

Andrea Giampiccoli / Oliver Mtapuri / Anna Dłużewska

Investigating the intersection between sustainable tourism and community-based tourism

Abstract

This paper interrogates the intersection between sustainable tourism (ST) and community-based tourism (CBT). It is a conceptual paper that unpacks the conceptualization of tourism and traces the emergence of sustainable tourism as one of the responses to conventional/mass tourism. The history of conventional tourism shows that, like any form of tourism, it has both positive and negative impacts on destinations. It is against this backdrop that CBT emerged. To achieve its aim, this article examined the main principles and attributes of CBT in CBT manuals and handbooks, focusing on two key concepts - sustainability and the environment. This examination revealed a significant mismatch in the conception of sustainability, while it is a fundamental requirement in tourism to tackle its negative environmental impacts. Environmental sustainability is considered more implicit in CBT, while it is often less regarded in conventional/mass tourism. We argue that the sustainability of tourism should be an intrinsic and universal principle of all forms of tourism that governments should enforce. The fact that conventional tourism produces most of the environmental damage, it is for this reason that it should elevate its role to become a solid promoter of sustainable measures for environmentally-friendly and sustainability-friendly practices instead.

Key words: sustainability; tourism; environment; sustainable tourism; community-based tourism

1. Introduction

In the last six decades, the tourism sector has continued to expand to assume the position of the fastest-growing sector of the economy in the world (Dłużewska & Rodzos, 2018). Besides, the tourism sector has proven to be resilient to the economic crisis and specific shocks such as terrorism attacks (Frangilli, 2005). It may seem surprising, but even in the face of natural disasters or terrorist attacks, the number of international tourists is not diminishing. Only the map of tourist destinations is changing. Tourism is also considered a strong incentive for other branches of the economy, such as construction, agriculture, or fisheries. Hence, many governments and supranational organizations perceive tourism as a positive phenomenon. For example, the United Nations General Assembly declared the year 2017 the International Year of Sustainable Tourism for Development. It was then recognized that tourism has the potential to be a "driver of development and peace, promoting the harmonious co-existence of people from all countries" (Beijing Declaration, 2016, p. 24). As such, it is a significant role and a big responsibility for the sector. Many authors (e.g., Mansfeld, 1992; Peake, 1989; Pizam, 1978; Tosun, 2002) consider tourism the contact of cultures, noting that the course of this contact is reflected both on the host community and on tourists. Despite the improvement in measurable indicators, tourism reduces the so-called subjective well-being in the receiving community (Dłużewska, 2019). This can be explained by changing the "reference" for comparison (Cummins & Nistico, 2002) or the so-called capacity to aspire (Appadurai, 2004). As a result, by comparing themselves with tourists, locals may

Andrea Giampiccoli, PhD, Durban University of Technology, Durban; South Africa; e-mail: andrea.giampiccoli@gmail.com

Oliver Mtapuri, PhD, Associate Professor, University of KwaZulu Natal, Durban, South Africa; e-mail: mtapurio@ukzn.ac.za

Anna Dłużewska, PhD, Associate Professor, Maria Curie Skłodowska University, Lublin, Poland; e-mail: dluzewska.a@gmail.com

feel worse off, more miserable and deprived. Eshun and Tichaawa (2020) argue that besides income and all other factors, local people are encouraged to preserve their culture in this global milieu, which erodes traditions.

Early literature on tourism concentrated on the economic aspects of tourism, and it was generally optimistic about tourism. However, tourism attractions are found in fragile environments and communities such that the environmental damage is greater than the economic benefits (Archer, Cooper & Ruhanen, 2005). Thus, in the 1990s, it was noted that people became more aware of the adverse social and environmental effects of tourism hitherto only benefits to the host countries were mentioned (Welford, Ytterhus, & Eligh, 1999). Today the positive and negative consequences and impacts of tourism are known (Archer et al., 2005; Dłużewska, 2009; Nagarjuna, 2015). It has also been noted that conventional/mass tourism does not function in redistributing resources in communities (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016). The tourism sector also continues to produce class and regional inequalities, fuelling economic, environmental, and social problems (Tosun, Timothy, & Öztürk, 2003). It is also recognized its impacts protrude to putting heavy pressure on culture and the environment (Dłużewska & Rodzos, 2018). These negative issues have cast doubt on tourism's reliability as a strategy for growth in developing countries (Tosun et al., 2003). Thus, alternative tourism concepts such as responsible tourism (RT), fair trade tourism (FTT), ecotourism (ET), and pro-poor tourism (PPT) have emerged over time (Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2014). Sustainable tourism also emerged as one of the alternatives to conventional/mass tourism to reduce the adverse effects of tourism to become "almost universally accepted as a desirable and politically appropriate approach to tourism development" (Hashemkhani Zolfani, Sedaghat, Maknoon, & Kazimieras Zavadskas, 2015, p. 1). In the context of developing countries where the main attractions are related to the natural environment, ecotourism was considered a panacea for all evil. By definition, it was perceived as the "good" and desired form of tourism, the opposite of "bad" mass tourism (Smith & Eadington 1992; Croall 1995). Instead, ecotourism can cause even more dysfunctions than the conventionally conceived mass tourism. First, it is based on ecosystems, and it is straightforward to break their balance (Duffy, 2013). Secondly, in many cases, ecotourism occurs in places without tourism infrastructure and, therefore, does not generate an economic function in the receiving destination (there is no possibility of leaving money). Consequently, it does not always help meet the social and economic needs of peripheral areas (d' Hauteserre & Funck, 2016). Lopes, Moreno Pires and Costa (2020) believe that because of the many pressures and challenges facing humanity at this time, tourism can be used to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals and sustainable transitions.

Community-based tourism also emerged through advocating for a new approach to tourism development with a narrative to counteract the negative impacts of mass tourism (Gadi Djou, Baiquni, Widodo, & Fandeli, 2017; López Guzmán, Sánchez-Cañizares, & Pavón 2011). Community-based tourism has been proposed "as a counterweight to neo-colonialism, neo-liberalism and conventional mass tourism" (Tolkach & King, 2015, p. 389), seemingly giving to it a more significant role, not just to 'fix' the current tourism sector but to restructure it against neo-colonial and neo-liberal forces. At the same time, these alternative forms of tourism do not represent the panacea to poverty and community development in needy communities (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016). CBT also allows for "dialogue" of host and guests, which seems to be the best solution from the perspective of "tourism as a contact of cultures" and that of "subjective well-being," and ask: "But do these alternatives offer viable responses and solutions to the existing problems as so many authors imply? Alternatively, are these new tourism practices further evidence of how the ebb and flow of tourism are conditioned and controlled from the First World?" (Mowforth & Munt, 2003, p. 54). New critiques are also emerging, focusing,

for instance, on ecotourism (Cohen & Cohen, 2012). Research on the relationship or comparison or establishing a correlation amongst alternative tourism forms can be found in various contexts (Dangi & Jamal, 2016; Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2014; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008; Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016; Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2015).

This article aims to investigate the relationship between sustainable tourism and CBT. It also takes the idea from Dangi and Jamal (2016), who did a similarly critical analysis of ST and CBT's relationship. This article will specifically focus on ST, as found in CBT handbooks/manuals/guidelines/standards. This is important as "Manuals/handbooks for CBT development are seen as more intrinsically linked to practical CBT development (at least surely this should be their aim)" (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2015, p. 29). Community-based tourism "handbooks/manuals/guidelines should serve as the guiding tools for CBT development. Anyone who aims to put CBT into practice needs to fully comprehend the underlying ideas, principles, and components of CBT. It is, therefore, imperative to analyze and gain a better understanding of the theoretical tools (the CBT handbooks/manuals/guidelines) that should guide CBT development" (Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2018, p. 759). This article does not undermine the value and relevance of other sustainability matters (social, cultural, and economic) but will focus on environmental sustainability. This is done by examining definitions and main principles/fundamentals/characteristics/attributes of CBT in CBT manuals/handbooks concerning two concepts: sustainability/sustainable and nature/environment. The focus on environmental sustainability is the concept of sustainability, which "has its origins in the environmentalism that grew to prominence in the 1970s" (Liu, 2003, p. 460). By the same token, although it got very quickly commodified and became part of the postmodern industry, the origins of CBT has also been traced back to the sustainable and ethnic tourisms of the 1970s (Ullán de la Rosa, Aledo Tur & García Andreu, 2019). This article presents the results of an investigation of ST matters as contained in CBT handbooks/manuals/guidelines. It is conceptual in nature as no new primary data was collected during its compilation.

