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ABOUT THE CHAPTER:
This chapter tries to find out the opinion and an extract of various researchers in the field of sustainable tourism, rural tourism and related aspects impacts at international, national and at domestic level. The aim of this literature review is to studies that have explored a given topic in the past. This chapter defines the current level of knowledge about the theoretical and conceptual research on tourism impact derived from different sources. This will give the understanding that how the sustainable rural tourism can lead to socio-cultural, economic and environmental growth of a destination. The literature review will also help in finding out the research gap which will give the direction for the further research.

2.1 INTRODUCTION
Tourism is emerging as an important feature of the economy of Himachal Pradesh. It is self-evident that tourism will never come to dominate all rural areas, particularly in the developing world – there are vast swathes of rural areas for which tourism is not relevant for the foreseeable future. Between these two extremes are poor rural areas with some tourism potential, and an urgent need to develop whatever economic potential they have. Thus, an important question is whether more can be done to develop tourism within such rural areas, as a way of dispersing the benefits of tourism and increasing its poverty impact. If more tourism can be developed in rural areas, particularly in ways that involve high local participation in decisions and enterprises, then poverty impacts are likely to be enhanced. The nature of rural tourism products, often involving small-scale operations and culturally-based or farm-based products, can be conducive to wide participation. Tourism can also bring a range of other benefits to rural areas, such as infrastructural development and spin-off enterprise opportunities. Any successful tourism development, whether pro-poor or not, depends on commercial, economic, and logistical issues, such as the quality of the product, accessibility and infrastructure of the destination, availability of skills, and interest of investors. In most of these aspects, rural areas may well be at a disadvantage compared to urbanized and more developed areas. These challenges may be
compounded by political and institutional obstacles, particularly in developing countries, i.e. the administrative complexity of dealing with low-populated areas, the lack of policy co-ordination between rural development and tourism development, and low priority provided to rural areas by central governments.

2.2 SUSTAINABLE TOURISM

WCED, 1987 Though it may be legitimate to argue that sustainable development has under-emphasised the cultural dimension or missed the culture mark entirely, it nevertheless runs through the three most cogent, powerful and politically significant expressions of the concept over several years. Not surprisingly, as global political statements they do not engage in detailed discussion of the relationships which exist between culture, cultures and the environment. However, the primacy of culture, and the explicit recognition of human rights, provides the spirit of sustainable development. Recognition of traditional rights must go hand and hand with measures to protect the local institutions that enforce responsibility in resource use, this recognition must also give local communities a decisive voice in the decisions about resource use.
tourism. This is defined as referring to a distinct rural community with its own traditions, heritage, arts, lifestyles, places, and values as preserved between generations. Tourists visit these areas to be informed about the culture and to experience folklore, customs, natural landscapes, and historical landmarks. They might also enjoy other activities in a rural setting such as nature, adventure, sports, festivals, crafts, and general sightseeing.

Lane (1994) explained that the decline of agriculture and forestry has pushed and motivated people, rural development actors, politicians, NGOs and governmental bodies to search for alternative modes of production. In addition to the socio-economic changes, the idea of sustainable development has strengthened the transition process of rural areas towards tourism. For a relatively long time tourism has been understood as a road to rural and community development but since the early 1990s it has also represented a tool to put sustainable development into practice on a local scale.

Muller (1994) describe that sustainable tourism has been promoted in policy documents, strategic plans and the academic literature related to tourism. There have been numerous attempts to define the term, yet few have explored stakeholder perceptions of sustainable tourism. Arguably, without a full understanding of how tourism is perceived by stakeholders who live in, use and manage the resource to which management is to be applied, there is a risk that sustainable tourism will not occur. This is because sustainable tourism, as we apply it, is able to deal with impacts in the short and long term by involving the needs and requirements of all stakeholders: it is both proactive and holistic. In addition to this, it is tourism in which stakeholders have a sense of ownership and a desire for it to be of high quality. Conversely, ‘maintainable tourism’ – when the status quo is being managed to keep up with short-term trends and impacts – is tourism in which stakeholder interests are presumed rather than thoroughly researched.

Muller (1994) Within the tourism literature, the term ‘sustainable tourism’ is commonly used. However, the term has been subjected to debates not only regarding its definition but also its validity and operationalisation. In terms of its definition, some authors have criticized sustainable tourism for being defined in a parochial, sectoral sense. They argue that sustainable tourism, although it may share some areas of concern with sustainable development, emphasizes growth in order for business viability to be maintained; therefore it has its own specific tourism-centric agenda. For this reason, we concur with these authors and define
sustainable tourism in broader terms, transferring the principles of sustainable development into the context of tourism needs. He suggests that the objective of sustainable tourism is to influence the following factors: economic health, subjective well being of the locals, unspoiled nature, protection of resources, healthy culture and optimum satisfaction of guest requirements.

**Coccossis (1996)** Sustainable tourism refers to an approach that seeks to reduce the environmental impact of tourism by addressing the physical degradation caused by visitors, such as through footpath erosion; resource depletion resulting from the operation of tourism-related businesses, such as the utilization of fossil fuels, water and other natural resources; and possible negative socio-cultural impacts on host communities. Successful implementation of these measures ensures that nonrenewable physical and cultural resources are not consumed in the process of tourist development and that economic sustainability maintains community structures, employment and human resources at a local level. Sustainable tourism has come to encompass a set of principles and management methods that chart a path for tourism development that provides local economic viability in ways that protect a destination’s environmental and socio-cultural base for the future.

**Hunter (1997)** Sustainable tourism, as a socially constructed and idealized set of aspirations, is dynamic in the sense that it is constantly being constructed and reconstructed by different stakeholders. It is a political process that depends on value systems and ethical judgments that are related to knowledge and power. What we see at its core are issues of economic efficiency and equity; environmental protection and cultural awareness. He suggested that tourism can be a destroyer of these special qualities which are so central to sustainable development and can be a driving force for their conservation and promotion. Consequently tourism and its integration into the rural product can be very much part of developing employment opportunities, increasing local prosperity, conservation and maintenance of the environment, celebrating cultural assets and generally ensuring a greater spread in terms of who can benefit (economically, socially and culturally).

