

AN ANALYSIS OF GOVERNANCE IN COMMUNITY-BASED TOURISM (CBT) IN LIGHT OF HALL'S TYPOLOGY: between ruptures and the inertia of traditional organizing

KELLEN DA SILVA COELHO
UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA (UFSC)

FRANCISCO ANTÔNIO DOS ANJOS

Agradecimento à órgão de fomento:

Agradecimentos à Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa e Inovação do Estado de Santa Catarina (FAPESC) -Bolsa de Pós-Doutorado.

AN ANALYSIS OF GOVERNANCE IN COMMUNITY-BASED TOURISM EXPERIENCES IN LIGHT OF HALL'S TYPOLOGY: Between Ruptures and Resistance to Traditional Organizing

Introductory Comments

Within organizational studies, many researchers have intensely sought alternative modes of organizing beyond the bureaucratic, functional, and instrumental. According to Misoczky and Flores (2012), there predominates in organizational contexts a naturalized conception of organization as synonymous with the enterprise, where the allocation of people and resources is conducted in favor of efficiency that reinforces domination. In this scenario, Cooper and Burrell (1988) mention that the organization of production supersedes the production of organizing.

This logic is understood by Böhm (2006) as organizational positioning, characterized by practices dictating how organizations should function and their purposes, centered on teleological interests. Such a foundation becomes naturalized, and certain practices seem indisputable, such as the role of strategic planning and institutional leadership. Böhm warns that positioning is a political construction, in which the act of positioning obstructs other possibilities of organizing.

Over the years, concerns have emerged regarding this way of thinking about organizations, and so-called new organizational forms have gained significant ground. These forms intend to critique positioned organizational practices and somewhat destabilize them, yet they do not present clear alternatives. Böhm (2006) defines this movement of denying the hegemonic conception of organization as de-positioning. In light of its limitations, he then proposes a repositioning of the concept of organization—as something political and reinventable, supported by principles such as collectivity, solidarity, horizontality, among other emancipatory ones. In this sense, it is necessary to adopt a perspective that transcends the business sphere, making it interesting to shed light on other fields of knowledge.

Along these lines, the functional and technocratic paradigm of thinking about cities and territories was also being questioned, especially after the 1980s. In Brazil, movements such as the “National Movement for Urban Reform” united diverse interests and fostered political participation in a society that, until then, was distant from decisions about territorial public policies.

It can be said that the last decades of the twentieth century were marked by severe criticism of the unequal development of Brazilian cities and, more specifically, of technocratism in how such cities were conceived and planned. Although the National Movement for Urban Reform originated in the 1960s, after the promulgation of the 1988 Brazilian Constitution during the country’s redemocratization, it positioned itself decisively as a relevant actor in confronting urban problems, denouncing exclusionary urbanization and the lack of democracy in city planning (MARICATO, 2000).

Transposing this to the field of Tourism, based on the ideals of the right-to-the-city struggle, there is a clear opposition to the conventional tourism model, planned in an exclusionary and commodified manner. From this perspective, community-based tourism (CBT)—although the term was not yet consolidated at that time—emerged as a critique of the conventional model, influenced by neoliberal principles and an organizational logic marked by domination and capital interests. In principle, community-based tourism (CBT) promotes communities as protagonists in the relationship, aiming at community participation, local empowerment, and sustainability.

However, it is important to highlight that CBT is quite diverse, and each of its initiatives has its own form of organization (BARTHOLO et al., 2009). Thus, it is assumed that an alternative form of organizing to managerialism is the most coherent within the CBT context, due to its counter-hegemonic perspective toward the market-centered tourism model. Understanding governance as the function of monitoring, supervising, and evaluating the performance of so-called management, with the aim of aligning it with the perspectives and needs of citizens, it is argued that comprehension of tourism governance becomes fundamental to the study of organizational practices (BRASIL, 2014). In this vein, the typology proposed by Hall (2011) — hierarchy, communities, networks, and markets — can represent a significant background for analyzing the forms of organization assumed by CBT movements.

Based on the considerations presented, the relevance of analyzing tourism governance configured in reports on CBT present in scientific article publications over the past two decades was identified. More specifically, to identify the predominant governance model in each of the articles in light of their authors, to explain the predominant model within the context of the analyzed articles, as well as to analyze the evidence and limitations in terms of rupture with a conventional tourism model that often impedes a cooperative tourism relationship among the diverse social actors of the community,

In the fields of Administration and Tourism, it is expected to bring forth reflections on the (de)construction of organizational practices in the CBT context portrayed in this study, as well as to inspire other studies that delve into the political formation of hegemonic and counter-hegemonic discourses involving organizing.

With this panorama exposed, a theoretical foundation was developed, composed of organizational studies, tourism governance, and community-based tourism.

Organizational studies: ruptures and inertia facing the bureaucratic model

Since the 1960s, the epistemological identity of the human sciences has been crossed by numerous inquiries, considering that consolidated theories and certain analytical categories no longer accounted for the complexity of contemporary social dynamics (COOPER; BURRELL, 1988).

In the field of organizational studies, this reflective movement was preceded by a period denominated by Reed (1992) as the "age of innocence." The 1970s were marked by the emergence of more pluralistic and interpretative approaches, dialoguing with postmodernist foundations, opposing the premises of Weberian rationalization.

This reflects and corroborates what was registered in the introductory comments about organizational positioning and de-positioning, respectively, emphatically criticized by Böhm (2006). One was an era of organizational positioning, based on imposed models, division of labor, orders given, and a hierarchy to be respected by a majority of organizational members. Another configuration was impregnated by behaviorist practices, forms of veiled controls, and a Fordist remake (DELLAGNELO, 2000).

From this arises an interest in proposing the construction of a theory that encompasses alternative management practices, such as social movements and other resistance movements against hegemonic models, aligning well with a disengagement from hegemonic discourses and an openness to other possibilities, whether present in the field of Management and adopting a processual approach to organizing, or even those fertilized by interactions with other disciplinary fields (MISOCZKY; FLORES; BÖHM, 2008). Thus, organization can be understood as a genuinely political construction, deconstructing legitimized thoughts and practices that are tributary to a bureaucratic and functionalist system. Böhm (2006) calls this rethinking of organizational theory a repositioning, emphasizing the importance of considering

relationships that occur beyond organizations, such as links with the economy, forms of state control, and how society legitimizes or not the hegemonic forms of social organizing.

In this context, it was understood that grasping the configurations assumed by governance practices is of special relevance, especially given the intent to analyze organizational forms in their complexity and plurality. From the reflections presented, interest arose in deepening the study within the scope of Community-Based Tourism (CBT), with special attention to tourism governance, understood as the set of processes, mechanisms, and interinstitutional relationships through which various actors—state, private, and community—interact in the conception and implementation of public policies (HALL, 2011). This focus allows for challenging the classical references of organizational theory by bringing to light possibly alternative organizational arrangements present in peripheral or subordinated contexts, such as those characterizing CBT. Thus, investigating governance within community tourism contributes not only to the theoretical-conceptual enrichment of the tourism field but also to the repositioning of organizational theory in light of contemporary dynamics of participation, autonomy, and territoriality.

