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This chapter reviews the literature relevant to the study of tourism planning. A review of relevant concepts, including tourism, tourism planning and development, sustainable environment, community and stakeholders is provided. The discussion of these concepts serves as the research background for developing research questions and the study’s objectives.

2.1 TOURISM

In the tourism literature, a number of approaches have been proposed to understand tourism components and their interactive roles. These can be considered to be a fundamental framework for understanding tourism. Tourism is concerned with pleasure, holidays, travel and going or arriving somewhere. These are the motivations for which people leave their normal place of work and residence for short-term temporary visit to other places. Tourism is concerned with consuming goods and services. Tourism involves the movement of people to, and their stay at various destinations. This involves a journey and services like transport, accommodation, catering and sight-seeing etc. The journey to and stay at a destination is outside the normal place of work and residence for a short period less than one year.

Mathieson and Wall (1982), explained tourism as to be a temporary movement of people to destinations outside their normal places of work and residence, the activities undertaken during their stay in those destinations, and the facilities created to cater to their needs. Tourism here, is considered to be a service industry that takes care of visitors when they are away from home.

Schmoll (1977) suggest tourism to be the study of man away from his usual habitat, of the industry which responds to his
needs, and the impacts that both he and the industry have on the hosts socio-cultural, economical, and physical environments.

Hunt and Layne (1991) acknowledge that coining a strict definition of tourism has been a problem. They say that travel was the most accepted term until 1987 and that since that time, 'tourism' is the accepted term used to singularly describe the activity of people taking trips away from home and the industry which has developed in response to this activity.

In the tourism planning and development context, tourism is defined as an interdisciplinary, multi-faceted phenomenon that involves the interrelated components of tourism products, activities and services provided by the public and private sectors (Gunn, 1994; Pearce, 1994, 1995). These tourism components are considered as fundamental factors in tourism planning and development and a basic knowledge of these components is required for successful tourism planning and management (Inskeep, 1991). Consequently, a discussion of comprehensive tourism planning is needed to provide a basic structure and guidelines for developing more competitive tourism products and services. Ravishankar (2004) emphasized that tourism play an important role in making this world a better place to live in. The factors influencing tourism planning and the growth of tourism such as increased disposable income and availability of greater leisure time are also the factors that determine the growth of sport. It has been noted that there is an increase in travel for sports related purpose. Major sporting events have become powerful tourism attraction in themselves-making a very positive contribution to the tourism image of the host destination. It seems the travel industry has already realized the potential of sports tourism. A number of tour operators have announced packages centered on international sport events. The continuing increase in the number of sporting events with media exposure, growth of mass participation events such as Olympics, football and rugby
championships, cricket matches and auto racing means sports tourism, is going to be the next niche area in tourism sector. *Punia (1996)* defined meaning and assess future of cultural tourism with special reference to the State of Haryana. According to author culture tourism may be defined as that form of tourism whose object is among other things, the discovery of monuments and sites. It contributes to their maintenance and protection and in doing so, brings social culture and economic benefits to the people. But with the spread of education men's curiosity to know more of historical and religious monuments of different regions are increasing day by day and that is why cultural tourism has achieved a special feature in the present day time. Moreover favourable attitude of tourist and tourism planners of the State further substantiates towards the property cultural tourism. *Batra (1996)* emphasized on Global trends in Tourism business. India's share in international tourism has so far been a mere 0.4%. Many factors like financial constraints, distance from the leading markets and lack of planning expertise etc. have been responsible for it. He also suggested that there is an urgent need to carry out an extensive survey of the tourists resources of the State and scientific lines. The publicity and marketing strategies adopted by the dept. of tourism have not been found effective. Therefore, there is an urgent need to redesign its marketing strategies so as to increase the tourist traffic in the State.

Tourism is worldwide phenomena and it is flourishing very rapidly in every nook & corner of the world. Tourism is not only a growth engine but also an employment generator.

### 2.2 PLANNING

Planning essentially attempts to allocate scarce resources between different competing uses with a view to maximizing output, income and employment and to ensure the balanced growth of different sectors. Careful planning is a prerequisite for complete success of any programme.
Planning, in general, is the process of decision-making that relates to the future of destination regions, attractions and services (Gunn, 1988; Inskeep, 1991; Mill & Morrison, 1985). It is a dynamic and vital process of identifying objectives as well as defining alternative methods and action to achieve the objectives that are already in place. Additionally, it includes an evaluation of selected methods and actions (Hudman & Hawkin, 1989).

Planning is an essential activity to achieve the goals of tourism development. As Murphy (1985) suggested that planning is concerned with anticipating and regulating change in a system to promote orderly development so as to increase the social, economic and environmental benefits of the development process. To do this, planning becomes 'an ordered sequence of operations, designed to lead to the achievement of either a single goal or to a balance between several goals. Dror (1973) defined planning as the process of preparing a set of decisions for action in the future, directed at achieving goals by preferable means. Chadwick (1971) defined planning as a process of human thought and action based upon the thought-in point of fact, forethought, thought for the future-nothing more or less than this is planning, which is a very general human activity. Smith (1984) identified four prerequisites for planning participation: opportunity and legal right, access to information, provision of resources for the public to get to involved, and genuine public (broad involvement of the public rather than selective). Hall, C. Michael (1998) found that the community approach to tourism planning stemmed from the realization that tourism was having irreversible and damaging effects to the communities and cultures that were exposed to tourism, and that alternative planning and management was needed to develop more socially acceptable guidelines for tourism expansion. The community approach, essentially a form of ‘bottom up’ planning, emphasized development in the community rather than development of the community.
According to Sewell & Coppock (1977) Planners should carefully identify the issue that require input from the public and those that do not; determine the segments of the public which should be consulted; and, articulate how all necessary and meaningful inputs can be obtained most effectively and efficiently. Jamal & Getz (1995) suggested that national tourism organizations act as conveners of collaborative projects. In their opinion, these organizations, which tend to have been formally established, possess the legitimacy, expertise, resources and the authority- required for this convening role. Ploger (2001) argued, planning is a form of discursive power. It can also be a process in the course of which conflicts will emerge over power relationships that reflect the entrenchment of strong economic or social interest. Hewawasam (2002) suggested that sound planning and management may lead to the consideration of the natural resources, particularly in areas that are rich in biodiversity, and to the maximization of the economic opportunities present in those areas. This is in line with the principles of Sustainable Development according to which the present generations must use the resources in such a way that they are also available for future generations. Jamieson (2006) claimed that the achievement of sustainable development goals of tourism needs the strategic planning and sound management, particularly in community destination zone. Those responsible for managing destinations need to begin thinking in an integrated manner about the everyday municipal concerns of tourism, and about the cultural and heritage dimensions of a community. Sustainable tourism destination management view destinations as more than the sum of their parts and seeks to create destinations that are healthy and viable in the long term for tourists and residents alike. Simpson (2001) advocated that tourism planning is vital to offset some of the negative impacts that tourism can have on the destination community. While several different approaches have been advocated over the years, tourism planning based on the
philosophies of sustainability has emerged as one of the most comprehensive and accepted approaches. However, the sustainable approach to tourism planning hinges on two key caveats: firstly, an enhanced level of multiple stakeholder participation in the tourism planning process is required; and secondly, a need for a strategic orientation towards tourism planning. He considered the physical, environmental and economic situation analysis' section is a key aspect of any planning exercise & incorporated these items, as it is necessary for a planning process to include an assessment of existing economic, environmental and socio-cultural parameters, alongside an evaluation of current visitor activity levels in the subject area. While a number of the items were not evident in the plan, other items were evident particularly the economic aspects such as the importance of tourism, the principal tourism sites in the area and quantitative analysis' of visitor numbers, length of stay, spending etc. This information is generally baseline data and local knowledge that form the basis of any planning exercise and should be readily available within a destination. Such basic information should be on hand to guide decision making and most definitely be available to inform a tourism planning and management strategy. Hall, Jenkins and Kearsley (1997) examined the extent to which sustainable development principles, specifically strategic planning and stakeholder participation, are integrated into the planning practices of local tourism destinations. While, the integration of sustainable development principles into tourism planning for any type of destination, be it national, state, regional or local, is vital; local tourism destinations have been selected for this investigation due to the fact that it is at the local level where there is considerable opportunity to mitigate the negative impacts of tourism, particularly as local government has the most direct and immediate control over tourism development in the area.
The planning and promotion of tourism destinations should be guided by a thorough analysis of the destinations’ competitive factors and development strategies (Hasan, 2000). Of major interest in tourism planning and development is destination sustainability and market longevity. Accordingly, as competition in the tourism market increases, an understanding of the driving forces contributing to destination competitiveness is essential and has become a fundamental step in maintaining tourism destinations, their growth and vitality (Ritchie & Crouch, 1993; Hasan, 2000). Many tourist destinations contain natural or man-made advantages to attract visitors. In the long-term sustainability and success of tourism destinations such tourism attractions should be identified and evaluated. Especially, each destination and tourist region could have a different advantage in its destination attractions. The assessment of destination attractions is needed to create a more competitive and quality environment in tourism planning and development.

Plan can be applied to any type of economic system. The need for planned development is paramount importance. The use of macro-economic planning techniques for tourism sector are however relatively new.

2.3 TOURISM PLANNING AND FEASIBILITY

Tourism planning requires certain systematic processes and approaches. Depending upon the types of planning and the specific forms of application, certain approaches could be taken, but conceptually, all of the approaches could be taken, but conceptually, all of the approaches could be applied to any level and types of tourism planning. Inskeep (1991) described several different approaches to tourism planning. Each approach emphasis the concepts of planning as continuous and incremental system-oriented, comprehensive, integrated, involving environmental and sustainable development and considering the community approach. Particularly, systems, comprehensive and
integrated approaches are similar or related to each other in terms of a view of tourism. Tourism can be seen as an interrelated system and all aspects of tourism development, including natural, institutional elements and environmental and socio-economic aspects should be considered. The overall plan and development patterns of an area are integrated in tourism planning and development. In a community approach, which is also frequently applied in tourism planning and development, the maximum involvement and participation of the local community in the tourism planning process is sought (Inskeep, 1999). Specifically, two different perspectives of community participation have been discussed, including the decision-making process and the benefits of tourism development to the community (MacIntosh & Goeldner, 1986; Timothy, 1999).

Tourism planning is a process of comprehensive evaluation and analysis of related issues, including not only the determination of goals, but also the development of alternative methods and actions to further decision-making. Particularly, Gunn (1988) said that tourism planning as a concept of viewing the future and dealing with anticipated consequences is the only way that tourism's advantages can be obtained. Tourism planning must be strategic and integrative. Murphy (1985) pointed out that tourism planning should fit within existing systems and should be used in urban and regional development strategies. In particular, these should be community involvement in the planning process. Additionally, Mathieson & Wall (1982) suggested that tourism planning is related to not only the components of tourism, but also the interrelationships among these components. Planning is a complex process involving a consideration of diverse economic, social and environmental structures. Thus, due to the sophisticated and varied nature of tourism planning and its process, it is required of tourism planning to incorporate numerous concepts and disciplines drawn from different fields. In
order to have comprehensive tourism planning all of the existing components and resources that include tourism attractions, destination management organizations, markets and local related business and services within a given region or destination, should be considered. Since the goals and objective that tourism addresses through development depend upon how important and sensitive tourism development is to the community, such goals should correspond with community or regional planning in a given destination. In general, the goals of tourism planning and development are based on the fact that tourism increases economic benefits, improves community infra/superstructure systems and enhances the community’s quality of life (Mathieson & Wall, 1982). Getz (1987) also stated that tourism planning is a process, based on research and evaluation, which seeks to optimize the potential contribution of tourism to human welfare and environmental quality. Additionally (Wilkinson, 1997) the objective of tourism planning is focused on providing better quality and services of tourism products and activities for tourists so that it increases the average of length of stay. Consequently, tourism planning in the proposed study can be thought of as a way of achieving goals, as well as proactive means of creating competitive and comparative advantage to destinations by adding value to tourism attractions/resources through tourist development. Thus, tourism planning & development can contribute to the competitiveness of tourism destinations.

Rose (1984) defined tourism Planning as multidimensional activity and seeks to be integrative, it embraces social, economic, political, psychological, anthropological, and technological factors, it is concerned with the past, present & future. The destruction of natural resources and environmental, socio-cultural, and unfair distribution of tourism benefits derived from unplanned tourism growth or lot of market-oriented development emphasize logical planning to cope with all level of tourism
elements together with globalization impacts. In order to cope with or to survive in changing affected from globalization. Timothy's (1999) studied on tourism planning in developing countries suggested that, as compared to Western paradigm, it appears that community participation in decision-making in developing nations is very weak or does not occur at all. He suggested that tourism planners should consider local constraints and conditions before imposing foreign ideologies into traditional societies. However, it might not be always accurate to State that local involvement does not occur at all in developing nations. In some parts of the world, some communities have strong local cultural institutions and decision-making traditions that require grassroots participation in the decision-making level for local matters (Tosun, 2005).

In tourism planning, three different levels—national, regional and local have been commonly identified and explained (WTO, 1980; Pearce, 1989). Inskeep (1991) also classified four different levels—international, national, regional and sub-regional. In these levels, tourism planning can be done executed in such a manner that tourism planning is incorporated as a sector into the overall development plan and policies. Additionally, depending upon the levels or sales of tourism planning, each level could focus on a different degree of specificity. Through understanding these scales, more effective planning for tourism development can be possible. Most general types of tourism planning include urban, rural and coastal (Gunn, 1994; Pearce, 1981, 1989). In urban areas, tourism planning is more complex, compared to development in other areas. Tourism development should be planned with consideration for already existing and developed sites. Community residents' interests and support are also necessary considerations. In case of rural areas having tourism attractions and sites, there are more possibilities for expansion. Local agricultural tourism products and activities, the natural
landscape and environments and traditional/cultural heritages are important sources of tourism planning and development. The coastal areas as another general tourism planning site is located in any areas of beach, which is mostly connected with beach resort development. Sun, sand and sea are the most important characteristics of this type of site, along with tourist activities being generally informal and unstructured (Pearce, 1989).

Likorish & Jenkins (1997) suggested that some governments, especially in the industrialized market-oriented economies, may have no explicit tourism policy. Their political philosophy will prevent any form of State planning, and even strategic action in the industrial and commercial fields may be strictly limited to urgent problem areas or to cases of 'market-failure', itself a very limited concept in the absence of policy and political will, action may be uncoordinated and reactive, with problems attached to this form of reluctant action. The authors concluded that weak State action and a low priority to tourism reflected in the absence of appropriate policies and strategies puts the national interest at risk. The author argued that in general, the government should be concerned at all levels in protecting its citizens, providing essential service and in creating the conditions in which their institutions, including enterprise and trade can operate favorably. The government's principal functions should be: formulating policy and approving the broad strategy for development; regulation, inspection and consumer protection; provision of consultative forum; fiscal action; financial assistance for development; establishing favourable conditions for growth; provision of statistics, economic and other technical information; and promotion of the destination. Chon & Olsen (1990) suggested the application of the strategic management process in the management of tourism organisations. According to them for organisations to make sound management decisions they should formally incorporate the strategic planning process into the
structure of their operations and thus force management to engage in some semblance of long-range thinking.