**Kearsley (1998)** said that within the literature it has been suggested that perceptions of sustainable tourism are personal and contextual and what is perceived as sustainable practice differs between people and locations. Similarly, it is evident here that stakeholder concerns are often contextual and localized. For example, local people were concerned with local issues and
operators were concerned with issues directly affecting them, such as marketing and the tourism product.

Augustyn (1998) emphasized that traditional ways of earning a livelihood on crops or stock provide the primary sources of income. To stimulate rural economies, it has become inevitable for rural regions to seek alternative uses for local resources. With comparatively advantageous effects in income and employment generation, tourism is an option for enhancing rural lifestyles and for inducing positive changes in the distribution of income in underprivileged regions. This perceived need for a revival of the rural economy has led to the development of policies catering for tourism and recreation out of agriculture’s way in rural areas. Tourism has become the priority tool of rural planning orthodoxy. Tourism helps to energize the rural economy and, in particular, plays an important role in creating a value added commercial channel for local produce. By integrating local products or cultural attributes into tourism, rustic flavoured event tourism has also helped to shape the emerging form of rural tourism.

Potter and Burney (2002) discussed that multifunctional countryside that is conceived as ‘producing not only food but also sustaining rural landscapes, protecting biodiversity, generating employment and contributing to the viability of rural areas’ is particularly prominent in terms of the demand for, and supply of, leisure and recreation, arenas in which rural tourism is increasingly considered. The obvious shortcomings of the conception that rural areas can be addressed in some homogeneous way have been recognized and instead rural areas are considered in terms of the diversity of needs, and more importantly, the opportunities they present. Subsequently, as argued by the European Commission (Commission of the European Communities 2005, p. 32) ‘increased diversification, innovation and value added of products and services, both within and beyond the agricultural sector, are indispensable in order to promote integrated and sustainable rural development’. In this multifunctional arena production and consumption run side by side and the countryside is considered a public good, providing ecological, aesthetic, amenity and recreational spaces that heretofore were largely ignored. While the drive towards a multifunctional countryside is gaining pace and sustainable rural tourism is seen as a key component of rural development (Sharpley 2000; Garrod et al. 2006; Saxena and Ilbery 2008), how this is played out in the context of the governance of sustainable rural tourism remains unclear.
Weaver (2004) discussed that sustainable rural tourism is not unproblematic, having a plethora of meanings depending on the context. Indeed the literature concedes that it is because of the oxymoronic nature of the term ‘sustainable tourism’ and its amenability to appropriation by supporters of various ideologies that can be used to represent and support just about any model of development. Nonetheless there is some consensus that it relates to tourism that is ‘economically viable, but does not destroy the resources on which the future of tourism will depend, notably the physical environment, and the social fabric of the host community’. This normative representation focuses on the interrelationship between the human and physical environment with competing social, economic, cultural and environmental interests, priorities and negotiations. Consequently conflict is evident between different interest groups as well as within those groups with a tourism affiliation.

Hall (2005) describe that in rural areas the conceptual link between tourism and sustainability leads to a tourism industry that sustains local economies without damaging the environment on which it depends. Rural tourism should: (1) sustain and create local incomes, employment and growth, (2) contribute to the costs of providing economic and social infrastructure, (3) encourage the development of other industrial sectors (e.g. through local purchasing links), (4) contribute to local resident amenities and services and (5) contribute to the conservation of environmental and cultural resources. Thus, the goals of rural tourism development are, in many respects, almost identical with the ones of sustainable tourism management, and compared to forestry and many other primary economies, such as mining and fisheries, tourism is also regarded as a more ‘soft’ and therefore ‘sustainable’ option to the environment.

2.3 RURAL TOURISM AND SUSTAINABILITY

Brabencová, 1998 Farm-based tourism, as an important element of rural restructuring and revitalisation, can play a crucial role when small farms have to adjust to depressed agricultural prices and increased competition. Employment creation, income growth, rejuvenation and integration of rural environments, growth of the aspiration and ambition of farmers, reorientation of farms to such specialisation as organic food production, improvements in the appearance of villages and development of infrastructure, have all been credited to farm tourism development in CEE. Risk factors identified, however, include mediocre knowledge of
agritourism and rural tourism, low quality farm accommodation, lack of information about the requirements of guests, lack of time to spend with guests, lack of finance to start a business, low levels of village infrastructure, low levels of information about tourism activities and opportunities in villages, and a general underestimation of the financial benefits for local governments.

Buzarovski, 2001 Nonetheless, tourism can be used as one of a range of tools in assisting environmental improvement in degraded rural regions (e.g. Speh and Plut, 2001). Local environmental action plans can assist tourism’s role in consolidating back linkages with local cultures and environment (e.g.), and can support the better understanding of changing relationships between localities and their resource hinterlands (e.g. Staddon, 1999, 2001). ‘Ecotourism’ in particular has come to be viewed as an ‘easy’ entry to niche tourism markets, however, drawing on a perceived ‘inexhaustible’ supply of natural products, and gesturing towards ideals of sustainability and environmental awareness.

2.3.1 RURAL TOURISM

Butler & Clarke, 1992, Tourism in rural areas can encompass many activities focused upon different types of resource, often with cultural and natural components. The range of potential activities that may be undertaken in a rural context include: touring; water-based activities; land-based activities; aerial activities; cultural and educational activities; conservation activities; gastronomic activities; health and fitness activities; and ‘metaphysical’ activities such as pilgrimage and retreats. Rural tourism goes beyond simply complementing traditional activities such as agriculture, and can act as a catalyst for a whole range of new entrepreneurial activities, partnerships and networks. Inevitably, however, there are contested opinions as to what is desirable in rural tourism development and, moreover, there is no universal agreement about the net benefits of rural tourism. In part, this reflects a shortage of theoretical research placing rural tourism in a conceptual framework. As a result, tourism has only recently received serious academic attention as a mechanism for rural development and as an opportunity to revitalize and sustain rural communities and economies.