Tourism Governance and the Typology Proposed by Hall (2011)

Governance, as a broad and transversal concept, occupies a central position in studies on politics and public policies, consolidating itself equally as a fundamental axis in reflections applied to the field of tourism (HALL, 2011). In the 1970s, the concept emerged as a form of management and became an object of study incorporated by various knowledge areas. Regarding Brazil, the term gained prominence with the promulgation of the 1988 Federal Constitution, which triggered the process of political-administrative decentralization and, consequently, participatory public policies. Thus, governance is configured through institutional arrangements, transcending governments and involving all members of civil society in the public administration process.

Traditional governance, also known as the "classical model," has historically been associated with hierarchical and centralized public administration, predominant until the mid-20th century. In contrast, the so-called new governance is characterized by a more open and collaborative approach, marked by participation and power-sharing between public and private actors in the decision-making process. Also notable are multilevel integration, involving different spheres of government and private agents; diversity and decentralization, adopting coordinated strategies instead of standardized norms; deliberation, promoting dialogue between sectors to legitimize decisions; flexibility and the possibility of revision, with norms adaptable to the political context; and finally, the encouragement of local experimentation and the creation and sharing of knowledge (HALL, 2011).

Given the diverse configurations and manifestations of governance practices, Hall (2011) considers the notion of "politics as theory" and presents a governance typology systematically suited for tourism.

Based on the relationship between State intervention and self-regulation, as well as the dynamics among political actors and modes of governance, Hall (2011) proposes twelve (12) analytical configurations. For the purposes of this article, the governance model he proposed is treated as an analytical category, with its twelve configurations interpreted as subcategories that allow for the analytical unfolding and operationalization of the different organizational arrangements identified. These subcategories are presented and described below to support the empirical analysis developed in this study.

- Classificatory type, referring to the ideological or philosophical basis of each model

- Governance/political themes, relating to the central issues of each model
- Political standpoint, corresponding to the way decisions are made
- Underlying democracy model, referring to the implicit form of democracy
- Primary focus, which is the main objective
- View of non-central actors, representing how actors outside the center are perceived
- Distinction between policy formulation and implementation, meaning the separation between planning and execution
- Success criteria, referring to how success is measured
- Implementation gaps, which are measured when outcomes differ from the plan
- Causes of gaps, which translate the failures behind these gaps
- Solutions for gaps, which are possible ways to correct failures
- Policy instruments used, which are the tools preferably adopted in the analyzed context

Finally, these subcategories support the identification of four types/models of governance: hierarchies, markets, networks, and communities.

- Hierarchies: governance based on strong control and regulation by the State, with decisions made top-down. This model is implemented through laws, regulations, sanctions, and mandatory norms. Decisions originate from central bodies and are implemented by local agents. Success is evaluated based on compliance with legal and political objectives.
- Markets: governance characterized by the teleology of markets and the adoption of economic mechanisms to regulate activities. This model denotes minimal direct State intervention. It is marked by the use of economic incentives, privatization, subsidies, and taxes to stimulate desired behaviors. Emphasis is placed on economic efficiency as the criterion of success. Implementation occurs through deregulation policies and self-regulation.
- Networks: governance through public-private partnerships, with collaborative action and diverse actors working toward common objectives. It materializes through councils, forums, and public-private partnerships. Decision-making is shared. Success is evaluated by the capacity for coordination, integration, and policy innovation.
- Communities: governance prioritizes local participation and community autonomy, aiming for minimal State intervention. Implementation occurs through assemblies, public hearings, community associations, and participatory processes. Success is measured by local empowerment, engagement, and the satisfaction of the involved community.

Given this conceptual framework, the following table synthesizes and organizes the subcategories proposed by Hall (2011), serving as a reference for the subsequent analysis.

Table 1 – Governance models and their subcategories

CHARACTERISTICS / MODELS	HIERARCHIES	COMMUNITIES	NETWORKS	MARKETS
Type of coordination or characteristic	Idealized model of bureaucratic or political administration	Idea that communities must resolve problems autonomously with minimal external involvement	Facilitate coordination between interdependent private actors	Market competition as maximum and efficient allocation of resources
	Distinguishes between public and private spheres	Based on images of community as a positive environment	Variations of coordinated political communities with focus on political elements	Demand for market goods with efficient allocation
Focus on public vs. common good	Governance without government	Promotion of collective spirit	Regular public control over political elements of the network	Use of market mechanisms to measure efficiency
Themes of governance / politics	Command and control (decisions from the top down)	Local collective, autonomous control of problems	Networks, governance, multilevel, negotiation, bargaining	Market, bargaining, trade, competition
Point of political view	Top: formal political authority, government	Local, decentralized, autonomous, collective problem-solving	Networks and horizontal Governance	Goods exchange and bargaining
Subject of political decision	Participants	Participants	Hybrid / plural interlocutors	Determined by the economic system
Main focus	Effectiveness; goals achieved	What influences action	Distributed power; multiple centers and interlocks	Efficiency of markets
View on central actors	Agents exercising implementation	Innovators or problem solvers	Complex network behavior that integrates diverse actors	Participants in the market that transact goods and services
Distinction between formalization and implementation	Distinction between formalization and implementation	Distinction between formalization and implementation	Combination of formal and informal processes	Market control
Criteria of success	Results aligned with objectives	Achievement of local objectives	Level of perspective and actor agreement	Market efficiency
Lack of implementation	Bureaucratic delays, bureaucratic failures	Political fatigue and disinterest	Dependency on external actors	When the market fails
Failure risk in implementation	High risk	High risk	Moderate risk	Low risk
Solutions to failures	Simplify bureaucratic instruments	Self-regulation	Self-regulation	Increase market capacity to regulate
Main instruments	Law	Public participation	Consensus and negotiation	Price, auditing, incentives, standards
Transfer of power	No transfer	Voluntary instruments	NGOs	Voluntary instruments
Definition of power or influence	Licenses, subsidies, permits	Education and voluntary associations	NGOs	Instruments of the market
Intervention	Yes	Yes	No	No

Source: Hall (2011).

This proposed typology aims to facilitate the recognition of organizational forms, allowing for total or partial identification of one type in relation to another. In this context, it is pertinent to acknowledge both the strengths and limitations of the proposed typology. Among its merits are its applicability in empirical studies, the inclusion of traditional and contemporary forms of governance, its conceptual coherence, and its adherence to the field of tourism, as well as its usefulness for comparative analyses across different institutional arrangements. However, it is important to emphasize that, in contexts characterized by hybrid structures, there may be difficulties in fully categorizing certain practices within one of the proposed governance categories. Moreover, although Hall's typology is widely referenced, it addresses symbolic,

cultural, and informal aspects rather timidly, not fully encompassing these elements, which are also fundamental constituents of governance processes.

