CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

About the chapter:
This chapter tries to find out the opinion and an extract of various researchers in the field of tourism 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 tourism industry and tourists can influence the environmental, socio-cultural and economic aspects 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 one of the largest and dynamically developing sectors of external economic activities. Its high growth and development rates, considerable volumes of foreign currency inflows, infrastructure development, and introduction of new management and educational experience actively affect various sectors of economy, which positively contribute to the social and economic development of the country as a whole. Many people emphasize the positive aspects of tourism as a source of foreign exchange, a way to balance foreign trade, an “industry without chimney” — in short, manna from heaven. But there are also a number of other positive and negative sides of tourism’s economic boom for local communities, which not always considered by advocates of tourism perspectives.

Tourists leave their impact on the socio-cultural life of host communities. The few studies which focus on the consequences of the impacts in mountain regions are restricted to individual areas, rather than presenting a generalized description or analysis. Either inadvertently or intentionally, and to differing degrees, tourists leaves their imprint not only on the physical and cultural landscape, but also on the social and cultural life of the inhabitants of many of the world's communities they visit.
2.2 TOURISM DEVELOPMENT AND ITS IMPACTS

Williams (1979) defined three categories of impact: economic, social and environmental/physical. Economic impacts largely identified by researchers include perceived personal and regional benefits that contribute to income and standard of living: increased employment opportunities; increases in tax revenues; and increases in real estate prices). Pizam and Milman (1986) identified six major categories of social and cultural impacts: impact on population structure, transformation of forms and types of occupations, transformation of values, influence on traditional lifestyle, modification of consumption patterns, and benefits to tourists.

Allen (1988) noted that the main goal in developing tourism is to maximize the positive impacts while minimizing the negative impacts to the host community (including
the business community and local residents). The social impacts of tourism may improve public utilities such as pavements, lighting, parking, litter control, landscaping and even water and sewage systems. Tourism may also encourage improvements in public transport infrastructure benefiting both tourists and residents. In many cases tourism creates opportunities to develop new facilities and services that would not otherwise be possible in a community. It can increase opportunities for shopping, but also improve the level of service in local shops and restaurants.

According to Allen (1988) the historic buildings and grounds, which might otherwise slowly deteriorate, have great appeal for tourism development and often can be renovated to assist the tourism industry and preserve cultural heritage. Overall tourism development can provide local residents with economic benefits, more facilities and a greater range of choice in services. 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.

Davis (1988) found a positive correlation between increased knowledge of the industry and positive attitudes towards tourism. These findings seem linked to demographic data which indicate that positive tourism attitudes are related to residents with high incomes, higher education levels and high social/political status in the local community. The major research focus regarding social factors has been length of residence. Again, inconsistent findings have been reported.

Mansfield (1992) described possible negative impacts of tourism development include: lack of economic diversification (tourism replaces other industries including fishing, mining, forestry and agriculture); economic strain due to inflation of prices of goods and services, emergence of crowding, congestion (including traffic), all forms of modern-day pollution and the extra demands on limited resources (especially water); increase in undesirable behaviours such as prostitution, crime, gambling, alcohol and drug abuse; and modification of cultural practices with a threat to authenticity by staging festivals/events entirely for tourists and the artificial reconstruction of sacred buildings and objects. Both researchers and residents have little difficulty identifying potential positive and negative impacts associated with tourism development on local host communities.
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Clements (1993) reported no relationship between length of residence and attitude towards tourism, others have reported a negative relationship. That is, the longer people have lived in the community, the more likely they are to have negative attitudes towards tourism development. Research into other social factors indicates that the state of the local economy (poverty), home ownership and different geographical regions in a country can all influence resident attitudes towards tourism.

Lankford (1994) described that successful development of a tourism industry requires effective planning that both recognizes tourists' demands and emphasizes the values of the local host community.

Researchers in the early years of the twenty-first century list an impressive range of both positive and negative impacts on the host community as a result of tourism development. The major positive contributions of tourism include: creation of jobs and business opportunities (including employment of minorities); increased availability for recreation, shopping and entertainment; increased demand for preservation of historical and architectural monuments; increased knowledge by locals of own culture; and promotion of community pride, tolerance and a stronger sense of ethnic/cultural identity within the host community.

Dwyer & Forsyth (1997) described that different types of tourists generate different economic, social and environmental impacts on destinations. These impacts, or ‘footprints’, vary across market segments depending on the mix of services utilized by the tourist. The economic impacts of tourism have long been recognized and there is an understanding that different types of tourists have the potential to bring greater or fewer economic impacts to a destination depending on their spending patterns. This is often referred to as ‘tourism yield’). Typically, the concept refers to the expenditure injections of tourists (sales revenues) or the profitability of catering for different visitor markets. Yield can be defined purely from an accounting perspective where it approximates sales revenues per visitor or the financial rate of return to operators or gross operating surplus of different industry sectors.

Crompton, (1998), studied relevant research on the social impacts of tourism (and on its environmental impacts) and found that little research has been undertaken to develop the concept of ‘sustainable yield’ or to measure the social and environmental costs and
benefits on a segment-by-segment basis, notwithstanding that the concept of sustainability has been current for almost two decades. The scientific quality of environmental impact assessment as exemplified in tourism research in particular has room for substantial improvement.

Buckley, 1998 said that methods of determining impacts are inadequately specified and impacts are rarely quantified. It seems fair to say that, with some exceptions, the thrust of the research effort in the tourism field has focused either on impact identification or upon resident perceptions of the impacts. It is thus difficult to draw any firm conclusions for any destination as to which tourist market segments incur high environmental and social impacts (positive or negative).

Smith and Krannich (1998) studies have shown the significant negative social impacts that tourism can have on rural communities or communities that have high dependence levels on tourism. The social and cultural characteristics of the host community are continuously influenced by the broader political, economic, social, cultural and environmental context. This suggests that people in different groups may see tourism and tourism development in significantly different ways based on their economic, social, cultural and environmental situation. Some residents may gain direct or indirect benefits from tourism and may view tourism positively for the local community, whereas others see the negative side of tourism and may have more negative attitudes towards tourism development.

Teivane (2000) described that there are also widely known negative impacts of tourism and not least in residents’ attitudes and social impacts. Researchers have found variables such as an increase in prices of goods, services and property values. Social disadvantages such as crowding, congestion and an increase of undesirable activities such as prostitution, gambling, alcohol, drugs and crime have also been found.

