Community-based tourism development model and community participation

Dr Andrea Giampiccoli
Durban University of Technology
Department of Hospitality and Tourism
PO Box 1334, Durban 4000
South Africa
Email: andrea.giampiccoli@gmail.com

Prof Melville Saayman *
North-West University
Private Bag X6001, Potchefstroom 2520
South Africa
Email: Melville.saayman@nwu.ac.za

Corresponding author*

Abstract

Community-based tourism (CBT) is about social justice, empowerment, equity of benefits, redistributive measures, ownership of tourism sector and holistic community development. The aim of this article is to explore the relationship between Tourism Area Life Cycle (TALC) and CBT by proposing a model depicting the various stages of TALC in relation to CBT, community participation and type of tourist. The research indicates, first, that the understandings of community participation and its relationship with CBT need to be more precise to show that CBT is in itself participatory. CBT can also be described as self-participatory: the community itself initiates and drives the development. Secondly, the findings indicate that tourism development at destinations go through stages during which CBT is gradually jeopardised and marginalised by outsiders and local elite. Tourism destination control, as a consequence of CBT, increases potential growth through external stakeholder support which is important. More research is required to investigate, understand and enhance the role of CBT in tourism destinations for the benefits of the local community and disadvantaged (poorest and socio-economically marginalised) – people in particular.

Keywords: Community-based tourism; CBT; community participation; Tourism Area Life Cycle; TALC, tourist typology

> *Overcoming poverty is not a task of* charity, *it is an act of* justice. (Nelson Mandela)

Introduction

The World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) mentions that "2016 marks the seventh consecutive year of sustained growth in international tourism …" (UNWTO, 2017:4). This is also evidenced by tourism's position as an economic export category in global rankings, where "tourism ranks third after chemicals and fuels, and ahead of automotive products and food". It is an important element of economic diversification for both emerging and developed countries and in developing countries is a top export sector (UNWTO, 2017:6). However, tourism also presents challenges, problems and negatives, such as the vast use of water and negative effects on communities (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2017:1; Nagarjuna, 2015:14). In addition, "many scholars argue that tourism also perpetuates class and regional inequalities and stimulates economic, environmental and social problems, which have created considerable doubts about tourism being a reliable development strategy in the less-developed world" (Tosun, Timothy, & Öztürk, 2003:133). For example in term of regional inequalities it has been mention from a South African perspective that "in South Africa tourism is highly concentrated

spatially in terms of its distribution and correspondingly in relation to its potential local impacts across the country" (Rogerson, 2013:15). It is important that these issues are also recognised by key tourism and international development organisations. The same UNWTO – together with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) – recognised the double face of tourism, its important contribution to, among others, job creation and environmental protection, and its negative impacts such as "greenhouse gas emissions, economic leakages, resource management or impact on local communities and cultural assets" (UNWTO & UNDP, 2017:4). The tourism sector "also contributes the negative impacts to the local community" (Jirojkul & Techato, 2017:1825).

Community-based tourism (CBT) is a form of tourism that arose to offset the negative impacts of conventional or mass tourism (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2017:2; Gadi Djou, Baiquni, Widodo, & Fandeli, 2017:16) such as leakages and falling of local control of natural resources. Community-based tourism is gaining popularity (Mearns & Lukhele, 2015:2) and it "is increasingly being promoted as a means of reducing poverty and fostering local community development" (Runyowa, 2017:2). This does not mean that CBT does not present challenges and difficulties and attract its own critics. For example, Mitchell and Muckosy (2008:2) suggest that CBT is not the answer to community poverty alleviation through tourism, instead, the same author propose, the need "it is working with mainstream tourism to strengthen links between tourism and local people – often indigenous populations who are located in disadvantaged regions and have vulnerable livelihoods." So, CBT marketing and market access is surely a problem in especially developing countries, a major challenge is then the difficulties that village-based enterprises meet when trying to market themselves internationally, where the target market is, and therefore, can easily fold at the outset if success is not visible (Timothy, 2002:161). As proposed by Suansri (2003:7), "Despite its promise, CBT 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".

Major challenges in CBT include local capacity, marketing and economic viability (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016:152). However, as extensively proposed it is the methods and techniques of implementation which are at the core of the success or failure of the ventures (Sakata & Prideaux, 2013:882). Moscardo (2008) in her edited book propose a different view expressing that "[w]hile community-based tourism and ecotourism have not on the whole been as effective or sustainable as promised, they still hold the greatest potential for many regions." On relation to CBT Moscardo, (2008:175) goes on to argue, based on the contributions of her edited book, that while there is little evidence that CBT or ecotourism make a valuable contribution to sustainable tourism development, this conclusion needs to be considered in the light of two qualifications.

> First, in the case of community-based tourism the reality in practice has not often matched the ideals in principles. Thus it could be argued that true community-based tourism has not been implemented [...] second, in many communities these are the only forms of tourism that are likely to be viable in terms of market demand and/or the physical resources available to the destination community. What is necessary to improve these forms of tourism is a greater awareness of the need to enhance community capacity for their development (Moscardo, 2008:175).

However, the increase in CBT literature is seen as important since CBT "is a complex and emerging field of study, and much remains to be learned" (Naik, 2014:46).

The Tourism Area Life Cycle (TALC) proposed by Butler (1980) is one of the most researched and discussed tourism models to investigate the evolution of a tourism destination (Zhang & Xiao, 2014:217; Acharya & Halpenny, 2016:1). The proposition of a link between CBT or CBT-

related issues and TALC is present in, for example, Zapata, Hall, Lindo, & Vanderschaeghe (2011). Sustainability and community are clearly relevant to TALC, as the same Butler (2004:164, emphasis added) wrote 24 years ago in the original TALC model article:

> The principles at the heart of sustainability are similarly implicit in the TALC (taking a long-term view, keeping development within environmental and social limits, *an emphasis on the community*, a respect for the environment, and the need for regulation and responsibility), although the elements of inter- and intra-generational equity, a major feature of sustainable development, were not discussed or implied in the TALC.

Following the proposed 'emphasis on the community' this article specifically attempts to advance new contexts between TALC and CBT. However, there is a scarcity of research dealing with community participation in a CBT context (Park, Phandanouvong, & Kim, 2017:2). While the debate on the role of community in tourism has been widely proposed, especially since Murphy book *Tourism: A community approach* (Murphy, 1985) it must be also recognised that, as recently in 2017, it has been noted that "Since the turn of the century, discussion of community-based tourism (CBT) has become prominent, including diverse understandings of what CBT entails and critical evaluations of the extent to which it is community-oriented" (Mayaka, Croy, & Wolfram Cox, 2017:1). This continued different understanding of CBT and the relation of CBT to community, leads to the need to endure investigating the meaning of CBT. This paper will specifically focus on community participation specifically related to a CBT approach, and CBT and community participation will be linked to the TALC model. It is important "to continue to investigate new models of tourism that can lead to a more sustainable, redistributive, just and locally controlled and contextualised tourism sector which is as environmentally-aware as it is experiential" (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2017:2). The contribution of this article, therefore, coincides with the need to continue to better understand the position of the community in CBT particularly proposing its link to TALC – thus the position of the community and CBT in a destination tourism development cycle. This article was based on a desktop research methodology encompassing a selected range of previous literature and it used direct references to give credence to specific passages.

Based on the above then, the aim of this article is to explore the relationship between TALC and CBT by proposing a model depicting the various stages of TALC in relation to CBT, community participation and types of tourists. This is a theoretical article as such, while various propositions from secondary literature are provided it does not boast its own case study (future research on the same issue can certainly include a case study). A literature review will mention issues related to CBT, TALC, community participation and tourist typology. Thereafter a further section will consider these various matters together, and attempt to develop a model that links CBT, TALC, community participation and types of tourists. A discussion and conclusion follows at the end of the article.

