Local Communities in Tourism Development of Rural Area, A Case Study of Two Local Tourism Initiatives in Wanayasa, Purwakarta

Jajang Gunawijaya[1], Annisa Pratiwi[2], Irfan Nugraha[3]
[1,2,3]Vokasi Pariwisata, Program Vokasi Universitas Indonesia

Abstract

This paper describes the challenges in the rural tourism development based on local participation. The rural tourism based on local participation has been identified as ideal model that will uplifting local economy without had significant impacted to their "nature" way of life. However, based on the research on two local groups who are managing the tourism in Wanayasa, we found out that there are challenges in developing the tourism based on local participation. Despite of each groups have differences characteristic in tourism management practice, there are some similarity challenges. Each of groups has facing the external and internal challenges. It shows us that the rural tourism development is the complex process. Furthermore, the integrative model which is including various stakeholders would be an alternative model to optimize the rural tourism development, especially in sustainable tourism.

Keywords: *sustainable tourism, rural tourism, local participation*

Abstrak

Makalah ini menjelaskan tantangan dalam pengembangan desa wisata berbasis partisipasi masyarakat lokal. Pariwisata pedesaan berbasis pada partisipasi masyarakat lokal telah diidentifikasi sebagai model ideal yang akan mengangkat perekonomian lokal yang signifikan telah berdampak pada sumber daya alam. Namun, berdasarkan penelitian pada dua kelompok masyarakat lokal yang mengelola pariwisata di Wanayasa, kami menemukan bahwa ada tantangan dalam mengembangkan pariwisata berbasis partisipasi masyarakat lokal. Meskipun masing-masing kelompok memiliki perbedaan karakteristik dalam praktek manajemen pariwisata, ada beberapa tantangan kesamaan. Masing-masing kelompok telah menghadapi tantangan eksternal dan internal. Ini menunjukkan bahwa pengembangan pariwisata pedesaan adalah proses yang kompleks. Selanjutnya, model integratif yang termasuk adalah berbagai pemangku kepentingan yang menjadi model alternatif untuk mengoptimalkan pengembangan pariwisata pedesaan, terutama di bidang pariwisata berkelanjutan.

Kata Kunci: *Pariwisata Berkelanjutan, Pariwisata Pedesaan, Partisipasi Masyarakat Lokal*

INTRODUCTION

The community approach to tourism development is an attempt to integrate the interests of all community stakeholders, including residents as a critically-important group, in analyses and proposals for development (Murphy & Murphy, 2004). Public involvement and community empowerment based upon local social capital constitute rational responses to challenges brought by the processes of tourism activity and their potential tourism product. Issues surrounding tourism development inflame local participation to contribute their skill and knowledge about tourism for the enhancement of their tourism product. Public involvement in planning and development is fundamental because of the nature of tourism in presenting communities, environment, and cultures.

Murphy stressed the importance of local involvement in tourism development, especially in rural tourism development. He indicated that the success of tourism relies on the goodwill and cooperation of local people because they are part of the tourism product. He argues that if tourism development and planning does not match with the local aspirations and capabilities, this can destroy the industries' potential. Thus, while there is a few discussion as to whether or not locals should be involved in tourism development, there is discussion about how they should be involved (Mowfort & Munt, 1998). Because local participation is generally regarded as a contributing factor in the success of development projects, it is now incorporated in policies of many NGOs and governments (Pretty, 1995).

Rural tourism benefits local communities in terms of stimulating economic growth, valuing social cultural heritage, triggering the growth of service industries, and raising the standard of living; these benefits in turn encouraging positive attitudes and behaviors among these communities toward regard to tourism development (Jaafar et al., 2013; Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012). Chaudhry and Gupta (2010) report that 75% of the world's poor live in rural areas and that rural tourism is a tool for rural revitalization.

Wanayasa village is a tourism product in Purwakarta District which has massive potential of natural and cultural resources. It is a district constitute three villages; they are Kiarapedes Village, Wanayasa Village, and Bojong Village. The main developed area is Wanayasa Village and followed by Kiarapedes Village and Bojong Village.

