for competition due to engagement in similar nature of tourism activities and thus low-income generation. The study proposes that choices to involve in tourism are contextual, and are affected by factors beyond simple financial benefits. In Uttarakhand, community decisions to take part in tourism are greatly affected by observed adverse outcomes of tourism on community traditions and values. Power structures among government departments and indifferent attitudes of government authorities are perceived as negatively influencing community participation supporting the findings of Jamal and Camargo's (2014) in Mexico, Saufi et al. (2014) in Indonesia and Bagri (2010) in India. The poor institutional framework further prevents social harmony among concerned departments and consequently promotes ambiguous and uneven tourism planning, inadequate attention to locals' involvement, implementation failure of tourism programs, and weak tourism guidelines. Government's emphasis on mass tourism apparently overlooks the opinions of local

individuals. Survey of tourist destinations and interaction with communities make it evident that very less work has been taken place for the improvement of tourism infrastructure, creating awareness and capacity building. Thus, residents have developed unconvinced perception that tourism is a vulnerable sector for future investment.

While considering emerging tourist destinations promotion only skill-based education can encourage locals to participate actively in tourism-related activities and minimise economic leakages. Capacity-building initiatives can develop the favourable attitude and increase the level of expertise. Tourism planners can organise skill development workshops, training sessions and seminars in order to develop and improve the business skills of the host community. The content of these programs should be professional, concentrating on specific job-related capabilities. Private tourism providers can also stimulate locals' participation in tourism by providing more access to them in their tourism activities. For instance, the communication between local people and tourists can take place, when more community-based activities in tour packages are offered by private tour operators. In such situations, residents can learn and understand the benefits of tourism activities such as homestay, tour guides, transport providers, etc. The establishment of tourist information centres in appropriate locations would assist communication with community members as well as with tourists.

Encouragement and engagement can be the appropriate ways to solve problems for prospective rural entrepreneurs. Collaboration with educational and financial organizations can help in motivating the tourism entrepreneurial initiatives from local residents. As UNWTO (2011) has acknowledged that tourism has the potential for women empowerment and promoting gender equality, women must be given priority in terms of education, training and engagement. Tosun (2000) observed that in developing countries like India, which are divided by class, political and gender issues, NGOs help is of immense significance in creating awareness, training, and providing finance/marketing support. In addition, tourism planners can employ techniques of community participation as suggested by Marien and Pizam (1997). In addition, six strategies for ensuring community participation as suggested by Bello et al. (2016) in the context of Malawi can also be employed. The present study also finds that government authorities neglect the role of the host community in tourism activities and this fosters the attitude that tourism is developed to benefit "outsiders" only. An institutional mechanism with greater stakeholder participation and above all, operationalization at the village level is definitely needed. This overall debate confirms that a complete transformation in the social, political, regulatory and economic structure of this mountainous state is required for participatory community-based tourism development.

Conclusion

Barriers to community participation affect not only residents' engagement but discourage them to involve in tourism-related decision-making even in the future. Local communities must be considered as the integral element of the tourism product. Tourism policymakers must avoid discrimination in the participatory approach and make sure the contribution of various stakeholders, including minorities and underprivileged sections, rather than just community leaders, elite and dominant interest groups. Participation in tourism develops a feeling of ownership among them, thereby making the implementation of policies more effective. It will empower local people and form a connection between tourism benefits and preservation. Government initiatives in terms of offering vocational training, workshops, capacity-building programs, information centres and financial support can transform community attitude favourably towards tourism development. Eliminating socio-cultural and apprehension barriers require a long educational process and flexibility. This orientation cannot be an overnight phenomenon;

it must be developed. Researchers suggest that the transformation in attitude and behaviour of and genuine collaboration from all stakeholders including state government, local tourism authorities, private tour operators, NGOs, and local communities are essential for sustainable and successful community-based tourism development.

References

- Anand, A., Chandan, P. & Singh, R. B. (2012). Homestays at Korzok: supplementing rural livelihoods and supporting green tourism in the Indian Himalayas. *Mountain Research and Development*, 32(2), 126-136.
- Aref, F. (2011). Barriers to community capacity building for tourism development in communities in Shiraz, Iran. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(3), 347-359.
- Bagri, S. C. & Kala, D. (2015). Tourists' satisfaction at Trijuginarayan, India: an importance-performance analysis. *Advances in Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 3(2), 89-115.
- Bagri, S. C. & Kala, D. (2016). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development and impacts in Koti-Kanasar, Indroli, Pattiur tourism circuit of Uttarakhand state, India. *PASOS Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, 14(1), 23-39.
- Bagri, S. C. (2010). *Identification and assessment of off-beat destination in Uttarakhand for community based ecotourism development & promotion*. Deutsche Gesellschaft Fur Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), German Technical Cooperation & Regional Economic Development.
- Bansal, S. P. & Kumar, J. (2013). Ecotourism for community development: a stakeholder's perspective in Great Himalayan National Park. In E. G. Carayannis (Ed.), *Creating a Sustainable Ecology Using Technology-Driven Solutions* (pp. 88-98). IGI Global.
- Bello, F. G., Lovelock, B. & Carr, N. (2016). Enhancing community participation in tourism planning associated with protected areas in developing countries: Lessons from Malawi. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*. Doi:10.1177/1467358416647763.
- Breugel, V. L. (2013). *Community-based tourism: local participation and perceived impact. A comparative study between two communities in Thailand*. Master Thesis. Nijmegen: Faculty of Social Sciences Radboud University.
- Burns, P. M. (2004). Tourism planning a third way? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(1), 24-27.
- Chaudhary, M. & Lama, R. (2014) Community based tourism development in Sikkim of India - a study of Darap and Pastanga villages. *Transnational Corporations Review*, 6(3), 228-237.
- Cole, S. (2006). Information and empowerment: The keys to achieving sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14(6), 629-644.
- Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking 'Participation': models, meanings and practices. *Community Development Journal*, 43(3), 269-283.
- Dogra, R. & Gupta, A. (2012). Barriers to community participation in tourism development: empirical evidence from a rural destination. *South Asian Journal of Tourism and Heritage*, 5(1), 129-142.
- Dyer, P., Gursoy, D., Sharma, B. & Carter, J. (2007). Structural modeling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Tourism Management*, 28(2), 409-422.
- Gupta, S. K. & Bhatt, V. (2009). Community based tourism development: A case study of eco village Sari in Kedarnath sanctuary region. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Systems*, 2(1), 136-148.
- Gurung, D. B. & Seeland, K. (2008). Ecotourism in Bhutan: extending its benefits to rural communities. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(2), 489-508.
- Idziak, W., Majewski, J. & Zmyślony, P. (2015). Community participation in sustainable rural tourism experience creation: a long-term appraisal and lessons from a thematic villages project in Poland. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(8/9), 1341-1362.
- Jamal, T. & Camargo, B. A. (2014). Sustainable tourism, justice and an ethic of care: Toward the Just Destination. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22(1), 11-30.

