

# COMMUNITY-BASED TOURISM: THE PERSPECTIVES OF THREE STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

**Pimrawee Rocharungsat\***

Tourism Program, Business School, James Cook University, Australia

## **Abstract**

*This research focuses on 'the perspectives of participants on community-based tourism (CBT)' based on the stakeholder theory. The research examined the groups of decision-maker, operator, and visitor. A Seven-page self-administered questionnaire was distributed to them in three representative developing countries: Thailand, Indonesia, and Malaysia. The techniques consisted of the assessment of scenarios, open-ended and close-ended questions, rating scales, and rankings of importance. The three main research objectives of the study were to find the overall perspectives of the three main stakeholders towards CBT, their expectations for future CBT development, and the factors which influence their perspectives. The results show similarities and differences among the three groups. Decision maker and visitor groups prefer to have highly regulated small scale tourism forms whereas operators prefer to have controlled carrying capacity but high intensity forms. All groups suggested that the best and most successful CBT should involve the community and maintain the community's benefits and life style. The visitor group emphasised cultural exchange and friendly communities. The shared management form is the most preferred although the community group should take most responsibility for CBT. Each group had a different emphasis concerning the first step to develop CBT. Factors which most influenced the decision makers and the visitors were their aesthetic and moral values while the operators' were more driven by moral and economic values. This study attempted to find a stakeholders' point of accommodation to successfully progress CBT. It is anticipated that the results from this study could guide the future research on CBT in general and could aid the practice of successful CBT.*

Key words: community-based tourism, tourism development, stakeholder, perspective, future tourism

## **Introduction**

The concept of community involvement in tourism has been significant for over 20 years (Hall, 2003) especially since the publication of Murphy's *Tourism: A Community Approach* (1985). Community involvement is often given priority status in the tourism agenda (Pearce and Moscardo, 1999). Most of the existing work however consists of case studies and these studies often consider the perspective of only one group of stakeholders, others just the community members. This study endeavours to fill in this gap. This paper is specifically concerned with the perspectives of three stakeholder groups. Kline (2001) stated community-based partnerships are one of the three clear trends in the evolution of sustainability. The research on community integration by Mitchell and Reid (2001) found that community catalysts may be critical to not only create awareness about tourism opportunities, but also plan, develop, and manage tourism in an integrated manner. Therefore, in addition to community members, other stakeholders involved in 'community-based tourism' (CBT) should also be studied.

---

\* pimrawee.rocharungsat@jcu.edu.au

The main aim of the paper is to gain a more in-depth understanding of the perspectives concerning community-based tourism held by decision makers, operators, and visitors. The study explored the attitudes towards community-based tourism of each stakeholder group. A comparison among the groups will address existing similarities and differences. Factors influencing their perspectives will be explored as well as stakeholder expectations for community-based tourism development. The results pertaining to the community-based tourism concept as well as the stakeholders' expectations could be important for implementing future community-based tourism development and management especially in countries where there is high opportunity to develop or promote community-based tourism as in the Pacific Rim countries such as in the Pacific Asia (Dowling, 2000).

## Methodology

### *Data Collection and Sample*

The data from the three stakeholders in this sample were collected from suitable organisations (for the group of decision makers and operators) and destinations (for the visitor group) within the countries studied (Thailand, Indonesia and Malaysia). To gain a suitable sample of decision makers and operators, international conferences in 2003 related to the topic of community tourism were reviewed. One was selected using the criteria of an appropriate time frame, location and expense for the researcher to access delegates. The APECO or Asia Pacific Eco Tourism Conference (22-26 October 2003) in Langkawi, Malaysia was the specific meeting attended.

The justification for choosing Thailand, Indonesia and Malaysia as destinations for data collection was because they are the countries included in the United Nations Developmental Programme of medium level developing countries. They are also well known as tourist destinations and their tourism is growing rapidly especially for community tourism and ecotourism (Dowling, 2000).

The decision maker group in this study was based on the criteria set out by WTO (1998). Decision makers refers to those whose roles in tourism development include: policy planning and research; providing basic infrastructure; developing some tourist attractions; setting and administering land use and environmental protection regulations; setting standards for encouraging education and training for tourism; maintaining public safety and health; and some marketing functions. Therefore, the decision makers in this study included local government, national government, NGOs, and academic professionals.

Operators (or private sector personnel) in this study were also defined according to the criteria set forth by WTO (1998). Operator roles include responsibility for developing accommodation, tour and travel operations and other commercial tourism enterprises including related on-site infrastructure.

The definitions of visitors in this study was adapted from Country Victoria Tourism Council (CVTC, 1997) and Encyclopaedia of Tourism (Jafari, 2000) as "people who decide to travel away from home for purposes other than employment or schooling" in the destinations related to community tourism. It was important to include domestic visitors not just international visitors in this category. WTO definitions are usually confined to international visitors so this broader and alternative definitional source was employed.