Literature review

Tourism and community participation

The tourism sector can have positive and negative impacts on a local community, so tourism "can affect the lives of the local community in various ways. For some local community, tourism can be a driving force of the overall development, and for others it may cause negative …" (Nagarjuna, 2015:14). In this context local community involvement becomes fundamental "in order to increase the benefits of tourism, and to minimize the negative impacts" (Nagarjuna, 2015:14). The issues and relevance of community involvement in tourism are well recognised by researchers (Salleh, Shukor, Othman, Samsudin, & Idris, 2016:565). In tourism models, participatory management is considered an essential element to avoid the negative tourism impacts of conventional tourism on community members and the ecosystems (Burgos &

Mertens, 2017:546). Along the same lines it is remarked that "local communities' involvement, enabling them to reap the benefits from the development that is happening around their neighbourhood is of the utmost importance" (Salleh *et al.*, 2016:565). Community involvement in tourism is the necessary foundation for change and development (Rasoolimanesh & Jaafar, 2016:5). Novelli and Gebhardt (2007:449) remark, "Community participation is often suggested as an essential ingredient in improving the quality of tourism's contribution to national development. On the other hand, increased participation of indigenous communities actually means involving low-income groups and people in rural and urban areas, who are not generally involved in the process of government." Thus, CBT should entail at community development in "remote, rural, impoverished, marginalized, economically depressed, undeveloped, poor, indigenous, ethnic minorities, and people in small towns" (Tasci, Semrad & Yilmaz, 2013:10). From a poverty perspective it is here proposed that specific poverty measurements, such as a poverty scale from United Nations, can assist in identifying disadvantaged community members and each country can apply its own criteria in this regard. However, poverty should not be seen exclusively to be related to "inadequate income and human development but also embraces vulnerability and a lack of voice, power and representation" (Zhao & Ritchie, 2007:121). By the same token, community development should not be seen exclusively related to statics. Community-based tourism "aims to the holistic goal of empowering underprivileged groups sustainably" (Tasci, Semrad & Yilmaz, 2013:84). Thus, issues beyond strict economic matters must also be considered such as community development which must include matters of social justice, empowerment, and self-reliance and so on (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016).

However, there are various possible forms of community participation in tourism (Tosun, 2006:494). Several authors (for example Tosun, 2000, 2006; Novelli & Gebhardt, 2007:448; Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2015:40) have attempted to examine them. Often studies (see Novelli & Gebhardt, 2007:448; Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2015:40; Tosun 2000a) use earlier conceptualisations of the level of community participation, such as the ones by Pretty (1995), Arnstein (1969) and Guaralado-Choguill (1996). In this context, "Each level [of community participation] allows for differing degrees of external involvement and local control, and reflects the power relationships between them" (Tosun, 2006:494). Tosun (2006:494) writes that "After reviewing studies on participatory development approaches in development studies [he] attempted to develop a typology of community participation in tourism". Tosun (2006) proposed three levels of participation tourism (see Table 1) by using Pretty (1995) and Arnstein (1969).

Table 1: Typology of community participation in tourism

Spontaneous participation	Induced participation	Coercive participation
Bottom-up; active participation; direct participation; participation in decision making, authentic participation; self-planning	Top-down; passive; formal; mostly indirect; degree of tokenism; some manipulation; pseudo-participation; participation in implementation and sharing benefits; choice between proposed alternatives and feedback	Top-down; passive; mostly indirect; formal; participation in implementation, but not necessarily sharing benefits; choice between proposed limited alternatives or no choice; paternalism; non-participation; high degree of tokenism and manipulation

Source: Tosun, 2006:494.

Tosun (2006) and Novelli and Gebhardt (2007:448) indicate that a variety "of very different intentions and possibilities can underpin the inclusion of stakeholders in tourism development". Novelli and Gebhardt (2007:449) say that in developing countries, participation is likely to be at the lower level of the ladder; however "this might be changing due to the increasing awareness of the important role that local communities play in relation to sustainable tourism." Giampiccoli and Mtapuri (2015:39) specifically intersect CBT and level

of community participation, and propose that "CBT development happens within specific participatory boundaries which enhance or impair community involvement." As such only the higher participatory levels, which involve citizen control and delegated power, self-mobilisation, transformation and empowerment can be associated with CBT (see Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2015).

Community-based tourism

CBT should be seen in the context of specific parameters and specific characteristics. The literature describes various characteristics and challenges, such as the issue that CBT should be an indigenous effort, that it should be aimed at individual and community wellbeing, that communities often lack financial resources and capacities, and that CBT often has difficulties in marketing or market access (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016:152). It is important that the word "community" in CBT should be understood to mean disadvantaged or marginalised community members of society (Tasci *et al.*, 2013:10). Another fundamental issue of CBT is that disadvantaged community members should be the actors and beneficiaries: they control, own and manage CBT development. Thus CBT "is a tourism conceived, managed and supplied by the local communities of a given territory" (Terencia, 2018:26). Again, CBT "is managed and run by the community itself, management decisions are made by local people and profits directly go to the community" (Nataraja & Devidasan, 2014:68).

CBT's origins can be traced back to the alternative development approaches of the 1970s (Giampiccoli, 2015). The alternative development strategies and alternative forms of tourism development, such as CBT, were therefore correlated to the alternative development concepts and issues, such as empowerment, self-reliance, and sustainability by the critics of negative impact of international mass tourism (Mitchell & Muckosy, 2008:1; Telfer, 2009:156; Zapata et. al., 2011:2). Mitchell and Muckosy (2008:1) assert that "[m]any communities and development practitioners believe that mainstream tourism exacerbates the exclusion of vulnerable groups and commodities indigenous culture. CBT emerged during the 1970s as part of this critique, and it generally involves collective ownership and management of tourist assets." Telfer (2009:156) specifically advances that in the 1970s

> [d]evelopment also began to focus on community-based initiative stressing local participation and self-reliance [...] tourism development has followed many of the concepts associated with the alternative development paradigm with respect to empowerment and sustainability. One of the pillars of the alternative development paradigm is local empowerment and this has been the focus of research on indigenous tourism, community-based tourism, ecotourism and the empowerment of women through tourism.

Community-based tourism is meant for disadvantaged community members and can be related to issues such as empowerment, sustainability, social justice and self-reliance (Giampiccoli, 2015). Nevertheless, even though the meaning of CBT is debated and each definition has its own specifics, "there are recurrent elements in the conceptualisation of CBT; that is, sustainable community development should involve participatory management of the planning, implementation, and evaluation of tourism projects" (Burgos & Mertens, 2017:547). Tasci et al. propose a comprehensive definition, "*CBT is a tourism that is planned, developed, owned and managed by the community for the community, guided by collective decision-making, responsibility, access, ownership and benefits*" (2013:9, italics in original). Here is a comprehensive description:

> The main principle of CBT is to build up the local communities rather than external parties. CBT disallows non local communities to be involved in the tourism management of the local communities. In addition, CBT is managed and owned by local people, because the main objective is to help local residents for their economic benefits [...]. The potential of CBT

> is that it empowers the community, encouraging them to engage in such decisions: planning, evaluation and control of resources. CBT encourages this whole and holistic approach to benefit the visitors (Kaur, Jawaid, & Bt Abu Othman, 2016:17).

The process of empowerment should follow a facilitative approach that it is "not owned/controlled by external agents and its aim should be to make the local community not merely participate, but also to own and control (and be able to manage) tourism facilities and the development process. External control and paternalistic approaches do not work in favour of community empowerment and capacity-building …" (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016:154). CBT is frequently an essential pathway for economic development, particularly for developing countries with community participation and involvement through operative partnerships and collaboration with other vital stakeholders central to its achievement (Park et al., 2017:1).

Participation and CBT

This section can be seen as fundamental (if a long digression) to propose a clarification of the relationship between community participation and CBT. The purpose is to explore some possible misunderstandings, misinterpretations or endorsements of CBT in its relationship to community participation.

Since the turn of the century, a debate around CBT "has become prominent, including diverse understandings of what CBT entails" (Mayaka, Croy, & Wolfram Cox, 2017:1). Community participation is essential to CBT, meaning that:

> development and use of the community's goods and resources should be locally controlled, community-based and community driven. Yet, within the vast literature on CBT, while community involvement and resident participation are relatively ubiquitous principles, community ownership and resident control over decision making face significant challenges, and examples of CBT success are sparse (Dangi & Jamal, 2016:10).

Community participation is seen as fundamental to the CBT model, which is "based on participation and community organization and is rooted in socially just and environmentally responsible development approaches" (Burgos & Mertens, 2017:546). One of the various aspects related to CBT is "local community participation to control tourism development", thus "CBT is the tourism form that has three important basic aspects, namely (a) community involvement; (b) equal economical access, and (c) political empowerment to support community as a decision maker" (Djou, Baiquni, Widodo, & Fandeli, 2017:16). While participation in CBT can be seen as a fundamental matter, it can also be differently understood.

CBT is described as "a type of tourism that *promotes* community participation in financing, development, management, and ownership" (Beeh, 2017:49). Others (Briones, Yusay, & Valdez, 2017:53) mention that the community is the main actor and focus of CBT "as *they may play as the stockpile of labor force*. Also, it must be noted that the *community must, in all aspects, be consulted* first and agree on any tourism-related project as they will be the first liners that will directly receive the impacts of such" (Briones, Yusay, & Valdez, 2017:53). Again, various definitions of CBT include the following characteristics and limitations (Amerta, 2017:102):

> 1. The form of governance of tourism which *provides the opportunity* for local communities to control and be actively involved in the management and development of tourism.