2. Literature review

2.1. Conceptualising tourism

The concern over the relationship between tourism and the natural and social environments has promoted the debate and the proposition of alternative forms of tourism since the 1970s (Fennell, 2006; Luo, Brown, & Huang, 2015; Mihalic, 2016; Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2017). However, it is also important to notice that "the origins of alternative tourism in the 1960s counterculture movement have largely been forgotten" (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008, p. 346). This 1960s origin is relevant as it indicates the primary aim of alternative tourism based on the counterculture movement which strove to reject a consumer society and alternative tourism also strove to alter prevailing social relations and the question is: 'Is tourism a new kind of development strategy, or more powerfully, a prime force within a new range of international relations?' (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008, p. 346). The latter question takes us back to the introduction, where it was asked, "But do these alternatives offer viable responses and solutions to the existing problems as so many authors imply? Alternatively, are these new tourism practices further evidence of how the ebb and flow of tourism are conditioned and controlled from the First World?" (Mowforth & Munt, 2003, p. 54).

Definitions and terminology for alternative tourism are contentious (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008), and alternative tourism has been given different names (Mihalic, 2016). For instance, alternative tourism has to be named green, soft, quality, eco, responsible tourism, minimum impact tourism, ethical tourism, new tourism, low impacts tourism, special interest tourism, sustainable tourism and so on

(Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008; Welford et al., 1999). Alternative tourism has also been understood in different ways such "as a polarised opposite of and substitute for mass tourism; as the new niche markets arising due to the demands of 'new' consumers; and yet others speak of a transformation in all tourism towards more benign forms" (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008, p. 346). Two issues are proposed here, and it is argued they should be considered as part of the same problem: first "all of these new tourism concepts have been used, misused and to some extent usurped, and although there is a great deal of rhetoric surrounding sustainable tourism this is often not translated into useful action because endless theories regarding the concept have not been operationalized" (Welford et al., 1999, p. 166); secondly whatever names have been given to alternative tourism, it is proposed that all of them represent "an alternative to the mainstream mass tourism that has been becoming environmentally, socially, ethically and politically intolerable" (Mihalic, 2016, p. 461). One of the terms/concepts proposed as a type of alternative tourism is ST (Welford et al., 1999). Sustainable tourism came out as an approach meant to minimize the negative impact of mass tourism and it "aims for economic viability, local prosperity, employment quality, social equity, visitor fulfillment, local control, community well-being, cultural richness, physical integrity, biological diversity, resource efficiency, and environmental purity" (Sawat-suk, Gede Darmawijaya, Rachusanti, & Phaokrueng, 2018, p. 14). Nevertheless, within "tourism, there is a multitude of definitions for sustainability and sustainable development" (Liu, 2003, p. 460). Sustainability gives the tourism sector the "notion of limits and appropriate prioritisation as tourism becomes embedded in social and environmental contexts and not viewed merely as an economic phenomenon" (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008, p. 348).

It is fundamental to keep in mind in this article two main issues. First, the application of alternative tourism forms such as RT, ST, and other green operations or corporate social responsibility activities and programs, which are, in most cases, voluntary and industry self-regulated. For example, "the Federation of Tour Operators (FTO) – the umbrella organization for the largest tour operators in the UK – encourages suppliers to respect minimum wage legislation, to create corporate social responsibility and sustainable development structures in mainstream corporations, and to establish sustainability accreditation and award systems for suppliers" (Mitchell, 2010, p. 4, emphasis added). Similarly, in South Africa, "The Responsible Tourism Guidelines encourage tourism operators to grow their businesses while providing social and economic benefits to local communities and respecting the environment" (Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, 2003, p. 4, emphasis added). The word used is encourage, which is not legally binding but just an encouragement to do something. As such, in the South African context, it has been noted that "operators seem only to recognize the need to involve communities in ecotourism in terms of their public relations value. There was little commitment to supporting indigenous people's rights to benefit from their traditional lands and wildlife. Local communities must have the opportunity to be fully and actively involved in ecotourism" along all scale of community participation (Scheyvens, 2002, p. 72). While the use of the code of conduct and self-regulation can be encouraged, industry owners are more eager to use greywater when gardening or to give a donation to a turtle saving society than "to develop partnerships with the poor or to support the implementation of effective labour rights legislation [...] They may support token community tourism projects that assist a small number of people, rather than making long term changes so that their practices, including employment, training, and procurement, are more pro-poor" (Scheyvens, 2007, p. 140).

However, while few industries accept government regulation without fierce opposition, in tourism the responses by companies were somewhat at variance with the spirit of the regulation (Mowforth & Munt, 2003) and as reported from a study of "operators stated that national governments had some

responsibility, and nearly 60 percent of operators said that governments had total responsibility". This view was echoed by travel agents, carriers, and hotels. "This points to the need for some form of authorised regulation rather than voluntary self-regulation" (Mowforth & Munt, 2003, p. 206). In recent times, tourism companies claim to operate in a more sustainable manner such that companies were accepting that there is room for change (Mowforth et al., 2003). It remains to be seen if these changes really "affected the dominant mode of profit maximisation as a motive for and a means of operating within this context. Alternatively, has it simply served to preserve the existing social, economic, and political structures in which the problems of tourism identified by many authors over the last twenty years are inherent?" (Mowforth et al., 2003, p. 221).

2.2. Regulation and codes of conduct

Tourism industry regulations can come from governments, professional associations, international bodies, and industry, but regulation emanating from industry associations are used to illegal and unethical conduct than is government regulation (Mowforth et al., 2003). Tourism businesses tend to want to ward off government regulation and the influence of conservationists and environmentalists based on phrases such as 'business realities' 'Commercial practicalities,' 'the real world,' 'the need to keep the competitive edge,' (Mowforth et al., 2003, p. 221). Looked from another angle, Government involvement is necessary. For example, Government's role is vital for the promulgation of policy, empowerment and overall capacity building (Giampiccoli, Saayman, & Jugmohan, 2014) and Government inclusion is necessary for practical reasons first, the need to level the playing field cannot be done voluntarily; secondly, because self-regulation is voluntary there is a likelihood to revert to short term interests by private firms at the expense of the environment, and that may include a need for government-led planning strategies and management initiatives (Bramwell & Lane, 2010).

However, the Government is often constrained by the global context. The role of Governments regarding alternative tourism, self-regulation, code of conducts and other techniques while multifaceted, it remains arguably industry-friendly (see Mowforth, Charlton, & Munt, 2008 for a comprehensive exposition of matters about voluntary self-regulation, code of conduct). Tourism and CBT remain embedded in a global context today of neoliberalism and western-based tourism models (Bianchi, 2002; Saayman, & Giampiccoli, 2016). Thus, government priorities are often aligned with foreign actors and local elites at the disadvantage of local communities (Scheyvens, 2011). The Government's role is elucidated by de Kadt (1979), who argues that the Government sometimes represents the interests of specific groups within certain limits such that tourism policies may reflect the influence of dominant classes to reinforce existing socio-economic patterns.

It is relevant to mention that while various alternative tourism approaches exist, they are also constrained by the same self-regulatory framework through which CBT attempts to distinguish itself, thus, "PPT, RT and FFT are based on voluntary, self-regulating frameworks to adhere to their set of principles. Instead, CBT is not a self-regulating voluntary process, as it is a form of tourism with its own characteristics, challenges, problems, and potentials. CBT is not based on the voluntarism of the mainstream tourism sector but is a form of tourism that starts from within the community. It is not the mainstream tourism sector going to the community, but the community itself that owns and manages the tourism process" (Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2014, p. 1673).