### *Questionnaire*

A seven-page questionnaire was the instrument for this study. The returned responses were 39.80 % from the decision makers; 42.38 % from the operators; and 79.17 % from the visitors. The questionnaire was divided into form A and form B to decrease the order effect. The techniques consisted of the assessment of scenarios, open-ended and closed-ended questions, rating scales, value statements and rankings of importance of a set of first steps for CBT. In order to address the aims of the study, the questionnaire contained four sections:

**Section 1** investigated the overall attitude and expectations of the three main stakeholders to 'community-based tourism'. Four different scenarios were provided. Respondents were asked to rank them in order of

their preference from the most preferred and best example of community-based tourism to the least preferred example.

In each scenario, the factors were in the same order for respondents to evaluate. The eleven characteristics were adapted from Weaver’s (2000) idealised types of mass tourism versus alternative tourism. The characteristics in the four scenarios were: the role of tourism, the control of tourism, the origins of tourists, the density of development, the character of attractions, seasonality, regulation emphasis, architecture and ownership, attraction emphasis, volume and mode, and regulation by amount. These characteristics were described in each scenario and varied but based on the level of tourism development or destination possibilities suggested by D. Weaver (2000) (see figure 1).

**Figure 1. Destination possibilities**

REGULATION	High	Deliberate Alternative Tourism (DAT)	Sustainable Mass Tourism (SMT)
	Low	Circumstantial Alternative Tourism (CAT)	Unsustainable Mass Tourism (UMT)
		Low	High

INTENSITY

Source: Weaver (2000)

Weaver’s broad context model consists of four inclusive idealised tourism types, based on mainly the relationship between the level of tourism intensity or scale, and the amount of regulation associated with the tourism sector. Although it is recognised that these two variables are continuous in reality, the use of discrete categories is pragmatic for purposes of generalisation and discussion (Weaver, 2000). In order to avoid any judgemental bias, the four scenarios in this study were relabelled as: **opportunistic alternative tourism (OAT), planned alternative tourism (PAT), controlled mass tourism (CMT), and unrestricted mass tourism (UMT).**

Following the ranking task there was an open-ended question asking for the reason why respondents chose their first ranked scenario. The next open-ended question asked them to provide from their own perspective and experience their criteria for considering a destination as exemplifying successful community-based tourism.

In this section, the closed question using the technique of ‘willingness to pay’, asked the respondents to chose the range of value in money they were willing to pay daily in the community-based tourism destination. This method originated from the work of economists for evaluating natural resources in the absence of price signals. It reveals what people are willing to pay for non-market goods and services provided by the natural environment (Rodriguez, 2003). In the last part of this section, five-point rating scales were used to measure respondents’ degree of agreement on the characteristics of community-based tourism. There were 15 negative and positive key phases provided that were identified in the researcher’s study of professionals’ perspectives about CBT, as well as some statements deriving from the community social representations of tourism from the research of Pearce *et al* (1991) .

**Section 2** explored the three main stakeholders’ expectations towards community-based tourism characteristics. The two main questions sought information on the management characteristics and the main group who should take most responsibility for community-based tourism development. Closed-ended questions were employed for this section.

**Section 3** aimed to find the stakeholders’ expectations for future community-based tourism development. The technique of importance rankings was implemented. There were nine statements provided for the respondents. Specifically, they were asked to consider the first step they thought should be taken to develop community-based tourism. It was noted that this first step should be relevant to a community which is just

starting community-based tourism. The nine statements given also originated from the study of professionals' perspectives.

The respondents' values were also explored using a ranking technique. Respondents ranked seven values that presented benefits of CBT to a community. The values were assessed indirectly by using benefits which can be seen as underlying or revealing values. It was based on the research of Rescher (1977) who used the idea of inputting value from the nature of the benefit at issue. He suggested six main principles for classifying values but in this study 'values' sorted by 'benefits at issue' was considered to be the most appropriate. In this approach, a value is invariably bound up with a 'benefit'. The survey in this study used seven out of ten values which were considered suitable for the content of community-based tourism. The seven categories of values were: material and physical (e.g. comfort, physical security); economic (economic security); moral (fairness, honesty); social (charitableness, courtesy); political (freedom, justice); aesthetic (beauty); and professional (professional recognition and success).

**Section 4** consisted of the demographic questions asking the respondents to identify their own position as being a 'decision-maker', 'operator', or 'visitor'. Other information gained from respondents was their age, gender, country, current position and length of time in their position.

## Findings

The results of the study are presented according to the aims of the study.

*Aim 1: To understand the overall attitude of the three main stakeholders towards community-based tourism.*

Table 1 presents the means from each group ranking as well as the means from every group. ANOVA analysis was used to find statistically significant differences among the means of the various groups at the 5% significance level.

**Table 1. Mean Ranking of the four scenarios**

	<b>Decision Maker (N= 41)</b>	<b>Operator (N=89 )</b>	<b>Visitor ( N=95)</b>	<b>Three groups</b>	<b>F value</b>	<b>p value</b>
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)		
Scenario 1: opportunistic alternative tourism (OAT)	2.63 (0.91)	2.51 (1.10)	2.49 (1.20)	2.52 (1.11)	0.23	0.797
Scenario 2: unrestricted mass tourism (UMT)	3.43 <sup>a</sup> (0.77)	2.84 <sup>b</sup> (0.96)	2.75 <sup>b</sup> (0.97)	2.90 (0.95)	7.43	0.001*
Scenario 3: planned alternative tourism (PAT)	1.33 <sup>a</sup> (0.70)	2.48 <sup>b</sup> (1.17)	2.28 <sup>b</sup> (1.10)	2.19 (1.14)	16.02	0.000*
Scenario 4: controlled mass tourism (CMT)	2.58 (0.95)	2.11 (1.14)	2.45 (1.20)	2.34 (1.14)	3.00	0.052

A rank of 1 = the best community-based tourism of the four scenarios

\* = There is a statistically significant difference between the means of the various groups at the 0.05 level.

