



Cultural heritage and Indigenous tourism

Lisa Ruhanen & Michelle Whitford

To cite this article: Lisa Ruhanen & Michelle Whitford (2019) Cultural heritage and Indigenous tourism, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 14:3, 179-191, DOI: [10.1080/1743873X.2019.1581788](https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2019.1581788)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2019.1581788>



Published online: 21 Feb 2019.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 6282



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 43 View citing articles [↗](#)



Cultural heritage and Indigenous tourism

Lisa Ruhanen^a and Michelle Whitford^b

^aUQ Business School, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia; ^bGriffith Business School, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia

ABSTRACT

Tourism is acknowledged as a vehicle that can help sustain both tangible and intangible elements of Indigenous cultural heritage, including languages, stories, song, art, dance, hunting methods, rituals and customs. Often, cultural heritage products developed for tourism promise to provide many socio-economic opportunities for the communities involved, however, tourism can also present a challenge as the self-management of Indigenous cultural product and cultural identity can be problematic. Given the pivotal role culture plays in the sustainability of Indigenous tourism products, it is time for a twenty-first century examination of the nexus between cultural heritage and Indigenous tourism. This paper reflects upon tourism and contemporary Indigenous cultural heritage, both tangible and intangible. Through a review of the current literature on Indigenous tourism and cultural heritage, the authors identify key areas for future research and aim to stimulate further discussion around the ways Indigenous tourism may be developed to sustain Indigenous cultural heritage.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 31 January 2019

Accepted 7 February 2019

KEYWORDS

Indigenous tourism; cultural heritage; intangible heritage

Introduction

The worldwide Indigenous population is estimated to be around 370 million (United Nations, 2017). Indigenous peoples, who represent a significant part of the world's vast cultural and linguistic diversity and heritage, possess unique knowledge systems and are the keepers of most of the world's intangible cultural heritage (The World Bank, 2018; United Nations, 2017; Warnholtz & Barkin, 2017). Indigenous peoples make up only five percent of the global population yet they account for about one-third of the global poor and fifteen percent of the extreme poor (The World Bank, 2018; United Nations, 2017). Additionally, an estimated 65% of the world's land is under Indigenous customary ownership (Rights and Resources Initiative, 2015); however, many governments around the globe only recognise a fraction of land as formally or legally belonging to Indigenous peoples (The World Bank, 2018). Further, the social, economic and political marginalisation of Indigenous peoples remains pervasive in all the regions of the world even though Indigenous knowledge systems are recognised as crucial for ongoing sustainable development (United Nations, 2017),.

As governments continue to focus on improving the socio-economic disadvantage experienced by too many Indigenous peoples, tourism has long been advocated as a social intervention that can be used to address a range of social, economic and political issues and as a possible trigger for the development of local host communities (de Kadt, 1979a, 1979b). The possibility of attracting investment, foreign currency, creating jobs and eventually creating the opportunity for economic growth for host communities has also led to the incorporation of tourism into the poverty reduction, sustainable development and social enterprise agendas, especially for communities with strong natural and

cultural assets, both intangible and tangible (Korstanje, 2012; Warnholtz & Barkin, 2018). For those Indigenous peoples who choose to share their culture through touristic endeavours, tourism is often lauded for its potential to provide a range of benefits including the maintenance, rejuvenation and/or preservation of Indigenous cultures, knowledges and traditions. Tourism has also been acknowledged as a vehicle that can help sustain intangible elements of Indigenous cultural heritage, including languages, stories, song, art, dance, hunting methods, rituals and customs (Burns, 2006; Einar Johansen & Mehmetoglu, 2011; Warnholtz & Barkin, 2018; Whitney-Squire, 2016).

As a growing number of Indigenous communities around the world engage with tourism as a vehicle for reforming their economies, consideration needs to be given, not only to the optimistic predictions regarding the benefits of tourism but also to the negative impacts tourism can inflict upon communities' tangible and intangible cultural assets. Indeed, the history of Indigenous peoples' engagement in tourism provides numerous examples of the threats to Indigenous culture that can accrue as a result of tourism. For instance, cultural degradation, commercialisation and commodification of intangible cultural heritage and loss of identity are but some of the ways tourism continues to negatively affect Indigenous cultures (McIntosh, Hinch, & Ingram, 2002; Ranasinghe & Cheng, 2018). Consequently, threats to intangible cultural heritage are problematic, not only for the maintenance and preservation of the culture but also for the commercial sustainability of the 'cultural product' and any long-term socio-economic benefits tourism may bring to a community and/or a region, yet they are increasingly being seen as unique tourism 'assets' (Nielsen & Wilson, 2012).

Thus, the increasing propensity for governments around the globe to utilise Indigenous tourism 'assets' as a socio-economic growth strategy for Indigenous communities and/or regions has given rise to an increasing number of academics focusing their research in this field. For example, recent overviews of this research (for example: Carr, Ruhanen, & Whitford, 2016; Nielsen & Wilson, 2012; Whitford & Ruhanen, 2016) revealed that while a wide range of topics are addressed in the literature (i.e. social enterprise and entrepreneurship, employment, self-determination), there is arguably a clear interest in the socio-economic agenda of development that is reflective of the wider development agenda.

Given the pivotal role culture plays in the development of sustainable Indigenous cultural tourism products, and the increasing significance governments are placing on the development of Indigenous tourism, an examination of the nexus between cultural heritage and Indigenous tourism is timely. As the opening paper of this special issue on cultural heritage and Indigenous tourism, this paper reflects upon contemporary Indigenous cultural heritage and tourism, both tangible and intangible. By highlighting key themes within the literature, this paper seeks to identify key areas for future research and stimulate further discussions around the ways Indigenous tourism may be developed to sustain Indigenous cultural heritage.

