Global Insight Journal
E-ISSN: 3084-0252 | P-ISSN: 3084-0260
Volume: 03, Issue: 01, Jan-Mar 2023
Multidisciplinary Research across Science, Technology, Humanities, and Social Sciences
www.globalinsightsjournal.com

CULTURAL TOURISM AND THE PROTECTION OF LIVING TRADITIONS

Dr. Arjun Bhattacharya
Assistant Professor
Department of Tourism and Heritage Management
Institute of Culture, Tourism and Social Studies, Kolkata, West Bengal, India

Abstract
Cultural tourism can create meaningful encounters between visitors and communities by enabling people to learn from local music, ritual practices, craftsmanship, foodways, oral traditions, and ecological knowledge. Yet these practices are living traditions, not static attractions. Their continuity depends on community recognition, everyday transmission, cultural rights, appropriate spaces, and the ability of practitioners to decide what may be shared, with whom, and under what conditions. This paper presents an evidence-based comparative analysis of cultural tourism and the protection of living traditions. It examines how tourism can support safeguarding through income, visibility, apprenticeships, cultural pride, and local enterprise, while also creating risks of simplification, decontextualisation, crowd pressure, unauthorised recording, imitation, and unequal benefit distribution. The study draws on cultural-tourism scholarship, UNESCO safeguarding principles, policy guidance, and documented management practices; it does not claim a new survey or field experiment. The analysis compares five tourism contexts: festivals and rituals, performing arts, craft knowledge, traditional foodways, and oral or ecological knowledge. It assesses each context according to community authority, cultural sensitivity, visitor demand, commercial pressure, transmission value, benefit-sharing capacity, and feasibility of protection. The findings show that cultural tourism is most constructive when communities lead interpretation, control access to sensitive knowledge, negotiate fair payment, retain the right to refuse participation, and use tourism income to strengthen local transmission rather than merely stage cultural display. Effective policy requires community-based planning, visitor education, ethical marketing, consent procedures, protection for cultural spaces, fair contracts, and monitoring systems that measure cultural well-being alongside visitor and revenue outcomes.

Keywords*: Cultural Tourism, Living Traditions, Intangible Cultural Heritage, Community Participation, Safeguarding, Festivals, Craft Knowledge, Cultural Rights, Visitor Management, Sustainable Development*

1. INTRODUCTION

Cultural tourism has become an important part of destination development because many visitors seek opportunities to understand the histories, values, arts, food, and everyday practices of the places they visit. Unlike sightseeing that is limited to monuments or landscapes, cultural tourism often involves encounters with people who carry knowledge, perform traditions, make objects, prepare food, tell stories, or organise collective ceremonies. The attraction is therefore not only a building, a museum object, or a scenic route. It may be a living relationship between people, place, memory, skill, and social practice. UN Tourism describes cultural tourism as travel motivated by learning, discovering, experiencing, and consuming cultural attractions and products, including both tangible and intangible dimensions. This definition is useful because it places living cultural expressions within the tourism experience, but it also raises an ethical question: how can visitor access be organised without treating cultural communities as passive suppliers of entertainment?

Living traditions are commonly discussed through the language of intangible cultural heritage. UNESCO identifies such heritage as practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, and skills that communities, groups, and individuals recognise as part of their cultural heritage and transmit across generations. These may include oral traditions, performing arts, social practices, rituals, festive events, knowledge concerning nature and the universe, and traditional craftsmanship. Their value lies not only in age

or visual appeal. They remain meaningful because they are renewed in everyday life, adapted by practitioners, and connected to social identity, language, belief, work, and relationships. A tradition may change over time and still be living; safeguarding therefore differs from freezing a practice in a single historical form.

Tourism can support living traditions in several ways. It can produce demand for local guides, performers, artisans, cooks, musicians, and small enterprises. It can encourage communities to document histories, train younger members, improve cultural spaces, and assert the value of local languages or skills that have been overlooked. In rural regions, small-scale cultural tourism can complement agriculture and provide opportunities for women, youth, and older knowledge holders to earn income without leaving their communities. Festivals and craft practices may receive new public attention, and visitors can become respectful advocates for cultural diversity. These possibilities are significant, especially where heritage work has insufficient local funding.

