Bhitargarh: A Catalyst for Living Archaeological Park in Bangladesh

Manzuma Sharmin Munne [1],*

[1]Department of Tourism and Hospitality Management, National University, Bangladesh; manzuma.sharmin@nu.ac.bd
*Correspondence: manzuma.sharmin@nu.ac.bd

Abstract

Purpose of the study: This paper aims to explore how community archaeology can be utilized to introduce the potential scopes of living archaeological park at the largest fortified settlement in Bangladesh.

Methodology: The qualitative study adopts in-depth interview with the team leader of the excavation. The responses of the interview were critically analyzed and documented to reach the outcome.

Findings: The findings suggest that the archaeological heritage tourism can be introduced at Bhitargarh as a form of living archaeological park in Bangladesh. It is mentioned that the archaeological (tangible heritage such as archaeological relics and excavated materials) and cultural (intangible heritage such as festival, events and traditions) resources can be preserved by the community archaeology at Bhitargarh. The findings of the study implores that the community archaeology of Bhitargarh can be empowered by the active community engagement in tourism planning, decision-making and tour operation

Implications: The implication of the study outcome can be significantly considered for: (i) The development of tourism at Bhitargarh (e.g. community based heritage tourism, micro-heritage tourism, and/or cultural heritage tourism; (ii) The preservation of the designated archaeological site in Bangladesh; (iii) The scope of research and outreach in community archaeology; (iv) The preservation of the excavated materials for education and research; (v) The scope of excavation investigation on the nearby fortified cities, etc.

Limitations and Future direction: A few limitations of the study are: (i) As the study area is recently excavated, there is limited study on it in relation with tourism; (ii) The outcome of the study is illustrated on the basis of the key expert's opinion related to the excavation experience and excavated materials analysis. The scopes of future research are not confined to the economic development. The emotional solidarity and place attachment of the residents' of Bhitargarh can be focused to develop community based heritage tourism which may assist the destination management organizations (DMO) to understand the residents' perception for the engagement in tourism operation, policy making and destination branding. In addition, a further study on tourist's intention to visit a living archaeological park can enlighten the planning and development of tourism at Bhitargarh.

1. Introduction

The archaeological excavation and the wider economic development can be ensured if local, regional, national and international governance are integrated (Lewer et al., 2019). Local capacity building is significant for the heritage justice as well as the preservation for cultural heritage and/or heritage tourism (Fortenberry, 2021). In this case, the common social institutions must be reinforced so that local participation can be ensured for heritage preservation (Dagouni & Foruseki, 2018). Community engagement is essential not only for the archaeological excavation but also for the heritage preservation (Lewer et al., 2019; Shai & Uziel, 2016). The incorporation of deeper civic engagement in planning process is essential for the protection of tangible and intangible heritage (Fortenberry, 2021). To incorporate the community and archaeological preservation, "Community Archaeology" is defined as an inclusive tool which can encourage a relationship between individuals and different backgrounds where cultural heritage are preserved in shape of the inhabitants' livelihood (Westmont & Antelid, 2018). The vulnerability of cultural heritage led by climatic and social changes can be source for the improvement of community resilience and the promotion of sustainable community-led heritage and tourism development (Ghahramani et al., 2020).

Community archaeology is the integration of the community engagement in the field work (e.g. survey and excavation) and post-field work (e.g. pottery reading, pottery washing registration and laboratory work) where versatile educational programs (e.g. research and outreach, public lectures and presentations) are included (Shai & Uziel, 2016). It has three motivators, such as, (i) cultural resource management, (ii) outreach and (iii) education so that resources can be preserved and archaeology can be rediscovered to solve social problems in communities (Westmont & Antelid, 2018), however four motivators are mentioned in another study, such as (i) research, archiving and inventory work to uncover valuable features, (ii) education, information and awareness raising, (iii) developing products and improving quality of local goods, (iv) protecting, sustaining and promoting cultural heritage (Maner & Menteş, 2018). Two challenges are stated in community archaeology; such as, (i) negotiation and compromising for community participation and (ii) scope of knowledge sharing to enlarge participation (van den Dries, 2014). It is mentioned that top-down approach should be moved to a more inclusive approach by the local government so that a strong network among state and non-state stakeholder can be established and the collective involvement in archaeological heritage tourism can be promoted (Li & Qian, 2017). Besides, inclusive and equitable approach for heritage tourism is found significant to ensure justice to under-represented communities (Fortenberry, 2021). Community residents can participate in de-exoticizing antiquity conservation, media and public outreach, and looting and public education through community engagement (Heng et al., 2020).

