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2.1: Development defined

The term ‘development’ is an elusive one and there are various ways of approaching towards it. Development means different thing to different people, interpreted in different ways and is one of the most slippery term in our tongue. Welch (1984) even observed that the word has become bereft of a precise meaning. Then, what does the term ‘development’ mean?

To begin with development can be viewed as either a process (Rostow 1960; Goulet 1968) or a state (Smith 1997). Rostow, one of the early advocators of development as process, has identified five successive stages of economic growth: from traditional, transitional, take-off, maturity and high mass consumption. The very philosophy behind this conception was that there is a natural path to economic growth the nations follow and the nations could be classified into any one of these stages. In his study, Goulet noted that ‘development is usually treated as a process, a particular kind of social change’. Friedmann’s (1980) conception of development treated it ‘as an evolutionary process having positive quotations’ (quoted in Pearce 1989). It can be expressed at different levels- human beings, a society, a nation, an economy, a skill etc. It is often associated with words such as under, over or balanced; too little, too much or just right, which suggest that development has a structure, and that the speakers have some idea about the structure ought to be developed. We also tend to think of development as a process of change or as a complex of such processes which is in some degree, lawful or at least sufficiently regular so that we can make intelligent statements about it.
Development as a state refers to the 'relative condition' of the object of interest. To understand development as a condition or 'state of being' requires the acceptance of a unit of measurement. For example, to call a country underdeveloped, developing or developed, one has to place the country into the economic condition paradigm. The measures like gross national product, per capita income or a composite index of development variables can be used to measure the relative economic condition of the nation. As has been mentioned, the state of development is relative and relevant only for a particular point in particular time.

There has been serious debate revolving around the assumption that development is an economic condition and it's most commonly used indicator is GNP. Serious criticisms were directed towards the relevance of the economic growth indicator like GNP, particularly from the supporters of green politics and welfare economists in defining development. In his seminal work, Anderson (1991) observed that he failed in finding a single alternative indicator to GNP. Instead, he argued for a whole set of indicators, rather than a single one, which can play all the roles which GNP is supposed to play.

According to Sen (1996), the central issue in economic development is to expand the social opportunities open to the people and the expansion of market has a crucial role to play in this transformation. But the creation and use of social opportunities on a wider basis require much more than the freeing of markets. They call emphatically for an active public policy that could enable people to use the opportunities and there should be possibility of more trade offers both at domestic and international levels. He called for a rapid expansion of basic education, mainly in the developing countries for optimally using such opportunities and capabilities because it is lack of, or inadequate awareness about the possibilities and capabilities that act as the major hurdle in the process.
Smith (1977) argues for development as "welfare improvement" and suggests development means a better state of affairs, with respect to who gets what where. Earlier, Goulet had identified three major goals of development—sustenance of life, self-esteem and freedom, each being broadly defined. This broadening of development both as process and state, away from the narrow considerations of economic growth to encompass wider economic and social concerns has contributed significantly to the burgeoning range of definitions.

As an illustration of the shift of the concept of development, Seers (1969) had argued that the questions to ask about a country’s development are three: what has been happening to poverty? What has been happening to unemployment? What has been happening to inequality? He concluded that if all three of these have declined from high levels, then beyond doubt, there will be a period of development for the country concerned. Later, Seers (1977) underlined the importance of an additional element—self-reliance. In this approach, ‘development plans’ would henceforth not to put the main emphasis on overall growth rates or even on new patterns of distribution. But the crucial target would be for: firstly, ownership as well as output in the leading economic sectors; secondly, the consumption patterns that economized on foreign exchange; thirdly, the institutional capacity for research and negotiations and; finally cultural goals (e.g. reducing cultural dependence on one or more of the big powers).

Mabogunje (1980), in his search for a meaning of development has identified four streams of definitions before introducing a fifth one of his own. Firstly, ‘development as economic growth’ where he argues that in the early post Second World War period, development was interpreted narrowly in forms of economic growth with priority given to increased commodity output rather than to the human being involved in the production. Secondly, the set of definitions treat
‘development as modernization’. He wrote: development, still in the sense of economic growth, came to be seen as part of a much wider process of social change described as modernization. The emphasis on development as modernization is on how to indicate wealth-oriented behaviour and values in individuals. Education was seen to be a critical aspect of social change but modernization also had a consumption dimension.

The third way is of viewing development as distributive justice. By the late 1960’s, the attention was increasingly being turned to who was getting, or not getting the benefit of economic and social change. The development came to be seen not simply as rising per capita income, but more importantly, reducing the poverty level of the masses, which denotes to the idea that development means social justice. Here, three issues have been brought to the forefront: the nature of goods and services provided by the government for their population; the question of accessibility of these public goods to different social classes; and the problem of how the burden of development (as externalities like air and water pollution) can be shared among these classes. The last one is an important extension of the concept, incorporating as it does not only who benefits but also who pays for development in terms of externalities.

Fourthly, development can be seen as socio-economic transformation. The advocates of this are the scholars of Marxist philosophical persuasion who argue that the question of distribution and social justice cannot be resolved independently of the prevailing mechanisms governing production and distribution. This interpretation is essentially a critique of the ‘capitalist mode of production’. This means that basic shifts in any of the aspects of the modes of production can trigger off wide ranging changes which may culminate not only in the transformation of the modes but also in changes in the relative importance of social classes. It is such a socio-economic transformation that really constitutes
development. The basic theoretical precepts of this approach has close link with 'dependency theory'.

The fifth interpretation of 'development as spatial organization' is attributed to Mabongunje himself. He argues: "spatial reorganization is seen as synonymous with development in the sense that spatial forms represent physical realization of patterns of social relations". The need for a pattern of social relations, which can inculcate new processes of production, thus requires the reconstruction of spatial structures both in the rural and urban areas of the country. While interpreting, he raises the notion that certain types of spatial arrangements can be expected to make a relatively better contribution to the attainment of specified goals than others and goes on to underline the importance of magnitude and the time factor in development.

The process of development in any society should ideally be viewed and assessed in terms of what it does for an average individual. It has to be seen in terms of the benefits and opportunities that it generates for people and how these are eventually distributed between men and women, the well off and deprived across the regions. Experiences show that, often, there is no direct correspondence between economic attainments of a society and the quality of life. It becomes, therefore, necessary to have a framework and evolve development strategies that forge and strengthen the link between the two and encourage the most effective and efficient use of available resources for furthering the well being of the people.

The broadening of the thinking on development, being manifested in the form of diverging perspectives, has lead to redefining the concept and its acceptance by formal global institutions at global level. For instance, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has been performing remarkable job for over a decade in measuring the level of human development across nations in
the world and the results are published through its Human Development Report. This Report mainly aimed at generating a policy focus on the broader attributes of human well-being in the contemporary discourses on development. Though, of late, in India, the Planning Commission has endeavoured upon first ever project on preparing a comprehensive Human Development Report in 2002. While conceptualizing the human development in Indian context, the Commission has observed that the process of realization of the choices in the well-being of people namely longevity, educational and health attainments and command over resources are mediated largely through personal means and access to public provisioning and transfers. However, in most cases, the underlying social and political processes are, perhaps, as important in translating the available means to socially desirable outcomes, both at individual and at societal levels. It, therefore, becomes necessary to view the process of development in terms of socially desirable outcomes and not merely in terms of material benefits.