However, tourism can also place intense pressure on living traditions. A ceremony may be moved from its appropriate date or place to fit a visitor schedule. A sacred performance may be reduced to a short show with no explanation of meaning. Artisans may be pushed toward low-cost souvenirs while complex forms of craftsmanship become economically unviable. Foodways can be standardised for convenience, while local producers and cooks receive little credit. Oral histories and indigenous knowledge may be recorded, published, or marketed without consent. In each case, the difficulty is not tourism alone; it is the imbalance of power that occurs when commercial demand, platform visibility, or outside interpretation becomes more influential than the people who sustain the tradition.

This study examines the relationship between cultural tourism and the protection of living traditions through a comparative, evidence-based framework. It identifies major opportunities and risk pathways across different cultural expressions, considers the role of community authority and visitor management, and proposes practical measures for destination managers, public institutions, tourism businesses, researchers, and community organisations. The central argument is that living traditions should not be evaluated only by their ability to attract visitors. Their continuity, dignity, and transmission must remain the primary purpose, while tourism is designed as a supportive activity that operates within cultural protocols and community-defined limits.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on cultural tourism recognises that heritage and tourism have a close but sometimes difficult relationship. Heritage management seeks to protect cultural meaning, continuity, and public value, whereas tourism development often aims to improve access, create memorable experiences, and generate economic return. McKercher and du Cros argue that successful cultural tourism requires a partnership between tourism and heritage management rather than the dominance of either field. Their approach remains relevant for living traditions because the experience of visitors must be aligned with the cultural values, capacities, and limits identified by knowledge holders. A destination can attract attention through culture while still harming the practice if management treats the tradition as a commodity detached from its social context.

Scholarship on intangible cultural heritage adds an important shift in emphasis. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett and Kurin show that heritage recognition can bring visibility and resources, but it can also transform everyday practice into something selected, labelled, and displayed for public audiences. This process may be helpful when it supports transmission and recognition, yet it may create new pressures around authenticity, representation, and institutional control. The safeguarding perspective developed through the 2003 UNESCO Convention is therefore community-centred: cultural expressions are heritage only when the communities, groups, or individuals concerned recognise them as such. Tourism planning that ignores this principle risks making decisions about cultural representation without those most directly affected.

Community-based tourism research further demonstrates that participation is not satisfied by inviting local people to perform after key

commercial decisions have already been made. Meaningful participation includes early involvement in deciding whether tourism is appropriate, setting conditions for access, determining what may not be photographed or recorded, agreeing on payment and revenue allocation, and reviewing impacts over time. Salazar notes that community-based cultural tourism carries promise but also faces practical constraints related to market access, institutional capacity, internal inequality, and the expectations of outside visitors. These concerns are particularly relevant where cultural labour is carried by women, older practitioners, marginalised groups, or communities with limited bargaining power.

Research on authenticity and commodification adds further nuance. Cohen and Wang show that authenticity is not a simple property that can be mechanically measured; visitors may seek different forms of experience, while communities may legitimately adapt traditions in contemporary conditions. Adaptation is not automatically damage. The concern arises when change is imposed by outside demand, when contextual meaning is erased, or when income flows away from practitioners. Richards observes that cultural tourism increasingly values participation, creativity, and experiential learning. This trend can support more respectful engagement when visitors learn directly from communities, but it can also increase pressure to make cultural life permanently available, performable, and shareable. The literature therefore supports a model in which community governance, cultural rights, visitor education, and fair economic arrangements are treated as the foundation of tourism development rather than as optional additions.