2. The form of governance of tourism that *can provide opportunities* for people who are not directly involved in tourism businesses to also get benefit from existing tourism.
3. This form of tourism demands a systematic empowerment and democratic and fair distribution of benefits to disadvantaged communities in destinations.

Three basic principles are mentioned in CBT planning: "1. *Involving community members in decision-making*, 2. The certainty of the local communities' benefit from tourism activities, and 3. Education of tourism for local communities" (Amerta, 2017:102). Another author (Beeh, 2017:51) states that CBT is defined as "a form of tourism that *provides opportunities* for local communities to control and engage in tourism management and development." All the added *italics* in the above few quotations point to a common (mis)understanding of CBT. The words "promotes", "they may play as the stockpile of labor force", "community must, in all aspect, be consulted", "provides the opportunity", "can provide opportunities", and "involving community members in decision-making" all seem to express that community participation is a consequence of CBT directed from the outside: the community is invited to participate or it is assisted or guided towards participation in CBT.

However, writing that in CBT "community must, in all aspect, be consulted" is contradictory and represents what CBT is not. How it is possible to consult an actor that should be in control (own and manage) CBT from the start? It is not possible to consult someone about CBT who already (should) own and manage it. Again, stating that CBT "*provides the opportunity* for local communities to control and be actively involved in the management and development of tourism" seems to share the misunderstanding. CBT seems to have very flexible meanings or be misinterpreted when a basic principle of CBT is mentioned as *"involving community members in decision-making"* (Amerta, 2017:102). Decision making in CBT should be *completely* in the hands of the community members, which means they cannot be involved in it because they control, own and manage the decision-making process a priori. These misunderstandings of CBT seem to match the current practices in CBT development:

> In many regions CBT is developed in such a manner that local communities are denied of their access to local resources to which they have every right. Moreover the local community people are offered low profile jobs like cleaning, security and similar type of jobs while high profile jobs are offered to the urban and in many cases to outsiders also. The developers talk of "integrating communities into tourism," but rarely do they visit a community and ask what it is locals want. Instead, operations are imposed in an all too familiar top-down fashion (Naik, 2014:45).

This description also applies to the more general realm of international cooperation and the argument that "international development agencies from industrial countries and multinational organizations have been heavily involved in interventions in the developing world over the past fifty years. However, the results have been disappointing and remain within a paternalistic framework, ignoring local cultural context instead of facilitating self-reliance" (Peredo & Chrisman, 2006). In this context,

> community participation in community-based tourism program in Kelimutu National Park was symbolic, or in tokenism levels. Theoretically, this participation form was less invited community and stakeholders in ecotourism planning and development programs. In implementation, local community often invited to listen, accepted information, and finally requested for agreement. Participation only used as requirement of program approval, that indicated program has been made through consultation process, informing to the public and accepted by public (Djou, Baiquni, Widodo, & Fandeli, 2017:16).

On a more general level "where CBT is initiated and even imposed by external development agencies, CBT participation takes place largely in an invited space, compromising the community's degree of voluntary involvement. […] Indeed, the amount and nature of participation have even been used as proxy for CBT success or failure" (Mayaka, Croy & Wolfram Cox, 2017:2). These authors suggest moving away from a Western perspective of participation "to examine participation within community-created rather than invited spaces" (Mayaka, Croy, & Wolfram Cox, 2017:2). The contemporary model of CBT reflects neo-colonial understandings and it can be seen as favouring conservation and private investments through partnership with external entities, leaving inadequate scope for the community's priorities (Manyara & Jones, 2007:642).

In this context it can be asserted that the "neo-liberal prescription to development assumes that private interest is more significant for growth than the 'commons' of public goods policy. The neo-liberal project eschews state intervention in the economy yet such development is captured by class elites and business interests that seek and receive state support in imposing market rule upon public policy. The foundation of capitalism is economic growth as measured by GDP" (Thornburg, 2013:4). However, "effective economic development at the community level should not focus exclusively on economic issues but rather on creating the conditions where the community itself determines its economic opportunities given its resources. In other words, the goal is not creating the proper market conditions but developing among community members a sense of empowerment so that they can take control of their own collective fate" (Thornburg, 2013:5). Therefore, the process should be reversed. Even if external entities are involved, CBT development should be regarded "as a long-term programme of governance to be carried out with and for the community" where external agents such as tour operators are not seen as direct intermediaries but rather "as 'facilitators' – sources of information that eventually can be utilised and transformed into knowledge by the communities themselves (Wearing & MacDonald, 2002:203). Again, it is said that "the development agent is more a catalyst or a facilitator than an independent initiator – presenting ideas but not issuing orders, encouraging rural and isolated area initiatives, but not organising people around his or her preconceived ideas of what is best for them (Connell 1997:257 in Wearing & MacDonald, 2002:204).

In this changed context, CBT can be successful. Locally originated CBT projects can succeed with proper external facilitators or advisers (Sakata & Prideaux, 2013; on the facilitative approach, see also Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013). A study proposes that a CBT village "is a fully managed destination based on the initiative of the local community. Since the planning, structuring, management, and development are done by the community. In addition to the development and management of Wae Rebo [the village] being entirely within the control of local communities, the utilization of financial results from the results of its management was undertaken by local communities" (Beeh, 2017:50). External entities have a specific role to play. In a CBT development in Kenya, external agents were not prominent in the CBT project but only influential in considering local CBT opportunities. In short, "the community created the CBTE [CBT enterprise] in response to the loss of their usual income stream, with an opportunity demonstrated and suggested by neighboring friend …" (Mayaka, Croy & Wolfram Cox, 2017:7).

It must be recognised that disadvantaged community members often lack the necessary resources and skills to proceed by themselves in a CBT development. External assistance is therefore often necessary (Ruiz-Ballesteros & Cáceres-Feria, 2016). Partnering with external entities can be necessary and advantageous; however, specific requirements, such as being facilitative, partnership should be temporary but long-term, community empowerment and ownership, management and control of the CBT development remaining fully in the hands of the community members, must be met (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013:9; Saayman &

Giampiccoli, 2016:152). Partnership should remain within a facilitative, not participatory, framework. Participation is seen as a

> process where the community is involved in a mere organisational capacity, subject to directives and a governing framework that has originated and is managed externally. Mere involvement or participation in projects is little more than window-dressing, often deepening the process of homogenisation and furthering a hegemonic ideology. Facilitation, on the other hand, encourages and diversifies approaches whereby each community can promote its own vision of development. The facilitation process should serve to promote genuine community empowerment (Giampiccoli, 2007:188).

Guidelines to advance CBT should be based on facilitating community empowerment to "provide people with the resources, opportunities, vocabulary, knowledge and skills to increase their capacity to determine their own future, and to participate in and affect the life of their community" (Ife, 2002:208). Facilitation provides the instruments – material and non-material – for the community to go ahead alone, independently, in a self-empowerment and self-reliance process (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2012:35). In this context "CBT should be an autonomous community decision for development and not an externally planned derivation …" (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2015:39).

Various levels of involvement feature in the understandings of CBT. Authors "claim that the problems encountered in the community-based tourism approach stem from the methods and techniques employed in its implementation" (Sakata & Prideaux, 2013:882). They "report community resentment to top-down approaches by external organisations such as NGOs, governments, and national elites" (Sakata & Prideaux, 2013:882). It is noted that "participation is simply not working, because it is used as a 'hegemonic' device to secure compliance to, and control by, existing power" (Sakata & Prideaux, 2013:882). It must be clarified that CBT has various readings and various amounts of community involvement, but the level of involvement is fundamental: "CBT involves direct local participation (collective action) in the development, management and benefits of tourism activities that are integrated into the local economy. The level of this 'local involvement' will determine whether a particular destination can be classified as CBT" (Ruiz-Ballesteros & Cáceres-Feria, 2016:514). Thus, to "better implement CBT we need to measure the community involvement, community awareness, community complexities, community benefit from the tourism, and understand the community complexes in the destination areas" (Naik, 2014:42). Involvement is not enough; it is the level and type of involvement that determine CBT as such.

At the same time, while the level of involvement is fundamental, the need is to go beyond involvement or participation. True CBT is about people initiating, owing and controlling the development process from the beginning. It is not about their participation if the process is controlled by outside entities. The issue is how to assist them to develop the CBT process themselves, not to make them participate in it. External entities can be useful in facilitating CBT development if they participate by assisting the community.

CBT is therefore *not* about participation (or involvement) if such participation is organised or directed by external entities. Instead, the community should participate in its own *self*-originated, owned and managed CBT development; that is to say, *self*-participation. Community participation can therefore not be promoted or stimulated; CBT implies community *self*-participation (not guided or directed by outsiders). Therefore, "perhaps the only forms of local participation that are likely to break existing patterns of power and unequal development are those which originate from within the local communities themselves" (Mitchell & Eagles, 2001:5; Mowforth & Munt, 1998:240 in Mitchell & Eagles, 2001:5).