Against this backdrop, it is also pertinent to provide a brief explanation of Community-Based Tourism (CBT), which constitutes the setting in which the governance practices analyzed in this work are configured and which serve as the foundation for the proposed reflection.

Community-Based Tourism

The term CBT itself was coined amidst debates about sustainable development and alternative practices to conventional tourism at the end of the 20th century. Although the concept was developed in various regions worldwide, the term as currently understood gained greater prominence and structure from the 1990s onward, focusing on the inclusion of local communities in tourism organization processes, aiming for more sustainable and equitable tourism.

It is markedly characterized by active community involvement, where communities hold control over tourism activities, resource management, and consequently, the distribution of benefits generated. Sustainability and preservation are also integral to its essence, as it values sustainable practices based on the economic, environmental, and cultural balance of tourism. Furthermore, social justice and community empowerment are core elements, considering that CBT promotes social justice and equitable distribution of tourism profits (COELHO; ANJOS, 2025).

In short, CBT is suspected to promote communities as protagonists in the relationship, aiming at community participation, local empowerment, and sustainability. However, it is diverse, and each initiative possesses its own organizational form (BARTHOLLO et al., 2009).

It is considered that an organizational model alternative to traditional managerialism is more coherent in the context of Community-Based Tourism (CBT), especially given its counter-hegemonic perspective in relation to market-centered tourism. In this regard, Hall's typology (2011) was adopted as the fundamental theoretical framework to understand the nuances of tourism governance present in CBT, enabling a more comprehensive analysis of the alternative forms of organization and management that characterize this segment.

Methodological Procedures

Based on this theoretical support and the objectives presented, methodological steps were selected, prioritizing conformity to support this work. This study is classified as a theoretical essay and was based on scientific articles delimited as follows: indexed in the Scopus database, in Portuguese and English languages, final stage, all open access, published in journals, with Brazilian territoriality, containing the term "community-based tourism" in the title, abstract, or keywords, with a temporal cut from 2006 to 2025. It is worth mentioning that these works were accessed on March 8, 2025.

With this scope, eleven (11) articles were found, and two (2) were excluded due to duplication, totaling nine (9) works: one (1) published in 2019, one (1) in 2021, five (5) in 2022, and two (2) in 2023.

Subsequently, each article was read, extracting indications related to the governance model category typified by Michael Hall (2011) through its twelve subcategories. To contribute to a better understanding, the constitutive and operational definitions regarding the governance model guiding this study are presented (KERLINGER, 1980).

Table 2 : Analytical category: governance model

CONSTITUTIVE DEFINITION	OPERATIONAL DEFINITION
The way the State interacts with other actors in the formulation and implementation of public policies.	It can be assessed through: classificatory type, public policy themes, positioning of public policies, underlying democratic models, primary focus of governance, view of non-central actors, distinction between policy formulation and implementation, success criteria, implementation gaps, causes of the gaps, solutions for the gaps, and public policy instruments used.

Source: Hall (2011).

Based on these methodological choices, the data from the reports of the experiences mentioned in the articles were organized and analyzed in a categorized manner (BRYMAN, 2015).

Presentation and analysis of the data

According to the research objectives, the data presentation will occur in two stages: the identification of the predominant governance model in each of the experiences reported in the analyzed articles, based on the authors' perspectives; and a critical discussion of the dominant model among the works under analysis, including evidence of rupture with conventional tourism.

Identification of the predominant governance model in each of the experiences reported in the articles under review based on their authors

Prior to the data exposition on the prevailing governance model in each analyzed article, a table is presented with some basic data of the respective articles: authors, year of publication, and the contextualized experience.

Table 3 – Data from the analyzed articles

ARTICLE	AUTHORS	YEAR OF PUBLICATION	REPORTED EXPERIENCE
1	Pimentel and Sampaio	2023	Associação Acolhida na Colônia (AAAC)
2	Budel et al. (2023)	2023	Mangabeira (Instituto Laurinda Amazônia)
3	Izidoro and Schiavetti	2022	Costa dos Corais
4	Oppliger and Oliveira	2022	Quilombola of Furnas dos Baianos (MS)
5	Martins and Fudemma	2022	Quilombola of Vale do Ribeira (SP)
6	Proença and Netto	2022	Nova Esperança Indigenous Community
7	Almeida et al.	2022	Conservation Units in Amapá
8	Faxina et al.	2021	Mem de Sá Island (SE)
9	Barros and Rodrigues	2019	Caiçara Territory of Paraty

After a detailed reading of each article, an effort was made to identify the subcategories of governance models proposed by Hall (2011). As expected, not all subcategories could be identified in every text, even implicitly, since in some cases there was no explanation—direct or indirect—about certain elements. However, this limitation did not compromise the analysis;

on the contrary, it contributed to enriching the interpretation precisely because of the complexity and diversity of the contexts addressed.

a) Article 1 – Associação Acolhida na Colônia (AAAC)

In the article by Pimentel and Sampaio (2023), the experience of Associação Acolhida na Colônia, located in Urubici, Santa Catarina, is analyzed, highlighting the tourism governance arrangements in the context of Community-Based Tourism (CBT). The research emphasizes the importance of collective management and the active participation of family farmers in leading local tourism. Using the Methodology of Organizational and Territorial Demand Incubation (MIDO-T), the community was able to organize its socio-ecological and economic practices, value its local culture, and strengthen social cohesion bonds.

A democratic and participatory governance structure was reported, with collective decisions and community assemblies, in addition to valuing local protagonism. According to the authors, decisions stem from the local members themselves, reflecting a political viewpoint aligned with the community and network models, highlighting the centrality of local actors in the formulation and implementation of tourism policies, breaking with verticalized organizational practices.

This governance configuration, centered on participation and local protagonism, not only redefines decision-making forms but also directly influences the meanings attributed to tourism practices. It is in this context that an apparent paradox emerges, related to the valorization and empowerment of local owners.

The valorization and empowerment of the owners originate from an apparent paradox. As tourism-related activities gained space and strength, replacing agricultural activities, the importance of the members as defenders of rural and inland life in its diverse manifestations increased. For this, the group needed to be a space for collective learning and mindset change, and it was this change that forged an identity with value for tourists, who seek differentiated experiences in relation to urban life (PIMENTEL; SAMPAIO, p. 188).

Within this context, there is significant articulation between the community and external organizations, characterizing network governance. It is important to highlight that this network does not compromise the community's autonomy but expands its capacities and legitimizes local processes.