The point of significance is indicated by different superscripted letter as identified by post hoc Scheffe test.

The decision maker group mostly preferred Scenario 3 (Planned Alternative Tourism) whereas the operator group mostly preferred Scenario 4 (Controlled Mass Tourism). The visitor group also chose Scenario 3 as the first rank but the preference was not as clearly differentiated as it was for the decision maker group because their second rank scenario, Controlled Mass Tourism, which received mean score of 2.45.

ANOVA analysis was used to find the statistically significant difference among the three groups. The mean scores for Scenario 2 (Unrestricted Mass Tourism) and Scenario 3 (Planned Alternative Tourism) were significantly different among the stakeholder groups respectively. The post hoc Scheffe test indicated that the mean differences for both Scenario 2 and 3 derived from the decision maker group versus the operator and the visitor group.

The open-ended question asked the respondents to state their reasons for choosing the first rank scenario as the best community-based tourism. The themes were coded following Weaver's (2000) tourism characteristics. The key descriptions that were counted from five cases will be reported.

In the theme of markets characteristic, the operators and the visitors agreed that the best community-based tourism scenario should have consistent tourist number. Tourists can be varied and high volume but should be under control. The operators also emphasised no high and low season in a destination. In the attractions theme, the operators voted for 'good promotion'. All three stakeholders agreed that the character of attractions for the best community tourism destination should not be manipulated; local culture and tradition should be maintained; and the main tourism product is community life style and resources. According to the responses of the decision makers, the orientation of tourists should be selected and limited. However, the operators and the visitors stressed more about adjusting to tourist demand and experiencing them with authentic attractions. The operators reported highest cases to the accommodation and economic status themes. They voted the best scenario for local houses and style within the same area of a community. Also, tourism can be both community supplementary or main income from their view.

Every group agreed with community involvement, input, and control and also emphasised community benefits in the theme of the best regulation for community-based tourism. The responses from the operators and the visitors added partnership control and benefit to all in this theme. They as well viewed management or control by experts or government possible for the best destinations. Conservation of local resources in the regulation was considered important. The management strategies theme was added in addition from Weaver's tourism characteristics. The decision makers and operators addressed good management systems such as the limit number of tourists, slowly developed, clear plan and zoning. The visitors stressed more to support of government to private sector and locals.

The next overall attitude measurement from the three groups was their positive and negative attitude towards community-based tourism. Fifteen statements were given for them to state their degree of agreement from the five-point Likert type scales.

**Table 2. Agreement on statements concerning CBT**

	<b>Decision Maker (n=41)</b>	<b>Operator (n=89)</b>	<b>Visitor (n=95)</b>	<b>F value</b>	<b>p value</b>
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)		
CBT will bring more money to the community (+)	1.72 (0.73)	1.56 (0.66)	1.56 (0.70)	0.90	0.408
If under community control, CBT will be okay (+)	1.71 <sup>a</sup> (0.57)	1.77 <sup>a</sup> (0.70)	2.20 <sup>b</sup> (0.95)	8.42	0.000*
CBT generate sustainability (+)	2.05 (1.00)	2.14 (1.00)	1.93 (0.92)	1.08	0.341
CBT provides chances for community involvement (+)	1.68 (0.70)	1.69 (0.54)	1.63 (0.76)	0.19	0.825
CBT encourages multiple cooperation (+)	1.80 (0.64)	1.70 (0.65)	1.68 (0.72)	0.52	0.596
CBT is a good concept (+)	1.66 (0.85)	1.78 (0.73)	1.68 (0.63)	0.59	0.554
CBT is the exchange of cultures (+)	2.13 (0.89)	1.99 (0.88)	1.99 (0.88)	0.39	0.678
CBT provides high quality service/ product (+)	2.49 (1.02)	2.70 (1.02)	2.48 (0.95)	1.20	0.303
CBT destroys community identities (-)	3.66 (1.07)	3.41 (1.10)	3.56 (1.10)	0.78	0.460
CBT makes community life difficult (-)	3.68 (1.19)	3.43 (0.84)	3.76 (1.01)	2.69	0.070
CBT is environmental destroyer (-)	3.70 (1.07)	3.24 (1.10)	3.63 (0.97)	4.06	0.019*
CBT is just for the rich (-)	4.23 (0.80)	3.83 (1.00)	3.98 (0.97)	2.60	0.076
CBT has practical problems (-)	2.50 (1.09)	2.76 (0.98)	2.92 (1.04)	2.41	0.092
CBT is unrealistic (-)	3.64 (1.06)	3.46 (1.00)	3.45 (0.99)	0.56	0.575
CBT has its limitation (-)	2.27 <sup>a</sup> (1.07)	2.39 <sup>a</sup> (0.94)	2.76 <sup>b</sup> (1.00)	4.66	0.010*

1= Strongly agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

\* = There is a statistically significant difference between the means of the various groups at the 0.05 level.

