POVERTY ALLEVIATION THROUGH TOURISM IN APPALACHIA: POLICIES AND PRACTICES IN THREE SITES IN EASTERN TENNESSEE
Abstract
This thesis provides a critical analysis of tourism trends in the northeastern corner of Tennessee. My intended audience is policymakers at the regional and local level, who can use this document to understand the effects of policy trends on localities. I present a literature review on cultural heritage and eco-tourism as they pertain to cultural sustainability, and more specifically on Appalachian Tourism. After an introduction to the region (both culturally and geographically) and to sustainable tourism, including data points from various resources that give context to the region’s demographic makeup, I introduce three local tourist attractions and briefly describe their situation to the communities they impact. Using these sites, I explore the public policies that drive funding, zoning, and other issues behind the sites. I explore the effect these policies have on the tourist sites as well as on the communities at large, paying special attention to issues that the community is at odds with. I explore of the barriers and enabling forces that connect the community with the policy makers (and impede this connection). In my conclusions, I present policy best practices from the literature research and how these could be implemented in the region studied to the benefit of the community.
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Prologue

In the secluded region of the Appalachian Mountains where the borders of Tennessee (Tennessee), North Carolina (NC), and Virginia (VA) converge, many communities rely on natural and cultural resources for their livelihoods. Craftspeople have apprentices who will carry on their trade in the next generation, musicians continue strumming their instruments, and locals and visitors alike scale the rock faces, bicycle and hike the Appalachian Trail and enjoy 4-wheeling at all times of the year. This setting may sound pristine and exotic, anachronistic in this time of global connectedness and increasing cultural homogenization, but it is my home, and home to several thousand others who make their livelihood and are raising the next generation there.

I was born into the communities that I am currently studying, and I once again call the area home after living abroad for several years. I am acquainted with many of the people who have helped to inform my work, and I have a personal stake in the benefits of tourism and economic growth in the area. As a native to the area, I have a unique firsthand knowledge of local attractions and destinations. Being an insider enhanced my research, giving me both the context to assess the situation.

Local culture such as farmer’s markets, festivals, musical shows, and craft markets draw...
outside dollars into an area. Such facets of everyday life could prove to boost return rates for small and mid-size businesses as well as tourism attractions in the area.

On a cloudy, humid morning in mid-August, the streets of Johnson City Tennessee are filling up with locals and tourists alike, walking from their homes or rooms to partake of the “best donut in Tennessee” at the Farmer’s Market. It’s breakfast time, and dozens of people are milling about getting their breakfast burrito or coffee cake at one stand or another, picking up the choicest vegetables and berries, sampling the handmade cheeses, smelling the soaps, and admiring the handiwork of local artisans who craft jewelry or wood carvings or pottery to sell both on the street and online. This farmer’s market (Figure 1), like others in the area, is a chance for locals to practice and showcase the arts (traditional or modern) that they continue to cherish, and it is one of the staples of small town life in the Appalachian Mountains.

Similarly, but on a much smaller scale with fewer visitors daily and fewer vendors, Mountain City holds its weekly farmers market in the parking lot of the court house (Figure 2). The low turnouts are due to the remoteness of the area and lack of marketing. The farmer’s market creates a sense of place. It is a space for the locals and visitors to gather and share in the local culture. This farmer’s market is less developed than others in the area, though. Although the market is well-filled with vendors, the Mountain City farmer’s market had fewer than 25 visitors during my hour’s visit, as compared with almost 100 in an hour at the Johnson City farmer’s market.
Tourism in the Appalachias can be beneficial to the economy, the environment, and the culture of the locality when it is balanced with other efforts by policy makers and community leaders. Local festivals, events, and programs including farmer’s markets are a draw to tourists because of the sense of place that they create in a town. An area such as Mountain City would benefit from increased marketing for their farmer’s market, which would draw in visitors who may be traveling through the area or visiting one of the other tourist destinations nearby.
Introduction

Heritage and eco-tourism have become staples to the tourism industry, bringing the influence of responsibility and sustainability to those who travel to these ends. The Appalachian Mountain region has been a target for a range of tourism initiatives over the past few decades, with several large sites interspersed with smaller destinations all across the region. Eco-tourism has recently been a growing enterprise in the region, with destinations such as Foothills Eco-Agri-Tourism Corporation (FEAT) in NC, Flag Rock Recreation Area in VA, and Clinch River Adventures, also in VA. Culinary tourism such as Bon Appalachia has also taken off, highlighting heritage cuisines throughout the area. The hope is that such enterprises will be a boon to the economy, the environment, and the culture of the region.

The efficacy of Anti-Poverty Tourism (APT) (Zhao and Ritchie, 2007) has been measured in various parts of the world over the past half century, but has rarely been applied in the United States as a means of advocacy for distressed regions. The Appalachian Mountain region of the United States contains 154 counties that are considered distressed, (that is, having a poverty rate of over 20%) with another 170 considered at risk (with a poverty rate of 17-19.9%). The richness of the Appalachian region is well known in the United States, including natural and cultural resources that are unique to the area. These resources have been extracted in one way or another and used for short term economic gains, such as in the coal and mineral industries, or mass-production of handicrafts. In many parts of the region, though, tourism is already taking hold as an industry of sustainable development with great gains for the communities they inhabit.

The Appalachian region is not a homogenous cultural or ecological region, and for this reason, it is important to consider sub-regions separately in a study such
as this. In this thesis, I will focus on the northeastern corner of Tennessee to provide a critical analysis of tourism trends in the area. I chose this area for two reasons: a) the area of study has a history of poverty initiatives since the early days of the Appalachian Regional Commission; and b) the area has a variety of well-established and new tourism destinations.

This study examines the policies that impact tourism in this region, and specifically looks at how those policies affect three chosen tourism sites in the area. The literature provides context for tourism and public policy in this Appalachian region. Then, three tourism destinations are explored along with the effects that tourism has had on the localities. These destinations within the sub-region of study were selected based on specific criteria: a) they are each affected by public policies; b) each are controversial within their community setting; and c) each are meant to appeal to an audience much larger than the immediate community. Data was culled from local and regional policy meetings such as town halls and legislative hearings that impact the sites. To help establish the context for the research, photography and qualitative analysis of each site is included. The data was evaluated for evidence of the effects of the tourism site on the local culture and community, as well as the policies driving those effects.

The Geography of the Appalachian Mountains

Although the landscape and peoples in the three corners of Tennessee, North Carolina, and Virginia are very similar and even fluid in terms of cultural and natural resources moving across the borders, this research focuses on the
northeastern corner of Tennessee. The map in figure 3 shows specifically the region of Tennessee that will be studied. This includes parts of Johnson, Washington, Carter, and Sullivan Counties in Tennessee.

Historically, this area, like most of the Appalachian Mountain Region, has been cut off geographically from trade and industry, with the landscape restricting transportation and communication over long distances until recently. Although the mountains here are ancient and low, travel has been impeded by sharp mountain switchbacks, impassable rivers, and rough terrain--as can be seen on the map below (figure 4), major thoroughfares in the area of study are few and far between. Even early railways, such as the Eastern Tennessee Western NC RR only connected the local townships to one another, not to the outside world.

Only in the past few decades has the tourism industry begun to open up to outsiders who seek adventure, heritage, and eco-tourism activities in the pristine mountain settings. Modern roadways brought industrial growth as well as outside monies to the area during the short-lived “War on Poverty.” Unfortunately, in the 1990s, international trade agreements caused those economic paths to growth to dry up after a couple of decades. The industrial expansion and bust, along with the lack of other sustainable economic influxes has left much of the area in “distressed” or “at risk” status over the past decade (see Figure 4: Map of major highways in the area. http://usgs.com
maps in figures 5 and 6, p 11). Those areas in “distressed” status have a poverty rate of 20% or greater along with other poverty indicators such as high unemployment and low rate of high school graduation. Areas “at risk” have a poverty rate of 17-19.9% along with these other poverty indicators. “Distressed” counties rank in the nation’s worst 10% where such factors are concerned, and “at-risk” counties rank between 10-25%.

Cultural tourism often follows ecotourism, as can be seen in towns bordering the Appalachian Trail, which benefit from the influx of outsiders through both the ecotourism market and through retail sales of “heritage” goods. Similarly, water recreation as eco-tourism is prominent in the area, with rivers and lakes providing both fast moving rapids and serene sailing areas.
A Brief History of Appalachia

The Appalachian Mountain region has been inhabited since before 6,000 BC, according to archaeologists who study the Cumberland Plateau in Tennessee. Since pre-history, various populations have inhabited the region, including native populations, later displaced by Europeans of diverse descent. Although the idea is still popular that Scots-Irish and Welsh descendants make up the largest portion of modern Appalachian populations, the story of diversity in the region is much more complex (Huus Larsen, 2009), with people from native, African, and various European backgrounds settling in the area. This misconception has pervaded tourism narratives and skewed even the locals’ views of Appalachian diversity.

As the diversity in natural resources has become more recognized over the past half century, and as resource depletion was recognized as detrimental to the environment, industrial economies have shifted from resource extraction to resource sustenance, with an eye toward conservation. A hallmark of Appalachian culture is pride in the beauty and richness of the region. Despite the extractive industries that have pervaded the region (and in some cases still do), eco-tourism and natural tourism have helped bring awareness regarding the importance of conservation.