Area Life Cycle (TALC) and tourist typologies

Butler's (1980) original TALC includes six stages: exploration, involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation, rejuvenation and decline. In the exploration stage "there would be no specific facilities provided for visitors. The use of local facilities and contact with local residents are therefore likely to be high …" (Butler, 1980:7). In the involvement stage "numbers of visitors increase and assume some regularity, some local residents […] begin to provide facilities primarily or even exclusively for visitors" (Butler 1980:7). This stage is characterised by an "increase for those locals involved in catering for visitors" (Butler, 1980:7). In the development stage, the destination begins to be promoted by the media, and as this stage progresses, "local involvement and control of development will decline rapidly. Some locally provided facilities will have disappeared, being superseded by larger, more elaborate, and more up-to-date facilities provided by external organizations, particularly for visitor accommodation" (Butler, 1980:8). In the consolidation stage, "major franchises and chains in the tourist industry will be represented but few, if any, additions will be made" (Butler, 1980:8). Thereafter, in the stagnation stage, "new development will be peripheral to the original tourist area and the existing properties are likely to experience frequent changes in ownership." In the decline stage, "local involvement in tourism is likely to increase at this stage, as employees and other residents are able to purchase facilities at significantly lower prices as the market declines," but it might become a "tourism slum" (Butler, 1980:9).

Finally, rejuvenation may occur through the construction of new built tourism attractions or the exploitation of untapped natural resources (Butler, 1980:9). While many tourist typologies have been proposed, two of the "most widely used tourist typologies are those formulated by Cohen (1972) and Plog (1974)" (Dey & Sarma, 2006:31). Cohen (1972) proposes four types of tourists: the organised mass tourist; the individual mass tourist; the explorer; and the drifter (see Table 2 for details). Butler (1980) in the original TALC article also referred to Cohen (1972) and Plog (1974) to build its model.

Table 2: Tourist typology

The organised mass tourist The organised mass tourist is the least adventurous and remains largely confined to his "environmental bubble" throughout his trip. The guided tour, conducted in an air-conditioned bus, traveling at high speed through a steaming countryside, represents the prototype of the organized mass tourist. This tourist type buys a package-tour as if it were just another commodity in the modern mass market. The itinerary of his trip is fixed in advance, and all his stops are well-prepared and guided; he makes almost no decisions for himself and stays almost exclusively in the microenvironment of his home country. Familiarity is at a maximum, novelty at a minimum
The individual mass tourist This type of tourist role is similar to the previous one, except that the tour is not entirely pre-planned, the tourist has a certain amount of control over his time and itinerary and is not bound to a group. However, all of his major arrangements are still made through a tourist agency. His excursions do not bring him much further afield than do those of the organized mass tourist. He, too, does his experiencing from within the "environmental bubble" of his home country and ventures out of it only occasionally – and even then only into well-charted territory. Familiarity is still dominant, but somewhat less so than in the proceeding type; the experience of novelty is somewhat greater, though it is often of the routine kind.
The explorer This type of tourist tries to get off the beaten track as much as possible, but he nevertheless looks for comfortable accommodations and reliable means of transportation. He tries to associate with the people he visits and to speak their language. The explorer dares to leave his "environmental bubble" much more than the previous two types, but he is still careful to be able to step back into it when the going becomes too rough. Though novelty dominates, the tourist does not immerse himself completely in his host society, but retains some of the basic routines and comforts of his native way
The drifter

This type of tourist ventures furthest away from the beaten track and from the accustomed ways of life of his home country. He shuns any kind of connection with the tourist establishment, and considers the ordinary tourist experience phony. He tends to make it wholly on his own, living with the people and often taking odd-jobs to keep himself going. He tries to live the way the people he visits live, and to share their shelter, foods, and habits, keeping only the most basic and essential of his old customs. The drifter has no fixed itinerary or timetable and no well-defined goals of travel. He is almost wholly immersed in his host culture. Novelty is here at its highest, familiarity disappears almost completely

Source: Cohen, 1972:167.

Cohen (1972:168) states that the first two tourist types, the organised mass tourist and the individual mass tourist, can be called "institutionalized tourist roles; they are dealt with in a routine way by the tourist establishment – the complex of travel agencies, travel companies, chains, etc., that cater to the tourist trade. I will call noninstitutionalized tourist roles, roles, at best only very loosely attached." Plog (2001), updating his earlier research, proposes six typologies of tourist: dependable psychocentric, near dependable (near psychocentric), centric dependable, centric venturer, near-venturer (near-allocentric), venturer (allocentric). He links his tourist typologies to the destination life cycle and writes, "Having seen how personality determines travel preferences, it is possible to apply those concepts to the topic of this article – that is, to explain why destination areas rise and fall in popularity" (2001:18).

The types differ in their need for organised and packaged travel, conformity and security, with venturers needing the least and dependable psychocentrics the most of these. At one end of the spectrum, venturers look for the unknown, new places to be discovered; they require few services and look for new experiences; venturers "go out on their own and discover what a place has to offer" (Plog, 2001:8). "Whether the destination is primitive or refined does not matter, because they [venturers] are interested in having a new experience of whatever kind" (p. 18). At the other end of the spectrum, the dependable psychocentrics "try to make so much of their daily lives predictable and dependable" (p. 15). This spectrum intersects with the destination life cycle. Venturers influence their greater number of near-venturer friends to visit new places and thus "initiate the destination's development cycle, because they not only ask for more services than did the Venturers, but they also tell their friends, relatives, and associates about their great experiences in this new place" (Plog, 2001:18). The presence of near-venturers leads "local people develop hotels, restaurants, shops selling 'native' items, and other services" (p. 18). From near-venturers the destination continues its development cycle: "the destination soon confronts the pressures arising from rapid growth and development" (p. 18). Up to this point of development "everyone seems happy at the destination, jobs are created, constructions go ahead and tax revenues increase seemingly proposing a perfect industry" (p. 18). Tourism development at the destination continues, but the decline is already imminent:

> Throughout this entire process, the seeds of the destination's almost inevitable decline are already sown in the midst of its success. Just when most people at the destination seem happiest about the success of their efforts to grow the tourism base year after year, unseen forces have started to move against them that will spell trouble in the future. At some point, the type of visitor the destination attracts tilts toward the Dependable side of the curve. With continued favorable publicity and increasing popularity for a destination, Dependables also become interested in taking a trip to this much-talked-about place (especially if it has become part of a package tour). Indeed, the greater its popularity, the more likely Dependables will visit, since they prefer to make safe choices (Plog, 2001:18).

Another tourist typology is presented by Smith (1989) who proposes the following tourist typologies: explorer, elite, off-beat, unusual, incipient mass, mass, and charter. Based on

various tourist typologies in literature, Coccossis and Constantoglou (2006:10) propose a typology that specifically links tourists to TALC, impact intention and contact with the local community (see Table 3).

Table 3: General model of demand typologies

Type	Destination preferred	Life cycle stage (TALC – Butler 1980)	Impact intention	Contact with the local community
Lonely travellers	Pioneer resort	Exploration	Small	High
Tourists travelling in small groups	Popular	Initial stages of tourism growth	Medium	Medium
Mass tourists	Famous	Stagnation	High	Small

Source: Coccossis & Constantoglou, 2006:10.

Based on Smith (1989), Saayman explains, "the more tourists visit the community, the higher the impact will be. When the number of tourists is limited, the impact on the community is small; in fact the tourists are hardly noticed. With the arrival of masses there will be an increase in the impact." (2012:89)

Linking diffusion and dependency theories and including the formal and informal dichotomy, Oppermann (1993) proposes that tourism development follows five phases: starting from the capital city and large urban areas, tourism development enlarges towards more isolated locations. During development, the formal sector based on Western-style holiday tastes will follow and to a certain extent replace the informal sector. Each new location will ultimately follow the same pattern of central node with its connected change in tourism structure (from informal to formal), diffusing the same tourism development outlines to more marginal underdeveloped locations (Oppermann (1993). Lea (1998:30), writing about a linear model of tourism development, includes three stages, namely discovery, local response and initiative, and institutionalisation. In the linear model, various trajectories are possible but the result is detrimental to local control. When institutionalised, the industry is taken over by large foreign companies, and when a possible reverse patterns develops, still "little real control is likely to shift from the powerful tourism intermediaries to local people" (Lea, 1998:31).