The point of significance is indicated by different superscripted letter as identified by post hoc Scheffe test.

(+) = positive statement / (-) = negative statement

Focussing on each group, the decision maker group strongly agree with 'CBT is a good concept', 'CBT provides chances for community involvement' and 'If under community control, CBT will be okay'. Ranking from the lowest mean, it is interesting that the operator group and the visitor group strongly agree with the same first three rank positive statements: 'CBT will bring more money to the community', 'CBT provides chance for community involvement', and 'CBT encourages multiple cooperation'. The positive statement that receives highest mean score or between the range of two to three (agree to undecided) in every group is 'CBT provides high quality service and product.'

The answers from all the three groups in the negative statements are distinctive. Every group scores between two to three for 'CBT has limitations' and 'CBT has practical problems'. This means they either mildly agree or are undecided about these two negative aspects of CBT. Conversely, all three groups strongly disagree with 'CBT is just for the rich'. The post hoc Scheffe test shows the differences between decision makers and operators versus visitors.

*Aim 2: To explore expectations for future community-based tourism development of the three main stakeholders.*

To understand the respondents' expectation of criteria for successful CBT, all the answers were coded into main themes. There are sub themes within the main themes.

**Table 3. Successful community-based tourism**

Themes	Decision Maker N=41	Operator N=89	Visitor N=95
<b>1) Community benefits</b>			
1.1 Maintain their original way of life/culture	8	33	12
1.2 Additional income/tourism is not the main business	4	2	1
1.3 Distribution of income/ job/ better life quality/place improvement	13	20	19
1.4 Provide education program/ awareness/ skills	2	12	1
1.5 Tourism is main income	0	2	1
1.6 Conservation of environment and resources	6	10	7
<b>2) Tourism product (attractions)</b>			
2.1 Present traditional authentic arts/ culture/ historical aspects/ daily routine of community	4	0	7
	1	0	0
2.2 Provide basic infrastructure	0	2	6
2.3 Expense and service should not be too expensive			
<b>3) Management</b>			
3.1 Should be based on sustainable development	3	6	7
3.2 Should have standard regulations	4	0	0
3.3 Should have strong community leader with vision	1	2	0
3.4 Support by government/ professionals/ operators	2	13	15
3.5 Get community involvement in such as management, control, input, support of tourism planning process	19	19	16
3.6 Originate from community readiness and capacity	5	0	0
3.7 Integrated cooperation (government, operators, and community)	7	8	8
3.8 Control and take care by tourism experts	0	2	0
<b>4) Tourist</b>			
4.1 Target the right group of tourist	1	6	0
4.2 Tourists are under restricted rules	0	1	9
4.3 Impress tourist and emphasise their benefits (cleanliness, safety, good service, transportation, etc.)	0	19	12
4.4 Friendly community and exchange of culture, not taking advantage from tourist	0	13	21
<b>5) Marketing</b>			
5.1 Not emphasise too much on marketing	1	0	0
5.2 More advertisement and promotion (nationally and internationally)	1	10	7

The results in Table 3 highlight four themes where there are different perspectives: community benefit (tourism as an additional income VS tourism as a main income), management (community control VS expert control), tourist (pro-community VS pro tourist), and marketing (low promotion VS high promotion).

The technique of 'willingness to pay' was used to measure stakeholders' expectation in money value (Australian Dollars). The question asked stakeholders how much they were willing to pay per day within one CBT destination. The results are demonstrated in Table 4.

**Table 4. Willingness to pay in CBT destination**

	<b>Decision Maker (N=41)</b> % (n)	<b>Operator (N=89)</b> % (n)	<b>Visitor (N=95)</b> % (n)	<b>Three groups (N=225)</b> % (n)
Less than A\$20	30.8 (12)	12.6 (11)	34.4 (31)	25.0 (54)
A\$20-\$50	48.7 (19)	51.7 (45)	41.1 (37)	46.8 (101)
A\$50-100	12.8 (5)	20.7 (18)	14.4 (13)	16.7 (36)
A\$100-200	5.1 (2)	9.2 (8)	3.3 (3)	6.0 (13)
A\$200-300	2.6 (1)	3.4 (3)	3.3 (3)	3.2 (7)
A\$300-500	-	2.3 (2)	2.2 (2)	1.9 (4)
More than \$500	-	-	1.1 (1)	1 (0.5)

The range is from less than A\$20 to more than A\$500. The data reveal that generally the three groups are willing to pay between A\$20 and A\$50 in CBT for one day. However, the second and third most frequent answers differ among the groups. The next two questions asked the respondents to choose the best approach to manage CBT and the most responsible actor in CBT management.

Two choices were given (bottom-up management and shared management) for the respondents to choose the most applicable community-based tourism management. Bottom-up or grass-root control received 32.4% from decision makers, 25.3% from operators, and 12.8% from visitors. Shared management authority among stakeholders received 67.6% from decision makers, 74.7% from operators, and 78.7% from visitors.