Tourism Policy

The ideology of progress drove much of the 20th century toward industrial growth and retraction in the early 21st century. Policy had long focused on creating wealth through production of goods and extraction of resources such as forests and coal. This was true in Appalachian subregions as well as the greater US; industry was focused on extracting resources from the region rather than bringing production in (Blee and Billings, 1999). After the failure of the War on Poverty in the 1990s, the policy trend towards extraction began a turnaround toward more sustainable
development of resources, including in the tourism sector. Recognition that sustaining resources is the most viable way of making use of them has been a hallmark of Appalachian development policy in the 21st century (ARC Report, 2015). Tourism policy has been a leader in this trend, with eco-tourism and heritage tourism becoming increasingly more important to local economies in the region. As noted by Michael Hall (2007) traditionally, the target of local tourism development has been regional economic growth, with poverty alleviation as a secondary goal.

This trickle-down idea of poverty alleviation from regional development, however, does not stand up to scrutiny (ibid), and as a result has been slowly replaced by the idea that every tourism development project must consider the local population, especially the economically distressed, as a topic of concern. The policies that govern the modes of tourism in the area of study would benefit from this same type of consideration as a best practice.

Policies do not have to be geared towards tourism in order to affect tourism. Tax policies, roadway legislation, state property laws, zoning laws, and a plethora of other policy decisions have an effect on tourism in a locality, from the federal level down to the community level.

**Anti-Poverty Tourism**

Scholarly writing abounds regarding tourism and its effects on local populations, particularly in relation to how tourism can affect impoverished communities (ibid; Croes and Rivera, 2015; Ashley et.al. 2000; Castenada, 2012). Most of the works relevant to this study focus on international (outside of the United States) tourism in developing and impoverished locations. The lack of information on poverty alleviation through tourism in the United States may be attributable to the fact that even poverty-stricken areas in the US fare well above those nations being
Harvey studied abroad, where the poorest live on less than one dollar per month (Hall 2007). Many of the lessons from studies of international APT destinations could be successfully applied to impoverished areas of the U.S. such as Johnson County, Tennessee, in order to provide guidance on how tourism can be a positive force for economic opportunities.

The APT model recognizes that poverty is not merely an economic indicator, but also involves socio-political and cultural forces. APT refers to any tourism initiatives that have poverty alleviation as one of the main goals (ibid). I have chosen to look at APT in this study because the model provided is robust and allows for consideration of the socio-political and cultural forces at play in poverty. It also accounts for the role of community in an appropriate tourism initiative.

APT has a few possible pitfalls, however. The name itself is politically charged, recalling the failed War on Poverty. Further, any tourism effort that is focused on poverty may be conducive to becoming “voyeur tourism,” in which poverty becomes the focus of the attractions and is perpetuated rather than alleviated. This can be overcome by ensuring that attractions focus on positive aspects of the community and culture rather than on the poverty. APT can also be seen as a political effort to leverage government funding rather than to strengthen communities. However, leveraging public funding for the public good can be achieved responsibly, as will be seen in the Doe Mountain example below. Finally, as with other tourism initiatives, APT can promote tourism that becomes too large and eclipses all other industry in an area, as in the example of Dollywood.

Despite these possibilities, APT has been successfully modeled against tourism efforts in other countries. The examples of APT given in Hall are from overseas: Hall questions whether “southern” nations (mostly developing countries
south of the equator) are benefiting from tourism in ways that other countries could be; Zhao and Ritchie discuss three aspects of APT as they pertain to an example in Turkey; and Harrison and Schivanni discuss community efforts in Laos (Ibid.)

Further, when used appropriately, tourism can make good use of natural and cultural resources in an area, instilling a sense of pride that perpetuates responsibility among locals in those resources. Tourism can also be used in concert with other industry anti-poverty efforts rather than in competition with them.

Much of the literature focuses greatly on the effects of tourism on local environment, local culture and the micro-economies of an area (Mouffakir and Burns, 2011, de la Barre, 2014; Cohen, 1988). Omar Mouffakir and Peter Burns (2011) discusses tourism in its “classic” senses: “dark thana-tourism, inappropriate tourism development, poor tourism planning, exploitative employment, malpractice with tourism statistics, appropriation of heritage for tourism, unsustainable tourism, sport and mega-events that overwhelm locales, sex tourism, gaming linked with organized crime, [and] commodification of culture…” (1). Some of these pitfalls of classic tourism have plagued the Appalachian region over the years. However, these darkly spun ideas ignore the complexities of APT, as Mouffakir acknowledges. Butcher discusses the changes in attitude by the industry overall as there was simultaneously a change towards discussing “…consumption generally, as a moral strategy for making a positive difference in the world.” Butcher argues that ideals of responsible tourism are relatively recent developments, and that “the ethical lobby now colonize the moral high ground which can on occasion have the effect of shutting down political debate on contrasting development choices and visions” (Mostafanazhed et. al. 2014, 20). Caton further notes that “tourism scholars [have not] been quick to engage with key philosophical questions—for example those involving the perennial
issues of truth, beauty, and virtue—despite their obvious relevance to the tourism world.” (ibid. 186).

Questions of authenticity are prominent in APT literature. Anna E. Papanicolau discusses the effects that tourism can have on local culture in terms of the questions of who defines authenticity, and when is it okay to use cultural artifacts for the sake of monetary gain (Moufakkir and Burns, 2011). She identifies the Mayan Riviera as a location where tourism made a change from the luxurious, resort style destination to one that incorporated various facets of ancient indigenous cultures into its motif in order to bring tourism to places that had previously not benefited from outside dollars. This commodification of the local culture, it may be argued, can dilute native lifeways by conformity to the mode of commercial success. Papanicolau shows that the differing approaches to tourism of various agencies and outlets results in outcomes ranging from those that “expand tourists’ imaginaries of contemporary [indigenous] realities by bringing them into contact with indigenous people who they otherwise would never have encountered,” to those that “contribute to the maintenance of a myth,” (ibid. 43) and do not socially or economically benefit those cultures that they purport to portray.

Understanding these controversies is the first step in understanding how to turn tourism into a net positive for local communities. Scholars point out the inherent irony of attempting to alleviate many of the downfalls of tourism using the very thing that created them: tourism (Hall, 2007, Mouffakir and Burns, 2011). However, reading these various studies and the means that they have devised to alleviate the negative impacts of classic tourism industry on micro-economies and communities demonstrates that appropriate models and use of sensitive methods can, indeed, have a positive impact (Hall, 2007).
Zhao and Ritchie’s work on APT is particularly translatable into domestic US APT, given the model of poverty alleviation presented. The model (see figure 7) begins with various stakeholders, applies the themes of destination competitiveness, local participation and destination sustainability, and looks at various determinants to success. It looks at these pieces in context of the greater macro and micro environment of the area, and with respect to other poverty alleviation approaches in the area.

Regina Scheyvens’ (2011) treatment of the topic of APT gives a thorough account of the positives and negatives of tourism industry is more optimistic than some of the more controversial works. Scheyvens briefly addresses the nuances behind APT, noting the various ways that tourism can entrench poverty in certain circumstances, and that the attraction of tourists to impoverished locales can perpetuate that poverty as a myth of “Otherness” (ibid). She goes on, however, to identify ways that tourism industry, governments, and non-governmental agencies can act in ways that promote appropriate tourism. Industry, though deeply concerned with profit margins and less so with development of communities, has been increasingly concerned with ethical tourism by means of “training and capacity building, support for labour rights, and education of tourists” (ibid. 115). Government
interests lie parallel to APT, Scheyven notes, and support and regulation from government players is key to success. Non-governmental agencies play a more nuanced role in APT, only recently beginning to see tourism as a legitimate development sector for appropriately improving the lives of impoverished communities through “voluntourism,” ecotourism, and other responsible tourism activities.

Early anthropologists’ studies of “primitive” cultures prompted luxury tourism that notably muddied indigenous lifeways (Smith and Richards, 2013). The UN World Tourism Organization finds that 10% of the world’s GDP is dependent upon tourism, though, and it makes sustainable tourism one of its mandates (http://UNWTO.org, 2016). The organization’s 2010 report “Tourism and Poverty Alleviation” is heavily focused on APT in developing nations, but also has some potent lessons for tourism in any context, stating:

Achieving sustainable tourism requires that several objectives be achieved:
• The natural, historical, cultural and other resources for tourism are conserved for continuous use in the future, while still bringing benefits to the present society. Tourism development is planned and managed so that it does not generate serious environmental or socio-cultural problems in the tourism area.
• The overall environmental quality of tourism areas is maintained and improved where needed.
• A high level of tourist satisfaction is maintained so that tourist destinations will retain their marketability and popularity.
• The benefits of tourism are widely spread throughout society. (19).

The UNWTO’s “Manual on Tourism and Poverty Alleviation: Practical Steps for Destinations” also provides some concrete advice for localities involved in APT. Beginning by with analysis and planning, the manual moves through action and on to assessment in its advisement. In April of 2016, 16 nations signed the most comprehensive Climate Change agreement ever drafted on the day of its initial availability, signifying an overwhelming buy in by most of the G20 Nations to the idea
that human activity has a significant impact on the earth’s natural systems (http://un.org, 2016). For decades, the tourism industry has increasingly recognized this impact, and has taken various steps to mitigate the impact of that industry on natural systems (Hall, 2015). Anthropologists and tourists alike have started to rethink models of tourism based on culturally appropriate and ethically and ecologically competent practices, and these models could be applied by policy and community organizations in the Appalachias.