Lane (1994) discusses the historical continuity in the development of rural tourism and
examines some of the key issues that combine to make rural tourism distinctive. Rural tourism should be

- Located in rural areas
- Functionally rural, that is, built upon the rural world's special features of small-scale enterprise, open space, contact with nature and the natural world, heritage, traditional societies and traditional practices
- Rural in scale, in terms of both buildings and settlements
- Traditional in character, growing slowly and organically, and connected with local people
- Representative of the complex patterns of the rural environment, economy, history and location

O'Rourke, 1999 'The rural' is no longer synonymous with agriculture, but is a rapidly changing concept that is reflected in the landscape as well as in rural demography, employment, mobility and consumption. Equally, 'rural tourism' is not restricted to farm-based or agrotourism, and can encompass all tourism based in, and making use of, rural landscapes. The differentiating features of rural tourism include its close association with the quality of the biophysical environment, a high degree of pluri-activity among hosts (with tourism businesses often part of wider ones), the importance of local culture and traditions, and the fragility of the rural economy in which it takes place. Accessibility (i.e. the ease with which people can reach, engage with, and use a site or attraction in both locational and economic terms) is also a critical factor in the success of rural tourism.

Hall and Jenkins (1998) Over the last three decades, many rural economies have suffered a severe downturn, with falling employment and income levels in traditional agrarian industries contributing to a vicious circle of economic decline and socio-economic problems. In particular, per capita rural incomes have fallen well below national averages, whilst the loss of public services, high unemployment levels and the consequential out-migration of younger, better educated members of rural communities have collectively endangered the fabric and structure of rural areas (OECD, 1993). As a result, not only has tourism been embraced as a potential means of reversing this decline but also, given the intimate relationship between the socio-economic health of rural areas in general and the prosperity of the farming community in particular, it has become an integral element of rural development policy.
Richards (2000) argues that it is not so much an increasing interest in cultural/heritage tourism that is responsible for the growth in this sector but rather the constantly expanding definition of cultural. Richards goes on to say that the market for culture/heritage products may actually be saturated. This would make future rural tourism development efforts focused on cultural/heritage attributes a risky proposition.

Christaller 1964 Rural environments have been attracting tourists and tourism for many years, due to their ability to fulfil tourists' expectations such as: tranquillity; beautiful landscapes; relaxation; sports and adventure activities; exposure to nature and to rural lifestyle and culture. The expansion of rural tourism, both in terms of number of tourists and in number of tourists and hospitality facilities, has been of a great economic and social importance to communities living in such settings. The growth of rural tourism is mainly characterised by the expansion of infrastructure, tourist opportunities, and types of activities offered to tourists. Thus, rural settings have been the hosts of adventure and sport tourism, cultural tourism in traditional rural environments, eco-tourism and agro-tourism to name a few.

Doxey (1975) attributed the affect of tourism on communities' socio-cultural resilience to their level of tourism development. He termed the 'irritation index' in an effort to explain how uncontrolled tourism development crosses this threshold and leads to social stress. Subsequently, in the 1980s and 1990s, more and more case studies proved that the further this threshold is crossed the more destructive locals' attitudes and behaviour become towards tourists and the tourist sector in their locality. Most of these studies also concluded that these causal relations lead to a deterioration of the destination’s level of attractively, a decline in the number of visitors and consequently an economic crisis.

2.4 RURAL TOURISM AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT

Gannon (1994) explained that the notion of rural tourism represents a panacea to the problems facing rural areas, that it is a 'magic wand that will speed up economic progress', must be treated with some caution. That is, the extent to which tourism contributes effectively to rural development and diversification, hence the extent to which it is deserving of government support and finance, is questioned in many quarters. In general, of course, the development of rural tourism as with most other forms of tourism may have undesirable economic, social and environmental consequences for local communities. However, studies have also shown that a
number of factors militate against the achievement of rural economic diversification and growth through tourism.

Long (1998) proposes a definition of rural that reflects lifestyles one is likely to encounter in a visit to a ‘rural’ community; ‘Rural can be perceived as a place of safety, with solid values, surrounded by open space and natural beauty, where one is treated respectfully and friendly’. In a functional sense, rural can be considered a place where small-scale enterprises dominate the economic scene, open space is abundant, contact with nature or ‘traditional societies’ is offered, development is slow growing using local capital and the types of touristic activity offered varies but reflects local resource capabilities (Lane, 1994).

Long’s (1998) definition of rural, once accepted, changes the focus from a statistical, easy to measure, parameter to one that is more ambiguous and benefit based. For the purpose of this paper, the basic elements of Long’s definition is accepted as a new way to look at rural tourism development. This will become clearer after a review of the transformational history of rural areas is addressed. Tourism activities have been widely regarded as key-tools for rural development. However, even when tourism and leisure may offer many chances for rural areas, policymakers shall remember about major complexity of local development troubles and actions, these going further from economical or technological frame limits to become part of a global dynamics on changing society as a whole, wherever any activities and/or processes are closely linked to circumstances under which they come into practice. So, a wide range of historical, cultural, educative, organizational, structural and other diverse factors shall determine at the end the real capacity for generating and/or accepting an innovation by economical agents acting in a concrete location.

Hall and Jenkins (1998) focused that while designing an appropriate set of rural tourism policies should imply the selective expansion of tourist flows in order to achieve one or more of following goals:

a) Sustaining previously existing local levels of incomes, employment and growth, and generating new wealth sources.
b) Contributing to payment for costs of providing economical and social infrastructure (directly and indirectly related to rural tourism activities and facilities).
c) Encouraging the development of primary and industrial sectors/activities at local level, as well as other services (directly linked to tourism activities or not).
d) Contributing to increase and diversification in amenities and services offered to local residents.

e) Contributing to preservation of environmental and cultural resources (especially when being primary scenic/aesthetic tourist attractions).

Reid, 1999 Rural tourism is distinctive by its projection of rural life, whether authentic or not. It is generally constructed around the built or natural environment, and includes programmes such as cultural festivals and traditional activities that often re-enact the past or provide a flavour of the traditional local or rural culture and its history. Rural tourism brings together the natural and cultural heritage, and this is what differentiates it from nature-based tourism. Local people and their way of life are a key component of rural tourism. There is enough theory to form the basis for the development of rural tourism as an enterprise in its own right.