The designated excavated site can be declared as either protected area (Diwan et al., 2021) or archaeology park (Shai & Uziel, 2016; Tsaravopoulos & Fragou, 2013) for the conservation of its archaeological, historical and socio-cultural significance. Living archaeological park is defined as "*distinctively related to an archaeological site which is closely connected with the cultural and natural dimensions for the benefit of local population and tourists*". It implies on the discovery of unique heritage attributes and spontaneous participation of inhabitants in the archaeological excavation process (Tsaravopoulos & Fragou, 2013). It is highlighted that the integration of community's economic dimensions and losses in decision and policy making processes is equally significant to understand community's culture and social dimensions and losses (Ghahramani et al., 2020). Besides, stakeholders' goals, priorities, interests and values are suggested to forecast the success of collaborative approach and to nurture operational advantages, community empowerment and equity, heritage tourism product and heritage site management (Alazaizeh et al., 2020). The purpose of the study is to explore the scope of archaeological heritage tourism development at Bhitargarh as a living archaeological park followed by community archaeology.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Study Area

The study area, Bhitargarh, is an archaeological site located in the northern corner of Bangladesh. It was a part of the Indian Subcontinent within the time interval of the 7th-12th century. The archaeological excavation of the site was tenured on 2008 and continued till 2014.

2.2 Method

The study is qualitative in nature. Open ended questionnaire was used to conduct a semi-structured interview session virtually and the recording of the discussion was preserved for future study. The interview questions were designed on the signifcance of the study area, community archaeology and scope of archaeological heritage tourism in the study area. The format of interview questions and the mode of the discussion was in English. The discussion of the study is illustrated by analysising of the interview recording. The interview session was conducted by the author.

2.3 Sample Design

The key respondent of the interview session is the team leader of the archaeological excavation team of Bhitargarh. As the respondent has the expertise as an archaeologiest and the real-time assessment from the archaeological investigation of Bhitargarh, the subjectivity of the respondent is considered significant to explore for the preservation of the site considering the significance of the tangible and intangible heirtage.

2.4 Data Collection

Primary data was collected in July, 2022 and secondary data was collected from the available sources (e.g. research articles, journal papers) on the study area.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1 Archaeological Significance of Bhitargarh

Bhitargarh was first unearthed in 2008 as a fortified settlement or walled city. It is located at the district of Panchgarh, Bangladesh (Jahan, 2019). It is also highlighted that the fortified site (rampart urban settlement) was developed around 7th-8th century CE (Rahman & Siddiq, 2021). Comparing the archaeological evidences of the early historic, historic and mediaeval fort cities, Bhitargarh was developed as an urban center. Though there is no evidence to prove that Bhitargarh can be classified as a pre-Muslim or mediaeval archaeological site (Rayhan, 2012), the excavated materials, such as, pottery, clay objects, iron objects, brass objects, copper and gold bangles, terracotta beads, stone beads, fragments of stone sculptures are dated a range of between the 7th-12th century CE (Jahan, 2019). According to the archaeologist,

There are many fortified cities in Bangladesh founded in different eras, such as: Mahasthangarh, Wari Bateshwar, Panam City, etc. Most of the fortified settlements are found in the districts Panchagarh, Nilphamari, Thakurgaon, Dinajpur, Rangpur, Bogura. Notably, a number of 16 fortified cities are found within the district of Panchagarh (750-1200 CE). It was a trend within this time interval to build higher walls to protect inhabitants and other resources from flood and to maintain drainage system. Among them, Bhitargarh is found as the largest fortified settlement or walled city in Bangladesh.