Williams and Lawson (2001) described tourism industry consisting of tourists, a business and an environment or community for operation. The interrelationships between various elements in the tourism system are studied widely, especially the host community’s feedback on the impacts of tourism because it has been recognized that the perception and attitudes of residents towards the impacts of tourism are essential in providing valuable input
in dealing with the strategic managerial decisions, marketing and operation of existing and future programmes and projects. Additionally, the views of the host community must be taken into account if the industry is to be sustainable in the long term.

Ratz, (2002) described the main goal of social impact analysis is to provide developers, local authorities and all other concerned parties with information on host community attitudes towards tourism, so that perceived positive impacts could be reinforced and perceived negative impacts can be minimized through more effective tourism planning and development strategies.

2.3 TOURISM AND SOCIETY

The flow of tourists is channeled by individual decisions: factors such as the special tourist attractions and facilities of different communities, accessibility, the initiative of the local tourist office and the community, government subsidies, what happens to be in vogue at the moment as regards both activity and "the place to go" for certain groups, and the like. Any of these may, of course, change for a given community over time, thereby redirecting the flow of tourists. The second model depicts the spiral of changes in the economy and infrastructure resulting from incremental growth: how villages have started with a few rooms for tourists, gradually adding various facilities, attracting people through marketing, then adding more rooms, a new pension or small hotel, and various additional facilities; next, attracting still more people, rooms, a new pension or small hotel, and other amenities, such as a swimming pool and additional ski lifts. The spiral is fuelled by government subsidies and tax incentives which make it profitable for communities and individuals to borrow large sums of money at low interest rates for renovation or further expansion. Ordinarily, growth in communities such as those described in this study takes place in relatively small increments, but occasionally the addition of a major facility such as a glacier lift makes a phenomenal impact. It has become recognized that planners must take the host community view into account if the industry is to be truly sustainable in the long term. There are several reasons why residents' attitudes towards tourism are important, particularly issues concerning residents' quality of life.

Butler (1981) have found that residents' attitudes towards tourism impact are heterogeneous, i.e. are diverse and far from homogeneous. Many studies focused on
identifying differences in attitudes towards tourism among residents with different backgrounds.

**Mathieson and Wall (1982)** suggest, the social and cultural impacts of tourism explain the way in which tourism contributes toward change in value systems, individual behaviour, family relationships, collective life styles, safety levels and so forth. Socio-cultural impacts are ‘people impacts’ concerned about the effects on host communities due to their direct and indirect associations with tourists (Mathieson and Wall, 1982).

**Allen (1988)** described the impacts of tourism on a community are not widely understood, even where tourism is growing dramatically, yet they should be one of the greatest concerns with respect to the long-term sustainability of tourism. The range of tourism impacts is broad and often influences areas beyond those usually associated with tourism. Yet despite the social impacts of tourism being about ‘people’ little research has examined the views or attitudes of local residents to tourism development or even specific forms of tourism development (such as cultural tourism development). Their attitudes toward tourism and perceptions of its impact on community life must be continually evaluated.’ Although limited research has been conducted on resident attitudes toward events, few studies have been completed concerning resident attitudes toward other market segments, including cultural tourism development. Those that have been conducted on cultural tourism development focus on rural communities.

**Howard (1994)** studies also developed a multiple-item attitudinal scale for measuring resident attitudes toward tourism and to assess the effects of some factors influencing resident attitudes. The factors influencing resident attitudes in literatures are summarized below. As income from tourism increases, dependence on and concern for agriculture decreases. The cultural landscape gradually alters with building and lifts filling in much of the former pastures and hayfields. Although in reality many of these changes occur simultaneously, for clarity in the diagram they are shown as happening sequentially. The order is mainly illustrative, varying from community to community and over time. The third model places various social and cultural changes accompanying the transition from a rural-agrarian society to an urban technological one within the framework of diffusion
A logistic growth curve is suggested, along which may be placed various social and cultural changes taking place in tourist communities as the amount of tourism increases.

**Zins (1999) and Richards (1996)** noted that since the 1970s the demand for cultural tourism in Europe has been growing considerably. Reasons for this include changes in working time and conditions, as well as expectations regarding holidays and leisure time. Passive and regenerative elements no longer dominate the way holidays are organized, but instead active holidays, and in this case increasingly culturally oriented elements, are attracting broad sections of population and social classes. Demand has grown due to a growing ‘new middle class’ with high levels of education and income. Although there appears to be growth in cultural tourism, little research has been conducted on resident attitudes toward cultural tourism development.

According to **Gursoy (2002)**, research on residents’ reactions to tourism can help tourism planners understand why residents support or oppose tourism. Such information can help planners select those developments that can minimize the negative impacts and maximize support for tourism development amongst certain members of the local population. Furthermore, a host’s anger, apathy, or mistrust will finally be conveyed to the tourists and is likely to result in their unwillingness to visit places where they feel unwelcome.

**Pearce (1996)** proposed the social representation theory as a better way to view and understand residents’ attitudes. This theory suggests that residents have representations of tourism which underpin their perception of impacts, formed by direct experiences, social interaction and other sources of information, such as the media. These representations are resistant to change, because they form a frame of reference through which new information is interpreted.

**Gursoy (2002)** described that the community consists of different groups of people who live in the same geographical area, which does not mean they necessarily belong to the same ‘community’. In any geographical area, there may be a number of communities, such as a gay or elderly community or communities defined by ethnic groups. Certainly such groups’ attitudes toward tourism development may be influenced by economic, social, cultural or environmental factors that may be more homogeneous at the group level rather
than the community level. There has been increased research that attempts to examine the underlying differences among residents concerning their attitudes towards tourism development, based on a range of models and concepts. Various authors have suggested possible theoretical frameworks for understanding this type of variation within the community, and how it may assist in understanding the variation in residents’ reactions toward tourism development.

Fredline (2004) studied that residents may have more positive perceptions of tourism if they perceive that their tourism exchanges bring them benefits, but will have negative perceptions of tourism if they perceive these benefits to be outweighed by costs. Residents who benefit from tourism, perhaps through employment or business turnover, will have more favourable perceptions than those who do not.

Fredline (2004), described that the social exchange approach suggests that residents can realistically weight up the costs and benefits of tourism, and their overall disposition toward the phenomenon will reflect some sort of informal cost-benefit analysis. However, Pearce et al. (1996) argue that the use of the social exchange theory to explain resident perceptions has many problems associated with it.

