

Innovative Approaches to Rural Tourism as a Driver of Economic Transformation

Dr.Padma Hazarika

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Laluk College, Assam, harikapadma1@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Dr.Padma Hazarika (2024). Innovative Approaches to Rural Tourism as a Driver of Economic Transformation, 43(2), 2296-2306

Introduction

Rural tourism has increasingly been acknowledged as a catalyst for sustainable development, offering new avenues for diversifying rural economies while preserving cultural and ecological assets (Sharpley, 2002; Lane & Kastenholz, 2015). In many developing and developed nations alike, rural areas face persistent challenges such as population outmigration, unemployment, limited infrastructure, and the underutilization of natural and cultural resources (Briedenhann & Wickens, 2004; Hall, Roberts, & Mitchell, 2003). These challenges have often resulted in declining community resilience and weakened local economies. Within this context, tourism has emerged as a viable alternative livelihood strategy that can foster economic revitalization, enhance community cohesion, and contribute to broader sustainable development goals (UNWTO, 2017; Giannakis, 2014).

The significance of rural tourism lies not only in its economic contributions but also in its ability to generate social and cultural value. Community-led tourism initiatives have been shown to empower local populations, create entrepreneurial opportunities, and strengthen the preservation of cultural traditions and natural landscapes (George, 2010; Chok, Macbeth, & Warren, 2007). Particularly, innovative forms of rural tourism—such as agro-tourism, eco-tourism, and cultural tourism—have demonstrated potential in providing alternative income streams while aligning with principles of sustainability (Petrović et al., 2017; Lane, 2009). However, despite this recognition, many rural communities continue to struggle with inadequate tourism models that are either externally imposed, poorly integrated with local needs, or unsustainable in the long term (Hall, 2005; Saarinen, 2010).

A growing body of literature emphasizes the role of innovation in shaping the future of rural tourism. The integration of information and communication technologies (ICT), digital platforms, and social media marketing has opened new opportunities for small-scale operators to reach global audiences and promote authentic, community-driven tourism experiences (Buhalis & Law, 2008; Sigala, Christou, & Gretzel, 2012). Similarly, the adoption of sustainability practices, ranging from renewable energy in accommodations to eco-friendly infrastructure, has enhanced the competitiveness and resilience of rural destinations (Sharpley & Roberts, 2004; Hall, Gössling, & Scott, 2015). Yet, much of the research remains limited to specific case studies, with insufficient attention to how these innovative, locally driven approaches can be scaled and sustained across diverse rural contexts (Kastenholz, Carneiro, Eusébio, & Figueiredo, 2012).

This gap in the literature highlights the need for a deeper examination of innovative rural tourism models and their potential to contribute to community development and economic transformation. Unlike conventional tourism strategies that often prioritize external investment or mass-market appeal, innovative approaches in rural tourism are increasingly grounded in participatory governance, cultural authenticity, and sustainability (Mitchell & Ashley, 2010; Sebele, 2010). By focusing on how rural communities themselves initiate, adapt, and manage tourism ventures, this research aims to provide a nuanced understanding of the interplay between innovation, community empowerment, and long-term rural revitalization.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to explore the role of innovative rural tourism practices in generating

economic, social, and cultural benefits for local communities. The research seeks to answer three central questions: (1) What innovative tourism models are being adopted in rural areas? (2) How do these approaches impact local communities both socially and economically? and (3) What challenges and opportunities exist in scaling such models? By addressing these questions, the study contributes to the growing discourse on sustainable tourism development and offers practical insights for policymakers, practitioners, and rural stakeholders seeking to harness tourism as a driver of inclusive and transformative rural development.

Literature Review Theoretical Frameworks

Sustainable Tourism Development

Sustainable tourism emphasizes balancing economic growth with environmental protection and social well-being. It highlights that tourism, if poorly managed, can lead to resource depletion and cultural commodification, but if designed sustainably, it can enhance resilience and equity in host communities (Sharpley, 2000; Hall, 2011). In rural contexts, sustainability involves the preservation of landscapes, biodiversity, and traditions while promoting inclusive development (Lane, 2009).