Labelling tourism as 'Indigenous'

Historically, the term Indigenous peoples was used to refer to descendants of those who occupied a given territory that was invaded, conquered or colonised by white colonial powers (Saugestad, 2000; Weaver, 2016) and as such, the object (and increasingly the subject) of Indigenous tourism has widely come to be seen as consisting of a group of culturally differentiated people who lived and occupied territories before the existence of the nation state (Saarinen, 2013). More recently, however, there has been a process of inclusion of Africans in the global Indigenous movement (Giblin, 2017; Kagumba, 2013; Saugestad, 2008). In some cases, such as the Maasai in Kenya, the labelling of African groups as 'Indigenous' has been undertaken in an attempt to access Indigenous tourism markets established elsewhere, such as in Australia, New Zealand, USA and Canada. In other cases, such as the Batwa in Uganda, it has been done to align with the Indigenous rights movement to protest, for example, eviction from cultural territories (Giblin, 2017). Interestingly, the use of the terms 'Indigenous' and 'Indigenous tourism' in the African context, and the extent to which these terms are applicable and relevant, is a topic of much debate, not only amongst scholars and researchers but also between African governments (Kagumba, 2013).

Such debate, however, is not a new phenomenon. Since the emergence of Indigenous tourism in the 1970s, there has been a variety of definitions pertaining to what constitutes Indigenous tourism (for an overview of these definitions see Pereiro, 2016). However, fundamental to these definitions is the centrality of Indigenous culture and identity. Many researchers also agree that a second crucial definitional element is the locus of control (Hinch & Butler, 2007; Pereiro, 2016; Zeppel, 2010). That is, Indigenous peoples should not be the focus of the tourism attractions/products per se, but rather tourism attractions/products should be 'based on the group's land and cultural identity and controlled from within the group'. Thus, the expectation is that Indigenous peoples will have control of the way their culture (tangible and intangible) is portrayed and accessed through tourism endeavours. It has been suggested, however, that in reality, Indigenous tourism actually works to uphold neo-colonialist attitudes (Korstanje, 2012) resulting in too many Indigenous communities/regions still being subjected to ethnocentric treatment, which includes 'protection' (from tourist consumption), by outsiders who believe they know better than Indigenous peoples (Richards, 2018). Indeed, in too many instances, Indigenous tourism ventures are developed according to the needs and priorities of non-Indigenous people (Nielsen & Wilson, 2012; Williams & Gonzalez, 2017), who often forget or neglect the very people(s) from which the tourism attractions/products are constructed (Tomaselli, 2012). Therefore, if the goal is to ensure Indigenous tourism cultural products develop sustainably, as we increasingly draw upon Indigenous culture to develop Indigenous tourism attractions/product, at the very least, we must seek to gain a more wholistic understanding of the role Indigenous cultural identity and cultural representation plays in the sustainable development of cultural Indigenous tourism products.

Identity, authenticity and the commercialisation of Indigenous culture

Tourism has the capacity to shape/or transform the culture of an Indigenous community (Ranasinghe & Cheng, 2018) by influencing the way individuals in a community see themselves and how they perceive their identity and in particular, their intangible cultural heritage (Heldt Cassel & Maureira, 2017). For instance, as a result of tourism, cultural practices and traditions are increasingly transformed into tourism products (Maraud & Guyot, 2016; Ryan & Aiken, 2015) and in the process, Indigenous identity is often reconstructed to satisfy tourist expectations (Coronado, 2014; Heldt Cassel & Maureira, 2017; Pereiro, 2016; Ryan & Aiken, 2015). Thus, while tourism presents an array of opportunities for Indigenous communities to increase awareness and appreciation of, their intangible cultural heritage, concomitantly tourism poses a challenge for those same communities to preserve and maintain the integrity of their intangible cultural heritage and associated 'tourism assets' (Ranasinghe & Cheng, 2018). Arguably, a cost benefit analysis is required in this instance to determine if the gain outweighs the cost.

For instance, due to modernisation, changes in lifestyle, livelihood and spiritual inclination, some Indigenous peoples have apparently lost connection with their culture and their identities (Ona & Solis, 2017). Tourism practices, however, can play an essential role in providing opportunities for Indigenous peoples (and others) to reconnect, discover, rediscover and/or reinforce their identities through engagement with their cultural heritage (i.e. traditional dance, crafts and art) (Burns, 2006; Espinosa Abascal, Fluker, & Jiang, 2015; Stronza, 2008). Involvement in tourism can also provide individuals with opportunities to learn Indigenous languages and consider or reinforce the importance of belonging to an Indigenous community (Heldt Cassel & Maureira, 2017). Moreover, tourism can be used to help support the development, revitalisation and/or preservation of vulnerable and critically endangered languages (Whitney-Squire, 2016). Indeed, the progressive loss of Indigenous languages globally is a serious threat to sustaining Indigenous peoples' identities and intangible cultural heritage.

Similarly, income generating activities such as handicrafts and food security (i.e. traditional activities such as hunting) present a range of opportunities for Indigenous communities to develop entrepreneurial and/or social enterprise tourism ventures (Ona & Solis, 2017). In Australia, for example,

modern Aboriginal art is an intrinsic part of a cultural revival. Community art centres, owned by Aboriginal communities and which are largely not-for-profit organisations, have a mandate that includes the promotion of cultural sustainability and the sharing of culture with visiting tourists (Butler, 2017).

We can see then, that tourism can act as a platform in which identities and culture can be contested and/or developed (King & Borges de Lima, 2018). Culture and identity are recognised as dynamic rather than static (Cohen, 1988), thus tourism can be used by Indigenous communities as a platform to revitalise, define, shape and transform their culture within a contemporary context and as 'a means of transmitting their culture, values and beliefs, and their ways of relating to the world of visitors' (Campos, Scott, & Breaky, 2014, p. 143). Resultant changes in cultural practice or the recontextualising of culture for socio-economic purposes are not necessarily indicative of cultural loss and/or loss of meaning for the cultural product or cultural symbols (Kagumba, 2013). Instead, such changes can be viewed as cultural progression and a change in meaning.

It has also been argued that the commoditisation of Indigenous culture can be viewed as a form of **empowerment for the Indigenous peoples involved as the culture that was once a source of marginalisation instead comes to hold socio-economic value and becomes celebrated and treasured in tourism contexts** (Kagumba, 2013; Pookhao, Bushell, Hawkins, & Staiff, 2018). Indeed, several authors have emphasised **the important role tourism plays in enabling Indigenous hosts to perform chosen aspects of their identities that benefit contemporary life within the communities and reflect a combination of tourism and local imaginaries** (Bunten, 2008, 2014; Heldt Cassel & Maureira, 2017; Kagumba, 2013; Mackley-Crump, 2016; Travesi, 2018). This gives the hosts the power to act as cultural brokers and the capacity to subvert dominant paradigms and tourists' representations and expectations about indigeneity (Bunten, 2014; Travesi, 2018).