**Ethics in Tourism and the impact on Local Cultures**

While classic tourism sometimes ignored or overlooked the impacts on local culture, by the 1990s scholars “started to define how to make tourism ethical instead of asserting that it was morally good or bad in all social contexts” (Castaneda, 2012, 48). Quetzil Castaneda argues that rather than moralization, which imposes a dichotomy between different types of tourist activities, the recent changes in tourism studies away from the dichotomy of “good” vs “evil” tourism should be termed “ethicalization” of tourism in order to detach it from that very dichotomy. Without wading into philosophical territory, the term “ethicalization” refers to the recognition of that false dichotomy and “that tourism development has multiple results with many kinds of costs and benefits for different stakeholders” (ibid, 48). Robertico Croes (2015) similarly argues that “the relationship between tourism development and poverty reduction is…a complex social issue, contingent on a number of factors such as personal motivation and aspirations, opportunities, institutional strength, the level of inequality, the strength of wealth creation, and a clear focus on helping the poor” (223). In short, “ethicalization” in tourism has begun to replace moralization in recognition of the complexities of tourism’s value to a community.
**Appalachian Tourism**

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) provides research on local tourism in the report *Sources of Growth in non-Metro Appalachia*. The report notes:

It has become clear that the most distressed economic conditions are generally occurring in the more isolated and rural parts of Appalachia, and that targeted efforts are needed to address those conditions. At the same time, it has also become clear that “in-vogue” economic development strategies, which often focus on seeking large scale high-tech cluster development, are not necessarily appropriate or realistic for isolated, rural areas (Vol I, 12).

This report recognizes the need for asset based development-- activities that use the human, cultural, and natural resources available in the area to achieve economic growth--in amenities industries, such as those that arise in response to increased tourism. This is opposed to the non-appropriate industrial based models that have resulted in net gains in other regions. The need to incorporate such strategies with other appropriate development methods is also clear: “An analyst can view an asset-based growth strategy as complementary to other growth strategies, and it often serves as a base for other development strategies.”

Sustainable tourism is defined in the ARC’s report as meeting the needs of both tourists and host regions while protecting and enhancing future opportunities (ibid. Vol I, 33). In terms of APT, this definition could be understood to include enhancing sustainable economic opportunities for the future. Virginia is ranked among the top 10 states as a heritage/cultural tourism destination, and the report discusses case studies in southeast Tennessee and southwest North Carolina as examples of asset-based economic growth. These include the Tennessee Overhill Heritage Association’s program to form a network of small museums in order to create an overnight market, and the marketing of a 300-mile footpath from Georgia to the Great Smokey Mountains in North Carolina, which are a part of a tourism
industry based on recreation and cultural heritage (ibid. Vol II 72). The study shows a growth in economic sectors related to tourism and recreation during the years 1997-2002, and discusses the highway corridor’s role in building eco- and heritage based tourism. The topography, geographical layout, and cultural context of this region are homogenous including highly traveled mountainous roads, access to water recreation and a shared-heritage of music, literature, language, and values.

Sandra Grunwell and Inhyuk Ha (2014) argue that areas where tourism has previously been an important factor in economic development, but where the economic downturn has depressed that industry, must balance tourism with other economic sector growth in order to turn around the decline. Rob Porter and Michael Tarrant (2001) found that “tourism, while providing a positive impact on the local economy in terms of revenue, may not provide positive benefits for people in terms of job quality and personal income” (33).

**Appalachian Tourism Policy and Regional locations**

Within the Tri-Cities area, each of the cities has found a name for itself for a different reason: Kingsport is home to corporate enterprises, Johnson City is a college town, and Bristol is the “Birthplace of Country Music,” as well as home to the Bristol Motor Speedway. Just 30 miles away from these small hubs sits Mountain City, Tennessee, where there is no industry and tourism dollars move through the town rather than staying there. Mountain City borders the NC state line, where Boone, NC bustles on the other side. Boone is also a college town, with Appalachian State University located there. The ARC map (figure 7) shows that Mountain City and Boone are both “at risk” for poverty, however the economic indicators are vastly different, with Mountain City having higher unemployment by 2.9%, lower mean household income by $8,600, and lower education levels, with a
14% gap in percentage of high school diploma completion (http://arc.gov/reports, 2016). Johnson City and Bristol are in transitional status. Tying the economic growth of those towns to tourism would be an impossible task considering the other economic factors in the area, but there is a positive correlation between a drop in the poverty rate and the amount of tourism money that is brought into an area. This indicates that tourism dollars translate to real economic gains for those who live in the area.

**ARC, FTDD, and the Dept of Development**

Of the various governmental agencies (federal, state, and local) with an interest in promoting growth and development in this area, it is perhaps most reasonable to speak of each one in terms of the scale of projects, their stated purpose, how they each impact the region, and their local investments in the specific area of Tennessee in this thesis. Each of the agencies are stakeholders in the region because their success depends upon the success of the area.

**Appalachian Regional Commission**

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) set out in 1965 “to assist the region in meeting its special problems, to promote its economic development, and to establish a framework for joint federal and state efforts toward providing the basic facilities essential to its growth and attacking its common problems and meeting its common needs on a coordinated and concerted regional basis.” The ARC, based in Washington, DC, attempts to fulfill this goal across the entirety of the Appalachian region (from New York to Georgia), however, funding for programs is limited. Tourism is a common theme in ARC projects and programs, with asset-based economic development being a long-standing consideration (ARC Report, 2004; ARC Report, 2015). In the report “Investing in Appalachia’s future”--a policy
document guiding the ARC from 2016-2020--Strategic Investment Goal #4 is Natural and Cultural Assets (ARC Report 2015, 31), and it recognizes that development and connection to regional multi-use trails and cultural heritage sites can be used to generate interest from the public and cause economic impact in the area. The policy document titled “Turning Assets into Opportunities” notes that “residents who benefit from tourism tend to value and conserve what tourists are coming to see.” (ARC Report, 2004, 5) These documents both give examples of successes in the area of asset based economic development, including heritage and eco-tourism, in Appalachia. However, as we will see below, there has been a lack of such activities in some towns while others are enjoying major growth in these activities. This disparity is likely due to a lack of focus in the area, based on state legislature discussions. (Tennessee Legislative Record, 2015)

The Strategic Goals of the ARC are well aligned to make APT a part of the overall tourism objective in the region. The ARC’s vision is “For Appalachia to achieve socioeconomic parity with the nation;” (ARC Budget, 2016) this larger vision strategically places poverty alleviation at the center of the ARC’s mission. The priority goals of the organization--economic opportunities, a ready workforce, critical infrastructure, natural and cultural assets, and leadership and community capacity--may be used as standards for each tourism project undertaken within the organization, and would point the region in the right direction for APT.

The ARC is not without its detractors; the equitability of projects and programs in the region has been in question since its inception in terms of appropriation of resources and distribution of projects. As Ronald Eller states in Uneven Ground: Appalachia since 1945, “Attempting to eliminate the disparities between mainstream American and Appalachia, government made the region a domestic testing ground
for strategies to promote economic growth, and social scientists used it as a laboratory for experimentation in human behavior modification.” Scholars argue that the ARC and other government agencies have not appropriately accounted for local communities needs and wants when implementing plans for the region, and have molded the region into a shape most fitting with the larger US culture and its expectations of the region. In terms of tourism, this has taken an exaggerated form of the expectations of travelers to the region in order to create a market for fetishized folk art and a “hillbilly” experience. The mass production of certain heritage items along with the commercialization of locations and events renders these as inauthentic in order to appeal to a larger audience of tourists or consumers. (Whisnant, 1983; Barker, 1993; Huus Larson, 2005) What tourism can bring to the region, if appropriately programmed in collaboration with stakeholders from all levels of the playing field, is not only enrichment of the local culture (which should be the basis of any heritage or eco-tourism effort) but also poverty relief to those locals who find the need.
First Tennessee Development District

The First Tennessee Development District (FTDD) covers several of the communities in eastern Tennessee. The FTDD receives state funding from the State capitol in Nashville for programs such as the Johnson City Downtown Redevelopment Loan program and Recreation Trails which are both a boon to tourism industry in the area. The map in figure 10 shows the area that the FTDD works in, along with “pins” for historical sites that are registered in the area. The areas included in this study are marked in black, and it is clear from the number of “pins” that Mountain City lacks, despite having a rich history on par with Bristol, Johnson City, and Sevierville, (Banker, 2010) lacks investment in historic places and districts.

Another example of a lost opportunity in Mountain City is the case of its Downtown designation. In 2012, in an effort to revitalize parts of the downtown area, Mountain City applied for and received designation in the Tennessee Downtowns program, an affiliate of the national Main Streets program. However, Mountain City did not choose to apply for the more beneficial Main Street designation after receiving Downtown status in 2012.
Figure 9: Map of First Tennessee Development District with towns of interest marked. Pins represent historical places.http://ftdd.maps.arcgis.gov
Mountain City concentrated their downtown revitalization efforts and monies on improving the aesthetics and streetscapes. The grant allowed for the committee to plant 20 trees along the sidewalk, add more trashcans as an encouragement to keep downtown clean, purchase new flower planters, and install wooden directional signs to indicate areas of interests to tourists as well as locals. Bike racks were also erected downtown to not only encourage a more “green” form of transportation for community members, but also as an attempt to capture visiting cyclists from the Virginia Creeper Trail. By committing to the beautification of Mountain City downtown, the steering committee believed it would pave the way for like-minded businesses owners to follow suit. (Tennessee Downtown Round 2 Report: Mountain City; 2)

The town used the grant from the Downtown Designation to create signage (figure 8, p25) for some of the more tourist-geared places in the area such as Doe Mountain Recreation Area, the “Snake”--a well-known motorcycle riding road in the area--and a local winery among other destinations. These signs are helpful, but the tourists aren’t coming. The designation was intended to bring education and money to the town to assist them in bringing in outside money dependent upon the heritage market of the town, but no outside advertising was undertaken by the tourism board, and the offered education did not change the town’s business sector’s attitudes or outlook towards tourism. That is not to say that the town has not improved. A small museum and visitor’s center with a campground now welcomes visitors on the main thoroughfare; the farmer’s market has come a long way since its inception in 2012; and shops on the main street are more successful and longer lasting now than prior to the Main Street designation (Mountain City Chamber of Commerce, 2016). Perhaps this growth will be
sustainable and will continue to fortify the town in the long run. However, the chance to apply for Downtown designation has passed, and the town will not benefit from the business education and grant that could have bolstered the tourism industry there.