2.4 IMPACTS DIMENSIONS

Martin and McCool’s (1992) studied of Montana residents found significant differences between residents’ attitudes depending on the level of tourism development in their community. Respondents in communities with higher levels of development were more concerned with tourism impacts, costs and who pays these costs. When examining the positive attitudes residents have towards tourism development, some researchers have agreed that people who are the most involved with tourists have the most positive attitudes.

Eagly and Chaiken, 1993 suggested a theoretical framework that has been proposed in this regard is the expectancy-value which states that the interaction between the importance that residents place on certain outcomes (value) and the degree to which they believe tourism to contribute to these outcomes (expectancy) provided useful insights in explaining variation in attitudes toward tourism.
Snaith and Haley (1994) discovered that only those residents living in the city centre felt that the problems, which visitors create, outweighed the benefits, similar to the expectancy-value and social exchange theories explained earlier. However, few others have agreed that people who live in the city centre have more negative views.

Pizam (1996) conducted their study in the Greek island of Samos, which is a mass tourism destination. Residents have different negative attitudes towards tourism depending on their social environment. There are some factors that many researchers agree, but there are also results in negative attitudes that researches cannot agree. Different results may be consequences of different sampling methods and locations.

Harvey (1995) noted ‘men who lose their jobs may find their wives, sisters, mothers employed by local tourism operations. While tourism may provide employment for young persons and females, men can feel that tourism provides them only few respectable and acceptable opportunities.’

Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) summarized the concepts and studies in terms of what they term the ‘intrinsic’ and ‘extrinsic’ dichotomy. The ‘extrinsic’ dimension refers to variables that affect resident attitudes at the macro level (where they have a common impact on the community as a whole), whereas the ‘intrinsic’ dimension realizes that the host community is heterogeneous and perceptions of impacts may vary according to variations in the characteristics and circumstances of individuals. There are a range of variables that have explained the differences between subgroups in the community, which also can help explain different reactions toward tourism, ranging from gender, employment status and length of. Some studies have discovered these differences through undertaking statistical tests or through segmentation of the resident community population in order to illustrate the range of resident reactions to tourism development.

Lindberg and Johnson (1997) suggest that a resident might consider not only how tourism affects them, but also how it affects others in the community. Residents may form an attitude not only on the basis of their own economic benefits, but also how much the benefits are related to others inside or outside the community. If a resident perceives an unfair distribution of benefits, it might lead to less overall support towards tourism than would otherwise be the case. These studies indicate that the host community is clearly not
homogeneous and so attitudes toward tourism development may differ based on economic, environmental and social situations. Understanding whether residents’ attitudes vary, and how and why they vary, is a key strategy in ensuring that the benefits of tourism are widely spread and tourism as a development option is supported by as many different groups within the community as possible. Although tourism development may have high level support at a community level, at a sub community scale this level of support could vary enormously. Understanding this variation, if it exists, is vital for the development of a more sustainable tourism destination.

Bachleitner and Zins (1999) studied residents’ involvement in decision-making is an important factor in their attitudes towards tourism development. The more residents are involved in the process of change, then the more favourable they perceive that process. It is widely acknowledged that tourism activities can contribute significantly to the economic development of regions. Governments and public entities have therefore made strenuous efforts to initiate or foster tourism activities within their geographical areas of influence. Tourism development does not take place in isolation; rather, it occurs within specific environments, each with its own idiosyncratic features. Within these specific environments, the support of the residents is a key factor in developing and implementing successful initiatives. Because tourism development can happen without planning, tourism planners should be concerned about the perceptions and attitudes of residents towards tourism developments in order to gain their support. Some of these community perceptions are positive, whereas others are negative.

According to Gursoy (2002), rural population, long-term residents, farmers, recreationists and younger people perceived that tourism contributes to an increase in crime. Harvey (1995) described that both men and women were concerned about the negative impacts, which were associated with tourism developments. They both felt that tourism would increase crime and vandalism in the area and that it would increase traffic problems and they would feel less safe. Many researchers have found a link between residents’ negative attitudes towards tourism and crime/traffic problems.

Cheyne and Mason (2000) explained that despite residents being generally supportive of tourism, there were several negative attitudes, including high property prices
and traffic congestion. They concluded that communities do not necessarily have shared interests, but are made up of groups and individuals with very mixed views, an idea very much in agreement with recent researchers. Regarding socio-demographic variables different researches have found very mixed results, as in many cases there were no reported relationships between socio demographic variables and attitudes towards tourism. Attitudes may differ depending on age, sex, income, community attachment, economic dependence/benefit from the industry and length of time living in the area. When traditional resource-based industries changed towards service-oriented industries such as tourism there were many positive changes in family support, employment status, pace of life and lifestyle for women.

Dyer (2006) studied that resident’s participation in planning and development stages is a fundamental necessity for sustainability of the development, like good will and cooperation of host communities (4). Some previous studies have aimed to identify, in theory, residents’ perceptions of the effects of tourism in their communities: and others have focused on the theoretical relationship between residents and the process of tourism planning.

2.5 SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS OF TOURISM

Yoon (2001) described that various tourism impacts as economic, socio-cultural and environmental tradeoffs, as perceived by residents, all play a part in determining their support for further tourism development. The relationships among the different components that form the total impact of tourism (economic, environmental, social and cultural) are the basis of the social-development theory of tourism, which is rooted in social-exchange theory. According to social development theory, attitudes towards tourism are thus influenced by residents’ perceptions of economic, social and environmental effects. The economic benefits, real or expected, produce support for tourism development. Several studies found that residents who benefit from tourism have a higher level of support for it and report more positive effects pointed out that people who derive personal benefits from tourism are also more likely than others to report negative effects. Economic dependency on tourism has thus emerged as significant variable underlying residents’ positive attitudes to tourism.
development. It is also important to consider the involvement of residents in the process of tourism planning.

**Jamal and Getz (1995)** supported community-based tourism planning—arguing that the involvement of residents leads to the development of socially responsible tourism and acceptable social effects in the view of the host community.

**Pizam (2000)** studied attitudes and behaviour of residents are important—because interaction between tourists and residents has a significant effect on visitors’ satisfaction with the destination. Moreover, residents should not only be considered in the planning process of new tourism activities, but also afterwards. Residents’ attitudes to tourism should be continuously monitored if new tourism initiatives are to succeed. Therefore, community participation in planning and development of a certain tourist destination is essential in order to achieve tourism development sustainability through local initiatives consistent with local idiosyncrasy. Nevertheless, lack of participation is very common, regardless of the economic development stage of the country.

