Indigenous peoples and tourism: the challenges and opportunities for sustainable tourism

Anna Carr, Lisa Ruhanen & Michelle Whitford

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Indigenous peoples and tourism: the challenges and opportunities for sustainable tourism

Anna Carr[a], Lisa Ruhanen[b] and Michelle Whitford[c]

[a]Department of Tourism, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand; [b]Tourism Cluster, UQ School of Business, The University of Queensland, Australia; [c]Department of Tourism, Sport and Hotel Management, Griffith University, Australia

ABSTRACT

The Indigenous tourism focus of the 16 papers in this special issue provides readers with an opportunity to explore the dynamics behind an array of issues pertaining to sustainable Indigenous tourism. These papers not only provide a long overdue balance to the far too common, negatively biased media reports about Indigenous peoples and their communities but also highlight the capacity of tourism as an effective tool for realizing sustainable Indigenous development. Throughout the papers reviewed in detail here, readers are reminded of the positive (capacity building) and negative (commodification) realities of Indigenous tourism development. Concomitantly, readers are privy to the practical and theoretical contributions pertaining to the management of cultural values and Indigenous businesses and the social and economic empowerment of Indigenous groups. The main contribution of this special issue, however, is a call for increasing research by, or in collaboration with, Indigenous researchers so that Indigenous authors and editors of academic journals become the norm in academia. Ultimately, Indigenous scholars and tourism providers should be the major contributors to, and commentators about, mainstream and niche approaches to Indigenous tourism management, whilst communities gain visibility not just as the visited "Other", but as global leaders within tourism and related sectors.

Introduction

This special issue introductory paper provides readers with a contextual overview of indigeneity and Indigenous tourism. Additionally, it examines the complex and continually evolving relationship between Indigenous tourism and the concepts and practices of sustainable tourism, before reviewing the 16 other papers in this special issue. This paper is written by the special issue's guest editors who, collectively, have over 50 years of experience in leading theoretical and applied Indigenous tourism research projects that have focused on a wide range of issues, and also in teaching and supervising both undergraduate and postgraduate projects centered on and around various aspects of Indigenous tourism. As researchers, the guest editors have worked collaboratively with Indigenous organizations including WINTA (World Indigenous Tourism Alliance), KUMA (Southern Māori Business Network Te Kupeka Umaka Māori Ki Araiteuru), Te Ana Whakairo (Ngai Tahu Māori Rock Art Trust) in New Zealand; and in Australia, the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders Studies, Torres Strait Regional Authority, Indigenous Business Australia and the Indigenous community

---

CONTACT Anna Carr ✉ anna.thompson@otago.ac.nz

organization, First Contact Inc. A combination of personal ancestry, respect for and empathy with Indigenous values provides the authors with an opportunity, both individually and collectively to continue to develop a passionate and continually evolving academic relationship with the complex, fluid and globally significant field of study identified as Indigenous tourism.

The study of Indigenous tourism

What makes the development of Indigenous tourism unique and thus, of special interest to academic researchers? From both praxis and theoretical perspectives, the intangible and tangible manifestations of Indigenous tourism development have gained an academic following since the mid-twentieth century. For instance, anthropologists and sociologists were amongst the earliest academics to explore a range of theoretical dimensions of Indigenous cultures such as identity, empowerment and authenticity. Ethnographic researchers were arguably the forerunners of studies focusing on the impacts of tourism on Indigenous peoples. Identified impacts of Indigenous tourism included issues pertaining to acculturation and commodification of culture and thus increasingly, research focused on (among other things), mitigating these negative impacts and identifying ways to ensure tourists had the opportunity to have meaningful experiences of "other cultures, in purer, simpler lifestyles" (MacCannell, 1976, p. 8). The early work of Almagor (1985), Cohen (1979) and Graburn (1976) in particular, must be credited with elevating the significance of Indigenous tourism research and paving the way for future scholars whose research interests are located in the study field of Indigenous tourism.

Globally, Indigenous tourism is commonly viewed as a means of facilitating socio-economic benefits to Indigenous individuals, communities and host regions. Like all forms of tourism, the development, implementation and management of Indigenous tourism should arguably be underpinned by the principles of sustainable development and natural resource management. From the early 1990s, researchers have produced seminal texts and/or journal articles about various dimensions of Indigenous tourism (see Altman & Finlayson, 1993; Bunten & Graburn, 2009; Butler & Hinch, 1996; Notzke, 1999, 2004; Ryan & Aicken, 2005; Smith, 1989, 1996; Smith & Brent, 2001; Smith & Richards, 2013; Sofield, 1993; Zeppel, 2006). Early works, such as these, have to varying degrees, been underpinned by the principles of sustainability and thus often espoused development that not only facilitates the economic well-being of Indigenous peoples and ensures conservation of Indigenous cultural landscapes and the environment, but also (and above all), ensures tourism development is used as a positive opportunity for enhancing the social, cultural and place identity of Indigenous peoples (Amoamo & Thompson, 2011; Bunten & Graburn, 2009; Carr, 2004; Lemelin, Thompson-Carr, Johnson, Stewart, & Dawson, 2013; Shackley, 2001; Smith & Richards, 2013; Sofield, 1991, 1993, 2003; Sofield & Birtles, 1996; Spark, 2002; Thompson, 2007; Thompson, 2013). These researchers explored issues around economic prosperity, tensions associated with the marketing of culture, enhancement of the socio-economic well-being of Indigenous peoples and challenges within the broader contexts of environmental, economic social and cultural sustainability when pursuing sustainable livelihoods. A recurring theme emerging from many of these studies (and others), was an underpinning notion that all communities (whether developing tourism or other industries, and/or despite whether the community is located remotely or in densely urbanized areas), often share common challenges and/or aspirations pertaining to the development of opportunities to (among other things), nurture healthy families or other groupings, facilitate employment, improve health and provide recreation and education opportunities for community members.