LITERATURE REVIEW SUMMARY TABLE

S. No.	Author / Year	Study Focus	Key Contribution	Limitations Identified
1	UNESCO (2003)	Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage	Established a community-centred framework for identifying, transmitting, and safeguarding living heritage.	A global legal framework; local delivery depends on national and community capacity.
2	Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (2004)	Intangible heritage and representation	Explained how recognition can transform living practices into heritage for public display and administration.	Focuses strongly on institutional framing rather than visitor-management practice.
3	McKercher & du Cros (2002)	Cultural tourism and heritage management	Showed the need to align heritage values, product design, visitor expectations, and management capacity.	Developed mainly from heritage-management settings; living traditions need additional consent safeguards.
4	Salazar (2012)	Community-based cultural tourism	Identified participation, local control, benefit sharing, and realistic planning as central to responsible tourism.	Community initiatives differ widely in power, resources, and market access.
5	Richards (2018)	Contemporary cultural-tourism trends	Highlighted the shift toward creative, experiential, and participatory forms of cultural tourism.	Trend analysis does not by itself resolve questions of cultural rights and representation.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The primary focus of this research is to examine how cultural tourism can support or weaken the continuity of living traditions. The study considers the interaction between tourism demand, community authority, cultural meaning, economic opportunity, visitor behaviour, and public policy. Rather than treating all cultural expressions as identical tourism resources, the analysis distinguishes between types of living tradition and the conditions required for their responsible presentation.

3.1 LIVING TRADITIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION

- Ritual practices, festivals, seasonal gatherings, and pilgrimage-related cultural expressions
- Music, dance, theatre, storytelling, oral histories, and other performing arts
- Traditional craftsmanship, artisan skills, design knowledge, and maker communities
- Foodways, culinary practices, agricultural knowledge, and local market traditions
- Language-based knowledge, indigenous ecological understanding, and place-based narratives

3.2 CULTURAL TOURISM CONTEXTS

- Historic towns, cultural landscapes, museums, interpretation centres, and heritage trails
- Rural communities, homestays, craft clusters, food routes, and community enterprises
- Festival circuits, pilgrimage destinations, public performances, and seasonal events
- Digital promotion, social media storytelling, online booking platforms, and audiovisual recording

3.3 SAFEGUARDING EVALUATION PARAMETERS

- Recognition of community authority, practitioner consent, and the right to decline participation
- Cultural sensitivity, including sacred boundaries, confidentiality, and restrictions on photography or recording
- Quality of economic benefit, fair payment, local ownership, and transparent revenue-sharing arrangements
- Contribution to transmission through apprenticeships, youth involvement, teaching spaces, and support for practitioners
- Visitor behaviour, crowd management, interpretation quality, accessibility, and impacts on everyday community life

3.4 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS FOCUS

- Differences between performative, ritual, craft-based, culinary, oral, and ecological knowledge systems
- Tourism opportunities compared with risks of commercial pressure, misrepresentation, and unauthorised extraction
- Community-led governance, public regulation, business responsibilities, and visitor education approaches
- Short-term economic gains versus long-term cultural viability and intergenerational transmission

3.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE SCOPE

- To identify the ways cultural tourism can contribute to the safeguarding of living traditions
- To assess major risks created by poorly managed visitor access and commercialisation
- To compare protection needs across diverse forms of intangible cultural heritage
- To recommend community-centred measures for planning, interpretation, benefit sharing, and monitoring

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study uses a comparative and evidence-based qualitative methodology to examine cultural tourism and the protection of living traditions. The research synthesises established cultural-tourism scholarship, heritage-management literature, UNESCO safeguarding principles, policy guidance, and documented examples of community-based tourism practice. It does not present an original survey, visitor count, economic-impact model, or ethnographic field experiment. This design is appropriate because the significance of a living tradition cannot be reduced to a single indicator; its meaning, vulnerability, and appropriate level of visitor access depend on local cultural context and the decisions of the communities concerned.