The economic approach to tourism planning is associated with economic impact statements and feasibility studies. An example would include the research carried out by Blake (2005) about the economic impact of the London 2012 Olympic Games. This approach views tourism as a means to create employment, earn foreign revenue and improve terms of trade. The planner is seen as an expert and development is defined in economic terms. The planning problems include the way how tourism can be used as a growth pole, the maximization of income and employment multipliers, influencing consume choice and providing economic values for externalities. Planning models include tourism master plans, economic multipliers and hedonic pricing while common planning methods are market segmentation, development incentives etc. Reed (1997) argued that power should be managed and balanced. The author suggested that it is possible and necessary to address the issue of power and authority by including legitimate stakeholders in a contended that it is wrong to assume that collaboration can overcome power imbalances completely because such power differences among stakeholders are so embedded in society that they always affect the nature of collaboration. Hence, it is necessary to examine the mechanisms of collaboration in tourism planning in order to manage power imbalances more effectively. Flyvbjerg & Richardson (2002) argued that non-communicative effects on communication play a very important role are highly influential on the decisions and outcomes of the process. This may enable powerful groups of interest to lobby outside normal communication channels in order to achieve individual goals that undermine common objectives. Christie & Crompton (2001) stressed that physical planning as an essential tool within a national tourism policy to ensure that tourism developments do not take place on sensitive ecological
sites and have no impacts on such sites and do not take place on land reserved for other purposes such as agriculture or a green belt. Physical planning also controls the location and densities of tourism development to prevent exceeding the physical carrying capacity of the area and having a negative impact on the host society and its culture.

Zoning is an important tool that physical planning can use to promote a balanced land use and thus avoid land use conflicts. However, in many remote tourism destinations, zoning is either neglected or badly implemented. This may be attributed mainly to the lack of capacities to elaborate and implement plans and zoning schemes at local level. Shafi (1985) emphasized that tourism is a special and complex industry and its promotional has to be directed at a large number of people in various lands of different socio-economic structures having different needs, tests, attitudes, expectations and behaviour pattern. Burns (2004) considered master planning as an inadequate approach to planning for various reasons: because from a technical perspective, such plans are very complicated, consultants are aware that a number of such plans sit and gather dust on ministry shelves; by their very nature, plans produced under this culture encourage a reductionist, homogenizing approach where, in effect, destinations are developed and changed to meet the requirements of known/familiar market segments and tourists". Furthermore, master planning is flawed because according to author, it is undemocratic and non-participative. He is critical towards the World Tourism Organization's approach of obtaining public involvement through a steering committee, since, the steering committees are, almost without exception, technical in nature, dominated by representatives of government and industry biased thus not a meaningful method of community participation in planning and decision-making. Finally, he also stated that master plans are limited by national boundaries. Bramwell &
Sharman(1999) have researched collaboration in tourism planning and have come up with its advantages. They deduced very similar benefits associated with collaboration. Collaboration avoids the cost of resolving wasteful, adversarial conflicts among stakeholders in the long term. It helps promote sustainable development by increasing efficiency, equity and harmony. Stakeholders have greater influence in the decision-making which affects their lives, hence it is a more politically legitimate approach. Moreover, collaboration improves the coordination of policies and promotes consideration of the economic, environmental and social impacts of tourism. Collaboration also adds value by building on the store of knowledge, insights and capabilities of stakeholders resulting in more innovative policies.

Emanuel de Kadt (1979) abstracted that the usual perspectives on tourism planning have been economic. And argued for the need to take much more explicit account of non-economic costs in this field. It emphasized that planners act in specific socio-political contexts, and that it is especially the dynamics of class structures and their expression in the power relations at local and national levels which influence outcomes in this field. Practical issues of social planning for tourism are discussed, and the dangers of development which is too massive and too fast are stressed. Some attention is also paid to the role of transnational enterprises in the tourism field, and to the question of bargaining at the international level.

Lai, Li & Feng (2006) found that a gap occur between planning and implementation once the planned approach to tourism development is adopted. Such a phenomenon is not rare to find in China, where tourism has become increasingly important for the country's economy. A case study is adopted for the examination which focuses on the 3-years implementation of 2001-2002 Guniujiang Guanyintang tourism Development Master Plan. Seven major causes are detected for failure of plans like: flaws of master planning, planner's inadequate background survey and analysis, planner's inaccurate
anticipation, planner's lack of practical experience, practitioner's misunderstanding, divergence of views between practitioner and planner, pitfalls of private investment and imbalance of development between regions of China. Phillips & Moutinho (1998) explained the underlying concepts of strategy, strategic planning and strategic planning systems. This knowledge is then applied to the hospitality and tourism industry through the promotion of two strategy diagnostic tools developed by the authors. These two tools: the strategic planning index and the marketing planning index have been field tested to help organizations to measure, and improve the effectiveness of their strategic planning systems. Comprising seven parts the study has Highlighted the importance hospitality and tourism and the relevance of strategic planning system; Reviewed the salient industrial trends and competitive challenges facing hoteliers and the tourism industry; Focused on strategic planning and follows three main themes - organizational strategy, strategic planning and a literature review; focused on empirical planning - performance studies, considering methodological issues and performance studies; contains the bulk of the empirical work and developed the two diagnostic tools. In the above parts authors considered some of the issues which need to be borne in mind when designing and implementing effective strategic planning system. Krippendorf (1982) emphasizes that attention to planning has now moved away from a narrow economic and physical planning focus and has started to address environmental concerns.

The concept of community has been significant in tourism, and tourism planning in particular, for over last two decades (Murphy, 1985; Haywood, 1988; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Mann, 2000). Indeed, the central role of the community in tourism planning has come to be recognized as one of the tenets of sustainable and socially responsible tourism. However, while
community-based planning is an important driver in academic and bureaucratic approaches to tourism development (Murphy, 1988), it is important to recognize that such an approach does not automatically lead to sustainable tourism development (Rechards & Hall, 2000; Scheyvens, 2002) a key point to remember is that the local should not be romanticized, as often seems to be the case in discussions of tourism planning. Nevertheless, a community-based approach provides the possibility that the need for consultation regarding the use of shared resources and the needs of neighbours will open the way to the resolution of tourism conflicts (Ashley & Roe, 1988; Tosun, 2000). When examining the role of the community in tourism it is impossible to separate the social, economic and political processes operating within a community from the conflict which occurs between stakeholders (Singh et al., 2003). Conflict and Disagreement between members of a community over the outputs and outcomes of tourism are, in fact, the norm.

Tourism planners therefore typically have to achieve a compromise between various stakeholders and interests in tourism development in an attempt to arrive at outcomes acceptable to stakeholders within the wider community (Inskeep, 1991; Hall, 2000). Indeed, much of the recent proliferation of tourism literature dealing with co-operation and collaboration in tourism destinations is a direct response to the need to find mechanisms to accommodate the various interests that exist in tourism development (Selin, 2000; Timothy, 1998-99). One of the responsibilities of the host population is to recognize the desire of many tourists to meet and interact with local people and to be prepared to foster the host-guest relationship in tourism (Tosun, 2002). The host population should have an active say in the kind of tourism appropriate to their own lifestyle, culture and natural resources, and to be free to reject
tourism as an economic option if other option are available (Singh et al., 2003).

Participation of host community in tourism planning and development is fundamental to the process (Selin, 2000; Timothy, 1998). In this context, Dowling (2000) asserts that the host population and local services are important in themselves and are incidentally basic resources in relation to tourism. The United Nation Environment Programme (1986) advocated that tourism should be subject to environmental planning and management, taking into account the well-being of the local population, which too often has to accept a large influx of tourists without having had a voice in such development. The demands of the public that their concerns be incorporated into the decision making process has resulted in the emergence of public participation and requirements that environmental impact statements be prepared. Most destination communities currently do not dictate the terms or conditions on which tourism takes place in their home area, yet it is they who must live with the direct consequences of tourism (Timothy, 1998). These consequences often include negative social and environmental impacts, even in situations where communities are benefiting economically from tourism. To ensure a strong likelihood of economic, political and social benefits of tourism accruing to host communities, there needs to be full participation (Murphy, 1988; Prentice, 1993; Timothy, 1998; Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Richard & Hall, 2000; Tosun, 2000). Full participation is said to occur where communities supply the majority of goods and services to tourists, have considerable input into planning decisions, and collectively manage common resources. The latter point is particularly relevant in situations where tourism is based on natural and cultural features. When tourism ventures are largely dependent on local cultural resources, and are locally managed, this allows communities to participate with equity in the
tourism process (Timothy, 1998; Tosun, 2000). Social disempowerment may occur if tourism results in crime, begging, perceptions of crowding, displacement from traditional lands, loss of authenticity or restitution and inequities in the distribution of the benefits of tourism (Timothy, 1999). Psychological empowerment should ideally mean that a community’s confidence in its ability to participate equitably and effectively in tourism planning, development and management is maximized (Scheyvens, 2002).

Flyvbjerg & Richardson (2002) argued that non-communicative effects on communication play a very important role are highly influential on the decisions and outcomes of the process. In fact, planning is also about politics and political decisions that impacts on planning are sometimes taken outside communication. This may enable powerful groups of interest to lobby outside normal communication channels in order to achieve individual goals that undermine common objectives. Dealing with power relations in planning is a complex issue. The authors agreed that the first step is to recognize power and conflict as part of the process and understanding their dynamics. Christie & Crompton (2001) stressed that physical planning as an essential tool within a national tourism policy to ensure that tourism developments do not take place on sensitive ecological sites and have no impacts on such sites and do not take place on land reserved for other purposes such as agriculture or a green belt. Physical planning also controls the location and densities of tourism development to prevent exceeding the physical carrying capacity of the area and having a negative impact on the host society and its culture.

Briankeogh (1990) sought insights into the information needs of residents of destination areas for a more effective participation in community tourism planning. Interviews were conducted with residents of New Brunswick, Canada, to identify
the main issues at stake with respect to a proposal to establish a tourist park in the community. An assessment of official reports and plans indicated that information was lacking on a number of issues. The study also revealed that residents were not very familiar with the information that was available, a situation which may have an overall adverse effect on resident perceptions and general opinions. Harrill (2004) viewed that planners are increasingly turning to tourism as a viable economic strategy, as many communities experience industrial restructuring. Consequently, many residents are exposed to tourism for the first time, whereas established destinations experience increasing volumes of tourists. Planners are now challenged with understanding how the public perceives tourism in order to gain local support for tourism projects and initiatives. And provided planners with a basis for initiating citizen participation process related to tourism issues and identifying groups of people concerned about, or opposed to, tourism planning and development in their communities. David (1994) abstracted that tourism planners are being asked to use greater community participation in tourism planning. There are two reasons for this, first, the impacts of tourism are felt most keenly at the local destination area and, second, community residents are being recognized as an essential ingredient in the hospitality atmosphere of a destination, however, while many planners rush towards involving various publics in their works they do so without a full consideration of the progress of public participation techniques employed in other aspects of planning.

In conclusion, tourism planning can be seen as a systematic process to promote the tourism resources that the local community presents to the tourism markets. Accordingly, it deals with what resources are to be developed, how well they meet market needs, how tourism resources utilized (Gunn, 1994). Therefore, in order to create or enhance tourism destination
competitiveness, an appropriate tourism planning procedure and approach should be selected.

In general, the goals of tourism planning and development are based on the fact that tourism increases economic benefits, improves community infra/superstructure systems and enhances the community's quality of life (Mathieson & Wall, 1982). Getz (1987) also stated that tourism planning is a process based on research and evaluation which seeks to optimize the potential contribution of tourism to human welfare and environmental quality. Additionally (Wilkinson, 1997) the objective of tourism planning is focused on providing better quality and services of tourism products and activities for tourists so that it increases the average of length of stay. Consequently, tourism planning in the proposed study can be thought of as a way of achieving goals, as well as proactive means of creating competitive and comparative advantage to destinations by adding value to tourism attractions/resources through tourist development. Thus, tourism planning & development can contribute to the competitiveness of tourism destinations.

The identification and evaluation of tourism resources is a foremost requirement in tourism planning (Gunn, 1994; Inskeep, 1991; Pearce, 1995). According to Inskeep (1991), the components of tourism planning and development can be classified as tourist attractions and activities, accommodations, other tourist facilities and services, transportation facilities and services, other infrastructures and institutional elements. These components can also be described as the framework of explaining the total natural and socio-environment from which they derive, the markets of international and domestic tourists that they serve and area residents' use of the attractions, facilities and infrastructure. Additionally, Pearce (1995) emphasized that an analysis and evaluation of two major components, including destinations' resources and the existing and potential markets.
(visitor statistics, tourist satisfaction, resources mapping and evaluation) are common procedures in tourism planning. Correlating these components can be referred to as the matching of tourism supply and demand and establishes the basic approach to tourism planning. **Mill (1990)** also explained that tourism planning tends to have certain components, even though the processes and outcomes of tourism planning vary. Particularly he stressed that the community's potential to attract, keep and satisfy tourists should be identified and assessed. Such an assessment should begin with a determination of the extent of existing tourism, while including and identification of the areas' tourism resources and their quality.

**Warner (2000)** pointed out that there are five strategies for managing conflict between community and tourism development, namely, force, withdrawal, accommodation, compromise and consensus. The last two seem to more appropriate to deal with conflict situations in tourism development projects as they likely to bring more collaboration and commitment towards the use and conservation of land resources, the main assets for tourism development. The author referred that the compromise strategy seeks to minimize a win-loss outcome through trade-offs. He added that although consensus building in some situations may contain elements of compromise, it finally seeks to avoid trade-offs altogether and to achieve a win-win solution. In order to minimize the negative impacts of land use conflicts, land degradation and to achieve balanced development, the planning initiatives must incorporate the issue of conflict mediation, management and resolution in all implementing stages. **Gunn (1979)** was one of the first to define tourism planning as a tool for destination area development, and to view it as a means for assessing the needs of a tourist receiving destination. According to **Gunn (1994)** the focus of planning is mainly is mainly to generate income and employment, and ensure resource
conservation and traveler satisfaction. Specifically, through planning under- or low-developed destinations can receive guidelines for further tourism development. Meanwhile, for already developed countries, planning can be used as a means to revitalize the tourism sector and maintain its future viability (WTO, 1994). Spanoudis (1982) proposed that tourism planning must always proceed within the framework of an overall plan for the development of an area's resources; and local conditions and demands must be satisfied before any other considerations are met. Every development process starts with the recognition by local/central government, in consultation with the private and public sector, that tourism is a desirable development option to be expanded in a planned manner. In order successfully to design a development plan, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of the development objectives to be achieved at national, regional or local levels. According to Sharpley and Sharpley (1997) a statement of the desired outcomes of developing tourism in a destination and may include a wide range of aims, such as job creation, economic diversification, the support of public services, the conservation or redevelopment of traditional buildings and, of course, the provision of recreational opportunities for tourists. The nature of these objectives depends on national, regional and local preferences grounded in the country's scale of political, socio-cultural, environmental and economic values, as well as its stage of development.