**Ko and Stewart (2002)** have examined structural model of residents’ attitudes towards tourism, which main conclusions are respectively:

1. Community satisfaction is influenced by perception of tourism impacts and may be useful in planning additional tourism development.
2. Host community backing for tourism development is affected directly and/or indirectly by the level of community concern, ecocentric values, and utilization of tourism resource base, community attachment, the state of local economy, economic benefits, social benefits, social costs and cultural benefits.
3. Host community support is affected by the level of concern, ecocentric values, utilization of resource base, perceived costs and benefits of tourism development.

### 2.6 Economic Impacts of Tourism

There are important implications for the use of tourism development in economic regeneration if as we would suggest the current use of tourism multipliers over-emphasizes the contribution of tourism and specifically hotels to local economic growth. This is of particular significance in the light of the growing reliance of tourist developments in the
furtherance of economic growth in many former industrial areas desperately looking for economic recovery.

**Archer (1973)** described that a key development in the coming of age of tourism in the eyes of policymakers was undoubtedly the development of tourist multiplier models. The attraction to policymakers is that this is a technique that will produce figures on the income and employment impact of tourism including the indirect and induced effects. Thus claims for the number of jobs or income can be shown courtesy of a scientific study.

**Harris & Narayanan (1999)** said that tourism multiplier has been refined over the years the most recent development being satellite accounting, the concept is much in evidence in the literature. The geographic range of studies shows that the multiplier is a global concept, there is also a range of techniques with even examples of export base models still being utilized, as well as the more ubiquitous Keynesian ad hoc and input-output models. There is also growing concern in a number of quarters of the accuracy of the number of jobs related to the tourist industry.

**Leiper (1999)** quoted the example of dentistry in Australia where the number of jobs in dentistry directly related to the tourist industry comprises almost entirely of aggregated sum of minute fractions evenly skimmed off every job in a dental clinic around the country in which tourists were treated.

**Wahill (1998)** described five types of multipliers: transactions (or sales multiplier); output multiplier; income multiplier; employment multiplier; government revenue multiplier. In terms of methodology Cooper et al. (1998) describe the four major techniques which have been employed to measure the value of the tourist multiplier. These include base theory, Keynesian multiplier, ad hoc and input-output. It is generally recognized that input-output is the preferred methodology but that the data requirements are so large that in many cases they are impracticable to use. It is well recognized that there are a range of weaknesses in and limitations to multiplier models, in particular data deficiencies, restrictive assumptions and operational limitations and supply constraints. An early debate on the role and importance of the export sector in sub-national economies between North (1955, 1964)
and Tiebout (1956, 1964) raises a number of key points fundamental to the role of exports in regional economic growth.

2.7 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF TOURISM

Sethna and Richmond (1978) found that Virgin Islanders agreed with a statement that suggested that the water and beaches were being spoiled by tourism. Air pollution is primarily a result of emissions from vehicles and airplanes. In rural areas, air pollution due to tourism is minimal, but in congested areas, emissions harm vegetation, soil, and visibility. Water resources are a prime attraction for tourism and recreational developments, and they frequently suffer negative impacts.

Lankford and Howard's (1994) study showed that the majority of respondents felt that tourism brings more littering and waste problems. Even though in recent years wildlife-oriented tourism has increased, our understanding of tourism effects on wildlife is limited. Most research looking at the impact of tourism on wildlife has generally focused on a limited number of larger mammals and birds in natural environments. For some species, parks and preserves are now the only sanctuary. Unfortunately, for species that require large territories or engage in migratory behaviors, these relatively small areas of protected land are not enough.

Andereck (1995) studied that the tourism industry produces large quantities of waste products. Hotels, airlines, attractions and other related businesses that serve tourists throw away tons of garbage a year. The problem seems to be particularly troublesome in third world countries with less sophisticated solid waste management programs and technologies. Tourism is also thought to be a clean industry, without the pollution problems associated with other types of economic development. Some others believe that tourism causes environmental pollution, the destruction of natural resources, the degradation of vegetation and the depletion of wildlife. Water pollution is primarily a result of wastewater generated by tourist facilities and runoff. Water pollution occurs on inland lakes and streams and in the marine environment. Much of this pollution, such as septic tank seepage, lawn fertilizer, road oil, and runoff from disturbed soil, is not serious.

Belsky (1999) studied the role of tourism in protecting and enhancing the natural environments surrounding many of destinations. He found that tourism development
was causing the following environmental problems in or around village communities: the accumulation of garbage, deforestation, pollution of land and water supplies and erosion. Tourism development had produced a backlash against conservation—especially by those not benefiting economically from tourism.

2.8 STAKEHOLDERS’ PARTICIPATION IN TOURISM

It is very important stakeholders’ perceptions of tourism to be understood and it was many times pointed out in academic literature. In tourism literature, the researchers focus on different aspects in studying and analyzing the perceptions of stakeholders.

Heinen (1994) asserts that it is very important stakeholders’ perceptions to be understood because different perceptions amongst stakeholders can result in unforeseen conflicts when implementing governance or planning processes to achieve sustainable development outcomes.

Berry & Ladkin (1997) focused in their research that focuses on the perception of sustainable tourism and examines the ways in which it is implemented at the regional level. The research was focused on small businesses and how the people dealing with small scale tourism business understood the concept of sustainability. The findings of the research showed that the vague principles of sustainability for small businesses did not easily translate into workable practice. The study concluded that although increasing the importance of sustainable tourism and the formulation of general principles and guidelines, cynical attitudes towards government policy and its implementation were significant barriers to the implementation of sustainable tourism practices in small businesses at the regional level. The data were captured using the technique of focus groups.

According to Hunter (1997) when a focus is more on the economic benefit, then the stance is - anthropocentric and in opposite – when the focus is more on the environment than on the economic benefit, the stance is – eco-centric. Hunter (1997) classifies the views on sustainable tourism development from a weak to very strong sustainability positions, namely – from very weak and weak anthropocentric or utilitarian position to strong eco-systems perspective and very strong eco-centric stance.
Hardy & Beeton (2001) argue that 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. They concluded that management strategies may not be suitably addressed if the needs of stakeholders are not understood. They also concluded that stakeholders perceptions of tourism in the Daintree region were different, heterogeneous and context specific. They underline also that until perceptions are fully incorporated into the management strategies for a given area, the management of resources in the region may continue to be “maintainable” rather than sustainable. The study suggests that an understanding of stakeholder perceptions is important because it facilitates for understanding of whether tourism is “sustainable”, or “maintainable” on a regional scale. When they refer to “maintainable” tourism they explain it as a situation when stakeholders’ perceptions are not taken into account and when they are not always convergent with management strategies, neither understood and recognised by stakeholders outside of a particular group that can lead to negative effect on the destination. The main conclusion of the study is that “sustainable tourism will not exist in the region until it is managed in such a way that differing perceptions are taken into account”.