It is clear from the high percentage of responses that every group identifies 'shared management authority' as the best form of CBT management. This implies that although community-based tourism emphasise the importance of the community, the form of shared management or responsibility among all stakeholders is still considered most desirable by every stakeholder group. However, when asking about which actor should take most responsible for CBT management, as expected, the 'local communities' choice is given the highest preference by every group. The decision maker group were predominantly of this view (80%). Although the operator (45.5%) and the visitor (54.0%) groups choose community as the first priority actor they also ranked local government and national government as worthwhile contributors.

Data pertaining to the first step which should be taken to develop CBT are presented in Table 5. Ranking of importance was the technique used to receive the insight understanding of the importance emphasised to each strategy of first step.

From the nine first steps both the decision maker group and visitor group rank 'understand what resources the community can offer' as the first priority first step for developing CBT. The decision maker group also rank equally 'make community aware of costs and benefits of tourism' as the first priority. The operator group rank 'identify key leader to do work' as the most important first step. The post hoc Scheffe test indicates that the operator group is different from the other two groups in ranking the key leader as more important. Operators are also different from the decision maker group and give higher rank to the strategy of developing a tourism plan; and further they are different from the visitor group in emphasising developing education and training programs less.

**Table 5. Ranking of the first step which is desirable to develop CBT**

First Step of CBT	Decision Maker	Operator	Visitor	F value	p value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)		
Make community aware of costs and benefits of tourism	4.05 (2.54)	4.75 (2.43)	4.31 (2.41)	1.32	0.269
Understand what resources the community can offer	4.05 (2.50)	4.56 (2.74)	4.20 (2.61)	0.67	0.511
Get community input and support in tourism development	4.20 (2.17)	5.08 (2.36)	4.43 (2.23)	2.75	0.066
Form organisational structure	4.45 (2.45)	4.44 (2.40)	5.09 (2.56)	1.80	0.168
Get all people involve to work together	4.80 (2.64)	4.43 (2.30)	4.77 (2.54)	0.54	0.585
Identify key leader to do the work	5.10 <sup>a</sup> (2.38)	3.87 <sup>b</sup> (2.36)	5.54 <sup>a</sup> (2.33)	11.50	0.000*
Develop education and training program for community	6.30 <sup>ab</sup> (2.49)	7.27 <sup>a</sup> (2.05)	5.77 <sup>b</sup> (2.63)	8.78	0.000*
Develop a tourism plan with clear goals and objectives	5.43 <sup>a</sup> (2.27)	4.10 <sup>b</sup> (2.17)	4.49 <sup>ab</sup> (2.56)	4.31	0.015*
Get the leading institutions and expert assistance to local people	6.63 (2.56)	6.45 (2.42)	6.29 (2.57)	0.25	0.776

A rank of 1 = the most important of the list.

\* = There is a statistically significant difference between the means of the various groups at the 0.05 level.

The point of significance is indicated by different superscripted letter as identified by post hoc Scheffe test.

*Aim 3: To identify the factors which influence the stakeholder perspectives.*

The final part of the study investigated factors that possibly affect the perspectives towards CBT held by each stakeholder group. 'Value' can be considered as independent variables which affect all areas of human endeavour in which social science may be interested (Rokeach, 1977). The results of the rankings are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6. Ranking of the benefit to community from CBT**

Benefits of CBT (values)	Decision Maker	Operator	Visitor	F value	p value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)		
Protection of environmental resources (Aesthetic value)	2.33 <sup>a</sup> (1.53)	3.31 <sup>b</sup> (1.84)	2.63 <sup>a</sup> (1.71)	5.57	0.004*
Improve the life of the poorest section of a community (Moral value)	2.75 (1.64)	2.56 (1.37)	2.84 (1.83)	0.68	0.507
Equality of opportunities (Social value)	3.90 (1.66)	4.47 (1.67)	4.35 (1.58)	1.69	0.187
Freedom to be involved in tourism management (Political value)	4.15 <sup>a</sup> (1.70)	5.39 <sup>b</sup> (1.40)	4.69 <sup>a</sup> (1.70)	9.32	0.000*
Community recognition (professional value)	4.53 (2.05)	4.61 (1.78)	4.70 (1.75)	0.14	0.867
More money in a community (Economic value)	4.53 <sup>a</sup> (1.87)	2.57 <sup>b</sup> (1.86)	4.03 <sup>a</sup> (2.15)	18.17	0.000*
New infrastructure/ facilities (Material and physical value)	5.83 <sup>a</sup> (1.36)	5.10 <sup>ab</sup> (1.79)	4.64 <sup>b</sup> (2.07)	5.77	0.004*

A rank of 1 = the most important of the list.

\* = There is a statistically significant difference between the means of the various groups at the 0.05 level.

The point of significance is indicated by different superscripted letter as identified by post hoc Scheffe test.

The results indicate that material and physical, political, and intellectual value are not as important as aesthetic, moral, social and economic values emphasised in the CBT benefits to the community.

From the ANOVA analysis, four benefits were significantly different. These results suggest that the operators see 'more money in a community' (economic value) as more important than the other two groups whereas both the decision makers and visitors see 'protection of environmental resources' (aesthetic value) and 'freedom to be involved in tourism management' (political value) as having a higher priority than the operator group.