On the other hand, objectives can represent a combination of political, socio-cultural, environmental and economic aims, although they should take into consideration the desires and needs of the local community in order to retain its support. Unfortunately, objectives are often in conflict each other and cannot all realistically be achieved (WTO, 1994). For example, if the two main objectives of a government are to achieve spatial distribution of tourism activity and increase tourist expenditure,
these objectives are opposed, since to increase tourism expenditure, tourists should be attracted to the capital or the largest cities of the country, where more alternatives for spending exist, e.g. in entertainment and shopping. Therefore, Haywood (1988) proposed that the choice of objectives will have to be limited to those aspirations which the industry is capable of meeting or are the most appropriate to serve. The aim of planning is to evaluate whether objectives have been fulfilled through measuring the economic, environmental and social impacts.

The most frequently used measures in tourism research have been concerned with the economic impacts of tourism planning and development. Frechtling (1994) asserted that tourism economic potential can be understood as the gross increase in the income of people located in an area, usually measured in monetary terms, and the changes in incomes that may occur in the absence of the tourism activity. Measures dealing with the direct benefits of tourism include labour earnings, business receipts, number of jobs and tax revenue. Archer (1977); Jackson (1986), Milne (1987), Witt (1987) & Archer and Fletcher (1988 & 1996) stressed on the concept of the multiplier analysis which is based upon the recognition that the tourism impacts is not restricted in the initial consumption of goods and services but also arises through the calculation of the direct and secondary effects created by additional tourism expenditure within the economy. There are four different types of tourism multipliers application in common use (Jackson, 1986; Fletcher and Archer, 1991): sales or transactions, output, income and employment. The extent of the multiplier depends on the size, structure and diversity of the local economy.

In an attempt to eliminate environmental costs, many countries have included in their legislation Environmental Impact Assessment for all projects, including tourism. The aim is to predict the environmental consequences of a proposed
development activity, and to ensure that potential risks are foreseen and necessary measures to avoid, mitigate or compensate for environmental damage are identified (Green and Hunter, 1993). A major tradition to tourism planning, or as Hall (2000) debated a form of non-planning, is ‘boosterism’. According to ‘boosterism’, tourism is beneficial for a destination and its inhabitant; environmental objects are promoted as assets in order to stimulate market interest and increase economic benefits and barriers to development are reduced (Getz, 1987 Hall, 1991; Dredge, 1999). As Page (1995) remarked local residents are not included in the planning process and the carrying capacity of the region is not given adequate consideration. As a result, this approach does not provide a sustainable solution to development and is practiced only by politicians who philosophically or pragmatically believe that economic growth is always to be promoted, and by others who will gain financially by tourism (Getz, 1987). Tourism evolution brings many problems to the local community, i.e. overcrowding, traffic congestion, superstructure, and socio-cultural deterioration. Most of these problems can be attributed to laissez-faire tourism policies and insufficient planning (Edgell, 1990), and although some destinations have benefited from tourism development without any ‘conscious’ planning, there are others suffering from inattentive planning (Mill & Morrison, 1985).

Although the majority of countries have prepared tourism development plans, many of these plans are not implemented, and others are only partially or very partially implemented (Baud-Bovy, 1982). This may be due to ‘conventional planning’ as defined by Gunn (1988), that has too often been oriented only to a plan, too vague and all encompassing, reactive, sporadic, divorced from budgets and extraneous data producing. Rather than conventional planning, Gunn (1994) proposed interactive planning, Bramwell and Sharman (1999) suggested collaborative
planning and Timothy (1998-99) recommended co-operative and participatory planning, all directed along the same lines, the incorporation of the local community's opinions and desires in the planning process. Better decisions can be reached by means of a participative process, even though it is far more difficult. This shift in emphasis does not mean that research and concepts by professional planners are abandoned. Rather, it means that many other constituencies, other than planners, have experiences, opinions and constructive recommendations. Final decisions have a much better chance of being implemented if publics have been involved (Gunn, 1994). Interactive planning proposed top-down, together with bottom-up input, for the better implementation of plans. On the other hand, Braddon (1982) proposed that tourism planning should be market oriented, providing the right product for the consumer-the tourist. Baud-Bovy and Lawson (1977) with their product analysis sequence for outdoor leisure planning, where emphasis is put on the 'product', indicate the need for a 'supply-led' approach to tourism planning. According to Inskeep (1991) the supply-led approach implies that only those types of attractions, facilities, and services that the area believes can best be integrated with minimum impacts into the local development patterns and society must be provided, and marketing should be done to attract only those tourists who find this product of interest to them. Mill (1990) and Gunn (1994) emphasized on integrated planning saying that it can reassure communities that the type of development results will be appropriate. Baud-Bovy (1982) asserted that any tourism development plan has to be integrated into the nation's socio-economic and political policies, into the natural and man-made environment, into the socio-cultural traditions, into the many related sectors of the economy and its financial schemes, and into the international tourism market.

Tourism planners should learn from mistakes made elsewhere and realize that the planning process is not a static but
a continuous process which has to integrate ‘exogenous changes and additional information’ (de Kadt, 1979; Hall, 2000). Therefore, tourism planning should be flexible and adaptable; to cope with rapidly changing conditions and situations faced by a community (Atach-Rosch, 1984; Choy, 1991). Nevertheless, many decision-makers and developers are often located at a considerable distance from the destination under development which means they may be unaware of, or unconcerned about any costs resulting from tourism development (Butler, 1993). Gunn (1988) remarked that planning is predicting and it requires some estimated perception of the future. Absence of planning or short-range planning that does not anticipate a future can result in serious malfunctions and inefficiencies. Wilkinson (1997b) proposed that strategic thinking should be incorporated into planning. Strategic thinking is defined as a continual processing of external and internal information and adjusting to changing situations. The manager looks out into the future and identifies the changes the future may bring; changes in markets, changes in products, changes in technology, or changes in regulatory or financial environments. The plan becomes a statement of how to deal with these changing conditions. The plan is subject to continuous evolution as the manager attempts to strategic competitive advantage in a changing environment (Porter, 1985).

Tourism planning can take place at various levels ranging from the macro national and regional levels to the various micro local planning levels (WTO, 1993). Pearce (1995) proposed, plans prepared at one level should be focused almost exclusively on that level, although it should be ensured that they fit into the context of the other levels, since planning at one level can be influenced by planning at another level. For example, some countries, such as France and Spain rely heavily on regional tourism plans to complement the national ones. According to
Tosun and Jenkins (1998), the evolution of tourism development planning can be broken down into five stages:

- **Unplanned tourism development era:** during this stage tourism planning is uncommon, unpopular and an unwanted idea, and therefore tourism emerges as an unplanned activity.

- **Beginning of partly supply-oriented tourism planning stage:** this stage is characterized by the construction of basic infrastructure, such as hotels, restaurants, transportation etc.

- **Entirely supply-oriented tourism planning stage:** at this stage, planning is directed towards the creation of facilities that satisfy increased tourism demand, although it ignores most resulting problems.

- **Market or demand-oriented tourism development planning stage:** at this stage, tourism planning is focused mainly on greater numbers of tourists and how to satisfy them.

- **Contemporary planning approach stage:** after the increase in the number of tourist arrivals and the 'careless and myopic tourism development planning approaches', environmental, socio-cultural and economic problems increase which attracts the attention of developers and planners.

According to Pearce (1989) and Liu, (1994), for a better understanding of the relationships within tourism, it is necessary to separate the components of the tourism system, in order to reduce its complexity and to identify the relationships of the components before drawing them back together. According to Tosun and Jenkins (1998), this approach has the advantage of taking a broader view instead of being myopic and isolated. Among the researchers who have adopted the system approach, Mill and Morrison (1985) considered four components of the
tourism system, namely market, travel, destination and marketing, while Leiper (1990) identified: the tourist, the geographical elements and the tourism industry. Harssel (1994) viewed the tourism system as a mixture of demand and supply components and Laws (1991), went further by identifying the following features of the tourism system:

- The internal environment includes policy, planning, marketing, organizational, financial, and human variables.
- The operating environment includes the tourists (domestic and foreign), the supplies of the input (capital, labour, land, technology, materials, power etc.), the competition from other industries (e.g. leisure) and the competition from other destinations.

The macro-environment. As planning is a ‘many sided phenomenon’ (Tosun and Jenkins, 1998), the system approach supports that successful tourism planning is essential to incorporate socio-cultural, economic, political, technological and geographical variables.

Therefore components of the tourism system are interrelated, tourism development of a country or region should be examined as a whole, Components exhibit a high degree of independence. The behavior of the whole system is usually something very much more than the sum of the parts (Wilson, 1981). The aim of planning is to evaluate whether objectives have been fulfilled through measuring the economic, environmental and social impacts. The most frequently used measures in tourism research have been concerned with the economic impacts. Frechtling (1994) asserted that tourism economic potential can be understood as the gross increase in the income of people located in an area, usually measured in monetary terms, and the changes in incomes that may occur in the absence of the tourism activity. Measures dealing with the direct benefits of tourism
include labour earnings, business receipts, number of jobs and tax revenue.

Effective tourism planning that incorporates meaningful public participation has been identified as a holistic approach for achieving sustainable development in tourism in many literatures (Timothy, 1999; Choi & Sirakaya, 2005; Kent, 2005). According to Timothy (1999), an effective tourism planning will maximize the economic benefits of tourism to the destination area, and mitigate the negative impacts on the local social, economic, and physical environments. Brohman (1996) asserted that an appropriately planned tourism development is needed not only to ensure quality of life but also to develop positive attitudes of residents towards tourism development. Kent (2005) point out that sustainable tourism development begins with tourism planning and an effective tourism planning must incorporate a meaningful public participation is one important factor for a successful search for sustainability in tourism industry.

Tourism planning in developed countries is found to be more comprehensive, integrative and environmentally sensitive for sustainable development. Such approaches to planning are also required in developing nations for sustainability, but as Tosun (2000) observed these approaches in developing countries requires considerable effort, financial resources, and expertise. Few educated and elite groups often do planning in developing countries with little involvement from grassroots people. In the context of developing nations, participation of stakeholders in decision-making has not been properly recognized in the planning documents or in practice (Tosun, 2001). A study done by World Tourism Organization (1994) on 25 case studies of tourism planning in developing world shows that only the Sri Lanka tourism plan considered community consultation or indirect participation. Kincaid (1988) described that the native felt envy towards tourists. Natives are too poor to escape the reality of
their lives; and too poor to live properly in the place where they live, which is the very place, the tourist want to go. So when the native see the tourist, they envy tourist. Natives envy tourist ability to leave tourist's own banality and boredom, they envy tourist's ability to turn their own banality and boredom into a source of pleasure for tourist. So this must be checked during tourism planning. **Sheldon & Var (1984)** discovered evidence suggesting that residents' attitudes toward tourism development are culturally bound, finding that natives were more sensitive to tourism's social and cultural impacts than were non-natives. According to author this is the key factor for tourism promotion and should be taken carefully in tourism planning. **Snaith & Haley (1999)** observed in their study of residents of the historic city of York, England; that the shorter the length of residence, the more positive residents' opinion about tourism were, although short and long-term residents both recognized the benefits and impacts of tourism. Proper tourism planning could make the impacts beneficial to tourism development. **Lankford (2001)** pointed out, tourism impact research is designed to provide planners with a database with which to develop a planning process aimed at addressing local concerns and issues. Specifically, the data from a community environmental scan (via survey or series of meetings) become the starting point in developing a citizen involvement process (which may take many years) to discuss impacts, to suggest mitigating strategies, and to decide on the scoped and density of tourism developments. Second, using appropriate statistical procedures, the planner can identify which groups of people are more concerned or opposed to tourism development within the community. This analysis assists the planner in developing a network of concerned citizens and enhances our ability to be the variations in the level and content of development to reflect local concerns. **Costa (1996)** linked to the national level, a number of regional organizations are responsible for translating national policy to the particularity
of each region and for setting up regional policies, according to the guidelines established by the national organization. The local organizations, which in accordance with the policies defined by national and regional organizations, are generally responsible for the implementation of the national and regional strategies; by pointing out the areas where the tourism equipment and infrastructure should be developed. They are also responsible for ensuring that tourism industry respects the social, cultural, natural, economic and aesthetic characteristics of each place and creating symbiotic link between host and guest. Dredge & Moore (1992) discussed the obstacles of the integration of tourism planning into traditional community plans was found in Queensland, Australia. Hunt (1975) defined tourism image as the impression held by people about a State in which they do not reside. However, it is important for planners to investigate the opinion of people on their state's image, in order to achieve their support on tourism development.

In order to have comprehensive tourism planning, all of the existing components and resources that include tourism attractions, destination management organizations, markets and local related businesses and services within a given region or destination should be considered. Since the goal and objectives that tourism addresses through development depend upon how important and sensitive tourism development is to the community, such goals should correspond with community or regional planning in a given destination.

2.4 SUSTAINABLE TOURISM AND PLANNING

A sustainable tourism destination rarely occurs by accident. Rather, it is the product of the careful planning, management and monitoring of tourism development. The concept of sustainable development emerged in the nineteen sixties. However, the term was first used in the Bruntland report, entitled Our Common Feature, Prepared by the World Commission on Development and
Environment in 1987. Sustainable development brings together the apparently contrasting concepts of economic development and environmental conservation. The vision put forward by the Bruntland report was one of economic development not concerned purely with attaining maximum economic growth. Sustainable development and sustainable tourism have been signaled by most researchers as the way forward for tourism development and planning in developing countries.

The sustainable development approach implies that the resources for development are conserved for indefinite future as well as present use; sustainable development is considered to be development that meet their own needs (Bruntland, 1987). This approach thus ensures that future generations everywhere will have sufficient resources to adequately sustain themselves and maintain a reasonable quality of life (Harris et al., 2002; Keyser, 2002). For people whose present quality of life is not of an acceptable standard, the resources, if sustained, will be available for them and their children potentially to achieve quality of life in the future. Achieving sustainability is now the underlying principle for all types of development, including tourism (Hunter & Green, 1995). The achievement of sustainability is an objective that will require much time and effort, and careful planning and management of resources development are the key means to achieving it (Inskeep, 1991). Keyser (2002) argues that the use of phrases such as 'beyond the rhetoric of sustainable development' and 'operationalizing sustainable development' clearly points to the need to stop talking about sustainable development and start acting to turn it into reality.

The concept of sustainable tourism emerged and was accepted by the tourism industry to address the environmental and social complexities of the industry around the same time as the concept of sustainable development came into prominence (Kent, 2005). In the context of tourism, the concept of
sustainability creates a linkage between the economy, environment and the society in such a way that it triggers benefits to the host population while maintaining the environmental and cultural integrity of those communities (Neto, 2003). The World Tourism Organization conceptualized the term sustainable tourism and defined it as development that meets the needs of the present tourists and host regions while protecting and enhancing opportunities for the future. It is envisaged as leading to management of all resources in such a way that economic, socio-cultural and aesthetic needs can be fulfilled while maintaining cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, biological diversity and life support systems (WTO, 2001; Liu, 2003). A sustainable tourism framework ensures increasing economic development, environmental protection, viable and resilient community, and a tourism industry confined within the capability of environment (McCool, 1996). Based on the concept of sustainable tourism, many small-scale local tourism ventures are promoted worldwide, but as Butler (1999) argues, in the context of tourism, the problem with sustainable development is not ensuring small-scale, environmentally and culturally appropriate forms of tourism, but in making the existing mass tourism development sustainable.