The authors state that the formulation and implementation of decisions occur jointly and dynamically, revealing a continuous process of political construction. The initiative's results are not evaluated by traditional economic indicators but rather by subjective and social criteria. Pimentel and Sampaio (2023) highlight community empowerment, perceived benefits, and the promotion of sustainability as the main outcomes of the experience.

Regarding implementation gaps, community members view them as opportunities for collective learning and improvement, demonstrating an adaptive approach to challenges. Concerning policy instruments, the Acolhida na Colônia experience is based on participatory and collaborative practices, such as meetings, certifications, and partnerships with institutions, characterizing a hybrid governance model that prioritizes negotiation, mutual recognition, and reciprocal legitimization between local and external actors.

Although there is interaction with public agents (hierarchical governance) and the use of certifications (an element associated with market mechanisms), these factors do not dominate the governance structure. Despite the presence of elements that could align with Hall's typology of market and hierarchy models, the arrangement described at Acolhida na Colônia is explicitly dominated by community and network governance logics.

In this case, the predominant governance model is the community model, characterized by direct participation, collective deliberation, and the valuation of local knowledge and territorial autonomy. Furthermore, there is a complementary interaction with network governance, especially in multiscale articulation. Thus, the model is configured as a hybrid and dynamic arrangement that breaks with conventional market and hierarchy logics, asserting itself as a cooperative alternative, situated and sustained by the values of territory and collectivity. However, it is important to highlight that, despite progress, practical and symbolic challenges remain, such as organizational isomorphism and financial dependence, which maintain ties to traditional governance logics.

b) Article 2 - Mangabeira (Instituto Laurinda Amazônia)

In the study by Budel et al. (2023), the tourist route developed by the Instituto Laurinda Amazônia in the community of Mangabeira is analyzed, with an emphasis on the symbolic dimensions of hospitality and the centrality of the flour house as a space for cultural, social, and relational construction. Through the application of Hall's (2011) analytical matrix, several subcategories associated with community and network governance were identified.

Initially, regarding the classificatory type, it was observed that the experience is structured around participatory management practices and the collective construction of tourism activities. As the authors report, it is an experience in constant development, not constituting a fixed tourism product, but rather a fluid and shared experience sustained by relationships of horizontality, flexibility, and a strong affective bond with the territory.

In this context, the protagonism of the women flour makers stands out, as they play a central role in organizing and conducting the activities. According to the authors, they are the main coordinators of the route, which evidences power-sharing and the centrality of non-state actors in shaping local governance.

An effective integration between policy formulation and implementation was also observed, with no rigid distinctions between planning and execution. Governance is constructed daily, based on lived experience, dialogue among community members, and constant adaptation to local realities. As the authors affirm, the route functions as a network of relationships, affections, and exchanges of knowledge, reaffirming its relational, continuous, and non-standardized character, differing from the traditional tourism model.

The criteria for evaluating the success of the experience also diverge from conventional economic parameters, instead relying on subjective and symbolic indicators such as self-esteem, the strengthening of social ties, and cultural appreciation. Identity-based engagement with the territory is understood as a fundamental dimension, especially regarding the recognition of the social and symbolic role of women in the construction and mediation of tourism experiences.

In addition to characteristics of the community governance model, elements of network governance were also identified, particularly in the role of the Laurinda Amazônia Institute, which performs mediation, facilitation, and political articulation functions. This institutional mediation appears to contribute to the enhancement of community capacities and the strengthening of local organization, in alignment with the principles of network governance, characterized by cooperation among various actors and scales.

Thus, the institutional arrangement observed in the Mangabeira experience reveals a predominance of the community governance model, marked by female leadership, collective deliberation, the appreciation of traditional knowledge, and the construction of identity-based ties to the territory. Additionally, elements of network governance are present, particularly through collaborative articulation with external institutions whose actions respect local rhythms

and priorities. Together, these elements constitute a culturally situated, affective, and participatory tourism management practice, distancing itself from hierarchical and market-oriented logics. However, despite being emancipatory in several aspects, the experience still faces symbolic and operational limitations that reflect the persistence of ties to conventional organizational rationalities.

c) Article 3 – Costa dos Corais

The study by Izidoro and Schiavetti (2022) addresses the community-based tourism initiative focused on manatee-watching within the Costa dos Corais Environmental Protection Area (APACC), coordinated by the Peixe-Boi Association, established in 2009 with the aim of promoting community involvement in the organization of tourism activities.

Regarding the classificatory category, tourism is framed as a tool for social and environmental empowerment. Community-based tourism is described as an opportunity for income generation and environmental conservation, as stated by Izidoro and Schiavetti (2022, p. 2): “the presence of the manatee also triggered new business opportunities, such as community-based tourism and the creation of tourism reception jobs that positively stimulated the region.”

Governance/policy is structured in a multisectoral manner, involving the participation of the local community, NGOs, tourism operators, and ICMBio, in a collaborative format. “Manatee watching is regulated by the APACC Management Plan” (p. 4), yet with strong community mediation.

In this context, there is active resident participation, and the selection of a social organization to coordinate activities points to a model of participatory democracy, where community guides and residents are recognized as key agents in the process.

The authors highlight intangible benefits associated with the tourism practice: “tourists reported psychological benefits, emotional connection, enjoyment, and learning after the activity” (p. 2).

Regarding challenges and gaps, there were reports on risks to local fauna and economic dependency on tourism, which are addressed through an adaptive learning approach.

The policy instruments include voluntary actions, environmental education, and decentralized institutional support. The study indicates, for example, that “55.99% of respondents declared themselves willing to act as volunteers, and 46.65% would be willing to contribute financially to the conservation of the manatee—preferably through non-governmental organizations (65.9%)” (p.5), suggesting a degree of trust in non-state structures and autonomous forms of co-management.

The institutional arrangement analyzed reflects a predominantly community-based governance, supported by an articulated cooperation network. In this context, the authors point to a governance model grounded in collective action and territorial engagement; however, there is also clear evidence of instrumental rationality, expressed through logics of efficiency, calculation, control, and dependency on state or private structures, closely aligned with the managerial model of governance.

d) Article 4 – Quilombola Community of Furnas dos Baianos (MS)

The article by Oppliger and Oliveira (2022) discusses tourism in the Quilombola community of Furnas dos Baianos, highlighting the absence of a consolidated governance model, whether community-based or networked. The research reveals an incipient arrangement,

in which tourism has not yet become a collective interest. As the authors state, “at the time of the research, tourism did not represent a common interest of the group” (p. 98).

The classificatory category demonstrates potential for community-based tourism, but there is still no community engagement or organizational structure. The authors point out: “participants emphasized that they are not prepared to work with this activity” (p. 98), portraying governance in its formative stages, without organized practices or effective collective mobilization.

The lack of integrated governance is evident in the absence of articulation among residents, the public sector, and the private sector. The authors note that “the efforts of public management and the interests of the private sector are still insufficient and have not gone beyond the Piraputanga Park Road” (p. 108), indicating the nonexistence of a coordinated network.