Other than assisting townships in the Main Street and Downtown designation process, the FTDD also administers grants through the Tennessee Arts Council, provides workforce resources to become a “work ready region,” and works toward economic and community development in the region (http://ftdd.org, 2016). They work in concert with the ARC to fund infrastructure and economic development projects.

According to the National Census Bureau, the poverty rate in Johnson County Tennessee, where Mountain City is located, was at 23% in 2014, 6% above the state and national averages. Washington County, where Johnson City is located, stands at 17.6%, on par with state and national averages (ARC Report, 2015). Although many factors can be taken to account for this disparity--e.g. East Tennessee State University’s location in Johnson City and industrial income through corporations--the lack of wealth in Johnson County can be felt in the streets of Mountain City and the surrounding countryside where several main street businesses are closed, and the standard of living is low. Some of the local attractions in Mountain City and the surrounding county, such as the Doe Mountain Recreation Area, Backbone Rock outdoor area, the Appalachian Trail portion abutting the county, and various local music and food festivals may begin to turn around some of the poverty in the area with an increase in tourism. This type of success is seen in Johnson City’s tourism initiatives and festival and event interests.
Disparities in Funding

Contributing factors to the disparities in economic stability in these areas are differences in the availability of public funding and the ways that funding is used (Tennessee Legislative Record, 2015). During State of Tennessee Legislature meetings, tourism has been discussed as a means to grow the economy of the entire state. However, the application of funding has not been equitable across the state to achieve this. The legislature announced in February of 2016 that it will increase the tourism budget its highest level ever, at $14.27M. However, these funds are not applied in locations such as Mountain City, and are funneled toward marketing for places such as Sevierville where Pigeon Forge is located and Bristol, the Birthplace of Country Music (ibid). Although marketing for these attractions is effective, moving some of that money back towards the less represented counties would boost their tourism efforts immensely.

Hotel taxes have been on the rise for the past year, with some counties not choosing to funnel funds from those taxes back into tourism. The report, “Economic Impact of Travel on Tennessee Counties” (2016), shows a spread of spending of county budgets from .03% to 31.91%, with the least expenditures all falling in the Appalachian Region of the state. The Tennessee Tourism Board’s 2016 Annual Report contains only one mention of efforts to increase the tourism draw to the least visited counties; the Discover Tennessee Trails and Byways program is meant to expand visitorship to the “back roads” of the state, and covers all 95 counties. Overall, marketing and funding of tourism in Tennessee appears to be geared towards the 5 most visited counties, with little attention paid to those areas where tourism has not yet reached its potential. This is likely because areas where tourism
is already a booming industry are proven to give a return for marketing and funding, however this does not indicate that other areas would not give a return as well.

**The Case Studies**

**Criteria**

There is a wide array of in northeastern Tennessee, with a range of types of tourism, capacities, and annual visitations. Attractions were selected for this study based on: being well established, being affected by public policies (through funding, taxation laws, zoning ordinances, or other related policies), those with a tangible effect on the local communities (by increasing business), those that engaged the community in planning or implementation, and those that have had controversial issues surrounding them. For each attraction, major themes, policy issues, the effects of the attraction on the local community, and any controversies and resolutions surrounding them were explored.

Doe Mountain Recreation Area is an eco-tourism site with trails for hiking, mountain biking, and using off highway vehicles, and it is located in the vicinity of Mountain City. Dollywood is a country-western themed amusement park in Sevier County with rollercoasters, fair rides, and country-western entertainment. The Bristol Motor Speedway is a NASCAR race track and event venue located in the city of Bristol. For this study, each of these destinations was explored using local government data and meeting records, by visiting the site locations and observing local and tourist interactions with the sites, and by visiting the surrounding towns to glean information about business and local interactions with the sites.
**Doe Mountain Recreation Area**

This OHV/Equine/Hiking trail park covers approximately 8600 acres between the town of Mountain City, Tennessee and Watauga Lake. The tract of land was previously planned as real estate development, but after the economic downturn of 2008, the state of Tennessee purchased the tract as a recreation area for local and non-local tourism. It is charged to the Doe Mountain Recreation Authority (DMRA), who are responsible for “conserving the land, waters, and wildlife of Doe Mountain and fostering economic development through recreational opportunities on the mountain.” (http://Doemountain.org, 2016) Since its charter in 2012, the DMRA has developed a comprehensive plan for development of the land into a premier destination for Off Highway Vehicle (OHV) trails, mountain bike trails, and hiking and horseback trails. Depending upon the extent of future development, the DMRA expects between 37,000-91,000 annual visitors to the park, according to the Tourism Feasibility plan. This will significantly affect town of Mountain City, which only has 2,500 residents. Estimates from the DMRA Management Plan show a likely increase in permanent value added of $300K to $4M in business brought into the town, job increase, and tourism dollars, and up to 100 permanent jobs created both at the site and in support of the site.

The report finds that land conservation for recreational use may be the most feasible economic development opportunity in the area. DMRA is rich in natural

![Figure 11: Signage for Doe Mountain Recreational Area at front gate.](image-url)
resources and recreational development opportunities. The town of Mountain City well positioned to capitalize on the DMRA as an attraction and to serve as a regional link to other recreational sites. (DMRA Management Plan, 2014) Similar ventures in Virginia and Tennessee were successes, including Damascus, Virginia which is successfully branding itself as a Trail Town and drawing thousands of tourists every year. Compared to other OHV destinations, the area would offer more scenic riding and longer trails rather than the challenge trails in other areas. Other recreational ideas for the DMRA include hunting, ziplining, camping and RVing, rappelling, and rock climbing, although these areas are yet to be developed. “Doe Mountain has all the qualities to be a world-class mountain biking and OHV destination and can be the main eco-tourism attraction within the region with the development of additional trail riding options.” (ibid. G.42)

Site Themes and Issues

A key question for this site is: “Will it be financially sustainable?” Several of the recorded DMRA board meetings make note that the site is operating without a financial surplus, but not in a deficit. Although the cash balance of the organization that oversees the site has climbed to about $65K, it fluctuates negatively in the winter months when little activity occurs at the site. In order to maintain financial stability, the DMRA has frequently discussed various income sources such as expanding trails, opening the site for alternative uses, and selling portions of the site as a one-time cash-gain. Because of the steady rate of increase in cash balance since the site’s opening in 2013, it appears that the DMRA will remain solvent into the future and will operate at a surplus at some point without taking action such as selling a plot. A surplus will take time to build, and it relies on the steady addition and upkeep by volunteers of bicycle, hiking, and OHV trails. Income for the site is
from the purchase of day or year passes to one of the different trail types. In terms of APT, it is important that a site be financially sustainable in order to be continually beneficial to an area.

A second issue is the ecological sustainability of the DMRA site. The site’s management plan explores biodiversity, habitats, and ecological assets in great depth in an effort to create guidelines for maintaining the area as well as for designing and constructing trails with minimal impact on the environment. The plan encourages environmental education for administrators and for visitors in order to build an appreciation for the resources available and to minimize visitor impact on the natural environment. An ongoing “natural resources committee” oversees the administration of the environmental guidelines. Environmental sustainability is important in APT destinations because environmental degradation has so often financially and culturally depleted areas in the past.

A final theme of the DMRA site is that of local participation. From its inception, the DMRA has attempted to include the surrounding community in the development and use of the area. During the creation of the management plan, the community was invited to participate in a charrette to invite information about community preferences and ideas. A Facebook page was also created to keep the community in touch with the site, and the DMRA encourages community participation in trail development and maintenance through volunteering. The DMRA is a community organization, composed mostly of locals, and although volunteerism is not high for the site, it does appear that the destination has community buy in on some level. APT destinations require community buy in in order to maintain
Funding

The Johnson County Mayor, Larry Johnson calls the DMRA his “weekend job,” volunteering at the center and on the trails. He and volunteers from the community spend weekends cutting trails and running the shop in the visitor’s center. This kind of civic backing from volunteers and civic leaders explains why DMRA has received funding from various sources, regional and federal, throughout its lifetime. Doe Mountain Recreation Area was funded through a $200K Recreational Trails Program (RTP) grant in 2012. A second RTP grant for $75,000 came through in April 2015. This grant was specifically intended to build restroom facilities on the DMRA property, making the recreation area more accessible to tourists. Two new grants are underway at the DMRA currently: one ARC grant for mountain biking trails, and one grant to hire a program coordinator for the DRMA. The area has also received a USDA Master planning grant to refund portions of expenses paid during their master planning sessions, amounting to around $11,000 in July 2014. The Johnson County Trails association received funds to obtain rights of way to the downtown connectivity of various trails for the area, and will use part of these funds in the DMRA trail system. Another ARC Grant in the amount of $312K was awarded to restore the fire tower, to

Figure 12: Firetower at DMRA. This structure has become a landmark for the area.
maintain and build OHV, pedestrian, and bike trails, and to purchase a 5 acre inholding from the Mountain Trail Riders’ Association. This level of funding on the federal and local levels demonstrates a strong drive on the part of the DMRA to see their programs succeed.