Sustainable tourism strives to meet the needs of the host community, the tourists, and the investors while ensuring environmental protection. A great deal of recent research on tourism has focused on small-scale sustainable tourism approaches like ecotourism, rural tourism, and alternative tourism (Liu, 2003; Kent, 2005). The tourism industry is becoming one of the largest and fastest growing economic sectors of the 21st century (WTO, 2000). Tourism represents a “massive and complex interaction of people, who demand a wide range of services and facilities, and inputs” (Price et al., 1997). Being a multi-sectorial economic driver, tourism development has been
perceived and promoted as a critical part of economic development and revenue generation, especially in the least developed countries. The tourism industry has, however recently been confronted with many challenges, complexities and issues, largely due to the potential negative impacts of tourism on the environment and the society. Tourism once thought to be a 'smokeless industry' is thus being questioned in relation to its negative environmental and societal impacts, which are not as benign as predicted (Berno & Bricker, 2001). The concept of sustainable development or sustainability, has also gained increasing attention in the context of tourism development. The notion of sustainable tourism development has emerged to describe development that strives to contribute to the sustainability of the environment, socio-cultural resources, and overall socio-economic development (McCool, 1996; Neto, 2003).

Sustainability in tourism development is especially pertinent in the context of mountain environments due to the fragility and vulnerability of mountain ecosystems, which makes them susceptible to degradation (Price, 1992; Colin & Inbakaran, 2002). Moreover, relatively marginalized populations who are susceptible to impacts and changes from rapid tourism growth inhabit the mountain regions.

The tourism industry can provide considerable benefits to host communities through economic development, infrastructures development, and as a medium for protecting the environment and culture (Andriotis, 2001; Rishi & Giridhar, 2007). However, there are also several problems associated with tourism, such as various social and environmental strains including environmental degradation, resources exploitation and conflicts, overcrowding, unplanned urban sprawl, waste management problems and acculturation (Andriotis, 2001; Gardner, 2008; Pradhan, 2008). These undesirable adverse impacts have fuelled the growing concern for conservation and preservation of natural resources,
societal wellbeing, and the long-term economic viability at tourist destinations (Choio & Sirakaya, 2005; Pradhan, 2008). An in-depth study by Singh (2008) in the case study region of Manali shows how tourism related development could betray the very purpose of tourism by bringing a number of associated problems, and recommended that environmentally and socially unacceptable development should be avoided to ensure the sustainability of the area. Butler (1991) suggested the tourism industry appears as a threat to the environment, in many parts of the world, causing a management problem in the destination areas. As a result, the notion of sustainable development or sustainability emerged as an alternative for tourism development, planning, and management that strives to minimize the adverse environmental and social consequences (Choi & Sirakaya, 2005).

The need for sustainability is critically felt in the case of tourism development, especially so in mountainous regions, as the growth rate of tourism is very high as compared to other sectors of the economy. Being a resource dependent industry, there is urgency for tourism developers, including government, to recognize their responsibility to the environment, and considers the environmental and social domains in order to remain viable in the long run (Horobin & Long, 1996). According to Prosser (1994), there are several social factors such as the dissatisfaction with the existing products, growing environmental concern, cultural sensitivity, realization of vulnerability of the resources by the host communities accompanied with a changing attitude of developers and tourist operators, which have lead to a search for sustainability in tourism. Sustainable tourism is particularly important in the context of mountain environments due to the fragility and vulnerability of mountain ecosystems, which makes them susceptible to degradation from resource use and development, thus requiring and appropriate management (Berkes & Gardner, 1997; Kent, 2005). Moreover, mountain
regions are inhabited by relatively marginalized populations, which are susceptible to social impacts and changes from rapid tourism growth, especially related to drug use and other illegal activities. As well, tourism impacts in the mountains are not only felt in the mountain communities, but also to the adjacent communities directly or indirectly, through water and air pollution, and by other means. Thus, as Price & Kim (1999) suggested, sustainable mountain development should concern both the mountain regions, and the populations living downstream or dependent on these regions. Any development including tourism in the mountains should be done through proper planning giving due consideration to the fragile ecosystems and local communities.

Sustainable tourism development is a multi-disciplinary and broad concept crossing wide range of issues such as environmental, economy, social and political (Tosun, 2001). As Berno & Bricker (2001) argue, the tourism industry is an integrated system in which the constituent parts are linked and often change in one-part affects the other parts. Moreover, the tourism industry includes diversity of stakeholders having different perceptions and interest in tourism development, which at times are often conflicting. Some of the major stakeholders in the tourism sector as identified in various literatures include: tourists (domestic and foreign); tourist businesses (investors, developers, operators, shareholders, management, employees, public and private); and, the host community and the concerned authority or governments. It has been argued that for a successful implementation of sustainable tourism practices involving this wide diversity of stakeholders is critical to success (Liu, 2003). Thus sustainability in tourism represents a wicked problem, where the problem is being influenced by not merely science but also by political and social values, and requires a holistic solution (Balint et al., 2006). The sustainable
development strategy needs to shift towards emphasis on implementation, since many sustainable tourism strategies have been devised, but there are as yet few examples of successful initiatives. This is quite evident in the white paper on Tourism Development and Promotion of 1996. Sustainable tourism development needs to be interpreted in terms of what destinations and the tourism industry can do to implement and operationalise sustainable tourism development (Mann, 2000).

Although societies are able function harmoniously in the presence of tourism, the possibility nevertheless remains that relationships within that society and its lifestyle, customs and traditions may well change as a result of the introduction of visitors with different habits, styles, customs and means of exchange (Weaver & Lawton, 2002). Even if a society survives under these circumstances, its culture can undergo irreversible alterations (Burns & Holden, 1995). Vital to sustainable tourism is responsible behaviour on the part of the visitor and the prevention of any form of distortion of the local culture (Greenwood, 1989; Nash & Smith, 1991; Graburn, 1993). To sustain the host’s desire for tourists to visit and the guests’ desire to return, the negative impacts of cultural tourism must be kept to be minimum through skilled management, an area in which social scientists and anthropologists can offer assistance (Greenwood, 1989; Graburn, 1993; Burns & Holden, 1995; Burns, 1999). Social sustainability is the ability of a community to absorb visitors for either long or short periods of time without being influenced negatively by people different from themselves (in other words, without experiencing social disharmony) or attempting to alleviate any disharmony by adapting their functions or relationships (Weaver & Lawton, 2002). The overuse of sites such as cultural villages and townships can become a particular problem, as has happened with heritage tourism elsewhere in the world. This overuse can result in both damage to buildings and
landscapes and an unsatisfactory experience for visitors (Boniface, 1995). Even if a community could speak with one voice, its ability to control local tourism development would be limited by a number of factors, including the following (Swarbrooke, 1999):

- If a destination community tries to control tourism activities, the power of the tourism industry allows for tour operators simply to move on to another destination where they will not face similar constraints.

- A community may wish to limit the growth in an area, but government policies may require the maximization of the attraction of foreign tourists to the destination to help the balance of payments of the country.

- Externally based organizations may already have a strong voice in the area because of their ownership of local businesses. An example of this would be hotels owned by national hotel chains or transnational companies.

The sustainable approach to tourism planning developed from broader international concerns over ecological issues. The concept of sustainability was formally recognized by the World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) defined sustainable practices as those, which meet the goals of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

According to Cooper (1995), sustainable development has been advocated for the tourism sector as a possible solution to the environmental and social degradation of the industry’s resources and due to the fact that tourism is a resource industry which is dependent on nature’s endowment and society’s heritage. The sustainable approach can also be viewed as an umbrella to some of the ad hoc methods and for this reason has emerged as one of the most comprehensive and accepted tourism
planning approaches. Faulkner (2003) stressed that the achievement of sustainable development objectives hinges on the adoption of a participatory model, involving the meaningful engagement of the community, along with industry stakeholders and relevant government agencies, which in turn will lead to agreement on planning directions and goals. Dutton and Hall (1989) claimed that the sustainable development has led to a need for decision-making bodies such as governments to actively seek and take into account host community attitudes to tourism. The engagement and involvement of multiple stakeholder groups is considered a pivotal issue in a sustainable approach as in typical planning processes stakeholders are consulted minimally near the end of the process, which leaves little chance for meaningful input into the process. A further prerequisite for a sustainable tourism planning approach is the use of strategic planning to supersede conventional planning approaches. Strategy as it applies to sustainable tourism planning and development seeks to achieve three basic strategic objective: conservation of tourism resource values; enhanced experiences of the visitors who interact with tourism resources; and the maximization of the economic, social and environmental returns to stakeholders in the host community. Trousdale (1999) suggested that there is a growing gap between sustainability doctrine and its 'real world' application. That is, despite the widespread acceptance of the sustainability concept, particularly in the academic sector, the question must be asked as to whether the destination planners, managers and industry operators who are making the day-to-day decisions about tourism within their respective destinations, are actually implementing the key principles of sustainable development theory. Therefore this study has sought to examine the extent to which sustainable development principles are integrated into the planning practices of local tourism destinations, and in turn attempt to determine whether tourism destinations are in fact adopting sustainable
approaches to tourism planning and destination management. Similar to the environmental approach, Smith (1996) argued that tourism system is an open system in that it responds to changes in social, natural and economic factors and is evolving into an increasing State of complexity. In addition tourism promotes infrastructure development and the redistribution of resources to further the amelioration of poverty. Wason (1998) identified forty different taxes, which are, in practice, imposed on the tourism industry to boost government revenue. Some of the most common taxes comprises: airport departure taxes, hotel room taxes and visa fees. The level of direct revenue earned by a country depends upon three variables: the number of visitors, average length of stay and average daily expenditure. It is possible for a government to manipulate one or more of the variable in a strategy for maximizing direct revenue from tourists. Andressen & Murphy's (1986) study of two Canadian communities located along major transportation corridors found that the perceived benefits of tourism significantly outweighed its adverse impacts. Authors discovered that the communities location and function as travel corridors did not create social or environmental problems as far as residents were concerned and that residents preferred an increased share of tourism's benefits.

The sustainable tourism development concept embraces a community-oriented approach, encouraging community involvement and participation. Host communities throughout the world play an integral role in the tourism industry. What they typically lack, however, is the power to influence the nature and direction of tourism development (Ashley & Roe, 1998). The level of choice exercised by host communities in becoming a destination is questionable in the case of tourism in general, and particularly so in developing countries. Thus, in worst-case of scenarios, host communities are actively disadvantaged by having tourism occur in their own backyards, which is why the
term ‘host’ can be hotly contested (Singh et al., 2003). For example, in many contexts in South Africa, indigenous peoples have been displaced from land so that national parks or wildlife areas can be created (Keyser, 2002). In such cases the rewards reaped from subsequent tourism development are typically pocketed by outside tourism operators and the government, while local people must deal with diminished livelihood options. Cultural tourism and sustainable tourism are often seen as virtually synonymous. The former is seen as sensitive, soft, intelligent tourism that is complementary to the concept of sustainable tourism (Weaver & Lawton, 2002). However there are several aspects to cultural tourism that may well prevent it from being a sustainable activity in its own right, and may in fact make it incompatible with principles of sustainable tourism.

The concept of sustainable tourism, popularized following the release of the Bruntland report, represents a direct application of the sustainable development concept. Sustainable tourism, in this context, is tourism that meets the needs of present generations without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (Hunter & Green, 1995; Harris et al., 2002). Some commentators, such as McIntyre (1993) and Mowforth and Munt (1998), prefer the term sustainable tourism development, since the term sustainable tourism could imply an emphasis on the well-being of the tourism sector itself, in the sense of ‘sustained tourism’, rather than on the communities where tourism takes place. The term ‘sustainable tourism’, however, is more widely used, with some arguing that the concept of sustainable tourism should take into account the sustainability of tourism as well as that of the local community (McIntyre, 1993). This contention is based on the argument that the term is meaningless if there is no tourism sector to which the adjective sustainable can be attached (Hunter, 1995). As with sustainable development, the label
‘sustainable tourism’ is susceptible to appropriation by those pursuing a particular political agenda (Weaver & Lawton, 2002). Sustainable tourism embraces a community-oriented approach, encouraging community involvement and participation (Keyser, 2002). Keyser (2002:381) notes that definitions of sustainable tourism emphasize three fundamental feature:

- Quality Sustainable tourism involved providing quality experiences for visitors, while improving the quality of life of the host community.

- Continuity Sustainable tourism ensures the continuity of the natural resources upon which it is based, and the continuity of the culture of the host communities.

- Balance Sustainable tourism balances the needs of the tourism industry, supporters of the environment, and the local community.

According to Ritchie and Crouch (2003), the social dimension of tourism has received little attention in impact studies, compared with the attention paid to the environmental impact of tourism. Socio-cultural impacts usually occur slowly over time and tend to be invisible and intangible (Mathieson & Wall, 1982). Swarbrooke (1999) notes that the social impact of tourism is usually permanent, or all but impossible to reverse. All the stakeholders in tourism are interrelated, and indeed interdependent, each with both rights and responsibilities that need to be recognized. The researcher believes that it is necessary to recognize that sustainable tourism may be an impossible dream, and the best hope for is to develop sustainable forms of tourism. This may be because tourism is inherently non-sustainable, or because unforeseen future political, economic, social and technological change may make current approaches to sustainable tourism management obsolete (Bramwell et al., 1996; Ashley & Roe, 1998). We must recognize that sustainable
tourism is an overtly political subject, in that it concerns the distribution of resources, both present and in future (Timothy, 1998). The fact that some people will gain and some people will lose as a result of sustainable tourism means that it is inherently political, and its political nature means that sustainable tourism is about who has the power—host communities, governments, the industry or the tourists (Richards & Hall, 2000).

Responsible Tourism as a concept has gained much momentum in the 1990's and is quite synonymous with the concept of sustainable tourism development, alternative tourism, ecotourism and green tourism. Responsible tourism is seen as a positive approach by tourism industry partners to develop, market, and manage the tourism industry in a responsible manner, to create a competitive advantage. According to the Responsible Tourism Handbook (2003) and the South African White Paper on Responsible tourism implies:

Tourism industry responsibility to the environment, through the promotion of balanced and sustainable tourism, and a focus on environmentally based tourism activities;

Responsibility of government and business to involve the local communities that are in close proximity to tourism plant and attractions, through the development of meaningful economic linkages;

The responsibility of local communities to become actively involved in the tourism industry, to practice sustainable development, and to ensure the safety and security of visitors; Responsibility to respect, invest and develop local cultures and protect them from over-commercialization and over-exploitation. Responsible Tourism is a concept underpinned by sound environmental, social and economic principles, offering a way to minimize environmental and cultural impacts, by benefiting local
communities and reducing poverty (SA Hospitality Industry Responsible Tourism Guide, 2002). This includes private sector, government, local communities, disadvantage communities, minority groups, consumers, NGO's, the media, employees and others. Singh (2001) asserted that despite the negative impacts, tourism provides a powerful stimulus to development. Hence, developed and developing countries are all desperately trying to promote tourism. But mass tourism has been linked to negative environmental impacts. Author Supported community based and human centered tourism arguing that such tourism might protect local cultures and ensure sustainability by encouraging environmentally-friendly activities.