"Indigenous" or "ethnic" tourism?

Many of the aforementioned challenges and issues facing Indigenous communities are equally important to non-Indigenous communities, especially those that host cultural and/or ethnic tourism experiences. The question here then, is what constitutes Indigenous tourism and in this instance,

what are the parameters the editors considered when defining "Indigenous" and "Indigenous tourism" for this special issue?

Arguably there is substantial overlap when considering cultural and/or community-based tourism (CBT), as many of the concerns facing Indigenous peoples stem from shared human values, experiences and realities affecting communities worldwide. Ethnic communities may be migrant and thus not Indigenous per se. They usually are comprised of cultural groups commonly linked by racial characteristics, language, beliefs and kinship lines. They may have common origins other than kinship, such as nationality or socially shared individual constructions of their ethnic identity (Stone, 2003). Indigenous peoples may also belong to a particular ethnic or cultural group and their self-identity can be very dynamic and complex, often fluidly interpreted with many young Indigenous peoples defying being constrained to one particular definition that may essentialize them as "Indigenous". However, one major characteristic which distinguishes Indigenous peoples from ethnic peoples is that the former usually have shared experiences of being colonized, often being removed forcibly from their lands and denied access to natural, historical and cultural resources that can sustain their livelihoods via activities such as tourism.

Within academic texts, the use of the terms "Indigenous" and "non-Indigenous" have thus been regularly used to describe the difference between the original inhabitants of a landscape and those people who are not the original inhabitants. According to Hinch and Butler (1996, p. 9), 'the umbrella term of Indigenous people is used to describe races of people who are endemic or native to a destination region' as opposed to "ethnic" communities who may inhabit an area they have migrated to. In contrast, "non-Indigenous" people are recognized as not having the continual history of occupying land prior to colonization and could be migrants (with another cultural or ethnic ancestry) who have also been colonized, or the colonizers or descendants of colonizing settlers themselves. Moreover, non-Indigenous inhabitants have usually been associated with Western societies originating from within European cultural and values systems (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, 2012) whereas the Indigenous are "pre-existing peoples" at a time of colonization (Goehring, 1993, p. 4).

While numerous scholars have provided us with a cache of definitions pertaining to what constitutes "Indigenous", there is little doubt that academic debate on the issue will continue, even with the United Nation's Declaration being used for guidance because, as Indigenous academic Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith explains, the term "Indigenous" is problematic:

> … it appears to collectivise many distinct populations whose experiences under imperialism have been vastly different. Other collective terms also in use refer to 'First Peoples' or 'Native Peoples', 'First Nations' or 'People of the Land', 'Aboriginals' or 'Fourth World Peoples' (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 6).

Sustainable tourism and Indigenous peoples

This *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* (JOST) special issue explores the interrelationships between sustainable tourism development and Indigenous peoples. The "Indigenous" focus of the 16 papers in this issue provides an opportunity to explore the dynamics behind sustainable Indigenous tourism development. The underpinning principles of the collective research clearly resonate with the "manifestations" of the United Nations (UN) Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UN, 2016) from 2007. The UN Declaration was notable for: "Affirming that Indigenous peoples are equal to all other peoples, while recognizing the right of all peoples to be different, to consider themselves different, and to be respected as such". Moreover, many of the "rights" in the Declaration underpin issues discussed in the special issue papers, including the rights to lands and territories (Articles 10 and 25), the use and revitalization of languages or recognition of place names (Article 13), involvement in decision-making processes (Article 18), involvement in development and employment opportunities (Articles 20, 21) and most significantly, the numerous Articles advocating Indigenous rights to lands, territories and natural or cultural resources and those which advocate cultural heritage traditions and revitalization (Article 11.1) and (Article 31.1). For instance, the latter advocates "Indigenous peoples

have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, as well as the manifestations of their sciences, technologies and cultures, including human and genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs, sports and traditional games and visual and performing arts".

Over 65 abstracts were submitted in the initial call for papers, the outcome of which is this double special issue, with 16 published papers presenting relevant, insightful research to an international audience of scholars, students, tourism practitioners and hopefully, community members in areas frequented by tourism activities. A special feature of the issue is the research papers provide a long overdue balance to habitually biased media reports about communities of Indigenous peoples who are too often depicted in a negative light. For instance, the papers overall, recognize that tourism can (and does) provide a positive development stage for indigeneity. Discussions include (among other things), the capacity of Indigenous tourism to nurture cultural arts, language revitalization and traditions (countering and enabling an escape from a "victim" narrative). Additionally, there is discussion focusing on the impetus for developing Indigenous tourism ventures, which is usually based on tourism's ability to create employment, often in non-urban locations where other employment opportunities are limited.

Other contributions to the special issue include discursive papers which seek to engage readers to think deeply about theoretical and practical issues facing Indigenous communities and many of the papers provide solutions for Indigenous tourism planning, for instance by testing methodologies for collaborative research with Indigenous communities. The papers also present the complexity of multi-faceted, yet diverse issues facing Indigenous peoples seeking economic empowerment or revitalization of their cultural identity through the provision of visitor services or experiences. All the papers are intertwined by a history of academic research on the topic and there is a recurrence of references to foundational tourism studies that have informed the papers' literature reviews, demonstrating the value of those early critical studies. Papers' discussions link several core issues including the value of Indigenous knowledge and cultural traditions (empowerment), governance and planning (implementation), and product development which touches on facets of cultural revitalization, heritage interpretation and authenticity (innovation). Geographically, thematically and theoretically, the papers adopt different perspectives and as each Indigenous group's circumstance is culturally laden and influenced by their political and social histories, there is no one story, no "one fix" and no easy solutions for many of the negative circumstances facing Indigenous peoples or communities.