**Effects on the local community**

During the charrette between stakeholders and Farmer Morgan, the firm who did the initial study, community members were able to voice their visions and opinions on the use of Doe Mountain Recreation Area. Some concerns were voiced, along with positive feedback to the management planning team. The community agreed that the DMRA must preserve, enhance, and protect Doe Mountain, and should create a high quality experience for destination adventurers and provide long term success. Over 100 community members participated in the meetings over the period of a week.

Other than this initial meeting, the firm conducted a User and Economic Survey in October of 2013. The survey “indicate[d] … users enjoy a positive social benefit from recreation areas that provide a trail system that is well marked and is not over crowded…” and “Although the current trail system on Doe Mountain is partially marked, upgrading the signage system should be considered a primary objective in the short term…” This indicates that room for improvement exists, but that the area is on its way to providing that social benefit that it seeks.
The park attracts day-users during peak months and appears to be self-sustaining, although not operating at a surplus (DMRA Meeting Minutes, June-September, 2014). Community members appear to use the trails significantly, although access poses a problem for some. The economic impact analysis report expected approximately 14,000 local visitors during a year, although data has not yet been available on the actual usage of the park by locals. The site planners anticipated a total of at least 37,000 visits per year, which could easily stress the community’s resources if reached (DMRA Management Plan, 2014, G.43).

The DMRA planned to request help from FTDD to promote a grand opening event, but a grand opening event has not yet occurred. No real advertising by the FTDD has taken place (DMRA Meeting Minutes, August 2014). The firetower (figure 12, p. 32) is an iconic landmark in the DMRA that requires a great deal of updating before it can be opened for use by park visitors, for which the DMRA has procured a grant from ARC. This marketing image could be a symbol that the community would recognize once this updating has occurred (DMRA Meeting Minutes, April 2015).

The DMRA is a community based program, using volunteer hours to build and maintain trails, holding a board of mostly community volunteers, and employing community members full and part time for its operation. An informal look at the community shows that since the DMRA was chartered in 2012 none of the new local businesses are focused on tourism. There are a small variety of restaurants in the town area, but they are spread out so that non-locals might have trouble finding them. Retail shops in the town are limited to craft or antique stores and a couple of chains such as Dollar General. Although it may, with movement towards the goals set forth in the management plan, all in all, it does not appear that the DMRA has yet had a tangible impact on the growth in the community’s economy.
**APT Best Practices**

To measure the efficacy of the DMRA as an APT destination, we can apply the model from the figure 3 to the management plan. The first step in this process is to define the stakeholders, who amount to anyone who has an interest in or benefits from the destination. A non-exhaustive list of stakeholders includes: community members in Mountain City and the surrounding countryside; local political leaders (such as the Mayor, town council members, aldermen, etc); the DMRA members (who include political leaders and community members); not for profit organizations such as the Trail Riders’ Association; local businesses and business leaders; and nearby universities who conduct biological or ecological studies.

The second step is to examine Anti-poverty tourism themes as they relate to the site. As far as competitiveness, the destination is shown in the project management study to have several pitfalls: it has several dead-end trails, signage is lacking, and there are currently too few trails to sustain the traffic expected. However, the study lays out three separate plans whereby the destination could become a highly competitive site in the region, with the most extensive plan calling for many more trails, cabins and RV areas, and a regional marketing campaign.

Although one of the reasons that the site lags behind in trail creation and signposting is that the area has suffered from a lack of engaged local volunteers, the plan itself was well received by the public in the planning meetings. Meeting minutes indicate that the area has had opportunities to partner with various organizations to coordinate volunteer activities when they have been available. The sustainability of the location is also addressed in the strategic plan document, although without many specifics. The three proposed scenarios each take into account the ecological impact of foot, bicycle, and OHV traffic on the site, and show that the destination is
apparently hearty enough to maintain high level traffic without depleting the natural environment. They also consider several future concepts that were raised by community members during the planning meetings, including making the firetower a meeting point and developing a resort near DMRA property for tourists. These future plans and scenarios account for increased business in the town of Mountain City, and couch this increase in terms of value-added for the community. They do not, however, include any recommendation or resources for educating community business leaders in dealing with such an increase.

The determinants in the APT model--opportunity, empowerment, and security--are found in the management plan, demonstrating that it is well focused on the surrounding community. The plans outline a possible 1-100 permanent positions in the community, and it appears there are opportunities for the community to become involved in the success of the DMRA. Because the DMRA is a community based program, it can empower the community to help them bring about a positive change economically. However, with such a large range in the expectations of employment, visitation, and economic gains, the security of that economic change is dubious. This is especially true because the management plan neglects to give a means of analysis, monitoring, or evaluation. To be sure, the DMRA tracks dollars and visitors to the park, however these numbers are not made available to the public, and do not appear to be used by the authority in relationship to the plan to measure its success.
The cultural aspect of the APT model is best viewed in light of the heritage and cultural activities of the area. Most prominently, this can be seen in the interconnectedness of the local population with the site: the activities of hiking, OHV riding, mountain biking, and hunting (which has been discussed as a future activity at the site) are common recreational activities in the area and are seen as a part of local identity. Further, the value placed on ecological sustainability is one that is held in common with locals. Even the visitor center reflects heritage (figure 14), having the same log-cabin motif that is common among both tourist attractions and homes in the area.

Based on the model of APT, the DMRA management plan is lacking in several key areas. However, these areas could be easily addressed in a follow up to the management plan, and the DMRA provides a firm foundation for tourism based economic growth, as is shown above.

Controversies and challenges

The November 2015 meeting minutes of the DMRA demonstrated some of the issues that the community is struggling with. A private landowner sought to buy a 5 acre tract of the DMRA land, and the board looked into selling this in order to increase their operating surplus. However, the state prohibits sale of public lands to
an individual without putting the land on the open market to create a bid. The idea was seen as too complicated to be feasible for the amount of land in question, and the bid was not sought.

Another strain on the DMRA has been the issue of access to the downtown area. The insurance company covering the Town of Mountain City will not cover liability from use of OHVs on town/county roads (DMRA Meeting Minutes, December 2015). This would complicate any local ordinances passed to allow usage of the roads for OHVs, and could be damaging to the town itself. The Tennessee Adventure Tourism and Rural Development Act of 2011 would allow for highway riding, if the highways are designated as Adventure Byways. The authority looked into that possibility, and has actively began designating portions of the highways as OHV trails. The DMRA also discussed the need for police patrols on roads carrying OHV traffic (DMRA Meeting Minutes, April 2015). Patrols would allow for greater community security and a more positive overall outlook on the area.

To try to alleviate some of the concerns of access to the town, the DMRA has sought a partnership with the Johnson County Trails Association, who have procured an RTP Grant to purchase right of ways across the county, and may use some of these funds within the recreational area. This would be a boost to the cross tourism between the town and the recreational area, bringing dining and retail business into town straight off of the trails.

Another challenge is that the DMRA is not perceived by locals to have had a positive effect on business in the community. No new businesses catering to the recreational area have arisen since the charter, and restaurant owners do not feel that they benefit from the tourists who visit the area. If this trend continues, it is likely
that the community will not see an economic benefit from the DMRA, and will stop supporting it.

Although it has many of the factors that are required for tourism to be successful and appropriate, because of its relative newness and a lack of marketing and regional awareness, the DMRA has not yet brought the increase in economic growth that it has the potential for. The site exhibits many of the important qualities to be a successful APT destination and to help sustain the economy of the town, if the management plan is fully implemented.

**Dollywood/Pigeon Forge**

Dollywood is a 150 acre theme park plus 35 acre water park with a Country-Western theme. It includes 15 western shows, 40 rides, and 5 yearly festivals. After a history of passing hands from owner to owner as the Rebel Railroad, and then Goldrush Junction, gathering more popularity all the while, Dolly Parton acquired partnership in the theme park in 1986, and the park took on her name as a marketing campaign. It has since grown in popularity and in size almost constantly. Pigeon Forge, the town surrounding Dollywood, began its tourism boom after the World’s Fair in nearby Knoxville in 1982, and it built its tourism on retail and amusement owned from outside the town and on land development. Today, it is booming with attractions along the main strip, interspersed with themed restaurants and theaters as well as museums. Dollywood and Pigeon Forge grew simultaneously.
in popularity and size as the town added more attractions, and so it is difficult to
discern any appreciable impact that the attraction has had on the community. John
Mikesell argues in his book Fiscal Administration: Analysis and Application for the
Public Sector that a government’s economic functions are stabilization, growth, the
fight against unemployment and inflation, and provision for standard of living
increases for locals. In line with Mikesell’s argument, tourism is the principal
economic development generator in the city of Pigeon Forge, Tennessee. (Bonimy,
2016). In a city with a population of less than 6,000 people, over 9 million tourists
visit annually, putting stress on infrastructure and local businesses.