Figure 1. Purwakarta District Map

On the matter of the rural tourism development in Wanayasa, it can be said that tourism product is appreciated and responded to sustainbly-developed by the local participation. In Wanayasa village, there are various local group formed by the local community and government tourism office of Purwakarta District. There are two main local group such as The Tourism Driving Force Group (*Kelompok Penggerak Pariwisata/KOMPEPAR)* and The Tourist Village Organizer (*Penyelenggara Kampung Wisata)*. Those groups are the main discuss of this study. We will see the difference of the two groups and their challenges in developing their tourism development area in coherence with local participation.

To elaborate this paper, we undertake an extensive review of the literature concerning rural tourism and local participation involvement in the tourism sector. In the result section, we describe the difference of two local group community in Wanayasa Village and their challenges in participating the tourism activities in Wanayasa Village.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A qualitative approach was used to gain an in-depth understanding of local community in participate the rural tourism development. The research included 20 semi-structured interviews conducted with members of two Local Action Groups in Wanayasa, Purwakarta. The interview provides rich source of knowledge about local action groups and their challenges in participating the rural tourism development. The result analyzed the local development strategies and challenges from the interviews. Particularly, diversity of demonstrated views manifests the character of local group communities.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter we will discuss the main concepts of this study. The literature review consists of two sections. In the first section, we will take a closer look at the rural tourism development. In Section 2.2 we will examine on the ways in which local communities and stakeholders can participate in tourism development. In Section 2.3 we will see the interactional community and the empowerment of local society influence the tourism development.

Rural Tourism Development

Tourism is a means to stimulating local economic development (Gurung & DeCoursey, 2000). In Europe and elsewhere, rural tourism provides economic and social benefits to rural destination communities (Iorio & Corsale, 2010). Sharpley (2000) observes that rural tourism can act as a catalyst for socio-economic development and regeneration. Furthermore, rural tourism can supplement the incomes of impoverished agricultural cooperative settlements (Fleischer & Pizam, 1997), and provide new sources of income for families living in remote rural areas (Gale, 2006; Su, 2011). Tourism contributes toward rural development because it provides another avenue for employment and income generation, expands the market for local products, and revitalizes traditional economies (Azman et al., 2011; Ghaderi & Handerson, 2012).

Local Participation In Tourism Development

Several authors have discussed the different ways in which local communities can be involved in tourism activities. Timothy (1999), for instance, has made a distinction between participation in the decision making process and the involvement in the benefits of tourism. Pretty (1995) has created a more refined typology of participation in development projects, mainly focusing on the agricultural sector. This has been useful in many (rural) development projects (Mikkelsen, 2005). Pretty's typology has later been adapted by France (1998) to fit the context of tourism development. Table 1 provides an overview of their typologies.

Starting from passive participation in which the community has no contribution in the planning and is not involved in any of the benefits either. The phase of consultation and the next phase of the participation such as material incentives and functional which the community provide some resources such as labour and land to the tourism activities. The highest level of community participation is self-mobilization. In this phase, the local communities have full control over the decision making process as well as over the execution and benefits. In this case, tourism development is seen as sustainable and the local community is independent.

Table 1. Overview typologies of participation

Prettys' typology of participation*	Frances' adapted typology of participation**
1. Passive participation	**1. Plantation**
People participate by being told what is going to happen or has already happened, with no ability to change it. The information being shared belongs only to external professionals.	Exploitative, rather than developmental. Possibly paternalist. Payment in kind. No attempt to participate on the part of workers, who are commonly racially and culturally different from 'management' and owners. Purely for material gain of owners.
2. Participation in information giving	**2. Manipulative and passive participation**
People participate by answering questions posed by extractive researchers and developers. People do not have the opportunity to influence proceedings, as the findings of the research are neither shared nor checked for accuracy.	Pretence of participation. Local workers is told what is decided. Some highly centralized multinational corporations based in developing countries. Neo-colonial attitudes prevail through the use of expatriate labour, capital and technology. Employees in tourism in non-menial jobs are likely to be expatriates or non-indigenous residents.
3. Participation by consultation	**3. Consultation**
People participate by being consulted, and external people listen to views. External professionals define both problems and solutions, and may modify these in the light peoples responses. The consultative process does not concede any share in decision making, and professionals are under no obligation to take on board people's views.	Residents consulted but external definition of problem and control. Operations of some MNC's is devolved from metropolitan centres to local elites.
4. Participation for material incentives	**4. Material incentives**
People participate by providing resources such as labour and land, in return for food, cash or other material incentives. People have no stake in prolonging activities when incentives end.	Locals contribute resources, but have no stake holding. Local employment in tourism services where local expertise is used and locals are hiring in some managerial positions.