This discussed the possibilities for destination communities to play a management role in responsible tourism. It was shown that economic gains do not always compensate for the social, cultural and environmental impacts of tourism in destination communities. The tourism industry in many countries is dominated by foreign ownership and capital, with little meaningful local involvement. There is nevertheless a strong rationale for host communities to play a role in managing tourism.

2.5 COMMUNITY AND TOURISM

According to Ap (1992), in developing and attracting tourism to a community, the goal is to achieve outcomes that obtain the best balance of benefits and costs for both residents and tourism actors. Thus, it is assumed that host resident actors seek tourism development for their community in order to satisfy their economic, social and psychological needs and to improve the community’s well being.

The type of tourist very often influences residents’ attitude towards tourism impacts. Cohen (1972) examined tourism growth from the angle of varying traveler characteristics. He classified tourist experiences and roles as follows: the non-institutionalized
(explorers and drifters) and the institutionalized (individual and organized mass tourists). Each of these types has different impacts on host societies. Similarly, Smith (1978) linked community impact from tourism development in terms of waves of tourist types. She identified seven tourist types in order of expanding community impacts, and increasing tourist flow. She also suggested that independent travelers and explorers, are more likely to directly experience local culture and lifestyles, and impact less on the community, compared to package tourists. Cohen (1972) and Smith (1978), although they identified that each type of tourists has different impacts on the host community, they failed to incorporate the stages of development experienced by a community and as a result to explain why certain destinations fail or succeed.

The most common governance tool used in tourism development that can incorporate public participation is Environment Impact Assessment. It is a forward-looking process aimed at identifying potential project impact before a project is undertaken (Sinclair & Diduck, 2009). Environment Impact Assessment is only used for particular tourism components including mega tourism development project like resorts, hotels, ski hills and other infrastructures, and does not replace the need for broader strategic planning. The need of impact assessment for sustainable tourism development has also been emphasized by the UN Guidelines on Integrated Planning for Sustainable Tourism Development (1999) as follows: there is a definite need for impact assessment of tourism development proposals. The capacity of sites must be considered, including physical, natural, social, and cultural limits and development should be compatible with local and environmental limits. Plans and operations should be evaluated regularly with adjustments as required. Kent (2005) in her research on adventure tourism suggested that for a small-scale tourism development project, a community-based
environmental assessment that implements and monitors the plans involving all the potential stakeholders as a suitable option for impact assessment. Though Environment Impact Assessment has been a pre-requisite for large-scale tourism projects in developed countries, many developing nations still lack the provision of Environment Impact Assessment for tourism projects (Butler, 1993). Public participation is an essential element at several stages of Environment Impact Assessment process like screening, scoping, report preparation and decision-making (Wood, 1995). The benefits of Environment Impact Assessment public participation includes providing access to local and traditional knowledge, identifying wide range of potential solutions that leads to more effective, timely and cost effective decisions (Webler et. Al., 1995; Palern, 2000; Sinclair & Diduck, 2000). Wild (1998) emphasized that a multi-stakeholder approach to Environment Impact Assessment with a strong public participation component is necessary for achieving sustainable development in the tourism industry. Though Environment Impact Assessment is an effective tool for potential stakeholder participation in developed countries as Paliwal (2005) argued, such an effective participation might be difficult to attain in developing countries, because of the societal and economic reasons. Inaccessibility to information, lack of proper knowledge on Environment Assessment process, and lack of institutional capacity are identified as the major barriers for effective participation in Environment Impact Assessment in developing nations (Sinclair & Diduck, 2000).

Caneday & Zeiger (1991) discovered that the more money residents made in tourism-development jobs, the less likely they were to identify negative impacts. In addition, the more education tourism-employed residents had, the more likely they were to find negative impacts. Conversely, the more education gained by entrepreneurs not employed in tourism, the less recognition they
had of tourism impacts. The authors related this finding to the
fact that this group did not directly attribute negative social,
economic and environmental impacts to the gambling industry.
Archer and Fletcher (1988 & 1996) stressed on the concept of
the multiplier analysis which is based upon the recognition that
the tourism impact is not restricted in the initial consumption of
goods and services but also arises through the calculation of the
direct and secondary effects created by additional tourism
expenditure within the economy. There are four different types of
tourism multipliers application in common use (Jackson, 1986;
Fletcher and Archer, 1991) : sales or transactions, output,
income and employment. The extent of the multiplier depends on
the size, structure and diversity of the local economy.

In an attempt to eliminate environmental costs, many
countries have included in their legislation Environmental Impact
Assessment for all projects, including tourism. The aim is to
predict the environmental consequences of a proposed
development activity, and to ensure that potential risks are
foreseen and necessary measures to avoid, mitigate or
compensate for environmental damage are identified (Green and
Hunter, 1993). According to Cooper et al. (1998) the socio-
cultural impacts of tourism are the most difficult to measure and
quantify, because they are often highly qualitative and subjective
in nature. There are two methods for collecting information for
social impact measurement:

- Primary research through surveys of interviews including
  attitudinal surveys, the Delphi technique and participant
  observation (Crandall,1994); and

- The analysis of secondary sources found in government
  records, public documents and newspapers.
A SWOT analysis of Environment Impact Assessment process in India conducted by Paliwal (2005) identified inadequate public participation as one of the weaknesses of this process. Unlike developed countries, public hearing in India is conducted just before making decisions and people’s input during public hearing are not taken into account in the planning and decision-making (Paliwal, 2005; Dhutta, 2009). Dhutta (2009) criticized the provision of public participation in current Environment Impact Assessment system as being guided by the ‘investor friendly’ approach rather than a pro-people and pro-environment emphasis. Paliwal (2005) suggested a number of improvements in the Indian Environment Impact Assessment system including: increasing accountability, proper management of baseline data, improving monitoring and implementation, building stakeholder capacity, and integrating environmental concerns in plans and policy.

In context of tourism industry, in case of India, Environment Impact Assessment is limited to few categories of projects, and is not mandatory for tourism development projects despite the potential for profound environmental and social strains. However, due to the potential negative impacts of development in high mountain areas, tourism project between 200m to 500 meters of High Tide Line or located at an elevation of more than 1000 meters and with costs of development exceeding Rs.50 million requires an environmental clearance from the Central government (Government of India, 1994). According to Cooper et al. (1998) the socio-cultural impacts of tourism are the most difficult to measure and quantify, because they are often highly qualitative and subjective in nature. There are two methods for collecting information for social impact measurement:
• Primary research through surveys of interviews including attitudinal surveys, the Delphi technique and participant observation (Crandall, 1994); and

• The analysis of secondary sources found in government records, public documents and newspapers.

The idea of community involvement as a cornerstone of sustainable tourism is problematic (Reed, 1997). Communities are rarely homogeneous, and thus will rarely take a single homogeneous view on any issue. There is a need to develop mechanisms for arbitrating the conflicting views on any issue. There is a need to develop mechanisms for arbitrating the conflicting views concerning tourism that will emerge in any community. Tourism management should not allow articulate minorities to dominate the process to the exclusion of other citizens; sustainable tourism is thus about stakeholders whose interests have to be balanced (Rechard & Hall, 2000).

Swarbrook (1999) notes that in some instances the community may wish to pursue policies that run counter to sustainable tourism; it cannot thus be assumed that community involvement will automatically ensure more sustainable forms of tourism. Pearce et al. (1996) proposed the idea of social representation in tourism and suggested that it can be used to understand the emerging social views and subjective cultures of developing tourism communities, as well as voicing community input into the shaping of sustainable tourism development. As Schroeder (1996) suggested, residents can help the building of a propitious image through their contact with tourists. The opposite can occur when the host population proceeds to anti-tourist protests to incoming tourists, something that will affect negatively visitors' satisfaction and the extent of repeat visitation.

According to Phillips (1994) and Andriotis et al. (1999). It is important to realize that local communities are not fixed in their attitudes, nor are they likely to share identical attitudes. Liu
(2003) and Butler (1999) suggested, in addition to promoting small-scale environmentally sound tourism ventures, it is also equally important to ensure sustainability of existing mass tourism. This is relevant, particularly in developing nations like India, where tourism is promoted widely as a driver for economic development. While tourism development is taking place rapidly, the issues of public participation, especially the local or community participation in tourism development process is pertinent. A greater level of community participation in tourism planning and decision-making is viewed as a prerequisite for sustainable tourism (Liu, 2003), yet few have considered this need in the developing world context. Such participation is deemed to ensure benefit sharing, create transparency, develop positive attitudes towards tourism development, minimize the potential negative impacts on the local community and environment, and facilitate implementation of principles of sustainable tourism development (Tosun, 2006).

Painter (1992) observed three types of participation: pseudo where attempts are made to offer a feeling of community participation, mainly restricted to informing and endorsement, partial where community is given some opportunities to influence the development process, but the final decisions are taken from the authorities, and full where each individual has equal influence on the outcome of the process. Through participation, communities can shape their own lives and the society they want to live in and how to sell it (Timothy, 1998). Communities are the destination of most travelers, and therefore tourism industry development and management must be brought effectively to bear in communities (Blank, 1989). According to Hall (2000) community participation in tourism planning is a bottom-up form of planning which emphasizes development in the community rather than development of the community. Since each group of people has different needs and receives different costs and
benefits from tourism development, they can have different views towards the development of their community (WTO, 1993). Thus, it might be appropriate to involve the community in the development process. When communities do not have input into the process they feel they lose control of their communities, as they may prefer resources in ways that will protect their environment and culture (Holland and Crotts, 1992; Thomlison and Getz, 1996). Undoubtedly, 'bottom-up' input together with 'top-down' is the best way to avoid confrontation and achieve harmonious development (Pigram, 1990). Only through the cooperation of businesses, citizens, local authorities and governmental and non-agencies, can a balanced tourism development be achieved. Prentice (1993) and Sharpley (1994) note that the community approach to tourism development in its original form was, in effect, the precursor of what has become sustainable tourism development. Fundamental to this approach is the recognition that a thriving and healthy tourism industry depends upon an equally healthy and thriving local community (Tosun, 1999, 2000). It is the local community that benefits from tourism but, at the same time, it is the local community that bears the costs of tourism and has to pick up the pieces once the tourists have gone (Haywood, 1998; Jurowski, 1997; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000). Tourism is a resource industry, and local communities are as much a resource, or part of the tourism product, as are tourist facilities and attractions.

The basic requirement for the community approach to tourism development is that all members of communities in tourist destination areas, rather than just those directly involved in the tourism industry, should be involved in the management and planning of tourism (Murphy, 1985; Haywood, 1988; Jurowski, 1997; Ashley & Roe, 1998; Mann, 2000). Pearce et al. (1996) include the education of both local people and communities, community ownership of tourist facilities, the
facilitation of local residents’ way of life and the undertaking of constant monitoring and research as equally essential ingredients of community-based tourism development. The purpose of this approach is to ensure that the objectives of tourism development coincide with the community’s wider social and economic goals, that the tourism industry gives back to the community while extracting a living from it, and that both the industry and its community base can benefit mutually from a long-term partnership (Pearce et al., 1996; Richards & Hall, 2000; Scheyvens, 2002).

Ritchie (1988) argued that attitudes towards tourism development may be due to several factors. In an attempt to investigate these factors, he divided the total population into subgroups. Such a method enables planners to appeal to, and enlist the support of highly positive segments of people. Conversely, it permits the anticipation of points of resistance which need to be addressed if tourism development is to go ahead successfully. Positive attitudes from residents increase with an individual’s economic and/or employment dependency of tourism (Rothman, 1978; Thomason et al. 1979; Snaith and Haley, 1994; 1999). Belisle and Hoy (1980) found that the greater the distance from the development, the more negative the attitudes toward tourism. Duffield and Long (1981) illustrated that communities with a small tourists-residents ratio tend to be positive about tourism. Thus, as tourist development increases and becomes pervasive, the level of satisfaction in the local community correspondingly decreases. Allen et al. (1988) compared the impact of tourism development on resident’s perceptions in 20 rural communities and found that lower to moderate levels of tourism development appeared beneficial, but as tourism development increased, perceptions of residents took a downward trend. Therefore, Doxey (1975); Dogan (1989); Ryan et al. (1998) suggested that in the initial stages of tourism
development, residents have a favourable opinion of tourism, but end up with a negative outlook. Pearce et al. (1996) asserted that communities having little contact with others, have greater difficulty in dealing with tourism than those with a longer history of dealing with other culture. They have identified additional single factors. They include: occupational status, number of minors in the family, size of household, length of residence, resident’s involvement in tourism decision-making. Birthplace, perceived impacts on local outdoor recreation opportunities, voting/political patterns and differences in perceptions between those living in the less developed peripheral areas and those living in the capital city. Similarly, although residents’ image of their community may be used to explain their attitudes to tourism development. Alternatively, research on tourism image has been focused on the influence of destination image on tourism behaviour and choice (Hunt, 1975; Gartner, 1986; Phelps, 1986). Hunt (1975) defined tourism image as the impression held by people about a State in which they do not reside. However, it is important for planners to investigate the opinion of people on their state’s image, in order to achieve their support on tourism development. Schroeder (1996) suggested that residents of North Dakota indicating a more positive image were more likely to recommend their area to others and be more supportive of State funding for the promotion and development of tourism. Residents of Texas who are satisfied with and proud of their community’s image, are willing to work hard to maintain it. Compliments from outsiders can affect residents’ perception of their own community and can ultimately influence their behaviour (Huang and Stewart, 1996). Residents attitudes have also been investigated using multiple factor studies, which acknowledge that residents attitudes are made up of both positive and negative perceptions of the economic, social and environmental implications of tourism development. Thus, such studies have attempted to classify people according to the extent to which overall perceptions are
positive or negative; whilst accepting that they are made up of negative and positive perceptions of different intensity (Andriotis et al., 1999). According to Madrigal (1995) residents are forced to take some kind of position on development. Residents who share perceptions may be considered part of the same nested community, whereas residents with competing views of development belong to different nested communities. Belisle and Hoy, (1980) have attributed the positive attitudes of residents toward tourism to a function of the incipient stage of tourism development. Consequently, in order to investigate all the aspects of tourism impacts through the stages of development, Brougham and Butler (1981) asserted that an ideal investigation of the social, cultural and economic effects of the tourist industry would need to look at a destination area before and after the appearance of visitors and their associated phenomena. Doxey (1975) investigated changes in residents' attitudes as a community moves from a discovery stage to moderate and finally to full tourism development. In particular, he asserted that community residents' attitudes pass through a predictable sequence of stages from euphoria in which residents are enthusiastic about tourism development and welcome strangers, to apathy, and form annoyance to antagonism in which irritation is expressed and outsiders are seen as the cause of all problem.