Themes and Issues

The question of authenticity is perhaps the most daunting, but also relevant,
issue for in Dollywood and Pigeon Forge. The theme park itself holds “historic
attractions,” where “the values and traditions of yesterday are at home beside
impressive roller-coasters…” (Background Release, http://dollywood.com, 2016)
The annual festivals at Dollywood range from Southern BBQ and Bluegrass to a
Festival of Nations that showcases world music and dance and “reminds guests of
shared similarities while embracing unique, time-honored traditions” (ibid). Within
the theme park itself, entertainment is coupled with the kind of thrills that one would
expect from a major theme park. Outside the gates to Dollywood, in the town of
Pigeon Forge, authenticity is not maintained. Actors play caricatures of Appalachian
people, with stereotypical characters such as those found in the Hatfield and McCoy
dinner theater and Dolly Parton’s Lumberjack Feud. A few venues purport to
maintain authenticity, but most of the attractions, restaurants, and shopping
destinations make their money from cheaply produced mass market replicas of
experiences or items that might once have been considered Appalachian Heritage.
A second issue for Pigeon Forge is where do the tourism dollars go? Many of the attractions, restaurants, and shops in Pigeon Forge are part of large, national chain corporations, such as the Hard Rock Cafe, Madame Tussaud's Wax Museum, and the Tanger Outlet shops. Others are locally owned such as Smoky Mountain Knife Works and the Great Smoky Arts and Crafts Community. On the whole, a survey of the Pigeon Forge Chamber of Commerce business listings shows that many larger businesses are owned by corporations outside of the town, while smaller businesses tend to be owned locally. Although this may be a standard model for many towns, in Pigeon Forge this indicates an imbalance where more money is leaving the town than is remaining with local owners. Funds remaining in the town include payroll to local employees and small business profits, while the lion’s share of the big business profits are funneled away from the town. As noted previously, Pigeon Forge also has one of the lowest lodging city tax rates in Tennessee, meaning that fewer tax dollars are remaining in the town as well. The APT model accounts for the question of money in the idea of site sustainability. Although the individual attractions at Pigeon Forge may last because they bring money to their companies, the model does not sustain the town financially by moving those dollars back out of the town to their national organizations.
Policy Issues

The effect on tourism is one of the top considerations of many decisions made in the town (Pigeon Forge City Commission Meeting Minutes, July 2016, January 2016, and September 2015). Zoning is geared towards mixed commercial retail and lodging rather than residential properties. The tourism board of Pigeon Forge is highly active in city commission meetings, weighing in on items from tax increases to right of way disputes.

Of the over $17.7B spent on travel in Tennessee in 2014, $12.4B were spent in the top 5 counties, including Sevier County, where Pigeon Forge is located (Tennessee Department of Tourism Report, 2016). Tourism dollars are affected in taxation policies throughout the state as well, with localities like Pigeon Forge, where high numbers of tourists are common, having lower taxation on lodging to draw hotels and lodgers to the areas (Tennessee Legislative Record, September 2015). This trend does not seem to have an actual effect on the numbers of visits to tourism areas (Mount, 2015). Rather, visitors tend to stay in locales regardless of the tax cost on lodging, meaning that places like Pigeon Forge who do not take advantage of the higher tax rate allowed by the state are missing out on potential monies available to, for example, increase road capacity to improve traffic conditions.

Effects on the local community

In Tourism in the Mountain South, Brenden Martin (2008) tells about “Slim Jim” and the “Travellin' Hillbillies.” This group of people travelled by motorcade in the 1950s to various places around the country, in order to draw attention to Gatlinburg in the Pigeon Forge area. “[Slim Jim] made a spectacle of himself by waving his gun in the air, clogging, and yelling “like a wild man.”” (141) This type of stereotypical “hillbilly” motif is frequently found in Pigeon Forge. From the Hatfield and McCoy
dinner theater, to the Smoky Mountain Opry, to the themed go kart and miniature
golf venues, the town of Pigeon Forge is a caricature of life in the Appalachian
Mountains. Although certain attractions strive for a measure of authenticity (e.g. the
Heritage Carriage Rides and the Old Mill) these are overshadowed by roller-
coasters, magic shows, and chain attractions such as Madame Tussaud’s Wax
Museum. The juxtaposition of buildings shaped like the Titanic, or like an upside-
down roman pavilion against the backdrop of the misty mountains is jarring, and the
9 mph average traffic through the area exemplifies the ills of tourism writ large (figure
17). Locals find themselves gridlocked in traffic in their daily lives, and the industry
becomes increasingly dependent upon garish tourist attractions that send money out
of the community rather than drawing money in.

The effect that such a tourism boom has on the local community is evident in
the types of jobs it creates, the problems with overcrowding, and infrastructure
demands, as Ronald Eller (2008) writes in Uneven Ground. In terms of APT,
stereotyping may cause a lack of community participation in tourism because of the
negative visibility on community members. Another consequence of big tourism is that it removes some power and opportunity from the people who live in the community by attracting non-local businesses that extract a great deal of money and bring less in.

Controversies and challenges

The economy of the town of Pigeon Forge is entirely based in tourism with little else to create growth. If tourism began to wane, the town would have little to fall back on. Also, the type of economy created by the industry—with low-wage positions dependent upon seasonal fluctuations of visitors—does not improve the economic status of people within the community.

The APT model (figure 7, p 17) can be applied to the town of Pigeon Forge or to Dollywood because tourism is so entrenched in the local economy. The stakeholders are inclusive of the entire community, including private businesses, governmental organizations, community leaders, and of course the tourists—however, the community members seem to be the invisible stakeholders in Pigeon Forge’s model. Pigeon Forge is a highly competitive tourist destination, considering the vast numbers of tourists that travel there each year; it is one of the most visited tourist destinations in the Appalachias. This popularity may be because of the variety of attractions available in the town, including theme parks, retail shopping, museums, aquariums, and adventure sports to name a few.

Local participation in a town such as Pigeon Forge could be defined as ownership and operation of area attractions as well as civic engagement in the
planning of the town by those who live in the town. Local participation is lacking in Pigeon Forge: many of the businesses, restaurants, and attractions are owned by outside corporations, and the town is not planned in such a way that the locals see benefits from the infrastructure. Dollywood is an exception, with Dolly Parton being a local of Sevierville, the town nearest Pigeon Forge, and having made it her mission to give back to her hometown through the destination. Outside of the park, many of the low-wage jobs that the tourism industry has brought in are filled by locals. This sort of “participation,” in the tourism economy, however, does not bolster the overall economic and cultural condition of the town, as Brenden Martin (2008) notes, “because a tourist-driven economy stifles economic diversification, spoils the landscape, and destroys the sense of community.” (195) Further, although the tourism economy in the area has boomed over the last half century, the sustainability of the tourism model in the area is dubious because it is built on non-local businesses bringing in and exporting funds back outside of the community.

In consideration of the determinants—opportunity, empowerment, and security—it is difficult to discern positive examples in the local community. Although the tourism board and the community council have sway over the industry through policy techniques such as taxation and zoning regulations, community members play a comparatively small role in decision making, primarily in voting on the council. Locals are not secure in their low-wage, often seasonal, jobs, and they are not empowered to make positive changes for their security and wellbeing. This is because those positions are limited, often temporary, and often do not offer benefits. They also are mostly with companies based outside of the region and the locals have no path to build a career with the companies beyond the short term because of the locations of career jobs within them. Analysis, monitoring, and evaluation of the
effect of tourism in Pigeon Forge on poverty alleviation seems to have been completely overlooked in the statistics regarding numbers of tourists and dollars spent each year. Rather than being a complement to other approaches toward economic growth, tourism effectively stifles other efforts by over-running the infrastructure and moving dollars away from the town.

The cultural implications of Dollywood and Pigeon Forge on the local community can be seen in the complex issue of authenticity. The identity of locals is obscured by the staged authenticity present in Dollywood’s actor and actress portrayals of Appalachian peoples. This is further heightened by the caricature representations in venues across the town itself. These types of misrepresentation cause local populations to feel disconnected from the town and cause a lack of sense of place.

Dollywood and the city of Pigeon Forge surrounding the attraction have several pitfalls in the areas of authenticity, local participation, and economic parity for the locals. Application of the APT model brings these to light and reveals that the poverty in this “at-risk” area is not a consideration in tourism planning.

**Bristol Motor Speedway (BMS)**

The city of Bristol was founded as a trading city where two railroads were built to meet in 1852. Over the years it has grown to a population of over 44,000 people, combining both the Tennessee and VA populations of the city. The BMS has been a NASCAR venue since 1961, when it opened as a half mile track to the Bristol 500 (a 500-lap race). The track hosts at least five main event NASCAR races per year and several short-track races as well. Throughout the years, the track has opened to various events such as college football games and the annual Pinnacle Speedway in
Lights at Christmas. Visitors come from throughout the region and the nation to share in the experience of race weeks at Bristol.

Themes and issues

NASCAR is marketed as the sport of the South, and many locals identify greatly with the sport of car-racing and take pride in the BMS (see the mural in figure 19). The theme of heritage is one that is prominent in studying the BMS and the surrounding area. Some of the locals feel that the town is overshadowed by the BMS and brings only seasonal business, while others value the BMS for the cultural significance of the sport to the community. Because of the history of NASCAR in the region, the perception is widely held that the venue enriches the town. Heritage is important in terms of APT in the question of local participation, and how the locals relate to a site.

A second theme for this destination is community buy-in. The community participates in several of the annual events that occur at the venue, such as the Christmas lights and college football games. Community members also visit the venue during races as well. The city council and the Mayor’s Office support race week through planning of other events in mindfulness of BMS events, and through volunteerism and visible programming to welcome visitors to the city.
Meeting Minutes, August, 2016). Community buy-in relates to site sustainability in the APT model. Without community backing, a site is less likely to succeed than if the community feels engaged.

**Policy Issues**

The City Council of Bristol Tennessee takes a balanced approach to tourism with consideration of other issues such as other industries and community needs. Lodging taxes in the town are among the highest in Tennessee, while most of these tax dollars are funneled back into tourism. This has the effect of ensuring that the town is continuing to invest in tourism, but without unduly taxing other sectors. Zoning is not overly geared towards businesses or high capacity lodging (Bristol City Council Meeting Minutes, August 2, 2016; June 7, 2016), lending to a more residential feel than that found in Pigeon Forge. This policy trend allows locals to feel that they have a place in their community, rather than their community being only geared towards bringing in tourists. This also allows for greater economic diversification in the area, with industry such as pharmaceuticals, medicine, and metal piping among the city’s employers.