## Discussion

### *Understanding the Overall Attitude from the Three Stakeholders*

It is clear that all the three groups agree more with the positive characteristics of CBT than with the negative ones. The statement 'CBT provides high quality service/ product' was rated between agree to undecided by every group. This result may emphasise the problem of product and quality control in CBT destinations analogous to many other small-scale tourism enterprises (Sallah, 2000). Godde (1998) explained that community-based tourism activity often depends on the social and cultural maintenance of the community and this may create the impacts of commoditization of cultures, inflation, and reallocation of resources. Also, in practice, visitors still experience culture shock, and can exhibit negative attitudes towards local standards of accommodation and hygiene (REST, 2003).

In the negative statements, two statements have means between 2 (agree) to 3 (undecided) across the groups. This implies they tend to agree with these two negative aspects of CBT; specifically that CBT has practical problems and CBT has limitations. This has been noted in many destinations for instance the Responsible Ecological Social Tours Project (REST, 2003) reported CBT having practical problems:

*"It is particularly difficult to standardise CBT activities to the satisfaction of the Tourism Industry. In reality, CBT is taking place in remote, unique, local places. Villagers are involved in and relying upon seasonal agricultural work. CBT visits their lives, and, in reality, villagers are not always able to stay at home, in their traditional outfits, waiting for 20 minutes of 'ethnic dancing.' Tour operators often expect their itineraries to run like clockwork in communities where time is being measured in Lunar months." (p.8)*

Following Tosun (2000) the issue of the restricted community participation in CBT may also help explaining the stakeholder reactions. He suggested that although community participation in the tourism development process is highly desirable, there seems to be formidable operational, structural and cultural limitations to such a tourism development approach in many developing countries. It was also found that although these limitations vary over time according to types, scale and levels of tourism development, the market served, and cultural attributes of communities, the forms and scale of tourism development are often beyond the control of local communities (Tosun, 2000).

In ranking the scenarios the significant differences rest largely with the different views of the decision makers. They prefer Planned Alternative Tourism more but the operators rank Controlled Mass Tourism more highly. The contrasts observed reflect mass and alternative tourism paradigms. These days we characterise conventional mass tourism as a beast; a monstrosity, which has few redeeming qualities for the destination, their people and natural resource base. Mass tourism has been criticised for its non-local orientation, leakage of money from the community, attractions transformed to meet the visitor demand, and an emphasis on commercialisation of natural and cultural resources (Fennell, 1999; International development research centre, 1995-2003; CBIK, 2001). This has been articulated throughout the 1980s, and an argument for a new form, more socially and ecologically benign; entitled alternative tourism was developed.

Krippendorf (1982, cited in Fennell, 1999) stated that the philosophy of alternative tourism was to ensure that tourism policies should no longer concentrate on economic and technical necessities alone, but emphasise the demand for an unspoiled environment and a much greater consideration of the needs of local people. Nevertheless, some researchers have pointed out that alternative tourism cannot replace conventional tourism simply because of mass tourism's power and multiple connections (Cohen, 1987, cited in Fennell, 1999). Butler (1990 cited in Fennell 1999) gave two reasons for mass tourism not being dismissed too

readily. The first is economic and the second is socio-psychological because many people seem to enjoy being a mass tourist. These may be the reasons why some mass tourism characteristics are still embedded in part in the characteristics of CBT. Some forms of synthesis between these different types of tourism have been noted (Kontogeorgopoulos, 2003). However, CBT should have a fair balance between adapting the tourists to the community and the community to the tourists (REST, 2003). Importantly, the decision makers emphasised more community involvement while some operators and visitors suggested tourism should be controlled by experts. As stated in the CBT handbook, the principle of 'outsiders assist, insiders do' is accepted in developing CBT (Suansri, 2003). Overall the stakeholders' different roles or position in CBT appear to influence their perspectives towards CBT in terms of overall attitudes.

### *Expectations for Future CBT Development*

A sound identification of desirable future forms of tourism development is required for CBT. It is useful to think of future images and expectations as a range of differentially probable possibilities rather than as a single point on continuum (Bell and Mau, 1971). For future CBT development, criteria for successful CBT are essential as the guideline for the development.

Each successful criterion from each group may have been allocated a different priority but it is clear that they all agree with 'distribution of benefits to a community' and 'community involvement' as an important criteria. They also stress the benefit of maintaining the local way of life and culture. This could be linked to the summary of Godde (1998) from community-based mountain tourism that the equity distribution of tourism opportunities and benefits are based on the principles of local control, partnerships, sustainable development, and conservation. The primary successful criteria for management identified by Godde (1998) are an integrated cooperation format such as support by government and private experts in providing educational and awareness programs. Ashley and Garland (1994) too advocated that governments should build on the existing good will and ideas of various actors, particularly by providing coordination, support, and positive policy frameworks for flexible development. From the study of Taquile Island in Peru, Mitchell and Reid (2001) noted that equitable participation could be obtained by collectively planning and providing tourism services without drastically changing traditional ways.