Tourism development must respect the needs of the local communities and should be done for triggering benefits to the communities where the development occurs. Tourism development done without considering the benefits for local communities will provoke conflict and hinder development in that destination. This is evident in the powerful movement of of Adivasi (tribal) communities against the establishment of a popular Indian chain hotel in Nagarhole National Park in southern India, as it displaced the tribal communities and restricts access to resources (Shekhar, 2003). The government's approval of a
tourism development proposal from outside investors without giving due consideration to local needs has provoked conflict and protest within the local communities. Shekhar's (2003) studies on the local people's attitude toward wildlife tourism in Sariska Tiger Reserve in India also shows that 63% of the residents were unhappy with the inequalities of tourism, and expressed that their involvement in tourism development is not adequate.

It has been argued that communities participation in tourism development is highly essential in order to provide equitable of local economic benefits. Communities participation in tourism development will ensure benefit-sharing transparency in development activities, and minimize probable negative impacts on the local community and environment. As Kapoor (2001) suggested public involvement is as an important tool for developing ownership, partnership, understanding, and commitment. Thus a participatory development approach creates income-generating opportunities for local people, develops positive attitudes towards tourism development, and facilitates implementation of principles of sustainable tourism development (Tosun, 2006). Tosun (1999) developed a typology for community participation for tourism development. He classified three types of community participation designed specifically for tourism development.

Spontaneous participation in Tosun's typology represents an ideal model for community participation in tourism development that provides full managerial responsibilities and authority to the host community. The induced type of participation represents a top-down, passive and indirect type of participation. This type of participation allows the general public to voice their opinion, but their opinions are often not taken into account by other powerful interest groups like the government, tour operators, multinational companies etc. This type of participation in tourism is more prevalent in developing countries. Instead of
enabling the local people to participate in the tourism development process, this type of participation is directed towards fostering and developing tourism with a vested interest of the power holders (Tosun, 2006). Community participation in tourism development, however, is confronted with operational, structural and cultural barriers) (Tosun, 2000). Stewart & Sinclair (2007) argued that participants often criticize public participation processes as dissatisfying, time consuming, costly, and inefficient.

Tourism is an economic activity in the sense that tourists are willing to spend money in return for certain goods and services, and organizations and businesses provide those goods and services at a profit. Under such circumstances, balanced and harmonious tourist-host relationships can occur only when the tourism product is small scale, locally owned and controlled, and not the major source of income and employment for the local community (Murphy,1985; Haywood,1988; Mann,2000). As soon as the hosts become dependent, either on tourists or on outside organizations, a form of exploitation results. The tourist-host relationship becomes based upon conflict and the local community begins to suffer from the social and cultural impacts of tourism. Gursoy & Jurowski (2002) found that local, heavy users of the area had negative perceptions of tourism's benefits and were not likely to support tourism development. The authors asserted that negative perceptions might be the result of residents' fear that if visitors increase, ability to use the recreation area might be impaired. Authors concluded that tourism planning should include protecting residents' use of the recreation area or enhance their ability to use it. Howie (2003) proposed the essential actions to tourism destination management which focus on tourist-oriented development:

- Convert resources with potential into attraction
- Provide an appropriate range of tourist accommodation and
- transport to from and within destination.
- Ensure the successful integration of the tourist-related developments into the changing activity patterns of the place an a long-term sustainable basis.

Planning is about setting and meeting objectives. Although various approaches have been developed in general planning, e.g. integrated, interactive, collaborative, bottom-up etc. The encouragement of the involvement and the active participation of the local community in the planning process are of the primary importance for keeping the control of the tourism industry in the hands of the local population and achieving a balanced tourism development. Early tourism research (Ogilvie, 1933; Alexander, 1953) into the outcomes of tourism planning was restricted primarily to the measurement of the economic impacts for destination areas, due to the ease with which economic impacts may be measured, compared to environmental and social impacts (Mathieson & Wall, 1982; Kontogeorgopoulos, 1988; Archer & Cooper, 1998) and the attempt of local governments to optimize economic benefits. Community involvement in tourism can be viewed from two perspectives: in the benefits of tourism development and in the decision-making process (McIntosh and Goeldner, 1986). For residents to receive benefits from tourism development they must be given opportunities to participate in, and gain financially from, tourism (Timothy, 1999). However, benefits from tourism are often concentrated in the hands of a limited number of people who have the capital to invest in tourism at the expense of other segments of the community (e.g. lower class, uneducated and poor people). Therefore, Vivian (1992) found many traditional societies repressive since they often exclude large numbers of people from the development and planning process. Brohman (1996) proposed that tourism benefits and costs should be distributed more equally within the local community, allowing a larger proportion of the local
population to benefit from tourism expansion, rather than merely bearing the burden of its costs.

Community participation in planning and decision-making level for tourism development is vital as the people who enjoy or suffer the main impacts of tourism are those who live in the communities in tourist destination areas (Tosun, 2000). As Murphy (1988) emphasized, tourism relies on the cooperation and goodwill of local people; therefore, any development and planning must fit within local aspirations and capacity for successful implementation. Thus, the success of any plan in tourism depends upon the degree of community participation in the decision-making level.

Tosun (2000) argues that the cases of participatory tourism development examined in developing nations represents a manipulative participation or passive participation, and there is no evidence that shows that participation moves beyond community consultation or manipulative participation. Painter (1992) identified three major form of community participation:

- Information exchange. The outcome of the process is determined by the available information, e.g. through surveys on community opinions, public hearings and media representations.
- Negotiation through face-to-face contact and public discussions between a usually small number of individuals and the public authority.
- Protest. In this case, there are oppositional direct actions, rather than co-operative forms of participation, such as demonstrations, strikes and blocking traffic.

Murphy (1983 &1985) and Joppe, (1996) emphasized community development on an ecosystem approach. They suggested that since the host community is the destination in which individual, business and government goals become the
tangible tourist products and images of the industry the ecosystem approach ensure that all interested parties truly have the opportunity to shape the outcome by determining the process. Murphy (1985) paid attention to the opinions of the local population and indicated that since tourism involves putting the whole community on show, including its residents, it needs to consider and involve the same residents in the planning and management decisions. Concurrently, he identified the limit of a community's carrying capacity in the planning process. Haywood (1988) observed that tourism and tourists are consumers and users of community resources, therefore, community is a commodity. The naturalness of the community, its way of life, its institutions, and its culture are bought and sold. In fact some communities are internationally planned and constructed for consumption by tourists.

Potter (1999) remarked that although since the 1970s various agencies have promoted community participation in practice most of the time community participation has little influence in policy making. Likewise, Dowling (1993) remarked that although research into community attitudes towards tourism is reasonably well-developed, incorporation of such views into the planning process is far less common. On the other hand, although there is evidence that informed citizens are willing to be involved in the development process and the future of their communities (Keogh, 1990), past experience in planning has observed that communities have limited knowledge of tourism development.

There are occasions where the government (which very often has the role of planner and developer) is unwilling to negotiate on particular problems for political reasons or because of other interests (Pearce et al., 1996). Inskeep (1991) disapproved of the reluctance of some governments to pursue community involvement and noted: planning is for the residents of an area, and they should be given the opportunity to participate in
the planning of its future development and express their views on the type of future community they want to live in. Only by having the locals on their side can tourist shop to cohabit peacefully; and only then host community can make sure that the environment to which tourists were attracted in the first place will be safeguarded for the lasting economic well-being of the local people, and for the enjoyment of a continuity influx of tourists (Dogart and Dogart, 1996). A number of factors may be found that hinder and constrain participatory development. Botes and van Rensburg (2000) identified that these obstacles may be external, internal and a combination of both. As they are: External obstacles refer to those factors outside the end-beneficiary community that inhibit or prevent true community participation taking place. External obstacles suggested the role of development professionals, the broader government orientation towards promoting participation, the tendency among development agencies to apply selective participation, and their techno-financial bias. Internal obstacles refer to conflicting interest in groups, gate keeping by local elites, and alleged lack of public interest in becoming involved. Some of the obstacles such as excessive pressures for immediate result and techno-financial bias include both internal and external characteristics.

According to Shepherd and Bowler (1997) many community members may lack specific expertise or education and, therefore, their participation may be considered unnecessary. Timothy (1999) gave an explanation for limited involvement of the community in the decision-making process during the infancy of the tourism industry in many developing countries indicating that there is little experience and knowledge of the industry's dynamics by community members. Tosun (2000) identified as a limitation of community participation in developing countries the requirement of costly administrative procedures (time, organizational skill and money). There is the fear that community
involvement may delay schedules of plans or may force developers to revise projects (Jenkins, 1993; Shepherd and Bowler, 1997). Since resources are scare in many developing countries, developers and planners prefer to allocate them to physical investment rather than to bureaucratic formalities. Hall (2000) identified as a problem in the incorporation of the community to tourism planning the structure of the government. As he mentioned the nature of systems of governance led to difficulties in ensuring that tourism policies at different levels of government are adequately coordinated and decisions and policies at one level are not at odds with decisions at another. Often authorities cannot reject or oppose decisions undertaken by transnational tourism organizations because of the fear that they will lose economic returns. As a result, the tourism industry often is controlled by outsiders. Tosun (2000) asserted that public bodies may not want to spend their limited financial resources on organizing community participation whose benefits appears to be relatively long term. Private sector may avoid practicing participatory tourism development strategy since it involves contradictory investment criteria. In addition, community participation may lead to conflicting objectives amongst the local aims (WTO, 1994). Concern is also being expressed that participation will not obtain a representative or collective community view, and residents are often skeptical of community involvement, for past practice has tended to be ineffective in their empowerment to affect decisions, and use time wisely (Godfrey, 1993). Moreover, it should be considered that many community members may be more interested in their own interest rather than their community’s. According to Phillips (1994) and Andriotis et al. (1999). It is important to realize that local communities are not fixed in their attitudes, nor are they likely to share identical attitudes. Ritchie (1988) argued that attitudes towards tourism development may be due to several factors. In an attempt to investigate these factors, he divided the total population into
subgroups. Such a method enables planners to appeal to, and enlist the support of highly positive segments of people. Conversely, it permits the anticipation of points of resistance which need to be addressed if tourism development is to go ahead successfully. Positive attitudes from residents increase with an individual's economic and/or employment dependency of tourism (Rothman, 1978; Thomason et al. 1979; Snaith and Haley, 1994; 1999). Belisle and Hoy (1980) found that the greater the distance from the development, the more negative the attitudes toward tourism. Duffield and Long (1981) illustrated that communities with a small tourists-residents ratio tend to be positive about tourism. Thus, as tourist development increases and becomes pervasive, the level of satisfaction in the local community correspondingly decreases. Allen et al. (1988) compared the impact of tourism development on resident's perceptions in 20 rural communities and found that lower to moderate levels of tourism development appeared beneficial, but as tourism development increased, perceptions of residents took a downward trend. Therefore, Doxey (1975); Dogan (1989); Ryan et al. (1998) suggested that in the initial stages of tourism development, residents have a favourable opinion of tourism, but end up with a negative outlook. Pearce et al. (1996) asserted that communities having little contact with others, have greater difficulty in dealing with tourism than those with a longer history of dealing with other culture. They have identified additional single factors. They include: occupational status, number of minors in the family, size of household, length of residence, resident's involvement in tourism decision-making. Birthplace, perceived impacts on local outdoor recreation opportunities, voting/political patterns and differences in perceptions between those living in the less developed peripheral areas and those living in the capital city. Similarly, although residents' image of their community may be used to explain their attitudes to tourism development. Alternatively, research on tourism image has been
focused on the influence of destination image on tourism behaviour and choice (Hunt, 1975; Gartner, 1986; Phelps, 1986).

Milman and Pizam (1988) found that residents of Florida believed that tourism development had improved their own image of their area. Schroeder (1996) suggested that residents of North Dakota indicating a more positive image were more likely to recommend their area to others and be more supportive of State funding for the promotion and development of tourism. Residents of Texas who are satisfied with and proud of their community's image, are willing to work hard to maintain it. Compliments from outsiders can affect residents' perception of their own community and can ultimately influence their behaviour (Huang and Stewart, 1996). Residents attitudes have also been investigated using multiple factor studies, which acknowledge that residents attitudes are made up of both positive and negative perceptions of the economic, social and environmental implications of tourism development. Thus, such studies have attempted to classify people according to the extent to which overall perceptions are positive or negative; whilst accepting that they are made up of negative and positive perceptions of different intensity (Andriotis et al., 1999). According to Madrigal (1995) residents are forced to take some kind of position on development. Residents who share perceptions may be considered part of the same nested community, whereas residents with competing views of development belong to different nested communities. Belisle and Hoy, (1980) have attributed the positive attitudes of residents toward tourism to a function of the incipient stage of tourism development. Consequently, in order to investigate all the aspects of tourism impacts through the stages of development, Brougham and Butler (1981) asserted that an ideal investigation of the social, cultural and economic effects of the tourist industry would need to look at a destination area before and after the
appearance of visitors and their associated phenomena. The type of tourist very often influences residents’ attitude towards tourism impacts. **Cohen (1972)** examined tourism growth from the angle of varying traveler characteristics. He classified tourist experiences and roles as follows: the non-institutionalized (explorers and drifters) and the institutionalized (individual and organized mass tourists). Each of these types has different impacts on host societies. Similarly, **Smith (1978)** linked community impact from tourism development in terms of waves of tourist types. She identified seven tourist types in order of expanding community impacts, and increasing tourist flow. She also suggested that independent travelers and explorers, are more likely to directly experience local culture and lifestyles, and impact less on the community, compared to package tourists. **Cohen (1972)** and **Smith (1978)**, although they identified that each type of tourists has different impacts on the host community, they failed to incorporate the stages of development experienced by a community and as a result to explain why certain destinations fail or succeed. **Doxey (1975)** investigated changes in residents’ attitudes as a community moves from a discovery stage to moderate and finally to full tourism development. In particular, he asserted that community residents’ attitudes pass through a predictable sequence of stages from euphoria in which residents are enthusiastic about tourism development and welcome strangers, to apathy, and form annoyance to antagonism in which irritation is expressed and outsiders are seen as the cause of all problem.

Participation in tourism development refers to the involvement of the residents in decision-making about the types of tourism development that might occur in their region, and the involvement of residents in the tourism activities developed in order for them to gain economic benefits from tourism (**Timothy, 1999**). Much of the recent research on tourism in developing
nations focused on community based tourism development, which considered the sharing of tourism benefits. Local participation in tourism planning and decision-making in tourism development process is often ignored, and research to determine the significance of local people's input in the decision-making level is limited. Provisions of public participation in decision-making and planning in tourism development projects are ensured at the policy-level in the case of developed nations (Butler, 1993). In developing nations tourism development refers to initiating plans and programs through the development of various forms of infrastructures. This type of development is perceived as a means of generating wealth, creating jobs, enhancing living standards and increasing national economic security. However, development also uses the environment for commercial purposes that destroy its values and generate conflicts within the communities who depend on it for subsistence living (Sexena, 2008). Development will trigger dissimilar effects on different social groups depending on the interests and the role they hold in the society. As Author argues each social groups tends to interpret development in terms of how its interests can be served and how the distribution of benefits would affect it. In reality, development in most developing nations often serves the interest of dominant social and economic groups. Therefore, development should advocate inclusive participation in decision making so that those who are adversely affected will also have a say.