2.3. Nomenclatures and terminology

The second issue to consider is related to the complexities of definitions and terminologies. The definition of each type of tourism is contested (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2019). For example, in Thailand,

CBT definitions and concepts are confusing and deserving of the development of a working definition (Boonratana, 2010). By the same token, for ST, it is observed that "there is a multitude of definitions for sustainability and sustainable development" (Liu, 2003, p. 460). It is also observed that terminology about alternative tourism is frequently "unclear and overlapping or, does not necessarily mean in reality what the term suggests what it indicates. Terminology can be used as camouflage and may contribute to the mismatch between theory (the terminology) and practice in alternative development approaches" (Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2014, p. 1668). Terms such as ET, green tourism, adventure tourism, ethnic tourism to mention some have "helped fragment the concept of alternative tourism into disparate and often meaningless lexicon subsets. Defining the concept of alternative tourism is important because of the relationship to basic problems of human society, including environmental destruction, inequalities of wealth, and irresponsible development" (Theobald, 2005, p. 76; on similar issues see Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2019, p. 24). For example, whether the venture is successful or a failure is also a subjective judgment call based on the associated interpretation of CBT and one's world-view and the specific interpretation and understanding of CBT can either emancipate disadvantaged communities or exploit them (Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2016). Also, discourses can be exploitative or emancipatory. This article supports tourism that is emancipatory in pursuit of social justice, empowerment, and self-reliance in communities.

2.4. Focusing on community-based tourism

For this article, the aim of CBT will be highlighted, taking into account its origins and definitions, leading to the exposition of its relationship to ST and sustainability, as elaborated in the next section. Literature amply supports that CBT has its roots and origins in the 1970s alternative development milieu (Cornelissen, 2005; Giampiccoli, 2015; Karim, Mohammad, & Serafino, 2012; Mitchell & Muckosy, 2008; Ruhui, 2007; Telfer, 2009; Zapata, Hall, Lindo, & Vanderschaeghe, 2011; see Giampiccoli, 2015 for a history of CBT) and is intended for disadvantaged community members incorporating matters such as empowerment, sustainability, social justice and self-reliance (Giampiccoli, 2015). Telfer (2009) well explains in that CBT developed in the 1970s when the focus was on alternative development paradigms which promoted issues of local participation, self-reliance, empowerment, and sustainability and protruded to research in CBT, ecotourism, indigenous tourism and the emancipation and empowerment of women via tourism.

Importantly, CBT is proposed explicitly for disadvantaged members in society (Tasci, Semrad, & Yilmaz, 2013). Communities in the margins are a crucial focus of CBT (Garraway, 2008; Giampiccoli et al., 2018). It is deliberate that CBT was associated with terms like remote, rural, impoverished, undeveloped, marginalized economically depressed, poor, and small towns (Tasci et al., 2013). A CBT handbook explicitly links CBT, disadvantaged people, and other alternative development matters when proposing that "CBST [community-based sustainable tourism] primarily utilizes marginalized sectors of society to attain social justice and equity" (Jealous, 1998, p. 10).

While it is not the aim of this article to enter into this debate, it must be recognized that the concept of "disadvantaged/poor" people is, however, complex for which equally debates are active. However, and importantly, it is supported that poverty should not be understood exclusively as associated with the inadequacy of income and human development but should take power, voice, and representation into account (Zhao & Ritchie, 2007). By the same token, community development must be understood in an all-inclusive perspective, not just statistical poverty data. Community-based tourism should aim for the empowerment and sustainability of underprivileged communities (Tasci et al., 2013). On the same line and, arguably, part of the same general picture is that also tourism must be holistically

understood, as its footprint should be measured in terms of both its economic value and pressure on both the nature and culture in host nations (Dłużewska & Rodzos, 2018).

Thus, while there are communities in poverty, and could consider community-based ecotourism (CBET) for community development, this does not mean that tourism is good for all destinations and is not the only solution for contexts in poverty (Garraway, 2008). Thus, despite CBT is growing in popularity (Mearns & Lukhele, 2015), it "should not be regarded as a perfect, pre-packaged solution to community problems. CBT is neither a miracle cure nor a knight in shining armour that will gallop into rescue communities from all their troubles. If carelessly applied, CBT can create problems and even bring disaster upon the community" (Suansri, 2003, p. 7). This implies that there is no one size fits all solutions to complex challenges of poverty and inequality. These complex challenges are context-specific with an associated history. Understanding the context and unpacking the history may yield insights useful for framing appropriate responses to community development issues holistically.

Going back to the definitional complexities, it is noted that sustainability can also be a highly contested issue within the definition of CBT, which is also contested. For example, "the term CBT is commonly used in South Africa; the definition is contested and means different things to different people. The lack of consensus seems to stem from whether the community owns and/or manages the tourism venture or facilities and whether the focus is on the provision of jobs for local people, or issues of community involvement in decision-making and sustainability of those projects" (Strydom, Mangope, & Henama, 2019, p. 9, emphasis added). However, Strydom et al. (2019) view that many authors have accepted a broad definition of CBT whereby local people have substantial ownership, influence, and decision-making power concerning community-based enterprises through which they provide their services to tourists. Community-based tourism projects remain within a western-based approach to tourism development, in which local communities understand "tourism and tourists" through western eyes at the expense of the community perspective (Sammy, 2008, p. 76). Some communities may view tourists as bringers of income, while others may view them as intruders into their ecosystem.

Issues of local control, ownership, and management by the local community are fundamental to CBT and are equally and heavily debated in the literature. Community-based tourism has put forward as having two types, top-down and bottom-up, arguing that the top-down approach is supported by international organizations but has produced negative effects while the bottom-up approach has produced better outcomes (Zapata et al., 2011). Again, CBT distinguishes itself from the top-down approach by emphasizing local control and input concerning the scale of the tourism operations such that communities can manage tourism developments based on their own priorities and requirements (Johnson, 2010). Based on extant literature, two main trajectories of CBT have been proposed, the first aims to promote a tourism that ensures the community's involvement in the profitable tourism industry, therefore, remaining within a neo-colonial and neoliberal context. In contrast, the second trajectory "is to develop the community through tourism" with communities as owners, beneficiaries and managers of their own ventures whose success is self-defined (Mayaka, Croy, & Wolfram Cox, 2019, p. 178). Similarly to the previous proposition (Mayaka et al., 2019, p. 178), this article also supports that "CBT fits within this second trajectory where its values extend beyond economics". CBT denotes a type of tourism that is "managed and controlled by the community" (Leksakundilok & Hirsch, 2008, p. 214). Other definitions and conceptualizations in the literature follow similar lines. Thus CBT is a venture conceived, planned, developed, owned, managed, run and organized by the community for the enjoyment of the broader economic benefits by the community in a given territory through collective decision making (Nataraja & Devidasan, 2014; Johnson, 2010; Kayat, 2014; Kaur, Jawaid & Othman, 2016; Tasci et al., 2013; Terencia, 2018).

To be precise about some variation in the use of terms – especially that which is relevant about environmental sustainability, "Tourism managed by the community is called "community-based tourism". If that CBT is managed alongside the application of ecotourism concepts, then called "community-based ecotourism" (Leksakundilok, 2004, p. 33). Community-based tourism should also be considered in its progression to re-configure the tourism sector on a global scale (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016; Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2016). In this context, where CBT is envisaged as a global player and global transformative agent of tourism, issues related to sustainability increase their relevance with the potential for making a global impact. The practice of CBT should be transboundary (cutting across urban and rural divides); trans-vocational (cutting across various vocations, talents, abilities, and callings), and transdisciplinary, multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary and incorporating Big History – for the transversal of knowledge for the common good.

3. Discussion: The relationship between CBT and ST

Concerning ST and CBT, it is acknowledged that "While the discourse of sustainable tourism (ST) is oriented towards long-term sustainability, the literature on community-based tourism looks towards local-level responsibilities and practices of tourism development and management" (Dangi & Jamal, 2016, p. 1). However, Dangi and Jamal (2016) also observe that sustainability and "community" well-being are essential for both ST and CBT and represent the common denominator between the two.