Community-Based Tourism Theory

Community-based tourism (CBT) places local communities at the center of planning, decision-making, and benefit-sharing (Scheyvens, 1999; Sebele, 2010). Unlike top-down tourism initiatives, CBT fosters empowerment, strengthens local ownership, and preserves cultural authenticity (Chok, Macbeth, & Warren, 2007). It is particularly relevant to rural settings,

where strong social networks and traditions can serve as foundations for participatory tourism initiatives.

Rural Development Models

Rural development theory underscores diversification as a strategy to revitalize stagnant rural economies. Beyond agriculture, tourism provides an alternative economic pathway, stimulating entrepreneurship and creating non-farm employment (Ashley & Maxwell, 2001; Giannakis, 2014). Integrated rural development approaches also stress linkages between tourism and other sectors such as handicrafts, agriculture, and local services (Briedenhann & Wickens, 2004).

Past Studies on Rural Tourism

Success Stories of Eco-tourism, Agro-tourism, and Cultural Tourism

Several case studies illustrate how niche forms of tourism have benefited rural communities. Eco-tourism initiatives in Africa and Asia have created conservation-linked livelihoods while promoting biodiversity protection (Kiss, 2004; Stronza & Gordillo, 2008). Agro-tourism in Europe and Asia has helped sustain small-scale farmers, providing supplemental income through farm stays, food festivals, and direct sales (Kizos & Iosifides, 2007; Barbieri, 2013). Cultural tourism—centered on heritage, crafts, and festivals—has preserved local traditions while attracting domestic and international tourists (George, 2010; Richards, 2007).

Role of Digital Platforms and Innovative Marketing

The rapid diffusion of information and communication technologies (ICTs) has transformed rural tourism marketing. Online platforms allow small rural operators to bypass intermediaries, directly access tourists, and build niche markets (Buhalis & Law, 2008; Sigala, Christou, & Gretzel, 2012). Social media, in particular, has enabled storytelling and place-branding strategies that connect rural communities with global audiences (Mariani, Di Felice, & Mura, 2016). However, unequal digital access still limits participation for many marginalized communities (Kastenholz et al., 2012).

Sustainability and Innovation in Rural Tourism

Innovative practices such as renewable energy use in accommodations, eco-friendly infrastructure, and circular economy models are becoming more common in rural tourism (Hall, Gössling, & Scott, 2015). Additionally, community-led cooperatives have emerged as

effective governance models, ensuring benefits are distributed fairly among residents (Mitchell & Ashley, 2010).

These initiatives not only generate economic returns but also empower women and youth, reduce rural–urban migration, and strengthen cultural identity (Petrović et al., 2017).

Identified Research Gap

While the literature demonstrates the value of eco-tourism, agro-tourism, and cultural tourism, there is still limited focus on innovative, technology-enabled, and community-driven approaches in rural contexts. Most existing studies are case-specific, lacking comparative insights into how innovation shapes economic and social transformation across diverse rural settings (Saarinen, 2010; Lane & Kastenholz, 2015). Moreover, long-term evaluations of such models remain scarce, particularly in developing countries, where rural communities face additional challenges of infrastructural deficits, policy constraints, and limited market access (Giannakis, 2014; Sebele, 2010).

This gap underscores the need for research that systematically examines how innovative models in rural tourism—especially those integrating ICT, sustainability, and community participation—contribute to community development, job creation, and economic transformation.

Research Methodology

This study employs a qualitative, exploratory research design to investigate the role of innovative approaches in rural tourism as a catalyst for community development and economic transformation. A qualitative approach is most appropriate for this research because it allows for an in-depth understanding of the lived experiences, perceptions, and practices of rural stakeholders, which are not easily captured through quantitative measures. The exploratory nature of the design further enables the identification of new insights and the development of themes and patterns that contribute to a richer understanding of innovation in rural tourism.