In relation to the formality or informality of the tourism sector, especially in developing countries, Oppermann (1993:551) advances that in the tourism development process, the informal tourism sector has a discovery function; the formal sector penetrates the established informal resorts. Not every resort develops through the same stages from discovery through the informal sector: over-penetration of the formal sector creates a world-renowned international tourism resort. The informal sector is characterised by its high integration into the local economic structure, which results in low leakage and, therefore, a high multiplier effect on the local economy. By contrast, a high proportion of the formal sector's expenditures are lost to the local economy due to high leakage towards the national capital and abroad for example through expatriate salaries and import of western style features such as furniture. The formal sector is typified in its spatial occurrence as very concentrated, close to international or at least domestic airports, whereas the informal sector is spatially better distributed.

CBT can be informal or formal, and specific trajectories between informality and formality in CBT development are possible (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2016). Especially in the initial stage, "CBT ventures started by the poor with very little capital outlay tend to be linked to informal tourism structures" (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2012:34). CBT by disadvantaged community

members should be seen in an informality framework (especially in the initial stages of CBT development). Giampiccoli and Mtapuri (2012:33) observe that "the formal tourism economy will expand, marginalising the informal sector and small companies, but benefiting larger companies with high capital and human and technological resources." In the diffusion or development stage, "development is inevitable, it occurs in stages and development is diffused from the core to the periphery" (Telfer, 2002:123).

Thus, "development of tourism starts with a pioneer resort and multiplication of resorts leads to a hierarchy and a functional specialisation of resorts. In the last stage the resorts are evenly distributed across the country" (Batta, 2000:42). At some point, the development will spread and diffuse to less developed areas (Browett, 1980:65), eventually favouring an adjustment of the regional inequalities after initial divergence (Oppermann, 1993:538). The diffusion paradigm can be correlated to both localities and industry: "growth poles can be some regions or particular sectors within the regions having high multiplier effect" (Batta, 2000:43). The diffusion approach says that "while initial control of the industry is held locally, eventually larger multinational firms enter the market" (Telfer, 2002:123).

CBT, TALC, community participation and tourist types

Butler's TALC (1980) is a well-recognised and frequently discussed tourism development model (Acharya & Halpenny, 2016:1; Zhang & Xiao, 2014:217). In accordance with the TALC model various studies "refer to the concept by identifying schematic development similarities of different tourist areas […] As a result; the model itself undergoes continuous development" (Kruczek, Kruczek, & Szromek, 2018:3). At the same time it has been noted that "most tourism studies have used the notion of TALC and have examined the destination as a homogenous unit embedding the tourism enterprises within" (Acharya & Halpenny, 2016:2).

Community participation in tourism and CBT have both been related to this TALC model. Following TALC, Amerta (2017:100) proposed six stages of development by extrapolating specific issues of community participation and control of tourism. The stages can be summarised as follows:

  1. Exploration stage (exploration and spontaneous growth)

  A relatively small number of adventurous travellers visit and are exposed to the natural and cultural beauty of the unspoilt tourist destination. Tourism facilities and services obtained are not good. Things to do in the area have not been changed and contact with the local community is relatively high.

  2. Involvement stage (engagement)

  The local community begins to provide tourist facilities, and promotion of the tourist area is started with the help of government involvement. This results in an increasing number of tourists.

  3. Development stage (development and construction)

  The number of tourist arrivals increases sharply. At peak season tourists equal or even outnumber the local population. Outside investors flock to renew facilities. With increasing tourist numbers and popularity, destruction of the area and facilities begins. Planning and control by national and regional authorities are needed, not only to solve the problems that occur but also for international marketing.

4. Consolidation stage (consolidation)

The growth rate has begun to decline, although the total number of tourists still increases.

5. Stagnation stage (stability)

The number of tourists is at its peak and the destination is no longer able to be serve them all. More facilities, better business utilisation and other supporting components are needed to maintain the number of tourists who visit. Environmental, social and economic problems may occur.

6. Decline or Rejuvenation stage (loss of quality or rebirth)

The original tourist destination is "lost" and visitors who knew it no longer come, while the destination becomes a new "resort" that depends on a smaller geographic catchment area for daily trips and weekend visits. Ownership is likely to change and changes in tourism facilities, such as accommodation, occur. Policy makers admit the stage and decide to give the destination a "new birth" by reviewing the position of the destination and formulating new policies for its use, marketing and distribution channels. (Amerta, 2017O100)

Tosun (2006), using a Turkish case study and referring also to Butler (1980), Cohen (1972) and Plog (1974), proposes that the following process will happen elsewhere too. His explanation is also based on Noronba's (1976) "discovery and local response and initiative stages". Tosun's explanation is worth being quoted at length (2006:497):

> When the tourism development process in Ürgüp is elaborated within the destination life cycle model, it may be argued that without creating opportunities for indigenous local people to take part actively in tourism development at the right time and stage of tourism development, it would be very difficult for local people to obtain adequate benefits or sustain their current share from tourism development in their locality. For example, although local people at the initial stage of tourism development [exploration stage] owned and operated small scale guest-houses, economy class hotels or souvenir shops after [the] discovery and local response and initiative stages, it has become gradually more difficult for these indigenous people to operate a tourism related business. Work in the sector since tourism development has become institutionalised (Butler's development stage), which attracted capital to open large scale businesses with the encouragement of the Tourism Incentive Law. In a gradual manner local control over tourism development has been lost while the local tourist destination has attracted more of Plog's (1974) allocentrics and Cohen's (1972) institutionalised tourists. In the emergence of a strong competition under the imperfect market conditions, these locally owned small businesses in the tourism industry could not survive and were closed.

A study from China explains that during the starting stage of development in the investigated destination area, "local people participated only passively in tourism. In the early stages of development, tourists were accommodated in the local community due to the lack of hotels. Local people were passively involved in the industry, without achieving economic benefits. Nevertheless, tourist arrivals continued to increase […] and more tourist facilities, mainly simple hostels, were built" (Zhang & Xiao, 2014:223). During the "acceleration stage, with rapid tourism development" the local community "became polarized in terms of wealth […] While some made bigger and more immediate profits, others, e.g. those who lost their land

and were incapable of operating businesses, became poorer" (Zhang & Xiao, 2014:226). The case from China about its studied destination development explains that "it is interesting to note the losses or gains for the destination community along its path of developing tourism" (Zhang & Xiao, 2014:228).

In the exploration stage, while proactive villagers in the attraction areas directly felt the benefits of having incoming visitors, hardly any loss was perceived of (or from) the destination community. In the second stage of development, competition for the use of resources by different governmental bodies/administrative units resulted in conflicts, and the compulsory resolutions of these conflicts brought about a higher level of unity (through combination and upgrade of administrative units or areas), in which losses were perceived by those who were then disadvantaged in accessing or controlling resources for tourism development. Subsequently, in the stage of fluctuation, local governments' excessive and exploitative uses of natural heritage and land for tourism-related construction brought about opportunities and wealth for some residents; in the meantime, accompanying house-demolition programs created poverty for others. In the acceleration stage, the influx of external investors and businesses has weakened residents' active participation in tourism, in which a large proportion of the benefits was perceivably "leaked" from the destination community. Notably in its current stage, the destination's typically tourism-driven economy is expanding to spill over (or penetrate into) other economic sectors in its transition towards a leisure-oriented economy supported by China's booming domestic tourism (Zhang & Xiao, 2014:228).

It has been stated that "CBT products and services can be described in terms of their life cycle" (Zapata et al., 2011:733). Zapata et al. show how CBT case studies "passed through three different phases, although with different rhythms of growth and results: the exploration phase, where the business idea was conceived; the engagement phase, where the tourist supply and infrastructure were developed; and a third phase marked by growth in the flows of visitors and development" (Zapata et al., 2011:733). In detail:

Exploration phase

> Foreigners, as volunteers or staff working for farming co-operatives or environmental NGOs, visited the communities to support activities related to agriculture production or nature conservation. Visitors were received as guests who came to do some work for the community and who got accommodation and food in exchange. Hospitality was not understood in terms of a merchandised activity with a related price, but as a host and guest relationship free of charges but also free of demands from the visitors. In most communities, it was these external visitors who introduced the idea to develop the production and supply of tourist services in the community as a means to diversify the local economy (Zapata et al., 2011:733).

Engagement phase

> To develop the idea of achieving socio-economic development through tourism it was necessary to raise some initial investments: "At the beginning there were only ideas. But where would we get the necessary funding? We could not start from nothing!" (interviewee of UCA San Ramón). Only when the investment opportunity took place could the business concept be born. However, the national survey made of the 34 CBT projects indicated that eight out of the total had not yet succeeded to get the financial resources to start operating. In some of these cases, the community stayed permanently stuck at the exploration stage, and tourism remained as an idea circulating in the popular imagination of the communities. In most other cases where the necessary physical capital

was successfully gained, it was done with external funding such as donations for the creation of the basic infrastructure (e.g. a house-museum for the Quetzalcoatl Handicraft Cooperative in San Juan de Oriente funded by an Italian NGO). Only six out of the 34 CBTs studied relied almost exclusively on their own capital through personal credits (Zapata *et al.,* 2011:733).