According to Ap & Pang (2002) stakeholders’ perceptions of sustainable tourism are important, because they can “lead to misrepresentation and abuse of the concept and further depletion of the environment especially with mass tourism”. According to the research, the lack of stakeholders’ awareness about the possible consequences of tourism can affect negatively sustainable tourism development and people who are engaged in the Project implementation connected with sustainable tourism has to be aware of this.

According to WTO (2002) “a lack of awareness among local stakeholders” can hamper sustainable tourism development outcomes and that is why it is so important to know the vision of the stakeholders for tourism development. According to Mc Donald (2006) understanding stakeholders perceptions of sustainability and stakeholders’ values associated with natural resources are critical aspects for understanding sustainable tourism development outcomes at a given destination”. 
Mc Donald (2006) did also important research which aim was to understand stakeholders, their values, perceptions and visions of sustainable tourism development in Swan River region. He described that understanding tourism stakeholders is a prerequisite for developing sustainable tourism development goals or implementing planning and management processes. This research adopted complex system perspective as theoretical approach and Swan River was viewed as a complex system, which incorporates socio-cultural, economic, political and ecological systems. Tourism development on the Swan River was not considered as occurring in isolation, but as component of the complex system had the potential to influence and be influenced by the other components of the system. Qualitative methodology was used in the research with the aim to understand sustainable tourism development of the Swan River. Cottrell (2006) predicted sustainable tourism in Holland and China through exploring the residents’ perceptions of tourism. The residents’ satisfaction with tourism was examined using the Prism of Sustainability elaborated by Spangenberg & Valentine.

Gasul (2006) described that has a main focus the perceptions and attitudes of the public and stakeholders is the study of. In the study mapping and raking the attitudes and perceptions of the stakeholders enabled to identify existing and future conflicts that could constitute an obstacle to implementing a sustainable tourism strategy.

2.9 COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN TOURISM

Residents holding strong positive or negative attitudes do not necessarily affect tourists, tourism development or local government planners. These attitudes will only affect the tourism industry if residents act consistently towards tourism in line with their attitudes. That is, if residents are rude and hostile to tourists visiting their community, then tourism developers may locate their new facilities/product elsewhere. A possible explanation of these findings may be the way citizenship, civic duty, community involvement and gender roles have been conceptualised in the Australian community (Crawford and Maddern, 2001). Formal citizenship has historically been defined primarily in male terms (public, political life) and therefore associated with local government, (tourism) planning and future economic development within the community. Thus, citizenship (and therefore intention to act by political means) has been masculinised. Community activities (such as Red Cross,
Country Women’s Association, church groups, school committees and fund-raising associations) organised and managed by women have been marginalized (Crawford and Maddern, 2001).

2.10 SUSTAINABLE TOURISM AND TOURISM IMPACTS

The product that the travel and tourism industry packages and sells ultimately relies on clean seas, pristine mountain slopes, unpolluted water, litter free streets, well preserved buildings and archaeological sites and diverse cultural traditions. As such, tourism is an industrial activity that exerts a series of impacts that are similar to most other industrial activities. It consumes often scarce resources, produces waste by-products and requires specific infrastructure and superstructure needs to support it. The very activity of tourism often degrades what tourists came to experience and results in the common assertion that tourists destroy tourism. As a huge, broadly based, diverse industry, that lacks a clear legislative focus, tourism defies attempts to control its impacts. Moreover, as an industry that is highly integrated into host communities, tourism is both dependent on the host communities for its survival while exerting impacts on all sectors of the host community.

TABLE 2.1
SOME RELEVANT RESEARCH FINDINGS ON TOURISM IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writer (s)</th>
<th>Issue/Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Krippendroff (1987)</td>
<td>* Tourism has colonialist characteristics robbing local populations of autonomous decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison (1992)</td>
<td>*Tourism provides new opportunities and instigates social changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns &amp; Holden (1995)</td>
<td>* Tourism provides socioeconomic benefit at one extreme and dependency and reinforcement of social discrepancies at the other extreme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Biggest problem is congestion/overcrowding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpley (1994)</td>
<td>* Employment opportunities and presence of visitors lure young people to areas of tourism development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Tourism improves quality of life through improvements to infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizam et al, 1982</td>
<td>* Tourism is a potential determinant of crime.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Erosion of the local language and dialect.
- Tourism instigates social interaction within host community.
- Tourism contributes to the preservation of religious and historic buildings.
- Hosts adopt foreign language through necessity.
- Hosts develop stereotypical attitudes to tourists.
- Commoditization of religion and resulting conflict.
- Resentment is generated by the economic gaps arising between host and tourists.
- Local resentment is generated by inflated prices.
- Attitudes changes are an indication of acculturation.
- Tourism destroys traditional culture.
- Culture is seen as a commercial resource.
- Provides employment opportunities to local communities and a significant source of foreign exchange.
- Having negative environmental impacts in the area such as the destruction of the area’s ecology.

Freeman, 1984 defined a stakeholder is defined as “a group or individual who has an interest in the actions of an organization and the ability to influence it”. Stakeholders consist of residents, management, government (local, state and federal), activist groups/ non-governmental organizations, employees, tourists and industry associations. For tourism to move towards being more sustainable, a balance of environmental, social and economic.

McKercher, 1993 described that a unique characteristic of tourism is its necessity to import clients rather than export a finished product. This often results in conflicts with host communities. Therefore, if tourism development is to be consistent with sustainable development we must recognize the need for businesses to consider both the provision of services and the way in which those services are consumed (i.e. both demand and supply).

Welford and Ytterhus, 1998 described that for sustainable tourism to occur, it must be closely integrated with all other activities that occur in the host region. Integration can
only occur if there is a broadly based understanding of some ‘fundamental truths’ about all
types of tourism development. It is only through this understanding that the costs and
benefits of tourism can be fully assessed and understood. Indeed, the difficulty in controlling
tourism in a sustainable way is indicative of the fundamental problems we have in moving
towards sustainable development.