5. Functional participation	**5. Functional participation**
People participate by forming groups or committees which are externally initiated. Groups/committees are seen as means to achieve predetermined goals. The groups tend to be dependent on external initiations and facilitators, but may eventually become self-dependent.	Participation seen by outsiders as a way of achieving goals. Major decisions are external. Increasing use of local technology, capital and expertise. Some small, locally owned hotels. Minority élites often the most likely to participate. In larger hotels, some decisions made locally, but according to external forces.
6. Interactive participation	**6. Interactive participation**
People participate by being involved in analysis and development of action plans, for example. Participation is seen as a right and not just as a mechanical function. Groups may be formed and together with partner (donor agencies) make use of systematic and structured learning processes. Groups take control over local decisions, and so people have a stake in maintaining structures or practices.	Residents contribute to planning. Groups take control of local decisions. Hotels owned by local people or groups of local people. Locally owned taxis, tour agencies, and restaurants. Maintenance of cultural events for the benefit of residents and tourists.
7. Self-mobilization	**7. Self-mobilization**
People participate by taking initiatives to change systems independent of external institutions, although the latter can help with an enabling framework. They retain control over how resources are used. Such self-initiated mobilization and collective action may or may not challenge existing inequitable distribution of wealth and power.	Independent initiatives. Local people who have accumulated capital from tourism strengthen and extend their activities.
*Pretty (1995), **France (1998)*	

Based on both these typologies, Tosun (2006) developed another typology for community participation in tourism, including three levels. He distinguishes between coercive, induced and spontaneous participation. Spontaneous participation is here regarded as a bottom-up type of participation, meaning that the ideas and decisions were made at the local level. Coercive and induced participation are both top-down, and can be distinguished mainly by having no control at all (coercive) or having limited choices (induced). Tosuns' research focussed on the expected nature of local participation by asking people about the ways in which they would like to participate. He found that different groups have different expectations, which often conflict with each other. In his earlier research Tosun (2000) also explains that participation is ideal when power shifts to people who are originally excluded.

Komarudin (2013) said that the type of stakeholders involved in tourism development , i.e.:

Selfmobilization, groups of people who have direct contact with tourist and develop independent tourism service.

Empowerment, it is the highest of local participation. The local communities have control over all development without the forces or external influences. The advantage from the tourism activities is fully distributed to the internal community.

Partnership, coalition between developers and local communities will be carried out in the process of participatory.

Interaction, local community have the involvement in a great scale. The rights of local communities can be accepted in the local level. Tourism is governed by community organization, and they received limited support from the government or agency.

Consultation, i.e. there are several ways in consulting tourism development, the consultation happened in a community such as meeting or hearing that open for public.

Interactional Community and Empowerment

The quality of tourism development in rural areas is influenced by their natural and man-made environment and also the resident there. Individuals and communities can have a range of roles in the development process, including as key actors in the tourism policy and planning process, etc. Community action emerges in result of interactions among participants of social fields such as education, tourism and recreation, environment, local governance, which are linked to specific rural area (Theodori, 2005). 'Social field' is a process of interaction in time focused on joint interests of its participants. Whereas participants of social field get together because of common interests, community action that addresses common concerns of participants from different social fields enhances relationship among them (Theodori, 2005). Empowerment of local society requires two types of investments: 1) investments in integration of stakeholders; 2) investments in activities facilitating collective efforts (Helling, Serrano & Warren, 2005). Given the fundamental meaning that empowerment has for practice of local participation in Wanayasa Village, then following discussion concentrates on the local action groups namely KOMPEPAR and The tourist village organizer on tourism development.

DISCUSSION AND FINDING

Local Action Group in Purwakarta's Region

The practice of the local participation in Wanayasa reflected in the presence of two groups of managing tourist destination, i.e. The Tourism Driving Force (*KOMPEPAR)* and The Tourist Village Organizer (*Penyelenggara Kampung Wisata)*. The differences can be seen in historical of these group communities. Kompepar is self-supporting group community that the members of kompepar are conscious of tourism assets and they are colaborating with tourism department in Purwakarta district. The members are from the number of people around Setu Winayasa. (the residents). Meanwhile, The Tourist Village Organizer have become the most distinguished organization at the local level that engage partners from the public servants of government.