Long and Lane (2000) found that in Europe as a whole, three critical issues in the development of rural tourism have been recognized. First, although visitors are attracted to rural areas by their distinctive regional, social and cultural heritage, landscape qualities and perceived cleaner environment, these very qualities may be threatened by the impacts of tourism and recreational activity. Second, training for rural tourism provision is often not available or not taken up to assist improvement in the quality and appropriateness of rural tourism products. Third, rural tourism products can be relatively isolated and in most cases will benefit from collaboration and networking in promotion and marketing (Edmunds, 1999; Roberts and Hall, 2001).

Kantanen and Tikkanen (2006) discussed that rural tourism is an entity constructed, preferred and consumed explicitly or implicitly as cultural appreciation either as experiences or through knowledge gaining. It can be argued then that cultural tourism is not a niche market within tourism. Rather, it is an amalgamation of tourism typologies and diverse activities that have a cultural focus such as heritage tourism, arts tourism, urban cultural tourism, rural cultural tourism and indigenous cultural tourism. Raj (2003) agreed that travel is directed toward experiences of special characters of destinations and development of knowledge about different communities.

2.5 RURAL TOURISM AND CULTURAL TOURISM

Richards (1996) argues there is a conceptual and technical definition of cultural tourism. According to Richards (1996, p. 24) the conceptual definition of cultural tourism is that it
represents 'the movement of persons to cultural attractions away from their normal place of residence, with the intention to gather new information and experiences to satisfy their cultural needs'. The technical definition is that cultural tourism includes 'all movements of persons to specific cultural attractions, such as heritage sites, artistic and cultural manifestations, arts and drama outside their normal place of residence'. Silberberg (1995, p. 361) considers cultural tourism as 'visits by persons from outside the host community motivated wholly or in part by interest in the historical, artistic, scientific or lifestyle/heritage offerings of a community, region, group or institution'.

Butler & Hall, 1998 Rural values, ways of living and certain tangible characteristics of the countryside refer to the idea of rurality. Rurality is a very contested concept and worth its own wider discussion elsewhere. Here, in the context of rural tourism as an ideological policy tool, the control over the characteristics and commoditisation of rurality should also be based on the values, preferences and needs of local rural communities, rather than primarily on the tourism industry's commercial tasks. On a society level the definition and meaning of rurality is out of local control but the limits and preferences of its uses in tourism spaces can still be set locally through a collaborative process. Rural areas and communities are increasingly open to new economies and activities, and the ongoing economic transition of rural areas reflects the issue of globalisation. The consequences of ever-deeper interconnectedness and the dependency of distant places and people may create the need for high rural tourism development goals, but that may also result locally in disconnectedness and non-dependency within already fragmented rural communities.

Roberts and Hall, 2001 Rural tourism and agri-tourism are terms that are often used interchangeably. They are symbiotic, with agri-tourism as a part of the overall concept of rural tourism related to agrarian activities or off-farm diversification. In Ireland, tourism in rural areas is no longer as closely connected to the land and is best described as rural tourism. As the majority of Polish operators are entering into tourism and enterprises have evolved from farming enterprises, agri-tourism best describes their economic activity. The terms are grouped together for comparative purposes. Within the EU, rural/agri-tourism is considered to be crucial to allaying mass outmigration and economic decline. This is the reason why 'appropriate policies have been implemented to support its development.
Sharpley (2004) The imperative of sustainability in rural tourism development may direct development more toward social, cultural and heritage issues and it may even limit the potential for economic development of rural areas as outlined by. This can be a problem for rural community development. Indeed, there is a need for a broader view on the relationship between tourism and the countryside beyond rural tourism as a specific and very limited niche market. However, in the context of rural community development, a growing conventional or alternative tourism should be integrated into larger rural policy issues and goals and the development indicators in tourism strategies and plans should also reflect the 'promised' or (at least) indicated developmental contribution of tourism in rural communities. In contrast to this, the focus of the strategies still remains solely on tourism and its indicators such as the occupancy rate, tourism employment and revenue, even though tourism is introduced to communities almost as the saviour of rural ways of living and values.

2.6 RURAL TOURISM AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Wilkinson, 1989 suggests that tourism development should be integrated into the broader context of sustainability. Specifically, it is recognized that the magnitude and type of tourism development should vary from one location to another according to environmental and socio-cultural characteristics and the potential role of other economic sectors. Along these lines, suggests that ‘sustainable tourism must be regarded as an adaptive paradigm capable of addressing widely different situations, and articulating different goals in terms of the utilization of natural resources’.

Hunter (1997) points out the need for a more central vision of the meaning and implications of sustainable development. He further suggests that debate in the centre of the sustainability spectrum largely focuses on a trade-off between continuous economic growth and sustainable development. Those who advocate a strong interpretation of sustainable development reject the possibility of limitless economic growth and perceive a need to preserve natural resources. For advocates of weak sustainable development, however, a greater degree of substitution is possible between natural capital and human-made capital and, therefore, it is enough to maintain, or increase, the total (natural plus human-made) capital stock through time. Moreover, Hunter (1997) recognizes that different interpretations of sustainable development will have applicability under different socio-cultural, economic and environmental settings.
Hunter (1997) Accordingly, at least four models of sustainable tourism are identified by: (i) tourism imperative (i.e., the needs and desires of tourists and tourism operators are primary), (ii) product-led tourism (i.e., the environmental side of the tourism/environment system is secondary to the primary need to develop new, and maintain existing, tourism products), (iii) environment-led tourism (i.e., there is a paramount concern for the status of the environment) and (iv) neotenous tourism (i.e., tourism is actively and continuously discouraged on ecological grounds).

Verbole and Cottrell, 2002 Small-scale, ‘community’ based, ‘sustainable’ rural tourism projects have been a notable element of European-aided projects in a number of countries. More analysis is required of the importance of local community relationships in a region where continuity from the communist past may be unseen but crucial. , for example, points to rural tourism development as a negotiated process involving a number of social actors — individuals, groups and organisations, each interacting with each other in attempting to attain their own particular goals and aspirations. Based on work in Slovenia, she indicates the importance of understanding the sociopolitical dimensions of rural tourism development at the community level, factors often minimised in Western consultancy-led rural development programmes.