It is found that within Bhitargarh region, a citadel was built alongside the *Talma* River which was connected with hilly forestry region of India; and a channel titled *Shalmera* was linked to the river *Talma* at the south-western side of the mud rampart. The fortification walls were arranged in three rings of walls as a box fortification and both fortified enclosures are surrounded by trench. The presence of the bricks in the brick fortification, inner fortification, outer mud rampart and the bank of the river symbolizes that three fortifications were built at the same time (Rayhan, 2012). It is revealed from the recent excavation that the city was enclosed within four concentric quadrangles, made by earth and brick ramparts. It is also revealed

that these are the foundations of religious and secular monuments (Jahan, 2019). According to the archaeologist,

The specialties of Bhitargarh are, (i) It is the only fortified settlement which had 4 enclosures (one within the other). All the enclosures are surrounded by the moats; (ii) It had the largest area (about 25 sq km) compared to the Mahasthangarh and Wari Bateshwar. In addition, there were trenches outside the boundary wall.

Bhitargarh was comprised by a braided river landscape along with complex patterns of broad ridges, connected with numerous shallow former channels and basin (Rayhan, 2012). It had the significant strategic position connected to Tibet, Sikkim, Nepal, Bhutan, India (near Bihar, Koch Bihar and the regions of the middle and lower Ganga valleys) (Jahan, 2019; Rahman & Siddiq, 2021). The size and the co-ordination of the architecture represents as the largest and strategically important fort-city of the Indian subcontinent. It is assumed that the site was divided into habitation, citadel and trade center (Rayhan, 2012). According to the archaeologist,

Bhitargarh was a well-planned and well-connected city connected by land and river. Both mode of transportation were influential to maintain cultural and commercial connection with Tibet, Sikkim, Nepal, Bhutan and India. It might be used as a stopover within the trail.

It is revealed that the fortified settlement was governed by the efficient political support for controlling and managing the settlement system. The ethnographic data of the site supports that large-scale agricultural production was done by the residents (Rayhan, 2012). The inhabitants of Bhitargarh surprisingly developed a creative system of cultivation and irrigation (Jahan, 2019). In addition, the inhabitants had good command over geometry, architecture and military engineering who knew about the raw materials, brick making, stone-dam and use of fire. The fortification had strong security system and equipped troops (Rayhan, 2012). It is revealed that ten ponds were served for the residents in ancient times. Notably, *Maharaja* Pond covers ten brick-paved bathing ghats and brick-cased embankments (Jahan, 2019). According to the archaeologist,

The inhabitants of Bhitargarh were extraordinarily rich in education and efficient in governance. The idea of the eco-friendly architecture, water management and harvesting system was commendable. They had strong cultural bonding. Though the availability of strong safety and security system was assumed, there is no evidence of military artifact in the excavated materials.

3.2 Community Archaeology of Bhitargarh

The ideological and practical necessity of prospective community participants must be considered prior the participatory process (Dragouni & Fouseki, 2018) where the intension of participation is motivated because of the high place attachment of the community member in a relatively inexperienced destination (Dragouni & Fouseki, 2018). It is found that the archaeological excavation of Bhitargarh was started in 2008 (Jahan, 2019). According to the archaeologist,

The archaeological survey for excavation in Bhitargarh was started in 2006. After analyzing the survey outcome, the archaeological excavation was started in 2008 and continued to 2014. Two crucial challenges are mentioned relating the excavation. First, working on a privately owned property was the first challenge for the excavation. Second, the area was surrounded by the local residence, farming land and tea garden. So, she had to reshape the methodology of the excavation strategically. In that case, community archaeology was followed.

According to community archaeology, the archaeological preservation can be enhanced by the active participation of community residents (e.g. volunteer and professional support) so that the attachment with the archaeological site can be developed (Shai & Uziel, 2016). Besides heritage value can play either as a significant drive or a barrier (Dragouni & Fouseki, 2018). Major constraints of heritage tourism product and tangible archaeological heritage site development are stated as follows: conservation and preservation, complimentary facilities, signage, on-site interpretation and heritage management strategies (Darabseh et al., 2017). Some other obstacles for the community archaeology; such as, (i) control over the community engagement daily, (ii) focus on only development-led archaeological research, (iii) time and financial

constraints, (iv) lack of incentives, (v) lack of stimulation from the academics in community based research and (vi) lack of national legislation (van den Dries, 2014). As the community archaeology was followed for the excavation of Bhitargarh, the residents of a whole union (including 3 mouzas and many villages) were prioritized in the excavation process. According to the archaeologist,

The community of Bhitargarh was given utmost importance as the key beneficiaries from the excavation. Awareness raising program, seminars, workshops and training programs were organized to build the attachment with the excavation. For example, they were trained prior to the field work by the archaeologist on how to excavate and how to store the excavated materials. After the successful training, the excavation team was formed mostly with the community residents. The whole process of excavation encouraged them because they were empowered by the active participation in excavation. Though the excavation was stopped in the middle of field work a few times, the cordial support from the community residents and the local stakeholders was really appreciable.