The initial papers in the special issue synthesize and review common issues in Indigenous tourism research (Whitford & Ruhanen, 2016) and provide international case studies with implications for best practice (Fletcher, Pforr, & Brueckner, 2016; Pereiro, 2016; Reggers, Grabowski, Wearing, Chatterton, & Schweinsberg, 2016; Whitney-Squire, 2016). Other contributions present research that ranges from visitors' experiences of Indigenous events (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2016) to reflections on how policy-makers or managers can influence the recognition of Indigenous cultural manifestations and values within tourism settings including protected natural areas (Hillmer-Pegram, 2016; Shultis & Heffner, 2016; Walker & Moscardo, 2016). Contributors also posit research questions that are the outcome of direct collaboration with Indigenous peoples (Espeso-Molinero, Carlisle, & Pastor-Alfonso, 2016; Holmes, Grimwood, King, & the Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation, 2016; Reggers et al., 2016; Whitney-Squire, 2016). Several papers were longitudinal ethnographic studies spanning many years (Fletcher et al., 2016; Holmes et al., 2016; Pereiro, 2016; Reggers et al., 2016) whilst others were conducted as more focused analyses of products and visitor markets (Abascal, Fluker, & Jiang, 2016; Espeso-Molinero et al., 2016; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2016).

The unique dynamics of Indigenous peoples who have experienced colonization and continue to exist within constrained circumstances are linked within all the papers. These include insights into issues with Indigenous entrepreneurship and innovation (Chan, Iankova, Zhang, McDonald, & Qi, 2016; Espeso-Molinero et al., 2016; Koot, 2016; Siever & Matthews, 2016). Additionally, several contributors have explored new innovative opportunities to strengthen cultural identity by Indigenous

control of the representation, branding or images presented in online marketing (Mkono, 2016; Seiver & Matthews, 2016).

The papers

The first main paper by Whitford and Ruhanen (2016), sets the scene for the following contributions through an analysis of Indigenous tourism research published in 153 journals over a 35 year period from a variety of disciplines including anthropology, geography and tourism, among others. They chart the historical development of Indigenous tourism including product development, changing market demand for Indigenous tourism and government policies in countries, such as Australia, New Zealand, the United States and Canada. They identify trends in the research themes, noting a distinct trend in research addressing Indigenous tourism in the context of sustainable tourism and development. The secondary analysis is complimented by surveying researchers of Indigenous tourism. In contemplating future directions for Indigenous tourism research, they call for researchers to embed Indigenous perspectives through iterative and adaptable methodologies where affected stakeholders are a part of the research process, knowledge creation and outcomes.

The shared global experiences of Indigenous businesses are explored by Fletcher et al. (2016). Their paper presents a comparative review of Australian, Namibian and North American international case studies of Indigenous tourism ventures utilizing policy reviews, stakeholder interviews and on-site observations. They conclude that "best practice" approaches to sustainable development are dependent on the local context and stress the need for broader, governing enablers (i.e. policy and land tenure), opportunities for collaboration that empower Indigenous stakeholders and increased diversity within Indigenous tourism product development.

Pereiro's (2016) ethnographic fieldwork offers insights into Latin American Indigenous communities with lessons from a specific case study on the Guna sustainable tourism model. The paper conceptualizes trends in Latin American Indigenous tourism and debates best/bad practice arising from cultural commodification before presenting reflections and findings from collaborative anthropological field work conducted in Guna Yala from 2003 to 2013. The Guna (1996) "Statute of Guna Tourism" enabled the Guna people to respond to growing visitor numbers via Indigenous-led planning and monitoring of the visitor sector (Pereiro, Martínez, Ventocilla, De León, & Del Valle, 2012). Thus, the community could respond through involvement in the provision of accommodation, activities and retail development. While the Guna may shape tourism, rather than being shaped by tourism, they still grapple with social and environmental challenges. Pereiro also observes cultural changes being shaped by factors other than tourism. For example, modernization, with the expansion of digital media and urbanization, stresses the need for the empowerment of Indigenous peoples via their involvement in the governance of the regions they inhabit.

Reggers et al. (2016) undertook a longitudinal study (between 2004 and 2014), on the establishment of the Kokoda Trail in Papua New Guinea. Their richly informed paper critiques the implementation of a CBT approach to sustainable development utilizing participatory rural appraisal (PRA) techniques such as social mapping, where villagers could record amenities and plan tourism infrastructure. The authors express the need to be culturally and politically aware and utilizing cautious approaches when collaborating with communities to ensure that planning, (including their own adaptation of CBT and PRA within a Papua New Guinea context) is not merely adopting the latest "trend" or using development "buzzwords". The depth of field work, research commitment to intensive planning and monitoring through community engagement with repeated workshops, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, observations and community planning sessions, that accompanied the establishment of the trail, provides a best practice exemplar of product development. Issues of community rivalry, community dependency and the long-term commitment of Indigenous tourism researchers in a participatory planning process are also detailed within the paper. The overall contribution from the authors' reflections and research findings includes a comprehensive understanding of PRA frameworks for analyzing and reviewing community involvement in planning, negotiation,

development and implementation of a complex tourism venture in a politically tense and geographically challenging setting.