2.7 TOURISM IMPACTS ON RURAL COMMUNITIES

Fuller and Reid (1998) suggest that approach to development lends itself well to tourism communities. This represents a drastic departure from the entrepreneurial, incremental approach which dominates tourism planning and development today. A main reason for the absence of this approach until now is that often the need for planning is recognized well after the initiation of tourism in a community and, generally, only once tourism development starts to have negative effects and impairs the everyday life of the residents. Further to this, the first attempt to rectify development problems usually focuses on the creation of a planning document that reacts to the tangible side-effects of tourism but does not address the community's underlying need for a process that enhances dialogue, trust and participatory decision-making. Concrete issues including hours of operation and traffic control are often the focus of attention and planning. All too often, however, these issues are not adequately dealt with because the community actors do not have a history of involvement in decision-making nor an established
mechanism that allows them to speak to each other and make decisions in a nonadversarial manner. Ideally, as capacity is encouraged and more community members feel able to take a meaningful part in decision-making processes in their communities, mutual trust will develop between the various parties. He argued that the 'process is pedagogy' by suggesting that the knowledge and skills of community members is increased as they become more involved in community activities.

There is also need of learning new knowledge and skills, and enriching old ones, can help to increase and maintain self-esteem, self-actualization, and other humanistic concepts of development which in turn can motivate community members for future involvement and action. Community development specialists and planners should be encouraged to involve stakeholders more directly in the process of planning community activities. Tourism has been widely promoted and used in rural development as a replacement economy for traditional livelihoods. The future prospects of tourism, especially, are seen as a potential instrument to control the economic transition process and its social consequences in rural communities. In addition to the characteristics of tourism as a future-oriented growing economy the real or perceived lack of alternatives in rural areas has served almost as an absolute necessity to develop tourism; in rural areas tourism is often seen as the only realistic means of development.

Reid (1999) Many tourism destinations throughout the world are now reaching a stage of maturity which produces conflicts and communities are reacting negatively and even resisting further or continued development. Planners and scholars interested in community development have advocated a community-based development approach to decision-making in order to encourage and give citizens the voice and the skills to shape their own image of their community. It is useful to identify elements that are common to these definitions: a focus on change; indigenous problem identification; participation of all concerned community members in the activities and processes of the community development; and the notion of self-help and community control of both the processes and outcomes of decision making.

Burns (1999) Tourism can be the 'saviour' of rural communities but, in the context of rural tourism as an ideological development tool with strong links to sustainability, tourism should be integrated primarily with regions, communities and their development goals—not the other way around. As has been mentioned previously, high development goals for rural tourism may separate rural communities and tourism actors from each other. Thus, tourism may grow
and increasingly provide employment opportunities but they will not necessarily meet local employment needs. Tourism may also have social, economic and environmental costs in the rural areas as far as other local sources of livelihood are concerned, and these costs are often disregarded in tourism development discourses and related practices. However, it should be noted that the last remaining ‘traditional jobs’ are often those which are symbolically loaded and highly valued by local communities. This may lower the threshold of dissatisfaction and raise the intensity of possible conflicts between rural communities, traditional economies and tourism industry which is the case in some parts of northern Finland and Norway.

Tosun 2000 suggested that community participation in the development process should be considered as a categorical term that legitimizes a variety of community participation. He proposed that different forms (active, direct, indirect, passive etc.) of community participation in the tourism development are appropriate under different circumstances in various tourism destinations which are at different level of development. Therefore, community participation in rural tourism should not be regarded as being within a rigid framework, but rather as an adaptive and flexible paradigm. It should be noted that community participation is a desired objective in the tourism development process. However, although community participation is strongly linked to some notion of democracy, or democratic rights (involvement, participation and empowerment) in the developed world, it has formidable operational, structural and cultural limitations in many developing countries.

Weaver 2000 Rural environments have been attracting tourists and tourism for many years, due to their ability to fulfill tourists’ expectations such as: tranquility; beautiful landscapes; relaxation; sports and adventure activities; exposure to nature and to rural lifestyle and culture. The expansion of rural tourism, both in terms of number of tourists and in number of tourists and hospitality facilities, has been of a great economic and social importance to communities living in such settings. The growth of rural tourism is mainly characterised by the expansion of infrastructure, tourist opportunities, and types of activities offered to tourists. Thus, rural settings have been the hosts of adventure and sport tourism, cultural tourism in traditional rural environments, eco-tourism and agro-tourism to name a few. The urge to control the expanding negative impacts of tourism on natural and human environments and the constantly growing demand for domestic and international tourism on a global scale – called for some kind of holistic yet alternative approach to the planning, development and operation of tourism. This
need brought researchers at the beginning of the 1980s to seek solutions for this problem in the concept of ‘sustainability’ as a preferred alternative development paradigm. Being such an important agent of socio-cultural and environmental change, tourism was one of the first economic sectors to explore ways of how to embark on the sustainability wagon.

**Sharpley, 2002** Rural tourism development plans, strategies and other initiatives are important for rural community development and the tourism industry in rural areas but, instead of monitoring tourism development indicators in rural development processes, the indicators of the developmental contribution of tourism should be evaluated (and before that established). This would serve both the long-term development needs of communities and tourism. The relationship between rural and tourism development is not necessarily a ‘zero-sum game’ but too ambitious and unrealistic goals in tourism may lead to that situation and the juxtaposition of rural communities and tourism development. In addition to community perspectives the creation of too high expectations, it is perhaps unethical for the existing and future rural tourism entrepreneurs for whom the unrealistic hopes may cause economic losses based on over-investment etc.

**Sharpley, (2002)** Rural tourism development plans, strategies and other initiatives are important for rural community development and the tourism industry in rural areas but, instead of monitoring tourism development indicators in rural development processes, the indicators of the developmental contribution of tourism should be evaluated (and before that established). This would serve both the long-term development needs of communities and tourism. The relationship between rural and tourism development is not necessarily a ‘zero-sum game’ but too ambitious and unrealistic goals in tourism may lead to that situation and the juxtaposition of rural communities and tourism development. In addition to community perspectives the creation of too high expectations, it is perhaps unethical for the existing and future rural tourism entrepreneurs for whom the unrealistic hopes may cause economic losses based on over-investment etc.