While there are different interpretations and understandings of CBT, communities' participation and the benefits accruing to communities, including sustainability, are also proposed principles (Vietnam's Responsible Tourism Programme [ESRT] & WWF Vietnam, 2013). From an Asia/Pacific perspective, the link between CBT and sustainability and the environment is documented as a way of preserving the biodiversity linked to livelihoods, poverty reduction and sustainability in Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) developing countries (Asker, Boronyak, Carrard, & Paddon, 2010). Along similar lines, Sawatsuk et al. (2018, p. 14) characterised CBT as "a form of sustainable tourism to turn greedy tourism to green tourism". Community-based tourism is also included in the document Tourism and the Sustainable Development Goals – Journey to 2030 (United Nations World Tourism Organization [UNWTO] & United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], 2017), directing future tourism development within ecotourism and CBT framework (at least for Jamaica). For instance, The Jamaican Roadmap for sustainable development goals implements the document Tourism and the Sustainable Development Goals – Journey to 2030 writes: "The Roadmap discusses the challenges of tourism, its impact on the environment and the opportunity to refocus the tourism offer from a mass, low-cost model, towards a more sustainable model. In this context, the Roadmap underlines the value of investments in protected areas to the diversification of Jamaica's tourism product through ecotourism and community-based tourism" (UNWTO & UNDP, 2017, p. 34).

The terms 'sustainable' and 'CBT' have been put together to form "Sustainable CBT" to enhance the visitor experience while minimizing damage to the environment and culture and contributing to economic growth (Strydom et al., 2019). When CBT is linked to ET, it forms CBET also to show specific differences amongst the terms when "The term "community-based ecotourism" is used to designate ecotourism ventures that are characterized by high environmental attentions, increased control and participation of the local residents, as well as significant benefits for the host community. This notion is clearly distinguished from other ecotourism ventures that are mainly or even totally planned and managed by external operators and generate insignificant benefits for local people" (Manu & Kuuder, 2012). Thus, specific terminologies can also serve (at least on paper) to reinforce and properly distinguish others so, "Additional terms like community based sustainable tourism

(CBST), community-based mountain tourism (CBMT) or community-based ecotourism (CBET)" (Häusler & Strasdas, 2003, p. 3) each add a specific word ('sustainable,' 'mountain,' 'eco') to CBT giving to each type of CBT a specific context or aim. Thus, the link between CBT and sustainability and/or environmental issues using the term CBET can be seen, for example, when insinuating CBET that promotes sustainability and collective responsibility (Denman, 2001, p. 2). In the term CBET "ecotourism represents the ecology and nature/the environment, while CBT represents the social and economic aspects of community well-being" (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2019, p. 30). Various authors explain other differences in their own understanding. For example, Dixey, (n.d., p. 4) argues that CBT emphasises community participation and a CBT that promises to "delivers net socio-economic and/or environmental benefits is considered a form of tourism that falls under the umbrella of the leading paradigms of pro-poor tourism, responsible and sustainable tourism". Other researches, notably, Saayman et al., (2016) and Giampiccoli and Saayman (2014) argue for the existence of substantial differences between CBT on one side and PPT and responsible tourism on the other. They argue that CBT is the one that is counteracting conventional/mass tourism embedded in the neoliberal framework, while PPT and responsible tourism are embedded and working with/within the conventional/mass tourism in a neoliberal framework. The argument is that the foundations of CBT and PPT are different, and the philosophies that underpin them are also different. While CBT supports social justice and equity, PPT is paternalistic and is practiced at the mercy of the privileged class whose main preoccupation is profit and assigning the leftovers to PPT.

Community-based tourism manuals/handbooks can be explicit in linking sustainability and/or environmental issues with CBT. A CBT handbook published in 1998 asserts, "The idea of sustainable tourism development – tourism which meets present needs while protecting and enhancing opportunities for the future – has been around since the 1980s. Added to this is the most recent idea that sustainable tourism should also be community-based, giving full and fair participation to local people throughout the tourism planning and development process" (Jealous, 1998, p. 2, emphasis in original). Other CBT manuals also present various associations between CBT and sustainability and/or environmental issues. It reads: "Adopting good practice in Community Based Tourism contributes to each of the 'three pillars of sustainability' delivering social, environmental and economic benefits [...] That is, effective Community-Based Tourism can address social needs, contribute to building a more sustainable environment, and be commercially viable" (Asker et al., 2010, p. 1). The Community-based tourism standard handbook (Suansri & Yeejaw-haw, 2013) from Thailand proposes 'The Goal of the CBT Standard' considers CBT as a tool for sustainable destination management with community participation. While on the one hand, Suansri (2003) links CBT to environmental conservation, on the other, there is a strong argument for a more comprehensive CBET term that includes environmental matters as there is a nil/low significance of environmental sustainability in the term CBT (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2019). This could increase the variety of understandings and associations (and arguably the clarity) between various forms of alternative tourism. A CBT manual (Asker et al., 2010, p. 2) suggests that "Typically Sustainable Tourism, Community Based Tourism, Rural tourism, and Ecotourism have similar objectives".

The Operational Guidelines for Community-Based Tourism in South Africa (OGCBTSA) goes a step further and links CBT with sustainability and environmental issues and also reinforces the role of CBT in sustainability by positing that "All tourism has some impacts on the environment – it is unavoidable – but CBT ventures take steps to prevent and reduce negative impacts" (NDT, 2016, p. 16, emphasis added). This inadvertently transfers sustainability issues onto the shoulders of CBT while decreasing responsibility on sustainability from other types of tourism, including conventional/mass tourism. Thus, research on the NDT (2016) document proposes notes:

The findings propose that the OGCBTSA is mostly not aligned with the fundamental principle of CBT as proposed in the literature. Various issues presented in the CBT framework remain weak and often not necessary in the definitions and models of CBT proposed by the OGCBTSA. In this context, this article indicates that the definitions and models of CBT in the OGCBTSA mostly lean towards the neoliberal approach whereby private companies can gain relevance and take on leading roles in CBT (Giampiccoli et al., 2018, p. 767).

As such, an examination of the results of Table 1 and Table 2 gives an indication of the presence of sustainability and environmental terms in CBT definitions and main principles in CBT manuals/handbooks.

Table 1
Presence of the terms sustainability and/or natural environment in CBT definitions in CBT manuals/handbooks/guidelines

CBT manuals/handbook	CBT definitions	Sustainability	Natural environment
Community-based tourism (CBT)			
Effective community based tourism: a best practice manual. (Asker et al., 2010, p. 2).	CBT is commonly understood to be managed and owned by the community, for the community. It is a form of 'local' tourism, favouring local service providers and suppliers and focused on interpreting and communicating the local culture and environment.	X	X
ASEAN Community Based Tourism Standard. (Association of Southeast Asian Nations [ASEAN], 2016, p. 2).	Community Based Tourism (CBT) is tourism activity, community owned and operated, and managed or coordinated at the community level that contributes to the well-being of communities through supporting sustainable livelihoods and protecting valued socio-cultural traditions and natural and cultural heritage resources.	√	√
Community Based Tourism Standards in Cambodia. (Netherlands Development Organisation [SNV] & Cambodia Community-Based Ecotourism Network [CCBEN], 2009, p. 3)..	Community Based Tourism (CBT) is a form of tourism owned and managed by community in collaboration with other stakeholders in order to enhance: local well-being; natural and cultural resource conservation; host and guest interaction and education.	X	√
Operational Guidelines for Community-Based Tourism in South Africa. (National Department of Tourism [NDT], 2016, p. 5).	Community-based tourism refers to any tourism business or activity that is located within a community, it may either be privately owned or managed or operated with the involvement of the local community members. It should be able create community linkages and adhere to responsible tourism ¹ practices that take environmental, social and cultural sustainability into account.	√	√
Community Based Tourism Handbook. (Suansri, 2003, p. 14).	CBT is tourism that takes environmental, social, and cultural sustainability into account. It is managed and owned by the community, for the community, with the purpose of enabling visitors to increase their awareness and learn about the community and local ways of life	√	√
Community-based tourism for conservation and development: a resource kit. (The Mountain Institute, 2000, p. 1).	Community-based Tourism is a visitor-host interaction that has meaningful participation by both, and generates economic and conservation benefits for local communities and environments.	X	√
A toolkit for monitoring and managing community-based tourism. (Twining-Ward, Jamieson, Noakes, & Day, 2007, p. 9).	Community-based tourism (CBT) is a type of sustainable tourism that promotes pro-poor strategies in a community setting. CBT initiatives aim to involve local residents in the running and management of small tourism projects as a means of alleviating poverty and providing an alternative income source for community members. CBT initiatives also encourage respect for local traditions and culture as well as for natural heritage.	√	√