According to Byrkjeland (1995), when discussing the possibility of sustainable
tourism, there are two different dimensions that should be taken into consideration. First, the
environmental impact that results from the overall amount of tourism related activity must
be considered, and secondly, the environmental impact that results from the tendency of
tourism to analyse and concentrate people. The complexity of the environmental impact
caused by tourism requires an integrative approach that focuses on the totality of tourism
and leisure-related activities within an area.

Brown and Essex, 1997 described the desirability of basing tourism development on
sustainability principles is widely appreciated among academics, and industry. Effective
implementation of sustainability-based tourism strategies requires an understanding of the
social, environmental and economic implications of the industry). Systematic analyses of
tourism impacts can help planners, decision makers and tourism promoters identify issues
and develop appropriate policy and management responses.

Cater and Goodall (1997) suggested that net foreign exchange earnings from
tourism are considerably less than the gross receipts. Substantial leakages result from the
repatriation of wages and profits, and imports. So-called Third World destinations receive
only a small return for the exploitation of an increasingly scarce resource – their natural
environment. Such destinations have to bear certain costs, both in terms of environmental
degradation and in prospects for movement towards sustainable development. Furthermore,
due to their low level of development, they can rarely afford preventive and restorative
measures. Any extra earnings which do accrue locally benefit small commercial elite, more
concerned with early profits than environmental considerations. It is therefore insufficient to
advocate local as opposed to foreign ownership without considering distributional aspects
and environmental accountability.
Lane (2000) claimed that tourism stakeholder involvement "can lead to democratic empowerment and equity, operational advantages, and an enhanced tourism product. Again, this highlights that the stakeholder approach has both normative and instrumental values. Stakeholder participation requires a significant degree of involvement.

Mannigel (2008) argued that active information exchange (i.e., dynamically consulting with a swapping of views and opinions), and negotiation and active participation are mechanisms that will empower local stakeholders within the framework of shared. A collaborative learning process is necessitated where planners/managers, scientists and various tourism players participate. Dialogue and mutual adaptation then become crucial elements in planning and management, and it is believed that the various parties will learn to "live with" negotiated solutions as they share basic common interests and goals. The final outcome of a successful collaborative process would thus be mutual trust among the actors involved. Sustainable tourism development meets the needs of the present tourists and host regions while protecting and enhancing the opportunity for the future. It is envisaged as leading to management of all resources in such a way that economic, social and aesthetic needs can be fulfilled, while maintaining cultural integrity essential ecological processes, biological diversity and life support systems" (WTO, 1996)

Beeton (2001) argued that "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". The study suggests that an understanding of stakeholder perceptions is important because it facilitates for understanding of whether tourism is "sustainable", or "maintainable" on a regional scale. When they refer to "maintainable" tourism they explain it as a situation when stakeholders' perceptions are not taken into account and when they are not always convergent with management strategies, neither understood and recognized by stakeholders outside of a particular group that can lead to negative effect on the destination. The main conclusion of the study is that "sustainable tourism will not exist in the region until it is managed in such a way that differing perceptions are taken into account.

English Tourism Council (2002) described sustainable tourism as about managing tourism's impacts on the environment, communities, and the future economy to make sure
that the effects are positive rather than negative for the benefit of future generations. It is a management approach that is relevant to all types of tourism, regardless of whether it takes place in cities, towns, countryside or the coast.

Haley (2005) described that there have been several assessments of social impacts, both conceptual and empirical, the social costs and benefit of tourism remain under researched. Social impact studies are crucial, as support for tourism development within host communities has been recognised as fundamental precondition for a sustainable industry. The majority of studies have been based upon the resident/host perception approach. That is, residents’ perceptions and attitudes towards tourism have been assessed in order to identify the effects of tourism development on local communities.

Davidson and Lockwood, 2007 describe that regions are becoming an increasingly important scale for planning and development across a range of sectors, including tourism. Nature based tourism is a key industry sector (De Lacy and Whitmore, 2006), and a significant proportion of regional nature-based tourism is focused on protected areas.

2.11 IMPACT STUDIES IN INDIA

Tourism in India has grown significantly since the 1970’s, through both international and domestic tourism. The two destination areas analysed here, Himachal Pradesh and the hill areas of Uttar Pradesh, are both in the Western Himalayas and so focus on mountain, recreational and religious tourism. They provide interesting comparisons with developments in Nepal. Unlike Nepal, tourism is not a major sector of the economy of these destination areas. Domestic tourism provides up to 95% of the market in these regions, with 60–70% coming from the northern region of India. Pilgrimages form an important market segment, especially in the UP Hills, where 70% of domestic tourists are pilgrims. Large crowds, often concentrated in small towns, are common in both areas during the peak season (AME, 1995a). ‘Mountain Tourism in Himachal Pradesh and Hill Districts of Uttar Pradesh: An Overview’ by the Academy of Mountain Environics (AME, 1995a) provides information and a general analysis for both these regions. This overview is complemented by case studies of specific destinations within the two areas. Tremendous development in tourism industry over the last four decades, its multifarious benefits and the magnitude of impacts
and its future growth prospects have all together make tourism a subject of extensive study and research. Although tourism is not a new thing in India but the systematic researches started very late.

Bhattacharya (1956) wrote a book on the Cultural Heritage of India. In this book he had presented a detail of Indian Cultural Heritage. During this period culture was one of the new area for study purposes.

Gokhale (1961) wrote book on “India, thought and thought the ages. These two books are quite interesting books on the Indian culture and thought. These two books presented a detail of the Indian culture and heritage the Indian philosophy. By seeing the importance of culture in tourism process

Allekin (1969) presented and reported to Government of India on cultural tourism and in which he explained the importance of cultural tourism India. This was the first effort for the development of the Cultural Tourism in India. In the seventies culture and heritage also seems to be the hot area in study as described in the studies of Gupta and Lal Krishan (1974) on museum, in which they had described various museums of India in detail and of Martin (1975) on India as a tourism destination. This book is on the various destinations of India. The studies on specifically tourism issues has started as of Anand (1976) on Hotel Industry, Singh, T.V. (1976) on Tourism Industry in U.P., Acharya Ram (1978) on civil aviation and tourism administration, Bhatia (1978) undertook a study on tourism in India history and development. These studies can be considered as pioneer studies in Indian tourism research.