The background of local group is reflected in the tourism management. Kompepar improve the area of tourist destination by maintaining the facilities. Meanwhile, the tourist village organizer manage the tourist destination depends on the capability of the public servants. They tried to synergize the village development with their tourism planning. In short, Kompepar is an independent group which legitimized by the department of tourism Purwakarta, while the tourist village organizer come from the institution of village government engaged with local government. Kompepar is focusing on the management of

6

Setu Wanayasa. It is the main attraction located in Wanayasa Village. This can be seen in the description of the developed organization led by the leader of Kompepar.

In the beginning, Kompepar had no attention to make Setu Wanayasa as source of beneficial economy. At the start of this organizations development, Kompepar protect the lake cleaned for ecology system can be preserved, especially for the fisherman can caught the fish easier. The members itself always did internal discussion to arrange the management planning of Setu Wanayasa.

From time to time, Komempar had increased the tourism activities significantly. So the members of Komempar developed the service independently. It was seen from their direct interaction with the visitors which result the facilities, such as the necessity of parking lot, sanitation facility and security. Then Kompepar made an effort for the management in Setu Wanayasa, such as making retribution and engaging with the local government. The retribution itself is to support the members for their income, so that the practice of the management of Setu can run optimally. Meanwhile, networking with the institutions of government aims to make it easier for improving the quality of tourism potential in Setu Wanayasa. For example, at this time Kompepar is hiring land from a public figure in Wanayasa as a parking lot and commercial place like restaurant. In addition, after Kompepar Setu Wanayasa got letter of assignment from in the local tourism department, Kompepar asked an attraction for visitors called "bebek-bebekan" or a small boat with duck-shaped. And it is fulfilled by the local tourism department. It is coherence with Wilkonsin, 1991 which says that community development is also more than creating jobs or local income, there is also a need to improve local services and facilities. Beyond development that seeks to create jobs and income, community development which improves local services and facilities are often necessary.

Nevertheless, the development process management doesn't happen naturally. There are also some competitions with other groups often coercively. The leader of the Kompepar said, if he had used to taking the threat or action that could risk his life. The leader of the Kompepar didn't deny, if Kompepar is the first independent developed community in Wanayasa Purwakarta. The legitimation for the management of Setu Wanayasa is based on their community involvement in rural tourism development in Wanayasa.

Within the field of community development, there are three broadly defined approaches: a self-help approach, a technical assistance approach, and a conflict approach. The self-help approach stresses the need for the people to work together to solve their problems (Littrell & Hobbs, 1989). The process of community residents working together is more important than the actual project, since successful collaboration is believed to create the conditions for future efforts to work together. The self-help approach is generally focuses on development of the community. The technical assistance approach relies heavily on planning and technical know-how (Fear, et al, 1989). Technical experts, often from the outsides, are the important change agents employed by a local sponsoring agency to provide assistance for a specific problem. The third community development perspective, a conflict approach, critically examines the power structure and distribution of benefits among groups within the community (Robinson, 1998)

Furthermore, the local governments of Purwakarta plan to develop their tourism, the tourist village organizer has to take advantage of the bureaucracy of the village, to increase their potential tourism. This can be seen from the maintenance of access to the tourist

destinations as well as visits ad training from the local government. However, the tourist village organizer admitted that the support from the local government was not optimal. The background of the local government has given the experience for the tourist village organizer over the process bureaucracy. They realized that the cooperation with local government can't be fulfilled immediately due to the network priority development program.

The significant problem arises when the tourist village organizer was dealing with the other party such as Perhutani who manages one of the forests around the Wanayasa village. Even though it has been agreed upon the framework of cooperation, the tourist village organizer had difficulties in determining the cooperation. This leads to the asymmetrical relationship between the tourist village organizer and Perhutani, which is the tourist village or.

Local Concern of Tourism Development in Wanayasa

Based on comparison above it can be seen the challenge appear on two local groups that participated in rural tourism development. Their capability between Kompepar and the tourist village organizer emerge the challenges in local participation. Based on the field, the challenge have internal and external aspect, that are the dynamic that happen inside the group and the interaction between the group and stakeholders outside the groups.