The appropriate first steps to develop CBT are another way to assess and account for future CBT development. Looking at the top ranks, every group gives a relatively high rank to two steps and there are also two strategies that were ranked as of substantially lesser importance by every group. Thus, it is possible to categorise the nine first steps into three classes based on the emphasis of importance from the responses. Although there is no exact priority of steps in developing CBT, this may help overall in deciding what should be emphasised in the process.

- |                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| First priority  | - Understand what resources the community can offer<br>- Get all people involve to work together   |
| Second priority | - Make community aware of costs and benefits of tourism<br>- Develop a tourism plan with clear goals and objectives<br>- Form organisational structure<br>- Get community input and support in tourism development<br>- Identify key leader to do the work |
| Third priority  | - Develop education and training program for community<br>- Get the leading institutions and expert assistance to local people   |

There is strong evidence of support for the first priority among the steps. An understanding of community resources is essential because in interacting with the outside world, it will not be easy for any community to develop without sufficient and strong social, cultural, and economic resources (Suansri, 2003). The first step of getting all people involved is also consistent with the suggestions of McIntyre (1993, cited in Mitcheel and Reid, 2001) that local planners should encourage community participation from the early stages of tourism planning to provide residents with realistic expectations. The degree of community involvement and control is just as important as the quantity of cash benefits for developing skills, institutions and resource management (Ashley and Garland, 1994).

### Factors Which Influence the Stakeholders' Perspectives

The major values that related to the three stakeholders' perspectives towards CBT are aesthetic (represented through protection of environmental resources), moral (represented through improving the life of the poorest section of a community ) and economic (represented through more money to a community). The social value (represented through equality of opportunities) is emphasised more by the group of decision makers.

### Conclusion

The following Table 7 summarises the perspectives of the three stakeholders in this study in all key aspects.

**Table 7. Summary of the perspectives of the three stakeholders**

<b>Decision Maker</b>	
Overall attitude	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CBT should be high regulated small scale (Planned Alternative Tourism form)</li> <li>- Best CBT should manage and control by community and focus on the community benefit.</li> <li>- Agree most that 'CBT is a good concept' and disagree most that 'CBT is just for the rich'</li> </ul>
Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Successful CBT should have community involvement, distribution of community benefits and maintain community life style.</li> <li>- Expense per day within a CBT destination is between A\$20-50</li> <li>- Management characteristic: shared management</li> <li>- Community is the group who should take most responsible for CBT</li> <li>- The most important first step to develop CBT is to create community awareness and understand community resources.</li> </ul>
Influence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Aesthetic and moral values</li> </ul>
<b>Operator</b>	
Overall attitude	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CBT should have carrying capacity although high intensity (Controlled Mass Tourism form)</li> <li>- Best CBT should emphasise community benefits. Management should be partnership-typed management with effective community cooperation and clear practical plan such as restricted rules and zoning. CBT could be both as main and additional income of a community offering community life style and resources as tourism products with conservation of original culture so that tourists will experience authentic life style.</li> <li>- Agree most that 'CBT will bring more money to the community' and disagree most that 'CBT is just for the rich'</li> </ul>
Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Successful CBT should maintain community life style, have distribution of community benefits, and get community involvement in CBT management.</li> <li>- Expense per day within a CBT destination is between A\$20-50</li> <li>- Management characteristic: shared management</li> <li>- Community is the group who should take most responsible for CBT</li> <li>- The most important first step to develop CBT is to identify key leader to do the work.</li> </ul>
Influence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Moral and economic values</li> </ul>
<b>Visitor</b>	
Overall attitude	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CBT should be high regulated small scale (Planned Alternative Tourism form)</li> <li>- Best CBT should emphasise community benefits. Management should better input and controlled by community but also with partnership management. Tourist attractions should be local culture.</li> <li>- Agree most that 'CBT will bring more money to the community' and disagree most that 'CBT is just for the rich'</li> </ul>
Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Successful CBT should have friendly community and exchanging of culture, distribution of community benefits and community involvement in CBT management.</li> <li>- Expense per day within a CBT destination is between A\$20-50</li> <li>- Management characteristic: shared management</li> <li>- Community is the group who should take most responsible for CBT</li> <li>- The most important first step to develop CBT is to understand community resources.</li> </ul>
Influence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Aesthetic and moral values</li> </ul>

In conclusion, the agreements are not always close but there are substantial links among the points of view. Some optimism for the implementation of CBT can be generated from these findings. Nevertheless as REST (2003) reports:

“...it is unrealistic to imagine that communities will always be able to successfully and independently implement all stages of CBT: juggling marketing, hospitality, conservation and evaluation. Nevertheless, if all stakeholders are serious in their hopes to realize a successful, sustainable model of CBT, we must first share this goal of a strong, empowered community.” (REST, 2003: 10)

To successfully develop and manage community-based tourism, consensus is essentially needed among the stakeholders groups although internal conflicts cannot be avoided and may need to be managed. Ashley and Garland (1994) have argued that CBT development needs the support of a wide range of Ministries and officials at local, regional, and national level. It also needs the advice of extension agents if it is to succeed. Mitchell and Reid (2001) discussed from a review of the work of other scholars that the process of planning community tourism destinations tends to be overly simplistic or in many cases non-existent. Frequently, destinations are created through the imagination of an entrepreneur, private firm, or national government without the real community input. Tourism planners therefore have to find an accommodation between various stakeholders and interests in tourism development in an attempt to arrive at outcomes acceptable to stakeholders within the wider community (Hall, 2000 cited in Hall 2003). This study endeavoured to find that point of accommodation between the three stakeholder groups (decision maker, operator and visitor) for the future application of CBT development.