When it comes to participation and democracy, the situation is marked by organizational weakness. Residents express resistance to tourism and a lack of understanding about its meaning: “residents who wish to work in this activity need to understand what tourism is and what it represents” (p. 105). The absence of collective decision-making processes distances the case from the community-based model.

The only concrete initiative observed is the Chácara dos Mirantes, configured as a private microenterprise. The owners invest their own resources and market directly: “all investments in the property to accommodate tourists were made with their own resources... sales are direct or through travel agencies/operators” (p. 107). The logic that guides the practice is one of operational efficiency, focused on “carrying capacity, respect for animals, and responsible use of natural resources” (p. 107), which aligns with a market-based governance model, albeit in isolation.

Tourism governance in Furnas dos Baianos does not yet fit squarely within any of Hall’s (2011) ideal governance models. The community collective is not organized, nor is there a network structure. The only effective action aligns with the market model, in the form of private and commercial management. It is, therefore, an incipient arrangement, still in the process of definition, lacking consistent elements of community or network governance. In this context, there are no apparent issues related to infrastructure or signs of subordination to hierarchical or bureaucratic governance.

e) Article 5 – Quilombola Community of Vale do Ribeira (São Paulo)

Martins and Futemma (2022) focused on analyzing CBT from the perspective of young people in a Quilombola community located in the Vale do Ribeira region, in the state of São Paulo. More specifically, they investigated whether CBT could encourage Quilombola youth to engage in effective and continuous actions related to both tourism management and heritage conservation. This study highlights tourism as a common good, managed by the community itself.

In classificatory terms, tourism is understood as a common good oriented toward cultural appreciation, environmental conservation, and the strengthening of local identity. The active participation of Quilombola youth reflects a democratic and collective model of governance. According to Martins and Futemma (2022), the youth act as guides, managers, and coordinators: interviewees reported that, through their involvement in tourism, they were able to invest in technical training, participate in collective decision-making, and engage in cultural valorization and environmental conservation efforts. In this context, decentralization and collective deliberation are both aspirations and core aspects of tourism management. The authors emphasize that decisions must be made in assemblies and through internal agreements,

grounded in traditional norms and informal rules, indicating horizontal practices. The authors also highlight the value of potential partnerships, particularly in guide training and the structuring of the Quilombola Circuit, noting that such collaborations should be complementary and must not undermine local autonomy.

The policy instruments adopted are primarily informal, based on internal norms and local agreements. There is no mention of the use of top-down state regulations (hierarchical) or market instruments such as pricing or competition. Decision-making and implementation occur in an integrated manner, reinforcing the community-based fluidity.

Regarding success criteria, these are assessed through internal measures: cultural appreciation, youth retention within the territory, and environmental conservation. No hierarchical or market-oriented indicators were identified.

In summary, tourism governance in the Ivaporunduva Quilombo aligns with the community governance model, supported by local norms, self-management, and community leadership, with complementary support from institutional networks. The case exemplifies a consolidated CBT experience, with a high degree of alignment with Hall's (2011) community governance typology.

f) Article 6 – Nova Esperança “Pisasú Sarusawa” Indigenous Community (Rio Cuieiras – Amazonas)

Proença and Netto (2022) examine how the tourism model relates to sociocultural impacts in the context of the Nova Esperança Indigenous Community. The transition from informal practices to a structured CBT model involved challenges such as the commodification of culture and the management of sociocultural impacts.

The classificatory structure of the experience is strongly community-oriented, with the authors characterizing CBT as a model of "internal management that enabled the Indigenous population to appropriate the flow of tourists, handicrafts, lodging, and other technical and financial operations" (p.1). CBT is adopted as an alternative to the previous extractive model and strengthens local autonomy, aligning with the “community” type of governance.

The political focus is also clearly community-based, linking tourism to the territorial and cultural struggle of Indigenous peoples: the shift in tourism management is related to the fight for land rights and the strengthening of a collective way of life. This represents a decentralized decision-making process, as expressed by the statement that there was “appropriation by the Indigenous people of the tourist flow” (p. 1), eliminating the separation between policy formulation and implementation.

In this sense, participation and power-sharing were also evident: “This mobilization... involved the community, universities, public authorities, and third sector organizations” (p. 2). Governance instruments are non-coercive and based on local norms and sociocultural values, with emphasis on the strengthening of community organization (pp. 6–7). The success of tourism is measured in terms of cultural appreciation, self-esteem, and reinforcement of traditions: “economic benefits; pride; [...] collective lifestyle; commercialization of culture; traditions and customs; and beliefs” (p. 1).

The perception of non-state actors reinforces this arrangement, highlighting the Indigenous community's leadership in the process and their direct role in decision-making (p. 4). The transition from a previous exploitative model to the adoption of community-based tourism (CBT) reveals the existence of prior gaps, which were addressed through internal restructuring and partnerships between the community, universities, public authorities, and third sector organizations (pp. 3 and 6).

That said, the governance model in Nova Esperança is essentially community-based, articulated through networks, forming a hybrid governance structure that strengthens Indigenous autonomy and participatory tourism management.

g) Article 7 – Conservation Units in Amapá

The study by Almeida et al. (2022) investigated the situation of ecotourism in the conservation units (CUs) of the State of Amapá, addressing the state of ecotourism, opportunities, access, obstacles, and control in the analyzed CUs.

They strongly advocate CBT as an alternative to private concessions, given its role in promoting inclusion and conservation. The proposal to replace large concessions with several smaller ones focused on local organizations reinforces community empowerment (p. 12).

The obstruction of networked governance is implicitly mentioned in the excerpts that emphasize the need for coordination among diverse actors, as well as the absence of public policies, infrastructure, and management plans.

The authors offer several critiques of the market model, noting that granting tourism visitation rights to private companies is seen as a limited solution that tends to concentrate profits and marginalize the local population (p. 12). The hierarchical model, in turn, is indirectly referenced in criticisms of the fragmented and ineffective actions of the state. According to Almeida et al. (2022), the responsibility of public authorities to promote ecotourism and develop management plans is described as an unmet expectation (pp. 10–11).

Regarding policy instruments, the study highlights the lack of structured mechanisms: management plans, visitation control, and financial incentives (pp. 8–9). This absence constitutes an implementation gap, as highlighted by Hall (2011) in his typology.

Therefore, it is concluded that the governance model desired by the authors is community-based, with strong networked articulation and state support, while the market and hierarchical models are portrayed as insufficient or counterproductive. However, a significant paradox can be observed when the authors argue for control and implicitly accept a dependence on state or private structures, grounded in a logic that equates organization with enterprise.

h) Article 8 – Ilha Mem de Sá (SE)

Faxina et al. (2021) analyzed the environmental sustainability of the Ilha Mem de Sá community, Sergipe, Brazil, based on sustainability indicators across social, economic, and natural dimensions. They advocate community-based tourism (CBT) as a management reference: “the evaluation of environmental sustainability [...] can be used as a planning and management tool [...] especially by community leaderships, fostering empowerment and local participation, principles upheld by CBT” (p. 1). The choice of CBT reinforces the values of community governance.