If too high development goals lead to the distinction between tourism development and rural development the rural transition process towards tourism becomes problematic to rural communities to whom tourism is initially introduced based on the ideological concept of rural tourism and means for rural community development. Rural tourism as an ideological concept and policy tool is not automatically sustainable tourism nor sustainable rural development, but it
has a stronger connection to the idea of sustainability as a small-scale, long-term and locally controlled economic activity than often non-locally controlled, short-term mass (conventional) tourism development, which is probably needed if the high development goals are going to be fulfilled.

The imperative of sustainability in rural tourism development may direct development more toward social, cultural and heritage issues and it may even limit the potential for economic development of rural areas as outlined by Sharpley (2004). This can be a problem for rural community development. Indeed, there is a need for a broader view on the relationship between tourism and the countryside beyond rural tourism as a specific and very limited niche market. However, in the context of rural community development, a growing conventional or alternative tourism should be integrated into larger rural policy issues and goals and the development indicators in tourism strategies and plans should also reflect the ‘promised’ or (at least) indicated developmental contribution of tourism in rural communities. In contrast to this, the focus of the strategies still remains solely on tourism and its indicators such as the occupancy rate, tourism employment and revenue, even though tourism is introduced to communities almost as the saviour of rural ways of living and values.

Simpson 2008, Only smaller businesses are able to operate from a rural location, as it is their very size that ensures that the consumption of resources is in line with the limited and fragile capacity of these areas and does not compromise their sustainable development. The rural location also constitutes an attractive alternative for a variety of reasons. Of particular note are the financial benefits, based on the lower investment required in rural areas, or the benefits derived from grants and aids designed to stimulate growth in the area, and those benefits of a more personal nature, linked to the local entrepreneur and the rural location itself. These more personal outcomes are reflected in the lifestyle achieved by the local entrepreneur, which is enriched both socially and culturally. Other benefits such as the impact on the rural area can be seen in the form of improvements and investments made in its conservation.

Cloke & Little (1997) Rural values, ways of living and certain tangible characteristics of the countryside refer to the idea of rurality. Rurality is a very contested concept and worth its own wider discussion elsewhere. Here, in the context of rural tourism as an ideological policy tool, the control over the characteristics and commoditisation of rurality should also be based on the values, preferences and needs of local rural communities, rather than primarily on the tourism
industry's commercial tasks. On a society level the definition and meaning of rurality is out of local control but the limits and preferences of its uses in tourism spaces can still be set locally through a collaborative process.

**Teo (2002)** Rural areas and communities are increasingly open to new economies and activities, and the ongoing economic transition of rural areas reflects the issue of globalisation. The consequences of ever-deeper interconnectedness and the dependency of distant places and people may create the need for high rural tourism development goals, but that may also result locally in disconnectedness and non-dependency within already fragmented rural communities. It is clear that rural areas will change in the future and there is no way back to nostalgic small-scale farming and forestry communities. Even though globalisation is impossible to control locally, the local outcomes of the globalization process are still somewhat dependent on the goals set in different development programmes and policies and the issue of power in development processes.

**Friedmann (1992)** Rural tourism helps to empower local communities and build capacity which, in turn, improves their livelihoods. Empowerment is a multi-dimensional concept including economic, social, political, and psychological empowerment. Regular economic gains from formal or informal sector employment and business opportunities help economically empower the community. Shared income among community members also helps improve local livelihoods by providing infrastructure, education, and health.

### 2.8 RURAL TOURISM AND COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

**McIntosh and Goeldner (1986)** described community participation in tourism can be examined from at least two perspectives: in the decision-making process and tourism benefits sharing. Participation in the former generally refers to empowering local residents to determine their hopes and concerns for tourism, while the latter is usually realized in ways of increasing incomes, employment, and education of locals, etc. Until now, most of the relevant research is mainly focused on community’s participation in the decision-making part, especially the process of planning, and a number of process models have been built, yet little concern has been directed to the relationship between these two dimensions of community participation in tourism.

**Haywood (1988)** said that there are a number of institutional and system-based obstacles to full-scale representation in the planning process. These obstacles include: the presence of extensive bureaucratic organisations at various levels in tourism; a lack of comprehensive
tourism planning in a majority of communities; the perception that participation is an unnecessary, unwieldy and time-consuming endeavor and an idealistic dream; the view by the industry that a more comprehensive approach to planning - one more responsible to society - may pose a threat (to the extent that recommendations mean adding to the cost of doing business); and a lack interest on the part of decision-making officials in encouraging representational democracy.

**Pearce, 1992** discussed the government’s role as a ‘catalyst’ has been little discussed. Typically, public sector planners are responsible for preparing policy statements, developing destination-marketing strategies, controlling development within the local planning system, and providing tourism information. And, it is also standard for governments to dominate tourism planning affairs and have the mandate and power to direct the growth and development of tourism. Moreover, it is largely through governments that tourism-related investments and overseas aid as well as international policy pressures are agreed upon and channeled. Community participation advocates cannot therefore ignore the role played and the approach undertaken by governments and/or government-mandated tourism organisations.

**Jamal and Getz (1995)** described rural tourism as having a legitimate ‘change agent’ in charge of effectively facilitating the participatory programme. The complex nature of participatory planning and the diversity of tourists and tourism products are key justification for strongly advocating such support from local and national governments. As these commentators pointed out, a major component of the tourism product is public goods, which must be shared among every party in the system. However, for this system to work effectively, the tangible elements and intangible services provided by all the industries concerned, need to be supported with suitable infrastructure, public services, and public-related services, and to be bolstered by the attitudes of local communities. Indeed, the success of tourist businesses largely rests upon the wider social and natural environments in which they operate.

**Beeker (1998)** said that communities may vary in their capacity or readiness to participate in tourism planning activities, community mobilisation may not occur in the absence of a mandate, an organisational base, or government support. This is particularly true in a community lacking: a strong, recognized leader; mature community-based organizations; and, a successful problem-solving history. More specifically, Beeker’s point is that community mobilisation may not be possible in the absence of prior governmental investment in community.
development, i.e. without creating new networks, strengthening the existing ones, invigorating community institutions, and motivating and training community members to become effective leaders and participants.