While the process of establishing local Indigenous identities and cultures in the global tourist market can result in the reinvention, recreation and preservation of Indigenous cultural attributes, it may, however, serve to impact on the privacy of the Indigenous peoples involved and result in a sense of invasion and threat (Pereiro, 2016). Thus, when Indigenous tourism is no longer an organised, commercial activity/product and instead becomes a 'way of community life', we must question the extent to which Indigenous tourism threatens Indigenous identity and culture. For example, in a study which focused on the effect of tourism on the Indigenous Vedda community in Sri Lanka, Ranasinghe and Cheng (2018) found that while Indigenous cultural tourism resulted in the opening up of this remote, culturally distinctive space to global networks, the community and their culture and traditions have been pushed to the wayside by new regulations and neoliberal economic conditions. Critical modifications to the Vedda culture and traditional way of life are threatening the survival of the Vedda people's cultural heritage, identity and language and as a result, the values of the Vedda have altered as they have become a money-driven, commodity-oriented group leading a hybrid life: one real and one for the sake of tourists' amusement.

This hybrid existence, forged by Indigenous peoples to cope with tourism, is well documented in the literature (Bresner, 2014; Bunten, 2014; Coronado, 2014; Heldt Cassel & Maureira, 2017; Liu, 2018; McIntosh et al., 2002; Pereiro, 2016; Ranasinghe & Cheng, 2018; Stronza, 2008). For Indigenous hosts, expressing a visual, Indigenous identity in tourism is often a balancing act between maintaining a level of recognition and familiarity that mirrors the expectations of the public imagination and at the same time, conveying a representation that is locally meaningful and emblematic to the Indigenous hosts (Bresner, 2014). It also represents a paradox. There is an expectation that the Indigenous culture that has been commercialised as a tourism product is one that has been preserved from the pre-modern era and therefore considered authentic (at least in terms of tourist expectations), yet in such a discourse, the complexities of culture, from the Indigenous hosts' perspectives, are largely excluded (Coronado, 2014). This means, due to their economic dependence on tourists, Indigenous hosts typically accommodate guests' desires rather than demanding that guests accommodate themselves to the situation of the tour destination (Hsu & Nilep, 2018). At the same time, when tourists value the authenticity of archaic or 'traditional' practices, destination areas and their

Indigenous inhabitants are not able to evolve in response to changing economic or historical situations (Hsu & Nilep, 2018) and, when an Indigenous culture is transformed as a result of its commercialisation for tourism, it often comes to be viewed by tourists as inauthentic (Bunten, 2008; Coronado, 2014; Mackley-Crump, 2016; Ruhanen, Whitford, & McLennan, 2015; Travesi, 2018).

As tourists' perceptions of authenticity are an essential component in Indigenous tourism (Hsu, 2018; McIntosh et al., 2002), questions regarding how to maintain the authenticity of Indigenous culture, while at the same time allowing an Indigenous group to evolve in response to changing socio-economic and cultural situations are central in the quest to ensure the sustainable development of the Indigenous tourism product. To thus contribute to the analysis of authenticity in a manner that supports sustainable development by considering host perspectives, a growing number of authors are conceptualising authenticity within the dynamic context of living culture in Indigenous tourism destinations (for example see: Bresner, 2014; Bunten, 2008, 2014; Heldt Cassel & Maureira, 2017; Hsu, 2018; Hsu & Nilep, 2018; Kagumba, 2013; Mackley-Crump, 2016; Ranasinghe & Cheng, 2018; Travesi, 2018). Such research increasingly emphasises the amorphous nature of 'authentic' cultural practices, recognising them as constantly 'in transition' (Bresner, 2014, p. 138), negotiated and reinvented in relation to both host-guest relationships and resultant of the complicated crossovers and cultural mixings that are increasingly common in a globalised world. Authenticity in this context is thus seen as being dependent on how actors 'choose to authentically represent themselves' (Mackley-Crump, 2016, p. 173). These approaches also attempt to shift the tourist gaze from seeking something predetermined and 'frozen in time' to instead viewing culture and cultural identity as something more representative of the dynamic interaction between modernity and tradition.

Yet, despite moves to understand and view Indigenous cultural heritage from a more dynamic host-centred perspective, these analyses of 'interactive, dynamic' authenticity generally do not probe the power dimensions, 'othering' and forms of exploitation that are at play when tourists gaze upon the everyday lives of Indigenous peoples or their tropes in promotional literature (Bott, 2018). This means hegemony continues to be perpetuated through popular representations and the commercialisation of Indigenous cultures (Richards, 2018), and too often the culture and identities of Indigenous peoples continue to be reduced into a commodity to be bought and sold (Coronado, 2014). Around the world, many Indigenous people still find themselves with very little control of the imagery that commodifies their difference by stereotyping them as, for example, 'exotic', 'mysterious' and 'timelessly authentic', and which thus establishes tourist expectations regarding what constitutes an Indigenous tourism experience, as well as the authenticity of that experience. Indigenous peoples, therefore, continue to find themselves in the position of the 'powerless' where their culture is externally commercialised and the sharing of their culture is neither a consultative process, nor a process that considers Indigenous rights. For example, Liu (2018) shows how the process of developing a cultural heritage location in Southwest China into a tourism destination that is built to satisfy the touristic 'alien imagination' (p. 362) rather than Indigenous viewpoints, has led to the cultural standardisation and delocalisation of the location and thus the erasure of distinctive locality. In another example, Williams and Gonzalez (2017) show how, in the creation of Hawaii's unique tourism niche, native Hawaiian culture has been commodified in a way that continues to be invasive, unsustainable and ultimately, incompatible with Indigenous sovereignty. The authors show how tourism continues to be used to smooth over issues related to colonial occupation, while the Indigenous peoples are left to grapple with what it means to work in a form of Indigenous tourism within this context of ongoing occupation. Bott (2018) also explores how minority Indigenous groups in Vietnam continue to be represented in ways that reproduce certain racial and gendered tropes and how the power plays from this 'othering' has considerable and troubling effects on Indigenous groups. In his review of cultural research trends, Richards (2018, p. 16) provides several examples where minority voices in Indigenous cultural tourism are 'currently drowned out by dominant narratives and ignored by Western analyses of the tourism system', thus suggesting there is a need to listen more carefully to minority voices.