Deliberation through local instances was noted: “associativism and cooperativism [...] can foster solutions to socio-environmental problems, while simultaneously strengthening local protagonism” (p. 17). Policy formulation and implementation are integrated: “the evaluation is constructed based on community demands” (p. 9), without separation between phases.

This configuration allows for greater popular participation, which, in this case, is promoted by instruments adapted to the local context, through internal agreements and local knowledge: “sustainability evaluation can be used as a mechanism for public managers and the community itself to identify [...] priority actions” (p. 8). Along this line, success criteria are also subjective and local, such as “rescuing local identity” and “solidarity coexistence” (p. 17), distant from market parameters.

In this dynamic, articulation with external actors, such as universities, is manifested, but in a complementary and non-dominant manner (p. 7).

Finally, the article criticizes the low state presence and does not mention market practices, reaffirming the predominant governance model as community-based, with punctual network traits, in an approach grounded in environmental sustainability and the self-determination of local actors. The authors point to legitimate community desires for autonomy, yet face contradictions between discourse and practice, with logistical limitations preventing the consolidation of an emancipatory model.

i) Article 9 – Caiçara Territory of Paraty

Barros and Rodrigues (2019), in turn, discussed the process of constructing differentiated school education and its contribution to tourism development in the caiçara territory of Paraty.

The twelve (12) subcategories proposed by Hall were identified integrally within the context of the caiçara communities of Praia do Sono and Pouso da Cajaíba, in Paraty (RJ), which, since 2016, have implemented a differentiated education proposal articulated with community-based tourism (CBT).

Regarding the classificatory type, it is worth mentioning that it manifests in the local and collective configuration of governance, with emphasis on the role of the Forum of Traditional Communities of Angra dos Reis, Paraty, and Ubatuba, which articulate knowledge and actions of resistance and sustainable development (p. 2). Regarding the second category, public policy themes, the article presents two central axes: differentiated education and CBT, which have the valorization of territory, traditional knowledge, and local culture as their foundation (p. 3).

Regarding the positioning of public policies, there is an explicit critique of predatory tourism imposed from outside in, and a repositioning of communities as protagonists in defining their own development strategies. A connection is thus established with the subcategory of underlying democratic models, as the pedagogical proposal is constructed participatively through dialogic and collaborative methodologies, such as project pedagogy and generative themes, inspired by Paulo Freire (p. 6).

Regarding the primary focus of governance, it is evident that it aims to strengthen the territorial, cultural, and economic identity of the communities, promoting autonomy, belonging, and sustainability (p. 13).

In this sense, concerning the view of non-central actors, it is clear that residents, teachers, and youth are treated as active agents in the transformation process, rather than passive recipients of policies.

The curricular proposal was developed with intense participation from the community and the Support Collective for Differentiated Education, involving meetings, local diagnostics, and collaborative material production (pp. 6–7), without segregating policy formulation and implementation.

Success criteria are measured not by some qualitative indicators: the strengthening of self-esteem, identity affirmation, critical awareness regarding development, and appropriation of sustainable tourism tools (pp. 13–14).

The authors report some difficulties, such as resistance from certain families who fear that differentiated education might be inferior to what is offered in the city (p. 13), reflecting a deeply rooted ideological view that associates educational quality with urban standardization and the conventional teaching model (p. 13).

As proposed solutions, the authors emphasize the need to strengthen dialogue between schools and families, as well as to invest in the ongoing training of teachers and community leaders, ensuring collective involvement and the shared construction of meanings and goals (pp. 13–14).

Regarding the public policy instruments used, tools such as curricula adapted to the territory, integrative pedagogical projects (such as the “Tourist Guide”), social cartography workshops, photography, intercultural debates, and field activities involving youth, teachers, and leaders in a continuous teaching-learning process connected to daily life and TBC perspectives are applied (pp. 9–12).

Thus, the article by Barros and Rodrigues (2019) reveals a significant experience of community governance, where education and tourism are conceived in an articulated manner, composing a common project aimed at valuing the territory, strengthening social protagonism, and promoting sustainability.

Based on the data derived from the authors’ accounts of their conceptualizations and ways of describing experiences related to Community-Based Tourism (CBT) in the nine (9) studies, this article reserves space to analyze the predominant governance model among the analyzed articles, according to the typology proposed by Hall (2011).

The predominant governance model in Community-Based Tourism experiences: a critical analysis

From the analysis of the nine (9) selected articles, it was possible to identify that the predominant governance model in Community-Based Tourism (CBT) experiences is the community model, frequently hybridized with elements of network governance. This finding is primarily grounded in the centrality attributed to local communities in the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of tourism practices, as well as in the appreciation of subjective, symbolic, and territorial aspects that transcend instrumental and bureaucratic management logics.

The analyzed experiences largely reveal decision-making processes grounded in horizontality, the protagonism of local groups (whether women, youth, Indigenous peoples, or traditional communities), and the collective construction of policies and actions. There is an observed emphasis on autonomy, empowerment, and the valorization of local knowledge as structuring elements of governance. This scenario contrasts with the conception of tourism as an activity driven by efficiency and competitiveness goals, typical of market and hierarchical models.

Cases such as the Associação Acolhida na Colônia (Pimentel and Sampaio, 2023), the protagonism of women flour-makers in Mangabeira (Budel et al., 2023), and the quilombola youth in Vale do Ribeira (Martins and Fudemma, 2022) demonstrate organizational practices aligned with the principles of community governance. These arrangements are characterized by collective deliberation, community protagonism, and the strengthening of social and cultural ties, while also establishing partnerships with external institutions (universities, NGOs, public sector) in a complementary, rather than subordinate, manner.

Such multiscale partnerships, although present, do not undermine the community logic—instead, they strengthen local institutional capacity and expand available resources without compromising decision-making autonomy. This configures the presence of network governance, which, however, does not override the community essence of the experiences.

Another point reinforcing the predominance of community governance is how success criteria are defined. Contrary to traditional economic performance indicators, subjective and contextual metrics prevail, such as self-esteem, social cohesion, cultural strengthening, and permanence in the territory. These elements point to a substantive rationality of organizing, as suggested by Böhm (2006), which distances itself from a functionalist and normative stance, proposing a repositioning anchored in ethical, political, and collective principles.

Even in cases where some relation to market or hierarchical governance is recognized—such as in Furnas dos Baianos (Oppliger and Oliveira, 2022) or the protected areas of Amapá (Almeida et al., 2022)—these models do not consolidate as dominant. The former reveals an absence of structured community governance, dominated by an isolated private logic; the latter, while proposing the strengthening of local models, expresses tensions between the community ideal and dependence on state or business structures, revealing contradictions between discourse and practice.