Table 1 Continued

Handbook on community based tourism "How to develop and sustain CBT". (Hamzah & Khalifah, 2009, p. 4).	Community based tourism (CBT) is a community development tool that strengthens the ability of rural communities to manage tourism resources while ensuring the local community's participation. CBT can help the local community in generating income, diversifying the local economy, preserving culture, conserving the environment and providing educational opportunities.	X	√
Training Manual for Community-Based Tourism. (Häusler & Strasdas, 2003, p. 3).	CBT is a form of tourism in which a significant number of local people has substantial control over, and involvement in its development and management. The major proportion of the benefits remains within the local economy.	X	X
Vietnam community based tourism handbook: a market-based approach. (Vietnam's Responsible Tourism Programme [ESRT] & WWF Vietnam, 2013, p. 5)..	CBT provides visitors with an experience of local life, in which local communities are directly involved in tourism activities and get socio-economic benefits from tourism activities and take responsibility for protecting the natural resources, environment and local culture.	X	√
CBT manuals/handbook	CBT definitions	Sustainability	Natural environment
Community-based ecotourism (CBET) / Community-based sustainable tourism (CBST)			
Making ecotourism work. A manual on establishing community-based Ecotourism enterprise (CBEE) in the Philippines. (Calanog, Reyes, & Eugenio, 2012, p. 187).	Community-based Ecotourism Enterprise is an enterprise controlled and managed by concerned local people and stakeholders in a community whose main product is to "sell" ecotourism services.	X	√
Guidelines for community-based ecotourism development. (Denman, 2001, p. 2).	Ecotourism is a "responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment and sustains the well-being of local people. This definition not only implies that there should be a recognition of, and positive support for, the conservation of natural resources, both by suppliers and consumers, but also that there is a necessary social dimension to ecotourism. The term 'community-based ecotourism' takes this social dimension a stage further. This is a form of ecotourism where the local community has substantial control over, and involvement in, its development and management, and a major proportion of the benefits remain within the community.	√	√
Community based sustainable tourism. A handbook (Jealous, 1998, p. 2).	Community-based sustainable tourism (CBST) implies that the tourism development concept should focus on the development of the community in a manner where the natural resource is protected and maintained for continued utilization. CBST is a vision for community empowerment and alternative model of tourism development.	√	√

Table 1 shows that in 13 CBT manuals/handbooks, there is a total of 26 results unevenly split between the number of times the word sustainability and the natural environment are mentioned. Eleven manuals mention the environment with a positive (√) outcome. Six out of 13 manuals mention sustainability also positively. Whereas, the mentioning of the environment is negative in 2 occurrences and the sustainability is negative seven times (represented by a negative X).

Table 1 showing that the natural environment is mentioned in the definitions of the 11 of the 13 manuals can reflect some high-level awareness of the need to preserve the environment, which has gained currency in contemporary times. On the other hand, in Table 1, there is some paucity in terms of the number of times sustainability is mentioned.

It is interesting to note that the definition by Calanog et al. (2012) in Table 1 on CBET shows a negative (X) for sustainability. The same definition by Calanog et al. (2012) does not refer to the natural environment, but because it being CBET and 'selling' ecotourism services, it seems implicit that it is related to the environment (thus it has been marked as a positive outcome (√)). On the other hand,

this anomaly could also be seen as an inaccurate contextualization of CBET, and, importantly, it not guaranteed the conservation/protection (sustainability) of the natural environment. That is, it is here proposed that any CBET definition, contrary to what is proposed by Calanog et al. (2012), should have included both sustainability and natural environment issues. These two matters cannot be considered implicit but instead should be part of it to reflect their importance in CBET. In Table 1, there is a preponderant inclusion of sustainability and/or natural environment in the CBT definitions in CBT manuals/handbooks. However, on the one hand, more than half of the definitions (seven out of 13) do not explicitly include sustainability.

On the other hand, the natural environment is often mentioned in many of the cases. Current times dictate that both are a sine qua non in all forms of tourism. Table 2 looks at how these two words are mentioned in the main fundamental principles contained in these CBT Handbooks.

Table 2
Presence of terms sustainability and/or natural environment in CBT specifically in listed main fundamental principles/attributes in CBT manuals/handbooks/guidelines.

CBT manuals/handbook	CBT Main fundamental principles/attributes	Sustainability	Natural environment
Community-based tourism (CBT)			
Effective community based tourism: a best practice manual. (Asker et al., 2010, p. 3).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aiming to benefit local communities, particularly rural or indigenous people's or people in small towns, contributing to their wellbeing and the wellbeing of their cultural and environmental assets • Hosting tourists in the local community • Managing a tourism scheme communally • Sharing the profits/benefits equitably • Using a portion of the profits/resources for community development and/or to maintain and protect a community cultural or natural heritage asset (e.g. conservation) • Involving communities in tourism planning, on-going decision making, development and operations. 	X	√
ASEAN Community Based Tourism Standard. (Association of Southeast Asian Nations [ASEAN], 2016, p. 2).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involve and empower community to ensure ownership and transparent management, • Establish partnerships with relevant stakeholders, • Gain recognised standing with relevant authorities, • Improve social well-being and maintenance of human dignity, • Include a fair and transparent benefit sharing mechanism, • Enhance linkages to local and regional economies, • Respect local culture and tradition, • Contribute to natural resource conservation, • Improve the quality of visitor experiences by strengthening meaningful host and guest interaction, and • Work towards financial self-sufficiency. 	X	√
Community Based Tourism Standards in Cambodia. (Netherlands Development Organisation [SNV] & Cambodia Community-Based Ecotourism Network [CCBEN], 2009, p. 3).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involve and empower community members to ensure ownership and transparent management • Establish partnership with relevant stakeholders • Gain legal recognition from relevant authorities • Achieve social well-being and human dignity • Establish a fair and transparent benefit sharing mechanism • Enhance linkages to local and regional economy • Respect the local culture and tradition • Contribute to natural resource conservation • Improve quality of visitor experiences by strengthening meaningful host and guest interaction • Work towards financial self-sufficiency. 	X	√