These examples indeed highlight the complexity of issues surrounding identity, authenticity, and the commercialisation of Indigenous cultural heritage. They also show that, despite global efforts to increase Indigenous voices and control in tourism (Nielsen & Wilson, 2012), questions of cultural ownership and the 'right' to share culture still, too often neglect the very people whose culture is being shared. From a sustainability perspective, as long as questions concerning ownership, control, authenticity and the commercialisation of Indigenous cultural heritage remain an ongoing issue, the ability for Indigenous communities involved in tourism to develop in sustainable ways also remains questionable.

Sustainable development of Indigenous cultural heritage through tourism

Sustainable development and sustainability are recognised as important and essential objectives in the endeavour to foster Indigenous tourism enterprises that will achieve long-term success and which will contribute to the socio-economic and cultural improvement of Indigenous lives. Development, sustainability and the combination thereof, however, have been heavily contested concepts (Warnholtz & Barkin, 2018) that largely stem from a Western definition of development. In the contemporary definition of sustainable development, development has underpinning values of the neo-liberal mainstream market, relative equity, self-determination and self-empowerment. These are terms that are all derived from prioritising individual well-being and interests over those of the community (Warnholtz & Barkin, 2018). From this perspective, Indigenous tourism ventures are considered successful if Indigenous communities are involved in and or have some control over them (Kessy, 2017). Indeed, academics have long stressed the importance of developing tourism in harmony with Indigenous community interests and in a way that ensures Indigenous people maintain ownership and control over product development and cultural experiences (for example: Altman & Finlayson, 1992; King & Stewart, 1996; McIntosh et al., 2002). The ongoing failure of many tourism programmes as 'sustainable development tools', however, (Carr et al., 2016; Ruhanen & Whitford, 2018) suggests that benchmarking success on some form of involvement or control by Indigenous communities is simply not appropriate, nor sustainable. In many cases the failures are not caused by lack of involvement or control, but instead by the language of the objectives and the policies of development agencies which prioritise the sustainability of the tourism sector over that of the host communities' culture (Warnholtz & Barkin, 2018).

Given the ongoing problems arising from Western-centric attempts to 'sustainably' develop Indigenous enterprises for tourism, critical voices are increasingly proposing alternative ways to development and sustainability that take a much greater community-driven approach. Scholars have sought to shift the emphasis away from the immediate needs of visitors and the tourism industry in general to instead consider the cultural values at stake within tourism development (for example: Carr et al., 2016; Pereiro, 2016; Saarinen, 2013; Scherrer & Doohan, 2013; Thompson-Carr, 2013; Warnholtz & Barkin, 2018; Whitford & Ruhanen, 2016; Whitney-Squire, 2016; Zeppel, 2010). Foundational to this shift is the consideration of Indigenous peoples' relationship with the land and by extension, the cultural space in which tourism initiatives can support sustainable, meaningful engagement within the industry (Whitney-Squire, 2016, p. 1169). For an Indigenous enterprise to be sustainable, the Indigenous groups involved need not only be given control of the tourism enterprises in which their culture is the central element, they also need to be given the capacity to build their own future, as well as the ability to exert political control over their cultural and natural resources (Carr et al., 2016; Espeso-Molinero, Carlisle, & Pastor-Alfonso, 2016; Kessy, 2017; Warnholtz & Barkin, 2018). Projects thus need to be developed in a manner that corresponds to a community's own values and future aspirations, allowing them to draw on lessons of their historical experience, as well as of their real and potential cultural resources (Warnholtz & Barkin, 2018; Yang, 2012). Indeed, embedding Indigenous values and world-views in tourism development is increasingly being emphasised as unequivocally necessary to affect positive outcomes (Carr et al., 2016).

One alternative approach to development that delivers a model embedded in Indigenous values and world-views is *ethnodevelopment* (see: Borges de Lima & King, 2018). While *ethnodevelopment* is a well-established concept in the development studies literature, it is not so well known in the field of tourism studies (King & Borges de Lima, 2018). *Ethnodevelopment* is a type of development that recognises diversity as a fundamental resource for addressing the endogenous needs of specific ethnic groups and minority communities and as such, is concerned with the maintenance of ethnic diversity (Stavenhagen, 1986). It recognises the importance of the cultural dimension in identity formation, the need for the empowerment of marginalised groups, and the importance of encouraging local involvement in decision-making. It focuses on the crucial roles that culture and Indigenous or traditional knowledge and skills play in the local acceptance and success of development projects and therefore, the sustainability of local livelihoods (King & Borges de Lima, 2018). In compliance with the concepts of Indigenous community and communality and with the absolute definition of equity, *ethnodevelopment* favours reciprocity, collective participation, common labour and the well-being of the community above that of the individual; thus, cultural processes are determined by and managed for the social group. In *ethnodevelopment*, the preservation and protection of local identity and tradition occurs within the group's own structures and institutions, as well as within a local context that creates linkages to the global (Warnholtz & Barkin, 2018). For Indigenous communities, this form of development potentially offers a way to define Indigenous development as community-focused, culturally-driven and rooted in ethnicity and diversity.

Indigenous knowledge in governance, development and research

As there is a shift towards developing, analysing and understanding Indigenous tourism from more Indigenous-centric models, such as through *ethnodevelopment*, there is also a shift towards greater use of Indigenous knowledge in Indigenous tourism and its development. Given that local communities are the custodians of cultural heritage resources and Indigenous knowledge systems, it is cogent that these communities should control the way their cultural heritage is passed onto others through mechanisms such as tourism, and at the same time be active participants in the process (Nkwanyana, 2018). Indeed, scholars and practitioners are increasingly recognising that in the development of Indigenous tourism initiatives, the employment of top-down strategies focused predominantly towards the provision of tourist facilities lead to the sustained perpetuation of stereotyped ideas of Indigenous peoples (Espeso-Molinero et al., 2016; Whitford & Ruhanen, 2010). Such strategies also silence those Indigenous voices on the margins, thus potentially perpetuating the perception of Indigenous knowledge as inferior, static, simple and primitive (Buzinde, Vandever, & Nyaupane, 2017). When strategies imposed from above disregard local cultural identities, local knowledge systems, marginal voices and specific realities of Indigenous entrepreneurs, the chances of success are reduced considerably (Whitford & Ruhanen, 2010). Thus, in developing Indigenous enterprises and strategies, the full participation and involvement of Indigenous peoples through collaborative strategies that foster knowledge dialogue between scientific and traditional wisdom offer a viable solution to the current implementation gaps (Espeso-Molinero et al., 2016).