It is highlighted that residents' identity and connection with the heritage site can be strengthened by the community engagement during archaeological excavation and heritage protection (Lewer et al., 2019). Community perceptions towards tourism are insignificant in shaping the intention to participate. Three significant points are highlighted to relate community participation and tourism; such as, (i) the community value must be prioritized in the community-led collaboration for the planning of heritage tourism, (ii) if community residents misunderstand tourism as a threat to heritage and place identity, they must be convinced highlighting the benefits of collaborative planning and engagement strategies to avoid undesirable tourism change, and (iii) community can be indifferent to participate if they feel a significant gap of tourism gain and potential socio-economic spillovers (Dragouni & Fouseki, 2018). According to the archaeologist,

As the community residents participated in the excavation and supported to preserve them, it can be assumed that they will be considerate to preserve the tangible resource and to utilize the resources as a form of tourism. Thus economic development and socio-cultural enrichment can be accelerated by the introduction of tourism in Bhitargarh. However, archaeological preservation must be maintained by the local, regional and national governing bodies.

3.3 Scope of Tourism at Bhitargarh

Social intuition, defined as cultural integrity and knowledge exchange and economic empathy, defined as defined as demand-supply balance and revenue generation, are significant tools for the community resilience and financial retention (Munne et al., 2021). Local economy can be enriched by the participation in archaeological excavation and the introduction of archaeological heritage tourism (Tsaravopoulos & Fragou, 2013). As a result, less prestigious micro-heritage sites can be asymmetrical with the macro-heritage sites to ensure the sustainable heritage development (Lewer et al., 2019). Following the insight of micro-heritage tourism development, the tangible archaeological heritage in Bhitargarh can be adopted to preserve the site (Jahan, 2019). According to the archaeologist,

The architectural structure of Bhitargarh is surrounded by the local residence, open space or near farmland. So, tourists can experience the archaeological site living with the residents and/or gossiping with the inhabitants. Here, every house can be a part of the excavated walls or trenches. As a result, the archaeological site, community and community culture can be offered to tourists as a uniform product.

Cultural heritage tourism (CHT) is mentioned as a new form to reshape economic viability, social equity, cultural heritage and environmental responsibilities. Besides, it is also outlined that the sustainability of the CHT site can be followed by the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). It depicts major points, such as: strengthening environmental sustainability for the environmental preservation, facilitating regional approach for the heritage preservation, enhancing stakeholder involvement and awareness for the transparency of decision-making and economic benefits, and avoidance costly mistakes for the even distribution of tourism costs and benefits in community (Jha-Thakur et al., 2021). It is stated that tourists' experience in community based tourism (CBT) can be hindered due to the absence of standard infrastructure and recreational facilities in the rural areas (Suchana & Munne, 2020). However, accommodation is found more significant factor than the amenity, attraction and activities. It is highlighted that the tourist choice and the service diversity can be

affected due to the improvement of local transport system (Hasan et al., 2022). According to the archaeologist,

The community local residence surrounded by the archaeological site can be offered for the accommodation where tourists can enjoy local food and experience rural lifestyle also. In addition, tourists can also take part in the knowledge exchange, local cultural festivals and local sports. It can be a fusion of the cultural heritage tourism and/or community based heritage tourism amid of archaeological site. Thus, community empowerment can be ensured and a new tourism dimension can be discovered in Bangladesh. If the destination is patronized by the local and national governing bodies, Bhitargarh can be declared as a protected area for the first living archaeological park in Bangladesh.