According to the Commission, the conventional measures of well-being such as GDP or per capita income and even their distributionally sensitive variants are inherently limited in capturing these wide aspects of well being and the contingent process of development. The income or GDP in general is a predominant means in obtaining valued outcomes is the course of development. However, the human development indicators are more appropriate in capturing desirable ‘outcomes’ for which the ‘means’ are ultimately engaged in the process of development. Such an approach has not only made a useful distinction between means and ends of development process, thereby highlighting the need to formulate and prescribe appropriate public policy programmes, but it has also facilitated a move towards a more comprehensive evaluative and monitoring framework to guide the process of social change. For this report, the Commission has put together an extensive database for the covering nearly 70 (seventy) distinct social indicators on various aspects of the quality of life and well-being of the
people for different time periods in terms of gender as well as rural-urban
dimensions. Based on these variables, a core set of composite indices namely
'human development index', 'human poverty index', and for the first time a
'gender equity index' have been constructed. These indices present a quantitative
estimate of attainments of the society as a whole, the extent of deprivation and
relative attainment of women against men.

The Planning Commission made the observation that the human
development cannot be limited to just building relevant indicators and indices. It is
not always possible to assign a number to an attainment or a state of deprivation,
nor is it always possible to quantity the processes that mediate between the inputs
on the one hand and the development outcomes on the other. Human development
has to reflect and address the social concerns and the process that underlie the
various outcomes. It also has to recognize the local constraints and aspiration of
the people. Hence, besides the indicators like economic, educational and health
attainment and demographic concerns of the society, the report analyzed the core
set of variables on various aspects of social environment, physical environment
having a direct bearing on the well-being of people and the issues of governance
for human development.

2.1.1: Development Discourses in the Globalized World

The debate on development in the last few years is at a turning point with
globalization taking over the central stage. Interestingly, though globalization is
not a recent phenomenon, the subject has been receiving unprecedented attention
across the world in the last two decades as never before. Perhaps, most of the
academic and professional dialogues in the classrooms, summits, board meetings
and media (electronic and print) are getting centered on the treatise on
globalization. If one does attempt to prepare a bibliography on this subject, even a
thick volume would be inadequate, which prompted one of its pioneer proponents Jagadish Bhagwati (2004)\textsuperscript{11} to ask: “Does the world need yet another book on globalization” in the preface of his recent book. He stated further, for the most part, we have fierce opponents locked in combat, and are doomed to unending controversy. In this backdrop, the attempt here is only confined to highlight mainly the ‘pro’ and ‘anti’ positions on the debate. Specifically, the arguments of Bhagwati, a major protagonists and Joseph Stiglitz a protagonists turned critic and have been mainly considered.

What is central to globalization? It means many things to many people. After an extensive review of literature, Roberts and Hyte (2000)\textsuperscript{12} observed that the term is often used without clarification. It refers to set processes that increasingly make the parts of the world interdependently integrated (Dicken 1998)\textsuperscript{13}. For some others, it means also the control decision-making by a new “largely unaccountable political and economic elite” or more explicitly the Wall Street-US Treasury-IMF/ World Bank Complex (McMichels and also Wade and Veneroso quoted in Roberts and Hyte, 2000). For them, globalization is not just economic integration but centralized, homogenized control. Perhaps, the predominant dimension is that it is largely an economic phenomenon because other forms such as cultural or communication globalization is the complementary effect of economic globalization.

According to Bhagwati, a pioneer among its advocates, economic globalization constitutes “integration of national economies into the international economy through trade, direct foreign investment (by corporations and multinationals), short-term capital flows, international flows of workers and humanity generally, and flows of technology”. Basing on this postulation, Bhagwati stated that economic globalization was the favoured target of many of the critics of globalization. Then, he went on to identify the critique of
globalization as: firstly, a multitude of hard-core protesters who have deep-seated antipathy to globalization but belong to different ideological and intellectual positions. Second group constitutes the critics of globalization whose discontents are well within the parameters of mainstream dissent and discourse.

What have been the arguments and counter-arguments of on globalization? The advocators of globalization argue that the internationalization of trade help economic development when the country’s exports drive its economic growth. Because of globalization, many people in the world now live longer than before and their standard of living is far better. Globalization has also reduced the sense of isolation felt in much of the developing countries and has given rise to many people in the developing countries, the access to knowledge well beyond the reach of even the wealthiest in any country of a century. The success story of South Asian nations has been cited by the protagonists of globalization to justify their thinking and practices. For them, globalization (which typically is associated with accepting triumphant capitalism) is progress; developing countries must accept it if they are to grow and to fight poverty effectively. At the same time, those who argue against globalization are skeptical about its benefits and criticize that it has not brought the promised economic benefits. A growing divide between the ‘haves’ and ‘have-nots’ has left increasing numbers in the developing countries in dire poverty, living on less than a dollar a day. Despite repeated promises of poverty reduction made over last decade of the twentieth century, the actual number of people of living in the poverty has actually increased by almost 100 million (World Bank 2000). Surprisingly, this occurred at a time when the total world income actually increased by an average of 2.5 per cent annually.

If the globalization has not succeeded in reducing poverty, neither has it succeeded in ensuring stability (Stiglitz 2002). Crises in Asia and Latin America have threatened the economies and stability of all developing countries. There are
fears of financial contagion spreading around the world, that the collapse of one emerging market currency will mean others fall as well. He further argued that globalization and the introduction of a market economy has not produced the promised results in Russia and most of the other economies making the transition from communism to the market. Instead, it brought unprecedented poverty: in many respects, for most of the people, the market economy proved even worse than their communist leaders had predicted.

The critics accuse Western countries of hypocrisy and certainly with reasons. They say that the Western countries have pushed poor countries to eliminate trade barriers but kept up their own barriers, preventing developing countries from exporting their agricultural products and so depriving them of desperately needed export income. Not only that: because of a lopsided terms of trade, the developing countries in general and some of the poorest countries in particular were acutely made off worse. Further, the western banks benefited from the loosening of capital market controls in Latin America and Asia, and the later suffered badly as their currencies collapsed and banking systems weakened as a result of abrupt outflow of money (Stiglitz 2002).

Not only in trade liberalization but also in every other aspects of globalization even seemingly well intended efforts have been backfired. And the price the countries have to pay for globalization efforts have been greater. Studies often pointed about the badly destroyed environment, corrupt political process, undermining of traditional values and threat to cultural identity as a result of the rapid pace of change that has not allowed countries time for cultural adaptation. The crises that have brought in their wake massive unemployment have, in turn, been followed by longer-term problems of social dissolution like urban violence and ethnic conflicts. Then, is the globalization working for the poor in the world, a fundamental requisite for a sustainable world? The studies show that it is
2.1.2: Prominence of Alternative Thinking on Development

Above discussions highlight the friction prevailing between traditional as well as radical theoretical propositions in approaching the concept of 'development'. These often contradicting interpretations also make it as an ambiguous term; for, Cowen and Shenton (1996)\textsuperscript{17} 'the term seems to defy definition, although not for want of definition on offer'. As such, a commonly accepted definition encompassing various dimensions of development is hardly seen. According to Thomas (2000)\textsuperscript{18}, it can also considered to be virtually synonymous with progress, implying positive transformation or 'good change'. In this sense, development could be viewed as philosophy, a continuous progress and its outcomes, and at the same time a continually changing combination of means and ends.

Despite its arguably ambiguous nature, the importance of a definitional framework for development cannot be undermined which, has been reiterated by everyone attempted doing so. Traditionally, development has been defined in terms of western-centric modernization achieved through economic growth (Redclift 1987)\textsuperscript{19} but the growth-based conception has drawn severe criticisms as well. Notably Seers argued that if unemployment, poverty and inequality levels are not reducing, 'it would be strange to call the result 'development', even if per capita income had doubled. However, a broadly accepted view was put forward by Goulet who suggested that the term "development refers to the destination of a journey (state) and to the journey (process) itself". Accordingly, development can be viewed as a "process of qualitative and quantitative progression in the human well-being achieved through continuous spatial reorganization of means of production and economic, social and political relationships". This definition tries not only to capture Goulet's 'state' and 'process' dimension of development paradigm, it also attempts to integrate spatial relationships of different dimensions
and magnitude in attainment of the human well being. For him, ‘good-life’ of people is central to development and it has three basic values: the sustenance of life, esteem and freedom. In other words, though indirectly, it explains that there are many forces constraining the process of development and appropriate policies are to be framed in attaining well-being.