Whitney-Squire (2016) presents a collaborative study that was undertaken with the Haida First Nation people of Haida Gwaii in British Columbia, Canada. Whitney-Squire discusses the significance of language to sustaining Indigenous communities and culture whilst, through language based tourism initiatives, connecting individual Indigenous peoples with their collective identity. Whitney-Squire examined related issues of empowerment and product development, self-identification and cultural integrity, not only with the Haida but also with the Māori people of New Zealand and Hawaiians of Hawaii. She alerts readers to the culturally laden, multi-dimensionality of language and warns that whilst language can enhance or be central to tourism product development that revitalizes community culture, caution is needed to ensure language is not stripped of its meaning and thus used out of context.

Whitney-Squire's paper highlights the importance of "Indigenous voice" and this theme continues with the next two contributions, which also address approaches to communicate, strengthen and acknowledge the cultural values of Indigenous communities. They too draw on research that is geographically situated in a North American context. However, while the first paper (Holmes et al., 2016) describes a cultural group who are empowered, the following paper by Hillmer-Pegram (2016) exposes a situation where local Indigenous peoples were being disempowered by the colonial processes of cruise tourism.

The paper by Holmes et al. (2016) is notable for being written with the input of the First Nation peoples. Not only is the research undertaken in collaboration with the Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation, they are further empowered by participating in the process of academic publication of the research. This study shows that the impacts arising from irresponsible and ignorant visitor behavior have been a key challenge for Indigenous communities. This led to the Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation developing an Indigenous informed code of conduct to guide visitor behavior. The paper describes how information and narratives from workshops and interviews enabled an "Indigenized visitor code of conduct" to safeguard unique Indigenous values in sensitive environments. Importantly, the research was Indigenous driven and guided by a Lutsel K'e research coordinator and this was integral to the research process and outcomes. The paper has many lessons for those interested in improving and enabling approaches to CBT.

Hillmer-Pegram's (2016) paper explores tourism impacts (particularly the burgeoning cruise tourism sector), on the values of the Indigenous Iñupiat people of Barrow, Alaska. Drawing on literature from sustainable tourism, Indigenous tourism and the radical political economy of tourism, the paper presents data that are analyzed using a theoretical framework that examines issues around spaces of confluence and divergence with tourism development, tourists and the Iñupiat. The research methodology also follows the approach used by Holmes et al. (2016), which utilizes site visits enabling participant observations, workshops with community leaders and stakeholder interviews, with these results triangulated with online visitor data. The paper's findings highlighted the divergence between tourism and Iñupiaq values, including how the influence of non-Indigenous, non-local tourism operators within the community can lead to conflicts between tourism activities in spaces where traditional subsistence practices are enacted. On a positive note, the research noted that the Indigenous leaders of Barrow are conceptualizing a future vision for tourism that is compatible with, if not led by, Indigenous values. The paper contributes a notable example of how Indigenous peoples utilize capitalist opportunities to enhance subsistence lifestyles through tourism employment. Additionally, the theoretical contribution of the paper lies in its depiction of how a radical political economy approach, within an Indigenous (nature based) tourism context, can be drawn upon to further sustainable tourism studies.

The interdependency between Indigenous peoples' economic development, cultural values and their connection to traditional lands and natural resources, is further explored in the next three papers: Koot (2016), Shultis and Heffner (2016) and Walker and Moscardo (2016). Koot (2016) presents findings from ethnographic field-work that highlights the raw, hard truth of the long-lasting impacts

of colonization and neoliberal capitalism. Koot's South African study of the Indigenous South Kalahari Bushmen (≠Khomani) found colonial prejudice towards Bushmen continues despite the fact that successful tourism ventures in the region are dependent on the portrayal of the people and the "Bushman image and symbolism (which) have created exchange value and are therefore linked with public relations, marketing and branding". This study is set within the context of *Baasskap* culture, where there are paternalistic attitudes towards Bushmen ("immature" workers) and a harsh contrast between luxury lodges and poverty-ridden villagers without land who provide cheap tourism labor. Because of traditional power dynamics, even cooperative ventures are not fulfilling promises with little trickle-down of capital from tourism to the ≠Khomani, whose cultural image is frozen in a "primitive" marketing narrative. The paper contributes a grounded, rather grim, insight into post-apartheid tourism settings where capitalistic, power-led structures require political and governmental change for equality to be realized in such Indigenous settings.

The next contributions explore governance and Indigenous values in tourism management. Shultis and Heffner's (2016) paper examines Indigenous management involvement in a co-managed national park in the Yukon Territory of Canada. It explores new approaches to integrate traditional ecological knowledge and cultural values that can inform decision-makers and protected area managers planning the conservation of biological diversity. The future role of Indigenous peoples in the management of outdoor recreation and nature-based tourism in protected areas is the focus and they examine the barriers to conservation discourses that enable meaningful engagement by Indigenous peoples. Shultis and Hefner critique theoretical advances and models such as the study of cultural landscapes, socio-ecological systems (SES) and resilience theory, to identify barriers to Indigenous-led conservation, including worldviews that are exclusionary in that they do not take into account Indigenous ways of knowing. The paper further contributes a discussion on parks as leisure landscapes (rather than living, working places) and culture/nature dualism by reflecting on four years of community participant observations in Tombstone Territorial Park, a co-managed protected area established as part of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement. The authors progress the idea of integrating indigeneist ways of thinking and managing conservation by proposing a pyramid of change, where traditional western discourses and ways of doing can progress with Indigenous control of parks or new approaches such as bio-cultural conservation.