- Kayat, K. (2002). Exploring factors influencing individual participation in community-based tourism: The case of Kampung relau homestay program, Malaysia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 7(2), 19-27.
- Khani, F. (2012). Participation of rural community and tourism development in Iran. *Community Development*, 43(2), 259-277.
- Kim, S., Park, E. & Phandanouvong, T. (2014). Barriers to local residents' participation in community-based tourism: Lessons from Houay Kaeng Village in Laos. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 12, 01045, 1-8.
- Kunjuraman, V. & Hussin, R. (2017). Challenges of community-based homestay programme in Sabah, Malaysia: Hopeful or hopeless? *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 21, 1-9.
- Lama, W. B., Jackson, R & Wangchuk, R. (2012). Snow leopards and Himalayan homestays: catalysts for community-based conservation in Ladakh. In N. Chettri, U. Sherchan, S. Chaudhary & B. Shakya (Eds.), *Mountain biodiversity conservation and management* (pp. 9-11). Working Paper 2012/2. Kathmandu, Nepal: International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development.
- Manyara, G. & 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), 628-644.
- Marien, C. & Pizam, A. (1997). Implementing sustainable development through citizen participation in the planning process. In S. Wahab & J. J. Pigram (Eds.), *Tourism development and growth: The challenge for sustainability* (pp. 164-178). London: Routledge.
- Marzuki, A., Hay, I. & James, J. (2012). Public participation shortcomings in tourism planning: the case of the Langkawi Islands, Malaysia. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(4), 585-602.
- Mbaiwa, J. (2005). The problems and prospects of sustainable tourism development in the Okavango Delta, Botswana. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 13(2), 203-227.
- Moscardo, G. (2011). Exploring social representations of tourism planning: Issues for governance. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4/5), 423-436.
- Murphy, P. E. (1985). *Tourism: A community approach*. London: Methuen.
- Mustapha, N. A., Azman, I. & Ibrahim, Y. (2013). Barriers to community participation in tourism development in Island destination. *Journal of Tourism, Hospitality & Culinary Arts*, 5(1), 102-124.
- Nepal, S. K. & Chipeniuk, R. (2005). Mountain tourism: toward a conceptual framework. *Tourism Geographies*, 7(3), 313-333.
- Nyaupane, G. P., Morais, D. B. & Dowler, L. (2006). The role of community involvement and number/type of visitors on tourism impacts: A controlled comparison of Annapurna, Nepal and Northwest Yunnan, China. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1373-1385.
- Pongponrat, K. (2011). Participatory management process in local tourism development: A case study on Fisherman village on Samui Island, Thailand. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 16(1), 57-73.
- Saufi, A. O'Brien, D. & Wilkins, H. (2014) Inhibitors to host community participation in sustainable tourism development in developing countries. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22(5), 801-820.
- Snyman, S. L. (2012). The role of tourism employment in poverty reduction and community perceptions of conservation and tourism in southern Africa. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(3), 395-416.
- Sood, J. Lynch, P. & Anastasiadou, C. (2017) Community non-participation in homestays in Kullu, Himachal Pradesh, India. *Tourism Management*, 60, 332-347.
- Stone, L. S. & Stone, T. M. (2011). Community-based tourism enterprises: challenges and prospects for community participation; Khama Rhino Sanctuary Trust, Botswana. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(1), 97-114.
- Stylidis, D., Biran, A., Sit, J. & Szivas, E.M. (2014). Residents' support for tourism development: the role of residents' place image and perceived tourism impacts. *Tourism Management*, 45, 260-274.
- Thapa, K. (2005). *Challenges and Opportunities of Village Tourism in Sirubari*. B.Sc. Thesis. Kathmandu: School of Environmental Management and Sustainable Development, Pokhara Univeristy.
- Tosun, C. (1999). Towards a typology of community participation in the tourism development process. *International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality*, 10, 113-134.

- 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. & Timothy, D. J. (2003). Arguments for community participation in tourism development. *Journal of Tourism Studies, 14*(2), 2-11.
- UNWTO. (2011). *Global report on women in tourism 2010*. Retrieved from http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/global_report_on_women_in_tourism_2010.pdf.
- Wang, H., Yang, Z., Chen, L., Yang, J. & Li, R. (2010). Minority community participation in tourism: A case of Kanas-Tuva villages in Xinjiang, China. *Tourism Management, 31*(6), 759-764.

Received: 26/03/2018

Accepted: 15/08/2018