Finally, experiences such as differentiated education in Paraty (Barros and Rodrigues, 2019) illustrate how community governance can articulate tourism with other social fields (education, culture, territorial resistance), composing innovative development arrangements based on local particularities.

In summary, community governance, when strategically articulated with network governance, legitimizes itself as the main normative and practical reference among the analyzed CBC (Community-Based Tourism) experiences. This model has shown the capacity to integrate tradition and innovation, strengthening cultural identities without closing off external dialogue; producing alternative forms of development centered on well-being and sustainability; and building concrete resistance to hegemonic logics through collective action and territorial affirmation.

However, the challenge remains to overcome internal contradictions, infrastructure gaps, dependence on public policies, and symbolic tensions inherited from the dominant organizational model. These limitations, far from invalidating progress, point to the need to broaden the debate on constructing truly emancipatory organizational models, grounded in collectivity, plurality, and social justice.

As a conclusion: between ideation and practice – shifts and silences in CBT experiences

Through the analytical effort undertaken in this study, it became evident that the idealization of Community-Based Tourism (CBT) as an organizational alternative predominated, with community governance models and, complementarily, network governance being prevalent. However, a persistent tension was observed: although the reviewed articles propose CBT based on principles such as participation and equity, the organizational practices described frequently overlook the analysis of material, symbolic, and political conditions that limit them (BARCELLOS et al., 2017).

This discursive pattern reinforces what Barcellos et al. (2017) call an abstract and conceptual approach to organizational alternatives, in which practices are generally "dispositionless," that is, insufficiently grounded in the analysis of the material, symbolic, and political conditions that make them possible or restrict them.

The idealization of CBT as "another form of organization" tends to obscure its internal contradictions, unresolved power asymmetries, and invisible conflicts, indirectly reinforcing organizational practices inherited from bureaucratic or business models. This idealization and consequent neglect of the material and political conditions of participation echo the critiques of the National Movement for Urban Reform (MNRU) and Ermínia Maricato (2000), who denounce the commodification of cities and the recurring lack of genuine political participation by communities. "Pseudo-participation" — where public authorities and private entities simulate mandatory public consultation but effectively circumvent the real decision-making process about what the community truly wants and needs — manifests both in urban planning generally and in CBT initiatives.

In this sense, a critical reading of the experiences reveals that, even when self-identified as community-based, many initiatives remain subject to traditional governance mechanisms,

such as dependence on public funding, the use of managerial tools, or the centrality of external institutional actors mediating processes.

Therefore, there is an ambivalent movement: while experiences affirm alternative organizational principles — such as collective deliberation, reciprocity, and territorial belonging — they are also permeated by conventional organizational forms that, consciously or unconsciously, reposition them within the dominant logic. This ambivalence is central to Maricato's critique, who highlights how the logic of commodification and capital interests infiltrate even proposals aimed at social welfare, distorting them and hindering community autonomy. The MNRU, throughout its history, has warned how the logic of profit overrides the social function of the city, and this same logic is sometimes replicated in local development initiatives.

From the perspective proposed by Böhm (2006), which understands organization as a field of symbolic and political dispute rather than a static entity, it is possible to assert that CBT, as presented in the analyzed experiences, often stands at a threshold between resistance and reproduction. That is, although it carries transformative potential, its organizational practices do not effectively break with what Steffen Böhm (2006) calls the "hegemony of managerialism" — an organizational regime based on efficiency, predictability, and standardization that constrains the emergence of substantive forms of organizing. The perpetuation of this "hegemony of managerialism" in CBT experiences illustrates the reason why genuine participation is frequently undermined: the primacy of efficiency and control, typical of business logic and traditional public management, clashes with the complexity and rhythms of truly popular deliberation.

This is the core of Maricato's (2000) critique regarding the capture of urban planning and city management by economic interests that disregard the real needs and desires of communities.

From a theoretical contribution perspective, this analysis suggests that the discourse on Community-Based Tourism (CBT) needs to be repoliticized and repositioned (Böhm, 2006). This implies not only valuing its principles but also acknowledging its incompleteness, tensions, and antagonisms. As studies on resistance organizations indicate, especially in light of Laclau and Mouffe's (1984) Political Discourse Theory, every attempt to construct a new organizational hegemony involves precarious chains of equivalence, with identities in dispute, unstable boundaries, and subjects in constant re-elaboration. Therefore, the repoliticization of CBT is a crucial "perspective" aligned with the ideals of the National Urban Reform Movement (MNRU). The Urban Reform Movement has always maintained that the city is a field of political struggle, and that democratizing access to urban resources and decisions is a constant fight against the logic of commodification. For communities involved in CBT, this means demanding participation that goes beyond formal consultation—one that truly influences the decision-making process, the use of resources, and the tourism development model they desire, rather than merely what is imposed upon them.

Hence, rather than asserting an ideal model of CBT, it is necessary to problematize its modes of organization: who decides, how decisions are made, with which symbolic and material resources, under what conditions, and with whom dialogues or confrontations occur. These are questions that require visibility and situated analysis. Otherwise, there is a risk of turning CBT into an empty signifier, appropriated by multiple actors but stripped of its political-organizational potential. The absence of clear answers to these fundamental questions about "who decides and how" precisely generates the scenario of pseudo-participation so criticized by Maricato (2000) and opposed by the MNRU. Without clarity regarding the mechanisms and effectiveness of participation, communities become subject to external decisions, losing protagonism and the ability to shape their own destinies.

Thus, the critique proposed here does not aim to invalidate the experiences but to epistemologically reposition them: it is necessary to observe less the ideal and more the everyday dynamics of practices; shift the focus from declarations to daily organizational dynamics; and recognize that transformation does not occur through the enunciation of values but through the constant struggle over how to organize the common. In this sense, the “perspectives” for CBT and the advancement of Urban Reform converge: the need to strengthen communities’ self-organization capacities, build strategic alliances, and persist in demanding participation mechanisms that are truly deliberative and binding. Only through persistent and conscious struggle over “what the community truly wants for itself, what reasons it has, and what perspectives it holds” will it be possible to transcend pseudo-participation and build CBT and cities that are more just, equitable, and democratic—where the common good and life prevail over market logic.