Growth and development phase

This third stage was characterised by the rise of arrivals once initial investments had been made in the economic and human resources necessary to start operating. The analysis of the CBT life cycle showed the existence of three CBT models according to the rhythm of growth of the flow of visitors: CBT with rapid growth, CBT with moderate or slow growth, and stagnated CBT. As discussed later, the different types of growth were related to different modes of organising the tourism services in the community from top-down to bottom-up approaches (Zapata *et al.*, 2011:735).

A model of CBT development and community participation

Based on the above literature, a possible link among the various elements is here proposed. In addition, this proposed model includes three different types of CBT. Mtapuri and Giampiccoli (2013, 2016) proposed two models of CBT – although they can coexist and are not mutually exclusive: single CBT enterprises (e.g. community lodge); and many enterprises (usually SMMEs) under a single umbrella entity.

A third CBT model can be added where many enterprises (usually SMMEs) are present and cooperate without any umbrella entity (if the SMMEs remain within specific characteristics of CBT such as the distribution of benefits to community members not directly involved in CBT). Zapata et al. (2011) propose bottom-up and top-down models of CBT. Table 4 shows various tourism developments stages and links the various CBT elements discussed above. Table 4 also shows how the tourism development stages of a locality shift from CBT being the main tourism system to being virtually non-existent, but having the potential to revive.

Table 4: Proposed links between TALC, CBT and community participation: authors' elaboration based on the literature

In the **CBT type** column, A stands for multiple micro to small enterprises with any formal collaboration; B stands for multiple micro to small enterprises under a common

organisational umbrella; C stands for single community-owned structures; BCBT stands for bottom-up CBT and TCBT stands for top-down CBT.

Modified TALC stage	Community participation (CP)	Outsiders or local elite	External entities or facilitators	CBT stage	CBT level	Formal or informal	CBT type	Tourist typology
Exploration	Bottom-up, passive or involuntary CP. Local people participate only passively in tourism. They host tourists as guests.	Outsiders and local elite not involved	None	Embryonic stage; Slow growth	Very high	Completely informal	A; BCBT	Solo pioneer; Deep drifter; Deep venturer; Deep lonely traveller
Consolidated exploration	Mostly passive or involuntary CP. Initial germination of voluntary CP. Guests becoming tourists, paying money.	Outsiders not involved while local elite starts to consider its involvement	Possible arrival of first NGOs. Government sector may start to consider tourism, but no real involvement happens.	Germination stage; Slow growth	Very high	Essentially informal with a very small germinating formality	A; BCBT	Drifter; Venturer; Lonely traveller
Involvement	CP shifts to top-down approach in proportion to the arrival of external entities. Persistence of minority self-organised CBT (possibly	Outsiders start to consider tourism business in the locality. Local elite starts to be involved.	Consistent presence of various external entities (NGOs, international organisations, etc.) Government involvement grows steadily.	Involvement; Moderate growth	High to medium	Full germination of formal CBT. Informality decreases but remains in balance with formality.	Mostly A with possible germination of B; Mostly BCBT with initial TCBT	Explorer; Near venturer; Centric venturer

	facilitated by bottom-up CP).							
Consolidated involvement	Mostly top-down, passive, dictated by external entities and government projects. Minority self-organised CBT remains (possibly facilitated by bottom-up CP).	Outsiders start to establish tourism businesses in the locality. Local elite grows its involvement in tourism.	All types of external entities are fully involved. Government is fully involved	Consolidated involvement; Moderate to fast growth	Medium	Development of CBT. Formality is surpassing informality. CBT sector starts to suffer against outsider and local elite tourism businesses.	Balanced A and B; Germination of C; Balanced BCBT and TCBT	Tourists travelling in small groups; Centric dependable
Development	CP is always more top-down, passive. Bottom-up projects are always more marginal in their relevance.	Outsiders fully involved in the tourism sector. Local elite fully involved but surpassed by, dependent on and associated with outsiders.	Facilitators remain constant in their efforts but start to decrease their presence. A number of projects previously started will terminate, facilitators moving elsewhere.	Development; Fast growth	Medium to low to very low	CBT is institutionalised and becomes the rule but decreases in relevance in the local tourism sector. Informal CBT is increasingly marginalised to the point of disappearing.	Balanced A, B, and C; Mostly TCBT and decreasing BCBT	Individual mass tourist; Near dependable; Centric venturer or Centric dependable in the informal CBT market
Consolidation	Consistently a top-down, passive CP approach. Bottom-up projects are always marginal.	Outside businesses control local tourism. Local elite is dependent on outsiders.	Facilitators of CP in tourism and CBT becoming irrelevant even if present.	Consolidation; Slow growth	Very low	Formal CBT but its relevance decreases. Informal CBT remains but increase in marginality – virtually no value.	Balanced A, B, and C; Essentially TCBT with BCBT becoming marginal	Organised mass tourist; Dependable psychocentric; Centric venturer or Centric dependable in the informal CBT market
Stagnation	Consistently a top-down,	Outside businesses start to	Possible return of a few external	Stagnation;	Very low	Formal CBT is stable but	Balanced A and B;	Organised mass tourist;

	passive CP approach. Bottom-up projects are always marginal.	struggle and decrease their presence. Local elite also struggling but it can advance and take over former outsider businesses.	entities and facilitators.	Slow to medium growth		marginal to the local tourism sector. Informal CBT remains virtually irrelevant.	Decrease of C; Balanced BCBT and TCBT; BCBT more marginal	Dependable psychocentric; Centric venturer or Centric dependable in the informal CBT market
Rejuvenation	Consistently a top-down, passive CP approach. New self-organising CBT projects may arise.	Some outsiders with some local elite members search for new tourism development possibilities and attempt to remain in the area.	Increase in facilitators' presence. Facilitators may be more radical or environmental, and may adhere more to alternative tourism approaches.	Rejuvenation or revival; Medium to fast growth	Medium to high	CBT revives as a possible alternative tourism development option. Formal CBT re-establishes itself. Informal CBT grows again but remains marginal to formal CBT.	Balanced A and B; Possible re-germination of C; Balanced BCBT and TCBT, but BCBT could revive	Tourists travelling in small groups; Individual mass tourist; Centric venturer or Centric dependable in the informal CBT market
Decline	Consistently a top-down, passive CP approach but its relevance decreases. New self-organising CBT projects may arise.	Outsiders consistently decrease their participation in tourism. Local elite could take advantage and regain control of local tourism businesses.	More facilitators may arrive. They may be more radical or environmental, and may adhere more to alternative tourism approaches.	Decline or revival; Slow to no growth	Low	Growth in informal (survivalist) CBT. Possible shift of some formal CBT ventures to informality.	Mostly A with marginal and potentially growing B; Balanced BCBT and TCBT but both in decline	Explorer; Tourists travelling in small groups; Centric venturer or Centric dependable in the informal CBT market

As Table 4 shows, along the tourism development process the level of relevance of CBT goes from very high to very low, coming back to medium or high in the rejuvenation stage. At the same time community participation in tourism, or CBT, goes from a bottom-up approach to a top-down approach along the stages until the decline or rejuvenation stages offer new opportunities for bottom-up CBT. When the tourism sector is in difficulty and needs to be reinvented, new opportunities for CBT can arise, thus mobilising a new wave of bottom-up CBT. For example, in the rejuvenation stage the local population has a better understanding of the tourism sector because all the stages of development have been gone through. Local disadvantaged community members, although they might still lack resources, are in a better position than at the outset to revive the CBT concept alone and own the CBT development process. External entities as facilitators, outside businesses and local elites all play a role in CBT and its relevance.

TALC is related to tourism growth and decline. It must be noted that the origin al TALC model "argued that when development and growth peaked, astute potential developers would seek new locations with lower costs, untouched resources and greater opportunities for expansion" (Butler, 2011:5). The TALC "it argued that destinations can be viewed as products, and that their pattern of development closely mirrors the classic life cycle curve, with a period of slow initial growth, followed by a rapid development and take up period, which then gives way to slower growth and eventually probably a decline" (Butler, 2009:347). Thus, "In the original TALC model, development and growth were expressed in terms of visitor numbers, as other alternative measures were not generally available" (Butler, 2009:348).