Mishra, Sharma and Acharya (1981), have studied on world tourism and evaluated the role and impact of tourism vis-à-vis development in India with reference to 42 other countries having various types of economies. They are of the view that tourism is an important activity in India and the growing importance assigned to tourism depicts the country’s earnerstness to attract more and more tourists from every part of the world. India’s tourism infrastructure is modern and several agencies are engaged in setting up a sound base for the development of tourism in the country. They predict that India’s enormous tourism potential is destined to attract an increasing number of tourists every year. However, the only snag in attracting a large number of tourist generating countries of Europe and
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America, which can be overcome through the emergence of modern aircraft and improved airline services, travel to distant places in lessor time.

The same enthusiasm kept going by Singh et al. (1982), Chib (1983), Kaur (1985), Pillai (1985) and Dube (1987). They covered various aspects of tourism from History, Pilgrimage, Environment, Himalaya, National Parks and specific area studies. In addition to this Government of India also undertook various surveys time to time and declared the tourism policy in 1982 in which cultural and heritage tourism was given due importance.

The decade of 90’s has seen a tremendous growth in the tourism studies in India. These studies covered almost every issue related with tourism. In 1990 Bala Usha conducted a detailed study on the tourism of India, whereas in the same year Akhtar undertook his study on J & K tourism, at that time J&K was the hot destination. Chopra (1991) and Sharma (1991) also undertook their studies on Indian tourism but the theme was quite limited to general concepts of tourism. They covered almost all the aspects of Indian tourism. Sharma (1991), conducted an empirical and analytic study on “Tourism in India: Centre – State Administration”. He studied regarding tourism development in Rajasthan while exploring tourism potential and role of various agencies in promoting tourism. He concluded that the domestic tourists were critical of charges of rooms, meals, soft and hard drinks, they were of the view that these things should be more subsidized or economical, whereas the foreign tourists were satisfied with these rates.

Maneet (1992), studied on the Indian Perspective of today’s tourism and discusses various aspects related with tourism development. He is of the view that tourism is an economic activity, which helps to earn foreign exchange. But on the other hand it is a medium of social and cultural development, generator or employment and also as promoter of employment. Further it promotes goodwill and friendship among the nations. Indian tourism is opening up its potential with increasing priority being given by the government of India and series of incentives on the anvil. In 1994 Punia conducted a detailed study of Haryana tourism, Prem Singh Jina undertook his study on ladakh and Shalini Singh conducted a research on cultural tourism. The studies conducted by Punia and Jina are one of the best studies, Punia had undertaken a detail study of Haryana tourism and come up
with some good recommendations. The studies conducted by Jina were so detailed studied and he presented several magnificent recommendations.

All of these there studies have been focused on different areas and conducted very effectively. In 1995 Deva Krishna came up with his study on temples of India. Batra and Chawla did their study on Tourism Management issues and Chattopadhyaya undertook study on economic impact of tourism. He undertook his study on the West Bengal. In 1996 Singh wrote a book on profile of Indian tourism, whereas in the same year Dharm Rajan and Seth studied the trends of Indian tourism and Kumar (1996) studied the relation of tourism and economy. Singh (1996) wrote a book on Indian tourism. In 1997 Kumar Akshay did study of tourism management in India. Reddy, Raman and Reddy (1998), attempted to review and analyse tourism development in India under the Plans and suggest some policy measures for its development. Negi (1998), has discussed the trends towards specialization in the travel agency in a most lucid and comprehensive way. He highlights the role of travel agency and tour operation, travel agents role as creators and intermediaries, their professional status, services offered and relation with public and tourism organizations. In 1998 Bhardwaj et al edited a book on Domestic tourism in India, Singh P.K. undertook study on 50 years of Indian tourism, Badan, Zulfikar, Sarkar, Sarkar & Dhar Sharma, covered various aspects of tourism. In the same year Malhotra, R.K. Sinha came up with a number of books on tourism. These books were focused on the various topics related with tourism from tourism management to impact evaluation. In 1999 Sinha P.C. published a number of books on tourism. In 1999 Sharma and Mishra undertook studies on culture and tourism. But these studies were not containing any primary studies but they covered various aspects dealing with the cultural tourism.

Mishra (2000) undertook a study of religious tourism in India, whereas Tiwari and Sharma (2000) undertook his study on tourism planning and in the same year Rattan Deep Singh came up with a study on marketing while Dhar undertook study on introduction to tourism, Seth published a manual on India. This year M. Chand published a book on travel agency management. In this book he really came up with Indian studies, this book is a detailed book on the travel agency management, the travel agent and the various techniques involved. In 2001 studies were made on impacts of tourism as of Bansal 2001, Modi 2001.
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2.12 IMPACT STUDIES WITH REFERENCE TO HIMACHAL PRADESH

The Himachal Pradesh government has tried to control the development of Manali as a tourist resort, through the development of Master Plans. Singh (1989) raises questions about the concentration of tourism that is taking place around Manali and makes recommendations for a more integrated approach to tourism development that would disperse tourism activities more evenly throughout the region. He is critical of the second Master Plan for Manali, prepared in 1984, which took no account of the pace at which tourism was growing and the rapid urbanisation that was taking place around Manali. He questions the concept of allowing rapid growth of urban areas, a growth that is likely to radically alter the way in which the people live in the rural-pastoral valley. He would have preferred a plan, which focused on disbursing tourism activities. An analysis of the findings of the Berkes and Gardner study (1997) shows that Manali has continued to grow rapidly since Singh conducted his research, though is not clear to what extent this is a result of master plans. Two of the positive features of more recent policies of the State Government, noted by AME (1995a) are the dispersal of tourism to areas that have a potential, but are yet to be developed as tourist destinations, and constant appraisals of tourism activities (involving both residents and tourists). The State Government’s policies also emphasize private sector provision of accommodation, catering and transport facilities, so that it can concentrate on building up infrastructure (AME, 1995a).

Himachal Pradesh being one of the famous tourist destinations has attracted many scholars to undertake their researches but there is a lack of enough literature available on Himachal Pradesh. Tourism being one of the newest disciplines in the academics.
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 industries 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, entrepreneurship and legislation to develop tourism and attract more and more tourists towards this valley. Tourism can be developed at best if it is formed as an integral part of the overall development.

Gupta, S. (1988) has conducted a study on the financial performance of H.P.T.D.C. Lal Virender (1988) also conducted a study on H.P.T.D.C. Singh, Mian Goverdhan (1989) has written a book on Himachal Pradesh. This book can be considered as one of the best efforts on history and culture of Himachal Pradesh. Tyagi Archana (1989) had made an attempt to study the development and potential of tourism in Himachal Pradesh. The main Objective of her study was to critically examine the performance and development of
tourism and to identify tourism potential in the state. To achieve this objective the data has been collected by both primary as well as from secondary sources. The findings of this study reveal that Himachal is pleased with all the ingredients, which make a state a tourist state. Besides all the tourists’ attractions, this state could not achieve the name and fame.