The tourism development process around Setu Wanayasa seems to be an important factor of community development of Kompepar. The first pattern refers to Kompepar's case. Shortly, the history of organization's development showed that local participation process has a success in managing and developing the tourist destination of Setu Wanayasa. Moreover, the legitimacy from the local government attempt Komenpar as a strategic partner, In formally, Komempar have legitimacy in developing Setu Wanayasa.

However, on a practical level, the success of Komempar cause local participation reach the type of manipulation. It led to an exclusive group. It is because the income they make from the retribution of tourism activities is only benefit for their community. The competition between other local group has been emerged. The income has been distributed and the utilization is limited to the scope of the community. This is why the case of Kompepar shows that local participation perceived the internalitation pattern.

On the other hand, the tourist village organizer shows a different trend with Kompepar. Even the tourist village organizer is a representatives of government institutions, interestingly, they were able to develop local participation wider. This local group developed tourist activity in larger scope. It makes no benefit for the member itself. They work as a local government so they negotiate with other parties easier. Besides that, the dissemination of knowledge on rural tourism discourse can be circulated widely through the network of local government.

However, the tourist village organizer's case has showed local participation can handle the limitation of externalizing the existence. At first, the tourist village organizer is experiencing problems when facing the birocracy mechanism, so every ideas submitted is not applicable in short time. Second, limitation of politic capability caused the gap between tourist village organizer and other stakeholders. Both aspect above showing that the external limitation happen because the local participation has been developed and supported by local goverment

structrural. It makes that the process of local participation in Wanayasa is constructed in birocracy scheme.

Scholars identify several limitations to participation in tourism decision-making in less developed countries. A summary of barriers to participation appears the most relevant in the context of developing tourism is that proposed by Tosun (2000). He distinguished between limitations at the operational level, structural and cultural limitations. Among operational limitations to community participation he focused on centralization of public administration of tourism development, lack of coordination between involved parties and lack of information available to local people of the tourist destination.

CONCLUSION

In this study, we investigated the participation of local community surrounding Wanayasa Village in rural tourism development and the challenges of the local group for the tourism development. It is clear from this case that local participation is a natural outcome of completed tourism project and that tourism is an effective respons to many problems. Furthermore, the benefits of tourism encourage local communities to participate in tourism development program. In Wanayasa village, without a support from the local government, the local participation is still hard to run optimally.

The fact that involving local community is an important component in developing rural tourism,as how Tosun said, without any economy and politic, according to Roberts and Morag's opinion, local participation in rural tourism is hard to work ideally. It can be seen from the two different local group that show the challenges in a different pattern. First, the independent group (Kompepar) that start from independent contribution became tourism government partner. The local participation has been build is now being exclusive. On the other hand, local group that initiated by Purwakarta's tourism goverment engage with local participation in wider scale but they trapped in birocracy scheme. It caused the limitation with other stakeholders. In other words, local participation process that undergo the limitation in represent tourism development system in Purwakarta region has not yet build comprehensively.

REFERENCES

Azman, N., Halim, S. A., Liu, O. P., & Komoo, I. (2011). The Langkawi Global Geopark: local community's perspectives on public education. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *17*(3), 261–279. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2011.557863

Borland, Helen. (2009). *Conceptualizing strategic global sustainability and corporate transformational change*. International Marketing Review, 26 (4), 554-572.

Borland, H. and Adam, Lindgreen.2012. *Sustainability, Epistemology, ecocentric Business, and Marketing Strategy: Ideology, Reality, and Vision*. Journal Business Ethics, 173-187.

Chaudhry, P., & Gupta, R. K. (2010). Urban greenery and its sustainable extension strategies in hot arid region of India. International *Journal of Sustainable Society*, *2*(2), 146–155. http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJSSoc.2010.033627

Derek hall. Lesley Roberts, and Morag Mitchell (editors). (2004). *New Directions in Tourism Analysis Series*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

Fear, Frank A., Larry Gamm, and Frederick Fisher. 1989. The technical Assistance Approach. In Community Development in perspective edited by James A. Christenson and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press. Pages 69-88

Fleischer, A., & Pizam, A. (1997). Rural tourism in Israel. *Tourism Management*, *18*(6), 367–372. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(97)00034-4

Gale, T. E. (2006). Finding meaning in sustainability and a livelihood based on tourism: An ethnographic case study of rural citizens in the Aysén region of Chile (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.