Tourism overdevelopment, as predicted in the TALC model, brings with it many related problems, including a change in attitudes towards tourism from it being a panacea to it being responsible for all ills in a community (Butler, 2009:351). For example, in relation to TALC it has been "noted that a problem with uni-linear models is that they do not address structural changes such as economic restructuring and cultural changes in societies which clearly influence resort relevance in the postmodern world" (Butler, 2011:14). The frequent failure of planning and regulation of tourism development, the large leakage of expenditure out of the tourism destinations to foreign based companies and general reductions in quality of life have all eroded the initial good will show to early tourism development. The cycle of development is matched by a cycle of attitude change, not always consistent and not always moving towards a negative position, but generally reflective of the nature and scale of tourism in destinations. It is not inconceivable that some present tourism destinations may withdraw from tourism or at least from some of its less desirable (normally expressed as ''mass'') forms, a trend particularly likely in those destinations which have become retirement communities (Butler, 2009:351).

In this context it can be argued that "The interrelationship between lifecycle (representing tourism growth) and carrying capacity is nevertheless a dynamic one […] the limit of growth in the evolution model is not primarily based on the capacity of the destination and its (''original'') resources for absorbing tourism, but on the industry (activity) and its capacity. By changing the tourism product (destination) through development and marketing, and by introducing new types of facilities and infrastructure, etc., the destination and its limits of growth can be modified and moved forward to a new, higher level" (Saarinen, 2006:1128). This last passage seems to give opportunities to exploit new form of tourism to counterbalance the negative effect of mass tourism within the context of TALC. It is here proposed that CBT could be a valuable alternative option. This attitude going towards a more community oriented tourism can be already seen when mentioning that "the stage of the destination in the life cycle heavily influences the acceptability of a destination-wide planning exercise. In the early stages of the life cycle for example, success often obscures the long term view, whilst in the later stages, particularly when a destination is in decline, opposition to long term planning exercises may be rationalized on the basis of cost. In seeking to remedy the issue of local opposition, focus

group participants identified the development of a community tourism vision as an important starting point from which whole-of-destination collaboration may occur" (Wilde & Cox, 2008:474). It is here also suggested that the growth on tourism offer opportunities of learning through exposure to the local community enhancing its capacity and understandings, thus allowing the community to become more aware of the problems and opportunities linked to tourisms sector. It is the growth of tourism during a destination lifecycle that enhance the opportunities for CBT as the tourism growth bring awareness and knowledge about tourism to the wider community allowing its new involvement through a more community oriented approach.

As regards the types of tourist, it is relevant to understand the volume of tourism coming to the destination and the tourists' preferred type of structure. CBT in the decline and rejuvenation stages could attract centric-venturer or centric-dependable tourists and occasionally also explorers. When the decline becomes pronounced, the locality can become a new source of adventure. CBT can exploit the new context and contribute to the revival of the area.

On the other hand, the initial development of CBT involves, especially in more remote areas, a transition from guests to tourists. The embryonic and the germination stages of CBT both show slow growth. In the embryonic stage, guests may sometimes simply be welcomed and not asked to pay – although in the contemporary world this is increasingly rare – but in the germination stage, community members start asking for payment: guests become tourists.

Many different actors influence CBT. The role of facilitators and local elites needs to be understood in the general context of power relations. Local elites, for example, can have a relevant role. It may be that "local elites are complicit in the underdevelopment of their states, not as instruments of capital but as a result of the prevailing ideological climate of privatisation and deregulation in which the range of development options available to them has become even more constrained" (Bianchi, 2002:289). Beyond that, external facilitators and government need to be understood in their actual position in the power relation framework.

The approach to tourism development in developing countries has been grounded in technocrats' Western model of development (Bianchi, 2002:273). Long ago, De Kadt (1979:45) proposed that "while governments may have some impact on the configuration of social forces, they inevitably represent the interests of certain groups more than others and operate within the limits which are fairly narrow at any one moment of time. To the extent that policies in any sector, such as tourism, reflect the existing socio-economic situation, the development of the sector is likely to reinforce the position of the more powerful classes, confirming existing social patters, even though, for example, the employment distribution of tourism may generate some shift in the social position of particular groups." Instead, the restructuring of the tourism sector should be towards a social justice and redistributive approach. Therefore, as proposed long ago but arguably very valid today, "if by 'development' one includes the goal of reducing inequalities and redistributing social goods according to the priorities of basic needs, then the distributive aspect of tourism is of central importance" (Britton, 1981:19).

Charity and a paternalistic approach are not enough. The elimination of poverty "should not be regarded as 'charity' – the domain of 'bighearted' pop stars or 'enlightened' bureaucrats" (Chok, Macbeth, & Warren, 2007:160). Instead, "CBT should be interpreted within the context of growth working towards the restructuring of the tourism industry on a global scale, not as a 'paternalistic' niche segment of the tourism industry" (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016:165). This model serves to elucidate how CBT along its development process in certain locations suffers through external influences that work against it – sometimes involuntarily (such could be the case of NGOs working in CBT but not along proper CBT lines) – and jeopardise the outcome

of CBT. However, CBT seems to have a window of possible recovery in the later stages of development, with rejuvenation and decline making transformation of the local tourism sector possible.

Conclusions

Tourism is a growing and relevant sector in many localities. Tourism development can also have negative impacts on the local community; therefore community involvement in tourism is seen as fundamental in the process to balance tourism's negative impacts and community wellbeing. CBT is a form of tourism specially directed towards disadvantaged community development. Specific understandings of community participation in CBT have been proposed in the literature. This article uses the TALC model and tourism typologies together with issues of community participation, CBT and various tourism development stages to build a reciprocal relationship among the various elements. The article's key findings are:

1. There is a need to clarify that CBT is not about participation if participation is externally invited and controlled. CBT should be understood to be self-participatory, meaning participation decided on and implemented by community members themselves.
2. Destinations go through tourism development stages. CBT's initial control of the tourism area and its potential is gradually jeopardised and reduced by the growth in tourism due to external businesses, the local elite and external facilitators. This last entity, while supposedly coming to assist CBT, often implements a top-down approach grounded in Western models that do not fit and do not contribute to community participation and CBT. CBT must instead benefit disadvantaged community members and bring about redistribution, social justice and empowerment.

These findings have two main implications for destination areas:

1. Linked to the understanding of CBT as a self-participatory process, the implication is that increased CBT development requires specific prerequisites so that community members alone see the potential of CBT and have the necessary resources and capacities to advance CBT themselves. Such prerequisites could include education and skills development in tourism or CBT, and access to microfinance.
2. The second implication is that government should implement measures at each stage of tourism development to favour locally controlled tourism, small tourism businesses, etc., or at least balance their relevance with that of externally controlled and large businesses.

Whenever community participation is defined in CBT, it is relevant to recall what Arnstein (1969:216) says:

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

Only in this sense can CBT and community participation have common ground.

References

Acharya, B. P., & Halpenny, E. A. (2016). *Applying the Tourism Area Life Cycle and Small Tourism Enterprises' Growth Cycle Models to Explain Communities' Sustainability*. 2016 Conference. 4, University of Massachusetts – Amherst, ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst.

Amerta, I. M. S. (2017). Community based tourism development. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1(3): 97-107.

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

Batta, R. N. (2000). *Tourism and the environment: a quest for sustainability: with special reference to developing countries, and policy analysis on Himachal Pradesh*. New Delhi: Indus Publishing.

Beeh, Y. Y. (2017). The role of community in the development of Wae Rebo as a community-based tourism destination in east Nusa Tenggara. *Journal of Business on Hospitality and Tourism,* 13(1): 46-63.

Bianchi, R. V. (2002). Toward a new political economy of global tourism. In: Sharpley, R. & Telfer, D. J. eds. *Tourism and Development Concepts and Issues.* Clevedon: Channel View Publications, 265-299.

Briones, Z. B. H., Yusay, R. M. S., & Valdez, S. (2017). Enhancing community based tourism programs of Gawad Kalinga Enchanted Farm towards sustainable tourism development. *Journal of Economic Development, Management, IT, Finance and Marketing,* 9(1): 51-60.

Britton, S. G. (1981). *Tourism, Dependency and Development: a mode of analysis.* (No. 23). Canberra: Australian National University Press.

Browett, J. (1980). Development, the diffusionist paradigm and geography. *Progress in Human Geography,* 4(1): 57-79.

Burgos, A., & Mertens, F. (2017). Participatory management of community-based tourism: A network perspective. *Community Development,* 48(4): 546-565.

Butler. R. (2009). Tourism in the future: Cycles, waves or wheels? *Futures*, 41:346-352.

Butler, R. W. (1980). The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer,* 24(1): 5-12.

Butler, R. W. (2004). The tourism area life cycle in the twenty-first century. In Lew, A. A., Hall, C. M. & Williams, A. M. eds. *A Companion to Tourism.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 159-169.