Table 2 Continued

Community Based Tourism Handbook. (Suansri, 2003, p. 12).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognize, support and promote community ownership of tourism; • Involve community members from the start in every aspect; • Promote community pride; • Improve the quality of life; • Ensure environmental sustainability; • Preserve the unique character and culture of the local area; • Foster cross-cultural learning; • Respect cultural differences and human dignity; • Distribute benefits fairly among community members; • Contribute a fixed percentage of income to community projects; 	√	√
Community-based tourism for conservation and development: a resource kit. (The Mountain Institute, 2000).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must contribute to increasing and/or improving conservation of natural and/or cultural resources, including biological diversity, water, forests, cultural landscapes, monuments, etc; • Must contribute to local economic development through increasing tourism revenues and other benefits to community participants, and ideally to an increasing number of participants; • Must have a level of participation ideally progressing toward self-mobilization, but not always necessarily so; and • Has a duty to the visitor to provide a socially and environmentally responsible product. 	√	√
A toolkit for monitoring and managing community-based tourism. (Twining-Ward et al., 2007, p. 9).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender equity, • Poverty reduction, • Business sustainability, and • Local capacity development. <p>(Note: selected themes only based relevance to SNV's core concerns in the Asia Region).</p>	X/√	√
Handbook on community based tourism "How to develop and sustain CBT". (Hamzah & Khalifah, 2009, p. 4).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involving appreciation not only of nature, but also of indigenous cultures prevailing in natural areas, as part of the visitor experience; • Containing education and interpretation as part of the tourist offer; • Generally, but not exclusively, organised for small groups by small, specialised and locally owned businesses; • Minimising negative impacts on the natural and socio-cultural environment; • Supporting the protection of natural and cultural areas by generating economic benefits from it; • Providing alternative income and employment for local communities; and • increasing local and visitor awareness of conservation. 	X	√
Training Manual for Community-Based Tourism. (Häusler & Strasdas, 2003, p. 3).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes education and interpretation as part of the tourism service; • Increases local and visitor awareness of conservation; • Is generally, but not exclusively, organised for small groups by small, specialised and locally owned businesses; • Minimises negative impacts on the natural and socio-cultural environment; • Supports the protection of natural areas by generating economic benefits for the management of these areas. 	X	√
Vietnam community based tourism handbook: a market-based approach. (Vietnam's Responsible Tourism Programme (ESRT) & WWF Vietnam, 2013, p. 5).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social equity. • Respect local cultural and natural heritage • Benefit sharing • Local ownership and participation 	X	√
CBT manuals/handbook	CBT Main principles/fundamentals/characteristics/attributes	Sustainability	Natural environment
Community-based ecotourism (CBET) / Community-based sustainable tourism (CBST)			
Making ecotourism work. A manual on establishing community-based Ecotourism enterprise (CBEE) in the Philippines. (Calanog et al., 2012, p. 187).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is concerned with the protection of the environment • It aims to provide a meaningful satisfaction to visitors. • There is equitable distribution of income and share benefits to local community • It encourages people empowerment and active gender role in the enterprise 	X	√

Table 2 Continued

<p>Guidelines for community-based ecotourism development. (Denman, 2001, p. 2).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involving appreciation not only of nature, but also of indigenous cultures prevailing in natural areas, as part of the visitor experience; • Containing education and interpretation as part of the tourist offer; • Generally, but not exclusively, organised for small groups by small, specialised and locally owned businesses (while recognising that foreign operators also market and operate ecotourism); • Minimising negative impacts on the natural and socio-cultural environment; • Supporting the protection of natural areas by generating economic benefits for the managers of natural areas; • Providing alternative income and employment for local communities; and • Increasing local and visitor awareness of conservation. • (Note: The document proposes ecotourism principles within the CBET context). 	<p>X</p>	<p>V</p>
<p>Community based sustainable tourism. A handbook. (Jealous, 1998, p. 3).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social dimension • Cultural dimension • Economic dimension • Political dimension • Ecological dimension 	<p>X</p>	<p>√</p>

Note: In Operational Guidelines for Community-Based Tourism in South Africa. (NDT, 2016) there was not specific list/indication of CBT main principles/fundamentals/characteristics/attributes. Therefore the document has been excluded from Table 2.

Table 2 shows that of the 12 manuals, all 12 mentions the environment while only 2.5 cases of the 12 mention the concept of sustainability. Specifically, while all of the outcomes for the natural environment are positive, the consideration of sustainability has only two positive outcomes against nine negative outcomes (and a half negative half positive outcome). The results in Table 2 seem to show that while the natural environment is regarded highly as a CBT principle, the specific concept of sustainability is much less so based on only 2 out of 12 as contained in CBT principles in CBT manuals/handbooks. If the result of Table 1 and Table 2 are put together, the result indicates that while the natural environment is almost always mentioned (total of 23 of 25 times), the concept of sustainability, on the other side, is less likely to be mentioned (16.5 negatives against 8.5 positive presences).

A recent study by Giampiccoli and Saayman (2017) questions a situation whereby the poor are expected to run and manage their CBT venture while taking care of the environment while for conventional tourism, this appears to be voluntary. The results produced in this article corroborate this opinion in which the protection/conservation/awareness of the natural environment is part of the definition or main principles – thus 'officially' – related to CBT. It is argued here that this does not seem to be the case with the other types of Tourism 2020 04EN Tiskara Osijek šaljem ourism, notably conventional/mass tourism, where the definition does not 'officially' include nature conservation/protection. It is also evident from this article that the concept of sustainability in the definition or main principles of CBT is often absent. This should be seen as negative in the same way as it should be in any other form of tourism. It is argued that "sustainability" should be part and parcel of the general definition of tourism, not an option but an imperative in modern times (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2019). As written in the document Making tourism more sustainable. A guide for policymakers (United Nations Environment Programme [UNEP], & UNWTO, 2005, p. 2) "Sustainable tourism is not a discrete or special form of tourism. Rather, all forms of tourism should strive to be more sustainable".

However, the Tourism and the Sustainable Development Goals – Journey to 2030 (UNWTO & UNDP, 2017) the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme mention that UNDP and UNWTO and all stakeholders from the public and private sectors will pursue all efforts that support countries to achieve sustainable development using tourism as one of the tools to do so (Steiner, 2017). Indeed, the role to enhance sustainability in tourism is expected of all stakeholders (private sector, communities, governments, Non-governmental organisations).

4. Conclusion

This article's results show that in almost all cases (23 positives against two negative), CBT manuals/handbooks link CBT to the natural environment. Whereas the concept of sustainability is much less frequent, with 16.5 negative mentions against 8.5 positives. The outcome related to the natural environment is positive to the extent that this is a necessity – but debatable to the extent that it seems to shift the burden of natural conservation to CBT but not to all other tourism sectors (notably conventional/mass tourism). Sustainability is a fundamental requirement in tourism – as much in any other industry – to tackle the various negative environmental impacts. Matters of sustainability and nature conservation should not only be associated with CBT but with all tourism sub-sectors who should be protagonists in sustainability and nature conservation efforts.

At the same time CBT should be considered for what it is worth and not negatively perceived, for example, "Negative attitudes exist within the industry towards community tourism products which are often viewed with skepticism and regarded as inferior within the formal sector" (Government of Barbados', 2012, p. 10). As such, it has been proposed, "The name CBT is unsellable!" In Thailand, it took years of effort before community-based tourism was recognized, and stakeholders in public and private sectors accepted that community members could manage their own tourism programs" (Suansri & Yeejaw-haw, 2013, p. 9). Sustainability and, especially, environmental issues are considered more implicit in CBT, but at the same time, CBT is often regarded as inferior to conventional/mass tourism. This shows that there is a glaring mismatch in conception. The following implications are pertinent to policy and practice. Sustainability of tourism should be a requirement and enforced in all tourisms (the plural is deliberate).

In other words, while the sustainability of tourism should be an intrinsic principle of CBT – it should be a universal principle applied to all tourisms. Governments should enforce sustainability parameters in all tourisms based on each sector/company's resources, capacities, and, taking into account the level of negative impacts caused. This issue "does not mean that CBT should not respect the environment but that both CBT and conventional tourism should be regarded similarly concerning environmental issues. This is because CBT should be seen as a form of tourism on its own not a subsystem of the conventional tourism sector, CBT and conventional tourism are two different approaches of tourism that run parallel" (Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2017, p. 9). It is the conventional tourism sector that produces most of the damage, more than the CBT sector. This implies that since it is the conventional sector with a more technological and financial capacity than CBT, it should spearhead the establishment and promotion of sustainable measures in practice. It is unjust and paternalistic to propose that disadvantaged people in society should take care of 'sustainability' and the natural environment. Conventional/mass tourism should also adhere to sustainability criteria and environmental matters, even legally, if necessary. By implication, if CBT is considered more sustainable and environmentally friendly, it should be promoted and facilitated at greater scale such that CBT principles should influence and circumscribe the whole tourism sector (see Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016) leading to a more sustainable approach to tourism, in general, that is both environmentally-friendly as well as sustainability-friendly. The ultimate outcome would be a smart CBT that is both sustainability and environmentally friendly.