Walker and Moscardo (2016) present findings about the tour guiding aspirations of traditional Indigenous owners from Stanley Island (North-East Australia). As with Hillmer-Pegram's earlier paper, expedition cruises frequent the area and the community also had opportunities to transform visitors' values and perceptions of the island's place images. The paper also touches on issues raised in Shultis and Heffner's work on integrating Indigenous values in conservation management by examining how interpretation can convey Indigenous values. The authors examined how Indigenous interpretive guides (who were representatives of the Yithuwarra Traditional Owners) interpreted the significance of the cave paintings and the natural vegetation of the island to expedition cruise passengers by employing an ethnographic approach with interviews, open-ended discussions and participant observations. Findings from research with the Indigenous interpreters were triangulated with a survey of the experiences of expedition cruise passengers. Similar to Shultis and Heffner's paper, Walker and Moscardo conclude that interpretation planning has been dominated by western approaches that exclude Indigenous values. They advocate the need for a new approach to the interpretation of place values by considering Indigenous community values throughout interpretive planning.

The paper by Chan et al. (2016) introduces the readers to Chinese perspectives of Indigenous sustainable tourism issues. The authors examined entrepreneurial activities at the Honghe Hani Rice Terraces UNESCO World Heritage Site in China. Their findings are mainly informed by the outcomes of field work that included interviewing and observing Indigenous Hani and Yi villagers' responses to cultural change as a result of tourism and the arrival of new settlers in the region. They propose that while cultural change is being imposed on some community members, other Indigenous people are increasing their socio-economic standing by adapting entrepreneurial strategies introduced by newcomers through a process of "self-gentrification". Importantly, this paper contributes a non-Western,

Chinese perspective of indigeneity and coping strategies and in particular, the paper discusses the role of returning Indigenous migrants who proceed to innovate and practice entrepreneurship in their communities. The authors conclude that while individuals shape the future of their own communities through self-gentrification, modernizing and adapting to change threatens traditional ways of life as a result of outsider and tourism influences. Indigenous tourism is shown as an innovative practice and one that reflects traditional values.

The next author's long experience and strong publication record will be familiar to researchers of Indigenous research issues. Higgins-Desbiolles (2016) analyses an innovative setting of Indigenous festivals for the expression of Indigenous cultural identity. Her research on the Spirit Festival (Adelaide, Australia) was undertaken as a collaborative consultation with the Tandanya National Aboriginal Cultural Institute. Using mixed methods, Higgins-Desbiolles utilized the findings to critique first, from a praxis perspective, the role of festivals as a means for Indigenous entrepreneurship and development, and second to theoretically explore the Getz paradigm and its validity within an Indigenous context in a neoliberal era. Tensions and issues around Indigenous and social sustainability were unearthed, with various Indigenous and visitor viewpoints expressed, but overall the Spirit Festival was found to provide a platform for the positive visibility of Indigenous Australians and to demonstrate their value as holders of culture, knowledge and spirit.

The final four papers explore issues around product design, innovation and development. Also set in Australia, Seiver and Matthews (2016) work continues one thread of the previous paper by exploring the visibility of Australian Aboriginal culture in destination marketing. Focusing on four regional tourism destinations in New South Wales, all of which have significant Aboriginal tourism businesses, the paper reports on a content analysis of online and print promotional material. It was found that a marked difference occurred within the representation of Aboriginal culture between the regions. One of the study regions in particular presented traditional, frozen stereotypes of the culture by marketing "a destination image that was constructed primarily through a gaze of whiteness". In contrast, the other three destinations presented images representing a diversity of modern and traditional cultural experiences reflecting greater involvement by Aboriginal people in the planning and promotional activities of their region. The authors conclude that inclusive planning practices are needed, not only at national and state levels, but also at local levels to ensure the inclusion of diverse and informed representations of Aboriginal culture in marketing collateral, and which in turn, could enhance the success of Indigenous tourism development and create further opportunities.

Mkono (2016) utilizes netnography to explore how Indigenous businesses can harness the internet as the increasingly dominating trend towards online marketing enables international engagement with the marketing of tourism products. The Indigenous online "voice" is becoming a forceful marketing tool and Mkono frames online sites and spaces as platforms for communication and cultural engagement. In her study, Mkono adopted a passive "lurker" stance to analyze the experiences of visitors to four Australian Indigenous tourism experiences. The data-set consisted of 588 online tourist reviews and 137 operators' responses. The findings not only showed the frustrations of some operators, but also the ability of others to negotiate their cultural identities and the experiences of their visitors, using online platforms. The paper suggests the internet is not only a cost-effective means to access the marketplace of travelers from near and afar, it also provides the opportunity for Indigenous peoples to adopt the use of social media, which then empowers those Indigenous peoples as they directly manage visitor satisfaction and brands via online communication. The paper also advances the use of netnography, a relatively new methodological approach within Indigenous tourism studies, and its potential as an operational tool for Indigenous businesses.

The penultimate paper, Espeso-Molinero et al. (2016), provides a fresh perspective on Indigenous product development arising from collaboration with the Hack Winik (the "True People"), members of the Lacandon Mayan community in Chiapas, Mexico. Chiapas is a state that is inhabited by over one million Indigenous people, mostly living in poverty. The research explores a capacity building initiative utilizing participatory action research where the researchers assisted four Indigenous Hack Winik companies with the development of cultural and heritage tourism products. Several of the

research team were Lacandon and the authors present an Indigenous tourism product design (ITPD) model to conceptualize the stages of a planning process which would enable both western and traditional Indigenous dialogues within the planning timeframe. The negotiation of western-Indigenous differences were included in the models, though western time frames dominated despite the collaborative and Indigenous informed research process. The ITPD model is a significant contribution as it conceptualizes a tested, community grounded methodology for capacity building where the research and product design team members included Indigenous representatives from the communities.