The analysis follows the pathway through which a cultural expression becomes visible to visitors: the tradition is identified or promoted;

Global Insight Journal
E-ISSN: 3084-0252 | P-ISSN: 3084-0260
Volume: 03, Issue: 01, Jan-Mar 2023
Multidisciplinary Research across Science, Technology, Humanities, and Social Sciences
www.globalinsightsjournal.com

practitioners and organisers decide whether participation is appropriate; a tourism product or encounter is designed; visitors receive information and access; payment and benefits are distributed; and the community experiences the consequences for time, space, transmission, and cultural dignity. Each context is assessed through common dimensions: community authority, cultural sensitivity, commercial pressure, visitor behaviour, benefits for practitioners, support for transmission, management capacity, and availability of grievance or review mechanisms.

The methodology also recognises that cultural communities are not homogeneous. Different generations, genders, occupational groups, language communities, artists, religious leaders, artisans, and local residents may hold different views about tourism. A respectful analysis should therefore avoid assuming that a single spokesperson can authorise all cultural use. Safeguarding is treated as a continuing process of consultation, learning, adjustment, and community decision-making rather than a one-time approval obtained at the beginning of a tourism project.

METHODOLOGY FRAMEWORK

1. The study uses a comparative design covering major forms of living tradition that may be included in cultural tourism.
2. Published scholarship, international safeguarding guidance, and heritage-management sources support qualitative synthesis.
3. The analysis considers cultural, social, economic, spatial, and ethical dimensions rather than visitor demand alone.
4. Traditions are compared according to whether access is public, restricted, seasonal, sacred, skill-based, or knowledge-based.
5. Community consent and practitioner authority are treated as core conditions, not as supplementary consultation steps.
6. The assessment includes direct payment, local enterprise opportunities, cultural visibility, and support for intergenerational transmission.
7. Potential harms include crowding, stereotyping, schedule distortion, imitation, cultural appropriation, and unauthorised recording.
8. The analysis distinguishes voluntary adaptation by practitioners from change imposed by outside commercial expectations.
9. No fabricated statistics, visitor totals, revenue figures, or claims of universal community opinion are presented.
10. Recommendations focus on fair governance, cultural protocols, visitor education, ethical marketing, and ongoing impact review.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis presents a comparative evaluation of how cultural tourism affects the protection of living traditions. The analysis is based on documented cultural-tourism practices, heritage-management principles, and the different ways in which visitor demand interacts with community life. It does not treat culture as a single product category. A festival, a ritual, a craft workshop, a culinary practice, and a storytelling walk may all be marketed as cultural experiences, but their sensitivity, ownership, timing, and protection needs are very different.

Five major contexts are considered: festivals and ritual practices; performing arts and music; craft knowledge and making skills; foodways and traditional gastronomy; and oral traditions or ecological knowledge. The comparison is qualitative because the cultural significance of any practice depends on local history, community rules, religious or social meaning, the degree of public accessibility, and the ability of practitioners to control tourism participation.

5.1 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TOURISM CONTEXTS AND SAFEGUARDING NEEDS

S. No.	Living Tradition	Common Tourism Setting	Potential Benefits	Key Risks	Protection Requirements	Vulnerability Level	Priority
1	Festivals and	Seasonal events,	Local income, intergenerational	Schedule distortion,	Community calendar	Very High	Immediate

	ritual practices	pilgrimage routes, historic towns	visibility, support for organisers	crowding, ritual intrusion, loss of sacred boundaries	control, visitor codes, protected spaces, crowd limits		
2	Performing arts and music	Stages, cultural centres, hospitality venues, public squares	Paid performance, apprenticeships, stronger local recognition	Shortened formats, stereotyping, unpaid exposure, performer fatigue	Fair contracts, performer consent, contextual interpretation, revenue shares	High	High
3	Craft knowledge and making skills	Workshops, craft markets, village trails, museums	Direct sales, skill transmission, youth interest, local enterprise	Imitation goods, price pressure, disclosure of restricted knowledge	Authenticity safeguards, intellectual-property awareness, maker-led pricing	High	High
4	Foodways and traditional gastronomy	Food trails, homestays, markets, restaurants, farm visits	Demand for local produce, women-led enterprise, culinary learning	Standardisation, unsafe copying, exclusion of local producers	Local sourcing, credit to knowledge holders, hygiene support, fair procurement	Moderate-High	Important
5	Oral traditions and ecological knowledge	Guided walks, storytelling, rural and indigenous landscapes	Interpretive work, documentation support, language visibility	Extraction, misrepresentation, disclosure of confidential knowledge	Free prior informed consent, cultural protocols, control of recordings	Very High	Immediate