![Map of traffic routes to and from the Bristol Motor Speedway](http://www.bristolmotorspeedway.com)
Even with this balanced approach, the city has had to make some concessions for the BMS. Race weekend traffic has been an issue in the past, however a bypass of US Hwy 11E/19 directs race traffic away from the downtown area and directly onto the interstate (figure 20, p. 50). This has effectively removed the congestion and overcrowding of the large venue’s event days.

**Effects on the local community**

The BMS brings seasonal business to local restaurants and retail shops. It is a part of the town’s heritage and helps shape the way locals see themselves. Tourism in Bristol is not solely based around the BMS, though. For example, the town of Bristol has its name as the “Birthplace of Country Music,” with the home of Tennessee “Ernie” Ford as one of the local attractions. The town also sits at the end of Virginia’s Crooked Road Heritage Music Trail, and attracts visitors for this reason as well. Having these and other heritage based attractions balances out the BMS’s appeal as a large event venue.

**Controversies and challenges**

Since the opening of the BMS, the town has had to find ways to deal with the influx of traffic and the crowds. One means of dealing with this has been the highway 11 bypass, which directs race and event traffic directly into and out of the BMS without taxing the town’s smaller downtown
roads. The local perception is that this does not detract from businesses in the
downtown area, and restaurants and shops see an influx of visitors during race
weeks. The local government also publishes traffic plans for race weekends and
events. This has proven to effectively satisfy the locals in their traffic issues.

The APT model can be applied to the BMS and the town of Bristol in order to
discern the efficacy of the site in appropriately countering economic distress. The
stakeholders in tourism in the city include the private sector tourist sites, such as
BMS, the local government, volunteers, tourists and event goers, and community
members. Because of the ongoing relationship between tourist sites and the local
government, the APT themes of competitiveness, local participation, and
sustainability are addressed (Bristol City Council Meeting Minutes, August 2, 2016)
The city is competitive in tourism by virtue of the variety of destinations that it offers.
The sustainability of the BMS is exemplified by its long history of economic solvency,
and some of this stability is extended to the city of Bristol.

The APT determinants of opportunity, empowerment, and security are
demonstrated in the city, as well. Many of the local tourist attractions are locally
owned and festivals such as the Rhythm and Roots festival are locally organized.
Community members have opportunities to gain economically, as well as culturally,
from such venues and destinations through individual or collective participation in the
industry. Security, in this case, comes from a diversified economy that has tourism
as one of its components.

In the case of Bristol, monitoring and evaluation of poverty alleviation is
achieved not only through ARC studies and data collection, but also through local
evaluation of destinations and events. These can be seen in local business trends,
tourism marketing strategies, and event coordination. These show a boost in
tourism marketing in the past year, including for the BMS, as well as more stable locally owned businesses, and thoughtful planning of festivals and events with the local population in mind. ARC data (figures 5 and 6, p11) shows that the county that Bristol is located in has remained “transitional” for the past ten years, while the counties surrounding it have seen higher poverty rates during the same time. This indicates that although little to no economic growth has occurred, the county has fared better than its neighbors, and is benefiting from the diverse economy including tourism.

The effects of the BMS on the surrounding local culture are best viewed through the lenses of heritage and ownership. Because NASCAR is the “sport of the South” many locals feel a great sense of pride in the venues where races are held, as can be seen by the mural in Figure 19. The town of Bristol is also the home of other heritage sites such as the Birthplace of Country Music, the Crooked Road Heritage Music Trail, and various festivals and events. These examples of authentic heritage encourage a sense of place in an area, and allow the locals to feel empowered to create positive changes and take ownership of the town.

Conclusions

Tourism is not a panacea to all of the problems that come along with economic distress in an area. The case studies presented here are diverse in their size and audience, but each demonstrates an effect that tourism can have in a distressed community. The communities these destinations are based in have been at varying poverty levels, each one above the national average, for the past ten years according to ARC data. However, the effects of tourism on the towns’ economies and cultures have been vastly different, and can be measured through the lens of APT.
The DMRA has potential to grow into an effective main attraction for the Mountain City area. The civic buy-in for the destination is high, and a great deal of public funding has been used to bring the area to its current state of operation. If the DMRA reaches the potential seen in the management plan, it can bring new business to the town in the form of retail, dining, and venues specific to adventure tourism. The APT model shows that this site has the potential to promote economic growth for the town of Mountain City.

Pigeon Forge’s unbalanced focus on tourism industry, on the other hand, has caused massive overgrowth in outside businesses compared with other cities of its size. The amusement industry in the area is dependent upon outside proprietorship and national chains to maintain the numbers of tourists who visit on an annual basis. The low-wage jobs do not provide opportunities for locals to rise above the economic conditions of the area, and no other industry exists to help prop up the economy. Attractions there are not based around community needs and do not represent the community in a positive light. Applying the APT model to Dollywood and the town of Pigeon Forge shows that the attractions do not bring economic stability to the area.

The BMS and the town of Bristol have a more balanced policy outlook where tourism is involved. The town does not focus too many of its resources on tourism, and it does not favor any single tourist destination, for example the BMS, over others. It has developed a tourism industry that is widely focused on Music Heritage as well as destinations. When looked at using the APT model, the BMS has benefits for the town economically, and the town also benefits from other tourist attractions.
After viewing these three sites through the lens of the APT model, there are several specific recommendations that should be made to policy makers. With security in mind, the community surrounding Doe Mountain would benefit from the addition of patrols on roads where OHVs will be active. Further, for the site to be most successful, the town of Mountain City should consider alternative insurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competitiveness/Participation/Sustainability</th>
<th>Opportunity/Empowerment/Security</th>
<th>Analysis/Monitoring/Evaluation</th>
<th>Cultural Aspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMRA/Mountain City</td>
<td>• Similar sites have been competitive in the area, but dead-end trails and lacking signs make this site less competitive. • Local buy-in is high. • Ecological sustainability is heavily reviewed in management plan. • Economic sustainability is lacking with no surplus operating budget.</td>
<td>• Plan offers 1-100 permanent positions in town. • DMRA is community based, using volunteer hours for upkeep and growth.</td>
<td>• Site activities are aligned with local identity and interests. • Eco-sustainability is aligned with local values and eco-heritage. • Heritage reflected in ambience: log-cabin style visitor center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollywood/Pigeon Forge</td>
<td>• Highly competitive as one of the most visited sites in Appalachia. • Local participation is low with few businesses owned locally. • Dependent on non-local businesses exporting money back out of the community</td>
<td>• Low-wage seasonal jobs for locals does not lend to security. • Infrastructure is not built around community needs. • Community involvement is limited to voting for city council.</td>
<td>• Staged authenticity at Dollywood. • Caricatures of local peoples cause disconnection from the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMS/Bristol</td>
<td>• Competitive as a regional venue for racing and other events. • Town is competitive with a variety of tourism offerings. • Economic sustainability of BMS lends to that of the town.</td>
<td>• Attractions are locally owned and festivals locally organized. • Individual and collective involvement in sites. • Diversified economy lends to local security.</td>
<td>• Heritage of NASCAR, Country Music, Folk Music, etc encourage a sense of place • Locals feel ownership of the site due to reflections of heritage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22: Summary table of APT model applied to each site.

**Specific Recommendations**

After viewing these three sites through the lens of the APT model, there are several specific recommendations that should be made to policy makers. With security in mind, the community surrounding Doe Mountain would benefit from the addition of patrols on roads where OHVs will be active. Further, for the site to be most successful, the town of Mountain City should consider alternative insurance
agencies or a more robust policy to ensure no liability concerns for OHVs on public roads. The town might also consider using metrics regarding the DMRA to guide specific lodging and recreation taxes in the area: for example, if it is found that DMRA visitors lodge within the town limits most often, then an increase in the currently low lodging tax could bring in revenue to be used for other tourism initiatives.

The town of Pigeon Forge would benefit from a more diverse City Commission board, where town lay-people could have opportunities to create change in policy. There is also room for a tax increase on lodging in this town, where funds could be funneled back into the community. One of the greatest needs in the Pigeon Forge area is for the infrastructure to be realigned to meet the community’s needs in terms of roads and traffic. The town is also in need of incentives to draw in industry other than tourism. Generally, policy decisions in Pigeon Forge lack the balance that would come from having the community’s voice heard more prominently in policy decisions.

The town of Bristol, surrounding the BMS, strikes that balance well, and policy decisions consider the needs of the community as well as that of tourism in the area. The town would benefit from a more robust tourism advertising campaign, which is in the works with the popularity of the Birthplace of Country Music on the rise and talks of a new heritage music trail which would take root there.

These examples can lend to more general recommendations for policy makers where tourism initiatives are being considered, as well, although there is no “one-size fits all” policy formula for APT. Any consideration of tourism initiatives should be in-line with community needs regarding infrastructure, over-crowding, use of public works, etc. Also, in areas where tourism is not already established,
revenue from tourism related taxes, such as lodging, should be redirected back into tourism initiatives. However, in areas where tourism may already be booming, towns should consider directing portions of that revenue to community planning and infrastructure in order to alleviate some of the stresses that large tourism has on an area. Consideration of how various tourism initiatives effect one another—for example how race weeks and BMS events effect festivals in Bristol—should also be taken when considering scheduling and logistics. Municipalities should also make analytics regarding the effect of sites on poverty a priority if considering tourism as an anti-poverty measure.