The study can be applied to the Pacific Rim countries where community tourism has high potential and where uniqueness of communities can be presented. However, the countries also face the challenges as tourism development is at vastly different stages (Kennedy, 2003). The findings of the study, for instance, the first steps or pros and cons of CBT can be implemented in the destinations where community tourism is in the developing stage. Additionally, the successful criteria are significant tool for community tourism evaluation towards successful development as the consensus has already revealed from the three main stakeholders.

## References

- Ashley, C. and Garland, E. (1994) *Promoting Community-Based Tourism Development: why, what and how?* Namibia: Ministry of Environmental and Tourism.
- Bell, W. and Mau, J.A. (1971) Images of the future: theory and research strategies. in Bell, W. and Mau, J.A. (1971) eds *The sociology of the future*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; pp. 6-44.
- CVTC. (1997) *Local Government and Tourism: the partnerships*. Melbourne: Country Victoria Tourism Council & Tourism Victoria.
- Dowling, R.K. (2000) Ecotourism in Southeast Asia: a golden opportunity for local communities. in Chon, K. S. (2000) ed. *Tourism in Southeast Asia: a new direction*. New York and London: The Haworth Hospitality Press; pp. 1-16.
- Fennell, D.A. (1999) *Ecotourism: an introduction*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Godde, P. (1998) *Community-based mountain tourism: practices for linking conservation with enterprise*. [http://www.mtnforum.org/resources/library/cbmt\\_01.htm](http://www.mtnforum.org/resources/library/cbmt_01.htm). (accessed 3 March 2004)
- Hall, C.M. (2003) Politics and place: an analysis of power in tourism communities. in Singh, S., Timothy, D.J. and Dowling, R. (2003) eds *Tourism in Destination Communities*. UK: CABI Publishing; pp. 99-113.
- Jafari, J. (2000) ed. *Encyclopaedia of tourism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kennedy, I. (2003) *Senate foreign affairs, defence and trade references committee, inquiry into Papua New Guinea and the island states of the South-West Pacific*. [http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/fadt\\_ctte/png/submissions/sub04.pdf](http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/fadt_ctte/png/submissions/sub04.pdf). (accessed 1 October 2004)
- Kline, E. (2001) *Putting the community back in the centre: community-based planning, and development*. [http://www.ase.tufts.edu/gdae/downloads/Sustainable%20Article%20\(Single%20Spaced%20Version\).pdf](http://www.ase.tufts.edu/gdae/downloads/Sustainable%20Article%20(Single%20Spaced%20Version).pdf). (accessed 2 May 2002)

- Kontogeorgopoulos, N. (2003) Towards a Southeast Asian model of resort-based 'mass ecotourism': evidence from Phuket, Thailand and Bali, Indonesia. *Asean Journal on Hospitality and Tourism*, **2** (1 & 2).
- Murphy, P.E. (1985) *Tourism: a community approach*. New York: Methuen.
- Mitchell, R.E. and Reid, D.G. (2001) Community integration island tourism in Peru. *Annals of Tourism Research*, **28** (1); pp. 113-139.
- Pearce, P.L. and Moscardo, G. (1999) Tourism community analysis: asking the right questions. in Pearce, D.G. and Butler, R.W. (1999) eds *Contemporary Issues in Tourism Development*. London and New York: Routledge; pp.31-51.
- Pearce, P.L., Moscardo, G. and Ross, G.F. (1991) Tourism impact and community perception: an equity-social representational perspective. *Australian Psychologist*, **26** (3); pp. 147-152.
- Rescher, N. (1977) The dimensions of values. in Smith, M. (1977) ed. *A practical guide to value clarification*. California: University associates, Inc.; pp. 279-284.
- REST (2003) *Community-based tourism: the sustainability challenge*.  
[http://www.iadb.org/int/jpn/English/support\\_files/REST-ENG.pdf](http://www.iadb.org/int/jpn/English/support_files/REST-ENG.pdf). (accessed 2 March 2004)
- Rodriguez, F. (2003) Water resources management and willingness to pay: the case of Cotacachi, Ecuador. *Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource Management Collaborative Research Support Program (SANREMCRSP Research Brief)* (No. 15).
- Rokeach, M. (1977) The nature of human value systems. in Smith, M. (1977) ed. *A practical guide to value clarification*. California: University Associates, Inc.; pp. 222-245.
- Sallah, H. (2000) Small-scale tourism enterprises in The Gambia. *Tourism Concern Bulletin 1 Fair Trade in Tourism*. Spring 2000.
- Suansri, P. (2003) *Community-Based Tourism Handbook*. Thailand: REST Project.
- Tosun, C. (2000) Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries. *Tourism Management*, **21**; pp. 613-633.
- Weaver, D.B. (2000) A broad context model of destination development scenarios. *Tourism Management*, **21**; 224.
- WTO (1998) *Guide for local authorities on developing sustainable tourism*. Spain: WTO.