Participation has been found to be crucial to the success of development as it increases efficiency, build trust and understanding at the local level, and create transparency and accountability (Pretty, 1995; Kapoor, 2001; Webler et al., 2001). It is also a fundamental right that will initiate collective action, empowerment as well as institutional building (Pretty, 1995). Theoretically public participation in any development is done with an objective minimize the impact of such development on the
society or the general public. However, in reality an effective public participation is still lacking, especially in developing nations, because of the bureaucratic barriers that usually originates from the existing traditional top down approaches (Briffet, 1999). The growing concern over the need of public participation in decision-making has been attributed to several factors. Some of the factors identified in various literature includes the growing gap of understanding between the public and officials, legalized provision of public participation, the complex and uncertain nature of the problems, uncertainty of risks associated with development, and the recognition that any kind of decision should consider the inherent social and political values rather than being purely scientific (Balint et al., 2006).

Empowerment is not an easily defined concept, yet it is a term that has been enthusiastically adopted by agencies with diverse social and political aims because it is both attractive and seen as politically correct. Empowerment should be a precursor to community involvement in tourism, as it is a means to determine and achieve socio-economic objectives. The local community needs to be empowered to decide what forms of tourism they want to be developed in their respective communities, and how the tourism costs and benefits are to be shared among different stakeholders (Scheyvens, 2002; Singh, et al., 2003). A framework that specifies four dimensions of empowerment (economic, social, psychological and political) helps explain what empowerment can mean for host communities involved in tourism, as well as how disempowerment may manifest itself (Scheyvens, 2002). It is demonstrates multiple ways in which communities need to be empowered if they are to have at least some management control over tourism and secure maximum benefits from engaging in tourism initiatives (Singh et al., 2003). Economic gains from involvement in both formal and informal sector activities can lead to empowerment for host
communities, but what is more important than the total amount of these economic benefits is the spread of the benefits. For a community to be economically empowered it will need secure access to productive resources in a tourism area. This is particularly important in the case of common property resources and in situations where protected areas have been established. Social empowerment refers to a situation in which a community's sense of cohesion and integrity has been confirmed or strengthened through its involvement in tourism. Social empowerment perhaps most clearly results from tourism when profits are used to fund social development projects identified by the community, such as water supply systems or clinics in the local area (Scheyvens, 2002). Social disempowerment may occur if tourism results in crime, begging, perceptions of crowding, displacement from traditional lands, loss of authenticity or restitution and inequities in the distribution of the benefits of tourism (Timothy, 1999). Psychological empowerment should ideally mean that a community’s confidence in its ability to participate equitably and effectively in tourism planning, development and management is maximized (Scheyvens, 2002).

According to Scheyvens (2002), a host community that is optimistic about the future, has faith in the abilities of its residents. A community that is relatively self-reliant, and demonstrates pride in its traditions and culture, can be said to be psychologically powerful. Tourism that is sensitive to cultural norms and builds respect for local traditions can, therefore, be empowering for local people. Preservation of tradition is extremely important in terms of maintaining a group’s sense of self-esteem and well-being (Singh et al., 2003). Scheyvens (2002) asserts that it is at this level of empowerment that the issue of community management of tourism most clearly comes to the fore. Once community members are politically empowered by involvement in tourism, their voice and concerns guide the
development of any tourism initiative from the feasibility stage through to its implementation. A community is usually diverse in terms of class, gender, caste, age and ethnicity, so it is important that democratic structures that encourage the involvement of a range of interest groups are in place (Timothy, 1999). Forming organizations, or working through traditional organizations structures, can certainly help communities gain greater control over tourist development in their areas and give them political strength to deal with outsiders, including the private sector and government officials (Ashley & Garland, 1994). Studied by Britton and Clarke (1987), Opperman (1993), and Dahles and Bras (1999) reveal that small-scale initiatives have gained much support in discussions of community involvement in tourism because these initiatives are more likely to be owned and managed locally, and thus provide greater local benefits than tourism enterprises controlled by outsiders. Essentially, when local people can meet many of the needs of tourists themselves, they are more likely to retain some control over tourism (Opperman, 1993; Dalhles & Bras, 1999). Controlling one’s own enterprise is a positive step in the direction of self-determination for people otherwise dependent on the tourism industry for menial jobs or handouts, and is more likely to lead to self-fulfillment. If tourism moves ‘up scale’ in an area, local people can lose important economic advantages as well as control over tourism enterprises (Thomlinson & Getz, 1996). While community enterprises certainly offer opportunities for residents to manage tourism on their own terms, other configurations, such as joint ventures with private sector partners, also enable host communities to play a management role (Ashley & Roe, 1998). Whether destination communities always see small-scale or alternative forms of tourism as preferable to mass or luxury tourism should also be questioned. Thomlison & Getz (1996) argue that while small-scale tourism is perceived to fit in well with the philosophy of alternative tourism, in practice mass tourism
may be the preferred option if it brings in more money to local communities. Some communities may prefer mass tourism that involves, for example, one bus load of tourists arriving per day at a set time for a cultural performance and to buy crafts and then returning to their hotels, rather than tourism where outsiders come to stay in their village, as the latter is more culturally invasive (Britton & Clarke, 1987; Scheyvens, 2002). Communities may in fact be concerned that small-scale enterprises simply cannot compete with larger tourism ventures. Therefore, while some host communities will wish to pursue small-scale, alternative forms of tourism, others will prefer mass tourism (Opperman, 1993; Dahles & Bras, 1999). It is in the latter cases, however, that concerns are more likely to arise about the lack of community control over tourism. With pre-travel information, visitors can often prepare themselves for travel to places the culture is known to be quite different from their own (Swarbrook, 1999). Tourists are able to obtain information about the culture of the host community, especially unacceptable behavior, and essential actions, such as correct greeting behavior and tipping, travel agents and tour operators (Swarbrooke, 1999; Keyser, 2002). There is a need for government and the tourism industry to create tourism awareness by initiating programmes to inform the public about tourism, and to obtain feedback from local people about their perceptions of tourism. Tourism is particularly dependent on the use of community spaces and resources, and community receptiveness (Mason, 2003).

Pearce et. al (1996) urged tourism scholars to use contextual, process approach. In other words, an understanding of tourism and community relationships should be derived from the words and images of communities themselves. Authors developed a series of critical questions. Indeed, these questions, raised from a community cultural standpoint, should be regarded
as an essential prerequisite to achieving effective participatory design and process.

A number of studies have investigated residents' reactions to tourism development. The results of those studies have suggested that community support for tourism development is essential for the successful operation and sustainability of tourism (Juroski, 1994; Yoon, 1998). This is because it relies heavily upon the goodwill of the local community and residents and understanding local community's reactions toward tourism development is essential in achieving the goal of favourable host community support for tourism development (Yoon, Gursoy & Chen, 2000).

There is a need for governments and the tourism industry to create tourism awareness by initiating programmes to inform the public about tourism, and to obtain feedback from local people about their perceptions of tourism. Tourism is particularly dependent on the use of community spaces and resources, and community receptiveness.

2.6 STAKEHOLDERS IN TOURISM PLANNING

Tourism crosses multiple sectors and includes a diversity of stakeholders. Thus, sustainability in tourism requires holistic planning that integrates multiple sectors and incorporates meaningful public participation in decision-making (Timothy, 1999; Choi & Sirakaya, 2005). Public participation can be described as the process of engaging the public in political, economic, or management decisions. It is an approach to promoting grassroots level involvement in governance and decision-making process. The seminal Brundtland Commission Report, "Our Common Future" (1987), formally called for greater public participation in environmental decision-making in order to promote sustainable development in the face of rapid global development (WCED, 1987). The traditional form of top-down
governance is not dynamic enough to cope with the world that is getting more complex by the day (Fischer, 2006). Given the complexity of factors, public involvement in the decision-making and governance process is highly recommended in the literature (Renn et al., 1993; Palern, 2000; Kapoor, 2001; Webler et al., 2001; Sinclair & Diduck, 2009; Fitzpatrick & Sinclair, 2003). There are multiple justifications and advantages for public involvement in development decisions that have the potential to impact natural resources and the environment management: involving multi-stakeholder participation in decision-making process, incorporating local socio-cultural, economic and environmental issues and knowledge into consideration, transparency in decision-making processes, and increasing social acceptability of policies, etc. (Renn et al., 1993; Webler et al., 1995; Sinclair & Diduck, 2009). Further, public participation in project decision-making can also initiate individual and social learning processes, which transform alienated individual actions into collective actions contributing to sustainability of environmental and natural resources (Webler et al., 1995; Sinclair et al., 2008).

Since tourism stakeholders have been considered as important key players of components that influence the success or failure of tourism in a region, their participation and involvement should be considered in tourism planning and development.

In order to maximize economic benefits many governments allowed the private sector to take important decisions about tourism developments allowed the private sector to be take important decisions about tourism development in an unrestricted and unplanned way (Hawkins, 1992). However, the focus of the private sector and tourism planning was naturally oriented toward short-term economic gains, through the construction of facilities which attract foreign visitors. As a result, too little attention was
paid to socio-cultural effects on host communities and environmental problems for receiving destinations, which in the long-term, may outweigh the benefits (Seth, 1985, Jenkins, 1994).

Sharpley and Sharpley (1997) asserted that in the tourism industry, there are examples where partnership arrangements are highly effective for the success of tourism planning and development. Since the public sector is concerned with the provision of services, the resolving of land-use conflicts and the formulation and implementation of development policies, and the private sector is mainly concerned with profit, partnerships between the private and public sector on various issues can benefit destinations. Balint et al., (2006) suggested that effective public participation that incorporates new insights, attitudes and approaches is essential to ensure sustainable development in tourism. Choi & Sirakaya (2005) in their study on sustainability indicators found that tourism planning is a necessary condition to achieve the goals of sustainable tourism development. The study further emphasized that it should be planned and managed by community stakeholders, and all the participants should be well informed about the pertinent issues by providing them with complete and relevant information. As none of the business of government can operate in isolation, tourism planning must be integrated with other planning as well (Gunn, 1988). An integrated tourism as pointed out by Hall (1999) is an ‘interactive’ or ‘collaborative’ approach requiring participation and interaction between different government agencies having responsibilities for various tourism related activities; and between responsible organization and various stakeholders. Coordinating among different government agencies, the public, the private sectors and various stakeholders in tourism, however, is a very challenging task (Jamal & Getz, 1995) Tourism planning must be accountable and should facilitate participation of various stakeholders,
Perceptions of various stakeholders including operators, local people, and regulators must be incorporated into tourism planning, as tourism impacts and interacts with all these stakeholders (Hardy & Beeton, 2001). Brohman (1996) emphasized that tourism planning should respect the desires and needs of residents, as various researchers suggested that positive resident attitudes, supports and inputs are essential for a long-term sustainability of tourism industry. The need for greater community involvement and environmental sensitivity in tourism planning has been emphasized throughout the literature (e.g., Inskeep, 1991; Brohman, 1996; Timothy, 1999; Tosun, 2000; Saxena, 2008).

Thomason et al. (1979) compared the attitudes of three groups affected by tourism expansion: residents, entrepreneurs, and public sector providers, and highlighted significant differences between their attitudes towards environmental issues, with entrepreneurs having more positive attitudes than the other two groups. Murphy (1983) observed three decision-making groups (residents, business sector and administration) to test whether a certain set of related variables can successfully discriminate these groups. He found significant differences between the perceptions and attitudes of the three groups toward tourism development, with the business sector being the most distinct. Nevertheless, he remarked that all groups were sufficiently close in their overall interest in their community's future. Lankford (1994) examined residents', government employees', elected officials' and business owners' attitudes to tourism development, in 13 cities and six counties within the Columbia River Gorge region of Oregon and Washington. He observed that although all the groups recognized the economic significance of tourism within their community and, residents were more skeptical than the other groups regarding additional tourism development. Sitikarn (2002) suggested that opportunities for
public participation in tourism should be ensured at the planning stage, implementation and evaluation stage, and in sharing the benefits. He identifies involvement of local people in decision-making level to be crucial as it directly affects them. Meanwhile, empowerment of the local people through training, workshop, and awareness program are also thought to be essential to ensure effective participation at all levels of development. Public participation allows various stakeholders to identify their needs and bring these into the realm of decision-making (Sitikaran, 2002). Sharing these needs enable various stakeholders to influence and share control over development initiatives, the decisions and resources, which affect them (Evans & Percy, 1999). Tourism planning may involve capacity-building and reinforcement of the self-worth of community members so that they can play an active role in decision-making or power-sharing processes with external stakeholders (Singh et al., 2003). The complexity outlined thus far suggested that re-conceptualizing multiple interests and identities - is critical to meeting the formidable challenges facing community-based tourism planning efforts. Sewell & Phillip (1979) identified three fundamental predicaments in achieving participatory planning: it is difficult to achieve a high degree of participation with a large number of participants as the depth of engagement tends to decline as more people participate in the activity; in order to overcome predicament- the idea of resorting to community group 'representatives' has been introduced. The difficulty, then, is to obtain equity in participation whereby all views will be represented; when trying to achieve a high degree of participation, and/or when resorting to representatives, it is not always possible to attain a high level of efficiency in terms of time and available resources. They concluded while it is clear that the public needs to be consulted on a wide range of issues, not all citizens wish to be consulted on a large number of issues that are of little interest to most people. Clearly, identifying
tourism stakeholders themselves is problematic. Haywood (1988) identified that there are a number of institutional and system-based obstacles to full-scale representation in the planning process. These obstacles include: the presence of extensive bureaucratic organizations at various levels in tourism; a lack of comprehensive tourism planning in a majority of communities; the perception that participation is an unnecessary, unwieldy and time-consuming endeavor and an idealistic dream; the view by the industry that a more comprehensive approach to planning - one more responsible to society - may pose a threat (to the extent that recommendations mean adding to the cost of doing business); and a lackluster interest on the part of decision-making officials in encouraging representational democracy.

Vasudevarao & Chakrapani (1997) advocated a self-emerging community argue, as expected, against the paternalistic nature of participatory tourism planning and development, stressing that a genuine participator approach requires responsibility for directing change to lie with the people themselves, not with an outside organisation or change agency. In other words, central to community-driven planning is an explicit recognition that outsiders cannot assess the perceptions, preferences or priorities of host communities. Under this perception, all necessary changes would emerge from within the communities themselves.

While communities may vary in their capacity or readiness to participate in tourism planning activities, community mobilization may not occur in the absence of a mandate, an organizational base, or government support. According to Beeker et al. (1998), this is particularly true in a community lacking: a strong, recognized leader; mature community-based organizations; and, a successful problem-solving history. More specifically, Beeker's point is that community mobilization may not be possible in the absence of prior governmental investment in community development, i.e. without creating new networks,
strengthening the existing ones, invigorating community institutions, and motivating and training community members to become effective leaders and participants. Hanna (2005) remarked that a number of tourism stakeholders still tend to exercise political power and have control over the future of community and tourism development, tourism analysts fail to acknowledge this State of affair, assuming instead that there is equal access. Power emanates from institutional authority with tourism planners rooted in these structures. And practice is confined by the limits set by legislation, budgets, and community political and social dynamics.