Areas for Possible Future Research

There are several questions raised by the current research that cannot be addressed in this thesis. For example, what are some of the differences between National, State, and Local Policies. Are there disparities between them and how should they be aligned? A deeper look at funding for private ventures could show how public spending benefits the public. A comprehensive overview of the Appalachian Mountains tourism industry to determine how tourism fits into the overall region as an economic boon would be beneficial.
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Appalachian Regional Commission. "Investing in Appalachia’s Future: Appalachian Regional Commission’s 5-Year Strategic Plan 2016-2020." Washington DC, 2015. This is an ARC Strategic planning report for 2016-2020. Strategic investment goals are: Economic Opportunities; Ready Workforce; Critical Infrastructure; Natural and Cultural Assets; and Leadership and Community Capacity. For the purpose of this study, goal 4 is particularly relevant. The objectives of this goal are aligned with sustainably promoting tourism in the region.

Banker, Mark T. Appalachians All: East Tennesseans and the Elusive History of an American Region. University of Tennessee Press. December 2010. This book is particularly valuable for its focus on identity of Appalachians. “That other Appalachia was a uniform, static place, peopled by “strange and peculiar” folk whose lives contrasted starkly with modern standards in the rapidly changing United States.” p 161 It involves discussion on the intersectionality of Appalachian peoples. Dissociation from this understanding has had mixed results: embracing progress and myths of industrial goodness led to the selling of resources, labor, and identity (“perhaps too readily”)

Barker, Gary. “The Mountain Crafts: Romancing the Marketplace.” Journal of the Appalachian Studies Association. Vol 5, pp20-25, 1993. This article deals heavily with the commodification of culture in Appalachia. The “refinement” and commercialization of handicrafts, such as a heritage coverlet that could not have been commodified in its original form because of crooked seams, were means to achieve market status for native mountaineers. There is also discussion of the selection of certain crafts for promotion over others because of the market demand. Current market products are derivatives of early crafts, not authentic “folk art.”

de la Barre, Suzanne. “Wilderness and Cultural Tour Guides, Place Identity and Sustainable Tourism in Remote Areas.” Journal of Sustainable Tourism. Vol. 21, No. 6, 825–844, 2013. This article explores sustainable tourism and place-based approaches to tourism in remote areas. The study considers infrastructure and the significance of “lifestyle entrepreneurs” in the tourism industry.

Center for Regional Economic Competitiveness and West Virginia University. “Appalachia Then and Now: Examining Changes to the Appalachian Region since 1965.” Report for the Appalachian Regional Commission. February 2015. This is an Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) Study on economic and social developments in the Appalachian Region between 1965 and 2015. They used the same 10 key measures used to establish Appalachia’s needs in 1965. Key findings include that Appalachia’s poverty rate has been cut in half from 31% to 16.6%, but income disparity is still problematic; unemployment rates have reached overall parity with the US, but are still higher in some counties; total private employment is still at a widening gap as compared with the rest of the nation; the mix of industry from extractive/productive and service sector is climbing towards the national
average, but still lags behind; the educational gap and health gap between Appalachia and the wider US is growing; transportation access is lagging as far as it ever has; and telecommunications access has grown but is still behind the US in terms of broadband.

Economic Development Research Group, Inc.; Regional Technology Strategies, Inc.; MIT Dept. of Urban Studies & Planning. "Sources of Regional Growth in Non-Metro Appalachia" Report for the Appalachian Regional Commission. Revised 2007. This is an ARC study on the regional growth on non-urban areas in Appalachia, and the sources of that growth. “It has become clear that the most distressed economic conditions are generally occurring in the more isolated and rural parts of Appalachia, and that targeted efforts are needed to address those conditions. At the same time, it has also become clear that “in-vogue” economic development strategies, which often focus on seeking large scale high-tech cluster development, are not necessarily appropriate or realistic for isolated, rural areas.” (p10) This indicates an appropriate view of the need for unique economic development in the region. Cultural based growth path is reviewed along with a theoretical foundation of the mixture of use of tangible and intangible assets to spur sustainable economic growth. “Sustainable Tourism can be defined as the means to "... meet the needs of present tourists and host regions while protecting and enhancing opportunities for the future. It is envisaged as leading to management of all resources in such a way that economic, social and aesthetic needs can be fulfilled while maintaining cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, biological diversity and life support systems."” (quoted from World Tourism Organization 1988 p 33)

A case study of Southwest Tennessee/Southeast NC, Chattanooga through Asheville shows possible uses of tourism for growth. The report points out “sustainability and local economy as the main beneficiary” for asset-based development.

This article touches on poverty reduction through tourism. Anti-Poverty Tourism is a new philosophy of tourism development and poverty alleviation that shows the direct effects of tourism on poverty as opposed to the “trickle down” effect hoped for previously. “The poor become the focus of concern; whether they can reap net benefits from tourism is now the primary criterion for justifying any tourism based development initiative.” p10. “Anti-poverty Tourism” is “any tourism development in which poverty alleviation is set as the central or one of the central objectives.” Destination Competitiveness is a decisive factor influencing the performance of a location, touristically. Local Participation in tourism as a necessity for increasing local positive attitudes to tourism development. The Continuum of Poverty Alleviation Strategies--"argues that tourism per se fits very well into neoliberal interpretations of poverty alleviation, while it tends to aggravate poverty-enhancing inequalities if allowed to operate in a free market environment.

This book touches on Ethics in Tourism. From Butcher, 2002—“tourism changes the tourist, the site, and the economy of the host community.” Authors discuss the limitations to alternative tourist industries, exaggerations of the criticism of mass tourism. On *The Moralisation of Tourism*, the authors discuss the ethical deficit: can ethics apply to an industry devoted to freedom, and entertainment? Proposals to shift from niche marketing to incorporation of ethics into tourism in general. Or, are tourists beginning to police themselves by moving toward “green, new, ethical, environmentally responsible, good, enlightened, and experiential types of tourism?”

Irony of moralization in mass tourism. So-called moral tourism increases likelihood of exaggeration of the value of alternative types of tourism, increasing the problem due to ignorance of the travelers. But, if not through moralization, then how can the impacts be mitigated? The economic growth gained by mass tourism could be a boon to underdeveloped areas. “Is tourism to blame for culture fluidity?” or is tourism’s role negligible compared to internet, tv, and mass media?

Speaking on alternative tourism: Macleod asserts that small tourism is more impactful than mass tourism because of increased one on one contact. Smith and Graburn assert that mass tourism is greater impact because of the economic impact, numbers, and expectations of the travelers. Considering that “this moralization dwells in books and journals and hardly ever reaches the target.” A 2010 study shows that consumers prioritize personal wants over sustainability and ethics. It cites WTO Global Code of Ethics, and the negligible dissemination of them by the nations who signed.


This book discusses the interactivity between partnership, politics, and policy making and tourism as a “social engineering strategy.” Horizontal, vertical, and lateral cooperation among stakeholders is key.

Can Seng Ooi discusses building consensus. Tourism without harming the local community or tourism that maximizes market spread through undifferentiated, homogenized products with goals set by outside planners and international tourism industry.

The stakeholder approach to tourism policy is often difficult in practice. A balanced approach is necessary—bring the benefits of tourism while minimizing the negative impacts. The relationship between heritage and tourism is a continuum between co-existence, exploitation, and imaginative reconstruction. When is change brought about by tourism activities acceptable?

Patrick Fohl and Yvonne Probstle: Discuss how cooperation as the cure. Cooperation projects are defined by collaboration between two or more partners, legally independent. At the core is the exchange of resources and
having the same or compatible goals. Partners limit autonomy but gain a greater chance of success. Concentrating on strengths of each partner to generate added value. Market oriented vs. hierarchical coordination with cooperative coordination as the link between.

This book discusses the complex nature of the relationship between tourism and poverty and the entrenchment of poverty through tourism. Simply put, do the benefits of tourism outweigh the impact on culture, environment, and other industry? Also, what happens when tourism is at a downswing? Is it sustainable to make tourism a major player in the local market? Is APT tourism as benign as it claims or is it simply justifying bigger tourism opportunities for the rich? More tourism doesn’t mean higher economic gains. It is the “WAY” in which tourism is conducted, rather than the lip service given to promotion and ethics that needs to change in order for the poor to gain more.

Fordian tourism used “cowboy economics,” wherein entrepreneurs and governments use and abuse locations in order to increase profit margins. Ecotourism impacting populations, and vice versa. Community based tourism underlies alternative tourism industry.

Community based tourism studies movement from emphasis on the economic good that the industry generates (advocacy platform) to the idea that tourism “extorted a price from the common pool of the public” (cautionary platform), to the modern tourism model based on the sociocultural and socioeconomic impacts (adaptancy platform), and finally to current (2002) holistic approaches focused on community perceptions, structural networks, cultural conflicts, development options, nodal growth, social exchange, partnerships, and grass-roots movements for change (knowledge based platform).

Tourism and Local Society and Culture Michael Fagence notes that literature is focused on less developed social and economic areas, reasoning the expectation that “developed communities lie within economic and social contexts that can more easily adapt to, and cope with, the challenges.” Various factors of tourism appear to be detrimental to the cultural aspects that drew the tourism industry to these places originally raising questions of authenticity. Residents’ perceptions of tourism impact the industry and vice versa. Fagence discusses challenges to community and factors determining the outcomes of cultural consequences. He presents a case study on Pennsylvania and Ontario Anabaptist community with careful attention to the vulnerability of the culture.