Notes:

¹ Responsible tourism "Refers to a tourism management strategy in which the tourism sector and tourists take responsibility to protect and conserve the natural environment, respect and conserve local cultures and ways of life, and contribute to stronger local economies and a better quality of life for local people" (NDT, 2016:5).

Acknowledgment

One of the authors received funding from the Department of Science and Innovation and National Research Foundation-funded South African Research Chair (SARCHi) at the University of KwaZulu-Natal. The views expressed in this article are not necessarily the views of the National Research Foundation or its management or governance structures.

References

- Appadurai, A. (2004). The capacity to aspire. Culture and the term of recognition. In V. Rao & M. Walton (Eds.), *Cultural politics in a global age. Uncertainty, solidarity and innovation* (pp. 29–35). Oxford: Oneworld Publications.
- Archer, B., Cooper, C., & Ruhanen, L. (2005). The positive and negative impacts of tourism. In W. F. Theobald (Ed.), *Global tourism* (pp. 79–102). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Asker, S., Boronyak, L., Carrard N., & Paddon, M. (2010). *Effective community based tourism: A best practice manual*. Toowong: Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre.
- Association of Southeast Asian Nations. (2016). *ASEAN community based tourism standard*. Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat.
- Bianchi, R. V. (2002). Toward a new political economy of global tourism. In R. Sharpley & D. J. Telfer (Eds.), *Tourism and development concepts and issues* (pp. 265–299). Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Boonratana, R. (2010). Community-based tourism in Thailand: The need and justification for an operational definition. *Kasetsart Journal Social Sciences*, 31, 280–289.
- Calanog, L. A., Reyes, D. P. T., & Eugenio, V. F. (2012). *Making ecotourism work. A manual on establishing community-based ecotourism enterprise (CBEE) in the Philippines*. Makati City: Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) Philippines.
- Cohen, E., & Cohen, S. A. (2012). Current sociological theories and issues in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(4), 2177–2202.
- Cornelissen S. (2005). *The global tourism system: Governance, development and lessons from South Africa*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Croall, J. (1995). *Preserve or destroy: Tourism and the environment*. Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.
- Cummins, R. A., & Nistico, H. (2002). Maintaining life satisfaction: The role of positive cognitive bias. *Journal of Happiness studies*, 3(1), 37–69.
- d’Hauteserre, A. M., & Funck, C. (2016). Innovation in island ecotourism in different contexts: Yakushima (Japan) and Tahiti and its Islands. *Island Studies Journal*, 11(1), 227–244.
- Dangi, T. B., & Jamal, T. (2016). An integrated approach to "sustainable community-based tourism". *Sustainability*, 8, 475, 1–32.
- de Kadt, E. (1979). Social planning for tourism in the developing countries. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(1), 36–48.
- Denman, R. (2001). *Guidelines for community-based ecotourism development*. Gland: WWF International.
- Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism. (2003). *Responsible tourism handbook: A guide to good practice for tourism operators*. Pretoria: DEAT.
- Dixey, L. M. (n.d.). *Competing with the best: Good practices in community-based tourism in the Caribbean*. St. Michael, Barbados: Caribbean Tourism Organization.
- Dłużewska, A., & Rodzios J. (2018). Sustainable tourism supranational policies and the wellbeing — Gaps and challenges from the hosts' and the guests' perspective. *Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes*, 5, 250–268.
- Dłużewska, A. (2009). *Spółeczno-kulturowe dysfunkcje turystyczne w krajach islamu* [Socio-cultural tourism dysfunctions in Muslim countries]. Warsaw: Warsaw University Press.
- Dłużewska, A. M. (2019). Well-being versus sustainable development in tourism—The host perspective. *Sustainable Development*, 27, 512–522.
- Duffy, R. (2013). *A trip too far: Ecotourism, politics and exploitation*. London: Routledge.

- Eshun, E., & Tichaawa, T. M. (2020). Towards sustainable ecotourism development in Ghana: Contributions of the local communities. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 68(3), 261-277.
- Fennell, D. A. (2006). *Tourism ethics*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Frangialli, F. (2005). Foreword. In W. F. Theobald (Ed.), *Global tourism* (p. IX). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Gadi Djou, J. A., Baiquni, M., Widodo, T., & Fandeli, C. (2017). Symbolic participation in community-based tourism in Kelimutu National Park, Ende, East Nusa Tenggara. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 19(1), 15-20.
- Garraway, J. (2008). Prospects for community-based ecotourism. *First Magazine*. Retrieved December 24, 2018, from <http://www.fi.rstmagazine.com/DownloadSpecialistPublicationDetail.45.ashx>
- Giampiccoli, A., & Mtapuri, O. (2015). Between theory and practice: A conceptualization of community based tourism and community participation. *Loyola Journal of Social Sciences*, XXIX(1), 27-52.
- Giampiccoli, A., & Saayman, M. (2014). A conceptualisation of alternative forms of tourism in relation to community development. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(27), 1667-1677.
- Giampiccoli, A., & Saayman, M. (2016). Community-based tourism: From a local to a global push. *Acta Commercii*, 16(1), a372, 1-10.
- Giampiccoli, A., & Saayman, M. (2017). Community-based tourism, responsible tourism, and infrastructure development and poverty. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 6(2), 1-28.
- Giampiccoli, A., & Saayman, M. (2018). South African community-based tourism operational guidelines: Analysis and critical review. *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development*, 10(6), 759-770.
- Giampiccoli, A., Saayman, M., & Jugmohan, S. (2014). Developing community-based tourism in South Africa: Addressing the missing link. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 20(3:2), 1139-1161.
- Government of Barbados (2012). *Green paper on the sustainable development of tourism in Barbados: A policy framework*. Retrieved January 30, 2018, from <http://www.bhta.org/images/Download/GreenPaper.pdf>
- Hamzah, A., & Khalifah, Z. (2009). *Handbook on community based tourism "How to develop and sustain CBT"*. Kuala Lumpur: Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Secretariat.
- Hashemkhani Zolfani, S., Sedaghat, M., Maknoon, R., & Kazimieras Zavadskas, E. (2015). Sustainable tourism: A comprehensive literature review on frameworks and applications. *Economic Research-Ekonomika Istraživanja*, 28(1), 1-30.
- Häusler, N., & Strasdas, W. (2003). *Training manual for community-based tourism*. Zschortau: InWEnt - Capacity Building International.
- Jealous, V. (1998). CBST: The Philippine perspective, criteria & goal for each NGO/PO/community. In C.T. Urquico (Ed.), *Community based sustainable tourism. A handbook* (pp. 8-12). Quezon City: Accessing Support Service and Entrepreneurial Technology.
- Johnson, P. A. (2010). Realizing rural community based tourism development: Prospects for social-economy enterprises. *Journal of Rural and Community Development*, 5(1/2), 150-162.
- Karim, R., Mohammad, F., & Serafino, L. (2012). Integrating pro-poor tourism activities in a community-based idea of development: The case of the district of Hunza-Neger, Pakistan. *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Tourism and Leisure (ICTL) 2012*. Bangkok, Thailand. Retrieved 4 June 4, 2013, from www.ictlconference.com
- Kaur, P., Jawaid, A., & Othman, N. B. A. (2016). The impact of community-based tourism on community development in Sarawak. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(1), 15-26.
- Kayat, K. (2014). Community-based rural tourism: A proposed sustainability framework. *SHS Web of Conferences* 12, 01010. doi:10.1051/shsconf/20141201010
- Leksakundilok, A. (2004). Ecotourism and community-based ecotourism in the Mekong Region. *Working Paper Series, Working Paper No. 10*. Australian Mekong Resource Centre University of Sydney. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from <http://sydney.edu.au/mekong/documents/wp10.pdf>
- Liu, Z. (2003). Sustainable tourism development: A critique. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 11(6), 459-475.
- Luo, X., Brown, G., & Huang, S. (2015). Host perceptions of backpackers: Examining the influence of intergroup contact. *Tourism Management*, 50, 292-305.
- Lopes, L., Moreno Pires, S., & Costa, R. (2020). A strategy for a sustainable tourism development of the Greek Island of Chios. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 68(3), 243-260.