Sustainability of any tourism development projects and development relied on the extent to which the development is planned and constructed with the knowledge and support of the tourism stakeholders.

2.7 PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

It is the most important step in the planning process and no planning process can be successful unless the plan is implemented to make the desired output. To implement plan effectively it needs proper mechanism to co-ordinate all the activities. Various views of authors on plan implementation are as follows:

Hall (1991) has found that plan implementation involves the joint efforts of various organizational parties, often located at different tiers of government. The implementation success is, therefore, closely tied to whether these organizations interact and co-ordinate fragmented activities effectively so that all decisions, policies and activities are consistent and coherent and not at cross-purposes. Klijn (1997) opined that the political culture of the country, its general economic conditions, as well government policies may determine plan outcomes by laying the foundation for the nature of relations and communication networks between
different levels of governmental agencies, their interdependencies, their strategic perspectives, and their problem solving capacities. According to Yuksel et al (1999) plan implementation may also suffer from the misuse of resources, a lack of accountability, non-transparency in decision-making, excessive rule and regulations, priorities set which are inconsistent with appropriate development, a high degree of concentration of political power, and incompetent administration. Smith & Eadington (1994) made it clear that a better tourism planning approach should constitute benefits for all aspects of community; including sociological, economic, environmental. It is argued that the community will benefit from tourism development if the community members participate fully both in making decisions that affect welfare and in implementing these decisions. Therefore, the community based planning process requires involvement of local residents and decision-makers at each step in the process. This manifests a significant shift of tourism planning from being centralized to being decentralized. 

Robinson (1996) stated that the existence of co-operative and coordinated relations between tourism organizations at different spatial scales is imperative in order to formulate and implement effective local development plans. In addition, a vast range of broader external factors in the macro environment may influence organizational relations within the micro-environment and changes in economic, social, and environmental policies can have direct and indirect effects on the way the tourism industry behaves. Inskeep (1991) has stated that tourism should be viewed as a single system which comprise of interrelated parts. He simplified tourism as system that can be defined, analyzed, planned and managed in an integrated manner. Further, he also argued that tourism should be viewed as socio-economic sector as well as environmental dimension and utilizing facilities that are part of various existing standard industrial classifications. At the
same time the tourism system can be described in economic term of demand and supply. Besides he stated that in the planning for tourism development, the concept of tourism as an integrated system based on demand and supply factors is basic to its effective planning & management. Furthermore, the demand and supply sides must be balanced within the framework of maintaining social and environmental objectives. Gun & Van (2002) emphasized that there must have been 'integrated tourism plan' that balance all aspects relevant. For example, utilizing resources, land using, physical structure constructions, social facilities, and preparation of manpower upon changing etc. Nevertheless tourism planning have been in modern stage, it has diversification of such planning that depends on the particular characteristics of destination and tourism. Further, they examined that tourism planning has different objectives and processes; the most popular today is at the site scale - individual property development for hotels, restaurants, resorts, roads, and attractions. The Destination zone - can define as a community and the surrounding area when tourism functions are better understood. In order to determine greatest potential for a larger area, a Regional scale (nation, province, state) of planning is needed. Jantarat & Williams (2000) found that the reason the proposed collaborative a national tourism organization was perceived to have expertise and to be government-mandated. Indeed, the proactive role played by national tourism organizations is vital to bring stakeholders to the table, constructively explore their differences of opinion, and assist the search for common solutions or identify necessary trade-offs and compromises. Understandably so much organizations are seen as important mechanisms in the promotion of participatory planning, due, in no small part, to the fact that one of their essential roles is to find effective ways of involving all sectors and all constituencies in the planning activities. Murphy (1985) found, tourism was seized upon with little for thought concerning a
viable tourism product, the social and environmental consequences of development, or the spill over effects in surrounding areas. Unfortunately many destinations are still paying the social and environmental consequences of rapid tourism development and have been forced to implement remedial actions for failing to plan and control tourism development. A number of different planning approaches have evolved to meet the changing development demands and characteristics of the tourism industry and the global increase in visitor numbers. The first of these, the often criticized economic approach to tourism planning, Getz (1986), reflected the confidence in the tourism sector, and a level of ignorance regarding the impacts of tourism on the destination. Planning was seen as simply encouraging new hotels to open, ensuring there was transportation access to the area, and organizing a tourist promotion campaign. The second phase, the land use approach, was also grounded in a period when the negative impacts had not been realized or were minimal enough to be hidden or ignored. Tourism planning generally involved detailed surveys and appraisals of the physical resources of the country or region with little or no concern about possible spin-off effects of proposals and projects on adjacent areas or environments.

2.8 IMPORTANCE OF TOURISM PLANNING IN INDIA AND HIMACHAL

India is a land of great diversity endowed with rare natural and cultural heritage. The Indian Himalaya offers many forms of tourism characterized by pilgrimage, adventure tourism, and wilderness tourism (Singh, 2001). Thus these mountain regions are attracting great attention from domestic as well as foreign tourists. Himachal Pradesh is one of the major national and international tourist destinations located in the Northern Himalayan Region of India, as it is known for its scenic natural beauty and cultural-historic qualities (Gardner et al., 2002). The
opportunity for exploring the natural environment and rich cultures has made the mountains a prominent global tourist destination. The opportunities of tourism that lie in the mountain areas, including the Himalaya, have attracted various profit motive investors including foreign corporations, who invest in large scale developments are often presented as ecotourism initiatives with the aim of improving livelihood opportunities for the local people (EQUATIONS, 2008), but sometimes the reality of these developments turn to be different, and they actually end up threatening the economic and environmental viability of the place. With the aim of creating a world-class tourism infrastructure, the government of India is acting as a catalyst for promoting private initiative and investments in large-scale tourism infrastructure development. The gigantic Himalayan Ski Village project – proposed in Manali with the intention of attracting a new generation of Indian and foreign ski enthusiasts- is a typical example of such commercial tourism ventures in the Indian Himalayan context (Singh, 2008). The Indian Himalaya has the potential to offer the best mountain-based adventure tourism in the world. Being one of the largest sources of revenue generation, both the central and the State government are making efforts to promote tourism development in this region. To achieve this, efforts are being made to diversify principal source markets, improve the tourism infrastructure and amenities, and promote new forms of tourism like rural tourism, adventure tourism, and cultural tourism (Government of India, 2007). Anand (1976) offered system approach for arriving at key decision areas. The study was divided in four parts. The first part covers the theoretical foundation and focuses attention on the primary problem of identification of tourist attraction from vast spectrum of international communication. The second part deals with the questions of consumer preferences and consumer behaviour on one hand and nature of tourists plant & required marketing efforts on the other hand. The third part is devoted to the consequences
and impact of international tourism. The last part attempts at integrated consumer preferences and character of the tourist plant by suggesting a short term and long term strategy for development within the framework of Indian planned economy and democratic policy. Srivastava (1983) made an attempt to highlight the tourism in India. In his article, he has tried to study the development of tourism in India. He has argued conducted that tourism in India is much more than mere money. He felt that it is not only economic compulsion to earn foreign exchange but a sense of social obligation that calls for sound tourism policy. He clearly pointed out the need to create a set of economic tourism facilities. Reddy & Ramana (1998) made an attempt to review and analyze tourism development in India under the plans and suggest some policy measures for its development. According to different research scholar, tourism is one of the vital and potential sectors of the Indian economy. According to authors tourism development mostly depends upon the facilities of structure as well as infrastructure, but stressed through well defined, well planned and well integrated programmes for attracting tourists and attaining objectives of tourism. They find out that tourism is a major industry of the country as it contribute to about 4% gross domestic product, employs about 135 lakh persons or 4.5 % total employee labour earns foreign exchange to the tune of Rs. 3500 crores per annum (1991-92). According to author's various objective has been set up in different five year plans, one of them is (in VIII five year plan 1992-97) to develop select tourism places and areas, diversification from culture oriented tourism to holiday and leisure tourism, development of trekking, water sports They suggests that the plan must consider various processes in quantitative terms and to outline the objective. Shah (1998) in his article revealed various problems which are presently being confronted by tourism industry. If these are not tackled timely then these can deprive the country to reap the benefits which liberalization has brought for this country but
there is complete lack of new culture to promote tourism. The paper has thus come out with suggestions as to what the government should do for planning developing of infrastructure, marketing HRD and district level planning for promoting tourism industry in the country. Author finds out that with globalization of the world economy has emerged as a vibrant and dynamic industry. In 1995, alone 567 million tourists traversed the global spending about US$ 72 billion. This generated about 8% of world's export earning which is more than that is contributing by any other industry. Author concludes that tourism industry has tremendous economic potentialities to accelerate growth process in developing country like India.

Himachal is beautiful destination for national & international tourists. The snow-capped mountains, rich culture of Himachal, scenic places, rivers, lakes, flora &fauna, historical mountains, different religious beliefs and hospitable people are the main attractions for the tourist. Tourism is also a source of employment. Besides, providing employment to a large number of people, tourism can be the instrument of regional policy. Singh (1978) emphasized on the economic potential of tourism in Himachal Pradesh with special reference to Shimla. The main objective of this study was to analyze the various economic aspects of tourism with regard to employment and income generation. 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 its natural resources, which can help to generate employment and income as well as foreign exchange. Chand Amar (1982) concluded a study of the economic potential of tourism in Himachal Pradesh with special reference to Kullu & Manali. The main objectives of this study were to discuss the various facilities available to the tourists and to know the difficulties faced by these tourists during their stay. It is concluded from his study that
the tourism industry must adopt proper planning, co-ordination, entrepreneurship and legislation to develop tourism and attract more and more tourist towards to this valley. Tourism can be developed at best if it is formed as an integral part of the overall development. Singh (1989) made an attempt to examine the problems and prospects of tourism in the Kullu valley. They opined that Kullu valley alone has an intake of about 60 percent tourists of the State. The higher fares and inadequate public transport facilities were noted to create inconvenience to the tourists in their local movements. They also believed that valley lacks cheaper hotels and has inadequate accommodation.

Sharma B.R. (1990) focused on the existing facilities to the tourists during peak and off season and the difficulties faced by the tourists during their stay at Shimla. Author emphasized the steps to be taken to ease these difficulties to make Shimla a better hill station so that it can attract a greater number of tourists every year. Despite all the diverse attractions of Shimla, it did not attract due share in tourists. The reason behind it are the lack of proper transport connections and other physical facilities and the disturbance in neighbouring states. To attract the maximum tourist traffic to the State as well as to Shimla, he suggested better transport facilities and construction of small helipads at different places.

Mahajan, A. (1992) has conducted a study on tourism in Kangra valley with its developmental potential and problems. He opined that Kangra is blessed with immense tourist potential but the problem is related to marketing. Moreover, he also pointed out the poor accessibility of destinations. Kumar Raj (1992) has stressed on tourism in Himachal Pradesh with a case of Kullu-Manali and Mandi. It focused on various cultural and heritage resources. He also pointed out the problems of marketing, facilities at the destinations.
Mountains, which occupy about one fifth of the continent of the world, hold significant values because of their rich biological diversity due to altitudinal and climatic variation. Mountain regions are also home to diverse ethnic communities having their own culture and traditions (Ives, 1992). Mountains were recognized as a global priority after the term Sustainable Mountain Development was first used in chapter 13 of Agenda 21 entitled ‘Managing Fragile Ecosystems: Sustainable Mountain Development’ (UNCED, 1992). The importance of the world’s mountains was re-emphasized further by the UN General Assembly in 1998 along with the declaration of international Year of Mountains in 2002.

Mountains are one of the most prominent global tourist destinations characterized by rich cultural, historical, linguistic and ecological diversity (Price, 1992). While marginality, fragility, steepness and inaccessibility often remain constraints for development in mountains, tourism appears as an obvious choice for development in spite of these complexities. Travel and tourism is gaining popularity in the mountains as mountain destinations often offer a clean and unspoiled environment, unique landscape and wildlife, scenic beauty, cultural and biological diversity, and recreational opportunities (UNEP, 2007). Tourism in the mountains, especially in the developing world, is gaining popularity because of the opportunities that lie within for exploring natural environments and rich cultural heritages, the availability of cheap labour, and liberal policies for tourism investment (Zurick, 1992). Singh (1978) made an attempt to highlight the economic potential of tourism in H.P. with special reference to Shimla. The main objective of the study was to highlight the various vistas that tourism industry can open in H.P. by offering of jobs, generating revenue for the State and encouraging simultaneous development of other related industry. Shartna (1984) focused on tourism marketing and considered it
Mahajan (1992) observed that Kangra valley had vast potential for a successful implementation of an ambitious programmes for promoting tourism. He also concluded that the valley had been the religious and cultural metropolis of the country since earlier time and in recent years the Kangra valley had come to be known for a more vibrant holiday destination. Kumar (1992) identified the purpose of visit to places surveyed, to study the existing facilities available for the tourist to analyze the problems faced by tourists and suggest remedial measure thereof & to analyze the tourism potential in these tourist places. To promote tourism activities in the valley it is necessary that transport facilities should be properly upgraded, the ropeways must be constructed to connect the difficult hills of tourist attraction and the tourist information centre must be well equipped with information about all places of tourist interest. Gupta (1994) asserted on the main objectives in references to Shimla Town, to identify the purposes of visits of tourists to Shimla town and its surrounding areas, to study and analyze the main characteristics of tourists visiting Shimla and to study the availability of proper infrastructure and accommodation facilities available to the tourist in Shimla. Mr. Gupta concludes in his paper that the young educated from the different parts of India prefer to travel Shimla and its surrounding places namely for the purposes of leisure. According to him climate scenic beauty, peaceful atmosphere, culture and traditions are the main attractions for the tourists. He also
pointed out various problems faced by the tourists are inadequate accommodation comparatively high tariff charges of hotels, poor sanitary services, power failures and high coolie charges. According to him, some suggestions can be useful in increasing the tourists arrivals in Shimla and to provide better facilities to them. Firstly, the State government should develop appropriate policy in respect to the class of the tourists to be encouraged and motivated to visit the State to achieve the objective of rapid economic development and secondly the State government with the active cooperation and participation of private sector should make efforts to develop super structure for providing various facilities to the tourists.

2.9 IDENTIFICATION OF RESEARCH GAP

The review concludes that a lot of research has been conducted with respect to tourism planning and development in general and at an international level. However, from the review the following research gap has emerged:

- Although research has been widely conducted on assessment and review of tourism plan and policies at international level such research is lacking in India.

- The importance of tourism policies has been discussed in literature but research lacks the review of successful implementation of tourism policies.

- The participation of stakeholders (service providers) and communities has been emphasized in tourism planning research. But studies lack the feedback of stakeholders and communities on tourism policies implemented in their areas.

- Particularly in the context of India, tourism policies have been given emphasis in five year plans but the progress has not monitored.
No particular study has been carried out within Himachal Pradesh to review and evaluate the tourism policies implemented till date.

Therefore, with the above apparent research gap reviews the nature of tourism planning through various tourism policies in the State of Himachal Pradesh.