Butler, R. W. (2011). Tourism Area Life cycle. *Contemporary Tourism Reviews*, 3-33. Goodfellow Publishers Limited. Available at: https://www.goodfellowpublishers.com/free_files/fileTALC.pdf

Chok, S., Macbeth, J., & Warren, C. (2007). Tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation: a critical analysis of "pro-poor tourism" and implications for sustainability. *Current Issues in Tourism,* 10(2/3): 144-165.

Coccossis, H., & Constantoglou, M. E. (2006). The use of typologies in tourism planning: problems and conflicts. *46th Congress of the European Regional Science Association*

(ERSA). Southern Europe and the Mediterranean, University of Thessaly-Department of Planning and Regional Development, Volos, Greece.

Cohen, E. (1972). Towards a sociology of international tourism. *Social Research,* 39: 164–182.

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.

Dey, B., & Sarma, M. K. (2006). Tourist typologies and segmentation variables with regard to ecotourists. *Tourism Management,* 8: 31-39.

Djou, J. A. G, Baiquni, M., Widodo, T., & Fandeli, C. (2017). Symbolic participation in community-based tourism in Kelimutu National Park, Ende, East Nusa Tenggara. *Journal of Business and Management*, 19(1): 15-20.

Giampiccoli, A. (2007). Hegemony, globalization and tourism policies in developing countries. In: Burns, P. M. & Novellim, M. eds. *Tourism and Politics. Global Framework and Local Realities.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Giampiccoli, A. (2015). Community-based tourism: origins and present trends. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance,* 21(2): 675-687.

Giampiccoli, A., & Mtapuri, O. (2012). Community-based tourism: an exploration of the concept(s) from a political perspective. *Tourism Review International,* 16: 29-43.

Giampiccoli, A., & Mtapuri, O. (2015). Between theory and practice: a conceptualization of community based tourism and community participation. *Loyola Journal of Social Sciences,* 29(1): 27-52.

Ife, J. (2002). *Community Development: Community-based Alternative in the Age of Globalisation*. Sydney: Pearson Education.

Jirojkul, S., & Techato, K. (2017). Social responsibility in community-based tourism enterprise. *Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences,* 12(7): 1825-1829.

Kaur, P., Jawaid, A., & Othman, N. B. A. (2016). The impact of community based tourism on community development in Sarawak. *Journal of Borneo Kalimantan, Institute of Borneo Studies,* 2: 15-26.

Kruczek, Z., Kruczek, M., & Szromek, A. R. (2018). Possibilities of using the tourism area life cycle model to understand and provide sustainable solutions for tourism development in the Antarctic region. *Sustainability,* 10(89): 1-16.

Lea, J. (1998). *Tourism and Development in the Third World*. London: Routledge.

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.

Mayaka, M., Croy, W. G., & Cox, J. W. (2017, August.) Participation as motif in community-based tourism: a practice perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism.* DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2017.1359278.

Mearns, K. F., & Lukhele, S. E. (2015). Addressing the operational challenges of community-based tourism in Swaziland. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure,* 4(1): 1-13.

Mitchell, R. E., & Eagles, P. F. J. (2001). An Integrative Approach to Tourism: Lessons from the Andes of Peru. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 9(1): 4-28.

Mitchell, J., & Muckosy, P. (2008). A misguided quest: Community-based tourism in Latin America. *ODI Opinion*, 102. Available at http://www.dfid.gov.uk/r4d/PDF/Outputs/COPLA/tourism-OpPaper.pdf.

Moscardo, G. (2008). Building community capacity for tourism development: conclusion. In: Moscardo, G. ed. *Building community capacity for tourism development*. Wallingford: CAB International, 172-179.

Mtapuri, O., & Giampiccoli, A. (2013). Interrogating the role of the state and nonstate actors in community-based tourism ventures: toward a model for spreading the benefits to the wider community. *South African Geographical Journal,* 95(1): 1-15.

Mtapuri, O., & Giampiccoli, A. (2016). Towards a comprehensive model of community-based tourism development. *South African Geographical Journal,* 98(1): 154-168.

Mtapuri, O., & Giampiccoli, A. (2017). A conceptual coalescence: towards luxury community-based tourism. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure,* 6(3): 1-14.

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

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.

Naik, S. (2014). Community based tourism approach – a review. *Compass*, 1(2): 42-47.

Nataraja, T. C., & Devidasan, S. D. (2014). Community based tourism: case study on potential of Shivanahalli village. *Compass*, 1(2): 67-75.

Novelli, M., & Gebhardt, K. (2007). Community based tourism in Namibia: "reality show" or "window dressing". *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(5): 443-479.

Oppermann, M. (1993). Tourism space in developing countries. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 20: 535-556.

Park, E., Phandanouvong, T., & Kim, S. (2017). Evaluating participation in community-based tourism: a local perspective in Laos. *Current Issues in Tourism*. DOI: 10.1080/13683500.2017.1323851.

Peredo, A. M., & Chrisman, J. J. (2006). Toward a theory of community-based enterprise. *Academy of Management Review,* 31(2): 309-328.

Plog, S. C. (2001). Why destination areas rise and fall in popularity: an update of a Cornell quarterly classic. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly,* 42(3): 13-24.

Plog, S. C. (1974, November). Why destination areas rise and fall in popularity. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly,* 13-16.

Pretty, J. (1995). The many interpretations of participation. *Focus,* 16: 4-5.

Rasoolimanesh, S. M., & Jaafar, M. (2016). Community participation toward tourism development and conservation program in rural world heritage sites. In Butowski, L. ed. *Tourism – from Empirical Research towards Practical Application.* London: InTech, 1-14.

Rogerson, C. M. (2013). Tourism and local development in South Africa: Challenging local governments. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, September (Supplement 2), 9-23.

Ruiz-Ballesteros, E., & Cáceres-Feria, R. (2016). Community-building and amenity migration in community-based tourism development. An approach from southwest Spain. *Tourism Management,* 54: 513-523.

Runyowa, D. (2017). Community-based tourism development in Victoria Falls, Kompisi Cultural Village: an entrepreneur's model. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure,* 6(2): 1-7.

Saarinen, J. (2006). Traditions of sustainability in tourism studies. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(4): 1121-1140.

Saayman, M. (2012). *An Introduction to Sports Tourism and Event Management.* Bloemfontein: Sun Media Metro.

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.

Sakata, H., & Prideaux, B. (2013). An alternative approach to community-based ecotourism: a bottom-up locally initiated non-monetised project in Papua New Guinea. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 21(6): 880-899.

Salleh, N. H. M., Shukor, M. S., Othman, R., Samsudin, M., & Idris, S. H. M. (2016). Factors of local community participation in tourism-related business: case of Langkawi Island. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity,* 6(8): 565-571.

Smith, V. L. (1989). *Hosts and Guests; the Anthropology of Tourism.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Suansri, P. (2003). *Community Based Tourism Handbook.* Bangkok: Responsible Ecological Social Tour (REST).

Tasci, A. D. S., Semrad, K. J., & Yilmaz, S. S. (2013). *Community based tourism finding the equilibrium in COMCEC context: Setting the Pathway for the Future.* Ankara: COMCEC Coordination Office.

Telfer, D. J. (2002). The evolution of tourism and development theory. In: Sharpley, R. & Telfer, D. J. eds. *Tourism and Development Concepts and Issues.* Clevedon: Channel View Publications, 35-78.

Terencia, N. M. (2018). Community based tourism and development in third world countries: the case of the Bamileke region of Cameroon. World academy of science, engineering and technology. *International Journal of Social and Tourism Sciences,* 12(1): 26-30.

Thornburg, J. (2013, 8-12 July). Cuban community development, tourism and a sustainable future. *VIII Congreso Internacional de Áreas Protegidas of the IX Convención Internacional sobre Medio Ambiente y Desarrollo*, Havana, Cuba.

Timothy, D. (2002). Tourism and community development issues. In: Sharpley, R. & Telfer, D. J. eds. *Tourism and Development Concepts and Issues.* Clevedon: Channel View Publications, 135-178.

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: 493-504.

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.

Wearing, S., & McDonald, M. (2002). The Development of Community-based Tourism: Re-thinking the Relationship between Tour Operators and Development Agents as Intermediaries in Rural and Isolated Area Communities, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 10(3): 191-206.

Wilde, S. J. & Cox, C. (2008). Linking destination competitiveness and destination development: findings from a mature Australian tourism destination. *The Travel and Tourism Research Association (TTRA) European Chapter Conference - Competition in tourism: business and destination perspectives.* Helsinki, Finland, TTRA, 467-478.

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.

Zhang, C., & Xiao, H. (2014). Destination development in China: towards an effective model of explanation. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22(2): 214-233.

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