With burgeoning studies showcasing the complexity and sophistication of many Indigenous natural resource management systems, researchers are also becoming more cognisant that Indigenous knowledge augurs well for sustainable development studies and environmental conservation (Borges de Lima & King, 2018; Buzinde et al., 2017; Espeso-Molinero et al., 2016; Pereira, 2016; Scherrer & Doohan, 2013). Indeed, it is becoming increasingly common to not only have Indigenous people employed by national conservation agencies and involved in environmental stewardship, but also to have protected-areas' boards co-managed by, or composed exclusively of, Indigenous membership (Maraud & Guyot, 2016). The inclusion of Indigenous knowledge in the packaging of tourism products also increases the 'authenticity' of those products while having the potential of enriching the experiences of tourists (Nkwanyana, 2018). From a cultural sustainability perspective, the inclusion of Indigenous knowledge in tourism development and participation in cultural

activities by Indigenous peoples are also important ways of passing cultural heritage from one generation to the next (Nkwanyana, 2018).

Recognition of this 'strong relationship between successful sustainable development projects and Indigenous knowledge' (Buzinde et al., 2017, p. 45) suggests that, in future research and development endeavours, the dividing practice of separating Indigenous and scientific knowledge should be avoided (Dyll, 2018). As recognised by Dyll (2018), the rethinking of indigeneity requires removing imperialist epistemological assumptions of researchers as 'experts' and of Indigenous knowledge as a barrier to progress. Indeed, tourism needs to become a space that is seen as one that provides the opportunity for potential mutual learning (Scherrer & Doohan, 2013). In order to overcome the historical marginalisation of Indigenous peoples, there is a need for more collaborative research between academics and Indigenous communities, as well as strategies that foster the exchange of ideas between traditional and scientific knowledge (Espeso-Molinero et al., 2016). Research processes in future development initiatives must therefore be undertaken with multiple partners and the academic methodologies used must enable cultural factors to be considered and Indigenous knowledge as a significant element of the theoretical scaffolding of the study.

Recognition of the positive correlation between successful sustainable development projects and Indigenous knowledge also provides support for community-based approaches to tourism. Such approaches regard Indigenous knowledge as the basis for grassroots decision-making processes and therefore involve local communities and groups in problem identification and solution generation (Buzinde et al., 2017). Pookhao et al. (2018) suggest that bottom-up, community-based approaches to tourism development and governance are also viable means to improve the quality of life for Indigenous people through local empowerment.

While community-based tourism approaches have been utilised extensively within tourism contexts (Buzinde et al., 2017) and are suggested as a way to better include Indigenous voices in tourism, when such approaches are implemented as elements of national development policies they have the tendency to fail (Warnholtz & Barkin, 2018). Warnholtz and Barkin (2018) suggest that the issues in determining the success or failure of Indigenous community-based tourism projects are also much more complex than have hitherto been realised in the context of the generally accepted tourism development paradigm. The authors identify a lack of research comparing Indigenous community-based tourism interventions from the perspectives of the host community on the one hand, and those of the development policy-formulators and practitioners on the other hand. They suggest that in designing successful interventions on behalf of a host community the focus of policy-thinking and planning should incorporate spaces for local empowerment and self-determination in order to meet the needs and expectations of that community, along with those of the tourists. They also suggest that projects need to be based more firmly on the concept of local community-based development, as well as on a more inclusive definition of tourism as a multi-faceted and multi-dimensional phenomenon. Pookhao et al. (2018) add that studies into Indigenous community-based tourism enterprises and initiatives need to also take a place-based ethnographic focus that is linked to the broader context of supranational institutions, governmental organisations, NGOs, tourists and local entrepreneurs because all of these greatly influence the success or otherwise of the tourism development projects. Indeed, initiatives that maintain dialogue both within and beyond the local communities and which are established on the basis of community-based, collaborative and participatory decision-making have been observed to more successfully encourage cultural revival, the positive evaluation of local culture and identity, the inclusion of local communities in the development of their own futures, and their involvement in environmental stewardship (Borges de Lima & King, 2018).

Special issue papers

The following seven papers in the issue explore Indigenous cultural heritage and tourism in different countries and contexts with contributions from Latin America, North America, Scandinavia, Africa and Australia.

The first paper, 'Evolution of indigenous tourism among the Lacandon of Chiapas: an application of Weaver's model', by Pilar Espeso-Molinero and María José Pastor-Alfonso uses Weaver's six-stage Indigenous tourism model (pre-European in situ control; in situ exposure; ex situ exhibitionism and exploitation; in situ exhibitionism and exploitation; in situ quasi-empowerment; and ex situ quasi-empowerment) to assess the development of tourism in the Lacandon Maya (Hach Winik) region of Chiapas, Mexico. While the model has applicability for the Lacandon context, key differences due to the Latin American context were observed.

Tatjana Thimm's paper, 'Cultural sustainability – a framework for Aboriginal tourism in British Columbia', uses a range of primary and secondary data sources to develop a framework to assess the cultural sustainability of Aboriginal tourism in British Columbia. The framework highlights the importance of cultural sustainability for achieving success through tourism while also acknowledging the protection of human rights, good self-governance, identity, control of land, authentic and market-ready tourism products.

An African perspective on cultural heritage tourism is offered in Kokel Melubo and Anna Carr's paper, 'Developing indigenous tourism in the bomas: Critiquing issues from within the Maasai community in Tanzania'. Their study draws on the insights of local stakeholders including the Maasai community to identify the critical challenges for providing indigenous cultural tourism in the Ngorongoro Conservation Area of Tanzania. As was the case in Thimm's Canadian context, the study findings here highlight a number of challenges in developing successful Indigenous cultural tourism and Melubo and Carr discuss the importance of targeted community based strategies to facilitate the development of Maasai cultural tourism.