Timothy (1999) says that decision-making and benefit-sharing as two essential perspectives from which the involvement of community in tourism development should be examined. Although, when dealing with the governments and external capitals, the grassroots-elected villagers’ committee does stand for the interests of the entire community, it is still reasonable to take the committee as a group of community’s elites. The field research also revealed an obvious trend towards the centralization of decision-making right in tourism development to the minority of the community. In rural areas the community members’ commonly lack democratic awareness and insufficient abilities to participate in the tourism planning process, thus, providing the villagers’ committee the chance to overlook the public opinions and attitudes.

Scheyvens (1999) said that some disadvantaged groups, particularly those who do not earn cash, can be empowered through economic opportunities. Social empowerment concerns with the ability of a community to live in harmony and be cohesive. Political empowerment is more than the power to vote. It relates to the access of individual household members to the process by which decisions are made. Finally, psychological power concerns the self-esteem of community members that can be enhanced by external recognition and appreciation of the unique cultural and natural resources and traditional knowledge. Various types of empowerment could be intertwined as one form leads to the other. For example, if women are socially empowered, it releases their non-economic yet challenging household work, which will free their time that can be used to earn income, which gives them economic empowerment. In turn, it may contribute to self-confidence (psychological empowerment) and political empowerment.

Weiler & Ham (2002) In a rural nature-based tourism context, capacity-building programs provide the skills, know-how, and capital necessary to start and operate small-scale tourism enterprises. This provides the human resources needed to provide quality services to tourists, which are often absent in rural communities. Capacity building ultimately strengthens the people’s socioeconomic empowerment. Broad-based and pro-poor growth are two major approaches to reducing poverty through economic growth. Broad-based growth focuses on enveloping the overall economy of the region. An increase in employment opportunities and a
growth in the overall income of the population can potentially benefit the poor. However, the key questions that arise are how the broad-based growth is inclusive for the poor. The pro-poor growth approach focuses on improving the conditions of the poor by supporting small- and medium-sized businesses and providing financial capital through micro-credit programs.

MacDonald & Jolliffe (2003) said that through integrating the cultural tourism and rural tourism, a new concept ‘cultural rural tourism’ is created by, which is defined as ‘referring to a distinct rural community with its own traditions, heritage, arts, lifestyles, places, and values as preserved between generations’. Since ‘there can be no other country in the world with so much diversity and unique localities within its own territory, where there are numerous local and ethnic cultures, customs and folklores relating to different nations, or places.

Narayan (2005) showed that the empowerment approach can help reduce poverty by engaging citizens in the development process and strengthening good governance. Some authors have provided an alternative development approach to empowerment, in which public participation and involvement processes have been central. Often, empowerment is considered the final outcome, but the process of empowering people is equally important. Many authors have emphasized the ways communities and households can be empowered through access to information, inclusion and participation, and capacity building. The goal of capacity building is to secure the empowerment of those who have less economic and political power to reduce their dependency on the government and non-local NGOs by providing new skills related to leadership; understanding the business; solving problems; and expressing their issues, needs, and visions. The poorest groups in rural communities often lack the necessary skills, knowledge, and resources to participate in tourism-related businesses.

Tosun (2000) argue that there appears to be a lack of communication between communities and government bodies that substantially contribute to maintaining a ‘knowledge gap’ and isolating the local community from the tourism development process. As Tosun sees it, the underlying problem is the inevitable presence of obstacles associated with a centralized public administration, too bureaucratic to respond to local public needs. This state of affairs calls for a major change in the way policy makers work with communities; a necessary change which has not gone unnoticed by scholars.

Jamal and Getz (1995) suggested that national tourism organisations act as conveners of collaborative projects. In their opinion, these organizations, which tend to have been formally
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established, possess the legitimacy, expertise, resources – and the authority – required for this convening role. Indeed, the proactive role played by various organizations is vital to bring stakeholders to the table, constructively explore their differences of opinion, and assist the search for common solutions or identify necessary trade-offs and compromises. Understandably so, such organizations are seen as important mechanisms in the promotion of participatory planning, due, in no small part, to the fact that one of their essential roles is to find effective ways of involving all sectors and all constituencies in the planning activities. This latter point brings the discussion back to the shareholder-selection issue tackled earlier.

Bourke and Luloff (1996) identifies and the author concurs, that some level of community readiness is necessary, it remains to determine, how and when a community should be deemed ready to participate in the planning process. To date, two competing views seem to prevail. On the one hand, advocates of a self-emerging community argue, as expected, against the paternalistic nature of participatory tourism planning and development, stressing that a genuine participatory approach requires responsibility for directing change to lie with the people themselves, not with an outside organisation or change agency. In other words, central to community-driven planning is an explicit recognition that outsiders cannot assess the perceptions, preferences or priorities of host communities. Under this perception, all necessary changes would emerge from within the communities themselves. Alternatively, many commentators hold the view that it is too naïve and unrealistic to believe that local communities are readily self-emerging and evolving toward more self-governing programmes. These two competing conceptions can be seen at play most acutely within the developing world context where the capacity and readiness of communities to participate are more constrained, all the more as they will often set their own limitations.

Pearce (1996) urged tourism scholars to use an emic, contextual, processual approach. In other words, an understanding of tourism and community relationships should be derived from the words and images of communities themselves. To that end he developed a series of critical questions such as, for example: what prototypes do residents use to understand tourism and its impact?; what visual images do residents have when they talk about tourism either to researchers or to others in their communities? Indeed, these questions, raised from a community cultural standpoint, should be regarded as an essential prerequisite to achieving effective participatory design and process. The complexity outlined thus far suggests that re-conceptualizing multiple
interests and identities within a community – or within communities - is critical to meeting the formidable challenges facing community-based tourism planning efforts.

Reed (1997) however is more restrained, cautiously arguing that relying solely on local authorities to convene power relations may be misguided as these authorities will often have their own agenda and may not consistently act neutrally. In the absence of well described theoretical and practice models for community inclusiveness, representativeness, and readiness, how to manage power relations so as to achieve parity in participatory planning remains unclear.