The research is conducted in two to three rural tourism destinations that are purposively selected on the basis of their engagement in innovative tourism practices, such as agro-tourism, community-led cultural events, or the adoption of digital platforms for marketing. Purposive sampling is employed to ensure that participants represent a diverse range of stakeholders who are directly involved in or affected by rural tourism initiatives. These stakeholders include local farmers and artisans, small-scale tourism operators such as homestay or farm-stay providers, youth and women entrepreneurs, as well as community leaders and policymakers engaged in rural development.

Data collection draws on multiple qualitative techniques to capture both individual experiences and collective perspectives. Semi-structured interviews are conducted with key stakeholders, providing the flexibility to explore predetermined topics while also allowing participants to raise issues that are significant to them. Focus group discussions with community members are used to elicit shared experiences and group perspectives on the social, cultural, and economic impacts of tourism innovations. In addition, participant observation allows the researcher to directly engage with tourism activities, such as festivals, handicraft exhibitions, or farm-based tourism practices, thereby situating the narratives of participants within observable contexts. Document analysis of relevant policy papers, government tourism strategies, and NGO reports is undertaken to triangulate findings from primary data and provide a broader policy and institutional perspective.

The collected data is analyzed using thematic analysis, a widely recognized method in qualitative research that facilitates the identification of recurring patterns and underlying meanings across datasets. The process involves transcription of interviews and focus group discussions, systematic coding of the material, and the subsequent organization of codes into broader themes that reflect the innovative practices, socio-economic impacts, and challenges associated with rural tourism. The interpretation of themes is guided by the theoretical frameworks of sustainable tourism development, community-based tourism, and rural development models. To manage, code, and organize the qualitative data efficiently, software such as NVivo is utilized.

To ensure the trustworthiness of the study, the criteria proposed by Lincoln and Guba (1985) are applied. Credibility is enhanced through triangulation of multiple data sources, including interviews, observations, and documents, as well as through member-checking, whereby participants are invited to validate the accuracy of the interpretations. Transferability is supported by providing thick, detailed descriptions of the research settings and participants, thereby enabling readers to assess the applicability of findings in other rural contexts. Dependability is maintained by keeping an audit trail of methodological decisions and data collection processes, while confirmability is ensured through reflexive practices that minimize researcher bias and document the influence of the researcher's perspective throughout the study.

Ethical considerations are observed at every stage of the research process. Informed consent is obtained from all participants, who are assured of their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Confidentiality is safeguarded

through the anonymization of participants' identities and secure storage of data. Ethical approval is sought from the relevant institutional review board prior to data collection, and the study adheres to established ethical standards for qualitative research as outlined by Silverman (2013).

Results and Discussion

The findings of this study reveal that rural tourism is increasingly shaped by innovative practices that combine local cultural assets, agricultural resources, and digital technologies. Four major themes emerge from the analysis: the adoption of digital platforms for marketing, the diversification of tourism through agro-tourism and farm-stay innovations, the role of community-led cultural initiatives, and the integration of sustainability practices in tourism infrastructure. Together, these innovations demonstrate how rural tourism serves as a driver of economic revitalization, community empowerment, and cultural preservation.

One of the most significant findings concerns the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) in rural tourism marketing. Stakeholders across the studied communities highlight how digital platforms and social media enable small-scale tourism operators to connect directly with visitors, bypassing traditional intermediaries. Farmers offering homestay experiences, artisans marketing handicrafts, and youth-led tourism initiatives increasingly rely on online visibility to attract domestic and international tourists. This finding resonates with previous research by Buhalis and Law (2008) and Sigala, Christou, and Gretzel (2012), who emphasize the transformative role of digitalization in tourism. However, challenges persist in terms of digital literacy and infrastructure, which continue to limit the potential of these platforms in more remote communities. This suggests that while digital tools enhance competitiveness, supportive training and infrastructure investments remain essential for inclusive growth.