5.2 EXTENDED EVALUATION OF LIVING-TRADITION CONTEXTS

- Festivals and ritual practices are often highly visible to visitors because they involve music, movement, costumes, food, public processions, and collective celebration. Tourism can assist organisers by creating income for local vendors and raising recognition of the event. However, ritual meaning can be weakened when schedules are adjusted for convenience, sacred areas are opened without permission, or crowd behaviour disrupts worship and community participation. Protection should include community control over dates and locations, clear visitor conduct rules, designated observation areas, limits on commercial filming, and adequate support for sanitation, safety, and waste management that does not alter the character of the event.
- Performing arts and music can provide direct employment for practitioners and create occasions for teaching younger performers. Yet tourism programmes often demand short, repeatable, visually dramatic performances that are detached from the full narrative, social setting, or ceremonial purpose. This may encourage stereotype rather than understanding. Fair cultural tourism should involve performer-led interpretation, contracts that specify payment and recording rights, reasonable schedules, credit for artists and traditions, and opportunities for audiences to learn

about context without demanding access to all aspects of cultural life.

- Craft knowledge creates a particularly important connection between heritage and livelihood. Visitors may value the opportunity to meet makers, observe techniques, purchase locally made work, and participate in carefully designed workshops. These interactions can strengthen local enterprise and apprenticeships. At the same time, artisans may face imitation goods, pressure to lower prices, excessive focus on souvenir production, or demands to disclose techniques that are restricted within the community. Protection measures should support maker-led pricing, verification of locally produced goods, transparent commissions, intellectual-property awareness, and dedicated spaces where learning and production can continue without interruption.
- Foodways and traditional gastronomy can bring tourists into contact with local agriculture, markets, family knowledge, seasonal ingredients, and cultural hospitality. Culinary tourism can create opportunities for women-led enterprises, small farmers, home cooks, and young entrepreneurs. The risk is that cuisine is simplified into generic menu items while local knowledge holders and producers remain invisible. Responsible programmes should credit the communities that sustain the cuisine, use local supply chains where possible, maintain fair purchasing arrangements, and avoid presenting dishes as timeless spectacles when they are connected to changing household practices and seasonal conditions.
- Oral traditions and ecological knowledge require especially careful treatment because they may include information that is confidential, sacred, collectively held, or vulnerable to commercial appropriation. Storytelling, language walks, and community-led interpretation can strengthen visibility and support local guides. But recording, publishing, or digital circulation can strip communities of control over their own knowledge. Free, prior, and informed consent should guide any recording or dissemination. Communities should decide what can be shared publicly, how speakers are credited, whether fees are charged, and how material is stored, used, or removed.

5.3 OBSERVATIONS FROM DATA ANALYSIS

- The impact of tourism is tradition-specific: public performances may be suitable for regular visitor engagement, whereas sacred or confidential knowledge may require strict limits or complete non-disclosure.
- Economic benefit is most meaningful when practitioners set prices, receive direct payment, and have a transparent role in deciding how tourism revenue is used.
- Tourism can strengthen transmission when it creates demand for apprenticeships, local teaching, cultural spaces, and dignified livelihoods for practitioners.
- Visitor interest does not create an automatic right of access. Community consent, cultural protocols, and the right to refuse remain essential protections.
- Authenticity should not be confused with immobility. Traditions may adapt creatively, but the direction of change should be guided by practitioners rather than imposed by external marketing pressure.
- Digital promotion can increase visibility and bookings, but it also requires rules for photography, live streaming, recordings, data use, and attribution.
- Cultural-tourism monitoring should track cultural well-being, transmission opportunities, community satisfaction, and conflict reports alongside visitor numbers and revenue.

6. DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis indicates that cultural tourism can be a tool for safeguarding only when it accepts a basic priority: living traditions exist first for the communities who practise them, not for visitor consumption. Tourism can provide resources, recognition, and markets, but these benefits do not automatically protect heritage. A programme may be economically successful and still damage cultural continuity if it extracts labour, alters ritual time, appropriates knowledge, or leaves practitioners without control over

representation. Safeguarding therefore requires tourism planners to begin with the social life of the tradition: who practises it, why it matters, when it occurs, what boundaries apply, and what support is needed for transmission.

Community participation must be more substantial than consultation after a tourism product has already been designed. Practitioners and community organisations should participate in governance, product selection, pricing, interpretation, marketing approval, and ongoing review. Consent must also be specific. Agreement to perform for visitors does not necessarily include permission to photograph, livestream, reproduce designs, record songs, or publish stories online. This distinction is particularly important where cultural knowledge is collectively owned, religiously sensitive, or associated with indigenous rights. Businesses and researchers should use clear agreements written in accessible language and should recognise that communities may change or withdraw consent when circumstances change.

Economic arrangements deserve equal attention. Cultural labour is frequently undervalued because performers, artisans, cooks, guides, and organisers are treated as informal additions to a destination rather than as skilled professionals. Fair contracts should state payment, cancellation rules, transport, equipment, recording rights, commissions, and credit. Visitor spending should circulate locally through direct purchase, locally managed enterprises, community funds, or agreed contributions for cultural spaces and training. Tourism promotion that uses a tradition as a destination brand should not allow commercial intermediaries to capture all benefits while the people who sustain the practice bear the workload and cultural risk.

Visitor education is another major safeguard. Respectful tourism does not depend only on restricting visitors; it also depends on helping them understand where, when, and how to participate. Before arrival, visitors can receive information about dress, photography, silence, personal space, bargaining, environmental responsibility, and the cultural meaning of activities. On site, interpretation should be led where possible by community members or developed with their approval. Good interpretation does not reveal everything. It helps visitors appreciate that some cultural knowledge is not for sale, performance, or digital sharing. This approach can create a deeper and more ethical visitor experience than superficial entertainment.

Public institutions have a coordinating role. Local governments and destination-management organisations can provide small grants for apprenticeships, rehearsal spaces, archive care, market infrastructure, accessibility, and community-led interpretation. They can regulate unauthorised commercial filming, support fair-trade certification or local-maker verification, manage crowd pressure during festivals, and include cultural indicators in tourism plans. National cultural and tourism policies should be aligned so that promotional targets do not undermine safeguarding commitments. Monitoring should be participatory and should ask whether practitioners feel respected, whether young people are learning, whether cultural spaces remain usable, and whether tourism has created new conflicts or inequalities.

Digital technology offers both opportunity and risk. Online storytelling, virtual exhibitions, mapping, and booking systems can broaden access and enable practitioners to reach new markets. Digital tools can also help communities document practices in ways they control. At the same time, viral content can draw unwanted attention, encourage imitation, and circulate sacred or restricted material beyond community control. Digital strategies should therefore include consent protocols, metadata and attribution standards, rights statements, secure storage for restricted material, and clear procedures for removing content when communities request it. Technology should strengthen cultural agency, not replace face-to-face transmission or community authority.

7. CONCLUSION

This study examined cultural tourism and the protection of living traditions across festivals and rituals, performing arts, craft knowledge, foodways, and oral or ecological knowledge. The findings show that tourism can contribute to safeguarding when it creates fair income, supports apprenticeships, strengthens community confidence, and enables respectful

exchange between visitors and hosts. These contributions are most durable when practitioners retain authority over how their traditions are identified, presented, recorded, marketed, and changed. Living traditions should be understood as evolving social practices rather than fixed displays designed to meet outside expectations.