REFERENCES

- ALMEIDA, L. M. L. D. de; FONTOURA, A. G. da C.; VASCONCELOS, I. M. de; BRITO, D. M. C.; HILÁRIO, R. R. Situação atual, atrações e obstáculos para o ecoturismo em áreas protegidas do Amapá, Brasil. *Ambiente e Sociedade*, v. 25, 2022.
- BARCELLOS, Rebeca de Moraes Ribeiro de; DELLAGNELO, Eloise Helena do Livramento. REPOSICIONANDO NOSSAS CONCEPÇÕES SOBRE PRÁTICAS ORGANIZACIONAIS: o circuito fora do eixo e práticas organizacionais contra hegemônicas. In: ENANPAD, 2013, Rio de Janeiro. *Anais [...]*. Rio de Janeiro: Anpad, 2013. v. 1, p. 1-16. Disponível em: https://arquivo.anpad.org.br/abrir_pdf.php?e=MTU5MDA=. Acesso em: 29 mar. 2025.
- BARROS, A. L. R. D.; RODRIGUES, C. G. D. O. Diferenciação da educação e turismo comunitário nos territórios caiçaras de Paraty (RJ). *Ambiente e Sociedade*, v. 22, 2019.
- BARTHOLO, R.; SAN SOLO, D. G.; BURSZTYN, I. Turismo de base comunitária: Diversidade de olhares e experiências brasileiras. Rio de Janeiro: Letra e Imagem, 2009. 501p.
- BÖHM, S. *Repositioning organization theory*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- BRYMAN, A. *Social research methods*. Oxford University Press, 2015.
- BUDEL, L.; SEVERINI, V. F.; REJOWSKI, M. Dimensões da Hospitalidade no Turismo de Base Comunitária: simbologias, ritos e artefatos na casa de farinha em Mangabeira. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo*, [S. l.], v. 17, p. 2497, 2023. DOI: 10.7784/rbtur.v17.2497. Disponível em: <https://rbtur.org.br/rbtur/article/view/2497>. Acesso em: 8 mar. 2025.
- COELHO, Kellen da Silva. “Participação e ‘Não!’ ao Plano da CEPA”: uma análise das práticas organizativas de resistência à nova proposta de plano diretor apresentada pelo poder público de Florianópolis. In: ENANPAD, 2013, Rio de Janeiro. *Anais [...]*. Rio de Janeiro: Anpad, 2013. v. 1, p. 1-16. Disponível em: https://arquivo.anpad.org.br/abrir_pdf.php?e=MTU5MDk=. Acesso em: 29 mar. 2025.
- COELHO, Kellen da Silva; ANJOS, Francisco Antônio dos. A dimensão organizacional do Turismo de Base Comunitária (TBC): uma análise crítica da produção em periódicos de 2006 a 2025. *Revista Brasileira dos Observatórios de Turismo – ReBOT*, Natal, v. 4, n. 1, p. –, jun. 2025. Disponível em: Acesso em: 14 jul. 2025. DOI: 10.59776/2764-5835.2025.7205.
- DUARTE, M.; ALCADIPANI, M. Contribuições do organizar (organizing) para os estudos organizacionais. *O&S-Organizações & Sociedade*, v. 23, n. 76, p. 57-72, 2016. DOI: 10.1590/1984-9230763.
- FAXINA, Fabiana; FREITAS, Lara Brunelle Almeida; TREVIZAN, Salvador Dal Pozzo. Sustentabilidade ambiental em comunidades de pescadores inseridas em destino turístico: o caso da Ilha Mem de Sá – Brasil. *Revista de Gestão Ambiental e Sustentabilidade*, v. 10, n.

1, p. e16311, 2021. DOI: 10.5585/geas.v10i1.16311. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.uninove.br/geas/article/view/16311>. Acesso em: 8 mar. 2025.

HALL, C. M. A typology of governance and its implications for tourism policy analysis. **Journal of Sustainable Tourism**, v. 19, n. 4–5, p. 437–457, maio-junho 2011.

IZIDORO, F. B.; SCHIAVETTI, A. Associated benefits of manatee watching in the Costa dos Corais Environmental Protection Area. **Frontiers in Marine Science**, v. 9, art. 1002855, 2022. DOI: 10.3389/fmars.2022.1002855.

MARICATO, E. Urbanismo na periferia do mundo globalizado. **Metrópoles brasileiras. São Paulo em Perspectiva**, 14 (4), 21-33. 2000.

MARTINS, Mayara Roberta; FUTEMMA, Célia. O turismo como um bem comum e o papel da juventude em sua gestão no quilombo de Ivaporunduva no Vale do Ribeira, São Paulo, Brasil. **Desenvolvimento e Meio Ambiente**, v. 59, 2022. DOI: 10.5380/dma.v59i0.76646. Disponível em: <https://revistas.ufpr.br/made/article/view/76646>. Acesso em: 8 mar. 2025.

MISOCZKY, M. C.; FLORES, R. K.; BÖHM, S. A práxis da resistência e a hegemonia da organização. **Organizações e sociedade**, v. 15, n. 45, abr./jun. 2008.

MISOCZKY, M. Rememorando a Organização e Práxis dos Centros Populares de Cultura. . In: ENCONTRO DE ESTUDOS ORGANIZACIONAIS, 7., 2012, Curitiba. **Anais...** Curitiba: ANPAD, 2012. 1 CD..

OPPLIGER, E. A.; OLIVEIRA, A. K. M. Turismo como possibilidade econômica para o desenvolvimento sustentável da comunidade quilombola de Furnas dos Baianos, Aquidauana, Mato Grosso do Sul. **Revista Brasileira de Gestão e Desenvolvimento Regional**, v. 18, n. 2, 2022. DOI: 10.54399/rbgdr.v18i2.6498. Disponível em: <https://www.rbgdr.net/revista/index.php/rbgdr/article/view/6498>. Acesso em: 8 mar. 2025.

PIMENTEL, Ricardo; SAMPAIO, Carlos Alberto Cioce. Contribuições para a Sistematização de Experiências Ecosocioeconômicas: Um Estudo na Associação Acolhida na Colônia Urubici. **Fronteira: Journal of Social, Technological and Environmental Science**, [S. l.], v. 12, n. 3, p. 177–193, 2023. DOI: 10.21664/2238-8869.2023v12i3.p177-193. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.unievangelica.edu.br/index.php/fronteiras/article/view/6850>. Acesso em: 8 mar. 2025.

PIMENTEL, Ricardo; SAMPAIO, Carlos Alberto Cioce; ALBACH, Valéria de Meira. Diferença e unidade: as práticas da Associação de Agroturismo Acolhida na Colônia em Urubici. **Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural**, v. 23, n. 1, p. 185-198, jan./mar. 2025. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25145/j.pasos.2025.23.012>.

PROENÇA, A. R. G. B.; PANOSSO NETTO, A. Turismo em territórios indígenas: desenvolvimento e impacto sociocultural na Comunidade Indígena Nova Esperança “Pisasú Sarusawa” (Rio Cuieiras - Amazonas). **Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo**, v. 16, p. 2408, 2022. DOI: 10.7784/rbtur.v16.2408. Disponível em: <https://rbtur.org.br/rbtur/article/view/2408>. Acesso em: 8 mar. 2025.