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. Kumar Ajit (1992), Kumar Rajeev (1993) has conducted his study on the hotel workers in Shimla. Sharma, P.K. (1993) conducted a comparative study of Shimla and Manali. In his study he had considered Shimla as a charm loosing town but Manali as a growing tourist destination. 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.
Himachal Pradesh, east of Kashmir, has become a major tourist destination in the Indian Himalayas. Recent political instability in Kashmir and the UP Hills has contributed to the increasing number of tourists visiting this area. Other factors attracting tourists to Himachal Pradesh include the international popularity of His Holiness the Dalai Lama and the growing interest in trekking in the Himalayas. Case studies for two destinations, the Kullu Valley and Kinnaur, supplemented by the information from the AME overview (AME, 1995a), to provide an in-depth perspective on the impact of tourism on local communities. Singh’s study (1989) developed resort and tourist profiles for Kullu Valley and analysed community perception of tourism’s impact on their lives and the environment. The University of Manitoba studies (Berkes et al., 1997) focus on sustainability issues around the main tourist centre of the valley, Manali. A case study on Kinnaur, a destination at a higher altitude north of Kullu Valley, is included in another report by the Academy for Mountain Environics (AME, 1995b).

Kullu Valley, especially the town of Manali, is perhaps the most important tourist destination in Himachal Pradesh after the capital city of Shimla. The Kullu Valley has historically formed a part of important trade routes, though unlike many other areas of the Himalayas, it has experienced a relatively long period of social and political stability (Berkes 1997). The growth of tourism in the valley, particularly in Manali, has been phenomenal since the 1970s. Improved transportation networks, construction of accommodation facilities (aided by state subsidies) and vigorous marketing by the state government facilitated this growth.

The rapid growth in tourism has had significant impacts on society and the environment in and around Manali (Singh, 1989; Berkes et al., 1997). A small cluster of villages has rapidly become a semi-urban area, with large in-migration from elsewhere in the state, the country and even from other countries. While the social structure continues to be relatively unaffected, there is a visible change in individual behaviour. Environmental impacts as a result of population and infrastructure growth have been more dramatic and are likely to increase as options for construction in areas not prone to floods and erosion become fewer. In one of the studies for Kullu Valley (Singh, 1989), local residents expressed a strong dislike for agency tourism as it brought little benefit to them.
The paying guest scheme, which was developed by the state, is identified as a positive aspect of tourism in the area by AME (1995b), but recommendations are made to improve it further. The existing paying guest accommodation is close to the tourist centre itself, and is approached when government accommodation is not available or at the suggestion of earlier visitors. The study recommends that, if the paying guest scheme expands, the government will provide a centralized system for disseminating information on the availability of accommodation, and prioritises the provision of telephones to houses within the scheme. With a large number of repeat visits, a guesthouse with accommodation for about eight to ten persons could develop a regular clientele and ensure viability.

The risks would be low as most guesthouses are being run as an adjunct to orchards. The same study (AME, 1995b) also considers the role of outside tour agencies, operating from Delhi. At present, tour agencies operating in Kinnaur prefer to accommodate their groups in camps, which raises the question of whether there is scope for an alliance between the tour operators and guesthouse owners, or whether they are best left to develop as different forms of tourism in the area. The Kinnaur study (AME, 1995b) also mentions the lack of benefits to poorer sections of the community, though there is little detail about how they earn their livelihoods. In most orchard areas in the state, labourers demand a good wage for a significant part of the year and activities such as vending would have a high opportunity cost.

Kumar Satish (1997) conducted his study on Forts and their importance in the history of Himachal Pradesh. Chauhan Suman (1997) conducted study on social organizations and land control; a study of the role of temples in Kullu and Shimla. Singh Yoginder (1998) has undertaken his study on tourism in Himachal Pradesh with a case study of H.P.T.D.C. In his study he has evaluated the tourism industry in Himachal Pradesh.

2.13 CONCLUSION AND RESEARCH GAP

From the detailed discussion and review of various authors about tourism and its impacts it may be concluded that main goal in developing tourism is to maximize the positive impacts while minimizing the negative impacts to the host community (including the business community and local residents). The social impacts of tourism may improve
public utilities such as pavements, lighting, parking, litter control, landscaping and even water and sewage systems. Tourism may also encourage improvements in public transport infrastructure benefiting both tourists and residents. There are three important categories of impact: economic, social and environmental/physical.

Overall tourism development can provide local residents with economic benefits, more facilities and a greater range of choice in services. 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. The possible negative impacts of tourism development include: lack of economic diversification (tourism replaces other industries including fishing, mining, forestry and agriculture); economic strain due to inflation of prices of goods and services, emergence of crowding, congestion (including traffic), all forms of modern-day pollution and the extra demands on limited resources (especially water); increase in undesirable behaviours such as prostitution, crime, gambling, alcohol and drug abuse; and modification of cultural practices with a threat to authenticity by staging festivals/events entirely for tourists and the artificial reconstruction of sacred buildings and objects.

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 has been undertaken on community perception of tourism impacts in Himachal.
2. No specific study of tourism stakeholders for tourism impacts has been undertaken.
3. While planning for tourism, role of community participation in Himachal Pradesh is not studied in detail.
4. The studies related to community tourism planning and sustainable tourism impacts are not undertaken.
Summary

Hence it may be concluded that tourism many impacts such as contribution to income and standard of living, increased employment opportunities; increases in tax revenues, and increases in real estate prices. It also social and cultural impacts: impact on population structure, transformation of forms and types of occupations, transformation of values, influence on traditional lifestyle, modification of consumption patterns, and benefits to tourists. The main goal in developing tourism is to maximize the positive impacts while minimizing the negative impacts to the host community including the business community and local residents. The social impacts of tourism may improve public utilities such as pavements, lighting, parking, litter control, landscaping and even water and sewage systems. Tourism may also encourage improvements in public transport infrastructure benefiting both tourists and residents. In many cases tourism creates opportunities to develop new facilities and services that would not otherwise be possible in a community. Tourism is an instrument of economic development in Himachal Pradesh. Tourism industry in Himachal Pradesh has a vast potential. This is perhaps one of the industries whose development ensures the simultaneous development with a number of other related industries. There is need of assessment of tourism impacts in local community, tourists and other stakeholders in Himachal Pradesh.
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