- Mansfeld, Y. (1992). Group-differentiated perceptions of social impacts related to tourism development. *The Professional Geographer*, 44(4), 377-392.
- Manu, I., & Kuuder, C. J. W. (2012). Community-based ecotourism and livelihood enhancement in Sirigu, Ghana. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(18), 97-108.
- Mayaka, M., Croy, W. G., & Cox, J. W. (2019). A dimensional approach to community-based tourism: Recognising and differentiating form and context. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 74, 177-190.
- Mihalic, T. (2016). Sustainable-responsible tourism discourse - Towards 'responsustainable' tourism. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 111, 461-470.
- Mitchell, J., & Muckosy, P. (2008). A misguided quest: Community-based tourism in Latin America. *Overseas Development Institute, Opinion*, 102, 1-2.
- Mitchell, J. (2010). An unconventional but essential marriage: Pro-poor tourism and the mainstream industry. *Private Sector Development Proparco's Magazine*, 7, 3-6.
- Mowforth, M., & Munt, I. (2003). *Tourism and sustainability. New tourism in the Third World*. Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Mowforth, M., Charlton, C., & Munt, I. (2008). *Tourism and responsibility perspectives from Latin America and the Caribbean*. London: Routledge.
- Mtapuri, O., & Giampiccoli, A. (2017). A conceptual coalescence: Towards luxury community-based Tourism. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 6(3), 1-14.
- Mtapuri, O., & Giampiccoli, A. (2019). Tourism, community-based tourism and ecotourism: A definitional problematic. *South African Geographical Journal*, 101(1), 22-35.
- Nagarjuna, G. (2015). Local community involvement in tourism: A content analysis of websites of wildlife resorts. *Atna, Journal of Tourism Studies*, 10(1), 13-21.
- Nataraja, T. C., & Devidasan, S. D. (2014). Community based tourism: Case study on potential of Shivanahalli village. *Compass*, 1(2), 67-75.
- National Department of Tourism. (2016). *Operational guidelines for community-based tourism in South Africa*. Pretoria: National Department of Tourism.
- Netherlands Development Organisation & Cambodia Community-Based Ecotourism Network. (2009). *Community based tourism standards in Cambodia*. Retrieved December 22, 2018, from https://ysrinfo.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/7_cbt-standards-in-cambodia.pdf
- Peake, R. (1989). Swahili stratification and tourism in Malindi old town, Kenya. *Africa*, 59(2), 209-220.
- 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.
- Ruhiu, J. M. (2007). *Capital for investing in community based tourism (cbt) – Grants vs loans*. Presented at a National Ecotourism Conference Theme II: Ecotourism and Communities. Nairobi, Kenya, 22nd-24th October 2007.
- Saayman, M., & Giampiccoli, A. (2015). Community-based tourism and pro-poor tourism: Dissimilar positioning in relation to community development. *Journal for New Generation Sciences*, 13(3), 163-181.
- Saayman, M., & Giampiccoli, A. (2016). Community-based and pro-poor tourism: Initial assessment of their relation to community development. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 12, 145-190.
- Sammy, J. (2008). Examples of effective techniques for enhancing community understanding of tourism. In G. Moscardo (Ed.), *Building community capacity for tourism development* (pp. 75-85). Wallingford: CAB International.
- Sawatsuk, B., Gede Darmawijaya, I., Ratchusanti, S., & Phaokrueng, A. (2018). Factors determining the sustainable success of community-based tourism: Evidence of good corporate governance of Mae Kam Pong homestay, Thailand. *International Journal of Business and Economic Affairs (IJBEA)*, 3(1), 13-20.
- Scheyvens, R. (2002). *Tourism for development empowering community*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Scheyvens, R. (2007). Exploring the tourism-poverty nexus. In M. Hall (Ed.), *Pro-poor tourism: Who benefits? Perspective on tourism and poverty reduction* (pp.121-144). Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Scheyvens, R. (2011). The challenge of sustainable tourism development in the Maldives: Understanding the social and political dimensions of sustainability. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 52(2), 148-164.

- Smith, V. L., & Eadington, W. R. (1992). *Tourism alternatives: Potentials and problems in the development of tourism*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Steiner, A. (2017). Foreword by Achim Steiner. In UNWTO & UNDP (Eds.), *Tourism and the sustainable development goals – Journey to 2030* (pp. 8-9) Madrid: UNWTO and UNDP.
- Strydom, A. J., Mangope, D., & Henama, U. S. (2019). Making community-based tourism sustainable: Evidence from the Free State province, South Africa. *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 24(1), 7-18.
- Suansri, P. (2003). *Community based tourism handbook*. Bangkok: Responsible Ecological Social Tour-REST.
- Suansri, P., & Yeejaw-haw, S. (2013). *Community-based tourism standard handbook*. Chaing Mai: The Thailand Community-based tourism institute.
- Tasci, A, Semrad, K., & Yilmaz, S. (2013). *Community based tourism finding the equilibrium in COMCEC context: Setting the pathway for the future*. Ankara: COMCEC Coordination Office.
- Telfer, D. J. (2009). Development studies and tourism. In T. Jamal & M. Robison (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of tourism studies* (pp.146-165). London: SAGE Publications.
- Terencia, N. M. (2018). Community based tourism and development in third world countries: The case of the Bamileke region of Cameroon. *International Journal of Social and Tourism Sciences*, 12(1), 26-30.
- The Mountain Institute. (2000). *Community-based tourism for conservation and development: A resource kit*. Washington, D.C.: The Mountain Institute.
- Theobald, W. W. (2005). Part two: Results and residuals: The issue of impacts. In W. F. Theobald (Ed.), *Global tourism* (pp. 75-77). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Tolkach, D., & King, B. (2015). Strengthening community-based tourism in a new resource-based island nation: Why and how? *Tourism Management*, 48, 386-398.
- Tosun, C. (2002). Host perceptions of impacts: A comparative tourism study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 231-253.
- Tosun, C., Timothy, D. J., & Öztürk, Y. (2003). Tourism growth, national development and regional inequality in Turkey. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 11(2-3), 133-161.
- Twining-Ward, L., Jamieson, W., Noakes S., & Day, S. (2007). *A toolkit for monitoring and managing community-based tourism*. Ha Noi and Oahu: SNV Netherlands Development Organisation and University of Hawaii.
- Ullán de la Rosa, F. J., Aledo Tur, A., & García Andreu, H. (2019). Community-based tourism and political communitarianism in Prainha do Canto Verde, Brazil. *Latin American Perspectives*, 46(4), 210-229.
- United Nations Environment Programme & United Nations World Tourism Organization. (2005). *Making tourism more sustainable. A guide for policy makers*. Paris and Madrid: United Nations Environment Programme and World Tourism Organisation.
- United Nations World Tourism Organization & United Nations Development Programme. (2017). *Tourism and the sustainable development goals – Journey to 2030*. Madrid: UNWTO and UNDP.
- Urquico, C. T. (1998). *Community based sustainable tourism. A handbook*. Quezon City: Accessing Support Service and Entrepreneurial Technology, Inc.
- Vietnam's Responsible Tourism Programme & WWF Vietnam (2013). *Vietnam community based tourism handbook: A market-based approach*. Hanoi: Vietnam's Responsible Tourism Programme & WWF Vietnam.
- Welford, R., Ytterhus, B., & Eligh, J. (1999). Tourism and sustainable development: An analysis of policy and guidelines for managing provision and consumption. *Sustainable Development*, 7, 165-177.
- Zapata, M. J., Hall, M. C., Lindo, P., & Vanderschaeghe, M. (2011). Can community-based tourism contribute to development and poverty alleviation? Lessons from Nicaragua. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(8), 725-749.
- Zhao, W., & Ritchie, J. B. (2007). Tourism and poverty alleviation: An integrative research framework. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(2-3), 119-143.

Submitted: 10/04/2019

Accepted: 09/09/2020