Though, alternative thinking to the growth-oriented development has been there since the time of Aristotle, it has taken a definite shape and drew subsequent attention only in the beginning of 1970’s. A main breakthrough was appeared in the 1972 January issue of The Ecologist magazine, edited by Edward Goldsmith, which published it as a special issue called *A Blue Print for Survival*. It declared that the principal defeat of the industrial way life with its ethos of expansion is that it is not sustainable.... Radical change is both necessary and inevitable because of the present increase in human numbers and per capita consumption, by disrupting ecosystems and depleting resources, are undermining the very foundation of survival. Central to the analysis in the *Blue Print* was the question of economic growth and its environmental impacts. The research team at Massachusetts Institute of Technology has thus coined a central concept called “ecological demand”\(^{20}\), which they define as ‘a summation of all man’s demands on the environment such as the extraction of resources and the return of wastes. The report further stated that the world cannot accommodate this continued increase in ecological demand. Finite resources cannot sustain indefinite growth of whatever type. This is the nub of the environmental predicament.

Two more major events took place in 1972: the *UN Conference on the Environment* held in Sweden and publication of *Limit to Growth* in the USA authored by Dennis Meadows (1972)\(^{21}\) and his team. Club of Rome commissioned this study. The main conclusion of the study read that the ‘growth phase’ of human history will end within the next 100 years, whether it is halted by resource
depletion, pollution, lack of arable land to grow sufficient food or (preferably) by voluntary choices. The ‘growth’ referred here indicates mainly to the growth in population and growth in industrial output. Hence, they advocated for a ‘state of global equilibrium’ in which the forces tending to increase or decrease them in a carefully controlled balance. A decision to do nothing is a decision to increase the risk of collapse.

Then came the seminal work of Schumacher (1973) titled as Small is Beautiful. Like the earlier two publications, Schumacher also argues against unlimited growth primarily on environmental grounds, but adds a social and religious philosophy of its own. The anti-growth debate has taken the globally institutionalized dimension with the publication of Our Common Future in 1987, usually referred to as the Brundtland Report, authored by Gro Harten Brundtland, who chaired committee and prepared the report for the World Commission on Environment and Development. The report places environmental issues within the context of the Third World poverty and development. The report said: ‘it is impossible to separate economic development issues from environment issues; many forms of development erode the environmental resources upon which they must be based and environmental degradation can undermine economic development. Poverty is a major cause and effect of global environmental problems. It is therefore futile to attempt to deal with environmental problems without a broader perspective that encompasses the factors underlying world poverty and international inequality.

Brundtland Report is not against development per se, but only against some particular forms of growth. ‘What is needed new is a new era of economic growth – growth that is … socially and environmentally sustainable’. Hence, the Report has set out an agenda and a framework for what has been called since then as ‘sustainable development’. So, what does ‘sustainability’ and sustainable
development mean? The starting point of an understanding these concepts is to acknowledge that the history of human civilization has been strongly interwoven with the history of climate and environment— the natural resources and other environmental factors. And the impact of civilization (human influences) on climate and environment is now seen to constitute a serious problem to the existence of mankind.

The idea of sustainability can be traced back to Aristotle, who said ‘human well-being is realized only partly by satisfying whatever people’s preferences happen to be at a particular time, it is also necessary for successive generations to leave behind sufficient resources so that future generation are not constrained in their preferences (quoted in Rao, 2000).’ Thus, the future sets of meaningful choices should be at least as good as the sets available to the present generation. However, the definition put forward by Brundtland is one of the most accepted and often quoted definitions of sustainable development. It said “sustainable development is the development that meets the needs of present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs...” Sustainability implies a concern for social equity between generations, a concern that must logically be extended to equity within each generation. One peculiarity of this definition is that it needs to be followed up in several more direction to enable greater precision and applicability. Since the role of capital remains very important in the development process, it is also useful to examine and disaggregate various components of ‘capital’ as these are very relevant in the development process. Serageldin (1996) identified four broad types of capital: person-made, natural, human and social.

A closer approximation to a workable definition was attempted by Vellinga et al. (1995). According to him, sustainable development can be defined as “maintenance and sustainable utilization of the functions (goods and services)
provided by natural ecosystems and biosphere process". Conversely, in a situation of unsustainability, where the limits of the biosphere's carrying capacity exceed, not all of the environmental functions can be fully fulfilled any more.

There have been host attempts to the refinement of the definition of sustainable development. Many such definitions offered adopted an economic approach. For instance, Mitlin and Satterthwaite (1990)\(^{27}\) argues that 'to make development sustainable at the level of countries require that societies, in seeking to achieve development objective, also seek to maintain a constant stock of environmental assets for use by future generations and to avoid irreversible damage to any single asset'. This approach suggests an attempt to balance economic and ecological considerations. But, the approach adopted by Gilbert and Braat (1991\(^{28}\)) centered around two main features; perceived and interpreted potential for future benefits and specifications for optimization of resource use and of corresponding benefits. While defining SD, Gladwin et.al (1995)\(^{29}\) proposed an all inclusive set of social, economic and institutional aspects to be incorporated in the concept of sustainable development.

Our purpose here is not to have a review of the concepts related to sustainable development and, therefore, confines to delineating major dimensions of sustainable development. In general:

"It is being viewed as the attainment of a set of development objectives: maximization of economic welfare; non-declining levels of welfare, or of utility in each successive period; maintain resilience of the ecological, social and economic systems; and maintain critical thresholds of ecological capital by each major component"\(^{30}\).

Perhaps, contextualising sustainability is a major problematic in tourism context and it is reflected in the study of Ferrell and Twining-Ward (2005)\(^{31}\). They argued that movement towards a sustainable transition requires the identification
of, and the combating of, an array of counter forces, including the ideological values of potent and powerful cultures, conservative elements within tourism, mono-disciplinary science, and linear tools and methods.

The divergent and at the same time progressing intellectual and ideological positions discussed above makes it increasingly difficult to agreeing on any one line of thought on development because argumentations rooted in every perspective have its own sets of merits and demerits. Since tourism is a prominent form of development driving the global economy and economies of many nations, developing appropriate perspectives become an imperative but the challenge one has to encounter is multi-faceted due to its unique characteristic; i.e. the amalgamated or inter-linked existence, meaning there is nothing that can singularly called as tourism industry. Nevertheless, the following discussion is aimed at bringing tourism in the ambit of ongoing debate on development.