Bryan Grimwood, Meghan Muldoon and Zachary Stevens' paper on 'Settler colonialism, Indigenous cultures, and the promotional landscape of tourism in Ontario, Canada's "Near North"' discusses the notion of settler colonialism that have displaced Indigenous Peoples and cultural connections to land. Against this backdrop, they examine how Indigenous culture is portrayed in the promotion of northern Ontario; home for generations of the Anishinaabeg and Haudenosaunee First Nations. They use a critical discourse analysis of websites and case study sites to explore the role of tourism in maintaining and revitalising Indigenous culture. Importantly the paper contributes to critiques of settler colonial power relations and the impact on tourism and Indigenous cultures.

The fifth paper in the special issue, 'Authenticity as a compromise: A critical discourse analysis of Sami tourism websites' by Cecilla de Bernardi also explores the imagery associated with Indigenous cultural tourism and the prevalence of colonial images which no longer align with contemporary Indigenous culture. This study examines the connection between tourism marketing, authenticity and representation of cultural heritage through an examination of the websites of Sámi tourism companies from Sweden. The paper highlights aspects of the different discourses on representations and authenticity via the main channel to reach the tourist market.

From Australia, Trinidad Espinosa's paper, 'Indigenous tourism in Australia: understanding the link between cultural heritage and intention to participate using the means-end chain theory' uses means-end chain theory and mixed methods based on photographs to examine the link between visitor perceptions about Australian Indigenous tourism attributes and their intention to participate. Visitor perceptions of two Australian Indigenous tourism activities, focused on traditional and contemporary culture respectively, were examined. As with de Bernardi's study, it was found that some visitors associate Indigenous tourism with 'traditional' imagery but increasingly, participants focused on the contemporary aspects of Indigenous culture. Espinosa discusses the importance of Indigenous tourism stakeholders monitor and protecting their historical and evolving cultural heritage, particularly intangible heritage.

The final paper in the special issue by Chance Finegan provides a slightly different perspective to the previous papers. In 'The interpreter as researcher: Ethical heritage interpretation in Indigenous contexts', Finegan integrates Indigenous research and heritage interpretation scholarship to discuss how interpretation should be underpinned by research that is congruent with Indigenous expectations for research ethics and methods. The paper focuses on Indigenous research methods and

ethics, and discusses the connections between Western knowledge and colonialism, to highlight the issues for interpreters working with Indigenous content.

Conclusion

Travellers have long sought to experience the unfamiliar and exotic cultures and traditions of Indigenous peoples, with early examples of Indigenous tourism in the United States, Canada, Scandinavia, Australia, New Zealand and countries throughout Asia and Latin America. Similarly, contemporary travellers demonstrate a desire to seek out opportunities to experience Indigenous peoples and their culture (Nielsen & Wilson, 2012). Thus, we are witnessing world-wide growth in the awareness of, and interest in, Indigenous cultures, traditions, histories and knowledges.

Tourism has also long been promoted for its potential to revitalise Indigenous communities (Dyer, Aberdeen, & Schuler, 2003) and to sustain Indigenous cultural heritage. However, the nexus between culture and tourism is not always a positive one. Indigenous cultures have been the subject of academic writers and philosophers (predominantly anthropologists) for hundreds of years and for nearly half a century from a tourism lens. This paper has provided an overview of the main issues being addressed in contemporary research that explores the nexus between cultural heritage and Indigenous tourism and introduced the papers that form this special issue of the *Journal of Heritage Tourism*. This review, together with the special issue papers, have shown the myriad of ways that tourism can affect Indigenous culture and cultural identity. While modernisation and globalisation has led to the erosion of many Indigenous cultures and cultural heritage, tourism is arguably one mechanism through which to revive these cultures. However, of ongoing concern, is the paradoxical condition placed upon many Indigenous communities involved in tourism. This paradox sees Indigenous people negotiating the desire to develop socio-economically, while at the same time needing to 'stand still in time' to meet the needs of tourists. This conundrum has been contemplated by many researchers, and while a growing number of researchers are calling for the conceptualisation of 'authentic' cultural practices as constantly 'in transition', tourists still evaluate their Indigenous tourism experiences against expectations shaped by popular stereotypical representations of archaic practices. Indeed, around the world, many Indigenous people still find themselves with very little control of the imagery that commodifies their indigeneity and which stereotypes them as timelessly authentic. Here, therefore, lies a challenge for researchers: how can such entrenched stereotypes be challenged? And how can this be achieved on a global scale? Too often questions of cultural ownership and the 'right' to share culture still neglects the very people whose culture is being shared. Indeed there is a need to listen more carefully to minority voices. There is also a need to find better ways for giving these voices more prominence so they are better able to challenge dominant narratives, and as researchers, we need to be more cognisant of not only listening to Indigenous voices, but partnering with and co-creating our research to ensure Western analyses of tourist systems is not the domineering paradigm.

From a sustainability perspective it is also important that we as researchers consider alternative ways to development and sustainability. Such alternatives need to take a much greater community-driven approach and much less of a Western-centric view of what constitutes sustainable development, thus shifting focus from the immediate needs of visitors and the tourism industry in general to instead consider the cultural values at stake within tourism development. Questions thus arise around how to more meaningfully engage with Indigenous peoples' relationship with the land and by extension, the cultural space in which tourism initiatives operate, as meaningful engagement is arguably sustainable engagement.

With the increased adoption of ethnodevelopment, we are currently witnessing a greater shift towards developing, analysing and understanding Indigenous tourism from more Indigenous-centric models. There is also a shift towards greater use of Indigenous knowledge in Indigenous tourism and its development. While such a shift is positive and needed to ensure the continued integration of emic perspectives of Indigenous peoples, use of Indigenous-centric research and knowledge models

and application of Indigenous knowledge must become the norm in research and development that focuses on Indigenous cultural heritage in tourism and Indigenous development. As suggested by Dyll (2018, p. 333), ‘the application of critical and Indigenous qualitative methodologies necessitates the self-reflexive problematisation of Self–Other and researcher–researched relationships. Its objective is to make a case for research participants (normally known as ‘informants’, ‘subjects’, ‘sources’) to be included in certain kinds of studies as co-authors and co-researchers.’ As researchers, when we are involved in studies examining Indigenous issues in tourism and cultural heritage, we must all adapt our research practices to ensure they are ethical, transformative, participatory, and committed to dialogue with the Indigenous people who are partners in the research. Indeed, to overcome the historical marginalisation of Indigenous peoples, we need to make greater effort towards the collaborative co-creation of research between academics and Indigenous communities, while also adopting strategies that foster the exchange of ideas between traditional and scientific knowledge.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Dr **Lisa Ruhanen** is an Associate Professor and the Director of Education of the UQ Business School, The University of Queensland. She has been involved in over 30 academic and consultancy research projects in Australia and overseas. Her research areas include Indigenous tourism, sustainable tourism destination policy and planning, and climate change. Lisa has worked extensively as a consultant, external collaborator and executive committee member with a variety of divisions of the United Nations World Tourism Organization.