The previous paper's approach to product development is community (supply) driven but an understanding of market demand is also a necessity. The final paper, Abascal et al. (2016), examines market demand for existing Aboriginal tourism products (Brambuk Indigenous Cultural Centre and Rock Art sites) within the cultural landscape of the Grampians Gariwerd National Park (Victoria, Australia). Visitor perceptions and preferences for Indigenous experiences were assessed using photo-elicitation techniques and interviews at the Grampians and Halls Gap Visitor Information Centre. The researchers present a systematized approach for describing visitor's preferences and awareness of the available products including the influence of beliefs, desires and valuing of culture, enabling factors and causal history that affect visitor demand and participation in Indigenous tourism. As with previous papers, they also found the need for integrated, local, regional and national approaches for inclusively enabling local Aboriginal communities to take active part in decision-making and planning processes which centered on what aspects of culture could be, or equally should not be, the foci of tourism experiences.

Conclusion

Indigenous tourism, underpinned by the principles of sustainable development, arguably provides opportunities to realize unique, often innovative, developments or management approaches that can be very beneficial to Indigenous peoples. The papers in the special issue reflect this and contribute to theoretical and methodological understandings and reflections pertaining to equitable and empowering approaches to Indigenous tourism development. Informed knowledge and understanding of such issues are integral to developing sustainable Indigenous tourism communities, businesses and products, as well as sustaining natural resources, be this through economic, social, environmental, cultural or political means. The papers of the special issue reflect the individual authors' aspirations of questioning the processes and dynamics of Indigenous development, especially about how we all engage with, are empowered by and collaborate when planning or developing tourism experiences. Academic communities, such as the readership of these JOST special issue papers, will benefit from more nuanced understandings pertaining to issues related to Indigenous cultural experiences, histories, politics, values and traditions (among others).

The first key observation from the special issue is that tourism is only one tool to realize sustainable Indigenous (and also community) development, including Indigenous control over resources. The importance of governance, collaboration and embedding Indigenous values and world-views in tourism development is unequivocally necessary to affect positive outcomes with any tourism venture. Long-term success is still not guaranteed for Indigenous tourism and whilst there are successes, the reality seems to be that in some countries (both developed and developing), for every Indigenous community that succeeds in tourism there will be other communities that do not succeed (perhaps because of forces outside the community's control).

Secondly, these papers provide insights into the reality of Indigenous development where communities struggle against poverty or alternatively, where Indigenous tourism ventures are the only positive, empowering opportunity for a community. Even then, those tourism businesses that succeed may face a myriad of challenges including geographical isolation, succession issues, internal disagreements, managing the diverse cultural values and expectations of the tourism operators within the community/tourism supply chain and the visitors themselves. An innovative trend for such

businesses may include the empowering potential of online and social media enabling Indigenous communities to engage on a global stage and direct the marketing of their culture without intermediaries.

Thirdly, this issue presents studies from areas previously under-represented in the literature, thus furthering the academic discussion about tourism and Indigenous peoples, while also bringing new authors' research in the field together in a single volume. Indeed, over the years there has been much published and non-published research on Indigenous tourism. Some of the lesser known material now also gains exposure by informing some of this issue's papers' literature reviews, including unpublished and published theses by Indigenous researchers, such as Ingram (1990), Barnett (1997), Tahana and Opperman (1998), Pihema (2002), Wikitera (2006) and Amoamo (2008).

With over 5000 Indigenous groups worldwide, it is impossible for each group to be *studied* and presented in a focused collection, but readers should gain insights that will influence the sustainable development and management of Indigenous tourism products in urban, rural/remote, outdoor recreation and nature based tourism environments, whilst valuing cultural "place" values. Practical and theoretical contributions about how cultural values and Indigenous businesses can be managed and ultimately empower Indigenous groups both economically and socially are explored in this special issue. The range of research projects presented here offer questions and findings about the marketing, product development, planning and control of Indigenous tourism in a variety of environments: the implications of which are that these issues may be of interest to non-Indigenous communities too.

The special value of Indigenous tourism for sustainable tourism studies

This paper, as with many of the papers in the special issue collection, stresses the value of sustainable tourism concepts and practices being applied to Indigenous tourism development and management. But there is also a reverse side to that discussion. Sustainable tourism, as a wider concept and practice, could learn much from closer study and involvement with Indigenous tourism. So many key issues are involved. On an overall level, much of the work on sustainable tourism, to date, has been concentrated on understanding and managing the impacts of tourism on the physical environment. The cultural heritage is a much more difficult area to assess and manage, with intangible heritage being especially difficult (McKercher & du Cross, 2002). Much, though not all, of the heritage of Indigenous peoples, including language, is intangible. Research on Indigenous tourism and its intangible heritage, and the testing of new techniques, could bring benefits to many other forms of tourism.

Central to that research is the need to broaden the concept of sustainable tourism away from its western developed-world roots to embrace other scenarios, not least to maintain variety and alternatives in a globalizing world. In the past, that discussion has centered on the need to create an Asian, notably Chinese, form of sustainable tourism (see Honggang, Dan, & Jigang, 2016; Sofield & Li, 2011). Indigenous tourism also needs alternative approaches to practice, aims and issues such as business ownership, governance, and capacity building — issues exemplified by the ideas and issues raised by Higgins-Desbiolles (2016), Hillmer-Pegram (2016) and Pereiro (2016). Those alternatives may have application in other non-Indigenous forms of tourism. The now often contested value of CBT (Salazar, 2012) may also have much to learn from research into Indigenous tourism, moving CBT studies on to a new geographical basis, of multiple communities brought together by their Indigenous populations. The Guna sustainable tourism model (Pereiro, 2016) particularly deserves to have greater discussion and testing elsewhere.