Ghaderi, Z., & Henderson, J. C. (2012). Sustainable rural tourism in Iran: A perspective from Hawraman village. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, *2*, 47–54. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2012.03.001

Gurung, C. P., & DeCoursey, M. A. (2000). Too much too fast: lessons from Nepal's Lost Kingdom of Mustang.In P. M. Price, M. F. Price, & F. M. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Tourism and Development in Mountain Regions* (pp.239–253). New York, NY: CABI Publishing.

Iorio, M., & Corsale, A. (2010). Rural tourism and livelihood strategies in Romania. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *26*(2), 152–162. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2009.10.006

Jaafar, M., Kayat, K., Tangit, T. M., & Yacob, M. F. (2013). Nature-based rural tourism and its economic benefits: A case study of Kinabalu National Park. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, *5*(4), 342–352. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/WHATT-03-2013-0016

Littrell, Donald W. and Daryl Hobbs. The self-help approach. In community Development in Perspective edited by James A. Christenson amd Jerry W. Robinson, Jr. Ames, IA:Iowa State University Press. Pages 48-68

R. Butler, Hall M., Jenkins J. (1996. *Tourism and Recreation in Rural Areas*. Wiley: Chichester.

Mowfort, M. & Munt, I. 1998. *Tourism and Sustainability: Development and New Tourism in the Third World.* New York: Routledge.

Murphy. 1985. *Tourism: A Community Apporach.* London: Routledge

Murphy, P.E. 1998. *Tourism and Sustainable Development.In W.F. Theobald (Ed.*), Global Tourism (pp. 173-190). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Murphy, P. & Murphy, A.E. 2004. *Strategic Management for Tourism Communities.* Clevedon: Channel View publications.

Neckerman, Wout. 2013. *Sustainable of a Tourism Destination: Realism or idealism? Evaluating the sustainability of a destinantion project development through community-based ecotourism*. Breda University: Master Dissertation.

Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Residents' support for tourism: An identity perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *39*(1), 243–268. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.05.006

Okazaki, Etsuko. 2008*. A Community Based Tourism Model: Its conception and Use*. Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 16 (5).

Ozaki, Etsuko. *A Community-Based Tourism Model: Its Conception and Use.* Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Vol. 16, No. 5. Taylor and Francis.

Pretty. 1995. *Participatory Learning for Sustainable Agriculture.* World Development 23(8), 1247-1263

Reid D. 1991. *Sustainable Development: An Introductory Guide.* Earthscan: London.

Ritchie, J.R. Crafting 1999. *A Value-Driven Vision for a National Tourism Treasure.* Tourism Management, 20 (3), 273-282.

Ritchie, J.R., and Crouch, G.I. 2000. *The Destination Competitiveness: A Sustainability Perspective.* Tourism Management, 21 (1), 1-7.

Ritchie, J.R. and Crouch, G.I. 2003. *The Competitive Destination: A Sustainable Tourism Perspective.* Wallingford: CABI Publishing.

Robinson, Jerry W. 1989. The Community Approach. In Community Development in Perspective edited by James A. Christenson and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr, Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press. Pages 89-116

Sharpley, R. (2000). Tourism and sustainable development: Exploring the theoretical divide. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *8*(1), 1–19. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09669580008667346

Su, B. (2011). Rural tourism in China. *Tourism Management*, *32*(6), 1438–1441. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.12.005

Theodori, G. (2005). Community and community development in resource-based areas: Operational Definitions rooted in an interactional perspective, Society and Natural Resources 18, 661-669

Tosun, C. 2000. *Limits to Community Participation in the Tourism Development Process in Developing Countries.* Tourism Management 21, 613-633

Tosun, C. 2006. *Expected Nature of Community Participation in Tourism Development.* Tourism Management 27, 493-504

Wilkinson, K.P. (1991). *Community in Rural America.* Middleton: Social Ecology Pass.

Zimmerman, M.A. (1995). Psychological Empowerment: Issues and Illustrations. *American Journal of Community Psychology,* 23 (5), 581-599