Dr **Michelle Whitford** is Dean (Learning and Student Outcomes) at Griffith University. Her research expertise is in the field of Indigenous tourism and events and event policy and planning. Dr Whitford’s research work includes co-coordinating projects in the area of Indigenous tourism and events with a focus on supply and demand, capacity development, entrepreneurship, authenticity and commodification and management.

References

- Altman, J. C., & Finlayson, J. (1992). *Aborigines, tourism and sustainable development*. Canberra: Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, Australian National University. Retrieved from https://www.jcu.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/122204/jcudev_012859.pdf
- Borges de Lima, I., & King, V. T. (Eds.). (2018). *Tourism and ethnodevelopment: Inclusion, empowerment and self-determination*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bott, E. (2018). Among the piranhas: The troubling lifespan of ethnic tropes in “tribal” tourism to Vietnam. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(8), 1291–1307.
- Bresner, K. (2014). Sharing identity through indigenous tourism: Osoyoos Indian Band’s Nk’Mip Desert Cultural Centre. *Anthropologica*, 56(1), 135–150.
- Bunten, A. (2008). Sharing culture or selling out? Developing the commodified persona in the heritage industry. *The American Ethnologist*, 35(3), 380–395.
- Bunten, A. (2014). Deriding demand: Indigenous imaginaries in tourism. In N. B. Salazar & H. H. Graburn (Eds.), *Tourism imaginaries: Anthropological approaches* (pp. 80–102). New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
- Burns, P. M. (2006). Social identities and the cultural politics of tourism. In P. M. Burns & M. Novelli (Eds.), *Tourism and social identities: Global frameworks and local realities* (pp. 13–24). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Butler, S. (2017). ‘Temporary belonging’: Indigenous cultural tourism and community art centres. In S. Carson, & M. Pennings (Eds.), *Performing cultural tourism. Communities, tourists and creative practices* (pp. 27–42). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Buzinde, C. N., Vandever, V., & Nyaupane, G. (2017). Native American communities and community development: The case of Navajo Nation. In S. Carson, & M. Pennings (Eds.), *Performing cultural tourism: Communities, tourists and creative practices* (pp. 44–60). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Campos, M. V., Scott, N., & Breaky, N. (2014). Ecotourism: A new challenge for protected rainforest areas in Chile. In B. Prideaux (Ed.), *Rainforest tourism, conservation and management: Challenges for sustainable development* (pp. 134–145). New York, NY: Earthscan/Routledge.