It is found that the two strategies are categorized for visitor management of an archaeological site; as follows, (i) Hard strategies (Physical, regulatory and economic) and (ii) Soft strategies (signage, code of conduct and educative interpretive information). In addition, three strategies are also mentioned for the maintenance and the conservation of the archaeological site; as follows, (i) Restrictive strategy (carrying capacity), (ii) Redistributive strategy (adaptation to infrastructure development/expansion) and (iii) Interpretive strategy (communication and motivation trip) (Enseñat-Soberanis et al., 2019). Besides, heritage guiding is significant part for the tourism production and consumption at archaeological site. Community residents can be the tour guide and the interpreter of the significant information to provide authentic experience of the archaeological site (Ababneh, 2018). According to the archaeologist,

It is high time the local and national governing bodies would take initiatives for the archaeological preservation of Bhitargarh. Local inhabitants may demoralize to preserve this significance discovery if the site is abandoned for a long time. It will be an irreparable loss if the researchers or archeologists are not given the opportunity for the future research on this significant site.

3.4 Living Archaeological Park at Bhitargarh

"Living Archaeology Park" can be launched as a part of community archaeology (Shai & Uziel, 2016). It is mentioned that three important steps can be adopted to tune in a fortified settlement into living archaeological park (Tsaravopoulos & Fragou, 2013). They are:

3.4.1 Public participation in the archaeological process and benefits for the site preservation

Working teams can be divided for the excavation process; such as, object handling, conservation, storage and safekeeping of antiquities, maintenance of footpaths to areas of special interests. In addition, work team can be separated in shifts also; such as, fieldwork in the morning (e.g. excavation and cleaning). They can work as facilitators and guides to the excavation process. Educational programs in the evening (e.g. seminar on history of the archaeological site, objectives of the archaeological research, interpretation of archaeological material, technique of archaeological illustration for movable and non-movable finds, presentation of heritage to wider public (Tsaravopoulos & Fragou, 2013) though the integration of new programs and views (including digital screen display of the site and artifacts) is the challenge for the development and promotion of archaeological site (Rahal, 2020). It is also mentioned that outdoor activities can be initiated for tourists (e.g. hiking) as well as students (e.g. who wants to pursue archaeological excavation experience) (Tsaravopoulos & Fragou, 2013).

In the designated study area, "Bhitargarh festival" can be offered to the tourists. 26 educational institutions have been participating in the festival since 2017 on different activities (e.g. drawing, debate competition, recitation, and dance and music competition). In order to magnify the significance of the archaeological relics, a few events have been organized; such as, (i) Swimming competition in the Maharaja Dighi (Maharaja pond), (ii) Hans khela (duck game) in Phulpukuri dighi (Phulpukuri pond), (iii) fishing in the Maharaja Dighi (Maharaja pond), (iv) Indigenous games among the villagers, (v) photo exhibition to represent the archaeological, natural cultural, intangible and creative heritage of Bhitargarh. Besides, unique cultural and recreational products can be offered to the tourists by the host inhabitants; such as, (i) indigenous cultural performances, (ii) Satya Pirer Gaan (spiritual songs of Satya Pir), (ii) Lathi-khela (game with sticks and the exhibition of skilled stick and footwork). All of the mentioned festivals, events, sports and cultural activities have been organized to protect the intangible heritage of Bhitargarh (Jahan, 2019).

3.4.2 Benefits for the local community

Economic benefits and economic regeneration can be ensured through heritage tourism in the archaeological park. It is highlighted that boat trip, summer tent facilities and volunteering program can be offered to empower socio-cultural bonding and economic development (Tsaravopoulos & Fragou, 2013). On the contrary, marginalized or underprivileged people can also be benefitted financially and psychologically through knowledge and communication, excavation and recreational activities (Gibaja et al., 2021). According to the archaeologist,

Residents of Bhitargarh can be economically benefitted from the festival. Artists (singer of spiritual songs, artisans, indigenous performers and local artists) can be honored uniformly and rewarded accordingly. Thus, traditional intangible heritages can be protected due to the preservation of tangible archaeological site with the assistance of community.

3.4.3 Local communities and decision-making

The participatory planning model for decision-making process must be outlined in combination with the archaeologist and residents (Tsaravopoulos & Fragou, 2013). As residents of Bhitargarh are engaged with community archaeology, they must be prioritized in decision-making process for the living archaeological heritage park. The development of the living archaeological park can be hampered due to either expropriated or exchanged with other site land by stakeholders. In this case, all the stakeholders must be accommodated without any disputes (Tsaravopoulos & Fragou, 2013). Public forums and workshops can be organized for the accomplishment of proactive stakeholder and community engagement (Fortenberry, 2021). According to the archaeologist,

As the community of Bhitargarh has the engagement with the excavation, their contributions for the development of the living archaeological park might be commendable. Thus, community engagement in archaeological excavation process and community stakeholders' cooperation with the excavation team are patronized regionally and nationally.