Mowforth and Munt (1998), among others, see such intervention as inevitable: “while it is important that ideas for, and control of, tourism developments should come from within the community, it is also important that the local community be able to make use of, and benefit from, the assistance of national government resources to help establish and co-ordinate their ideas and schemes. This is particularly necessary where local communities may lack the resource, skill and finance base required. Hence, a partnership arrangement may often be more suitable than a community attempting to do everything entirely from within its own human, physical and financial resources”. Enlisting community participation should be seen as a step-by-step or incremental process; one that steadily expands as communities gain trust, develop mastery, and discover how they can make a contribution. This process will result in greater and more meaningful community participation. Still, adapting such a vision of community empowerment to tourism planning is a daunting challenge as it requires tourism planners to consider major changes; whether they be: in the way they envisage the tourism planning processes and goals; where they direct their interventions; how they work with communities; or how they develop, and deploy limited tourism funding.

Timothy’s (1999) studied the Javanese community and perceived themselves to lack tourism knowledge; Javanese felt they should not be involved in the planning process. Compounding this counter-productive self-perception, planners in the developing world often lack expertise on how to incorporate community participation into planning. This plight seems to be ongoing and keeps hampering the effectiveness of participatory programmes in developing countries. Clearly, the challenge is to find a model capable of overcoming these obstacles to community participation. Several methods have emerged from the relevant literature on this
issue. They include empowerment, training, partnership, motivation, building awareness and persuasion.

2.9 STUDIES WITH REFERENCE TO HIMACHAL PRADESH

Kapoor (1976) has studied on Tourism as an Instrument of Economic Development with special reference to Himachal Pradesh. The main objective of this study was to analyse the role of tourism industry in the overall economic development of the state and formulation of the strategy for the promotion of tourism. He has concluded in this study that tourism in Himachal Pradesh as a district product presents a vast potential. This is perhaps one of the industry whose development ensures the simultaneous development with a number of other related industries. The authorities associated with this trade throughout the world are now adopting new techniques for promotion of tourism.

Singh (1978), studied on the Economic Potential of Tourism in Himachal Pradesh with special reference to Shimla. The main objective of this study was to analyse the various economic aspects of tourism with regard to the employment and income generation. The data has been collected through both primary as well as secondary sources. The findings of this study are that there is an unexplored area of tourism in Himachal Pradesh. There is enough scope and vast potential for the tourism development due to hilly areas and natural resources, which can help to generate employment and income as well as foreign exchange.

Amar Chand (1982), conducted a study on the Economic Potential of Tourism in Himachal Pradesh with special reference to Kullu & Manali. The main objectives of this study were to discuss upon the various facilities available to the tourists and to know the difficulties faced by these tourists during their stay. For this purpose the primary as well as secondary sources of information has been used. It is concluded from this study that the tourism industry must be adopted proper planning, co-ordination, entrepreneur and legislation to develop tourism and attract more and more tourists towards to this valley. Tourism can be developed at best if it is formed as an integral part of the overall development.

Bhatt Rajesh (1989) also conducted study on H.P.T.D.C. Bansal, S.K. (1990) has conducted his study on Kangra Fort where he had described the impact of Turkish Sultans on Kangra Fort.
Saxena, B.R. (1999) has conducted study on fairs and festivals of Himachal Pradesh. His study was focused on fairs and festivals of Rampur Bushehar and surrounding areas. He also made a socio-economic and cultural analysis of fairs and festivals of Himachal Pradesh. In his study he also pointed out about the touristic importance of fairs and festivals.

Sharma, C.S. (1992) has conducted a study on H.P.T.D.C. with special reference to its organizational structure.

Thakur, D. (1991) has conducted his study on the tourism in Himachal Pradesh. In his study he has taken a case study of Shimla town where he has described the Shimla as a tourist destination, present trends and future perspectives.

Mahajan, A. (1992) has conducted a study on tourism in Kangra valley with its developmental potential and problems. He was of the opinion that Kangra is blessed with immense tourist potential but the problem is related with marketing of this. And moreover, he also pointed about the poor accessibility of destinations. In his study he has listed various cultural and heritage resources of Kangra valley including Masroor Temple.

Kumar Raj (1992) has conducted study on tourism in Himachal Pradesh with a case of Kullu-Manali and Mandi. In his study he presented a detail of various cultural and heritage resources. He also pointed about the problem of marketing, facilities at the destinations.

Gupta Santa (1993) conducted a historical and cultural study of fairs and festivals of Himachal Pradesh. He concluded that we should promote these fairs and festivals to maintain the existence of these fairs and festivals.

2.10 CONCLUSION AND RESEARCH GAP

From the detailed discussion and review of various authors about sustainable tourism, rural tourism, community participation it may be concluded that there is need of diversifying tourism for sustainable rural tourism which will not only provide the employment opportunities to rural people but also will lead to the community development. There is emergent need of community participation, capacity building and above all the sustainability of rural tourism. Overall tourism development in rural areas can provide local residents with economic benefits, more facilities and a greater range of choice in services. Rural tourism can contribute to social conditions that may lead to serious problems in the host society, including changes in values, individual behaviour, family relationships, lifestyles and community organization or structure.

Review of literature suggests that there is a lot of gap in the study. This gap is as follows
1. No specific and detailed study on sustainable rural tourism on Himachal context has been undertaken.

2. There is no specific study on the capacity building for rural tourism is undertaken in Himachal context.

3. While planning for tourism, role of community participation in Himachal Pradesh is not studied in detail.

4. The studies related to tourists perception about sustainable tourism have not been undertaken.

**Summary:**

The study of tourism literature has proved that rural tourism is an industry segment that warrants special attention. It is a relatively new product with a great potential that can revitalize and diversify the rural economy and counteract the global trend towards urbanisation and depopulation of rural areas. Most developed countries are ahead as far as rural tourism development and promotion are concerned. This study emphasizes the important role of rural tourism as part of the economic recovery and development of rural areas. The suitability for rural tourism of the Limpopo province, with its rural character and rich cultural heritage, is also documented. Tourism is landscape-orientated, and the environment and the people surrounding tourist attractions constitute the tourist destination. Rural tourism involves not just individual businesses, but the environment and the community surrounding tourism businesses. The development, promotion, marketing and management of rural tourism often require a cooperative and cohesive effort because of the integrated nature of tourism. The community or area as a whole and its image must be marketed as a tourism landscape, not simply a set of attractions. Rural tourism appears to be a realistic option for the Limpopo province, but will require proper planning and guidelines to be successful economically, culturally and environmentally.
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