- Carr, A., Ruhanen, L., & Whitford, M. (2016). Indigenous peoples and tourism: The challenges and opportunities for sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(8–9), 1067–1079.
- Cohen, E. (1988). Authenticity and commoditization in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(3), 371–386.
- Coronado, G. (2014). Selling culture? Between commoditisation and cultural control in Indigenous alternative tourism. *Pasos: Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, 12(1), 11–28.
- de Kadt, E. (1979a). Social planning for tourism in the developing countries. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(1), 36–48.
- De Kadt, E. (1979b). *Tourism: Passport to development? Perspectives on the social and cultural effects of tourism in developing countries*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Dyer, P., Aberdeen, L., & Schuler, S. (2003). Tourism impacts on an Australian indigenous community: A Djabugay case study. *Tourism Management*, 24(1), 83–95.
- Dyll, L. (2018). Indigenous environmental knowledge and challenging dualisms in development: Observations from the Kalahari. *Development in Practice*, 28(3), 332–344.
- Einar Johansen, T., & Mehmetoglu, M. (2011). Indigenous tourism from a visitor's perspective: An empirical examination of Valene L. Smith's 4Hs at a sami festival in Norway. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 6(2), 129–141.
- Espeso-Molinero, P., Carlisle, S., & Pastor-Alfonso, M. J. (2016). Knowledge dialogue through Indigenous tourism product design: A collaborative research process with the Lacandon of Chiapas, Mexico. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(8–9), 1331–1349.
- Espinosa Abascal, T., Fluker, M., & Jiang, M. (2015). Domestic demand for Indigenous tourism in Australia: Understanding motivations, barriers, and implications for future development. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 10(1), 1–20.
- Giblin, J. D. (2017). Touring and obscuring poverty: Urban and rural cultural-heritage tourism. *Heritage & Society*, 10(2), 128–146.
- Heldt Cassel, S., & Maureira, T. M. (2017). Performing identity and culture in Indigenous tourism – A study of Indigenous communities in Québec, Canada. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 15(1), 1–14.
- Hinch, T., & Butler, R. (2007). Introduction: Revisiting common ground. In R. Butler & T. Hinch (Eds.), *Tourism and indigenous peoples* (pp. 1–12). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hsu, P.-H. (2018). Tourist perceptions of living authenticity in indigenous tourism destinations: The case of Smangus Village in Taiwan. *Tourism, Culture & Communication*, 18(2), 117–131.
- Hsu, P.-H., & Nilep, C. (2018). Authenticity in indigenous tourism: The provider's perspective. *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies*, 8(2), 16–28.
- Kagumba, A. K. (2013). *Indigenous cultural tourism and the discourse of development among the Batwa of Mgahinga, South Western Uganda* (Master of Philosophy in Indigenous Studies). University of Tromsø, Norway.
- Kessy, D. (2017). Involving indigenous community in tourism activities: Strategies and interventions. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 6(4), 1–9.
- King, D. A., & Stewart, W. P. (1996). Ecotourism and commodification: Protecting people and places. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 5(3), 293–305.
- King, V. T., & Borges de Lima, I. (2018). Tourism and ethnodevelopment: An introduction. In I. Borges de Lima & V. T. King (Eds.), *Tourism and ethnodevelopment: Inclusion, empowerment and self-determination* (pp. 3–24). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Korstanje, M. (2012). Reconsidering cultural tourism: An anthropologist's perspective. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 7(2), 179–184.
- Liu, Z. (2018). Searching for a lost aura: A Naxi Dongba's spatial practices and space remaking in touristic commoditization. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 16(4), 348–364.
- Mackley-Crump, J. (2016). From Private Performance to the public stage: Reconsidering 'staged authenticity' and 'traditional' performances at the Pasifika festival. *Anthropological Forum*, 26(2), 155–176.
- Maraud, S., & Guyot, S. (2016). Mobilization of imaginaries to build Nordic Indigenous natures. *Polar Geography*, 39(3), 196–216.
- McIntosh, A. J., Hinch, T., & Ingram, T. (2002). Cultural identity and tourism. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 4(2), 39–42.
- Nielsen, N., & Wilson, E. (2012). From invisible to indigenous-driven: A critical typology of research in indigenous tourism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 19(1), 67–75.
- Nkwanyana, S. M. (2018). Conserving cultural heritage and the usage of indigenous knowledge: A case study of the Zululand District Municipality, KwaZulu-Natal. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 7(2), 1–12.
- Ona, J. G., & Solis, L. S. L. (2017). Challenges and opportunities for the development and promotion of Ibaloy crafts as tourism products. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 11(4), 593–607.
- Pereiro, X. (2016). A review of Indigenous tourism in Latin America: Reflections on an anthropological study of Guna tourism (Panama). *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(8–9), 1121–1138.
- Pookhao, N., Bushell, R., Hawkins, M., & Staiff, R. (2018). Empowerment through community-based ecotourism in a globalised world global-local nexus – Three Thai villages as case studies. In I. Borges de Lima & V. T. King (Eds.), *Tourism and ethnodevelopment: Inclusion, empowerment and self-determination* (pp. 65–81). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Ranasinghe, R., & Cheng, L. (2018). Tourism-induced mobilities and transformation of indigenous cultures: Where is the Vedda community in Sri Lanka heading to? *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 16(5), 521–538.
- Richards, G. (2018). Cultural tourism: A review of recent research and trends. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 36, 12–21.
- Rights and Resources Initiative. (2015). *Who owns the world's land? A global baseline of formally recognized indigenous and community land rights*. Washing, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://rightsandresources.org/wp-content/uploads/GlobalBaseline_complete_web.pdf
- Ruhanen, L., & Whitford, M. (2018). Racism as an inhibitor to the organisational legitimacy of Indigenous tourism businesses in Australia. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(15), 1728–1742.
- Ruhanen, L., Whitford, M., & McLennan, C. L. (2015). Indigenous tourism in Australia: Time for a reality check. *Tourism Management*, 48, 73–83.
- Ryan, C., & Aiken, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Indigenous tourism: The commodification and management of culture*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Saarinén, J. (2013). Indigenous tourism and the challenge of sustainability. In M. Smith & G. Richards (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of cultural tourism* (pp. 220–226). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Saugestad, S. (2000). Dilemmas in Norwegian development assistance to indigenous peoples. *Forum for Development Studies*, 27(2), 205–234.
- Saugestad, S. (2008). Beyond the 'Columbus context': New challenges as the indigenous discourse is applied to Africa. In H. Minde (Ed.), *Indigenous peoples: Self-determination, knowledge, indigeneity* (pp. 157–173). Delft: Eburon Academic Publishers.
- Scherrer, P., & Doohan, K. (2013). It's not about believing': Exploring the transformative potential of cultural acknowledgement in an Indigenous tourism context. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 54(2), 158–170.
- Stavenhagen, R. (1986). Ethnodevelopment: A neglected dimension in development thinking. In R. Apthorpe, & A. Kralh (Eds.), *Development studies: Critique and renewal* (pp. 71–94). Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Stronza, A. (2008). Through a new mirror: Reflections on tourism and identity in the Amazon. *Human Organization*, 67(3), 244–257.
- The World Bank. (2018). Indigenous peoples. Retrieved from <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/indigenouspeoples>
- Thompson-Carr, A. (2013). Maori tourism: A case study of managing indigenous cultural values. In M. Smith & G. Richards (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of cultural tourism* (pp. 227–235). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tomaselli, K. G. (Ed.). (2012). *Cultural tourism and identity: Rethinking indigeneity*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Travesi, C. (2018). Knowing and being known: Approaching Australian indigenous tourism through aboriginal and non-aboriginal politics of knowing. *Anthropological Forum*, 28(3), 275–292.
- United Nations. (2017). *State of the world's indigenous peoples: Education*. 3rd Volume. New York, NY: Author. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2017/12/State-of-Worlds-Indigenous-Peoples_III_WEB2018.pdf
- Warnholtz, G., & Barkin, D. (2017). Development for whom? Tourism used as a social intervention for the development of indigenous/rural communities in natural protected areas. In I. Borges de Lima & V. T. King (Eds.), *Tourism and ethnodevelopment: Inclusion, empowerment and self-determination* (pp. 49–65). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Warnholtz, G., & Barkin, D. (2018). Development for whom? Tourism used as a social intervention for the development of indigenous/rural communities in natural protected areas. In I. Borges de Lima & V. T. King (Eds.), *Tourism and ethnodevelopment: Inclusion, empowerment and self-determination* (pp. 27–43). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Weaver, D. B. (2016). Beyond convention: Reimagining indigenous tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 18(1), 28–37.
- Whitford, M., & Ruhanen, L. (2010). Australian Indigenous tourism policy: Practical and sustainable policies? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(4), 475–496.
- Whitford, M., & Ruhanen, L. (2016). Indigenous tourism research, past and present: Where to from here? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(8–9), 1080–1099.
- Whitney-Squire, K. (2016). Sustaining local language relationships through indigenous community-based tourism initiatives. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(8–9), 1156–1176.
- Williams, L. K., & Gonzalez, V. V. (2017). Indigeneity, sovereignty, sustainability and cultural tourism: Hosts and hostages at 'Iolani Palace, Hawai'i. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(5), 668–683.
- Yang, L. (2012). Tourists' perceptions of ethnic tourism in Lugu Lake, Yunnan, China. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 7(1), 59–81.
- Zeppel, H. (2010). Managing cultural values in sustainable tourism: Conflicts in protected areas. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 10(2), 93–104.