Finally, we have long-term aspirations that research by, or in collaboration with, Indigenous researchers appear more frequently in publications. Indigenous authors and editors of academic journals, based on their own intellectual merits should become the norm in academia. Ultimately, Indigenous scholars and tourism providers will be major contributors to, and commentators about, mainstream and niche approaches to tourism management and tourism studies, whilst communities gain visibility not just as the visited "Other", but as global leaders within tourism and related sectors.

Acknowledgments

Disclosure statement

Notes on contributors

Anna Carr specializes in tourism management in protected areas, cultural landscapes and Indigenous tourism development. She is a researcher and senior lecturer at the Department of Tourism, University of Otago, New Zealand, where she co-directs the Centre for Recreation Research. She recently co-edited *Mountaineering Tourism* and *Political Ecology of Tourism: Communities, Power and the Environment*.

Lisa Ruhanen is an associate professor of tourism and program leader for tourism postgraduate courses in 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.

Michelle Whitford is a senior lecturer and program director of the Bachelor of International Tourism and Hotel Management in the Department of Tourism, Sport and Hotel Management at Griffith University. Her research expertise includes event policy and planning and Indigenous tourism. She has co-coordinated projects in Indigenous tourism and other subjects for the Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre, the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Studies and numerous Australian Government agencies.

References

Abascal, T., Fluker, M., & Jiang, M. (2016). Domestic demand for indigenous tourism in Australia: Understanding intention to participate. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 24*(8—9). doi:10.1080/09669582.2016.1193187

Almagor, U. (1985). A tourist's 'vision quest' in an African game reserve. *Annals of Tourism Research, 12*, 31—47.

Altman, J.C., & Finlayson, J. (1993). Aborigines, tourism and sustainable development. *The Journal of Tourism Studies, 4*(1), 38—48.

Amoamo, M. (2008). *Decolonising Māori tourism: Representation and identity* (Unpublished thesis). University of Otago, Dunedin.

Amoamo, M., & Thompson, A. (2011). (Re)imaging Māori tourism: Representation and cultural hybridity in postcolonial New Zealand. *Tourist Studies, 10*(1), 35—55.

Barnett, S.J. (1997). Māori tourism. *Tourism Management, 18*(7), 471—473.

Bunten, A., & Graburn, N. (2009). Guest editorial: Current issues in indigenous tourism. *London Journal of Tourism, Sport and Creative Industries, 2*, 102—111.

Butler, R. & Hinch, T. (Eds.). (1996). *Tourism and indigenous peoples*. London: International Thomson Business Press.

Carr, A.M. (2004). Mountain places, cultural spaces — interpretation and sustainable visitor management of culturally significant landscapes: A case study of Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 12*(5), 432—459.

Chan, J.H., Iankova, K., Zhang, Y., McDonald, T., & Qi, X. (2016). The role of self-gentrification in sustainable tourism: Indigenous entrepreneurship at Honghe Hani Rice Terraces World Heritage Site, China. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *24* (8—9). doi:10.1080/09669582.2016.1189923

Cohen, E. (1979). *A phenomenology of tourist experiences. Sociology, 13*, 179—202.

Espeso-Molinero, P., Carlisle, S., & Pastor-Alfonso, M.J. (2016). Tourism product design from within: A collaborative research process with the Lacandon of Chiapas, Mexico. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 24*(8—9). doi:10.1080/ 09669582.2016.193188

Fletcher, C., Pforr, C., & Brueckner, M. (2016). Factors influencing indigenous engagement in tourism development: An international perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *24*(8—9). doi:10.1080/09669582.2016.1173045

Goehring, B. (1993). *Indigenous peoples of the world: An introduction to their past and future*. Saskatoon: Purich Publishing.

Graburn, N. (Ed.). (1976). *Ethnic and tourist arts: Cultural expressions from the fourth world*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2016). Sustaining spirit: A review and analysis of an urban Indigenous Australian cultural festival. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 24*(8−9) doi:10.1080/09669582.2016.1149184

Hillmer-Pegram, K. (2016). Integrating indigenous values with capitalism through tourism: Alaskan experiences and outstanding issues. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *24*(8−9) doi:10.1080/09669582.2016.1182536

Hinch, T., & Butler, R. (1996). Indigenous tourism: A common ground for discussion. In R. Butler & T. Hinch (Eds.), *Tourism and indigenous peoples*, (pp. 3−21), London: International Thomson Business Press.

Holmes, A.P., Grimwood, B.S.R., King, L.J. & The Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation. (2016). Creating an indigenized visitor code of conduct: The development of Denesoline self-determination for sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 24*(8−9). doi:10.1080/09669582.2016.1158828

Honggang, X., Dan, Z., & Jigang, B. (2016). Sustainability and nature-based mass tourism: Lessons from China's approach to the Huangshan Scenic Park. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 24*(2), 182−202.

Ingram T. (1990). *Indigenous entrepreneurship in the tourism industry in the pacific Islands* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Massey University, Palmerston North.

Koot, S.P. (2016). Contradictions of capitalism in the South African Kalahari: Indigenous Bushmen, their brand and *baasskap* in tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 24*(8−9). doi:10.1080/09669582.2016.1158825

Lemelin, H., Thompson-Carr, A., Johnston, M., Stewart, E., & Dawson, J. (2013). Indigenous people: Discussing the forgotten dimension of dark tourism and battlefield tourism. In D.K. Müller, L. Lundmark, & R. H.Lemelin (Eds.), *New issues in polar tourism: Communities, environments, politics* (pp. 205−212). Stuttgart: Springer Publications.