2.2: Placing Tourism in the Contemporary Discourse on Development

Tourism as an agent of development process having tremendous consequences of irreversible magnitude is still to earn a place in the development discourse. Pearce (1996)\(^3\), after reviewing the existing literature on tourism development arrived at a conclusion that tourism has been treated by the development writers in the same way they have ignored other service sectors for much of the development debate and has mainly centered on the transition from an agricultural to an industrial society and neglected tertiary sector. In another exhaustive review, Opperman (1993)\(^3\) summarized that the theoretical aspects of tourism development have seldom been addressed in tourism literature. The majority of tourism research is concerned with the case studies of economic, cultural or social impacts where as few studies discuss aspects of tourism development over time and space.
Nevertheless, there were some scholars attempted to establish the links between tourism and economic development theories in the early 1970s- the initial phase of the development of modern mass tourism (see Krapt 1961; Kasse’ 1973; Bryden 1973; van Doren 1979; de Kadt 1979)\textsuperscript{34}. Such studies in the 1980’s, mainly by Britton (1982)\textsuperscript{35} and Erisman (1983)\textsuperscript{36}, also deal with the unquestionable relationship between tourism and development. In his study, Krapf (\textit{ibid}) concluded that tourism has a special function in developing countries- a function which is defined in terms of a series of ‘economic imperatives’ such as exploitation of the country’s own natural resources, international competitiveness due to favorable terms of trade, an ability to provide internally many of the good and services required, improved balance of payment, social utility of investments in tourism and balanced growth. This kind of a view was reflected in most of the studies during 1960’s.

Perhaps, Tefler’s (2002)\textsuperscript{37} summarization of the debate on ‘development’ theories in tourism literature after World War II is one of the best documented and capable enough to provide an evolutionary perspective of the thought process. He delineated four main development paradigms over the period viz. modernization, dependency, economic neo-liberalism and alternative (see Table 2.1) However, the author cautions that it is just one perspective and the timeframes are only guidelines. The timeframe indicates when the paradigm gained prominence with many components being applicable still today. More over, these paradigms are not all mutually exclusive. Though strictly not on the line of Tefler’s classification, following review will attempt to sketch out the dominant paradigmatic debates in tourism.
### Table 2.1: Evolution of Tourism and Development Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Guide</th>
<th>Development Paradigms</th>
<th>Selected theoretical approaches or models</th>
<th>Key concepts/strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950s and 1960s</td>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>Stages</td>
<td>Societies pass through similar development stages as western countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>Spread of growth impulses from developed areas; growth poles; trickle down effect; state involvement, regional economic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950s and 1960s</td>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>Neocolonialism</td>
<td>Underdevelopment caused by exploitation by developed countries; western cultural influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dualism</td>
<td>Poverty is functional to global economic growth; rich and poor – between countries and within countries, regional inequalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structuralism</td>
<td>Domestic markets, import substitution, social reforms, protectionism, state involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 1970s and 1980s</td>
<td>Economic neoliberalism</td>
<td>Free market</td>
<td>Supply side macroeconomics; free competitive market; privatization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structural adjustment</td>
<td>Focus on market forces and competitive exports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On world</td>
<td>New world financial system; deregulation internationalization of production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s early 1980s</td>
<td>Alternative development</td>
<td>Basic needs</td>
<td>Priorities of food, housing, water, health and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grassroots</td>
<td>People-centered development; local control of decision-making, empowerment, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Women in development, gender relations, empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable development</td>
<td>Environmental management; meet the needs of the present generation without compromising future needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Tefler, 2002*
2.2.1: Dependency Theory and Tourism

Dependency theory has its origin in structuralism and has emerged as a critique of 'modernization' project in the 1960s. The proponents of this best known neo-Marxist position (Todaro (1997); Peet (1999); Hettne (1995) etc.)\(^{38}\) have argued that the developing countries have external and internal political, institutional structures, which keep them in a dependant position relative to developed countries. Since the debate on dependency theory is vast and diverse, it is attempted here to contextualize and capture the diversity by examining its application in tourism.

Though it is not specifically argued to have been within the dependency theory, drawing on the experience from Africa on the emergencies of a theory of the development of the tourism industry in under development countries, Kasse' (1973)\(^{39}\) suggests that the cost of tourism may be greater and the benefits may be smaller than popularly believed. Indeed, the much debated work on this topic was of Bryden (1973)\(^{40}\) who made an attempt to investigate the linkages between tourism and development is the Caribbean Islands. While acknowledging the definite economic impacts of tourism, he equally raised some serious doubts about the viability of tourism development in its present form. It is believed that Bryden was one of the first to recognize explicitly this relationship and to prove that tourism development takes different forms and its impact is conditioned by the context in which that development occurs. His study revealed that in Caribbean Island nations, there is a high degree of foreign ownership and the consequent repatriation of profits. Non-nationals mainly monopolize the tourism employment and the national governments provided infrastructure and incentives for such tourism development.
In his assessment on tourism and development process, van Doren (1979) argued that tourism cannot be considered outside the context of the different stages of development the countries have achieved. He then went on to develop a typology that combines the levels of social and economic development based on prosperity and welfare criteria with levels of tourist development. The typology, for all practical purpose, draws heavily, mainly of the stages of tourism development, from the works of Cohen (1974) and Smith (1977). He also suggested that the theories of development must be taken into account in the assessment of the impact of tourism. According to him, dependency or core-periphery theory, which explains the differences in the level of economic development in terms of external factors would be a ‘leading lady’ among the modern theories. Britton (1982) has explored further into the tourism dependency syndrome and argued that the study of tourism should be placed firmly within the dialogues on development. In his endeavour towards deriving a theory and management of tourism impacts, Preister (1992) observed that dependency theory has the advantages of addressing both causes and effects of tourism development, and has had a considerable success in accounting the effects.

Dependency theory can be conceptualized as a process of historical conditioning which alters the functioning of economic and social sub-systems within an under developed country. This conditioning causes the simultaneous disintegration of an indigenous economy and its reorientation to serve the needs of exogenous markets (Briton 1982). Britton concluded that the international tourism industry, because of the commercial power held by foreign enterprises, imposes on peripheral destinations a development mode, which reinforces dependency on, and vulnerability to, developed countries.
The impact of transnational corporations on indigenous communities and environment was a subject of enquiry in a study conducted by Ascher (1985) for UNESCO. The study observed that for a little more than twenty years, international tourism has been growing rapidly in a large number of developing countries. It's economic, social and cultural efforts are beginning to be better known. Far from being a panacea, it requires considerable precautions if it is to be economically advantageous. It's socio-cultural effects may be fraught with consequences for local societies when it goes beyond certain limits and it is likely to plunge developing countries even more deeply into an international system of dependency. Dependency theory has a global dimension which stresses upon the workings of capitalism in theorising the political and economic motivations for tourism as well as in explaining the resulting outcomes at local level. Despite its supposed advantages, Priester (1989) argued that the theory has two main weaknesses which limit its utility: the lack of local level refinement and failure to address social and political relations as they influence development outcomes. As a tool to analyze political economy, the theory has been used most frequently to account the negative effects of tourism. The theory maintains that capitalist ties between First World core nations and the Third World peripheral nations create and perpetuate underdevelopment is these countries.

Preister conceptualized that on an empirical level, there are four ways in which tourism establish dependency. Firstly, the surplus value is drained from the local area to core nations in the form of unequal exchange. Secondly, to the extend that tourism development relies on national and international clientele, it represent an economic sector dependent on extra local forces not only for the clientele but for the commodities judged necessary to keep them happy. Thirdly, tourism may develop in such a way as to restrict managerial and business opportunities of local residents either those directly associated with tourism or those secondary business opportunities generated from it. Finally, tourism may reduce existing ownership
and employment options both in number and in quantity because of conflict between these sectors and tourism industry. The dependency theory applied to tourism development has not addressed the third and fourth conditions, while the first and second conditions were treated in an unsatisfactory manner.

The draining of 'surplus' out of the country/region takes place in different forms and many studies have reported it (e.g. Bryden 1973; Perez 1975; Leys 1975; Wood 1979). For instance, in Wood's study, it was shown that in 15 of the 33 countries listed as underdeveloped in Southeast Asia by World Tourism Organization had a negative travel balance. Notably, these countries were mainly island nations. Although the drain may be important for national governments, it does not necessarily reflect what is happening is the local area. Moreover, the dependence on extra-local forces including resources is not only of typical to tourism but most of the economic activities in the world system also portray such characteristics. The last two propositions are typical to any form of development which aims at improving the objective and subjective well-being of the people living around the tourism business.