Residents and local business owners support the archaeological preservation for heritage value and economic value; however, tourists and government officials emphasize on preservation rather than use of the living archaeological park (Alazaizeh et al., 2020). However, it must be kept under consideration that the tourist acceptability level visiting archaeological park goes down due to the increasing number of tourists (Alazaizeh et al., 2016). In addition, Visitor Flow Management Process (VFMP) can be followed maintaining three stage-process of restriction in number of visitor, redistribution of visitor flow in time and space and interpretation in archaeological site (Enseñat-Soberanis et al., 2019). Moreover, an interpretive model can be developed to provide better visitor experience (Ababneh, 2018). According to the archaeologist,

Both tourist and host will be considerate to preserve the invaluable archeological tangible heritage and intangible heritage by the maintenance of carrying capacity and well-planned eco-friendly infrastructural development. It is also suggested that the living archaeological park at Bhitargarh will be model to encourage community to participation for the exploration of archaeological investigation and excavation, to preserve them for the socio-economic development through archaeological heritage tourism in Bangladesh.

4. Conclusions

The outcome of the study concludes that the archaeological significance of the largest fortified settlement in Bangladesh must be exhibited to domestic and international visitors. The introduction of Bhitargarh as an archaeological park will attract more tourists, accelerate economic development of community residents and encourage research and outreach. This archaeology park will motivate different stakeholders including the community residents to serve tourists directly and indirectly. Thus, the scope of active participation in planning and decision making process for micro-heritage tourism development will empower the community and enlighten residents to preserve the tangible and intangible heritage components related to the tangible archaeological site of Bhitargarh uniformly.

References

Ababneh, A. (2018). Tour guides and heritage interpretation: guides' interpretation of the past at the archaeological site of Jarash, Jordan. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, *13*(3), 257–272. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2017.1321003

Alazaizeh, M. M., Ababneh, A., & Jamaliah, M. M. (2020). Preservation vs. use: understanding tourism stakeholders' value perceptions toward Petra Archaeological Park. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, *18*(3), 252–266. https://doi.org/10.1080/14766825.2019.1628243

Alazaizeh, M. M., Hallo, J. C., Backman, S. J., Norman, W. C., & Vogel, M. A. (2016). Crowding standards at Petra Archaeological Park: a comparative study of McKercher's five types of heritage tourists. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, *11*(4), 364–381. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2015.1113977

Darabseh, F. M., Ababneh, A., & Almuhaisen, F. (2017). Assessing Umm el-Jimal's Potential for Heritage Tourism. *Archaeologies*, *13*(3), 460–488. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11759-017-9327-5

Diwan, H. D., Bhadauria, S. S., Kadwe, P., & Sanyal, D. (2021). Geologic- Geomorphic conditions, Archaeological-Architectural heritage structures and conservation of ancient hindu Malhar mud fort Chittisgarh, India. *International Journal of Scientific Development and Research*, *6*(7), 100–108.

Dragouni, M., & Fouseki, K. (2018). Drivers of community participation in heritage tourism planning: an empirical investigation. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, *13*(3), 237–256. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2017.1310214

Enseñat-Soberanis, F., Frausto-Martínez, O., & Gándara-Vázquez, M. (2019). A visitor flow management process for touristified archaeological sites. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, *14*(4), 340–357. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2018.1529179

Fortenberry, B. R. (2021). Heritage justice, conservation, and tourism in the Greater Caribbean. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *29*(2–3), 253–276. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1757684

Ghahramani, L., McArdle, K., & Fatoric, S. (2020). Minority community resilience and cultural heritage preservation: A case study of the gullah geechee community. *Sustainability*, *12*(6), 2266. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12062266

Gibaja, J. F., Remolins, G., Valenzuela, S., Higuera, S., Nieto, A., Palma, O., González, A., Oms, X., Guzmán, V., Cubas, M., Masclans, A., & Mozota, M. (2021). Inclusive archaeology: Scientific outreach among 'forgotten collectives' in the streets of Barcelona (Spain). *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage*, *8*(3), 160–177. https://doi.org/10.1080/20518196.2021.1873539