MacCannell, D. (1976). *The tourist: A new theory of the leisure class*. New York: Schocken.

McKercher, B., & du Cros, H. (2002). *Cultural tourism: The partnership between tourism and cultural heritage management*. New York: The Howarth Hospitality Press.

Mkono, M. (2016). Sustainability and indigenous tourism insights from social media: Worldview differences, cultural friction and negotiation. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 24*(8−9). doi:10.1080/09669582.2016.1177067

Notzke, C. (1999). Indigenous tourism development in the Arctic. *Annals of Tourism Research, 26*(1), 55−77.

Notzke, C. (2004). Indigenous tourism development in Southern Alberta, Canada: Tentative engagement. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 12*(1), 29−54.

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). doi:10.1080/09669582.2016.1189924

Pereiro, X., Martínez, M., Ventocilla, J., De León, C., & Del Valle, Y. (2012). Los turistores kunas. Antropología del turismo étnico en Panamá [Kuna tourism: The anthropology of ethnic tourism in Panama]. Mallorca: University of the Balearic Islands.

Pihema, W.T. (2002). *Boundaries of desire: How hapu and whanau mitigate the vectors of power during the establishment of a Māori tourism attraction* (Unpublished thesis). Victoria University, Wellington.

Reggers, A., Grabowski, S., Wearing, S.L., Chatterton, P., & Schweinsberg, S. (2016). Exploring outcomes of community-based tourism on the Kokoda Track, Papua New Guinea: A longitudinal study of participatory rural appraisal techniques. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 24*(8−9). doi:10.1080/09669582.2016.1145229

Ryan, C., & Aicken, M. (2005). *Indigenous tourism; the commodification and management of culture (advances in tourism research)*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Salazar, N.B. (2012). Community-based cultural tourism: Issues, threats and opportunities. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 20*(1), 9−22

Seiver, B., & Matthews, A. (2016). Beyond whiteness: A comparative analysis of representations of aboriginality in tourism destination images in New South Wales, Australia. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 24*(8−9). doi:10.1080/09669582.2016.1182537

Shackley, M. (2001). *Managing sacred sites*. London: Continuum.

Shultis, J., & Heffner, S. (2016). Hegemonic and emerging concepts of conservation: A critical examination of barriers to incorporating indigenous perspectives in protected area conservation policies and practice. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 24*(8−9). doi:10.1080/09669582.2016.1158827

Smith, V. (1989). *Hosts and guests: The anthropology of tourism*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Smith, V. (1996). Indigenous tourism: The 4 Hs. In R. Butler & T. Hinch (Eds.), *Tourism and indigenous peoples* (pp. 283−307). London: International Thomson Business Press.

Smith, V., & Brent, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Hosts and guests revisited: Tourism issues of the 21st century*. New York: Cognizant Communications.

Smith, M., & Richards, G. (Eds.). (2013). *Handbook of cultural tourism*. Oxon: Routledge.

Sofield, T.H.B. (1991). Sustainable ethnic tourism in the South Pacific: Some principles. *The Journal of Tourism Studies, 2*(1), 56−72.

Sofield, T.H.B. (1993). Indigenous tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research, 20*(4), 729−750.

Sofield, T.H.B. (2003). *Empowerment for sustainable tourism development*. Boston, MA: Pergamon.

Sofield, T.H.B., & Birtles, R.A. (1996). Indigenous peoples' cultural opportunity spectrum for tourism (IPCOST). In R. Butler & T. Hinch (Eds.), *Tourism and indigenous peoples: Issues and implications* (pp. 396−434). London: International Thomson Business Press.

Sofield, T., & Li, S. (2011). Tourism governance and sustainable national development in China: A macro-level synthesis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 19*(4−5), 501−534.

Spark, C. (2002). Brambuk living cultural centre: Indigenous culture and the production of place. *Tourist Studies, 2*(1), 23−42.

Stone, J. (2003). Max weber on race, ethnicity and nationalism. In J. Stone & R. Dennis (Eds.), *Race and ethnicity: Comparative and theoretical approaches* (pp. 28−42). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Tahana, N., & Opperman M. (1998). Māori cultural performances and tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research, 23*(1), 23−30.

Thompson, A.M. (2007). Strengthening of identity through participation in tourism guiding. In R. Butler, & T. Hinch (Eds.), *Tourism and indigenous peoples* (pp. 113−127). 2nd ed., Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Thompson, A. (2013). Māori Tourism: A case study of managing indigenous cultural values. In M. Smith & G. Richards (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural tourism*. (pp. 227−235). Oxon: Routledge.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonising methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Dunedin: Otago University Press.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). London: Zed Books.

United Nations. (2016). *2007 UN declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples*. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/development/desa/Indigenouspeoples/declaration-on-the-rights-of-Indigenous-peoples.html

Walker, K., & Moscardo, G. (2016). Moving beyond sense of place to care of place: The role of indigenous values and interpretation in promoting transformative change in tourists' place images and personal values. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 24*(8−9). doi:10.1080/09669582.2016.1177064

Whitford, M., & Ruhanen, L. (2016). Indigenous tourism research, past and present: Where to from here? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 24*(8−9). doi:10.1080/09669582.2016.1189925

Whitney-Squire, K. (2016). Sustaining local language relationships through indigenous community-based tourism initiatives. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 24*(8−9). doi:10.1080/09669582.2015.1091466

Wikitera, K.-A. (2006). *Whakarewarewa Tourism development: A critical analysis of place and space* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Auckland University of Technology, Auckland.

Zeppel, H. (2006). *Indigenous ecotourism: Sustainable development and management*. Wallingford: CABI.