The studies using the dependency theoretical framework have often concentrated in a single case study for empirical analysis and the results have been used to generalize to take a theoretical position. To have a balanced insight, what is most important is to acknowledge that tourism functions take place in grossly different socio-economic and political environment both at macro and micro level, and therefore, the development outcomes are naturally bound to differ. A judicious question that could be asked is under what circumstances the development outcomes are positive and negative. Then the question is: can dependency theory be a reliable theoretical as well as analytical tool to analyze the effects of tourism on economy, people and places? The answer lies in the refinement of theory of dependence so that it will have more analytical and operational values.
development phenomena need to be approached at two levels; the structural and socio-political levels. The structural level analysis includes the nature of tourism and of the local situation where as at the socio-political level, the efficacy of local actions are analyzed in the management of changes. The structural variables could be type and rate of development and distribution of factors of production. On the other side, the socio-political variables are the people and their varied social, cultural and political relations and interests.

Preister (1989) concluded that dependency theory, although the most successful to date in encountering the outcome of tourism development, is simply not complicated enough to account for both the positive and negative effects reported in the literature. We need taxonomy of the different kinds of tourism development which are being implemented, a more rigorous accounting of local conditions, and a way to assess the ability of people to manage changes stimulated by tourism. Though, strictly not on a dependency framework the study of Rodenburg (1980) on tourism operations in Bali brings out certain interesting facts. The focus of the study was on scale of tourism activity and its impact on economic development. The ‘scale’ was defined in terms of relative size, capitalization and relative bureaucratization i.e. the degree of industrialization. The typology thus derived is: large industrial tourism, small industrial tourism and craft tourism. The conclusions of the study are important for a democratic and decentralized economy where the development benefits are aimed to provide to the destination community. It showed that the objectives of development are not best met by the development of large industrial tourism. In Bali, craft and small industrial tourism are more appropriate scales to achieve the tourism development objectives. Moreover, smaller scale enterprises offer a greater opportunity for profit and control to local people than do enterprises on a large scale. Small tourism like any indigenous industrial organization accommodates traditional social relationships and values. Convincingly enough, large industrial units have
adjustment of the regional disparities after initial polarization (Hirschmann 1958; Alonso 1968, cited in Tefler 2002). Christaller (1963) was among the first to consider “tourism is to be a growth pole”. He observed that now-a-days, tourism gives the economically underdeveloped regions a chance to develop themselves—for these very regions the interest is the tourist. Friedmann (1966) recommended tourism as a development option for particularly problematic regions that have otherwise little development potential. Thus tourism was not only considered to have a positive influence on the economy, but it was seen as an “instrument” in the development of peripheral regions. However, several studies have indicated that tourism is largely concentrated in the capitals, main economic centers and the coast.

In the absence of sufficient connectivity, the tourism development was confined in the vicinity of urban centers. The tourism development has also often resulted into different types of conflicts in coastal areas which are more populated and developed. It has also been proved that in the barren coastline or remote part of the country, tourism will not have any backward linkages since almost all goods and services were to be imported which results into less multiplier effect. A good case is Cancun, Mexico (Spehs 1990, cited in Oppermann 1993), where even after 15 years of development, almost all of its supplies still come from far away.

There were also attempts to place the tourism development process into a formal/informal sector paradigm (Kermath and Thomas 1992; Michaud 1991; Walinschaft 1982). Some common features emerge out of these studies are: firstly, the idea that formal and informal sector competes each other. If it is logically placed, this is a thesis hard to prove. For instance, for the hawkers on the resort area, tourist demand provide only for a supplementary income besides their usual local customers. Second idea is that there is a government bias towards the formal sector that will eventually lead to extinction of the informal sector. But,
although a general government bias towards the tax-paying and more productive formal sector is unquestionable, the extinction of the informal sector remains doubtful. For instance, in the big resort towns, the abolition of the informal sector is open to debate. On the other hand, Kermath and Thomas (op.cit) suggest that in some type of resorts, the informal sector may be purposefully retained or supported because the bustling life of a market place may be the major tourist attraction.

2.2.3: Formal/Informal Sector Dichotomy

Opperman (1993) in his study stated that two main aspects not addressed in the formal-informal sector dictionary are the spatial distribution of both tourism sector in the whole country and a differentiation of tourists. For a better understanding of these, first we need to have an idea of the basic characteristics of formal and informal sector. The formal or upper end tourism sector in the developing countries is characterized by international standard hotels, western cuisine, and air conditioned buses. The informal or lower end tourism is typified by low budget accommodation and 'domestic cuisine'. But the methodology adopted by Wahschafft (1982)\(^{55}\) in his study on Pattaya was the size of the business to distinguish the sectors. Michaud (1991)\(^{56}\) did the differentiation based on both the size and organization of tourism business.

There is also a distinct pattern of capital requirement for the development of these sectors. For instance, the upper end tourism requires very high initial capital requirement to start the business which the destinations in the developing countries may not be having. This will result into the search for foreign capital and in many cases labour and subsequently developing a 'dependency syndrome'. In certain cases, the capital and labour may be available in the country but not with the resort destination community. The search of the domestic capital may lead to a
sort of 'domestic dependency syndrome'. In either case, the benefits to the destination communities are marginal. Whereas, the lower end tourism exemplified by its low capital requirement and local outsourcing of the goods and services. Since, the owners of such simple businesses are generally much better integrated into the local economic structure, dependence on national or overseas capital goods and services can, to a large extent, be minimized. The differences in the buying behaviour or the dependence on the outside goods and services and capital are well documented in the studies of Widmer-Munch (1990, quoted in Opperman 1993) and Michaud (1991)\textsuperscript{57}. In a recent study on backpackers, Sorenson (2003)\textsuperscript{58} also attempted to examine the spatial re-organization based on formal/ informal sector arrangements.

### 2. 2. 4 Community-based Tourism Development

Although much of the early research examining the impact of tourism on host communities focused solely on economic impacts (Pizam 1978; Britton 1982)\textsuperscript{59} and modernization theories, more recent works have included different dimensions of social effects (Ap 1990)\textsuperscript{60}. Perhaps, the socio-cultural effects of tourism are the greyest area in tourism studies, which is reflected in a recent review by Hashimoto (2002)\textsuperscript{61} who noted: “The issue of tourism as a form of socio-economic development and modernization is full of contradictions” (p.225). Often, non-availability of ‘appropriate’ development model for tourism has been highlighted as reasons for not only the optimizing the economic benefits of tourism but also for many adverse socio-cultural and environmental impacts. But, as a principle, if tourism can create adequate income and employment opportunities, as Weaver and Oppermann (2000)\textsuperscript{62} observed, it promotes a level of economic development conducive to increase social well-being and stability.
The existing literature and debate on the subject of tourism as a ‘rapid modernization’ project and a multitude of negative impacts to host societies have created many stereotype notions. A predominant notion is that local communities are mostly the ‘victims’ where as the tourists and tourism industry are major beneficiaries and very often take the hosts for granted. This argument moves very close with the over representation of multinational corporations and globalization processes, particularly in the developing countries. Citing many existing studies, Hashimoto (2000) concluded that the positive contributions of tourism to the social and cultural well-being of a host community are overshadowed by the attention given to the negative impacts. Such arguments may be true to some extent but it is very simplistic and misleading; for the role of other forces of change have been ignored or at least overlooked. Then, question often sought to answer in tourism study has been: is it appropriate to take shelter in tourism for whatever adverse things occurring in the destination? The answer to this question lies in finding answer to another set of questions: Even in the contemporary period, is it correct to argue that negative impacts at destinations continue to be primarily because of tourism and ever advancing economic and technological environments are relegated to secondary-level cause factors? If so, are there right tools and techniques to establish that tourism as a new form of exposure to particularly peripheral societies and cultures brings most changes there? Further, what role does the tourism industry play in the ‘modernization’ of traditional and often peripheral societies?