Hasan, S., Bhowmik, D., & Munne, M. S. (2022). Factors Influencing Tourist Experience : A Case Study of Adinath Temple , Maheshkhali. *International Journal of Science and Business*, *8*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5851005

Heng, P., Phon, K., & Heng, S. (2020). De-exoticizing Cambodia's archaeology through community engagement. *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage*, *7*(3), 198–214. https://doi.org/10.1080/20518196.2020.1767381

Jahan, S. H. (2019). Communities and Micro-Heritage in Bhitargarh, Bangladesh: A Case Study. In *Archaeology, Cultural Heritage Protection and Community Engagement in South Asia* (pp. 17–30). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6237-8

Jha-Thakur, U., Khosravi, F., Quattrone, G., Bandyopadhyay, S., Magedera, I., & Garikipati, S. (2021). Exploring the role of strategic environmental assessment in cultural heritage tourism planning: a case study of the Srirangapatna-Mysore region in India. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, *39*(2), 138–150. https://doi.org/10.1080/14615517.2020.1841595

Lewer, N., Lafortune-bernard, A., & Coningham, R. (2019). *Community Engagement in the Greater Lumbini Area of Nepal: The Micro-Heritage Case Study of Dohani.* Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6237-8

Li, H., & Qian, Z. (2017). Archaeological heritage tourism in China: the case of the Daming Palace from the tourists' perspective. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, *12*(4), 380–393. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2016.1208205

Maner, Ç., & Menteş, A. (2018). An Attempt of Community Archaeology iİvrïz Village: the Role of Archaeological Heritage, During the Process of Rural Regeneration and Heritage Conservation. *TÜBA-AR Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Arkeoloji Dergisi*, *23*, 228–240. https://doi.org/10.22520/tubaar.2018.23.012

Munne, M. S., Hasan, S., & Bhowmik, D. (2021). Second Home Tourism: an Intercession for Rejuvenetion of Tourism Destination in Covid-19 Crisis. *Geojournal of Tourism and Geosites*, *38*(4), 1265–1273. https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.38434-768

Rahal, W. (2020). The preservation of World Archaeological Sites and promotion of touurism: Qala'at Bani Hammad (M'sila) Algeria. *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, *33*(4), 1571–1578. https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.

Rahman, R. U., & Siddiq, A. B. (2021). Inhabiting the World's Largest Tropical Delta: Understanding Human-Environment Relationship from a Century-Long Archaeological Quest in Bangladesh. *Dhaulagiri Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, *15*, 56–64. https://doi.org/10.3126/dsaj.v15i01.41926

Rayhan, M. (2012). Bhitargarh : A Brief description of the archaeological site. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bangladesh*, *57*(1), 41–60.

Shai, I., & Uziel, J. (2016). All for Archaeology and Archaeology for All : The Tel Burna Archaeology Project ' s Approach to Community Archaeology. *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage*, *3*(1), 57–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/20518196.2015.1123887

Suchana, J. J., & Munne, M. S. (2020). Potentials of Community Based Tourism Development : A Study on Maheshkhali, Bangladesh. *International Journal of Science and Business*, *4*(5), 98–104. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3896777

Tsaravopoulos, A., & Fragou, G. (2013). Archaeological Sites as Self-Sustained Resources for Economic Regeneration : Towards the Creation of Living Archaeological Parks on the Islands of Kythera and Antikythera. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, *15*(1), 94–108. https://doi.org/10.1179/1350503313Z.00000000049

van den Dries, M. H. (2014). Community Archaeology in the Netherlands. *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage*, *1*(1), 69–88. https://doi.org/10.1179/2051819613Z.0000000008

Westmont, V. C., & Antelid, A. (2018). The place to be: Community archaeology as a tool for cultural integration. *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage*, *5*(4), 237–249. https://doi.org/10.1080/20518196.2018.1529550

Disclosure Statement

Acknowledgement

Author's Biography:

Manzuma Sharmin Munne, currently working as Lecturer, Dept. of Tourism and Hospitality Management, National University, Bangladesh. She has earned BBA and MBA from Dept. of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Faculty of Business Studies, University of Dhaka and awarded for the academic excellence in BBA from Faculty of Business Studies, University of Dhaka. As an early researcher, her research interest envisions to sustainable tourism, archaeological tourism development, tourist behavior and nature based tourism in Bangladesh.