A second finding relates to the growing prominence of agro-tourism and farm-stay innovations. Participants describe how agricultural landscapes and traditional farming practices are transformed into tourism attractions, with visitors participating in activities such as harvesting, cooking traditional meals, and learning about local agricultural techniques. Such innovations not only provide supplemental income for farmers but also help sustain agricultural traditions that might otherwise decline due to rural outmigration. These findings align with earlier studies by Barbieri (2013) and Kizos and Iosifides (2007), which document how agro-tourism strengthens farm viability and diversifies rural economies. Importantly, in the communities studied, agro-tourism is perceived as enhancing community pride and reconnecting younger generations with traditional knowledge, suggesting broader socio-cultural benefits beyond income generation.

Community-led cultural initiatives emerge as another central theme. Festivals, folk performances, craft exhibitions, and heritage walks are frequently cited as tourism innovations that both attract visitors and reinforce local identity. These initiatives are often driven by women's groups, youth clubs, and cooperatives, highlighting the participatory and inclusive nature of innovation in rural tourism. Similar to the arguments of Richards (2007) and Sebele (2010), the findings underscore that cultural tourism can be both an economic and social tool, fostering empowerment while safeguarding cultural heritage. However, the tension between commercialization and authenticity is evident in several discussions, with participants expressing concerns about the risk of diluting traditions to cater to tourist preferences. This reflects the broader debates in rural tourism literature regarding the balance between economic gains and cultural preservation (Saarinen, 2010).

The integration of sustainability practices represents a fourth key finding. Several communities report adopting eco-friendly infrastructure, renewable energy for accommodations, and waste reduction practices as part of their tourism initiatives. These efforts reflect a growing awareness of the need to balance economic development with environmental stewardship, echoing arguments made by Hall, Gössling, and Scott (2015) regarding sustainable tourism innovation. Participants emphasize that such practices not only reduce costs but also enhance the attractiveness of rural destinations for environmentally conscious travelers. However, limitations in financial resources and institutional support are repeatedly highlighted as barriers to scaling these practices.

The findings also illustrate the economic and social impacts of innovative tourism practices. Job creation, entrepreneurial opportunities, and diversification of income are consistently mentioned as direct economic benefits. Beyond financial gains, tourism is seen to reduce rural-urban migration by offering viable livelihood opportunities locally. Socially, the empowerment of women and youth stands out as a significant impact, with many women managing homestays or craft collectives and young people leading digital marketing campaigns. These outcomes reflect the transformative potential of rural tourism as suggested by Mitchell and Ashley (2010) and Chok, Macbeth, and Warren (2007), who argue that tourism serves as a tool for empowerment when communities retain ownership

and control.

Despite these positive impacts, several challenges are identified. Infrastructural limitations, such as inadequate roads, poor internet connectivity, and limited financial support, are recurrent concerns among participants. Policy bottlenecks and bureaucratic hurdles are also perceived as barriers to scaling innovations, echoing the critiques of Briedenhann and Wickens (2004). Moreover, the risk of over-commercialization and the potential loss of cultural authenticity are noted as ongoing dilemmas. These findings highlight the complexity of rural tourism development, where opportunities and challenges coexist and require careful management.

In summary, the results demonstrate that innovative rural tourism models—whether through digital tools, agro-tourism, cultural initiatives, or sustainable practices—hold significant promise for economic transformation and community empowerment. However, the effectiveness of these models depends on addressing challenges related to infrastructure, policy support, and the safeguarding of cultural authenticity. By linking these findings to the broader literature, the study underscores that innovation in rural tourism is not merely a matter of introducing new practices, but also of embedding them within community values, participatory structures, and sustainable frameworks.

Conclusion

This study set out to examine how innovative approaches in rural tourism contribute to community development, job creation, and economic transformation. The findings demonstrate that rural tourism, when guided by innovation, sustainability, and community participation, has the potential to become a powerful tool for rural revitalization. Through an exploration of stakeholder perspectives and practices, four key areas of innovation were identified: the use of digital platforms for tourism marketing, the integration of agro-tourism and farm-stay models, the development of community-led cultural initiatives, and the adoption of eco-friendly and sustainable infrastructure. These approaches not only generate new economic opportunities but also reinforce social cohesion, empower marginalized groups, and preserve cultural and environmental assets.