Studies by Graburn (1989), Bauman (1996), Burns and Holden (1995) and Stanley (1998) are suggestive of the negative role of tourism industry in the host country’s modernization process because their competitive edge lie in portraying destinations with adjectives such as ‘traditional’, ‘authentic’ ‘exotic’ etc. to make them competitive unique selling propositions (USP). In short, it can be said that social and cultural changes at destinations are a complex process and
there are interplay of a combination of factors, therefore, singling out tourism can be fraught with the dangers of reductionism in understanding the impacts.

The discussion of tools and techniques in socio-cultural impact studies of tourism suggest that it is not fully quantifiable and such attempts itself proved to be difficult; instead qualitative and subjective measures could be more useful to understand them. Even most of the quantifiable variables cannot be solely attributed to tourism; say crime rate, drug addicts, prostitutes or the like. A very recent exercise illustrative of this was of Cooper et. al. (1998) who after trying to devise quantifiable indicators of impacts have come to the conclusion that ‘the areas of social and cultural change that researchers examine are beyond quantitative measurements and are far more qualitative and subjective in nature which makes numerical measurements almost impossible’. That may perhaps make a reasonable case for adopting perceptual measures in the study of tourism impacts.

2.2.5: Importance of Community Perception Studies in Tourism

The preceding discussion on tourism impacts throws light on the complexity involved in understanding and measuring the impacts, particularly negative ones. At the micro-destination level, it becomes even more difficult due to sheer lack of data at secondary level and statistical models. It is in this context, a number of scholars argued that the resident community’s perceptions towards tourism can be used as an effective tool, which is directly related to the degree of tourism’s presence in the community (Butler 1980; Cooke 1982; Getz 1983; Haywood (1986)68. One of the earliest conceptions of these relationships is advocated by Doxey (1975)69, who through his ‘irridex index’ continuum showed that the interaction between the host community and the guests changes from welcome to antagonism as the community moves from a discovery stage to full
was partly responsible for friction between residents and tourists. During high season, the load on infrastructure is stretched to or beyond capacity and overcrowding and traffic congestion often causes in conveniences to tourists (Sheldon and Var 1984; Pizam 1978). But, Rotham (1978) in his study highlighted an interesting finding of the study by Sheldon and Var on Delaware, in which he showed that if the communities have had a long association with tourists, they were able to make major adjustments with relative ease as they comfortably develop a mechanism of accommodation.

Does the community perception vary with the levels of dependence on tourism? According to Pizam, the more dependent a person was on tourism as a means of livelihood, the more positive was that person’s over all attitudes towards tourism. His findings were confirmed by the study of Murphy (1981). Through a comparative analysis of three different types of destinations namely day-trip, short-stay and long-stay; he concluded that the residents develop identifiable attitudes towards tourism and that these could vary according to the type of development undertaken in their own towns. Another investigation of 23 Colorado communities (Long, et. al 1990) also suggests that resident community’s perceptions of negative impacts increased with greater levels of dependence on it. However, the study indicated that the support for tourism increased up only to a threshold limit called ‘social carrying capacity’ and beyond this level, support began to deteriorate. For instance, higher real estate costs and increased crime were the chief complaints offered by the community. The findings of the study by Smith and Krannich (1998) though are generally consistent with the patterns predicted by the tourism dependence hypothesis; some qualifications and limitations need to be mentioned. For instance, residents of communities with higher level of tourism development perceived significantly greater negative impact from economic development. On the other hand, the destinations, which
are tourism-hungry have scored highest on the perceived importance of tourism to their community and the need for additional development.

However, there have been studies indicating that dependency on tourism related jobs do not appear to be a significant factor in resident’s perception in major destination areas where almost everybody is informed about the impacts of tourism. Liu and Var (1986) prove this point in their study. They suggested, though there is a strong positive perception about the economic benefits of the tourists, there is a high level of agreement on the cultural benefits of tourism and ambivalence toward the environmental benefits. Interestingly, the residents are reluctant to attribute social and environmental costs to tourism. The main predictable demographic variables were length of residency and ethnicity.

Allen et. al. (1988) argues that negative attitudes about tourism appear to be confined to certain dimensions of community life mainly public service satisfaction and opportunities for public, civic and social involvement. Except for age and education, the study found no significant effects on community attitudes when including a number of demographic variables like sex, marital status, and employment status in a multivariate analysis. Later on, in another study, Allen et al. (1993) establish that the relationship between negative tourism attitudes and the level of dependence is less straightforward when the data on level of total economic activity for the community is included. The results of this study show that regardless of level of tourism dependence, communities were agreed on attracting more tourists and expansion of tourism industry because this would lead to higher quality of life.

There have also been studies focusing on resident attitudes towards environmental changes brought about by tourism. It has been shown that researchers have looked into both positive and negative impacts of tourism. It has
also been acknowledged widely that for long-term stability of the industry, resident inputs and positive attitudes are essential, especially in the areas of environmental impacts. Liu et. al (1987)\(^4\) have brought forward some remarkable conclusions in their study on resident perception of tourism's environmental impacts in three different geographical settings namely Hawaii, North Wales and Istanbul (Turkey). The study points out some geographically specific concerns. In Hawaii and N. Wales where tourism is a significant part of the economy, residents are primarily concerned with development of facilities, hospitality and promotion. Study further revealed that residents in more developed regions may be more aware of both positive and negative impacts largely because tourism is kept to the forefront of thinking through media, policy issues and community discussions.

A more scientific way of understanding the relationship between community perceptions and tourism development is to ascertain the social carrying capacity (SCC). The concept was advanced by D’Amore (1983)\(^5\) and later Murphy (1985)\(^6\) fine-tuned it. SCC refers to a certain threshold that represents a community’s ability to tolerate all negative social effects of tourism development. If tourism development is not carefully planned to meet local resident’s requirements and expectations, this threshold will be low, and locals will most likely develop negative attitude toward the process (Gunn, 1988)\(^7\). The cardinal question then is whether the locals will openly demonstrate their dissatisfaction. Murphy argued that dissatisfaction will lead to unfriendly atmosphere, where as, Krippendorf (1987)\(^8\) maintained that the negative reactions will not be made openly to tourists unless the locals have reached a point where they no longer want to come terms with the social implications.

There are three sets of factors characterizing the tourism development-local resident interaction and thus shaping social carrying capacity: destination characteristics, development process characteristics and tourist’s characteristics
The elements of destination are composed of two elements namely the socio-cultural structure of the host community and their locational qualities. The study by D'Amote (1983) indicated that the social structure of a local community has a major bearing on its ability to absorb positively the different norms and values brought by the tourists. Equally important are the kind of development process adopted by the destinations: whether it is participatory or centrally administered; externally developed or dominated by indigenous developers; planned or unplanned; 'enclavic' or 'open' development etc. The characteristics of the tourists visiting the destination definitely have a bearing on social carrying capacity levels of a given community. Crandall (1987) identified these factors mainly as volume of flow, length of stay, racial characteristics, economic characteristics and their tourist role. The more that contradictory characteristics interact with these characteristics, the lower will be the local’s tolerance threshold and, hence, their social-carrying capacity.