The analysis also shows that tourism can create serious risks when visitor access is treated as more important than cultural context. Schedule distortion, crowding, cultural stereotyping, low payment, imitation goods, unauthorised recordings, and extraction of restricted knowledge can weaken the very traditions that destinations seek to promote. Protection must therefore include community consent, fair compensation, culturally appropriate visitor management, restrictions on photography and commercial use where needed, transparent agreements, and mechanisms for communities to review or stop tourism activity that causes harm.

The study concludes that cultural tourism should be designed as a partnership in which safeguarding is a practical operating principle. Community-led governance, ethical marketing, local benefit sharing, visitor education, cultural-space protection, and monitoring of cultural well-being are not separate from tourism quality; they are the conditions that make cultural encounters meaningful and sustainable. Future research should examine long-term outcomes for practitioner livelihoods, youth transmission, digital rights, gendered cultural labour, and the effectiveness of local governance models. Such work can help ensure that tourism contributes not only to destination visibility but also to the dignity, continuity, and self-determined future of living traditions.

8. REFERENCES

1. *Aas, C., Ladkin, A., & Fletcher, J. (2005). Stakeholder collaboration and heritage management. Annals of Tourism Research, 32(1), 28-48.*
2. *Blake, J. (2006). Commentary on the UNESCO 2003 Convention on the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Leicester: Institute of Art and Law.*
3. *Bortolotto, C. (2007). From objects to processes: UNESCO's intangible cultural heritage. Journal of Museum Ethnography, 19, 21-33.*
4. *Chhabra, D. (2010). Sustainable Marketing of Cultural and Heritage Tourism. London: Routledge.*
5. *Cohen, E. (1988). Authenticity and commoditization in tourism. Annals of Tourism Research, 15(3), 371-386.*
6. *Cole, S. (2007). Beyond authenticity and commodification. Annals of Tourism Research, 34(4), 943-960.*
7. *Dicks, B. (2003). Culture on Display: The Production of Contemporary Visitability. Maidenhead: Open University Press.*
8. *Hafstein, V. T. (2018). Making Intangible Heritage: El Condor Pasa and Other Stories from UNESCO. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.*
9. *Harrison, R. (2013). Heritage: Critical Approaches. London: Routledge.*
10. *ICOMOS. (1999). International Cultural Tourism Charter: Managing Tourism at Places of Heritage Significance. Mexico City: ICOMOS.*
11. *Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (2004). Intangible heritage as metacultural production. Museum International, 56(1-2), 52-65.*
12. *Kurin, R. (2004). Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in the 2003 UNESCO Convention: A critical appraisal. Museum International, 56(1-2), 66-77.*
13. *McKercher, B., & du Cros, H. (2002). Cultural Tourism: The Partnership Between Tourism and Cultural Heritage Management. New York: Haworth Press.*
14. *OECD. (2009). The Impact of Culture on Tourism. Paris: OECD Publishing.*
15. *Richards, G. (2018). Cultural tourism: A review of recent research and trends. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 36, 12-21.*
16. *Salazar, N. B. (2012). Community-based cultural tourism: Issues, threats and opportunities. Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 20(1), 9-22.*

17. *Smith, L., & Akagawa, N. (Eds.). (2009). Intangible Heritage. London: Routledge.*
18. *Smith, M. K. (2009). Issues in Cultural Tourism Studies (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.*
19. *Timothy, D. J. (2011). Cultural Heritage and Tourism: An Introduction. Bristol: Channel View Publications.*
20. *Timothy, D. J., & Boyd, S. W. (2003). Heritage Tourism. Harlow: Prentice Hall.*
21. *UNESCO. (2003). Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Paris: UNESCO.*
22. *UNESCO. (2022). Basic Texts of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Paris: UNESCO.*
23. *UN Tourism. (2018). Tourism and Culture Synergies. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.*
24. *UN Tourism. (2019). Study on Tourism and Intangible Cultural Heritage. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.*
25. *Wang, N. (1999). Rethinking authenticity in tourism experience. Annals of Tourism Research, 26(2), 349-370.*