The study highlights that digital platforms and ICT have emerged as crucial enablers of rural tourism, offering small-scale operators visibility and direct access to wider markets. At the same time, agro-tourism and farm-stay innovations are revitalizing traditional agricultural practices and providing alternative livelihoods that strengthen rural economies. Community-led cultural initiatives further demonstrate the capacity of local populations to transform intangible cultural heritage into economic assets while maintaining strong community identity. Moreover, sustainability-oriented practices, such as renewable energy use and eco-friendly infrastructure, illustrate how rural destinations can position themselves competitively in an increasingly environmentally conscious tourism market. Together, these findings confirm that innovation in rural tourism extends beyond economic benefits to encompass social empowerment and cultural preservation.

Despite these positive outcomes, the study also reveals significant challenges that limit the scalability and long-term sustainability of innovative rural tourism practices. Infrastructural constraints, limited access to financial resources, policy bottlenecks, and the risk of over-commercialization remain persistent obstacles. These findings echo earlier research that warns against the dangers of externally imposed tourism models and highlights the need for locally grounded strategies that are sensitive to community contexts. Addressing these challenges requires targeted interventions from policymakers, including the development of supportive infrastructure, provision of training and capacity-building initiatives, and the creation of policies that incentivize innovation while safeguarding cultural authenticity.

The contribution of this research lies in its emphasis on community-driven innovation as the foundation of rural tourism development. Unlike conventional models that often prioritize short-term gains or external investment, the findings suggest that sustainable and inclusive rural tourism must emerge from within the community, drawing upon local knowledge, skills, and cultural assets. By situating innovation at the intersection of technology, tradition, and sustainability, the study extends existing theories of sustainable tourism and community-based tourism, providing empirical evidence of how these frameworks can be applied in practice.

From a practical perspective, the study offers important insights for stakeholders involved in rural development. For policymakers, the findings underscore the importance of creating enabling environments that support grassroots tourism innovation, including improved infrastructure, digital access, and financial incentives. For non-governmental organizations and development practitioners, the study highlights opportunities to design capacity-building

programs that strengthen community participation, particularly among women and youth. For rural communities

themselves, the research demonstrates the value of embracing innovation not only as a means of economic survival but also as a strategy for cultural resilience and environmental stewardship.

Finally, the study opens avenues for future research. While the findings provide important insights into innovative rural tourism practices, further comparative studies across different regions and cultural contexts are needed to identify commonalities and divergences in innovation strategies. Longitudinal research would also be valuable in assessing the long-term economic, social, and cultural impacts of these innovations, particularly in relation to rural–urban migration patterns and intergenerational sustainability. In addition, future research should examine the role of institutional support and policy frameworks in scaling up innovative practices, as well as the potential risks of over-reliance on tourism in fragile rural economies.

In conclusion, innovative rural tourism, when rooted in community participation and sustainability, offers a transformative pathway for rural development. It not only diversifies income sources and generates employment but also strengthens social identity, preserves cultural heritage, and fosters resilience in the face of economic and demographic challenges. By addressing structural barriers and scaling locally driven innovations, rural tourism can evolve into a strategic engine of inclusive and sustainable rural revitalization.