Preceding discussions have mainly been focusing on resident perceptions. Now the question is how do they differ from those of business community and tourism administers? Ironically, not much relevant research has been done in this direction. One such early attempt was made by Thomason et. al (1979) who studied the three groups affected by tourism industry namely entrepreneurs, residents and public sector provides. They found significant differences in altitudes of these three groups to mainly environmental issues such as crowding and strains on environmental and community services. Entrepreneurs had more positive altitudes than did residents and public sector providers. In another study, Murphy (1983) ‘found that resident’s altitudes differed from the local governments and business sectors. Residents were especially concerned that any development would or would not bring with additional amenities for local people. Though the perspectives of other stakeholders in tourism are also equally
Above cited reasons may also be attributed to a lack of an acceptable definition of tourism development. However, conceptualization advanced by Pearce (1996) that "tourism development is an expression that encompasses not only destinations, origins, motivations and impacts but also the complex linkages that exist between all the people and institutions that are interlocking the global supply and demand patterns" seems more acceptable. Needless to state that the concern of scholars on tourism development must address the issues like the way tourism development is talking place and the effect of each type of development. They must view development process from both the 'process approach' and 'state approach'. While treating tourism development process, the emphasis should be on the ways in which tourism develops and evolves. The causal and contextual elements of tourism development should be explained in a manner to integrate with the evolving impacts. For obtaining a comprehensive understanding of development, beside general studies, sectoral studies also need to be undertaken. The development process envisioned for tourism can take the society in general and tourism in particular to an end state or condition, i.e. well-being.

Though limited, there have been attempts to develop models of tourism development basing on both "process" and "state approach". One of the earliest attempts to develop a ‘state’ model was made by Miossec (1976)\(^9\). The model tried to capture the nature of development process and resultant physical changes. The model depicts the structural evolution of tourist regions through time and space, and it is one of the clearest and explicit conceptualizations of the process of tourism development. Though the model appears to be hypothetical, it has the power to explain the development process in empirical terms and the study by Pearce proves this. Miossec’s model stresses upon the provision of facilities, the behaviour and attitudes of the tourists, local decision–makers and host population.
The model conceptualizes that in the early phase, the region is isolated, there is little or no development, tourists have only a vague idea about the destination while the local residents tend to have a polarized view of what tourism may be bringing. The success of some pioneer resorts leads to further development. As the tourist industry expands, and increasingly complex hierarchical system of resorts and transport networks evolve, while changes in local attitude may lead to the complete acceptance of tourism, the adoption of planning controls or even the rejection of tourism. In the process, tourists have become more aware about what the region has to offer, with some spatial specialization occurring. With further development, Miossec suggest it is tourism itself rather than the original attractions which are now drawing visitors to the area. This change of character induces some tourists to move on to other destinations.

For any explorative and at the same time empirical analysis of tourism development, Miossec's model contains many undisputed dimensions. Firstly, it embodies a dynamic element, the development of the region through time and space. This notion of spatial and temporal evolution is critical, both in analyzing the past processes and is planning the path for future development. Secondly, it attempts an overview of this evolution; change in the behaviour of the tourist and the local population are related to the growth of resorts and the growth of expansion of transport network. However, Miossec notes: each of the four elements need not develop apace and their in lies the sources of many of the problems to which tourism may gives rise to. The key factor is that impact is related to development and, more importantly, particular impacts are related to specific stages of development.

However, there are some inbuilt limitations to this model. For instance, the context in which the development has taken place, the factors which influence the
location of the resorts and the form of hierarchies, the key agents and means in the
development process, and the major interventionists in the development are not
adequately addressed. Nevertheless, despite the limitations, this model adequate
enough to explain the tourism development mechanism over space and time.

Another model explaining the process of physical change was proposed by
Noronha (1976)\(^9\). He has identified three stages of tourism development. The first
begins with the discovery of an area by the tourists. As the words of discovery
spread, tourist flow to the area increases and host society respond to the new
economic activity, usually by beginning to construct facilities and offering
services in demand by the tourists. If tourism continuous to expand, it enters the
last stage of development in which it is fully institutionalized. It becomes a formal
business activity complete with attractions, service facilities and organizations
dedicated to supporting and promoting tourism to the area. The risk of major
socio-cultural and environmental changes accelerates as development evolved into
the fully institutionalized stage.

The theorization of Thurot (1973)\(^9\) has given a ‘class succession’
dimension to the development of destinations. In his study on the development of
international tourism in the Caribbean, he outlines a process based on the analysis
of the evolution of airline routes, in which the different destination pass through
three successive phases: discovery by rich tourists and construction of
international class hotels; development of ‘upper middle class’ hotels and
expansion of tourist traffic; loss of original value to new destinations and arrival of
‘middle class’ and mass tourists.

Plog (1974)\(^9\) is his seminal work has used the personality dimensions
called ‘centrism’ (meaning personal focus or interest) in explaining the levels of
the development of destinations. The study was based on the U.S. citizens
holidaying in different destinations, where it has been demonstrated that the traveling population could be classified along a continuum. The continuum comprises of five distinct personality dimensions namely allocentric, near-allocentric, mid-centric, near psychocentric and psychocentric. The allocentrics are described as individuals who have a wide range of interests and activities. They are more adventurous, outgoing, and self-confident, and they are motivated to travel by a desire to experience novelty, challenge, power and learning. On the other hand, psychocentrics are individuals focus on their own narrow range of interests and activities, is self-inhibited, nervous and non-adventurous. Mainly motivated to travel for status and conformity, they are most likely to choose destinations and hospitality services that are familiar, socially acceptable and safe. However, the study shows that the allocentrics and the psychocentrics constitute only a small share of the total tourist traffic.

The travel interests and demands of these groups, according to Plog, differ and different groups of tourists will visit different destinations. He further suggested that the market for a given destination evolves in the course of time and that the destination appeals to different groups at different times. He was quiet cautious in his conclusion when he said 'we can visualize a destination moving across the spectrum, however gradually or slowly, but far too often inexorably towards the potential of its own demise, as they allow themselves to become more commercialized and lose their qualities which originally attracted tourists'.

Gormsen (1981) in his analysis on the spatio-temporal development of international seaside tourism demonstrates how the periphery has been shifting. Though his theorization is essentially from a European perspective, it does capture the historical development of seaside tourism globally. The core of the model is the centre of Western Europe basing on which four peripheries have been identified with the last periphery covering most distant destinations in W. Africa,
the Caribbean, the Pacific and Indian Ocean Islands, S.E. Asia and South America. Unlike the conceptualization of Miossec, Butler and van Doorn; Gormsen’s study reveals that the initiative in the early stages of tourism comes from external developers but with time, there is a growing regional participation. He argued that at any given time, the outermost periphery will be dependent on ‘the leading strata of the metropolises’ not only to generate demand but also to develop facilities which are usually of a higher order. Historically, in the first periphery, ‘the bourgeoisie not only formed part of the tourist elite but also invested in the luxurious palace hotels which were rapidly being built on cliff-tops and along promenades. The more recent development of the outer peripheries has also seen a dependence on external capital and international investment; much of the tourism being characterized by large-scale hotels and group tours in which longer distances and travel to more alien cultures are encouraged.

2.3.1: Tourism Area Life-cycle Model

Perhaps, one of the most debated and researched model of tourism development. In tourism literature is Butler’s (1980) evolution of tourist area model. In conceptualizing this model, Butler has drawn heavily on the researches of Cohen (1972), Plog (1974), Stansfield (1978) and van Doren (1979). The basic presumption of the model revolves around a general decrease in local participation over time as control of and involvement in the development process passes to regional and national authorities and developers.

Butler has identified six stages in the evolutionary process of a tourist area, having the theoretical assumptions based on product life cycle. The stages identified are: exploration, involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation and rejuvenation/ decline. The first stage, exploration, is similar to discovery in the sense that initially small numbers of tourists choose to visit a particular place.
Once significant numbers of tourists have arrived, the stage of involvement commences. The appearance of small facilities or businesses catering to tourists is the first signs that the destination is beginning to enter the involvement stage. The third stage is development, referring to a condition of extensive facility construction to either provide attractions to tourists or service their needs. The development stage is the one most critical when addressing the impacts resulting from tourism development. That is, larger impacts are most likely to occur during this stage when a destination evolves from a small-scale provider of tourist services to one dominated by the tourism industry. Advertising and promotion are now necessary to maintain the size of the created industry.

Eventually, the early influx of tourists begins to level off and the destination enters the consolidation stage. If significant negative socio-cultural and environmental impacts occurred during the development stage, it is in the consolidation stage that they begin to be reorganized by larger segments of the host society. As tourist flow slows to the point where there is no growth in new arrivals, the destination enters the stagnation stage. One of the two scenarios emerges: either physical capacity has been reached or tourist interest declined. The destination now has two choices. It can enter a stage of decline as tourists move to newer or more appealing destinations, or it can begin a period of rejuvenation. Rejuvenation can occur in two dissimilar ways. If the facilities constructed to accommodate tourist needs have reached capacity, another round of development can begin. Or, if tourists are no longer interested in the destination, the product line may have to be changed.

The debates on the relevance/irrelevance of the model continue even now. No other model of tourism development has been so engaging to the scholar than Butler’s. Whether it was Wall (1983)\textsuperscript{103}, Hayward (1986)\textsuperscript{104}, Johnston (2001)\textsuperscript{105} or
Hayward (2004)\textsuperscript{106}, the sustaining the criticality of the model has been central to their inquiries.

In summary, most It can be seen the models discussed above revolve around the idea of ‘rise and fall’ or ‘waxing and waning’ of tourist destinations. But the question is: is it necessary always that a destination falls into its own demise after a glorious past? Debbage (1990)\textsuperscript{107} argue that decline is not inevitable and might be avoided by more appropriate management strategies. By defining the needs of each market segment and translating these needs into elements of a touristic experience, we can prevent those forms of development that incorporate in their very design the decline of the attraction. But this is not enough. To be more successful, tourism development must correspond to the inherent characteristics and needs of the region, its society and the customers sought.

Above discussion on models of tourism development throws light on to the idea that the causal and contextual elements of tourism development vary from one destination to another. Because of this, there is not, and cannot, have a universal model for developing tourism. To be realistic, successful, and sustainable; the appropriateness of the model is central and it must address the issues like its economic viability, social compatibility, environmental sustainability, physical attractiveness, political support and complementarily and marketability.

\section*{2.4: Coastal Tourism Development}

Undoubtedly, coastal tourism has emerged as a significant form of tourism since early 1970’s in India, with both the domestic and international tourists to many destinations growing exponentially. Amongst the features that characterize coastal tourism from other types of tourism are the importance of the natural
resources on which it is based—the Sun, Sand and Sea. The strength of such coasts are that comparatively little investment is often required to convert them into economically proposition, with tourist activities generally informal and unstructured and much of the development being concerned with providing access and accommodation.

After a review of the existing literature, Pearce (1996) has concluded that much research on coastal tourism has involved morphological studies of resort form and function but increasing attention is being directed to underlying processes. One such seminal work on coastal tourism was undertaken by Barbaza (1970) on Mediterranean–Black Sea coastline. Burbaza has distinguished three different types of development based on following criteria:

1. The size of and extent of the existing population and the vitality and diversity of its activities before the introduction of tourism.
2. The spontaneous or planned nature of tourist facilities provided.
3. The localised or extensive nature of the tourist area.

The resultant typology derived constitutes: Spontaneous development; tourist resorts resulting from planned and localized development; and extensive development. This study brings together a particular pattern in terms of the resort development. In one of the study locations, the development was dictated by demand where as in other locations the main driver of development was supply. In those locations were demand derived the development, the private sector has been the main catalyst.

Indeed, it can be seen most of the studies on coastal tourism appear to concentrate on European coasts, mainly the Mediterranean coast. In one such study on Costa Brava, Morris and Dickinson (1987) have surveyed the nature of
and 'trade-offs' (the social impacts). The typology thus derived characterizes as rapid growth, slow growth and transient development.

There are only very few instances of typology-based tourism development studies in India. In a recent study on tourism development in Lakshadweep Island, by adopting Guthunz and Krosigk (1996)\textsuperscript{113}, Jitendran and Morrison (2002)\textsuperscript{114} tried to examine the development patterns as: controlled tourism, segregated tourism, and enclave tourism. They suggested that these classifications represent some of the environment-friendly tourism development policy alternatives. In the initial phase of tourism development, this classification could be of relevance to sustainable development. And, in the case of Lakshadweep, the emphasis all along has been to develop tourism with minimum negative impacts. Another study on beach development in India was undertaken by Kazi and Sequeira (2001)\textsuperscript{115}, though the attempt was not any typology construction, but brought forward some adverse dimensions of unplanned and unregulated beach tourism development.

But, in general, not only that there has been inadequate research on impact of coastal tourism to the destination community, the importance of coastal tourism to the provincial or national governments has also not received the required level of attention, which otherwise should have received, considering its socio-economic significance. It is often said that their impact is systematically undervalued both economically and as the most important driver of coastal development (Cicin-sain and Knecht, 1999)\textsuperscript{116}. Nevertheless, existing studies, though very few, have shown how important is coastal tourism to many countries in the World. For instance, in their study Wilson and Wheeler (1997)\textsuperscript{117} argues that coastal tourism is the largest 'ocean industry' for the state of California, ahead of ports, offshore oil and gas, and fisheries and mariculture. Another study by Houston (1996)\textsuperscript{118} indicates that in the US, approximately 180 million people visit
the coast for recreational purposes, with 85% of the tourist related revenue generated by coastal states come from coastal tourism.

Though the benefits of tourism to coastal areas are great, its adverse impacts are not often immediately visible, which leads to a sort of management and administrative apathy. Further, considering the multi-dimensional nature of tourism business, different government organizations deal with different issues and, there lacks a co-coordinated effort. Nevertheless, there have been few attempts to evolve a set of development practices for the attainment of sustainable coastal tourism development. One such attempt was made by Year of the Ocean (YOTO (1998)\textsuperscript{119}, which in its paper on coastal tourism and recreation notes that sustainable development of coastal tourism depends on a number of factors including:

a. Good coastal management practices, especially related to location of infrastructure and provision of public access
b. Clean air and water and healthy ecosystem
c. Maintenance of a safe and secure recreational environment, especially relating to management of hazards, and provision of adequate levels of safety for boaters, swimmers and other recreational users.
d. Beach restoration, including beach nourishment and other efforts that maintain and enhance the recreational and amenity values of beaches.
e. Sound policies for coastal wildlife and habitat protection.

The healthy and sustainable coastal tourism requires attractive, safe, and functional recreational beaches, clean coastal waters, and healthy ecosystems producing abundant fish and wild life. Given the very large contribution to the economy associated with coastal tourism and recreation, it would be appropriate to have special policy and programmes and a pragmatic co-ordination among all
levels. Many countries have initiated many such actions including the U.S and the E.C. The E.C programmes called European Blue Flag programmes, now in place, covers about 1,000 beaches in different nations of the European Union is one such good example sustainable coastal governance. These flags can only be flown at those beaches that meet pre-standards in water quality, safety, beach management and environmental education and information. In the process, the non-governmental institutions have been playing the pivotal role.
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