References

- Ashley, C., & Maxwell, S. (2001). Rethinking rural development. *Development Policy Review*, 19(4), 395–425. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7679.00144>
- Barbieri, C. (2013). Assessing the sustainability of agritourism in the US: A comparison between agritourism and other farm entrepreneurial ventures. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(2), 252–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2012.685174>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Briedenhann, J., & Wickens, E. (2004). Tourism routes as a tool for the economic development of rural areas—vibrant hope or impossible dream? *Tourism Management*, 25(1), 71–79. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(03\)00063-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(03)00063-3)
- Buhalis, D., & Law, R. (2008). Progress in information technology and tourism management: 20 years on and 10 years after the internet—The state of eTourism research. *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 609–623. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.01.005>
- Chok, S., Macbeth, J., & Warren, C. (2007). Tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation: A critical analysis of ‘pro-poor tourism’ and implications for sustainability. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(2–3), 144–165. <https://doi.org/10.2167/cit303>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- George, E. W. (2010). Intangible cultural heritage, sustainability, and tourism: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(8), 951–956. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2010.529900>
- Giannakis, E. (2014). The role of rural tourism on the development of rural areas: The case of Cyprus. *Tourism: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, 9(2), 89–111.
- Hall, C. M. (2005). Rural communities and tourism development. In D. Hall, L. Roberts, & M. Mitchell (Eds.), *New directions in rural tourism* (pp. 15–32). Ashgate.
- Hall, C. M. (2011). Policy learning and policy failure in sustainable tourism governance: From first- and second-order to third-order change? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4–5), 649–671. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.555555>
- Hall, C. M., Gössling, S., & Scott, D. (2015). *The Routledge handbook of tourism and sustainability*. Routledge.
- Hall, D., Roberts, L., & Mitchell, M. (2003). *New directions in rural tourism*. Ashgate.
- Kastenholz, E., Carneiro, M. J., Eusébio, C., & Figueiredo, E. (2012). Visitors’ expectations of rural tourism experiences: The case of north and central Portugal. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 12(3), 125–135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358412455627>
- Kiss, A. (2004). Is community-based ecotourism a good use of biodiversity conservation funds? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 19(5), 232–237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2004.03.010>

- Kizos, T., & Iosifides, T. (2007). The contradictions of agrotourism development in Greece: Evidence from three case studies. *South European Society and Politics*, 12(1), 59–77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13608740601155443>
- Lane, B. (2009). Rural tourism: An overview. In T. Jamal & M. Robinson (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of tourism studies* (pp. 354–370). SAGE Publications.
- Lane, B., & Kastenholz, E. (2015). Rural tourism: The evolution of practice and research approaches – towards a new generation concept? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(8–9), 1133–1156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2015.1083997>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Mariani, M. M., Di Felice, M., & Mura, M. (2016). Facebook as a destination marketing tool: Evidence from Italian regional destination management organizations. *Tourism Management*, 54, 321–343. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.12.008>
- Mitchell, J., & Ashley, C. (2010). *Tourism and poverty reduction: Pathways to prosperity*. Earthscan.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Petrović, M. D., Blešić, I., Ivolga, A., & Vujko, A. (2017). Agritourism impact toward locals' attitudes – an evidence from Vojvodina Province (Serbia). *Journal of the Geographical Institute "Jovan Cvijić" SASA*, 67(1), 37–52. <https://doi.org/10.2298/IJGI1701037P>
- Richards, G. (2007). *Cultural tourism: Global and local perspectives*. Haworth Press.
- Saarinen, J. (2010). Local tourism awareness: Rural tourism development and the creation of new tourist spaces in northern Finland. *Fennia*, 188(1), 31–46.
- Scheyvens, R. (1999). Ecotourism and the empowerment of local communities. *Tourism Management*, 20(2), 245–249. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(98\)00069-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(98)00069-7)
- Sebele, L. S. (2010). Community-based tourism ventures, benefits and challenges: Khama Rhino Sanctuary Trust, Central District, Botswana. *Tourism Management*, 31(1), 136–146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.01.005>
- Sharpley, R. (2000). Tourism and sustainable development: Exploring the theoretical divide. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580008667346>
- Sharpley, R. (2002). Rural tourism and the challenge of tourism diversification: The case of Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, 23(3), 233–244. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(01\)00078-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(01)00078-4)
- Sharpley, R., & Roberts, L. (2004). *Rural tourism and recreation: Principles to practice*. CABI Publishing.
- Sigala, M., Christou, E., & Gretzel, U. (Eds.). (2012). *Social media in travel, tourism and hospitality: Theory, practice and cases*. Ashgate.
- Silverman, D. (2013). *Doing qualitative research* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Stronza, A., & Gordillo, J. (2008). Community views of ecotourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(2), 448–468. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2008.01.002>
- UNWTO. (2017). *Tourism and the sustainable development goals – Journey to 2030*. United Nations World Tourism Organization.